



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE—Thursday, May 4, 2017

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable DEAN HELLER, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, Father Patrick J. Conroy, the Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, we are astounded by the bountiful flow of Your blessings. We thank You for the gift of this day that we receive from Your generous bounty.

Inspire our lawmakers to use these precious hours and minutes for Your glory. Help them to understand that when they have an awareness of the brevity of their days on Earth, it will provide them with hearts of wisdom.

Bless also and strengthen the many staffers who provide the wind beneath the wings of our leaders.

We pray in Your Holy Name.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 4, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable DEAN HELLER, a Sen-

ator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

HIRE VETS ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 244, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany H.R. 244, a bill to encourage effective, voluntary investments to recruit, employ, and retain men and women who have served in the United States military with annual Federal awards to employers recognizing such efforts, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell amendment No. 210 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 211 (to amendment No. 210), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 212, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 213 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 212), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 214 (to amendment No. 213), of a perfecting nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I will speak in a few minutes about the business before the Senate today, but first I wish to speak about what is happening at the White House today.

President Trump is expected to sign an Executive order to protect religious freedom. Many times during the last year, the President has talked about his commitment and our commitment as a nation to religious freedom, but I expect that today he will lay down, specifically, by Executive order the policy of this administration to protect and to vigorously promote religious liberty—not to vigorously promote religion but to vigorously promote religious liberty.

Reports are that the President will tell the IRS that we can't challenge churches and what they say, as well as challenge their not-for-profit status, simply because of what that pastor or that rabbi or that imam believes in the place where they deliver their message and how they live out their faith. It also tells Federal agencies to stop forcing religious organizations to pay fines if they don't want to cover certain healthcare items that conflict with their faith views.

In fact, just this week, Senator STRANGE and I sent a letter to the Attorney General after we saw that in the Fifth Circuit the Attorney General's office had said that they want 60 more days for all of these pending cases on this very matter. In the letter that Senator STRANGE and I sent to our former colleague, the Attorney General, we just pointed out to him that the President repeatedly said, as a candidate for President, that this sort of continued action of taking religious organizations to court that simply want the ability to practice their faith is going to stop, and we hope it stops and we hope it stops now.

Lastly, I think this order has the potential to be either more specific or to really instruct the Attorney General to look throughout the agencies of government and issue guidance, so that in all of those agencies, as they go about the work that they do, one of the things they want to be sure they are

doing is promoting religious liberty; so that religious organizations that have traditionally or are hoping in the future to be delivery services for adoption, delivery services for addiction, delivery services for other problems that people face, would continue to have the ability to be competing to provide those services.

We know this hasn't happened over the last several months. Religious groups that have had contracts for a long time and the availability to provide those services, even when they scored the highest on the scoring of the competitive bids for these contracts, were not given the contracts because they were faith-based.

Well, if there is any country in the world that has understood the importance of religious liberty, it has been the United States. Religious freedom is the first freedom in the First Amendment to the Constitution, the first right in the Bill of Rights, and I don't believe that is by accident. No other country in the history of the world ever committed itself to religious freedom as our country did from the very first weeks of the government under the Constitution. No country ever held this as a principled tenet of what they would stand for as a country prior to the United States doing that.

We might recall how we come to the place today where the President has to issue an Executive order protecting religious freedom. In 1993, President Clinton signed into law the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. That act really affirmed that the Federal Government shouldn't infringe on individual religious beliefs unless there was an overriding public purpose to do so. If, in fact, it was found to be necessary to infringe on somebody's religious beliefs because of that overriding public purpose—if there was justification that there was one—then we should really only interfere with it in the least intrusive way and we should do the minimum necessary to meet whatever that greater public need might be.

It is unbelievable to me that in recent years, groups like the Little Sisters of the Poor, Christian colleges, or other groups that are traditionally providing services are suddenly finding themselves in court defending who they are and who they hope to be. The order issued today would finally provide that relief in a case like the Little Sisters of the Poor. I looked a few months ago at their stated purpose and it is, for the Little Sisters of the Poor, to receive older people without means, regardless of their faith, and treat them like they were Jesus Christ. Now, that doesn't sound like a group that the Federal Government would have to crack down on. But the Federal Government, in recent years, decided that, in fact, they should force this group to do things that violate its faith principles. There is no possible greater

good to be accomplished by that. Hopefully, this Executive order makes it clear today that harassment of religious groups is going to stop and that the Religious Freedom Restoration Act principles are still principles in our country and, more importantly, that the First Amendment is still a founding principle in our country.

There is no question in the mind of any American, I think, that the U.S. Government should do everything in its power to defend and protect religious freedom. Whether you are a person of faith or a person of no faith at all, you should be able to pursue those beliefs.

When Jefferson was asked in the last year of his Presidency which freedom is most important, he said that the right of conscience is the freedom that we should most vigorously defend—the right to believe what we believe and pursue what we believe. That has been further defined over the years by this: If there are times when that creates a true hazard to others, others have a right to come in and explain that, and the government has a right to see what can be done about that and still maintain in every way possible the essence of belief that people have.

So I commend the President for the action that he is reported to be taking later today. I continue to be not only supportive of the President's view that religious freedom is a critical tenet of who we are, but also I look forward to working with his administration as they further put this Executive order into place throughout the agencies of government.

Mr. President, I also wish to speak for a few minutes while I am here about the bill before the Senate today. I think the fact that we are moving forward with an update on how we spend our money and a prioritization of how we spend our money is incredibly important. I would have been and would be, if somehow we failed to do our job today, very disappointed if we think that the priorities of a year ago have to be the exact same priorities today.

Now, many of them will be the same, but many of them will not. So all of these appropriating committees have worked together, House and Senate, and have come to a process where we will have 12 bills—not debated on the floor as intensively as I would have liked to have seen them debated—that should be our goal for this year—but 12 bills where House Members and Senate Members, Republicans and Democrats, came together and decided what our priorities should be.

The subcommittee that I chair—the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee—dollar-wise, after we take Defense off the table, that is the biggest of the committees and, in some ways, it has the most challenging de-

bates as to where we wind up in these areas, but I think we have made good choices that hopefully can be improved on next year, but I am absolutely confident they are better than last year.

It is really important for the people we work for to understand that we had to make choices. There is very little difference in the money that will be spent this year and the money that was spent last year, but there is a difference in priorities. I think in the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, we have either eliminated or consolidated in a dramatic way 28 programs so that we could find that money and use it for what we now believe to be a better purpose.

One of those better purposes would be an increase for the second year in a row, and the second year in the last 14 years, in health research at the National Institutes of Health. There were 12 years with no increase at all, and now, for 2 back-to-back years, we are trying to get us back to the research buying power we were at 12 years ago. Again, as to the programs that weren't performing, many of them wound up with zero appropriations in both of these last 2 years so that the NIH appropriation could increase.

At a time when we are looking at precision medicine, when we are looking at immunotherapy, when we no longer look at cancer as just cancer and throw everything at it we want to throw at it, in fact, we look at the individual cancer, and we are at that moment because we understand now what we didn't understand a decade ago. We can look at the individual cancer and the individual patient and figure out how that patient has a unique potential to fight that cancer in their body. We looked at things that may not be required for people with cancer and other diseases, and if we can figure out which people need this procedure and which people don't, not only do you not pay for the procedure for people who don't need it, but also people don't go through the physical challenge of procedures they don't need.

As to Alzheimer's, one of the growing concerns in American families today—right up there now with cancer as one of the things that people worry about most as they look to the future—if we could reduce the onset of Alzheimer's by an average of 5 years, we would be spending almost 50 percent less in 2050 than we will be otherwise. In 2050, spending of tax dollars on Alzheimer's care will overwhelm the budget, but research commitments can do something about that.

The Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee bill puts us back, for the school year that begins next fall, where we will be back to year-round Pell. What does that mean? What is year-round Pell as opposed to what we

have now? Right now, we have two semesters where you can qualify for the Pell grant. A Pell grant is given based on income and need. If you qualify for a full Pell—I believe, in the Acting President pro tempore's State and, I know, in my State—there is no community college where full Pell doesn't pay for all tuition, all books, all fees. If you are at the level of need where you qualify for the full Pell grant, you have other things you have to worry about to sustain yourself, but paying for school is not one of them. As an adult going back to school and someone paying for your own school with your own effort, if you are the first person in your family to hope to graduate from school, anything that disrupts whatever pattern you are in minimizes the chances to achieve your goal. So if you have things working in the fall and the spring and you can also stay in a summer term, not only do you get done quicker, but you don't disrupt the pattern you found yourself in.

For 8 years now we haven't had year-round Pell. This vote we will take today allows that to happen, and it will make a big difference. It will also make a difference when you are in a program where you are being prepared to do a job that is uniquely available or available in your community. It is pretty hard to explain why we can do this and we have ways to pay for it through the fall and spring, but by the summer we just have to take a break. That is not a very easy thing to explain to an employer who has come to the community because you have that training potential in your community.

The third major allocation of money that had to come from somewhere else is opioid abuse. This bill will increase by 430 percent our commitment on this issue. It is not because we had 650 million new dollars to spend on opioid abuse. It is because in many places in our country today and in many States in our country, more people die from opioid overdoses than die from car accidents. It is because many families are destroyed by addiction to prescription drugs that leads to other drugs when those prescription drugs can't be available and, frankly, the abuse of prescription drugs, in some cases, where they are available. So we are looking at new ways to deal with pain and looking at new ways to deal with this growing problem.

In 2014 and 2015, each year more than 1,000 people in Missouri died of drug overdoses. In my State and most States, a fire department that also has a first responders unit is three times more likely to respond to a drug overdose than the average fire department to a fire. So there is a third area where this bill prioritizes what needs to be done.

In the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, title I, charter schools, all those things have a new focus as

this bill passes. The mental health initiatives, rural healthcare, and Head Start are all benefited by a reprioritization of what happens here, as are veterans workforce issues and Job Corps issues.

I think this bill is far from perfect, but it is better than the way we are spending our money today and better than we were spending our money a year and a half ago. Hopefully, it will not be quite as good as the way we spend our money starting October 1.

So we need to get this work done and get started immediately doing the business of setting priorities, making difficult choices, and spending people's money in a way that has a long-term plan to benefit them, their families, and our growing economy. I look forward to that vote later today, and then to have, I would hope—as I know the majority leader hopes—a greater effort this year than ever before to get these bills on the floor and to have them fully debated. The best possible thing would be to pass them one at a time and put them on the President's desk one at a time. But the next best thing is to look at the bills and reach individual conclusions about these individual bills. That is what the bill before us today does, and I urge its passage.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

U.S. WANTS TO COMPETE FOR A WORLD EXPO ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 48, H.R. 534.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 534) to require the Secretary of State to take such actions as may be necessary for the United States to rejoin the Bureau of International Expositions, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "U.S. Wants to Compete for a World Expo Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Bureau of International Expositions (BIE) is the organization responsible for gov-

erning World Fairs and International Expositions.

(2) Section 1(a) of Public Law 91-269 (22 U.S.C. 2801(a)) found that "international expositions . . . have a significant impact on the economic growth of the region surrounding the exposition and . . . are important instruments of national policy".

(3) The United States has not been an active member of the BIE since 2001.

(4) State and local governments and private entities in the United States have continued to participate in international expositions held in foreign countries as a means of promoting United States exports and creating jobs, but face significantly higher costs for such participation because the United States is not an active member.

(5) State and local governments and private entities in the United States have expressed interest in an international exposition being hosted in the United States, but the bid of a United States city, region, or State to host an international exposition is unlikely to be successful if the United States is not a member of the BIE.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should rejoin the BIE immediately to promote domestic job creation, global branding, and tourism to the United States; and

(2) the Secretary of State, in partnership with the Secretary of Commerce, State and local governments, and private and non-profit entities, should take all necessary steps to facilitate the timely submission of a request to rejoin the BIE.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State is authorized to take such actions as the Secretary determines necessary for the United States to rejoin and maintain membership in the BIE.

(b) AUTHORIZATION TO ACCEPT PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS.—In addition to funds otherwise available to the Secretary to carry out this section, the Secretary is authorized to accept contributions for such purpose.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary of State shall notify the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Foreign Relations and Appropriations of the Senate upon taking any action under subsection (a).

SEC. 5. CONTINUATION OF PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR WORLD'S FAIR PAVILIONS AND EXHIBITS.

(a) CONTINUATION OF PROHIBITION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to authorize any obligation or expenditure prohibited by section 204 of the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001 (22 U.S.C. 2452b) (relating to limitations on the obligation or expenditure of funds by the Department of State for a United States pavilion or exhibit at an international exposition or world's fair registered by the BIE).

(b) PROHIBITION ON SOLICITATION OF FUNDS.—Section 204(b)(1)(C) of the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001 (22 U.S.C. 2452b(b)(1)(C)) is amended by inserting after "expositions" the following: " , except that no employees of the Department of State may, in their official capacity, solicit funds to pay expenses for a United States pavilion or other major exhibit at any international exposition or world's fair registered by the Bureau of International Expositions".

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read

a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 534), as amended, was passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Minnesota for working with us on this piece of legislation. People sometimes say nothing ever gets done around here on a bipartisan basis, and this proves that is wrong. While that isn't one of the biggest pieces of legislation to come down the pike, it is important because of the importance of the State Department's rejoining the Bureau of International Expositions in order to preserve the possibility, in my case, for Houston's world fair bid to be considered. I know the Senator from Minnesota has a similar interest in her State. So it was a pleasure to work with her on it, and I am happy we are able to see this accomplished today.

HIRE VETS ACT—Continued

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if I may speak on the bill before the Senate, yesterday the House of Representatives passed the Omnibus appropriations bill. Of course, this is the legislation that keeps the Congress and the government up and running through the end of the fiscal year, the end of September. It actually represents the first demonstration of Republicans and Democrats in both Houses of Congress working with the White House in order to pass an important piece of legislation and keep the government up and running through the end of the fiscal year.

Over the last few weeks, we have had many productive conversations and debates about how best to establish our priorities, how much we should spend—particularly my concern about underfunding our military and our national security funding but also to update our priorities because that is one of the things that happens in an appropriations bill. When programs are obsolete or ineffective, there is no way to eliminate them while operating under a continuing resolution. It takes a positive piece of legislation like an appropriations bill—like this appropriations bill—to eliminate those obsolete or no longer effective programs.

I am hopeful that once we pass this bill and after the President signs it, we will continue to plot a course toward a

long-term strategic budget that reflects the priorities of the American people. I firmly believe we were elected to govern, not to shut down the government. In my view, that is an abdication of our responsibilities. I hope we will continue to follow on now after we have been able to accomplish this bipartisan, bicameral negotiation with the White House, and we will continue to govern and to demonstrate our sense of responsibility to the American people for doing just that.

This omnibus package includes a good blueprint for how we can order our priorities and take care of our country.

Yesterday I mentioned the increases in resources to better shore up border security. This is the largest increase in border security funding in 10 years. That is a significant accomplishment. This funding will help the Department of Homeland Security hire more Border Patrol agents and Customs officials to improve the infrastructure at our ports of entry and checkpoints and hire more immigration judges to process more immigration cases.

It also creates funding for our troops fighting abroad and for our military in general and includes a pay raise for our men and women in the military, which is very important as well, particularly in an All-Volunteer military and one that has been stressed by 15 years of continuous conflict around the world.

This bill also takes a more strategic look at the threats we are facing, including resources to shore up technology and equipment that will help our military stay No. 1. After years of putting military improvements and readiness on the back burner, actually cutting defense spending by 20 percent during the two terms of President Obama, this bill is a solid first step toward regaining our readiness and maintaining a capable and modern military.

While I never will doubt the American people responding or our military responding to the needs or the threats to our security, we don't want to be roused out of our complacency by a crisis occurring somewhere in the world, whether it is North Korea, Syria, Ukraine, Crimea, or elsewhere. We want to be ready on day one. Some of that readiness has seriously been called into question by some of our lack of prioritizing defense spending and military readiness generally.

In addition to those two important topics, many across the country have been impacted by severe weather, including violent storms and tornadoes. Of course, Texas has been a part of that sad story. Several in Texas have lost their lives due to these storms and the flooding caused by them. Of course we mourn for those who have lost loved ones and those who have been injured, but we have to do more than just grieve for them—we have to help them as well. This omnibus bill includes

funding for previously approved disaster relief, which will help communities in Texas and throughout the country rebuild and recover following a natural disaster.

This legislation also includes money to help reduce the rape kit backlog. This is a topic which most people are not all that familiar with, but years ago we passed something called the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Reduction Act, named for a heroic woman, Debbie Smith, who championed the use of forensic evidence and the tracing of DNA samples in order to solve sexual assault cases.

The amazing thing about this great technology and DNA testing is that it is enormously powerful. Even as long as 20 years later, we have had rape kits taken out of evidence lockers at law enforcement agencies and tested and come up with a hit on the FBI's database, which is the purpose of the testing. It also has the power to exonerate people who are perhaps falsely accused by excluding them scientifically from the possibility of being the assailant in a given case.

It is very important for us to fund important programs like the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Reduction Act. I know at one point there was an estimate that there were 400,000 untested rape kits in America. The problem was that we didn't really know how many there were because some of them were sitting, as I indicated earlier, in police evidence lockers, and others were sitting in the laboratory and not tested.

The question arose, when the identity of the assailant was known, what purpose could be served by testing the rape kit, which is not inexpensive? What we found is that the assailant, even if identified in the present case, is very likely to have been engaged in a course of conduct or serial assaults, and it helps us solve not only the present case but also other cases as well. Some of them are very old. That is important so that criminals can be brought to justice.

This bill also funds the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA. It funds a Federal study for a Gulf Coast protection project and active-shooter training for first responders—all priorities important to my home State of Texas.

This legislation also represents changes in Washington since November. It is the first major piece of bipartisan legislation negotiated with the new Trump administration. Instead of pushing more regulations and rules that cripple our economy and disregarding the needs of our military and the stark realities of the border, this legislation begins to steer our country in a better direction.

I know that no piece of legislation is perfect, and perhaps the best definition of a negotiation is that both sides are

dissatisfied because nobody gets everything they want. I look forward to voting for this legislation because I believe we were elected last November 8 to govern, not to abdicate those responsibilities or somehow engage in a shutdown narrative, which I don't think serves anyone well, certainly not the American people. I look forward to voting on this legislation and encourage all of our colleagues to do the same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. FLAKE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1039 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Under the previous order, the Senator from Indiana will be recognized for up to 20 minutes.

WORKING FOR THE COMMON GOOD

Mr. YOUNG. Today, Mr. President, I rise to speak from the floor of this proud Chamber for the first time. My message today is, at once, a warning and an invitation.

Dear colleagues, as our Senate increasingly grows more partisan, we move further and further away from the practical governance our Founding Fathers espoused, and so today I would like to talk about the principle of the common good in the hopes that this body might be reminded that is our unifying purpose for serving.

Two Hoosiers exemplify the principle of working for the common good that I believe our Founding Fathers envisioned.

Governor Ed Whitcomb was the 43rd Governor of Indiana. A hero from World War II, he twice escaped capture from the Japanese, making it to safety by swimming through shark-infested waters all night to get to safety. Whitcomb pursued the common good in the midst of a rift in his own Republican Party. He successfully led Indiana in improving our State's highways, mental health services, and creating our State's Higher Education Commission. He bucked his own party's inter-

ests frequently to do what he thought was right for Hoosiers. Governor Whitcomb has been described as Indiana's most amazing Governor. He passed away this past year and in tribute Republicans and Democrats alike acknowledged that he served all Hoosiers well.

Coach John Wooden was born and raised in Indiana, and he learned to coach basketball there before heading to UCLA where he became one of the most successful college basketball coaches of all time. Wooden understood the importance of working together as a team, that working together as a team was better than working as individuals. Wooden acknowledged this principle in saying, "Ten field horses couldn't pull an empty baby carriage if they worked independently of one another." He also said, "If you want to go fast, go alone. But if you want to go far, you need a team."

These two Hoosiers remind us that we are here not to work for ourselves or our parties, but the interest of all Americans for the common good of the American people.

Can we perpetuate our Founders' brilliant system to safeguard our liberties by vesting power in the American people themselves?

Our charge is simple, but it will not be easy: for our republican system to endure, we must breathe life back into the notion of the "common good" through the relentless application of common sense.

Now, I don't profess that Hoosiers have a monopoly on the common good, but rather than allowing ideological labels to guide policymaking decisions, we should instead be guided by what we in Indiana call Hoosier common sense. It is the notion that we should be guided by the facts, and that we are open to change or new ideas, regardless of ideology, when presented with results.

The common good—I happen to know from personal experience that any young boy or girl who grows up in Indiana already has a keen sense of the thing.

I was raised in a place where neighbor cared for neighbor. This is the common good in practice.

I lived among people of character who made others' concerns their own concerns. This is the common good.

I benefited from the selfless contributions of Americans who invested their own time, their own attention, their own resources and talents into helping their fellow Americans. This is the common good.

I came to know rank-and-file citizens who quietly took the initiative to care for the forgotten Hoosiers who needed a hand up. This is the common good.

With respect, my colleagues, I note that this outline of the common good would fully satisfy any ordinary rank-and-file Hoosier, and most ordinary Americans, but sadly, in our modern

politics sometimes our most stubborn partisans resist even the most self-evident truths. Forgive me as I must demonstrate that what works in practice also works in theory.

I will borrow from 18th century political theorist and English statesman Edmund Burke, for he brightly illuminated this notion of a common good. Burke argued that the common good could only exist where rule of law exists. Rule of law, properly understood, requires a shared allegiance by which people entrust their collective destiny to others who can speak and decide in their name. This, said Burke, is a partnership between the living, the unborn, and the dead.

The common good requires individual cooperation and compromise.

Burke noted that individuals are not simply a compendium of human wants and individual happiness is not realized by merely satisfying those wants. Our own happiness is linked to one another's happiness.

Our purpose, then—our duty—in both our private and public capacities, is to preserve a social order which addresses the needs of generations past, present, and future. This is our duty.

In the Marine Corps, I learned something about duty and practice. Marine leaders of every rank teach through the power of their example that every marine has a duty to serve a cause greater than themselves. Marines learn to venerate sacrifice for the greater good. We are trained to refrain from self-indulgent behavior, to check our egos at the door, and to never let ambition interfere with judgment.

For marines, our comrades' lives and our country's future depends on embracing uncomfortable facts and then improvising, adapting, and overcoming those facts together.

Of course, in the marines, there was no red State or blue State. Every marine fights for red, white, and blue. Marines don't have the luxury of stubbornly clinging to false doctrines or failed practices, and neither do we. Every day our men and women who wear the uniform from every branch take up arms "to provide for the common defense"—come what may.

Colleagues, if we are to keep the Republic, we too must remain open to fact-based conversations, to new information, and to new, better approaches.

Now look, I understand that this is not the United States Marine Corps. We have been issued a pen and a microphone, not rifles, but like the marines, we should be working to advance a common mission, common goals. We are the trustees of the common good.

Now, please don't misunderstand me. As a marine, I like a good fight as much as the next guy, but let's resolve whenever possible to fight together because I know most assuredly we are fighting for the same people—and, in most cases, we are fighting for the same ends.

I am fighting for Steve, a self-employed laborer from Indianapolis. Steve's in his fifties, but he hasn't seen his takehome pay increase in decades. Colleagues, you are fighting for Steve, too.

I am fighting for Whitney, a high school student from Gary. Whitney doesn't come from money, and she worries about the future. She is a hard-working student who helps her family how she can through a part-time job, but Whitney doesn't know if she can afford a college education. Colleagues, you are fighting for Whitney, too.

I am fighting for David, an Army helicopter mechanic from Evansville who spent nearly 15 years in uniform. David is exhausted by his countless overseas deployments, and he prays that his family will find relief from the stresses and strains of an overstretched force. Colleagues, you are fighting for David, too.

I am fighting for Carrie, a single mother of three young children from Paoli. Carrie is addicted to opioids. Her aging mother tries to make a bad situation better, but she is fearful the family will not find a way out of the crisis. Colleagues, you are fighting for Carrie, too.

I am fighting for Sherman, a trucker from Fort Wayne. Sherman is quickly approaching retirement. Sherman has put a small nest egg away for retirement, but in a few years, he and his wife will depend on Social Security and Medicare to make ends meet. Colleagues, you are fighting for Sherman, too.

I am fighting for Bob, a single father of two boys from South Bend. Bob's been able to pull together care for himself and his children by piecing together various forms of public assistance. Bob wants a better life for himself and his boys. I hope we are all fighting for Bob—I hope we are fighting for every single American.

Let's resolve to fight for these people. Let's renew our vow to fight for them more than we fight with one other.

Let's come together to grow our economy by simplifying our Tax Code and reducing the burden of Federal regulations. I ask you, colleagues, to join me in supporting the REINS Act, which I championed in the House of Representatives. Let every proposed major regulation come before this body for a vote before it can take effect, then let the American people hold us accountable when those regulations kill jobs and constrain household incomes.

Let's come together to help Americans acquire the skills to meaningfully participate in this 21st century economy. If we cooperate, we can develop new solutions for financing higher education that liberate students from avoidable student debt, like income share agreements. ISAs keep score

with outcomes, so people aren't punished if they are unemployed or have low incomes.

Let's come together to better serve the poor, the vulnerable, those on the margins of society. My social impact partnership bill passed unanimously out of the House last Congress.

This Congress, the Senate should come together to allow private investors to provide operating capital to those social service providers with the proven capacity to achieve measurable improvements in chronic social problems like homelessness and long-term unemployment.

If targeted improvements are achieved, government saves money and repays the project's initial investors, plus a modest return on investment.

Let's come together to restore confidence in our foreign policy and protect our men and women in uniform. While we rebuild our military, let's ensure we are optimizing every instrument of national power. The American people won't tolerate wasteful or ineffective foreign aid expenditures, but they will continue to support investments in smart, effective diplomacy.

Let's work with this administration to reform the State Department and foreign bodies like the United Nations.

Earlier, colleagues, I spoke of a former Republican Governor of Indiana, Ed Whitcomb—but there was another Whitcomb who was Governor, James Whitcomb, a Democrat, who also went on to serve in this body before passing. He also made his mark as Governor, saving the State from insolvency, establishing institutions for the physically and mentally handicapped, and advancing the first system of free public education.

But even more impressive is his dedication to those Hoosiers who fought from Indiana in the Mexican-American War. With Indiana's budget broke and our credit in shambles, Whitcomb took out personal loans to purchase arms and send these Hoosiers out in service of our Nation. Two Whitcombs, one Republican and one Democrat, who served our State and Nation for the common good.

In closing, colleagues, allow me to acknowledge that folks in your States probably feel a lot like those in Indiana: they are frustrated by our failure, and the Federal Government's failure to live up to the high expectations Americans have for other pillars of our public life—our churches, our State governments, and so on. Where good old Hoosier common sense seems to inform work in those areas, in Washington, our common sense is too often crowded out by stale partisan battles and unyielding ideological biases.

Colleagues, our charge, our duty, is to advance the common good by identifying common goals and then using common sense to further advance those goals.

In spite of our principled disagreements, let us disagree without questioning each other's motives; let us work through tough problems. Let us be principled in our beliefs but pragmatic in advancing those beliefs. Let us adapt to new realities. Let us have the courage to change our minds. Let us put results over rhetoric. Let us find practical solutions to pressing challenges. Let us, first and foremost, never forget that we are custodians of the common good.

My fellow Americans, let us rededicate ourselves to remain one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Thank you.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

CONGRATULATING SENATOR YOUNG

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I congratulate Senator YOUNG on his first major speech in the Senate. It was truly inspirational. Our colleagues who are here on the floor have had an opportunity to listen to a very important speech.

I also acknowledge a former Senator who is with us in the Chamber, Richard Lugar of Indiana, who also was an extraordinary representative of the people of Indiana.

I congratulate Senator YOUNG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I also congratulate my colleague from Indiana. He is a terrific partner. The theme of his speech of working together and building on Hoosier common sense couldn't be more important, couldn't be more timely, and couldn't have been presented any better.

I am fortunate to work with such a good partner for our State and for our Nation. Both of us have benefited from the wisdom, the advice, and the counsel of Senator Lugar, who, in our State, has set a benchmark for all of us to aspire to in terms of decency, intelligence, ability, craftsmanship, and leadership.

For a maiden speech, it was an extraordinary effort, a terrific job, and I am proud to be his partner from Indiana.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate will soon vote on the government funding bill the House passed yesterday, and with it, critical resources to address a number of issues facing our country.

As I have noted over the course of this week, the bill includes a number of provisions that are important to our country, and today I would like to take a closer look at the positive impact they can make in the lives of the men and women we represent.

Our country is suffering from a terrible epidemic. Heroin and prescription

opioid abuse is destroying families and communities all across our Nation. On average, overdoses from these drugs claim 91 lives every day—91 lives every day. Drug addiction can even devastate the lives of babies before they are born.

States like mine have been hit particularly hard by this epidemic. I have heard countless stories from Kentuckians who have experienced the heartbreak of addiction firsthand.

Here is one story that a grandmother from Independence, KY, shared with my office: “[M]y granddaughter is growing up without a father due to this evil drug,” she wrote. “Our children are the future of this country and deserve all the help and support we can give them.”

Unfortunately, her story is similar to thousands more all across the land. Grandparents and other family members are increasingly taking care of children when parents fall into addiction. As too many families have experienced, addiction can have long-lasting and damaging effects on children and can be financially challenging for the caregivers.

A mom in Florence, KY, contacted my office about her son who is battling addiction and frequently runs into trouble with the law. “There are so many lives lost and so many more headed in that direction,” she said. “It’s an epidemic, not a crime spree.”

We took decisive action against heroin and opioid abuse last year with the passage of the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act and the 21st Century Cures Act. This bill before us, when we pass it, will provide significant new resources to combat this crisis as well.

These critical funds will go to prevention, treatment, and enforcement programs that can help our communities heal from this scourge and help keep more families from ever knowing the suffering associated with this epidemic.

Look, there is still more work to do to get the opioid crisis under control, but this funding legislation will take another critical step in the right direction. That is why substance abuse treatment organizations support it, including one local group that recently contacted my office in support of the bill. This legislation, in their words, will help “[enhance] the ability of front lines providers to more effectively deploy resources and tackle this epidemic within our communities.”

That is making a positive and meaningful impact in the lives of the men and women we represent.

Healthcare benefits for thousands of retired coal miners were set to expire across the country at the end of this week. Men and women who dedicated their lives to providing an affordable and reliable source of energy to this Nation would have lost their healthcare, many of them when they needed it most.

I have met with retired coal miners numerous times in my office about this issue, including one retiree from Georgetown, KY, who worked as an underground miner for 10 years. He suffers from diabetes and heart disease, and his wife is a breast cancer survivor. “There is no question whether or not we need our health insurance to continue,” he said. “Without it, we would probably lose our home, [which] would be catastrophic not to mention what might happen to our health because we could not afford to get coverage or our medicine.”

These coal miner retirees clearly needed our help, which is why I have been fighting for their healthcare at every step of the way. Today I am proud that this funding legislation includes my proposal to permanently extend healthcare benefits for thousands of retirees across the Nation and in Kentucky. These coal miners and their families can live with the peace of mind they have been looking for. That is making a positive and meaningful impact in the lives of the men and women we represent.

For too long, Federal bureaucrats in Washington imposed one-size-fits-all education policies on our children. Distant bureaucrats dictated nationwide policies, even though the needs of a student in Kentucky are different from of a student in Maine or California. For this reason, we enacted the Every Student Succeeds Act education reform law last Congress, which sends power back to the States, parents, and teachers, and this funding bill will support its implementation, giving our schools the resources they need to prepare our students.

This funding legislation also supports school choice through reauthorization of the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program and through increased Federal funding for charter schools. Both of these school choice provisions will help expand opportunities for parents to send their children to the school that best meets their needs.

In my home State of Kentucky, the increased support for charter schools will be very important, as the new Republican majority in Frankfort recently passed a charter schools law.

Yesterday I met with State Representative Carney and charter school advocates who were key to shepherding this legislation into law down in Kentucky. I thank them for their efforts on behalf of Kentucky’s students and families, and I look forward to working with them to support charter schools in Kentucky going forward.

By funding the implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act and supporting school choice across the country, this legislation will help parents and students achieve strong educational outcomes. That is making a positive and meaningful impact in the lives of the men and women we represent.

Of course, this bill contains other important wins for the country as well. It includes the largest border security funding increase in a decade, allowing our country to better support border security agents, enhance technology, and update critical infrastructure down at the border. It includes important resources to help us begin rebuilding our military, allowing our country to give servicemembers more of the tools that they need, and fund a much needed raise for our men and women in uniform.

On military funding, we broke out of the years-long insistence by our colleagues on the other side that every increase in defense had to be met by an increase on the domestic side. That is no longer the law.

As I have outlined several times this week, this legislation includes other conservative priorities as well. Importantly, it achieves these things while conforming to spending caps and reducing bureaucracy, even consolidating, eliminating, or rescinding funds for over 150 government programs and initiatives.

Because of hard work from both Chambers and both sides of the aisle, we have a funding bill before us that can make many important and positive impacts in the lives of the people we represent. I know I will be supporting it, and I urge colleagues to do the same.

I look forward to its passage so we can send the agreement to President Trump for his signature.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 1:45 p.m. today be equally divided in the usual form and that at 1:45 p.m., the motion to refer with amendment be withdrawn, the motion to concur with amendment be withdrawn, and the Senate vote on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 244.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon the House approved the Omnibus appropriations bill that will fund the government through September. The bill is the result of weeks and weeks of bipartisan, bicameral negotiations, and the final product reflects the give-and-take of those negotiations. Again, I want to thank the

majority leader for all of his hard work and his desire to come to a good agreement, as well as the House leaders and the leadership of the Appropriations Committees. It has proved to many that Washington can work when we work together.

In my view, this is a very good bill for the American people. Not only does it explicitly preclude funding for an unnecessary and ineffective border wall, it excludes over 160 poison pill riders, it increases investments in programs that the middle class relies on, such as medical research, education, and infrastructure.

The National Institutes of Health will get an additional \$2 billion—part of the Cancer Moonshot. Pell grants will be restored for over 1 million students. Infrastructure programs like CDBG and TIGER will get an increase. Programs to combat the terrible scourge of opioid abuse will receive an increase. Clean energy research will receive an increase. Ninety-nine percent of the EPA's budget is protected.

In addition, there is a permanent extension of miners' health benefits, thanks to the hard work of JOE MANCHIN and so many others; funding to shore up Puerto Rico's Medicaid Program and a mechanism to allow the island to restructure its debt; and funding to help States like California, West Virginia, Louisiana, and North Carolina recover from natural disasters. It has a very good increase for NASA, which I will talk about at the end of my remarks before my colleague from Florida speaks about the hard and successful work he has done on the NASA budget.

Of course, the bill doesn't include all of the things we wanted. It doesn't include all of the things our Republican colleagues wanted. That is the nature of compromise. But at the end of the day, this is an agreement which reflects our basic principles, and it is something both Democrats and Republicans should support.

The bill shows how bipartisanship in Congress should work—both parties negotiating in good faith in order to find consensus. It passed in the House with an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 309 votes, and I expect it will receive the Senate's approval later today.

More broadly, I hope this deal provides a blueprint for future budget negotiations between our two parties here in Congress. If the four corners—the Senate and House Democrats and Republicans—work as well on the 2018 budget as we did on the 2017 budget, we will have a product we can be proud of, with no worries about any kind of government shutdown.

TRUMP CARE

Mr. President, on healthcare, as the House plans to vote on their new vision and version of TrumpCare later today, I just want to remind the American people of a few things.

We are now on the second major attempt to pass TrumpCare. While all the focus in the media has been on the changes to the bill, we shouldn't forget the bad things that stay in the underlying bill and what they would mean for millions of Americans.

Under the new bill, as under the old, TrumpCare would mean that premiums go up 20 percent in the first few years. Average costs go up by over \$1,500 a year on the middle class.

It would mean that if you are struggling to make it into the middle class with an income, say, around \$30,000 a year, your costs could go up by \$3 or \$4,000.

It would mean insurers could charge older Americans five times or more the amount charged to younger folks. Even the 1-to-5 ratio, as bad as it was, as much as it raised the hackles of the members of the AARP and senior citizens, the 54- through 64-year-olds throughout America—this bill makes that worse.

It would devastate Medicaid, a program that covers 68 million Americans. That would affect poor people in the inner cities, but it would also affect people in nursing homes, and the young men and women aged 45 to 50 who have parents in nursing homes are going to have to face an awful choice—more money out of their pockets or their parents having to find another place to live.

It would still mean, worst of all, that 24 million fewer Americans will have health insurance.

All those things stay the same. This minor change made by the House at the last minute doesn't change any of those things.

For the same reasons TrumpCare 1 only got the support of 17 percent of the American people, TrumpCare 2 will probably have even less support.

All the while, these cuts end up giving a massive tax break to the wealthiest Americans—those making over \$250,000 a year, multimillionaires, billionaires. Even insurance executives who make over \$500,000 a year will get a tax break, while middle class and older Americans get the short end of the stick. Here we are telling average Americans they are going to get less coverage, they are going to pay more, so we can give the multimillionaires a huge tax break. Who would be for that?

As more and more Americans find out, the vote over there is going to be much less popular even than it is today, and it is very unpopular today, with only 17 percent of Americans liking the bill. It is hard to get lower than that, but I think, as people learn more about this bill, it will get even lower.

The House Republicans have added an amendment that makes the bill even more cruel. It would allow States to opt out of the requirement to cover folks with preexisting conditions for the services they need. God forbid you

have a preexisting condition and live in a State that doesn't keep the requirement. Your only option might be a poorly subsidized high-risk pool where you might be forced to wait in line for virtually unaffordable coverage. Remember the death panels scare tactic used against ObamaCare? They didn't actually exist in ObamaCare, but they might in TrumpCare. These high-risk pools, with long lines and unaffordable coverage, are the real death panels.

That same amendment means an insurance company can charge an older American even more than five times the amount they are charged under the base bill. It would take us back to the days when insurance companies could price sick people out of insurance and drive older Americans to bankruptcy by charging outlandish rates. That is what House Republicans did with the bill to win more votes. It is unfathomable.

We don't even know how large the negative impact of these changes will be because we don't have a CBO score. Does anyone imagine this amendment will result in even more Americans being insured? Does anyone imagine it will provide better coverage for Americans with preexisting conditions? I don't think so.

That explains why Republican colleagues in the House are rushing it through with hardly any debate, no hearings, and no CBO score. They don't want the American people to see this bill. The leaders of the House were panicked that if they didn't pass the bill today, their Members would go home for 2 weeks—they are on recess over in the House—get beaten up by their constituents who hate this bill, and they would back off.

Only 17 percent of Americans approved of TrumpCare. The rest of them packed townhall meetings and public forums to demand that their House Members reject it. They wrote and called, emailed, and contacted Members on social media. Those were the voices of average Americans who stopped the first TrumpCare proposal from even receiving a vote.

Now Republicans are trying to sneak through their second, even worse version of TrumpCare without debate or any analysis of what it would mean for our country. Maybe it raises costs on working Americans even more. Maybe it doubles the amount of uninsured Americans. The House won't know before voting on the bill.

I sincerely hope that if this bill passes—I pray it doesn't—the Senate won't mimic the House and try to rush a bill through without hearings or debate or analysis.

Mr. President, regardless of the process, TrumpCare is a breathtakingly irresponsible piece of legislation that would endanger the health of tens of millions of Americans and break the bank for millions more. I don't know

what my friends in the House would say to their constituents if they vote for this bill.

What would you say to a 56-year-old in your district, who is already struggling to balance the cost of medicine and rent and groceries, when she has to pay more than five times as much in healthcare as someone who is 35 and healthy?

What would you say to the mother in your district whose daughter has cancer and who is worried that if she ever lapses in coverage, the insurance company can raise the rates so high on her family that she couldn't afford to get health insurance for her daughter and would have to watch her suffer? The agony a parent would go through. What do you say to that mother?

I don't know how any of my Republican colleagues here in the Senate when we get this bill and now in the House can explain why they voted to rip away people's healthcare.

If there were a Hippocratic Oath for Congress, "Do no harm," TrumpCare would never come up for a vote. It harms the American people in so many ways. It doesn't have to be this way. Republicans could drop these efforts for repeal, drop these attempts that are undermining our healthcare system and causing insurers to flee the marketplace, and come work with Democrats on improving the healthcare system. Our door is open.

So I would just make one final plea to my Republican friends in the House. I know they rarely listen to Senate leaders, especially Democratic ones, but this is an issue where so much is at stake that I hope they forget party labels at the moment. I ask them to do what representatives should do, something very simple: Think about your constituents. Consult your conscience before you vote for this bill.

I believe if they truly do and consider what every independent expert and medical association is saying about this bill and what it would mean for our healthcare system, they will come to the right conclusion and vote no today.

On one final issue, Mr. President, I see my friend from Florida about to take the floor. I would like to yield to him for a moment, but before I do, I would like to recognize his outstanding efforts in securing additional funding in the appropriations bill for NASA.

NASA had actually been targeted for certain cuts by the Trump administration in their budget that would nix the program to send a mission to Europa, a Moon of Jupiter. Thanks to the advocacy of Senator NELSON, NASA will get an overall increase of \$368 million in the appropriations bill—enough to fund that mission.

I know this issue is near and dear to BILL's heart. As a young Congressman, he was the second sitting Member of Congress and the first Member in the

House to serve on a NASA mission, aboard the space shuttle *Columbia*. He has a passion for and a deep knowledge of our space program. There is no one in the Senate who has done more for it than BILL NELSON. He has worked hard ever since he got to the Senate, and he has had great success.

Once again, he has had a success here today. His constituents in Florida and all Americans should be grateful that BILL is a real leader on both of these issues in our caucus and in the whole Senate.

I yield to my friend, the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

MR. NELSON. Mr. President, many, many thanks to the leader for his kind remarks.

The final bill was negotiated by the big four—the two leaders in the Senate and the two leaders in the House. It was not going to happen this way unless the leaders all agreed, so my profound thanks on behalf of the explorers and the adventurers of the United States—the "can do" little agency, NASA, that is now on its way to Mars.

On behalf of all of the NASA family, I thank the leaders and especially the Democratic leader. A personal thanks for his very kind comments.

Mr. President, we have approached the NASA bill in a bipartisan way. As a matter of fact, I give great credit to both the chairs and the ranking members on the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, as well as on the subcommittee on appropriations in the House that handles NASA appropriations. All of those leaders were absolutely key.

Of course, the same thing is true here in the Senate. As the ranking member, I have the privilege of sharing the leadership with our chairman, JOHN THUNE, on the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. It is that subcommittee's chairman and ranking member, as well as the chairman and ranking member from the subcommittee on the Appropriations Committee, from whom we will hear momentarily—to all of them, I am very grateful.

What it says is that NASA—America's civilian space program—should not be a partisan subject. What it says is that the leaders of NASA should not be partisans. As a matter of fact, they should even be more than bipartisans—they should be nonpartisans. That has been the tradition of NASA's, so like that of the Secretary of Defense. One considers that appointment to be a nonpartisan. So, too, we consider the Administrator of NASA to be a nonpartisan. I think, in this interim, with the Acting Administrator of NASA, that they are conducting themselves in a very significant way in keeping all of the advancements that they have done but that are now to be accelerated with this appropriations bill.

I congratulate the whole NASA team. It has been my argument to the Vice President and to the President that in the selection of the next leader of NASA, they need to do it in a non-partisan way so that we can keep going for this human mission that is going to the planet Mars in the decade of the 2030s.

With the increase in NASA funding, we now stand on the precipice of a new golden age of exploration and discovery. In March of this year, several of us were at the White House when the President signed the NASA authorization bill. What we have worked on for the better part of 2 years keeps NASA on a steady course, with a balanced and ambitious mix of science, technology, and exploration initiatives. Let's not forget that the first "A" in "NASA" is "aeronautics." It keeps all of that moving forward.

This additional \$368 million of funding for NASA gives that little agency the ability to build off of the momentum that is already there. For example, in the White House, the Vice President—and I have commended him both privately and publicly—is bringing about the reestablishment of the National Space Council. I shared with him that all of us look forward to working with him and the Council to develop and carry out the ambitious civil, commercial, and national security space agenda for this country.

The \$19.65 billion appropriation for NASA, coupled with the NASA authorization bill that we already passed a month or two ago, demonstrates our firm commitment to one day putting humans on Mars and permanently expanding our civilization out into the cosmos. We will soon have a regular cadence of missions that will be launching into deep space using the Space Launch System—the largest rocket ever, a third more powerful than the Saturn V rocket that took us to the Moon. Its spacecraft—the *Orion*—and other systems will be assembled and launched, and a lot of that is being done at Florida's Space Coast. The first rockets and spacecraft that will start the journey are being assembled right now at various sites across the country. Right now, the Space Launch System—the SLS rocket, the *Orion* spacecraft that sits on top of it—and the launch infrastructure at Cape Canaveral or, more specifically, the Kennedy Space Center, are all in the most challenging stages of their development.

These complex systems are all very intertwined, and it is vital that we make sure that NASA has the funding flexibility that it needs to address issues as they come up so that they can bring these systems together for the launch in early 2019 of the largest rocket ever.

We have asked NASA to look for new ways to expand commercial space activities in Earth's orbit, and we are

providing NASA with the tools and the direction it needs to expand our commercial space activity. We are right on track to begin launching astronauts to the International Space Station on American rockets, commercially made, and that is going to start next year.

People do not realize—they thought the space shuttle was being shut down in 2011. They thought that was the end of the space program. No. No. All of this is being developed aside from the robotic missions that there have been with the rovers on Mars and all of the pictures of the cosmos. I mean, it is just unbelievable. Next year we are going to replace the Hubble Space Telescope, which has peered back into the beginning of time. We are going to look back almost to the beginning of time with the James Webb Space Telescope.

All of this is strengthening a flourishing U.S. space industry, especially in the areas in which NASA centers are located around the country. What is happening at the Kennedy Space Center is that it is being transformed into a commercial as well as a government spaceport—into a busy civil, military, and commercial spaceport.

This appropriations budget allows us to continue all of this going on at the same time. We are going to put up geowhiz things like the Wide Field Infrared Survey Telescope, as well as additional Mars rovers. The rovers that are up there show that Mars, at one point, was warm and wet. We are going to find out whether there was life there. If there were, was it developed? If there were, was it civilized? If there were, what happened? These are lingering questions as we peer up into the night sky. The funding included in this budget deal moves us ever closer to answering that burning question: Are we alone in the universe? This budget helps us better understand our own planet by funding NASA's Earth Science Program, as well as funding aeronautics and education programs for our youth.

The investments that we as a country make in our space program pay immediate dividends to our quality of life right here on Earth. Of course, the space program creates thousands and thousands of jobs for skilled workers to build machines that help us explore the heavens and jobs for the researchers to understand and interpret what we discover and jobs for the engineers and the entrepreneurs to develop new technologies. These public investments also stimulate complementary investments of private capital and the thousands of jobs that follow from that, and those are companies that will partner with NASA.

Again, I thank our colleagues in both the House and the Senate for their continued support of our space program. In this time when we find ourselves far too divided in our politics, the exploration of space continues to be a pow-

erful force that brings us together into our search as we explore the universe.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I compliment our colleague from Florida on his articulating this powerful vision for humankind, which is the ability to look into the night sky and ponder the mysteries of the universe, the mysteries of life, in the most complete way. America has led this scientific adventure, this scientific journey, and we must continue to be at the lead of this journey for all of the reasons he has laid out today.

I thank my colleague from Florida for leading Congress in pursuing and advocating for this vision and for developing the instruments on the ground and the instruments in space that will advance our knowledge.

EQUALITY ACT

Mr. President, I rise to speak about a different vision, the vision articulated in our Constitution, those first three words of our Constitution, "We the People."

It is this vision of a nation founded on the principle of a government that would serve not the privileged, not the powerful, not the few, not the elite, but serve the entire set of citizenry. Those powerful words were put in supersized font in our Constitution. So from across the room, you might not be able to read the details, but you can read the mission: "We the People"—a government of, by, and for the people, as President Lincoln so eloquently said.

But this vision in the Constitution followed up on the principles articulated in the Declaration of Independence. In 1776, 56 of our Nation's best minds, our best leaders, gathered together in Philadelphia to debate, to work out a document unlike any other in history—a document that changed the course of world history—the Declaration of Independence. It said: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

Together, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution laid out the vision for our grand experiment in democracy, our grand experiment in establishing a democratic republic—a nation, of, by, and for the people, where each and every person is equal, each and every person has the ability to pursue their happiness, to pursue opportunity. We may not have always succeeded, but for centuries, the story of our Nation—the American story—has been one of striving to live up to that promise of a more perfect union, where every citizen is equal, every citizen has opportunity, and every citizen can pursue happiness.

Martin Luther King said in the midst of the civil rights struggle:

Human progress is neither automatic nor inevitable. . . . Every step toward the goal of justice requires sacrifice, suffering, struggle; the tireless exertions and passionate concern of dedicated individuals.

And it is with that type of tireless exertion and passionate concern that we have been on this path toward equality and opportunity for all.

We have made a lot of strides. We have broken down a lot of barriers in overcoming discrimination and in advancing opportunity for one group of Americans after another. For women, for African Americans, for indigenous peoples, for immigrants, for Americans with disabilities, the journey goes on and on. But regardless of how far we have come, it is clear we still have a long way to go.

There are still too many of our friends, too many of our neighbors, too many of our coworkers, our brothers and sisters who don't enjoy the same rights and protections as everyone else. They are members of the LGBTQ community, and they continue to go through every single day confronting discrimination simply because of who they are or whom they love. That is simply not right. There should be no room for that kind of hate, for that kind of discrimination here in the United States of America.

That is why this week I have reintroduced the Equality Act. I have reintroduced it with powerful support from Senator TAMMY BALDWIN and Senator CORY BOOKER, who have really been the leaders who have driven this forward here in the Senate. We have been joined now by 43 additional colleagues, so that is 46 Senators, original cosponsors, in support of this vision of equality. That is a powerful stride from where we were just a few years ago, when we didn't even have an Equality Act to be presented here in the halls of Congress.

We launched this act in partnership with the House, where Congressman DAVID CICILLINE has been the leader, and he has been joined by 194 of his colleagues as original cosponsors.

JOHN LEWIS said during the civil rights struggle: "If not us, then who? If not now, when?" All of us should be called to action in this fight for the fundamental principle of equality, for us to stand up together and declare once and for all that discrimination based on sexuality and gender identity is not welcome in this country. We must make nondiscrimination the law of the land here in the United States of America.

It is certainly true that we have made some progress in recent years. We passed the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr., Hate Crimes Prevention Act, which expanded the definition of a Federal hate crime to include assaults based on sexual identity or gender orientation. We repealed don't ask, don't tell, a policy that banned LGBTQ

soldiers from serving openly in our military for 17 years and that forced more than 13,000 servicemembers out of the military with dishonorable discharges.

What we did was undermine the effectiveness of our military by taking away the enormous talents and skills of those individuals. And 6 years after repealing that policy, our military is stronger for it.

In the Affordable Care Act, we make sure that no one can be denied healthcare because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Then, in 2013, the Supreme Court ruled that the Defense of Marriage Act, which defined marriage as a union between a man and a woman, was unconstitutional, it was discriminatory, it was in fundamental violation of the vision of our Constitution.

Then, in 2015, the Supreme Court found, in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, that love is love, regardless of gender or sexual orientation, and required all States to recognize same-sex marriages and issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples.

One barrier after another—one barrier after another of discrimination, one barrier after another that presented an obstruction to opportunity has fallen in a relatively short period of time, and that is something all of us should celebrate in the vision of equality and opportunity embedded in the vision of our Nation. But we cannot allow ourselves to lose sight of the fact that as much as these have been steps forward, we are still far from ending discrimination to the LGBTQ community here in America.

Today, every State is required to recognize same-sex marriages and issue wedding licenses to same-sex couples. But 30 of those States still do not have a legal framework that ends discrimination. In 30 of those States, the legal framework of the State does not prevent someone from being fired from their job for being gay or lesbian or transitioning; those States do not have a structure which prohibits a same-sex couple to be refused services, to be evicted from an apartment, to be banned from a restaurant, to be denied opportunities to serve on a jury, to be turned away at the door in pursuit of a mortgage.

We hear these stories from individuals. Ask the science teacher who was fired after telling her principal that she and her wife were planning to get pregnant or the same-sex couple that was forced to leave a park after kissing in public or how about the woman who was fired from her job as a security guard in a Savannah hospital, and when she took the hospital to court, she lost under the framework of law in that State.

Or ask the LGBTQ community in Orlando. What we see is that when we have discriminatory laws, a discrimi-

natory legal structure, that engenders discrimination, and the discrimination facilitates and engenders hate, and hate leads to violence. So we saw in Orlando when last summer a crazed gunman attacked those who were at the Pulse Nightclub and took the lives of 49 innocent people.

The States that have no framework are many. They cross our country—Idaho and Montana and Wyoming, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas and Oklahoma, Arizona, Alaska and Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Florida—no legal structure to end this sort of discrimination.

At some point in their lives, approximately two-thirds of all LGBTQ Americans face discrimination because of their sexuality or gender identification. Roughly a quarter of lesbian and gay and bisexual working Americans have lost a promotion because of nothing more than who they are or whom they love. And nearly—in fact, more than a quarter of transgender, working Americans report that in just a single year, they have been fired or not hired or denied advancement.

There is no Federal framework to end discrimination. Today, only 20 States and the District of Columbia have passed laws banning discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in the workplace, in housing, in public accommodations. Another three States have a partial set of protections. But instead of seeing the remaining States that still have a framework that provides for discrimination, we have seen more and more discriminatory legislation—laws like North Carolina's HB2, the so-called bathroom bill, which said that transgender individuals had to use a bathroom that matches their birth certificate and which blocked local jurisdictions from passing antidiscrimination measures to protect LGBTQ citizens; or Senate bill 149 out of South Dakota, signed into law in March, saying that LGBTQ people who want to adopt or foster children can be rejected by State-funded agencies based on the religious beliefs of the agency.

Already this year, there have been more than 100 discriminatory pieces of draft legislation offered in State legislatures across our country.

As long as people in our Nation are afraid to put their spouse's photo on their desk at work, as long as citizens are worried about being evicted from their apartment, as long as Americans can be denied service at a restaurant or a hotel room or kicked out of a public park or denied the right to use a bathroom just for being who they are or for whom they love, we need to keep fighting. We need to keep pushing to end discrimination.

Imagine, if you will, when you open a business in America, the principle, since the 1964 Civil Rights Act, has been that you open the door to all. You don't let in a person with one color of skin and slam the door on the next who has darker skin. You don't let in one gender and slam the door on the other gender. You don't let in one ethnicity and slam the door on the other ethnicity.

These fundamental provisions of equality, where the door is open to each citizen by those who provide services to the public—that is the foundation for each individual to be able to live their life fully, to be able to fully pursue their potential, to fully pursue their opportunity, to fully pursue happiness as envisioned in the Declaration of Independence.

A former Senator of this body, who served here when I was an intern in 1974, who served here in 2009 when I came to the U.S. Senate, Ted Kennedy said: "The promise of America will never be fulfilled as long as justice is denied to even one among us." Yet justice is denied every day—every day—in 30 States across our Nation where the door of discrimination is slammed shut on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals.

We the people in America understand that it is time to stop slamming the door of discrimination shut and open the door to full opportunity and full equality as envisioned in our founding documents. Sixty percent of Americans support same-sex marriages. More than half oppose North Carolina's bathroom bill and other similar bills that discriminate against transgender individuals.

According to one study by the Public Religion Research Institute, more than 70 percent of Americans support comprehensive Federal legislation. Public opinion is in support of moving forward—moving forward to keep the door of opportunity open and to stop slamming the door of discrimination in the face of our citizens. It is time for us to stand up for our fellow citizens, time for us to speak out against this discrimination, time for us to declare once and for all that every American, no matter who they are or whom they love, deserves to live free from fear, free from violence, and free from discrimination. It is time for us to stand with our friends, our neighbors, our coworkers, and our brothers and sisters in the LGBTQ community. It is time for us to move forward and create nondiscrimination legislation based on the same sound foundation that has served so well in regards to addressing discrimination in other parts of our society, and that is the 1964 Civil Rights Act. It is time to consider the Equality Act in the Senate of the United States.

At a time when so much discrimination, so many daily assaults occur on our fellow citizens, shouldn't we be

holding a hearing to have these citizens speak up and share their stories? Shouldn't we be holding a vote to determine whether or not we truly believe in our constitutional vision? Shouldn't we have to confront the fact that we still have discrimination in housing, in employment, in schools, in restaurants, and in theaters? In fact, in every walk of life in America, in 30 States, we still have this discrimination without a legal framework in those States to provide protection.

Under the Equality Act, sexual orientation and gender identity receive the same clear level of protection that race, religion, gender, and ethnicity already enjoy, thanks to the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The Equality Act will help us fulfill the promise of America, as Ted Kennedy presented it, that justice under the law is not complete when it is denied to even one among us.

I am a steadfast believer in our Nation's founding principle that all of us were created equal, that we are "endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." But you don't have liberty if the door of discrimination is slammed in your face when you seek an apartment. You don't have liberty when the ugly face of discrimination blocks you from an opportunity to serve in a job. You don't have pursuit of happiness when you face a discriminatory framework in 30 of our 50 States.

We all ought to have the same freedom to be who we are, to love whom we love, to pursue our lives and careers free of discrimination. I will not rest until that is true for everyone in our country. I say to my colleagues: Let us all not rest until we complete this vision of opportunity and equality for all.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REPUBLICAN HEALTHCARE BILL

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come this morning to talk about the impending passage of a very failed healthcare bill in the House of Representatives and to remind my colleagues that this legislation moving through the House of Representatives is the first time in the 50-plus years of the Medicaid Program that they are going to pass legislation to cap and cost-shift Medicaid costs to States.

This is an \$839 billion cost shift from the Federal government to States and a one-quarter cut to the Federal Medicaid investment over a period of ten years. Some 14 million Americans will

lose Medicaid coverage. These draconian and arbitrary budget caps will leave States with impossible choices to cut people from care, cut provider reimbursements, or reduce benefits. Overall, 24 million Americans will lose their health insurance. That is according to a recent Congressional Budget Office analysis.

Why do I say this is a broken promise? Because it was very clear that, when President Trump was a candidate, he said he was not going to cut Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid.

Why is that important? Because these are trusted programs that have worked cost effectively for so many Americans in giving them access to care. Now is not the time, as we have seen a Medicaid expansion, to now cost-shift Medicaid to the States by breaking this promise and putting in it, for the first time in 50 years, a substantial change to the way Medicaid works. It does represent, in my opinion, a war on Medicaid—one that we cannot afford to wage.

Communities that have benefited from Medicaid expansion have seen the value of coverage and a healthy population. All you have to do is to talk to healthcare providers, hospitals, chambers of commerce, and others to get them to say that, yes, having more people with healthcare coverage in our community has helped us in raising the standard of living.

Why is that? First of all, uncompensated care is no longer put at the hospital's doorstep. Secondly, the population with healthcare coverage is healthier, getting treatment in advance as opposed to waiting for a crisis. It represents an investment in the community that allows a community to stabilize.

These are important issues for us to discuss. I hope my colleagues in the Senate will not fall for this ploy or that they will not go back on promises made by this administration not to cut Medicaid.

There are other aspects of the bill coming over from the House of Representatives, obviously, dealing with preexisting conditions, and we know from our own experience in the State of Washington that high-risk pools have covered only a tiny portion of people with preexisting conditions and are inadequate unless properly funded. As an article from the Seattle Times, from 2009, entitled "Dozens of patients cut from state's high-risk insurance pool" stated: "with premiums that can top \$20,000 a year, patients don't exactly clamor to join the state's high-risk health-insurance pool—a public insurer of last resort for patients with cancer, AIDS and other serious diseases . . ." and "the premiums cover only about 30 percent of the patients' medical and prescription expenses."

There are many things that are working in the Affordable Care Act. We

have done great things on rebalancing; that is, to rebalance people from nursing home care to community-based care.

This chart shows how many States in the United States of America are doing this. This is in the Affordable Care Act. We wrote a provision encouraging States to try to rebalance their population, not encouraging so much nursing home care because it is so expensive, and instead, trying to deliver the long-term care people need in their individual communities.

The great success of this is that many States in the Affordable Care Act took us up on it—States like Nevada, Iowa, Missouri, Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi, Georgia, Kentucky, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and Maine. I saw in our own State, over a 15-year period of time, that we saved roughly \$2.7 billion. That is \$2.7 billion of cost. Instead of paying for a Medicaid population in expensive nursing home settings, we instead innovated and put them into what was a cost-effective delivery system in which people love to stay in their home as they age as opposed to the notion of expensive nursing home care.

I mention that because that \$2.7 billion could be the kind of savings we would see in these States. So I tell my colleagues from the House: Innovate; don't capitate. Don't try to say that you have an ingenious idea on how to take care of healthcare costs by simply capitating, for the first time in 50-plus years, the Medicaid Program and then leaving the States to pick up the bill.

It won't work. Follow the ideas and strategies that are much better in helping us cut costs for an aging population that is living longer, and look for fixes that are already there in the Affordable Care Act to do so.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I note, too, that we are going to be moving today, before we leave here, to what is the Omnibus resolution to keep the government open.

I wanted to mention an important aspect of the legislation we are going to be voting on. Pursuant to provisions in the Customs bill, we are now going to put funding into trade enforcement—a very important aspect of our trade agenda.

We know that more than 96 percent of the world's customers live outside the United States. By some estimates, at least 70 percent of the world's purchasing power is outside the United

States. That means that we need to keep working hard to reach these new markets and these customers. The growing middle class has great purchasing power.

In 2015, the global middle class spent \$33 trillion. By some estimates, the middle class could surpass 4 billion people by the year 2021, making it a majority of the world's population.

Approximately one in three jobs in the State of Washington are tied to international trade. Washington State exported approximately \$80 billion in goods in 2016—from airplanes and coffee to apples and software. I know this about our State: we understand that we are in a global economy and that we have great products to sell in international markets.

Agriculture exports are very important to our State. Agriculture adds about \$51 billion a year to our State's GDP, and the agricultural sector makes up more than 13 percent of our State's economy. In 2016, Washington exported \$15 billion worth of food and agriculture products with \$7 billion being of Washington origin. We are No. 1 in the nation in production of apples, hops, spearmint oil, wrinkled seed peas, concord grapes, sweet cherries, pears, green peas, raspberries for processing, blueberries and aquaculture. We are No. 2 in production of potatoes, certain kinds of grapes, nectarines, apricots, prunes, plums, sweet corn for processing, and a variety of other things.

This is to say that in the State of Washington, we grow a lot for overseas markets. Why am I talking about this important aspect of this bill that is passing to keep our government open today? Because in our State and across our country, we need to encourage more small businesses to export. And we need to make sure we have enforcement of a level playing field so that U.S. companies of all sizes and U.S. workers are protected as they compete in that global economy.

That is why, in the previously passed Customs bill, I created a Trade Enforcement Trust Fund at the Office of U.S. Trade Representative. Now, with this legislation passing today, we are putting \$15 million toward that trust fund to be spent exclusively on enforcing trade agreements. We need to enforce the agreements and make sure Washington and businesses around the country get a fair deal as we work on trade. And \$15 million in the fund would help us fight trade issues we have seen all over the globe.

For example, sometimes people try to sell their products by taking the great labels we have on Washington apples and putting them on foreign apples making them seem like Washington apples, when in reality they are not. This bill gives us money for trade enforcement to address these challenges.

Sometimes we have intellectual property that is hijacked or stolen from companies in our State. This bill puts more enforcement in place to fight those crimes and to make sure we are enforcing our trade agreements. The trust fund gives the framework and workforce to enforce trade laws governing exports to that burgeoning, as I said, growing middle class outside the United States. We must make sure our products are sold and sold correctly and any disputes that are happening are resolved and resolved quickly so our trade with those countries can be cost-effective to our growers, to our manufacturers, and to the workforce within our State.

I am sure every Member here who has companies that have done trade in this global economy can tell you stories of how the lack of trade enforcement has cost them business. This fund is a very positive shot in the arm to our U.S. trade office, so they have the resources to do more enforcement and make sure our products are winning in the overseas markets.

I yield the floor.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, BBEDCA, establishes statutory limits on discretionary spending and allows for various adjustments to those limits, while sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 allow the chairman of the Budget Committee to establish and make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments. The Senate is considering H.R. 244, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017. This measure provides full-year appropriations for Federal Government agencies and contains spending that qualifies for cap adjustments under current statute.

This measure includes \$93,470 million in budget authority that is designated as being for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of BBEDCA. Of that amount, \$76,985 million is for spending in the security category, and \$16,485 million is for non-

security spending. CBO estimates that this budget authority will result in \$41,444 million in outlays in fiscal year 2017.

Division F includes \$6,713 million in nonsecurity discretionary budget authority that is designated as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of BBEDCA. This designation makes the spending associated with this provision and its associated outlays of \$336 million eligible for an adjustment.

This legislation includes language that increases nonsecurity discretionary budget authority by \$1,444 million this year and designates it as emergency funding pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of BBEDCA. CBO estimates this budget authority will result in \$497 million in outlays in fiscal year 2017.

Finally, division H provides \$1,960 in nonsecurity discretionary budget authority for program integrity efforts. This funding is designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(C) and section 251(b)(2)(B) of BBEDCA. CBO estimates that this budget authority will result in \$1,635 million in outlays this year.

As a result of the aforementioned designations, I am revising the budget authority and outlay allocations to the Committee on Appropriations by increasing revised security budget authority by \$76,985 million, revised nonsecurity budget authority by \$26,602 million, and increasing outlays by \$43,912 million in fiscal year 2017. Further, I am increasing the budgetary aggregate for fiscal year 2017 by \$103,161 million in budget authority and outlays by \$43,541 million.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables, which provide details about the adjustment, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REVISION TO BUDGETARY AGGREGATES		
(Pursuant to Sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)		
	\$s in millions	2017
Current Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority		3,226,128
Outlays		3,224,630
Adjustments:		
Budget Authority		103,161
Outlays		43,541
Revised Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority		3,329,289
Outlays		3,268,171

REVISION TO SPENDING ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017		
(Pursuant to Sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)		
	\$s in millions	2017
Current Allocation:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority		557,015
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority		526,951
General Purpose Outlays		1,187,014
Adjustments:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority		76,985
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority		26,602
General Purpose Outlays		43,912

REVISION TO SPENDING ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

(Pursuant to Sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

	\$s in millions					2017
Revised Allocation:						
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority						634,000
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority						553,553
General Purpose Outlays						1,230,926
Memorandum: Detail of Adjustments Made Above	OCO	Program Integrity	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Total	
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	76,985	0	0	0	76,985	
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	16,485	1,960	6,713	1,444	26,602	
General Purpose Outlays	41,444	1,635	336	497	43,912	

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT FOR THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, this explanation reflects the status of negotiations and disposition of issues reached between the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

The explanation shall have the same effect with respect to the implementation of this act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a conference committee. The explanation comprises three parts: an overview of the application of the annex to accompany this statement, unclassified congressional direction, and a section-by-section analysis of the legislative text.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint explanatory statement for the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017 be printed in the RECORD.

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

DIVISION N—INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

The following is the explanation of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

This explanation reflects the status of negotiations and disposition of issues reached between the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (hereinafter, “the Agreement”). The explanation shall have the same effect with respect to the implementation of this Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a conference committee.

The explanation comprises three parts: an overview of the application of the annex to accompany this statement; unclassified congressional direction; and a section-by-section analysis of the legislative text.

PART I: APPLICATION OF THE CLASSIFIED ANNEX

The classified nature of U.S. intelligence activities prevents the congressional intelligence committees from publicly disclosing many details concerning the conclusions and recommendations of the Agreement. Therefore, a classified Schedule of Authorizations and a classified annex have been prepared to describe in detail the scope and intent of the congressional intelligence committees’ actions. The Agreement authorizes the Intelligence Community (IC) to obligate and expend funds not altered or modified by the classified Schedule of Authorizations as requested in the President’s budget, subject to modification under applicable reprogramming procedures.

The classified annex is the result of negotiations between the House Permanent Se-

lect Committee on Intelligence and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. It reconciles the differences between the committees’ respective versions of the bill for the National Intelligence Program (NIP) and the Homeland Security Intelligence Program (HSIP) for Fiscal Year 2017. The Agreement also makes recommendations for the Military Intelligence Program (MIP), and the Information Systems Security Program (ISSP), consistent with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, and provides certain direction for these two programs.

The Agreement supersedes the classified annexes to the reports accompanying: H.R. 5077, as passed by the House on May 24, 2016; H.R. 6393, as passed by the House on November 20, 2016; H.R. 6480, as passed by the House on December 8, 2016; S. 3017, as reported by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on June 6, 2016; and S. 133, as reported by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on January 20, 2017. All references to the House-passed and Senate-reported annexes are solely to identify the heritage of specific provisions.

The classified Schedule of Authorizations is incorporated into the bill pursuant to Section 102. It has the status of law. The classified annex supplements and adds detail to clarify the authorization levels found in the bill and the classified Schedule of Authorizations. The classified annex shall have the same legal force as the report to accompany the bill.

PART II: SELECT UNCLASSIFIED CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION

Managing intelligence community personnel

This Agreement by the congressional intelligence committees accepts the Senate’s recommendations that IC elements should build, develop, and maintain a workforce appropriately balanced among its civilian, military and contractor workforce sectors to meet the missions assigned to it in law and by the president. The Agreement recognizes that the size and shape of the IC’s multi-sector workforce should be based on mission needs, and encourages the IC to adjust its reliance on contractors when appropriate, both as a matter of general policy and as a way to conserve resources. The flexibility afforded in this provision should support this position. In addition, section 103 provides an increase in the number of civilian personnel authorized in the Schedule of Authorizations for the purposes of such contractor conversions in the interim for the remainder of fiscal year 2017. Nothing precludes the Congress from addressing the end strength for any element or office of the IC in the annual authorization bills.

Therefore, the committees direct that the ODNI provide the congressional intelligence committees briefings on the workforce initiative as directed in section 306, beginning July 1, 2017, and each 120 days thereafter until July 1, 2018, with benchmarks and mile-

stones, for IC elements to manage a multi-sector workforce without personnel ceilings starting in fiscal year 2019. The ODNI, in coordination with the IC elements, shall establish a common methodology for collecting and reporting data, and include new exhibits in the annual congressional budget justification books that display full-time equivalents (government civilians, core contractors, non-core contractors, and military personnel), by program, expenditure center and project.

In the absence of authorized position ceiling levels, agencies will be bound to authorized and appropriated personal services funding levels.

Further, the transfer of non-personal services funding in below-threshold reprogramming is a concern to the committees. Therefore, the committees direct agencies to provide a written notification to the committees of any realignment and/or reprogramming of funding between personal services and non-personal services.

Commercial Geospatial Intelligence Strategy

The congressional intelligence committees applaud the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) for issuing its October 2015 Commercial Geospatial Intelligence (GEOINT) Strategy, which states a goal of fostering a “more diverse, resilient, agile, and responsive GEOINT program that provides seamless user access to the best mix of commercial GEOINT . . . to fulfill National System for Geospatial-Intelligence (NSG) and Allied System for Geospatial-Intelligence (ASG) mission needs.” The committees also find merit in the NGA’s “GEOINT Pathfinder” project, which seeks to maximize the use of unclassified and commercially available data sources that can be easily and rapidly shared with a variety of military, United States and allied government, and non-government customers, and supports the project’s continuation and expansion.

The committees further commend the NGA for pursuing new methods of intelligence collection and analysis to inform, complement, and add to its support of warfighter requirements by looking to emerging commercial technology providers, including small satellite companies, which hold the promise of rapid technological innovation and potentially significant future cost savings to the U.S. taxpayer. The committees further encourage the Director of the NGA to ensure sufficient funding is available to acquire new, unclassified sources, including commercial satellite imagery providing unprecedented global persistence, as well as products and services that provide information and context about changes relevant to geospatial intelligence. The committees also encourage the NGA to pursue new business models, including commercial acquisition practices, to enable the NGA’s access to data, products, and services in ways consistent with best commercial practices.

The committees fully support the NGA’s course of action in partnering with the commercial GEOINT industry to meet future

warfighter intelligence requirements, while recognizing the need to take appropriate steps to protect national security, and encourage the Director of the NGA and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence to keep the committees informed of their progress in implementing this strategy. Therefore, this Agreement directs the Department of Defense (DoD), in building future-year budgets, to ensure continued funding is provided for implementation, through at least Fiscal Year 2021, of the Commercial Geospatial Intelligence Strategy issued by the NGA in October 2015.

Space Launch Facilities

The congressional intelligence committees continue to believe it is critical to preserve a variety of launch range capabilities to support national security space missions. Spaceports or launch and range complexes may provide capabilities to reach mid-to-low or polar-to-high inclination orbits. The committees believe an important component of this effort may be state-owned and operated spaceports that are commercially licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration, which leverage non-federal public and private investments to bolster U.S. launch capabilities. Additionally, the committees believe that these facilities may be able to provide additional flexibility and resilience to the Nation's launch infrastructure, especially as the nation considers concepts such as the reconstitution of satellites to address the growing foreign counterspace threat. The committees note recent testimony by the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, General Mark Welsh, who stated,

As we look at this space enterprise and how we do it differently in the future, as we look more at disaggregation, microsats, cube sats, small sats, things that don't have to go from a large launch complex all the time, I think proliferating launch complexes is probably going to be a natural outshoot of this. I think it's commercially viable, it may be a way for companies to get into the launch business who could not afford to get into it or don't see a future in it and for large national security space launches, but I think this has got to be part of the strategy that this whole national team puts together as we look to the future.

Therefore, the Agreement directs the IC, in partnership with the U.S. Air Force, to consider the role and contribution of spaceports or launch and range complexes to our national security space launch capacity, and directs the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Department of Defense and the U.S. Air Force, to brief the congressional intelligence committees on their plans to utilize such facilities within 90 days of enactment of this Act.

National Reconnaissance Office Workforce Optimization Strategy

The congressional intelligence committees have had longstanding interest in, and support for, a permanent government cadre to provide the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) with a stable, expert acquisition workforce. The committees applaud the substantial progress that the NRO has made in the past year in this regard. The committees have parallel interests in providing the IC with flexibility to manage a multi-sector workforce and in continuing the reduction in the reliance on contractors.

Therefore, the Agreement directs the NRO to conduct a workforce review to optimize the mix between government civilians and contractors and report to the committees with a strategy within 90 days of enactment of this Act.

Guidance and reporting requirement regarding interactions between the intelligence community and entertainment industry.

The congressional intelligence committees believe that there are important, valid reasons for elements of the IC to engage with the entertainment industry, among other things to ensure the correction of inaccuracies, demonstrate the IC's commitment to transparency, and to ensure that the IC recruits and retains highly qualified personnel to the fullest extent possible. The committees further believe that IC engagement with the entertainment industry should be conducted in the most cost effective and deliberate fashion possible, while ensuring that classified information is protected from unauthorized disclosure.

These engagements—some of which have been described in partially-declassified inspector general reports—cost taxpayer dollars, raise potential ethics concerns, increase the risk of disclosure of classified information, and consume the time and attention of IC personnel responsible for United States national security. Neither the production of entertainment nor the self-promotion of IC entities are legitimate purposes for these engagements.

Review of the National Intelligence University

The National Intelligence University (NIU) has made significant progress in recent years in its transition from a defense intelligence college to a national intelligence university that provides advanced education in a classified format. Such advanced education is integral to making intelligence a profession with recognized standards for performance and ethics and fostering an integrated IC workforce. While progress has been significant since the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) and Secretary of Defense agreed to redesignate Defense Intelligence Agency's (DIA) National Defense Intelligence College as NIU in 2011, the institution must continue to adapt to functioning as a university with a robust research agenda, and to serving the entire IC, not just elements of DoD.

Fiscal years 2017 and 2018 are of great significance for NIU, as it moves its principal facility to the IC Campus at Bethesda, completes activities associated with its 2018 decennial regional accreditation reaffirmation, and receives a new president. The congressional intelligence committees believe that these developments position NIU to make further progress in its vision to become the center of academic life for the IC.

To guide these next steps, the Agreement directs DIA, in coordination with ODNI and the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, to, no later than 30 days after enactment of this Act, select a five member, external, and independent panel to conduct a review of NIU. The panel shall submit a report detailing the results of such review to the congressional intelligence and defense committees within 180 days of enactment of this Act. The panel should be composed of recognized academics, personnel from other DoD joint professional military education institutions, national security experts, and at least one member of NIU's Board of Visitors.

This review and the resulting report shall, among other things, assess:

(1) Methods for ensuring a student body that is more representative of all IC elements;

(2) Incentives for IC elements to send personnel to NIU to earn a degree or certificate, to include designating attendance at NIU as positions reimbursable by ODNI and requir-

ing IC elements to employ the workforce concept of "float" for personnel enrolled in higher-education programs;

(3) How certificate programs align with NIU's unique value as an institution of advanced intelligence education;

(4) Methods to enhance NIU's research program, to include publication of a journal, hosting of conferences and other collaborative fora, and more formalized relationships with intelligence studies scholars;

(5) Whether and how educational components of other IC elements could provide educational offerings as part of the NIU curriculum;

(6) Potential advantages and risks associated with alternative governance models for NIU, to include moving it under the auspices of ODNI; and

(7) The feasibility and resource constraints of NIU tailoring degree offerings to meet the needs of IC personnel at different stages in their careers, similar to DoD's joint professional military education model.

Cost of living consideration

The congressional intelligence committees are concerned with the high cost of living for military, civilian, and contractor personnel at overseas Combatant Command intelligence centers. Although the committees recognize the benefits of co-locating intelligence analysts with the operational commander, the intelligence centers for both U.S. European Command (USEUCOM) and U.S. Africa Command (USAFRICOM) are located over 600 miles from their Combatant Command headquarters. Combatant Commanders based in the United States regularly communicate with forward deployed units, and the USEUCOM and USAFRICOM intelligence centers have developed mechanisms to effectively employ various teleconferencing and virtual communication tools to ensure collaboration across large distances.

The congressional intelligence committees are concerned that despite the utility of these virtual collaboration tools, DoD has not taken action to reduce the number of intelligence personnel stationed in high cost of living areas. These costs can exceed \$65,000 per person, per year in annual cost of living allowances compared to the continental United States (CONUS) expenses. The additional costs associated with stationing intelligence personnel in high-cost overseas locations detract from other critical intelligence priorities. The committees are further concerned that DoD does not adequately account for the long-run expense of high costs of living when selecting locations for intelligence facilities.

Therefore, the Agreement directs the DIA to evaluate alternate mechanisms for staffing overseas Combatant Command intelligence centers, particularly those that are not co-located with Combatant Command headquarters, and to identify cost-savings opportunities by shifting personnel to lower cost locations, including in the continental United States.

Defense Intelligence Agency education opportunities

DIA presently allows DIA employees to receive pay for a single year only while attending certain graduate degree programs on a full-time basis. Employees may pursue such opportunities at the National Intelligence University and similar institutions; and, in certain circumstances, also at public and private civilian universities. However, the one-year limit discourages DIA personnel from pursuing multi-year graduate degree

programs. Expanding DIA's program to allow highly qualified DIA employees to pursue multi-year graduate degree programs from accredited civilian universities would further improve retention, recruitment, and foster diversity of thought at DIA.

Therefore, the Agreement directs DIA, no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, to:

(1) Provide for and fund a program that allows for DIA employees to attend civilian graduate degree programs for up to two years each, based on the standard length of the relevant program, provided that:

(a) Where DIA deems appropriate, employees may pursue academic programs extending beyond two years. Consistent with current practices, the program should be made available to at least five employees each year, with each employee receiving a full-time salary while participating in the program; and

(b) Each DIA participant shall be subject to any program approvals, service obligations, repayment obligations, and other requirements pertaining to academic programs, as prescribed by applicable laws and policies.

(2) Brief the congressional intelligence committees on the status of the program's implementation.

Mental health prevalence

The congressional intelligence committees are committed to supporting the men and women of the IC, who bravely risk their lives serving their country as civilians in conflict zones and other dangerous locations around the world. These individuals often serve next to their military counterparts in areas of active hostilities. As such, they are often exposed to many of the emotional stresses generally associated with a tour of duty abroad. The committees believe there are deficiencies and inconsistencies in the pre- and post-deployment mental health and wellness services available to civilian employees.

Therefore, the Agreement directs the National Security Agency (NSA), NSA, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and DIA, no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, to provide a joint briefing to the congressional intelligence committees on the mental health screenings and related services that these agencies offer employees, both before and after they deploy to combat zones. Such briefing shall include a description of:

(1) Existing services available;

(2) Agency resources for and analysis of these services, including the frequency of use by employees compared to the total number returning from deployment; and

(3) How agencies with deployed civilian employees are sharing best practices and leveraging services or resources outside their agencies.

Review of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence

It has been more than ten years since the Congress established the position of the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, building on its predecessor, the Director of Central Intelligence. Given this experience and the evolving security environment, the committees believe it appropriate to review the DNI's roles, missions and functions and adapt its authorities, organization and resources as needed.

Therefore, the Agreement directs the President to form an independent, external panel of at least five individuals with significant intelligence and national security ex-

pertise to review ODNI's roles, missions and functions and make recommendations, as needed, regarding its authorities, organization and resources. The panel shall:

(1) Evaluate ODNI's ability to fulfill the responsibilities assigned to it in law given its current scope and structure;

(2) Assess whether any roles and responsibilities currently assigned to the DNI could be more effectively or efficiently executed by other IC components or government agencies outside the IC;

(3) Analyze the personnel, funding, and authorities required for each component of ODNI to perform each of its assigned responsibilities;

(4) Evaluate the organizational structure of ODNI;

(5) Review the size, role, purpose and function of ODNI's mission centers;

(6) Assess the value of the national intelligence manager construct;

(7) Review the size and mix of the ODNI workforce—to include the ratio between cadre and detailees, the balance between government and contractors, and grade structure—to perform its roles, missions and functions; and

(8) Make recommendations regarding the above.

The Agreement directs the President, no later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, to select the individuals who will serve on the external panel and notify the congressional intelligence committees of such selection.

In addition, the Agreement directs the panel, no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, to provide a report on this review to the congressional intelligence committees. This report shall be unclassified, but may contain a classified annex. The Agreement further directs ODNI to reimburse the Executive Office of the President for any costs associated with the review.

Improving pre-publication review

The congressional intelligence committees are concerned that current and former IC personnel have published written material without completing mandatory pre-publication review procedures or have rejected changes required by the review process, resulting in the publication of classified information. The committees are particularly troubled by press reports suggesting that officials are unaware of the existence or scope of pre-publication review requirements.

The committees are also aware of the perception that the pre-publication review process can be unfair, untimely, and unduly onerous—and that these burdens may be at least partially responsible for some individuals "opting out" of the mandatory review process. The committees further understand that IC agencies' pre-publication review mechanisms vary, and that there is no binding, IC-wide guidance on the subject.

The committees believe that all IC personnel must be made aware of pre-publication review requirements and that the review process must yield timely, reasoned, and impartial decisions that are subject to appeal. The committees also believe that efficiencies can be identified by limiting the information subject to pre-publication review, to the fullest extent possible, to only those materials that might reasonably contain or be derived from classified information obtained during the course of an individual's association with the IC. In short, the pre-publication review process should be improved to better incentivize compliance and to ensure that personnel fulfill their commitments.

Therefore, the Agreement directs that, no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the DNI shall issue an IC-wide policy regarding pre-publication review. The DNI shall transmit this policy to the congressional intelligence committees concurrently with its issuance. The policy should require each IC agency to develop and maintain a pre-publication policy that contains, at a minimum, the following elements:

(1) Identification of the individuals subject to pre-publication review requirements ("covered individuals");

(2) Guidance on the types of information that must be submitted for pre-publication review, including works (a) unrelated to an individual's IC employment; or (b) published in cooperation with a third party, e.g.—

(a) Authored jointly by covered individuals and third parties;

(b) Authored by covered individuals but published under the name of a third party; or

(c) Authored by a third party but with substantial input from covered individuals.

(3) Guidance on a process by which covered individuals can participate in pre-publication reviews, and communicate openly and frequently with reviewers;

(4) Requirements for timely responses, as well as reasoned edits and decisions by reviewers;

(5) Requirements for a prompt and transparent appeal process;

(6) Guidelines for the assertion of inter-agency equities in pre-publication review;

(7) A summary of the lawful measures each agency may take to enforce its policy, to include civil and criminal referrals; and

(8) A description of procedures for post-publication review of documents that are alleged or determined to reveal classified information but were not submitted for pre-publication review.

Additionally, the Agreement directs ODNI, no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, to provide to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the adequacy of IC information technology efforts to improve and expedite pre-publication review processes, and the resources needed to ensure that IC elements can meet this direction.

The Agreement further directs the DNI, no later than 270 days after the enactment of this Act, to certify to the congressional intelligence committees that IC elements' pre-publication review policies, non-disclosure agreements, and any other agreements imposing pre-publication review obligations reflect the policy described above.

Student loan debt report

IC components need to be able to recruit talented young professionals. However, the soaring cost of college and post-graduate education in the United States is causing many young people to forgo public service in favor of career opportunities with more competitive pay or loan forgiveness benefits.

Therefore, the Agreement directs ODNI, no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, to provide a report to the congressional intelligence committees on programs that seek to help IC personnel manage student loan debt. The report shall include details about each IC element's program, including loan forgiveness, loan repayment, and financial counseling programs; efforts to inform prospective and current employees about such programs; and the number of employees who use such programs. The report shall also include an analysis of the benefits and drawbacks of creating new programs and expanding existing programs, and shall identify any barriers to the establishment of IC-wide programs.

Workforce development partnership

The congressional intelligence committees have long promoted novel recruiting, hiring, and retention practices, especially with respect to highly expert, highly sought-after Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) students and professionals. Despite these efforts, the IC continues to struggle with meeting STEM recruitment, hiring, and retention goals inside the IC.

The committees are therefore encouraged to learn that the IC is considering new and creative practices in this regard. For example, the committees were intrigued by the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory's (PNNL) budding Workforce Development Partnership with the CIA. Partnerships like this may allow IC agencies to leverage PNNL's robust employee recruiting network and seek out STEM students who might not otherwise consider IC employment.

Similarly, to address concerns that potential hires will accept other job offers while awaiting clearances, NSA has a program to allow interim hires to work on unclassified projects until clearances are adjudicated. In addition, several IC agencies have instituted a unique pay scale for their junior STEM workforce. The committees recognize the benefits of these initiatives, and believes that such efforts could have wider applicability across the IC.

Therefore, the Agreement directs the DNI Chief Human Capital Officer, no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, to provide to the congressional intelligence committees an interagency briefing on new approaches, including outreach and advertising, the IC is considering or conducting to attract a diverse, robust Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math and information technology workforce to meet the increasing demands in the IC.

Distributed Common Ground/Surface System-Army

The congressional intelligence committees believe the Distributed Common Ground/Surface System-Army (DCGS-A) provides operational and tactical commanders with enhanced, state-of-the-art intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) tasking, processing, exploitation, and dissemination capabilities and connectivity to the defense intelligence information enterprise. DCGS-A is a critical tool for enabling military intelligence warfighters to process, fuse, and exploit data. In the past, the Army has struggled to keep pace for pre-deployment and in-theater training for DCGS-A. However, training for military intelligence analysts must be prioritized in the pre-deployment readiness cycle to ensure that those using this intelligence tool can effectively utilize its capabilities.

The Army has fielded over 95 percent of DCGS-A Increment 1 systems, with mixed results and often negative feedback from the users. The Army is in the process of fielding Increment 1, Release 2, which will address many of the initial concerns and deficiencies of Increment 1. The committees remain concerned that the Army has not sufficiently planned for user training in support of the release of Increment 1, Release 2 to operational users.

Therefore, the congressional intelligence committees request that the Army, no later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, submit a plan to the congressional intelligence and defense committees on how the Army will fully incorporate Distributed Common Ground/Surface System-Army (DCGS-A) training into the readiness cycle for Army personnel. The plan should specifi-

cally address any lessons learned from the fielding of DCGS-A Increment 1 and any ongoing corrective actions to improve the roll-out of Increment 1, Release 2.

Common controller for unmanned aircraft systems

The congressional intelligence committees support the Army's efforts to develop a common controller for the RQ-7A/B Shadow and the RQ-11B Raven tactical unmanned aerial vehicles. However, the committees are concerned that the Army is not collaborating with the Marine Corps on similar efforts to develop a ground controller for the Marine Corps family of tactical unmanned aerial systems (UAS), including the RQ-11B Raven, the RQ-12A Wasp, and the RQ-20A Puma.

Therefore, the Agreement requests that the Army and the Marine Corps Intelligence Activity (MCIA), no later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, jointly submit a report to the congressional intelligence and defense committees on the feasibility of developing a common controller for all Brigade and Below unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) airframes, as well as U.S. Marine Corps small unit UAS. The report should address the potential performance and operational benefits of a common controller, anticipated development costs, and anticipated life-cycle cost savings of a common controller.

Review of dual-hatting relationship

The congressional intelligence committees support further evaluation of the dual-hatting of a single individual as both Commander of U.S. Cyber Command (USCYBERCOM) and Director of the National Security Agency (DIRNSA).

Therefore, the Agreement directs the Secretary of Defense, no later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, to provide to the congressional intelligence and defense committees a briefing that reviews and provides an assessment of the dual-hatting of DIRNSA and Commander, USCYBERCOM. This briefing should address:

- (1) Roles and responsibilities, including intelligence authorities, of USCYBERCOM and NSA;
- (2) Assessment of the current impact of the dual-hatting relationship, including advantages and disadvantages;
- (3) Plans and recommendations on courses of action that would be necessary to end the dual-hatting of DIRNSA and Commander, USCYBERCOM, which satisfy Section 1642 of the conference report accompanying S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017;
- (4) Suggested timelines for carrying out such courses of action;
- (5) Recommendations for any changes in law that would be required by the end of dual-batting; and
- (6) Any additional topics as identified by the intelligence and defense committees.

The congressional intelligence committees further believe that a larger organizational review of NSA should be conducted with respect to the eventual termination of the dual-hatting relationship. The congressional intelligence committees seek to promote the efficient and effective execution of NSA's national intelligence mission. Specifically, the congressional intelligence committees believe that the organization of NSA should be examined to account for the evolution of its mission since its establishment, the current structure of the intelligence community, and the fact that the NSA is predominantly funded through the NIP.

Therefore, the Agreement further directs the DNI, no later than 120 days after the en-

actment of this Act, to conduct an assessment and provide a briefing to the congressional intelligence committees on options to better align the structure, budgetary procedures, and oversight of NSA with its national intelligence mission in the event of a termination of the dual-batting relationship. This briefing should include:

- (1) An assessment of the feasibility of transitioning NSA to civilian leadership appointed by the DNI in lieu of military leadership appointed by the Secretary of Defense;
- (2) How NSA could be organizationally separated from DoD if USCYBERCOM were elevated to become a unified combatant command; and
- (3) Any challenges, such as those requiring changes in law, associated with such a separation.

Acquisition security improvement

The congressional intelligence committees remain concerned about supply chain and cybersecurity vulnerabilities in the IC. The committees believe the IC should implement a more comprehensive approach to address these vulnerabilities, particularly during the acquisition process. However, ICD 801, the IC guideline governing the acquisition process, is outdated and must be revised to reflect current risks. In particular, despite issuance of ICD 731, *Supply Chain Risk Management*, in 2013, ICD 801 has not been updated to reflect this policy nor does it include consideration of cybersecurity vulnerabilities and mitigation.

Therefore, the Agreement directs ODNI, no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, to review and consider amendments to Intelligence Community Directive (ICD) 801 to better reflect and anticipate supply chain and cybersecurity risks and threats, as well as to outline policies to mitigate both risks and threats. In particular, the review should examine whether to:

- (1) Expand risk management criteria in the acquisition process to include cyber and supply chain threats;
- (2) Require counterintelligence and security assessments as part of the acquisition and procurement process;
- (3) Propose and adopt new education requirements for acquisition professionals on cyber and supply chain threats; and
- (4) Factor in the cost of cyber and supply chain security.

The Agreement further directs ODNI, no later than 210 days after the enactment of this Act, to provide to the congressional intelligence committees a report describing the review, including ODNI's process for considering amendments to ICD 801, and specifically addressing ODNI's analysis and conclusions with respect to paragraphs (1) through (4) above.

Cyber information sharing and customer feedback

The congressional intelligence committees commend NSA's new policies and procedures to facilitate greater information sharing of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) at the unclassified level.

With the recent enactment of the Cybersecurity Act of 2015, which encourages greater information sharing between private sector stakeholders, as well as with government entities, the committees believe the next step is to ensure the entire IC is working to disseminate timely, actionable information to private sector stakeholders so they can better protect their information technology networks. The vast majority of U.S. networks reside in the private sector, and it is

good governance to ensure that those networks are safe and secure for the general public.

The committees appreciate that the IC has begun efforts to increase unclassified cyber threat sharing. Because an increase in the quantity of reporting does not necessarily indicate effectiveness or usefulness, this Committee continues to monitor the quality of the information distributed.

Therefore, the Agreement directs ODNI, no later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act, to brief the congressional intelligence committees on IC-wide efforts to share more information with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) for further dissemination to the private sector. This briefing shall specifically address types of information shared, metrics on output, tabulation of low output producing agencies, recommendations on how low output agencies can increase sharing, timeliness of information shared, and average total time it takes for information to transit the system.

The Agreement also directs ODNI, in coordination with the DHS Office of Intelligence and Analysis (I&A), to conduct a survey of government and private sector participants of the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center (NCCIC). The survey shall be anonymous, provide an accurate assessment of the usefulness and timeliness of the data received, and determine if customers are satisfied with intelligence briefings on threat actors impacting their specific industry. The Agreement further directs ODNI, no later than one year after the enactment of this Act, to provide to the congressional intelligence and homeland security committees an unclassified report detailing the results of this survey.

Department of Homeland Security utilization of National Labs expertise

The congressional intelligence committees believe that the Department of Energy (DOE) National Labs represent a unique and invaluable resource for the government and the IC in particular.

Therefore, the Agreement directs, no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, DHS I&A, in coordination with DOE Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence (DOE-IN), to provide to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the current utilization of Department of Energy (DOE) National Labs expertise by DHS I&A. This report should address opportunities to increase DHS I&A's utilization of cybersecurity expertise of the National Labs as well as the budgetary implications of taking advantage of these potential opportunities.

Cybersecurity courses for Centers of Academic Excellence

The congressional intelligence committees are concerned by a recent analysis from a security firm, which determined that not one of the nation's leading undergraduate computer science programs requires students to take a cybersecurity course before graduating. Cybersecurity depends on IC professionals having a strong understanding of the cyber threat and how to mitigate it—which in turn requires a strong academic background. NSA and DHS cosponsor the Centers of Academic Excellence (CAE) in Cyber Defense program, which includes an emphasis on basic cybersecurity. Nevertheless, even some CAE-designated institutions lack cybersecurity course prerequisites in their computer science curricula.

Therefore, the Agreement directs ODNI, no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, to submit to the congressional in-

telligence committees a report on improving cybersecurity training within NIP-funded undergraduate and graduate computer science programs. The report should specifically address:

(1) The potential advantages and disadvantages of conditioning an institution's receipt of such funds on its computer science program's requiring cybersecurity as a precondition to graduation;

(2) How Centers of Academic Excellence programs might bolster cybersecurity educational requirements; and

(3) Recommendations to support the goal of ensuring that federally-funded computer science programs properly equip students to confront future cybersecurity challenges.

PART III: SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION OF LEGISLATIVE TEXT

The following is a section-by-section analysis and explanation of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Section 101. Authorization of appropriations

Section 101 lists the United States Government departments, agencies, and other elements for which the Act authorizes appropriations for intelligence and intelligence-related activities for Fiscal Year 2017.

Section 102. Classified Schedule of Authorizations

Section 102 provides that the details of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for intelligence and intelligence-related activities and the applicable personnel levels by program for Fiscal Year 2017 are contained in the classified Schedule of Authorizations and that the classified Schedule of Authorizations shall be made available to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the President.

Section 103. Personnel ceiling adjustments

Section 103 provides that the DNI may authorize employment of civilian personnel in Fiscal Year 2017 in excess of the number of authorized positions by an amount not exceeding three percent of the total limit applicable to each IC element under Section 102, and ten percent of the number of civilian personnel authorized under such schedule for the purposes of contractor conversions. The DNI may do so only if necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions.

Section 104. Intelligence Community Management Account

Section 104 authorizes appropriations for the Intelligence Community Management Account (ICMA) of the DNI and sets the authorized personnel levels for the elements within the ICMA for Fiscal Year 2017.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Section 201. Authorization of appropriations

Section 201 authorizes appropriations in the amount of \$514,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2017 for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund.

TITLE III—GENERAL INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MATTERS

Section 301. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities

Section 301 provides that the authorization of appropriations by the Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity that is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

Section 302. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law

Section 302 provides that funds authorized to be appropriated by the Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in compensation or benefits authorized by law.

Section 303. Support to nonprofit organizations assisting intelligence community employees

Section 303 permits the DNI to engage in fundraising in an official capacity for the benefit of nonprofit organizations that provide support to surviving family members of a deceased employee of an element of the IC or otherwise provide support for the welfare, education, or recreation of IC employees, former employees, or their family members. Section 303 requires the DNI to issue regulations ensuring that the fundraising authority is exercised consistent with all relevant ethical limitations and principles. Section 303 further requires that the DNI and the Director of the CIA notify the congressional intelligence committees within seven days after they engage in such fundraising.

Section 304. Promotion of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education in the intelligence community

Section 304 requires the DNI to submit a five-year investment strategy for outreach and recruiting efforts in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), to include cybersecurity and computer literacy. Section 304 further requires elements of the IC to submit STEM investment plans supporting this strategy for each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022, along with the materials justifying the budget request of each element for these STEM recruiting and outreach activities.

Section 305. Retention of employees of the intelligence community who have science, technology, engineering, or mathematics expertise

Section 305 authorizes a new payscale to permit salary increases for employees in the IC with STEM backgrounds. Section 305 also requires notifications to individual employees if a position is removed from this new payscale. Section 305 further requires the head of each IC element to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the new rates of pay and number of positions authorized under this payscale.

Section 306. Management of intelligence community personnel

Section 306 prohibits the Congress's use of government personnel ceilings in the management of the IC workforce starting in Fiscal Year 2019. Section 306 requires the DNI to provide briefings on the IC's initiative to maintain both employees and contractors within the IC, as well as both a briefing and a report on the methodology, cost analysis tool, and implementation plans. Section 306 further requires the IC IG to provide a written report on the accuracy of IC workforce data. This section will align the IC's management of personnel consistent with the practices of the Department of Defense and other federal agencies.

Section 307. Modifications to certain requirements for construction of facilities

Section 307 clarifies that the requirement to notify the congressional intelligence committees of improvement projects with an estimated cost greater than \$1,000,000 for facilities used primarily by IC personnel includes repairs and modifications.

Section 308. Guidance and reporting requirements regarding interactions between the intelligence community and entertainment industry

Section 308 requires the DNI to issue public guidance regarding engagements by elements of the Intelligence Community with entertainment industry entities. The guidance will include DNI providing an annual report to the congressional intelligence committees detailing interactions between the IC and the entertainment industry. Section 308 also requires the report to include a description of the nature, duration, costs, benefits, and results of each engagement, as well as a determination that each engagement did not result in a disclosure of classified information and whether any information was declassified for the disclosure. Section 308 further requires that before an IC element may engage with the entertainment industry, the head of that element must approve the proposed engagement. Contractual relationships for professional services and technical expertise are exempt from these reporting requirements.

Section 309. Protections for independent inspectors general of elements of the intelligence community

Section 309 requires the ODNI to develop and implement a uniform policy for each identified Inspector General (IG) office in the IC to better ensure their independence. The provision specifies elements to be incorporated in such a policy including (a) guidance regarding conflicts of interest, (b) standards to ensure independence, and (c) a waiver provision. Section 309 further prohibits the DNI from requiring an employee of an OIG to rotate to a position in the element for which such office conducts oversight.

Section 310. Congressional oversight of policy directives and guidance

Section 310 requires the DNI to submit to the congressional intelligence committees notifications and copies of any classified or unclassified Presidential Policy Directive, Presidential Policy Guidance, or other similar policy document issued by the President which assigns tasks, roles, or responsibilities to the IC, within the specified timeframes. Section 310 further requires the Director to notify the congressional intelligence committees of guidance to implement such policies.

Section 311. Notification of memoranda of understanding

Section 311 requires the head of each element of the IC to submit to the congressional intelligence committees copies of each memorandum of understanding or other agreement regarding significant operational activities or policy entered into between or among such element and any other entity or entities of the federal government within specified timeframes.

Section 311 does not require an IC element to submit to the congressional intelligence committees any memorandum or agreement that is solely administrative in nature, including a memorandum or agreement regarding joint duty or other routine personnel assignments. An IC element also may redact any personally identifiable information from a memorandum or agreement which must be submitted to the intelligence committees.

Section 312. Technical correction to Executive Schedule

Section 312 contains a technical correction regarding the annual rate of basic pay for the Director of the National Counter Proliferation Center.

Section 313. Maximum amount charged for declassification reviews

Section 313 prohibits the head of an element of the IC from charging reproduction fees for a mandatory declassification review in excess of reproduction fees that the head would charge for a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). It also permits agency heads to waive processing fees for declassification reviews in the same manner as for FOIA.

TITLE IV—MATTERS RELATING TO ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Subtitle A—Office of the Director of National Intelligence

Section 401. Designation of the Director of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center

Section 401 renames the National Counterintelligence Executive as the “National Counterintelligence and Security Center,” with conforming amendments.

Section 402. Analyses and impact statements by Director of National Intelligence regarding proposed investment into the United States

Section 402 directs the DNI to submit to the congressional intelligence committees, after the completion of a review or an investigation of any proposed investment into the United States, any analytic materials prepared by the DNI. This requirement includes, but is not limited to, national security threat assessments provided to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) in connection with national security reviews and investigations conducted by CFIUS pursuant to Section 721(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. §4565). This section is not intended to limit the ability of the DNI to transmit supplementary materials to the congressional intelligence committees along with the threat assessments.

Section 402 also directs the DNI to provide the committees with impact statements when the DNI determines a proposed investment into the United States will have an operational impact on the IC.

Section 403. Assistance for governmental entities and private entities in recognizing online violent extremist content

Section 403 requires the DNI to publish on a publicly available Internet website a list of all logos, symbols, insignia, and other markings commonly associated with, or adopted by, State Department-designated foreign terrorist organizations.

Subtitle B—Central Intelligence Agency

Section 411. Enhanced death benefits for personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency

Section 411 authorizes the Director of the CIA to pay death benefits substantially similar to those authorized for members of the Foreign Service, and requires the Director to submit implementing regulations to the congressional intelligence committees.

Section 412. Pay and retirement authorities of the Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency

Section 412 amends the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 to authorize the IG of the CIA to consider certain positions as law enforcement officers for purposes of calculating retirement eligibility and entitlements under chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code, if such officer or employee is appointed to a position with responsibility for investigating suspected offenses against the criminal laws of the United States. Section 412 may not be con-

strued to confer on the IG of the CIA, or any other officer or employee of the CIA, any police or law enforcement or internal security functions or authorities.

Subtitle C—Other Elements

Section 421. Enhancing the technical workforce for the Federal Bureau of Investigation

Section 421 requires the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to produce a comprehensive strategic workforce report to demonstrate progress in expanding initiatives to effectively integrate information technology expertise in the investigative process. Section 421 further requires the report to include: (1) progress on training, recruitment, and retention of cyber-related personnel; (2) an assessment of whether FBI officers with these skill sets are fully integrated in the FBI's workforce; (3) the FBI's collaboration with the private sector on cyber issues; and (4) an assessment of the utility of reinstituting and leveraging the FBI Director's Advisory Board.

Section 422. Plan on assumption of certain weather missions by the National Reconnaissance Office

Section 422 requires the Director of the NRO to develop a plan to carry out certain space-based environmental monitoring missions currently performed by the Air Force. It also authorizes certain pre-acquisition activities and directs that an independent cost estimate be submitted to the congressional intelligence and defense committees. The Director of NRO may waive the requirement of Section 422 if the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, jointly submit a certification to the congressional intelligence and defense committees.

TITLE V—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Section 501. Committee to counter active measures by the Russian Federation to exert covert influence over peoples and governments

Nothing in this section shall authorize the Committee to take action with regard to activities protected by the First Amendment. Section 501 requires the President to establish an interagency committee to counter active measures by the Russian Federation that constitute Russian actions to exert covert influence over peoples and governments.

Section 502. Limitation on travel of accredited diplomats of the Russian Federation in the United States from their diplomatic post

Section 502 requires the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Director of the FBI and the DNI, to establish an advance notification regime governing all Russian Federation accredited diplomatic and consular personnel in the United States, as well as to take action to secure compliance and address noncompliance with the notification requirement. Section 502 also requires the Secretary of State, the Director of the FBI, and the DNI to develop written mechanisms to share such travel information and address noncompliance. Section 502 further requires written reporting to the specified committees detailing the number of notifications, and the number of known or suspected violations of such personnel requirements.

Section 503. Study and report on enhanced intelligence and information sharing with Open Skies Treaty member states

Section 503 requires the DNI, with support of other federal agencies, to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of creating an intelligence sharing arrangement and database among parties to the Open Skies Treaty

(OST) with higher frequency, quality, and efficiency than that currently provided by the parameters of the OST. Section 503 also requires the Director to issue a report that includes an intelligence assessment on Russian Federation warfighting doctrine, the extent to which Russian Federation flights under the Open Skies Treaty contribute to the warfighting doctrine, a counterintelligence analysis as to the Russian Federation's capabilities, and a list of the covered parties that have been updated with this information.

TITLE VI—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 601. Declassification review of information on Guantanamo detainees and mitigation measures taken to monitor the individuals and prevent future attacks

Section 601 requires the DNI to complete a declassification review of intelligence reports prepared by the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) on the past terrorist activities of each Guantanamo detainee, for a detainee's Periodic Review Board (PRB) sessions, transfer, or release from Guantanamo. To the extent a transfer or release preceded the PRB's establishment, or the NCTC's preparation of intelligence reports, Section 601 requires the DNI to conduct a declassification review of intelligence reports containing the same or similar information as the intelligence reports prepared by the NCTC for PRB sessions, transfers, or releases.

Section 601 further requires the President to make any declassified intelligence reports publicly available, including unclassified summaries of measures being taken by the transferee countries to monitor the individual and prevent future terrorist activities. Section 601 requires the DNI to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report setting forth the results of the declassification review, including a description of covered reports that were not declassified. Section 601 also sets the schedule for such reviews and further defines past terrorist activities to include terrorist organization affiliations, terrorist training, role in terrorist attacks, responsibility for the death of United States citizens or members of the Armed Forces, any admission thereof, and a description of the intelligence supporting the past terrorist activities, including corroboration, confidence level, and any dissent or reassessment by the IC.

Section 602. Cyber Center for Education and Innovation Home of the National Cryptologic Museum

Section 602 amends 10 U.S.C. § 449 to enable the establishment of a Cyber Center for Education and Innovation-Home of the National Cryptologic Museum (the "Center"). Section 602 also establishes in the Treasury a fund for the benefit and operation of the Center.

Section 603. Report on national security systems

Section 603 requires the Director of the National Security Agency, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on national security systems.

Section 604. Joint facilities certification

Section 604 requires that before an element of the IC purchases, leases, or constructs a new facility that is 20,000 square feet or larger, the head of that element must first certify that all prospective joint facilities have been considered, that it is unable to identify a joint facility that meets its operational requirements, and it must list the reasons for not participating in joint facilities in that instance.

Section 605. Leadership and management of space activities

Section 605 requires the DNI, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to issue an update to the strategy for a comprehensive review of the United States national security overhead satellite architecture required in the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. Section 605 requires the DNI, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to submit a plan to functionally integrate the IC's governance, operations, analysis, collection, policy, and acquisition activities related to space and counterspace. The congressional intelligence committees believe the current fragmented arrangement across the IC does not provide sufficient coherence to meet the threat, fosters duplication, hinders integrated congressional oversight, and impedes effective alignment with the Department of Defense space activities. Section 605 also requires the DNI to submit a workforce plan for space and counterspace operations, policy, and acquisition. Section 605 further requires the Director of the NRO and the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command to submit a concept of operations and requirements documents for the Joint Interagency Combined Space Operations Center, and to conduct quarterly update briefings.

Section 606. Advances in life sciences and biotechnology

The congressional intelligence committees recognize the rapid advancements in the life sciences and biotechnology and firmly believes that biology in the twenty-first century will transform the world as physics did in the twentieth century. The potential risks associated with these advancements are less clear. The posture of the IC to follow and predict this rapidly changing landscape is a matter of concern recognizing the global diffusion and dual-use nature of life sciences and biotechnology along with the dispersed responsibility of the life sciences related issues across several National Intelligence Officer portfolios.

Section 606 requires the DNI to brief the congressional intelligence committees and the congressional defense committees on a proposed plan and actions to monitor advances in life sciences and biotechnology to be carried out by the DNI. The Director's plan should include, first, a description of the IC's approach to leverage the organic life science and biotechnology expertise both within and outside the Intelligence Community; second, an assessment of the current life sciences and biotechnology portfolio, the risks of genetic editing technologies, and the implications of these advances on future bio-defense requirements; and, third, an analysis of organizational requirements and responsibilities to include potentially creating new positions. Section 606 further requires the DNI to submit a written report and provide a briefing to the congressional intelligence committees and the congressional defense committees on the role of the IC in the event of a biological attack, including a technical capabilities assessment to address potential unknown pathogens.

Section 607. Reports on declassification proposals

Section 607 requires the DNI to provide the congressional intelligence committees with a report and briefing on the IC's progress in producing four feasibility studies undertaken in the course of the IC's fundamental classification guidance review, as required under Executive Order 13526. Section 607 fur-

ther requires the Director to provide the congressional intelligence committees with a briefing, interim report, and final report on the final feasibility studies produced by elements of the IC and an implementation plan for each initiative.

Section 608. Improvement in government classification and declassification

Section 608 assesses government classification and declassification in a digital era by requiring the DNI to review the system by which the Government classifies and declassifies national security information to improve the protection of such information, enable information sharing with allies and partners, and support appropriate declassification. Section 608 requires the DNI to submit a report with its findings and recommendations to the congressional intelligence committees. Section 608 further requires the DNI to provide an annual written notification to the congressional intelligence committees on the creation, validation, or substantial modification (to include termination) of existing and proposed controlled access programs, and the compartments and subcompartments within each. This certification shall include the rationale for each controlled access program, compartment, or subcompartment and how each controlled access program is being protected.

Section 609. Report on implementation of research and development recommendations

Section 609 requires the DNI to conduct and provide to the congressional intelligence committees a current assessment of the IC's implementation of the recommendations issued in 2013 by the National Commission for the Review of the Research and Development (R&D) Programs of the IC.

Section 610. Report on Intelligence Community Research and Development Corps

Section 610 requires the DNI to develop and brief the congressional intelligence committees on a plan, with milestones and benchmarks, to implement a R&D Reserve Corps, as recommended in 2013 by the bipartisan National Commission for the Review of the R&D Programs of the IC, including any funding and potential changes to existing authorities that may be needed to allow for the Corps' implementation.

Section 611. Report on information relating to academic programs, scholarships, fellowships, and internships sponsored, administered, or used by the intelligence community

Section 611 requires the DNI to submit to congressional intelligence committees a report on information that the IC collects on certain academic programs, scholarships, and internships sponsored, administered, or used by the IC.

Section 612. Report on intelligence community employees detailed to National Security Council

Section 612 requires the DNI to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a classified written report listing, by year, the number of employees of an element of the IC who have been detailed to the National Security Council during each of the previous ten years.

Section 613. Intelligence community reporting to Congress on foreign fighter flows

Section 613 directs DNI to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on foreign fighter flows to and from terrorist safe havens abroad.

Section 614. Report on cybersecurity threats to seaports of the United States and maritime shipping

Section 614 directs the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and

Analysis (I&A) to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the cybersecurity threats to seaports of the United States and maritime shipping.

Section 615. Report on reprisals against contractors of the intelligence community

Section 615 directs the IC IG to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on known or claimed reprisals made against employees of contractors of elements of the IC during the preceding three-year period. Section 615 further requires the report to include an evaluation of the usefulness of establishing a prohibition on reprisals as a means of encouraging IC contractors to make protected disclosures, and any recommendations the IC IG deems appropriate.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I support the Omnibus appropriations bill before us today. While this bill is not perfect, it is a strong statement of priorities, especially in light of the misguided and dangerous cuts that President Trump proposed for fiscal year 2018.

As a new member of the Appropriations Committee, I thank the chairman and vice chairman and their staffs for their thoughtful work on this bill and their careful consideration of Senators' requests and priorities.

This bill contains many critical investments for my home State of Maryland, including maintenance for the Port of Baltimore, millions for the Chesapeake Bay Program and other programs that support Bay clean-up, a \$6 million increase for the Appalachian Regional Commission, \$125 million for the Purple Line, and full funding for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. The bill also contains a critical down payment for the consolidation of the FBI headquarters and a commitment to full funding in fiscal year 2018. Prince George's County, MD, is home to two of the sites in contention to house the headquarters and the FBI's nearly 11,000 employees.

While President Trump as proposed cuts to medical research at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, MD, this omnibus bill increases funding by \$2 billion to find new cures and treatments. The bill continues critical NASA missions that are being worked on in Maryland, including the PACE Program, earth science, and the James Webb Space Telescope, the successor to the Hubble Space Telescope. While the bill cuts the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, it does so less than what the Trump administration has proposed, and it continues funding for the Joint Polar Satellite System weather satellite program and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite Program, which will help improve weather forecasting and warn about natural disasters. There is also important funding for oceanic and atmospheric research and the Sea Grant program, which has been a partner in Chesapeake Bay restoration. The bill slightly increases National Science Foundation funding and supports critical energy research at the

Department of Energy. While funding for the National Institute of Standards and Technology received a small cut, the final funding level is higher than what the House of Representatives initially proposed, and the bill includes support for the National Network for Manufacturing Innovation.

We were also able to preserve funding in this bill that communities across Maryland use to support economic development, affordable housing, and safety. That includes the Community Development Block Grant, TIGER transportation grants, housing vouchers and housing capital funds, the HOME Partnership Program, Community Oriented Policing grants, and SAFER and FIRE grants for firefighters. I am pleased that this bill includes investments to improve relationships between communities and police, which will be helpful as Baltimore works to implement its consent decree. We also included critical funding for afterschool programs and community schools, preserved funding for workforce training and Pell grants, and will finally allow students to access Pell year-round so that they can finish school more quickly.

As with any compromise, this bill is not perfect. As this is the first appropriations bill since the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act, I would have liked it to include greater investments in funding for title I, special education, teacher professional development, and student support and academic enrichment grants. The bill also continues a few riders that interfere in the District of Columbia's ability to use its funds as it sees fit.

Finally, the bill is notable for the things that it does not include. Congress has rejected draconian cuts to the Environmental Protection Agency and the State Department. There is important funding for border security, but not for a wasteful and ineffective border wall. In addition, Democrats successfully blocked many poison-pill riders from the bill that would have harmed our environment, banned funding for Planned Parenthood and other women's health programs, and rolled back important consumer protections. With the passage of the omnibus bill, we will avoid a dangerous government shutdown. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. CANTWELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that if the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 244 is agreed to, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 53, an enrollment correction to H.R. 244, that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I have come to the floor this afternoon to speak on the Omnibus appropriations bill that is now before the Senate. We will have an opportunity to vote on that very shortly here.

I would like to take a few moments to explain why I intend to support this legislative measure. I support this bill because I think it is good for the country, and I believe it is good for my State of Alaska.

I think what we have seen through this appropriations process is a negotiated bill going back and forth between both sides, between both bodies, and it is a bill that funds the Federal Government through the end of this fiscal year. It is far from perfect. I think we recognize that, but it is tough to find legislation anywhere where we are all going to be in agreement that it has everything each of us wants. I do believe it is a solid bill. It is a solid, bipartisan effort, and I would urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The first thing it does is it prevents the government from shutting down. Simply put, there are very few things in my mind that would warrant a government shutdown. The people of this country expect us to govern. They don't expect us to come to work and say we are going to shut it down. They expect us to figure out how we are going to fund it, to keep it open, and to do so in a responsible way that allows for the priorities to be reflected. I think we have done that.

I feel very strongly that those who would suggest that the way to deal with things is to shut it down is not the proper approach. That is why I have supported Senator PORTMAN's legislation to put an end to government shutdowns. We just don't need disruptions that ultimately hurt our economy and hurt our families.

I certainly would have preferred a process that would allow for funding the government by passing appropriations measures on an individual basis, one by one. My colleague from Vermont, who is on the floor, has been around for a few Congresses, and he knows that used to be the way we handled appropriations. We had an appropriations bill come to the floor. We debated it. We amended it. We moved it through. We worked through that process. It was somewhat tediously slow at times, but it was a very open and collaborative

process that I think reflected, again, the priorities around the country.

What we have in front of us is a measure that did in fact go through the full appropriations process, all 12 appropriations bills. It made it through the committee. Sometimes not all of them do, but for fiscal year 2017, these appropriations bills did.

As we saw at the end of last year, there was an agreement that we would not move forward with the appropriations bills at that time—actually, it was probably less than an agreement, but a decision was made—and we are here, as of May 4, still working on fiscal year 17.

This is clearly not the best option, in my view, in terms of how we handle our appropriations bills, but it is where we are right now, and the option we have in front of us, in my view, is clearly the best option.

Continuing resolutions are just not a way to operate. I think they are poor policy. Keeping funding at previous levels doesn't allow for Congress to have any input on any new priorities. In some cases, programs receive more money than they may actually need at that time; thus, you have a situation where you are ending up wasting dollars, rather than being good and efficient stewards of the taxpayer dollars.

I think we saw that with this omnibus bill we have in front of us now, it gave our new President the opportunity to weigh in. Clearly, we heard President Trump's priorities expressed not only throughout the campaign but early in his new administration, his priorities on national security, making sure that from a defense perspective and border security, these issues were addressed. I think we have done so in a responsible way on the defense spending side but also with a comprehensive approach to border security and utilizing new surveillance and new technologies.

This bill consolidates or terminates dozens of existing programs and rejects unnecessary spending tax dollars. It reduces spending and wasteful programs, eliminates unnecessary, ineffective, and duplicative programs.

Again, I think what we have put together within this appropriations omnibus is a spending proposal that does apply the taxpayer dollars responsibly. Overall, the bill puts real dollars behind our Nation's priorities by enhancing our national security, investing in education infrastructure and innovation, as well as improving the health and well-being of all Americans.

I would like to take just a few moments to speak specifically to some of the provisions that will be helpful in my State of Alaska. The omnibus bill sustains Alaska's contributions to our national defense, helps to protect our fisheries, address high energy costs, helps our very struggling timber industry in Southeastern Alaska, and helps

keep the Federal Government's commitment to Alaska Natives.

There are some programs that would appear to be pretty small, but in terms of consequence and impact on Alaska, they are quite significant.

Essential Air Service, we provide funding in this measure that helps maintain commercial air service to as many as 60 small communities in the State. The reason it is called Essential Air Service is because in most of these communities, there is no other way to get to these smaller communities. There is no road access. There is no other way. You might be able to run a riverboat out, but in terms of ability to access, this Essential Air Service is exactly that.

The bill provides for new investments in the Coast Guard that will help increase safety in Alaska's waters. There are infrastructure improvements in Kodiak to support homeporting Offshore Patrol Cutters in the Arctic region and funding for new cutters that we will see stationed throughout Alaska.

There is a lot going on in the news right now with regard to Russia and North Korea, and it certainly is front and foremost for Alaskans. We have our neighbors to the west of us there, in Russia, and of course we are within range of anything North Korea might consider. So there is a very keen interest and a desire to ensure that our Nation is investing in our Pacific and our Arctic defense.

This bill recognizes the issue, and it recognizes the strategic value that Alaska has. It provides \$4.3 billion for the procurement of F-35s, including some of those that will be based in the interior part of the State. We saw the need for the next generation of fighter jets in Alaska when, just a few weeks ago, Russian planes were buzzing the coast for 4 days straight. Well, today's news reports that F-22s intercepted two Russian Bear bombers 50 miles southwest of Alaska, according to the news this morning.

Again, when you are thinking about the investments we make to provide for our Nation's security, Alaska sits at the center up there in terms of strategic location.

There is also money for developing the long-range discrimination radar at Clear and funds for the ground-based missile defense at Fort Greely. Again, this is very significant at this time, given the geopolitics not too far from our State.

Another key part of our Arctic defense strategy is finally being realized, after years of me kind of pounding on this drum—funding for icebreakers. As of right now, we are woefully behind when it comes to our ability to maneuver in the Arctic regions in our waters. So there is \$150 million in advance procurement funding for an icebreaker that is in the DOD budget and an additional \$55 million in the Coast Guard

budget. It is imperative that we move to fund a new icebreaker now.

We also recognize the role the Coast Guard plays in terms of national defense across the country, particularly in the Arctic. So the bill provides \$1.3 billion in acquisition construction and improvement money. The Coast Guard needs to recapitalize its aging fleet, and we see this no more apparent than in Alaska. A ship that was built back in 1971 is still being used to patrol areas that are perhaps some of the roughest seas in the world. This is not smooth water sailing. Congress needs to recognize the role played by the Coast Guard, not only in national defense but in drug interdiction, fisheries patrol, and safety encroachment, and we must give it the assets it needs to do its job well.

On the education front, this bill provides funds for our public schools, including money for programs that were authorized in ESSA. It funds IDEA, Carl Perkins, impact aid, and 21st Century Community Learning Centers. Especially important for us in Alaska are the programs like ANEEP, Alaska Native Education Equity Program, strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-serving institutions, tribally controlled colleges and universities, and Indian education national activities.

We have all come to the floor over the course of these past few months this Congress to talk about the impact on our communities of the opioid epidemic in this country. This bill helps to get money where it is needed to help fight this epidemic.

Over \$1 billion is provided to various programs and agencies to specifically address this problem. Over \$600 million of that will go to SAMHSA, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, including \$500 million for a new program that was created by the 21st Century Cures Act that we passed earlier last year. The CDC, the Department of Justice, and the VA will see increased funding to help deal with this scourge of addiction.

As chairman of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, the division G of the omnibus is of particular significance to me. The Interior appropriations section probably has more impact on the State of Alaska than most would realize. It controls funding levels for the Federal agencies and Departments that have a huge presence in my State: BLM, Forest Service, EPA, Fish and Wildlife Service, Indian Health Service, BIA, and National Park Service. These are all within the auspices of Interior.

I will give you some of the highlights within the Interior bill. This is the centennial year of the National Park Service so we were able to do more to help address the maintenance backlog within our park system.

The two agencies that deliver services for Indian communities, BIA and Indian Health Service, we did our best to support those programs which are critical to the Indian community. For those agencies, we have provided full contract support costs. We continue Tribal court funding for those Public Law 280 States. We have really worked to do what we can within IHS to address the issues of suicide, domestic violence, alcohol, and substance abuse programs. Making sure we are doing right by providing the support for our healthcare facilities is critically important.

We also have oversight of the EPA within our jurisdiction. I have heard some criticism from some that we didn't do enough to reduce EPA spending and then others are saying we took too much from the EPA, but what we really looked to try to do was to take a commonsense approach, focus resources on the programs that do the concrete things to improve the quality of the environment for the public when it comes to clean air and clean water. We need to effectively make sure that whether it is the WIFIA program, the State revolving funds for our water and our waste water programs, making sure we have the resources to do right by our communities, and making sure there is clean air and clean water, whether it is the Targeted Air Shed Grant Program, which helps communities deal with pollution issues and air issues—I think we did a fair job with the EPA budget.

Again, we have worked to reduce in areas where we are just staffing up for initiatives that quite honestly have been questioned and challenged, making sure we are focusing on the priorities that deliver on EPA's mission, which is clean air and clean water.

Madam President, the last thing I would like to add is what we were able to do with regard to wildfires because this is an issue for so many of us in the West. We were able to include funding for wildland fire management programs to fully fund the 10-year average of suppression costs, as well as to allow for emergency funding in the event that we have a catastrophic wildfire season. I think we all understand the challenges our agencies face when we have fire borrowing going back and forth. So this is an effort we have long sought to address, and we will continue to work on that.

It has been interesting to watch and to read the news about this omnibus. You have the President who said: This is good. This is what winning looks like. You have Democrats who have said: We won.

It is not about a win for the D's or a win for the R's; it is about making sure this is right for the country. I would suggest that if both sides are taking credit, we must have hit the sweet spot somewhere in the middle.

I think at this place where we are right now, with over 7 months into this fiscal year, it is well past time that Congress pass a bill that funds the government for the balance of this fiscal year. These are uncertain times for the country—uncertain times certainly in my State—and I think it deserves some certainty from us. It is a good bill, and I think we owe it to the American people not to create unnecessary and unwanted drama about whether the Federal Government remains open for business.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor once again to discuss the threats facing our country, the challenges confronting the brave men and women of our Armed Forces. I feel compelled to remind my colleagues about what is at stake because of our failure right here to provide them the resources and equipment they need and deserve, placing their lives at greater risk. That is not my opinion; it is the opinion of the uniformed leaders of our country who have stated time after time that because of our sequestration and our mindless meat ax, we are putting the lives of the men and women who are serving our Nation in uniform at greater risk.

Don't we have an obligation to try to stop that? Obviously, there is not a majority here in the Senate who believes we should, to our everlasting shame. Unless we change course, we will only continue that failure.

We are about to vote on yet another Omnibus appropriations bill. It is well over 1,000 pages. Look here; this is what we are about to vote on without a single amendment—without a single amendment. Is there any Member of the U.S. Senate who has read this? Is there any Member who has read this bill of over \$1 trillion that we are about to vote on? Many of us are going to be compelled to vote for it because we don't want to shut down the government again. The American people don't want the government to shut down, no matter what some colleagues of mine say. But here it is.

I challenge any of my colleagues to come to the floor and tell me they have read this bill.

Is it any wonder that the American people are fed up with this way of doing business? There are 1,000 pages—1,000 pages. That is what we are going to vote on in a relatively short period of time—haven't read it—no amendments.

I am sure there may be some provisions in this 1,000-page document that Members would like to modify, like to add to. But what business are we doing? What is the world's greatest deliberative body doing here in a couple

hours? We are going to vote yes or no on a 1,000-page document. Shame on us. Shame on us.

Not a single appropriations bill—we have an Appropriations Committee. They have their subcommittees. My friend and colleague from Vermont is here and wants to talk about it. They churn out individual bills. I believe there are 13 of them, one of them being Defense, by the way. But all of that is without amendment, without debate on the floor of the world's greatest deliberative body. Yet we are going to go ahead and vote yes or no.

Many of us are going to vote yes because we don't want to shut down the U.S. Government. We don't want to deprive our citizens of the goods, services, and provisions that a government is supposed to provide people. I don't want to shut down the Grand Canyon again, my friends. I don't want to deprive people from all over the world the ability to see the Grand Canyon. So what do we do? CRAs.

I am all in favor of repealing regulations that are onerous and bad for America and small businesses and large. Is that a rationale for what we are about to do?

I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle: You blocked many of these bills that we wanted to bring to the floor. You blocked them. Why? For what purpose? Of course, on this side of the aisle, we have agreed to do something like that.

So I just say to my colleagues: You should not be curious when you see the approval ratings of the Congress of the United States in the teens.

Again, as I said, we will be blamed for putting our men and women in uniform at greater risk. That is not JOHN MCCAIN's view; that happens to be the opinion of our uniformed service Chiefs who are telling us that when we are not funding the military, we are putting the lives of the men and women serving at risk.

We passed the Budget Control Act 6 years ago as an attempt to address our spending problem. This legislation led to a \$443 billion cut to defense. What has also happened? Deficits came down for a while, and we are on track to return to \$1 trillion deficits again in a matter of years. The national debt is set at \$20 trillion and has grown and will continue to grow.

We slashed our military, friends. We slashed it. Yeah, great job, we slashed the spending on the military. In fact, if you look, you will see the only portion where there has been a reduction in spending is where? Defense.

When you look at the past several years since sequestration, do you think the world has gotten safer? Do you think the men and women who are serving are better protected, better equipped?

We have 60 percent of our F-18s not flying. Why? No parts. We have two

submarines tied up at the pier for a year because they cannot leave the pier. The Air Force is 1,000 pilots short.

What have we done? We have cut defense spending by 4 percent. Meanwhile, the interest on the debt has increased by 7 percent; nondefense, 19 percent; and the elephant in the room, the third rail that none of us want to touch is mandatory spending; that is Social Security and Medicare, primarily.

What have we done? We have shortchanged the men and women who are serving in the military, trying to defend this Nation while nondefense spending has gone up by 19 percent.

So the next time I hear one of my colleagues say: Well, we should continue to cut defense spending because of the debt, we have already done that. We have already shortchanged the men and women who are defending this Nation.

Over the past 10 years, as I mentioned, mandatory spending has grown by 56 percent, and defense has been cut by 4 percent.

The death spiral is occurring. We are in budget cuts with a high operational tempo, and the military is now in a vicious cycle. The death spiral works like this. This is the death spiral, OK? Constant and frequent deployments increase costs. To send our men and women overseas into harm's way increases costs. The more you fly the plane, the more it costs to maintain the plane. The more you deploy a soldier, the more you have to pay him or her to stay in the military.

When budget top lines are determined by politics and not requirements, the Department of Defense has to make tradeoffs. For example, the military may forgo buying military equipment to keep up with wartime costs, but this exacerbates the problem. Our equipment gets older as it is used more and the cost of maintaining aging equipment skyrockets. Here is the death spiral, why the state of our military is what it is today.

Three—count them—three of our Army brigades are at the highest level of readiness. Four of 64 Air Force squadrons are ready to fight tonight; that is four out of 64. Less than half of the Marine and Navy planes are ready for combat. The Air Force has a pilot shortfall of 1,500—1,000 of which are fighter pilots. The Navy has a maintenance backlog of 5.3 million days. The ship maintenance backlogs are so bad that some ships are like the submarine USS Boise, which is tied up in port and isn't qualified to dive and recently missed a deployment.

Look at this graphic. These are the aircraft—all of them that are fully mission capable. These are the Army units that are ready to fight tonight. This is the U.S. Air Force, and these depict the airplanes ready to fight; Marine Corps aircraft, the same way.

So here we are with this situation, and what are we doing? We aren't really addressing the issue because we are going to be faced in the next year or so with the same budget problem of sequestration.

While this is happening, our enemies aren't sitting still. Our adversaries are not waiting for this body to wake up to do its job and act. While we have forced our military to make tradeoffs between supporting immediate operational requirements and future modernization, China, Russia, and other adversaries have been singularly focused on developing military capabilities to target U.S. forces and take away our unique military advantages.

Our military has multiple missions. Our adversaries have one mission, and that is to undermine U.S. military superiority. I regret to inform my colleagues that they are succeeding much more than we anticipated.

The fact is, the U.S. military advantage is eroding. National Security Adviser GEN H.R. McMaster summed it up best when he testified that the U.S. Army is outgunned and outranged. The reality is not much different across the military services.

The President understands it. Rebuilding the military has been a major priority for this administration, but we have to face the simple fact that the military buildup proposed by this President is illegal because the Budget Control Act forbids it. Over the next 4 years, the Budget Control Act's caps on defense spending would leave President Trump \$216 billion short. Even President Obama's budget was \$113 billion above the BCA caps, and that budget barely slowed the deterioration of military readiness and capabilities.

I regret to say, Chairman THORNBERRY, the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and I fare even worse against the BCA. We believe that rebuilding our military will require a defense budget of \$640 billion in fiscal year 2018. Sustaining that level of funding over the remaining years with the Budget Control Act would require an additional \$433 billion.

Give our men and women in uniform a budget that will allow them to rise to meet the challenges of the 21st century. Congress must change the Budget Control Act, and the only way to do that is with a bipartisan budget agreement. As we stand here, there is no serious conversation that I am aware of in this body or anywhere else in Washington about what the agreement would look like or what it would achieve.

The next 4 years can't be like the last 4 years. We must find a way to provide the military with the resources they need and deserve to perform the missions we assign them. We must provide them with the timely authorization of appropriations bills. We must

provide them with something they have not had for years—certainty—so they can properly plan and efficiently use taxpayers' dollars to defend the Nation.

What are we looking at right now?

We are going to pass this thing. It will pass. Then, in September—how many months is that now? It is about 5 months from now—we are going to be bumping up against the same ceiling and the threat of shutting down the government. Are we going to wait until the beginning of September before we start to address this or not? Is that the kind of fiscal cowardice we are going to perform? We are going to see this movie again and again and again and again unless we repeal the Budget Control Act and start providing for the men and women who are serving this Nation and the challenges we are facing, which any military expert will tell you are the greatest they have been in 70 years. We have to stop this.

We will paper over our failures with continuing resolutions. We will cut piecemeal deals in the midnight hour that fail to fix the serious challenges this country faces. We will accept these outcomes because they are better than yearlong continuing resolutions or shutdowns. We will clear the pitifully low bar of success we have set for ourselves, and all the while, challenges we will have been charged to address will only get worse. We have to break this cycle.

After several years of political gridlock, we know a bipartisan budget deal will be necessary to pass appropriations bills. Let's try a novel idea. Why don't we work on the deal now? Why don't we sit down together, with all of us recognizing the challenges to our national security, and fix this problem instead of kicking the can down the road? My friends, if we do not, I guarantee you we will be doing this same thing again in September. What is that? We will be looking at another 1,000-page bill—1,000 pages that none of us has read. Oh, I take it back. There may be four or five Senators who know what is in it. Maybe 4, maybe 5, maybe as many as 8 out of 100 will know about it. If we do not stop this, this is exactly the movie we are going to see come September—not acceptable.

Don't we owe the men and women who are serving in uniform in harm's way today—several of whom have just been killed in the last few days—more than what we are giving them? Don't we owe them the best equipment and the best training we can possibly provide them with rather than their being dictated to by a meat-ax called sequestration? Don't we?

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

MR. LEAHY. Mr. President, as one of the Senators who has read this bill, I would note that most of this bill has

been here since November. We were prepared to go in November and vote on each part of it separately.

I would advise the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, who is a friend of mine, that his party did not want to go forward in November. They were asked by the then-President-elect not to go forward with it, and his party said it would not go forward with it. We could have passed all of the bills separately in November.

I would also note, as the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska said on the floor a few minutes ago, that Republicans and Democrats have been working very closely on this appropriations bill. She expressed—and I absolutely join her in this—that we go back to the way it always has been. My party is not in control of the schedule in the Senate, but I would ask that all of us in both parties work together and start doing the appropriations bills one by one, as we always have. In fact, this bill is the product of many long weeks and days and nights and weekends. I know. A lot of times, I went to bed at midnight, and my staff kept on working.

I thank Republican Chairman THAD COCHRAN, of Mississippi, for his leadership in reaching this agreement of keeping the government open for business. It is how Congress can and should work.

Forget the rhetoric. Forget political brinkmanship. This agreement shows something we have worked on and that when we come together and work through our differences—both parties here and both parties in the other body—that we can do the work of the American people.

I think the package before us is a good deal for the American people, and I will vote for it, but we should not be celebrating this fact. On this, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Arizona in that we should not be finishing our work 7 months into the fiscal year. I wish his party had allowed us to do it last November. These bills could have been and should have been finished then. In fact, we were 98 percent done with our negotiations, both Republicans and Democrats, when then-President-elect Trump said: Pencils down, and put everything on hold. The Senator from Arizona and his party have been operating on a continuing resolution ever since. I am glad to hear him say this is not the way he wants to do it.

I, certainly, agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska when she says this is not the way to do it. Those of us who have been here for a while know that does not work and it is no way to govern.

It is my goal—and I believe Chairman COCHRAN shares this goal—to return to regular order, which is when we consider each appropriations bill in committee, debate each one publicly on the

floor, and then vote it up or down. That is the way we should operate. That is what the American people deserve. I look forward to working with Chairman COCHRAN to make this a reality when we return, in very short order, to the fiscal year 2018 bills.

I have been on the Appropriations Committee for decades, and I have served as either chairman or ranking member of different subcommittees there, just as I have served as chairman or ranking member on Agriculture and the Judiciary. Yet I decided this year to take on the vice chairmanship of the Appropriations Committee because I believe in the power of the purse, in the ability of this committee to make a real difference in people's lives, and because of the respect I have for Chairman COCHRAN.

Our national budget is a reflection of our Nation's priorities, and the appropriations bills are where our priorities become realities. I am pleased to report we have worked hard to reflect Americans' values in the fiscal year 2017 consolidated appropriations bill before us. I think we have reached a good deal.

I am pleased that on a bipartisan basis we have rejected President Trump's ill-considered proposal to slash domestic programs by \$15 billion, including deep cuts in the NIH and low-income energy assistance. I am glad to see a \$2 billion increase for the National Institutes of Health. I was proud to have brought then-Vice President Biden to the University of Vermont last October to discuss his Cancer Moonshot Initiative and to see and hear how Vermonters are contributing to research to better treat—and hopefully cure—cancer. NIH funding is central to this effort.

Last year, the NIH accounted for nearly \$40 million in research funding for the University of Vermont. Everybody—Republicans and Democrats—agree they have spent it well. This research is leading to advancements in lung disease treatments, cancers, and to more effectively using genome testing to advance the emerging and promising field of precision medicine.

In this bill, we were able to protect funding for LIHEAP. As the distinguished Presiding Officer and I know, we are in States in which the temperatures can often plunge way below zero. LIHEAP is a vital lifeline—certainly in the State of Vermont—to prevent people from being forced to make the wrenching choice of putting food on their tables for their families or keeping them warm.

We have also put in \$512 million—nearly double the resources available last year—to combat the opioid epidemic. This is a plague that grips every community in the country. It does not make any difference whether one is a Republican or a Democrat. It is hitting all of us. It is a problem that does not

know the difference between rich or poor, urban or rural, Republican or Democrat. I think every Senator probably knows someone or a family with someone who has been in the grips of opioid addiction. My wife and I have sat down at kitchen tables with grieving parents who have lost their children. We have spoken to first responders who have seen so many people die. We have to confront this problem head-on in this country.

We are doing a number of other things. We are protecting funds for the EPA at the critical moment of confronting climate change. In that regard, I was pleased that Marcelle and I were able to host hundreds of Vermonters who had driven all night long in order to join the hundreds of thousands of people in the Nation's Capital for the Climate March.

I see that the distinguished chairman has come on the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I be able to yield to him, without losing my right to the floor, so I may finish my speech when he is finished.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Mississippi.

MR. COCHRAN. Mr. President, this afternoon, the Senate will consider the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2017. The bill will fund the Federal Government for the remainder of this fiscal year. I urge the Senate to approve the bill.

It provides our Armed Forces with the money they need to safeguard our homeland and protect our interests around the world. The funding levels are within the limits of the Budget Control Act. In total, the bill will increase Department of Defense spending by \$23.6 billion over President Obama's fiscal year 2017 request. These funds are badly needed to improve the readiness of our Armed Forces and to continue our campaign to defeat ISIL.

This bill includes the largest investment in border security in nearly a decade. Additional funding is provided for fencing and other physical infrastructure, communications and surveillance technology, the hiring of additional agents, and additional detention beds to help stop the practice of catch and release. These funds will help reduce human trafficking and the flow of illegal drugs into our country.

While the additional funds for defense and border security have received much of the attention, there are many other important programs that are funded within the bill.

For the second year in a row, providing funding for research at the National Institutes of Health is increased by \$2 billion. New funding is included to combat the opioid epidemic that has plagued communities across the country. The FBI receives additional funding to protect against terrorist threats and combat illegal cyber activity.

Throughout the bill, spending controls are placed on Federal agencies. There are more than 150 rescissions, consolidations, or program terminations within the bill. These savings have been reallocated to higher priorities.

The basis of this legislation is with regard to the 12 appropriations bills that were reported from the Appropriations Committee. This is the second year in a row that the committee has reported all 12 bills. This bill reflects a year's worth of concerted effort by the chairmen and ranking members of our 12 subcommittees. It also reflects a great deal of hard work by the committees' staffs, for which I am deeply grateful.

I urge Senators to support the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I note that the chairman and I are well aware of how well things go when we take each one of these bills. He certainly has led that effort, and that is the way we should do it.

I mentioned this when the Vermonters were here last weekend. Marcelle and I hosted them, so many of whom had driven through the night to join the hundreds of thousands of people in the Nation's Capital for the Climate March. Many of them asked: Why can't we do it the way we used to? I told them we were ready to go to all of the bills in November, and I am sorry that leadership said no.

There are things on which we have done a lot in this bill. Those of us on the Appropriations Committee have read this bill, and we have read most of it since last November.

The EPA provides funding to improve the environmental quality and ecological vibrancy of our small State's great Lake Champlain, the jewel of New England, as well as crucial funding for similar partnerships all over the country.

I am also pleased to report what is not in this bill. In a bipartisan way, we get rid of more than 160 poison pill riders—riders that would have undermined the health insurance of millions of Americans by attacking the protections they have under the Affordable Care Act and riders that would have slapped restrictions on women's access to healthcare, especially in rural areas, and riders that would have rolled back consumer financial protections of Dodd-Frank regulations and weaken environmental protections. Let's have votes up or down on those issues, anytime you want, but not in a must-pass spending bill.

I also particularly welcome the fact that not a single cent in the bill will go toward building President Trump's misguided wall on the southern border. When that issue came up in our debate, I said: Well let's have a vote, up or down, in the House and in the Senate,

on the wall, where all Republicans and all Democrats vote. If it passes, then I will stop my objection. Nobody wants such a vote because not enough people support it. The American people should not, and they will not, be forced to pay tens of billions of dollars for a bumper-sticker solution to an incredibly complex problem—a wall that the President promised that Mexico, not American taxpayers, would pay for, even though all American taxpayers know that Americans, not Mexicans, would pay for it. His own department estimates that it would cost U.S. taxpayers \$22 billion. Some said during the debate: Show me a 30-foot wall, and I will show you a 31-foot ladder. I can also show you pictures of small prop planes and boats and tunnels. A wall is nothing more than an illusion. It is a false promise of security. Instead of debating this boondoggle, which Democrats as well as Republicans and Independents oppose, let's consider real solutions with comprehensive immigration reform.

In 2013, the Senate passed the large effort of Republicans and Democrats working together on comprehensive immigration reforms. Let's resume that debate and not throw money at this expensive illusion, where we are cutting vital medical research at the National Institutes of Health and others to pay for it.

There are a lot of anti-science proposals and impulses in the proposals that came from the administration, and I am proud that both Republicans and Democrats rejected them.

So I support the bill before us. I am proud to join with Chairman COCHRAN. It is not a perfect bill, but no products we all come together on are perfect. But on balance, it is a good deal for the American people. It reflects values of both Republicans and Democrats. The bipartisan work that brought us to this point shows what is possible and it lays the groundwork for our negotiations on the fiscal year 2018 appropriations bills.

So I want to extend again my thanks to Chairman COCHRAN and to the subcommittee chairmen and ranking members. It takes a tremendous amount of work to draft each of the underlying bills contained in this consolidated appropriations bill. While we were negotiating, I remember being on the phone at 10, 11 o'clock at night, night after night, but I went to bed, and the staff would keep on working until 2 or 3 in the morning.

So I thank the staff of the Appropriations Committee and subcommittee clerks on both sides of the aisle, who have been here day in and day out for many weeks. I certainly thank my staff director, Charles "Chuck" Kieffer, deputy staff director Chanda Betourney, and Jessica Berry, Jay Tilton, JP Dowd, and Jean Kwon, as well as Senator SCHUMER and his staff, including Gerry Petrella, Meghan

Taira, Mike Lynch, and Mike Kuiken for the assistance they provided. I want to recognize and thank Bruce Evans and Fitz Elder from Chairman COCHRAN's staff, the majority staff director, and deputy staff director. They worked very, very hard and in their usual professional and courteous manner. I want to thank Bob Putnam, Hong Nguyen, and George Castro for the support they provide to the committee every day. And finally, I want to thank the editorial and printing staff, without whom we could never have produced this bill. Valerie Hutton, Penny Myles, Elmer Barnes and Karinthia Thames were here day and night, week after week, editing the dozens of drafts that ultimately became this consolidated bill. They work in relatively obscurity, but their expertise and dedication is not lost on us. We depend on them and we greatly appreciate what they do.

Lastly, on a personal matter, I wish to take a moment for special recognition of Charles Kieffer. Chuck is well known to the Senate. He is a familiar figure here in this Chamber. He has served on the Appropriations Committee for many years, under numerous chairmen and vice chairmen. I was grateful that he was willing to take on and continue there when I took over as vice chairman.

What a lot of people don't know is that he has been working around the clock on this, and in March he lost his father Jerry. Just a few weeks ago, he lost his mother Fran.

If you know even a little bit about his parents, there is no doubt where Chuck gets his dedication to public service. His father Jerry served as the executive director of the National Cultural Center at the Kennedy Center. He held positions in the Truman, Eisenhower, Nixon, Ford, and Carter administrations.

Chuck's mother Fran was a longtime member of the League of Women Voters. She dedicated time to numerous civic institutions throughout her lifetime. At 93 and 89, respectively, Jerry and Fran lived a long and full life, including a marriage of 68 years.

Their loss will be profoundly felt by their family and friends. My and Marcelle's thoughts are with Chuck, his wife Meg, and their family. I thank him for his tireless dedication to this institution, even during a time of great personal sorrow. I would like to think that his parents are looking down from their place of eternal reward with a great deal of pride in their son.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am going to be voting no on this 1,700-page bill.

I am not blind to some of the good parts of the bill. It includes last year's Intelligence Authorization Act, and it includes some parts of the bill that I

worked on that would counteract Russian activities in the United States and Europe—provisions that were blocked by the Obama administration since they refused to ever get tough on Russia.

It increases defense spending, although not to an adequate degree in relation to the threats we face.

For the first time in years, it recognizes that every dollar we spend on defense doesn't have to be matched by another dollar elsewhere in our budget.

Now, there are parts of this bill that got dropped that I would like to have seen, for instance, blocking Federal funding for sanctuary cities. We might as well call them "outlaw cities" because they refuse to comply with Federal immigration law and turn over illegal immigrants facing deportation to Federal authorities.

But I want to hone in on one particular provision that shows just how bad this process is. In a 1,700-page bill, they don't hide the good things in the bill. They only hide the bad things. So look to page 735, section 543, where you will find an increase in H-2B visas of almost 79,000—a 120-percent increase over the normal annual cap of a so-called seasonal visa program for temporary workers that can take up to 9 or 10 months.

It is not necessary. It has nothing to do with funding the government—nothing. It hasn't been vetted. It hasn't gone through the normal legislative process, which would be the Judiciary Committee, where the chairman and the senior Democrat both have written that they oppose this measure. I don't even know how it got in there. I don't know if it was the chairman or the ranking member. They may not know. It is 1,700 pages, after all. It takes hours to even figure out what it means because it is so complicated in language.

But this is what it does: It takes jobs away from American workers and abuses the immigrants that come into this country.

In the past 10 years, the Department of Labor has found 800 employers—800—that have abused 23,000 guest workers—everything from stealing their wages, demanding bribes for their visas, and even sexual abuse—and those are only the ones that have been caught. That is because unlike American workers, these immigrant workers cannot leave their job. If they are fired, they go back to their home country, where they often have huge families who are depending on them for their remittances. Their employers know that, and they take advantage of them. It is a newfangled form of indentured servitude.

Some people in this institution complain about the way Arab countries treat guest workers from South Asia and Southeast Asia. The conditions under which some of these H-2B work-

ers operate are hardly much better. They live in filth and squalor. They are charged exorbitant fees for their housing and for their food. The employers largely get away with it because they know that these immigrant workers will not complain. They will not go to the authorities. They will not report it to the Department of Labor because if they do, they go back to their home country.

Those are just the immigrant workers. What about the American workers? There are a lot of reasons why unscrupulous American employers favor temporary guest workers. They don't have to pay payroll taxes on them, for instance. They don't have to pay unemployment taxes on them. But the real reason is that those guest workers have virtually no leverage to demand higher wages. As I said, they can be sent home because they are tied to a single employer. Americans have more bargaining power. If they can get a better wage down the road, then they will go down the road. If they get better benefits, they can go to a new job, but those guest workers cannot.

So the employers who abuse the H-2B program go to the greatest lengths to avoid hiring an American worker. The program says you have to advertise for the jobs in advance, and they do, hundreds of miles away in obscure newspapers that have nothing to do with the employer's local economy.

Many employers discourage Americans from applying in the first place. Remember, these are unskilled labor positions—unskilled. These are not high-tech jobs, but unskilled guest workers. They subject American workers to the most extreme, unreasonable, extraneous tests before they hire them—tests they do not give to those foreign guest workers because they can pay them lower wages. When they finally are forced to hire an American worker, because they face penalties from the Department of Labor if they don't, they try to make conditions as bad as possible for them so they can fire them and then replace them with a foreigner.

A lot of arguments for this kind of program boil down to this: No American will do that job. That is a lie. It is a lie. There is no job that Americans will not do. There is no industry in America where a majority of workers are not native born, American citizens, or first generation lawful immigrants—not landscapers, not construction workers, not ski instructors, not lifeguards, not resort workers—not a single one. If the wage is decent and the employer obeys the law, Americans will do the job. If it is not, then, they should pay higher wages. To say anything else is an insult to the work ethic of the American people who make this country run.

We just had an election in which the President distinguished himself more

on immigration than on any other single issue. We all realize that, right? We all realize that uncontrolled mass migration is upending the politics and societies all across Europe. My colleagues realize that, right? What is it going to take for the people in Washington, DC, to realize just how out of touch they are when it comes to protecting the jobs and the wages of American workers?

I will vote no, and I will say that today is not the day when Washington realizes just how out of touch they are.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 3 minutes, and it will probably be less than that.

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

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I would like to thank the body for this bill.

This is an omnibus, and I am going to vote for it. There are some things that are disturbing about it—there is no doubt about that—not to mention the fact that Congress took 7 months to take care of this plan for the long term, which created uncertainty out there on the ground. There were 7 months when Congress sat on their hands, which left towns, hospitals, airports, and our citizenry in the lurch.

But it does do some good things, and I think it does reflect the values of rural America, which I think is really important. I think it is a responsible budget for rural America in States like Montana.

One of the things it does that I think is entirely appropriate is that it pushes the Education Department to reconsider the Upward Bound grant applications that were denied because of ridiculous—and I do mean ridiculous—format requirements, which will allow first-generation college kids to be able to go to college.

What the Department of Education did with the Upward Bound Program is the worst of the bureaucracy that government can allow. This bill helps fix that. It gives the Department of Education a pair of glasses so they can apply a little common sense to their rules.

It also does some good things for our national parks, it does some good things for our bases, and it does some good things to help our natural resources. But since I am ranking member on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security, I can tell you that overall, I think it really fits the needs of our homeland security, whether it is border security or cyber security. I think it is a responsible bill to help invest in our economy moving forward while keeping this country secure.

With that, I would encourage a "yes" vote on this bill. I would just ask that next time around, which is going to

start immediately, we let the subcommittees on appropriations do their work and bring these subcommittee bills to the floor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). Under the previous order, the motion to refer with amendment is withdrawn and the motion to concur with amendment is withdrawn.

Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 244.

Mr. WICKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) would have voted "nay."

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 121 Leg.]

YEAS—79

Alexander	Gillibrand	Perdue
Baldwin	Harris	Peters
Barrasso	Hassan	Portman
Bennet	Hatch	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Roberts
Blunt	Heitkamp	Rounds
Booker	Hirono	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sanders
Brown	Inhofe	Schatz
Burr	Johnson	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Capito	King	Shelby
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Lankford	Sullivan
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Cassidy	Manchin	Thune
Cochran	Markey	Tillis
Collins	McCain	Udall
Coons	McCaskey	Van Hollen
Cornyn	McConnell	Warner
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warren
Donnelly	Merkley	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	Young
Franken	Murray	
Gardner	Nelson	

NAYS—18

Corker	Fischer	Lee
Cotton	Flake	Paul
Crapo	Graham	Risch
Cruz	Grassley	Scott
Daines	Heller	Strange
Ernst	Kennedy	Toomey

NOT VOTING—3

Durbin	Isakson	Sasse

The motion was agreed to.

PROVIDING FOR A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 244

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the enrollment correction.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 53) providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 244.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 53, is agreed to, and the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 53, Scott Gottlieb to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Scott Gottlieb, of Connecticut, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Scott Gottlieb, of Connecticut, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, Dan Sullivan, Shelley Moore Capito, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, Orrin G. Hatch, Bill Cassidy, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, John Thune, Jerry Moran, James E. Risch.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the Gottlieb nomination occur following disposition of the Wilson nomination on Monday, May 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

NATIONAL DAY OF AWARENESS FOR MISSING AND MURDERED NATIVE WOMEN AND GIRLS

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, tomorrow, May 5, Hanna Harris should have been 25 years old. Instead of celebrating a birthday, we will be celebrating her memory. Hanna was a 21-year-old member of the Cheyenne Tribe. She lived in Lama Deer, MT, with her 10-month-old son. The last time she was seen alive was the Fourth of July of 2013. After that, she went missing, and 5 days later, her body was found. Hanna was found to have been raped and murdered.

For too long, the stories of missing and murdered American Indian and Alaska Native women have gone unheard. In fact, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, homicide was the third leading cause of death among American Indian and Alaska Native women between the ages of 10 and 24 years and the fifth leading cause of death for American Indian and Alaska Native women between 25 and 34 years of age.

According to a study commissioned by the Department of Justice, in some counties comprised primarily of Tribal land, American Indian women face murder rates that are more than 10 times the national average. Let me repeat that. In some counties, American Indian women face murder rates over 10 times the national average. If this were the case in any other community outside of Native communities, there would be public outcry, but there hasn't been until now. In fact, yesterday the Senate approved my resolution to designate May 5, Hanna Harris's birthday, as a day of remembrance. It will be a day to join together to commemorate the lives of those we lost tragically, like Hanna. It is a day to validate the pain Tribal communities have felt and feel every day. It will mark a national day of awareness for Native women and girls who have gone missing or have been murdered.

I was joined by 12 of my colleagues in passing this resolution to declare that the tragic loss of Native women and girls is not just an issue, it is an epidemic, and I thank them for their support.

Tomorrow, on Hanna's birthday, I will walk with Melinda Limberhand Harris, Hanna's mother, and with Tribal leadership, as well as members in Lama Deer, MT, who have also lost a mother, a daughter, a sister, or a friend. On May 5, we will remember RoyLynn Rides Horse, we will remember Kenzley Olson, and we will remember the thousands of other American Indian and Alaska Native women who have been killed or have disappeared without a trace. And we will remember

Hanna Harris on her birthday tomorrow as we walk together in Lame Deer, MT.

Mr. President, I yield my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, the House of Representatives has just passed a bill that would make major changes in the Affordable Care Act by a vote of 217 to 213. I congratulate the House. The Senate will carefully review the House bill, and we will go to work on a Senate bill.

Here are my goals for a Senate bill. I don't pretend to speak for every Member of the Senate or even every Republican, but these are my goals for a bill we will fashion here.

No. 1, rescue the thousands of Tennesseans and millions of Americans who, under the Affordable Care Act, will be trapped in ObamaCare exchanges with few or zero options for health insurance in the year 2018 unless Congress acts.

My second goal is to lower premium costs. Premium costs have increased and, in some States, are going through the roof under the Affordable Care Act.

No. 3, gradually transfer to the states more flexibility in administering the Medicaid program and do that in such a way as to not pull the rug out from under those who rely on the Medicaid program.

No. 4, make sure those who have preexisting health conditions have access to health insurance. This is one thing in the Affordable Care Act that has strong support from just about everybody, including the President, that if you have a preexisting condition, you must have access to healthcare. We need to make sure that is still true in any bill we create in the Senate.

There is some urgency here because of what is happening in the individual market. When we say "individual market," here is what we are talking about. Most Americans get their insurance either from the government or on the job. About 18 percent of Americans get their insurance through Medicare. We are not talking about Medicare today. The bill in the House or the bill we will create in the Senate does not affect Medicare.

About 60 percent of Americans get their insurance on the job and about 20 percent or so through Medicaid, and that leaves about 6 percent who go into an Obamacare market to buy it. Many of these Americans buy their insurance on marketplaces or exchanges created by the Affordable Care Act. We call

those the ObamaCare exchanges. About 85 percent of those who buy their insurance on the exchanges have a government subsidy to help them buy the insurance.

As every day goes by, we hear and we are going to continue to hear about insurance companies pulling out of counties and States. Yesterday we heard that the only insurer left in Iowa is now likely to leave. That means more than 70,000 people on the exchanges will have no insurance to buy. Most of them will have subsidies from the government. So it is like thousands of people in Iowa have bus tickets in a town where no buses run.

That is what is happening right now because of the 2010 law that we call the Affordable Care Act. I know this all too well because 34,000 people in Knoxville, TN, my home area, are going to have subsidies in 2018 but no insurance to buy with their subsidies unless Congress acts. That is because of the 2010 law that we seek to change. In 2016, last year, 7 percent of counties in the United States had just one insurer offering plans on their Affordable Care Act exchanges. This year, 2017, that number jumped to 32 percent. In one in three counties in the United States, if you have a subsidy to buy insurance on the ObamaCare exchange, you had only one insurance company offering you insurance. Five entire States have only one insurer offering ACA plans in their entire State this year: Alabama, Alaska, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Wyoming. That is because of the Affordable Care Act passed in 2010.

Unfortunately, every day we are going to be hearing not just about insurers leaving counties and States, but about the ones that remain because they are going to be charging sky-high premiums.

Premiums went up by as much as 62 percent this year in Tennessee and by 116 percent in Arizona. As the new rate increases are proposed to the States over the next few weeks and months, our constituents are going to be saying: What are you going to do about that? So there is an urgency, but we want to get it right.

So, again, here are my goals for the Senate bill we will write in the next few weeks:

No. 1, rescue—and "rescue" is not too strong a word—the millions of Americans across this country who are going to have few or zero insurance options in the year 2018 because of collapsing ObamaCare exchanges, unless Congress acts.

No. 2, lower premium rates because, in many States, premiums are going through the roof under the Affordable Care Act.

No. 3, gradually transfer to States more flexibility in managing their Medicaid programs. About 18 percent of Americans get their insurance on Medicaid. We will do so in a way that does

not pull the rug out from under those who are currently served by Medicaid.

Finally, preexisting conditions—make sure Americans who have insurance for preexisting conditions continue to have access to it. If you are on Medicaid or if you are on Medicare or, in almost every case, if you get insurance on the job, you have insurance for preexisting conditions. Under the Affordable Care Act in 2010, there had to be insurance for people with preexisting conditions. We want to make sure that those Americans continue to have access if they have a preexisting condition.

We will move ahead with deliberate speed. We are doing that because the exchanges are collapsing, people could be without insurance, and premiums will go up if we don't act, but we want to get it right. There will be no artificial deadlines. We will carefully consider the legislation passed by the House. We will work together carefully to write our own bill. We will make sure we know what our bill costs when we vote on it. In fact, by law, we have to do that. We will get it right, and then we will vote. And hopefully, Mr. President, the end result will be significant improvements for most Americans, giving them more choices of health insurance at a lower cost, and do that by gradually transferring more decisions from Washington, DC, to the states and to individuals.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I followed the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee. We speak to the American people in light of the House just voting 217 to 213 to repeal and replace ObamaCare. If there is somebody watching right now, quite likely she is concerned about her healthcare premiums.

On the campaign trail—I remember this so vividly—on the campaign trail when I was running for the Senate, I was in Jefferson Parish, on Veterans Boulevard, and a woman named Tina came up. I am going to paraphrase what she said a little bit because this is a G-rated program. She said: My name is Tina, and I am angry. I am paying \$500 more a month, \$6,000 more a year. My husband and I have no children and I have had a hysterectomy, and I am paying for pediatric dentistry and obstetrical benefits. I am angry.

If there is something right now that the average middle-class voter is saying about his or her insurance premiums, it is that they are angry. They feel they are being forced by Washington to buy things they do not need and sacrifice other parts of their budget because if they do not, they know the Federal Government will come after them with the force of law, penalizing their family, and they do not want that.

So what can we do? First, we acknowledge, as the House has, that ObamaCare is not working. Premiums are going up 20 to 40 percent per year. In Eleven States, so I am told, individual markets are in a death spiral.

I could go through that, which we already know. President Trump knew it. As Candidate Trump, President Trump pledged four major things:

No. 1, he pledged to eliminate mandates. The Senate is committed to working with the House and the President to eliminate those mandates. Washington, DC, should not tell you what to do.

No. 2, he pledged to care for those with preexisting reasons. As Senator ALEXANDER said, it is something that touches every family. The President was particularly concerned about those whose preexisting condition was opioid addiction. We have to recognize that they will not get better unless they receive treatment. It is better to treat than it is to incarcerate or to bury. So we must honor the President's pledge there.

He also pledged to cover all and to lower premiums. It is this last I wish to focus on now.

How do we lower premiums? How do we say to Tina, who 2 years ago was paying \$500 more a month, that her premium will be lower? Well, there are several ways. Let me focus first on lowering the cost of care.

Right now, healthcare is way too expensive. If you go in for an urgent care visit, you may pay \$1,500 in one urgent care center and \$50 in another. As a patient, you do not know. You would never buy a car that way. Can you imagine walking into a car dealership, picking your car, and then saying: Bill me 6 months from now, and I will pay whatever you ask. No one would do that. We shouldn't ask the average patient to do it because when we hide those costs from the patient, we do not allow her to be an informed consumer. Lacking information, she inevitably pays more.

So one thing I have proposed, along with Senator COLLINS and four other Senators—Senators from South Carolina, South Dakota, Georgia, and West Virginia—is price transparency, which is to say that when someone goes in to get their daughter's ear ache addressed, they know what it would cost at this urgent care center versus another.

A good example of exactly what I am talking about—there was an article in the Los Angeles Times a few years ago about the cash price of a CT scan in the Los Angeles Basin. It would vary from \$250 to \$2,500, and the person purchasing the service with cash would never know.

I envision a time when someone takes their smart phone and they scan a barcode, and the barcode says: You can go at midnight on Thursday and

get a CT scan of your daughter for \$250 or you can go right now and pay \$2,500. You look at a quality code, and both have equal quality. I can see the mother turning to her daughter and saying "Baby, we are staying up Thursday night" because that mother knows she can take care of her family's financial health, as well as her daughter's health, just by being an informed consumer.

So one way we lower premiums is by lowering the cost of healthcare, and the way we lower the cost of healthcare is by empowering patients with the knowledge of price.

The second way we can manage to lower the cost of premiums is to take care of those who are sick. The Senator from Tennessee ended by speaking about our commitment to care for those with preexisting conditions. Of course it is in the interest of the patient that he or she who has cancer is able to get care for their cancer. Jimmy Kimmel just spoke about his son being born with a congenital heart condition. He would have quickly died. Mr. Kimmel choked up as he spoke about it. Well, shouldn't every family have the reassurance that their child born in such a way would also have their needs addressed? I was struck that Nick Mulvaney, President Trump's OMB Director, agreed with Mr. Kimmel. This is not a Republican issue, not a Democratic issue; it is an American issue. But it is also in society's interest.

I am a physician. I worked in a public hospital for the uninsured for 30 years. I tell folks, as long as that emergency room door was open, no matter what time, day or night, in through that door came folks who had all kinds of healthcare conditions. Some of them would come every week. Some of them would come twice a week. We called them frequent fliers. They may have been addicted or mentally ill. They may have had terrible diabetes which was fully controlled or bad asthma, and they would come in with an exacerbation and could not breathe. Every time they came in, there was a \$2,000 to \$20,000 charge—every time. But if you manage that patient through a primary care office or an attached urgent care center, what you are charging \$2,000 for here, you can manage for \$150 there. Not only that, when you manage it for \$150 there, if that person actually works, she is more likely to hold a job, more likely to support her family, less likely to go on dependence, more likely to pay taxes. Society wins as she wins. That should be our goal. So another way to lower premiums is to actively manage the cost of disease.

People always say: We want government to run like a business. Let me describe what happens in a large corporation. Take ExxonMobil. You will find that ExxonMobil has an insurance company, a third-party administrator.

They look at someone who is a high-cost employee, and they actively engage in managing that patient's illness so that, one, they are better, but, two, they lower cost. We as a government should do that, which a responsible employer does as well.

The last thing I want to mention is that the way to lower premiums is by expanding coverage. When Candidate Trump said he wanted to lower premiums and preserve coverage, he understood that the two are linked. If you have a big risk pool—and a risk pool is just the folks who are insured. Everybody who has insurance—that is called the risk pool. If it is big, with lots of young folks who are in their twenties, others in their thirties and forties, and then a few folks like me in their fifties, if someone gets sick, you spread the expense of that one over the many. Particularly if the many include the younger and healthier, there is a subsidy for the older and sicker.

Go back to ExxonMobil. Let's imagine they have 50,000 employees. If they have 50,000 employees and 10 of them get cancer, have liver transplants, terrible car wrecks, or accidents, their premiums don't even blip. Because you spread the cost of these expensive illnesses over the many, all benefit, and cost is held down.

So when President Trump pledged to preserve coverage, he was recognizing that nexus between having a big risk pool and lowering that premium.

Let me finish by saying this: My commitment to Tina and my commitment to the voters of Louisiana and the people of the United States is to try to lower premiums. They cannot afford the un-Affordable Care Act. The way we can do that, which I have outlined today, includes empowering patients with the knowledge of price to lower the cost of healthcare; encouraging coverage that manages those who are sick so that those who are sick stay well and are less likely to consume expensive emergency room care, as an example, but are also more likely to live full, vibrant lives; and lastly, restoring what is called actuarial soundness, the law of big numbers, a risk pool in which if one of us gets cancer, that cost is spread over many.

Mr. President, if we manage to lower premiums, we will fulfill our promise to the American people, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to fulfill that promise.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NORTHEAST COLORADO FIRES

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the recent impact of prairie fires in northeastern Colorado. A lot of times when you turn on the national news in the spring, summer, or fall, you might see fires in Colorado, but most of the time those fires are located in western Colorado in the mountains.

We have had some horrible fires in recent years. The past decade has been littered with far too many fires of great consequence to our environment, to families, and to homes—and the damage they have caused. Oftentimes we don't see as much in the news about fires in other parts of the State, including the Eastern Plains of Colorado, the Great Plains and prairies.

At the end of March, Logan and Phillips Counties saw a blaze that burned 32,000 acres, destroying homes, harming cattle and farm operations, and shutting down a key interstate corridor. To put 32,000 acres into perspective, in 2016, the largest fire in Colorado was the Beaver Creek fire near Walden, burning tens of thousands of acres over the course of 3 months. The fire burned about 38,000 acres. The fire burning 32,000 acres in northeastern Colorado took only about 24 hours of time. So we had 38,000 acres burn in 3 months, and 32,000 acres in northeastern Colorado burned in 24 hours. In both cases, these were incredibly dangerous situations to land, people, and those around them.

These images from the Denver Post paint a frightening picture of the devastation the area faced. We can look at these pictures here. You can see what happened with the dirt, debris, smoke, and weather that was created by the fire, and you can see the damage and what happened. You can see the damage to property here.

I want to go back to the earlier picture and talk about some of the other impacts we saw. You can see the firemen from eastern Colorado working to protect property, trying to stop the fire before it reached the homestead.

You can see someone with a tractor, and they are trying to disc up the ground, trying to create a firebreak. People from around eastern Colorado, northeastern Colorado were getting into their tractors, getting their tillage equipment, their chisels, discs, and sweeps to try to break up the ground to create a firebreak so that maybe they could stop the fire. I commend the first responders for containing this fire and preventing any loss of life while also preventing other fire hotspots from breaking out into larger, devastating blazes because of the work they did.

In the middle of these fires, I remember talking to a county commissioner from Logan County, and he described the situation where they had tried to create a firebreak with their road graders and the farmers in the field trying

to disc up the ground to stop the fire from moving.

I remember vividly when the county commissioner told me that at a certain time of the day he had to make a phone call that he would never forget in his life. He called the county commissioners from the neighboring county and said that the fire was moving that way. He said: Hey, I want you to know, Logan County is unable to stop the fire. It is coming your way. I am sorry; it is in your hands now.

Imagine that phone call. This horrible thing that has happened in your county is also spreading to the next county, and you can't do anything about it, despite the incredible efforts and acts of heroism to try to stop it.

Fire departments from across Colorado came to northeastern Colorado in that part of the State to stand alongside local firefighters to get this fire under control. Dozens of agencies and departments responded.

Being from Yuma County, south of where this fire took place, I know how alarming and unforgiving these fast-moving prairie fires can be on the farmers, ranchers, and communities in their path. I fought prairie fires as well in northeastern Colorado and know how fast they move and how indiscriminate they are in their destruction.

I also know the challenges people now face in Phillips and Logan Counties as they try to recover in the spring, but I can confidently say that the community is recovering. According to local agronomist, Dave Gibson:

Within six days of the fire, 85 percent of the cropland was planted with oats to prevent soil erosion with neighbors volunteering to help and donate. It was an amazing effort.

My office has been in communication with State and Federal officials, along with those impacted, to ensure we are doing everything possible to assist in this process.

Those from northeastern Colorado are dependent upon agriculture for their way of life. Two-thirds of Colorado's agricultural production comes from the South Platte River valley, those areas considered to be in northeastern Colorado. I have spoken on the Senate floor about the difficult times these farmers are facing outside of the context of national disasters. When times are already tough, seeing your land and cattle operation burned up in a prairie fire makes things even worse. It is during these challenging times in agriculture, whether it is the impact of fire or low commodity prices, that we are reminded of the need for effective leadership.

I was pleased this last week when the Chamber came together in a bipartisan fashion to confirm Governor Sonny Perdue of Georgia as our Secretary of Agriculture. Senators on both sides of the aisle recognized that supporting

our Nation's farmers and ranchers is not a partisan issue.

It is my hope that we can support Secretary Perdue to expeditiously confirm the rest of his team at USDA because we need it in agriculture. Whether it is the FSA or a crop insurance issue as a result of a fire or a situation relating to trade and how we are going to address low commodity prices, the Secretary of Agriculture needs a team around him. Congress must work with Secretary Perdue to address this crisis in agriculture.

In Colorado, we have seen net farm incomes drop 80 percent since the record highs of 2011. If you look at this headline, this was in the Wall Street Journal some weeks ago. The headline says: "The Next American Farm Bust Is Upon Us." That is because if you look at just the State of Colorado alone, there has been a drop of 80 percent in farm income from the record highs of 2011. That is net farm income down 80 percent.

I believe this Congress needs to act with a four-pronged approach.

First, we need a long-term farm policy in place. With the farm bill expiring in September of 2018, Congress must begin negotiating about how we are going to move forward in a responsible fashion. I commend the Senate and House Agriculture Committees for holding hearings on the next farm bill, and I look forward to conducting our own roundtables and listening sessions to talk about and to learn about and to listen to how we can make a difference. Federal policy certainty with a long-term farm policy is essential for farmers and ranchers.

The second thing we must do is to provide regulatory relief. We have already repealed about \$85 billion worth of regulations over the last 3 months. That is an incredible feat to relieve the American economy from the harm and pressure of \$85 billion worth of regulatory overreach. By relieving the American business community of that \$85 billion worth of regulations and relieving the American family of that pressure as well, it also means we have been able to reduce paperwork by 54 million hours.

Imagine that: \$85 billion worth of regulatory reductions means there is 54 million hours of paperwork that no longer has to be completed. Instead, that money, time, and effort can be invested in growing opportunities and following up on sales leads and making that money work for the business and family instead of just for the government.

When it comes to agriculture, the regulatory relief to address this next American farm crisis—some of that regulatory relief, the \$85 billion, includes measures such as repealing the Bureau of Land Management 2.0 rule or finally getting the waters of the United States regulation out of the way. That

is the kind of regulatory relief we have to continue to pursue.

To those who may not know what waters of the United States regulation did, let's take an example in Colorado. Under the EPA's own study, two-thirds of Colorado waterways are described or defined as intermittent flow. Intermittent flow means they don't have water in them year-round. But according to the government, they would be considered navigable waterways. I don't know how you get anything to float down a dry river, but apparently the EPA can. That \$85 billion of regulatory relief includes stopping the waters of the United States rule. We have to continue to peel back the burdensome regulations on American agriculture.

The third thing we have to address is access to finance. Finance is critical to any farmer. There is an old joke, an old saying that if you go out to a farmer—and they may know this already—and ask: How do you make a small fortune in agriculture? The answer is that you start with a large one. I think it is time we fixed that.

Wouldn't it be nice if people weren't just relying on the bank, but they could actually produce enough money to help them into the future, to help them thrive, prosper, grow, and bring in new generations of family? During difficult economic times, when we are facing incredible challenges and low commodity prices, we do need to have access to financing. Whether it is through the community bank or banks on Wall Street or the Farm Credit Union or farm credit system, farmers, ranchers, and those in agriculture need access to financing to get through this difficult time.

That production loan, that operating loan is how they make it from season to season, harvest to harvest, and planting to planting to make sure they have the ability to stay on the farm. Right now we have a system that I am worried about—a financial regulatory system in place that perhaps a farmer walks into a bank one day, a bank they have been doing business with for 100 years, and they have never missed a payment, but all of a sudden, based on some Washington, DC, formulary, they can no longer get the loan they need to keep them into the next year, even though that bank in their hometown on Main Street knows they will be able to make that payment.

What we have created is a system and financial regulations that are going to make it impossible for some of these farmers to work out the crisis that is upon them. I sent a letter 2 weeks ago to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, requesting a review of all regulations potentially inhibiting rural access to finance.

The fourth thing we have to get right is trade opportunity for American agriculture. With corn and wheat prices near 10-year lows, the most obvious so-

lution is to open up more international markets for agriculture to continue to look for new opportunities to export American agricultural products overseas. The price of commodities for a bushel of corn is about the same price today as it was back when I was born in 1974. Opening up trade opportunities, opening new markets will give us the value-added opportunity to help get more for that bushel of corn.

Some of the greatest opportunities lie in Asia—50 percent of global population, 50 percent of GDP in the near future. Those are markets we have to open up in U.S. agriculture. Those are markets that already have access in many cases to U.S. markets, but if we want to sell products there, sometimes we are hit with tariffs. That is not fair. We have to make sure we are reducing the tariffs we face when we go into their markets because they seem to have unfettered access into ours much of the time.

Those are all measures we can address. The four things are long-term farm policies, regulatory relief, access to financing, trade opportunities that work for the American farmers and ranchers.

Those recent fires in northeast Colorado, as well as fires in past years in Colorado and across the West, are another reminder of the need to address wildfire borrowing. Wildfire borrowing is a process where the Department of Agriculture's Forest Service spends money that it has budgeted for the fires. It runs out of money because it didn't budget enough money to fight the fires, and it turns around and starts cannibalizing other areas of spending that could actually have been used to help reduce the next forest fire. We have to end the practice of fire borrowing, and we have to work with Secretary Perdue as head of the U.S. Forest Service within the Department of Agriculture to end wildfire borrowing and to improve forest and land management to prevent these uncontrollable fires that we have seen.

Supporting those impacted by fires, whether it is in the forest or around the prairie, is something we should all be able to get behind. In Logan and Phillips Counties, neighbors banded together. They worked to recover and rebuild from the devastation shown on these images. It has happened for generations in eastern Colorado and across this country. When there is a crisis, when there is a tragedy, neighbors help their neighbors. You can see it in these pictures. But we can also help our neighbors here in Washington, DC, and across our country's vast farmlands by doing what is right in addressing these challenges. Just as Logan County and Phillips County banded together, we should band together with American agriculture.

It is my hope that Congress can learn from the lessons taught in the after-

math of these difficult situations to come together, support rural communities, support agriculture, and make sure we support our fire response efforts, importantly, to prevent that next catastrophic fire.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GOVERNMENT FUNDING LEGISLATION

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, earlier today, the Senate voted to pass the Omnibus appropriations bill for 2017.

This bill is a product of bipartisan negotiations and hard work on the part of our Appropriations Committee, of which I am proud to be a member, and the leadership of both of our parties.

I am encouraged by the overwhelming support for this important legislation that reflects our Nation's priorities and funds the government in a responsible way. I am very pleased—and I can't emphasize this enough; very pleased—that the bill includes a bipartisan provision that keeps the promise of lifetime healthcare benefits for 22,000 coal miners and their families, including 8,500 West Virginians—my home State.

Bankruptcies in the coal industry meant that these miners would have lost their critical health insurance coverage at the end of last year. We passed that little, short-term extension for 4 months, and it was set to expire this coming week.

This appropriations bill provides certainty to these coal mining families. Because of this bill, they will keep the healthcare they earned through their years of hard work.

I worked closely with my West Virginia colleague, Senator JOE MANCHIN, as well as our Representatives—Representatives DAVID MCKINLEY, EVAN JENKINS, and ALEX MOONEY—to get this permanent miners' healthcare fix included in the bill.

I also want to particularly thank our majority leader, Senator MITCH MCCONNELL, for his leadership on behalf of the miners in West Virginia and in his home State of Kentucky, and the rest of Appalachia. I would also like to thank my fellow Republican from the State of Ohio, Senator ROB PORTMAN, who was a champion for those miners as well.

But, most importantly, I would like to thank the miners from across coal country who came to Washington to advocate for their healthcare benefits. I met with dozens—probably hundreds, over the course of the years—of West Virginia miners in my office over the last several years.

Last September, miners came by the thousands to the west front of the Capitol and stood for hours in just excruciatingly hot conditions. These miners and their families put a human face on the issue. They are the reason—they are the reason—that we have a successful result today.

Many of these miners have shared their stories with me through letters and emails and personal stories and visits, and I want to share just a few of their thoughts.

Brenda, a coal miner's widow from West Virginia, wrote that continued healthcare coverage presented a life or death situation for her. She wrote:

I have medical problems, which require monthly doctor visits and prescriptions and I will no longer be able to see my doctors—nor afford the prescriptions should our health insurance be taken away.

Alfred, a retired West Virginia coal miner wrote:

We were not given our health benefits as a gift. We worked hard in the mines every day for a long time, and it was backbreaking, year-to-year.

Howard, another retiree, wrote that he worked in the West Virginia coal mines for 41 years to earn this promise of healthcare benefits.

William, also a retired West Virginia miner, wrote that he has had several surgeries, including one on New Year's Day, 2017. The possible expiration of health benefits and the thought of temporary benefit extensions left him worried about whether he would be able to access necessary followup medical care for his surgery.

After learning that permanent healthcare would be included in this bill, Gisele wrote:

Tonight I will rest soundly knowing that we will be able to afford our medicines.

For Brenda, Alfred, William, Howard, Gisele, and thousands of other miners and widows across West Virginia, this bill keeps the promise of lifetime healthcare.

There is more work to be done to protect the pension benefits of our retired miners and to bring jobs back to coal country, to areas that have been hit hard by the previous administration's policies. But the permanent healthcare in this bill is a critical victory for our coal mining families and the communities where they live.

I would also like to quote a young man who sent me an email. I met him at a Chick-fil-A on a Saturday—not a Sunday, of course, on a Saturday. We struck up a little friendship, and the day he learned that this was in the bill, he texted me and said:

Senator, I met you in the Chick-fil-A. Thank you, you have now secured the benefits for my Paw Paw.

I thought it was such a heartfelt message that he sent to me—a new friend of mine who had been struggling along trying to figure out a way to help his grandfather.

There are a number of other important priorities in this bill as well. Mining communities will also be helped by tens of millions of dollars across different agencies to help us retrain our miners who have lost their jobs.

This bill also includes a significant investment in new fossil energy research, including carbon capture and sequestration. These funds will help spur the development of new markets for coal to keep coal mining jobs for years to come.

The appropriations bill also includes funding increases for rural broadband deployment, something I have been very concerned about, as well as continued funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission. Access to broadband is absolutely critical for economic development and improved access to health and education opportunities in our rural communities, and we are sadly underserved. There is much work to be done to bring access to high-speed internet to many communities, but this bill is a positive step.

As chairman of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee, I am glad that we included increased funding for the Drug-Free Communities Support Program and the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Program, or the HIDTA Program. Unfortunately, cascading across this country is the devastating problem of prescription drug abuse, opioid abuse, and heroin addiction. The Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education portion of the bill includes an \$800 million increase to combat opioid addiction. This includes the \$500 million authorized for the 21st Century Cures Act to help States with their response to the crisis. It also includes an increase for medication-assisted treatment programs and for other programs outlined by the CARA bill that we passed last summer.

In addition to these important treatment resources, we have also funded important enforcement and prevention aspects of the problem as well, including \$50 million for the Department of Veterans Affairs for opioid and substance abuse for the treatment of our veterans. This is a real problem for our returning veterans who have addiction issues. There are funds to implement the Jason Simcakoski act that Senator BALDWIN and I introduced.

Unfortunately, West Virginia is the epicenter of the opioid crisis that has struck communities across the country. Passage of this appropriations bill will make a difference—a big difference—for people who are struggling to overcome addiction and to help our States that are financially strapped and our local communities combat this terrible problem.

Another area of significance to a lot of people in my State and across the country is the increase in the funding

for the National Institutes of Health. There is a \$400 million increase for Alzheimer's research—something important to me, as I lost both of my parents who suffered from Alzheimer's, this terrible disease. We need to find not just treatments, but we need to find a cure, and I think NIH is where we are going to find it.

There are many other reasons to support this bill. It has additional flood relief for our devastated flood areas. I know the Presiding Officer has major floods in Louisiana, and we had them in West Virginia, and we have had them across the country.

Just to mention a few other things, this bill includes a pay increase for our troops, which is so important. They are on the frontlines.

The bill also works on scientific research for our educational institutions, something important to our universities in West Virginia.

But, most of all, I just want to voice my appreciation for the bipartisan work by the members of the appropriations committees, who worked hard to get this bill where we are. It is a responsible bill. It is a commonsense bill. It sets our priorities. Today, because of the fact that we passed it with support from both parties, I believe it will achieve a positive result for our country.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, it is a busy day. There is a lot going on in Washington, DC. Quite frankly, at home there is a lot going on in homes, families, and lives. Today is also a unique day for America as well. It is the one day that we as a nation have something called the National Day of Prayer. It started in 1988. It was an official day on this day, the first Thursday of May. But in the 1950s, Harry Truman started this process of a national day of prayer. So it far precedes that.

Our Nation has a rich and beautiful history in prayer. Members of the House and Senate, as the Presiding Officer knows, open the day every day with a prayer. It has been that way from the very beginning. Even the first Continental Congress on September 7, 1774, opened in prayer.

Tonight, Americans will gather in Statuary Hall in the U.S. Capitol to celebrate the National Day of Prayer. Statuary Hall was once the House of Representatives, where the House gathered. It was also the largest gathering place in Washington, DC, and many

churches for years met in Statuary Hall to be able to pray. It was the common meeting place. In fact, for a period of time in the early 1800s, four churches a Sunday used at that time the House of Representatives Chamber—what is now known as Statuary Hall—as their place for worship.

Thomas Jefferson worshipped there. In fact, every President from Thomas Jefferson all the way to Abraham Lincoln attended church on Sundays in Statuary Hall, what was at that time the House of Representatives Chamber.

That is an interesting fact. I have had folks talk about Thomas Jefferson's statement about the wall of separation between church and state. That was actually in a letter Thomas Jefferson wrote to the Danbury Baptist Association, saying they would not allow the State to take over churches—that there would be this wall of separation between church and state. Two days after President Jefferson wrote that statement, he attended church in the House of Representatives Chamber on a Sunday.

Even earlier, at our Constitutional Convention in 1787, Benjamin Franklin stated: "In the beginning of the Contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for Divine protection."

Many U.S. Presidents have signed proclamations for national prayer since 1799, from George Washington all the way to the present.

The National Day of Prayer is a good day for us to be able to reflect as a Nation and to be able to remember well that there are many people of faith in our country that do believe there is a Creator God and that he has made a difference in our own personal lives and he has made a difference in our Nation.

We go back to President Truman's statement. He said in 1952: "The President shall set aside and proclaim a suitable day each year, other than a Sunday, as a National Day of Prayer, on which the people of the United States may turn to God in prayer and meditation in churches, in groups, and as individuals."

As I mentioned, in 1988, President Reagan even affirmed that.

I don't think I could find very many Americans who would say we are running out of things to pray for: debt; anger in the Nation; conversation about hard, difficult issues that we face; terrorism and threats of violence from around the world. We are not out of things to pray for. Far from it. But people of faith believe that, regardless of the obstacles we face, there is a God that we can call out to who hears us and who cares about our daily lives. He is not a God who just created and walked away. He is a God whom we can know, and we feel confident that God knows and loves us.

Philippians 4:6 says: "Do not be anxious about anything, but in everything

by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known to God."

I am always encouraged when I travel around Oklahoma and around the Nation. I even ran into some people this week who stopped me in the hallway and just said: "I want you to know I'll pray for you."

I encourage Americans to pray for the President, for the Vice President, for their Cabinet, for the Supreme Court, for Members of the Senate and of the House, for the staff who serve around us and with us and serve people around this country, for our military, and for first responders. The list could go on and on of people who set aside their time and their life to be able to serve. It is not an unreasonable request to be able to say: Pray for them; ask God to continue to protect them.

It is amazing to me how many Christians I bump into of my own faith who find it easier to complain about government than it is to pray for those in government. I think that is an issue we need to fix, and today is a good day to begin that, on this National Day of Prayer.

I remember well, personally, that I grew up around the church. My mom dragged me to church. I mean it. She made me go. But I remember extremely well sitting in the balcony of the church one Sunday and actually paying attention to our pastor as he would read through Scriptures. Probably for the first time in my life, I started actually thinking about this one simple truth: There is a God, and I don't know Him.

I couldn't shake that reality. Laying in bed late that Sunday night by myself, I remember praying—probably for me, for the first time in my life, actually praying. And I prayed a very simple 8-year-old prayer. My prayer was this: God, I don't know You, but I know I have done things wrong in my life and I need Your forgiveness. Would You come into my life and take control?

It was the beginning point for me—just the most simple of ways for me to begin a relationship with God, trusting in His forgiveness and His ability to forgive.

I have in my office two paintings that hang. One painting is the hands of a potter at a wheel, shaping the clay as they choose to. It reminds me of the sovereignty of God. Below it is a painting of those same hands sitting at that same bowl holding it, but this time the bowl is done. It is full of water. There is a towel in it, and there are feet around the bowl. It reminds me of the call to serve that we all have—to be able to serve people in the most humble of ways. It reminds me that there is a God, and that He has called us to a task. Part of that task is to pray.

The National Day of Prayer is not a mandate from the Federal Government that all people should pray—far from

it. It is just a reminder. It is a reminder for people of faith who choose to pray that this is a good day when we can reset to be able to pray for our Nation and for our leaders. It is an acknowledgement, quite frankly, that millions of people of faith believe in God and that those individuals believe that God hears our prayers and responds. So thus we should pray.

Culturally, it is fascinating to me to be able to talk to people about prayer. I ran into some people that find it perfectly permissible in times of great struggle and anguish to pray, but in times of thanksgiving, it seems odd. Let me give a for instance.

A couple of years ago, a football coach in our country was fired from his job because at the end of a football game he would kneel down after the game was over and thank God for the safety of his players. For that, he was released from his job because, for some reason, Americans don't accept prayers of thanksgiving. But at those same football games, if a player was injured and the coaches and players were to kneel down, the crowd would see that as a good sign of respect—that we respect someone who is injured, and it is entirely reasonable to pray when there is an injury on the field but maybe not if it is just a prayer of thanksgiving.

It is an odd season for us as a nation, trying to figure out who we are and what we believe and if Americans of faith can live their faith. I would challenge us as a country, for those of us who have faith, to be able to live our faith with integrity and with consistency, and on a National Day of Prayer like this, to remind our Nation that there are millions of people of faith but that there are also millions of people that have no faith at all. They are also Americans, and they are also to be respected because many people are on a journey with God.

There are many people who don't practice faith at all today that consider simple things in their life. Their financial house may be in order. Their family life may be in order. But their spiritual life remains a vacuum, and they are, quite frankly, trying to figure that out.

I am always interested in the stories of Abraham Lincoln. Abraham Lincoln in his earliest political campaigns was chastised that he was anti-faith or that he was secretly an atheist because he never attended church everywhere. He said he had respect for the Bible and read the Bible and had respect for faith, but he just personally didn't practice it. In his earliest campaigns, he was really challenged by that and only narrowly won at times. In fact, he lost some of his campaigns, and he had attributed losing those campaigns to people having challenged him that he was anti-faith.

But then we read his words when he was President of the United States, and

we find a person who was on a journey with God. It wasn't anti-faith. He just didn't practice faith.

But listen to these words in 1863 from President Lincoln. He proclaimed a National Day of Prayer, as every President before him has, and he wrote this:

We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of Heaven. We have been preserved, these many years, in peace and in prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth, and power, as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us! It behooves us then, to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness.

That is a man who was on a journey with God, who came to the Presidency as a person of no faith, who understood the responsibilities, and his heart dramatically changed.

It is a good day for us to reflect on this National Day of Prayer. I would encourage the Nation, if they choose, to be able to watch and join in or to just quietly be able to pray on their own, to remember again that those of us who pray for others should probably spend some time praying for ourselves as well. At times, as we criticize others, we should probably self-evaluate and ask the simple question: Do we live the values that we demand of others?

It is a good day to pray. Later tonight, I will stand in that historic Statuary Hall where Presidents and Members of Congress and individuals have prayed for a long time, and I will read Daniel, Chapter 9 to the group, which reads:

Now, our God, hear the prayers and petitions of your servant. For your sake, Lord, look with favor on your desolate sanctuary. Give ear, our God, and hear us.

It is a similar prayer that many of us pray in gatherings all over this Capitol every week. Members of the House and the Senate and staff quietly find places in this building to pray. It is not a bad idea for the Nation to join us.

Hear, O God, our prayer. We need Your help.

Mr. President, I yield back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the vote on the motion to concur in the House message to accompany H.R. 244.

On vote No. 121, had I been present, I would have voted yea on the motion to concur in the House message to accompany H.R. 244.

I want to take a few minutes to acknowledge today's bipartisan passage of the Omnibus appropriations bill to fund the government through the end of the 2017 fiscal year. While I am disappointed that the bill's passage comes more than halfway through the fiscal year, the bill that was sent to the President today is the product of months of bipartisan work by the appropriations committees on both sides of Capitol Hill and represents how Congress should and can work together to provide the American people with critical investments that will create jobs and grow our Nation's economy. It is my hope that the bipartisan cooperation that made this bill possible will continue as Congress begins its work on appropriations for fiscal year 2018.

This bill includes critical investments in the middle class, our Nation's infrastructure, medical and scientific research, and our national security. I am proud to report that much of the funding in this bill will benefit my home State of Illinois, funding a wide variety of Illinois projects and priorities. Most importantly, it takes the threat of a government shutdown, which would have hurt our economy, off the table.

This bill fully rejects President Trump's proposed assault on medical research and instead includes a \$2 billion increase for the National Institutes of Health, or NIH, bringing the agency's funding level to \$34.1 billion. This 6 percent increase in NIH funding matches the steady, predictable growth called for in legislation I have introduced over the past several years, the American Cures Act.

Thanks to the NIH, we have cut the cancer death rate by 11 percent in women and 19 percent in men. HIV/AIDS is no longer a death sentence. Polio and smallpox are all but eradicated in this country. We are closer than ever to developing a universal in-

fluenza vaccine, to rebuilding parts of the human heart without needing to rely on transplants, and to finding new and effective therapies to delay the onset of neurological diseases like Alzheimer's and Parkinson's. These medical breakthroughs will not happen without sustained, robust Federal funding for medical research supported by the NIH.

President Trump's disastrous budget proposals for fiscal years 2017 and 2018 would have slashed NIH's budget by nearly 20 percent, bringing NIH to its lowest funding level in 15 years. I am pleased that Congress came together on a bipartisan basis to protect the NIH, and I want to thank my colleague Senator BLUNT, chairman of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies Subcommittee, for his efforts to provide this vital funding. I will be working hard to ensure that NIH gets another significant funding increase for fiscal year 2018.

While I am encouraged that this bill includes \$7.3 billion for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, or CDC, it is my hope that Congress will find a way to work together on a bipartisan basis to provide the CDC with even greater funding increases in the years to come.

The CDC has so many important responsibilities—from combating prescription drug abuse and fighting infectious disease outbreaks globally to preventing diabetes and protecting patients from antibiotic resistant superbugs. It is imperative that we provide this agency with the funding necessary to protect the public health.

Chairman COLE is a strong champion of CDC funding, and it is my hope that we can work together on a bipartisan, bicameral basis to plus-up overall CDC funding in the coming years.

I am pleased that harmful tobacco riders that would have severely undermined the Food and Drug Administration, or FDA's, ability to protect our Nation's youth from harmful, addictive tobacco products were not included in this bill. By omitting these terrible policy riders, the FDA can continue to regulate cigars and e-cigarettes. I have said it before and I will say it again: I remain troubled that Big Tobacco continues to market and develop products aimed at getting youth addicted to tobacco.

This bill includes more than \$1 billion to help combat our Nation's prescription opioid and heroin epidemic. This funding will be available to States and local communities to help with prevention, enforcement, treatment, and recovery. In 2015, more than 33,000 people in the United States died from an opioid overdose. To combat this epidemic, we must commit proper funding and resources toward solving the problem. This bill begins to do that.

I am proud that this bill increases funding to support critical transportation infrastructure projects in Illinois, despite President Trump's calls to eliminate funding for some of our most important transportation programs. The capital investment grant program, which President Trump has proposed to eliminate, allows communities to compete for funding to build and improve subway, commuter rail, light rail, bus rapid transit projects through New Starts, Small Starts, and Core Capacity grants. This program was increased by \$236 million in this bill to \$2.4 billion with \$100 million in Core Capacity funds specifically allocated to help fund the Chicago Transit Authority's modernization of the red and purple lines.

The Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery, TIGER, grant program, which Illinois has relied on repeatedly to help fund transit, highway, and bridge projects throughout our State, was also protected from elimination in this bill. As a result of bipartisan support for this program, Illinois will now be able to compete for the \$500 million in TIGER funds included in this bill.

Funding for federal highway and transit formula grants to States was increased in this bill to the full funding levels authorized in the 2015 bipartisan FAST Act. As a result, \$43.2 billion in highway funding, a \$905 million increase, and \$9.3 billion in transit funding, a \$753 million increase, will be provided to States around the country to improve and maintain their roads and public transportation. Federal funding comprises 80 percent of the funds included in the Illinois Department of Transportation's multiyear highway improvement program.

This bill also includes critical funding to improve freight and passenger rail around the country. Nowhere is this more important than in Illinois, our Nation's rail hub. And \$98 million in newly authorized rail safety and state of good repair grants was included in the bill, as well as \$1.495 billion in nationwide funding for Amtrak, which commuters in both Chicago and downstate Illinois rely on every day to get to their schools and jobs. By providing adequate funding to Amtrak, more than 500 communities in 46 States across the country will continue to see improved passenger rail service.

The bill allocates \$150 million in funding to provide rural areas with reliable air service through the Essential Air Service program. This funding supports critical air service in Quincy, Decatur, and Marion, IL.

This agreement provides \$1.3 billion to permanently extend the health benefits of more than 22,000 retired coal miners and widows, including nearly 2,000 in Illinois. Coal mining is difficult and dangerous work, and these men and women who spent decades working

in these mines risked their lives, health, and personal safety to ensure that our country had power. I heard countless heartbreaking stories from Illinois coal miners and their families about the fear and uncertainty they were facing if they lose their health benefits. While this bill does not provide relief for the miners' failing pension fund, they can find comfort in knowing they will have health care for life.

As vice chair of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I am particularly proud of the bipartisan work that was done in the subcommittee to provide critical equipment and training for our troops, as well as funds to continue the fight against terrorist threats like ISIL. I want to thank Chairman THAD COCHRAN and his staff for working with my staff and me on a bipartisan basis to finalize this section of the bill.

The bill provides a pay raise for military and civilian personnel, including those in Illinois. It continues the subcommittee's track record of providing 5 percent real growth in lifesaving medical research and makes critical boosts in broader science and technology research.

It also provides important defense funding with particular impact in Illinois. It supports well-paying manufacturing jobs by adding \$110 million to extend the Humvee production line at Rock Island Arsenal and \$979 million to extend the F-18 production line in St. Louis for downstate Illinois. It also provides \$140 million to stabilize rates at all three Army arsenals. Finally, it adds \$9.9 million not requested in the budget to ensure National Guard cyber protection teams in Illinois and across the country are fully funded.

The omnibus bill does not include any funding for a wall on our southern border. Mexico will not pay for a border wall as the President promised during last year's campaign, and it is absurd to suggest that the American people should now be stuck with the bill. Texas Republican Congressman WILL HURD, whose district covers 800 miles of the southwest border, has described the wall as "the most expensive and least effective way to secure the border." Senate Democrats on the Homeland Security Committee estimate this wall will cost nearly \$70 billion to build and \$150 million a year to maintain. Even the Trump administration acknowledges the wall will cost \$21.6 billion, not including maintenance.

While the Trump administration demanded \$3 billion in additional funding for immigration enforcement, congressional Democrats succeeded in cutting this amount in half. I am pleased that the omnibus does not include any funding for President Trump's plan to triple the number of immigration agents. This unnecessary and prohibitively expensive goal would help the adminis-

tration target 8 million undocumented immigrants who are now priorities for deportation under Trump administration policy. This ignores the reality that the vast majority of undocumented immigrants in our country are law-abiding individuals who make important economic contributions and have deep roots in our country.

Democrats also successfully resisted a rider that would have deprived communities around the country—including Chicago in my home State of Illinois—of billions of dollars in critical Federal funding if they refuse to take part in the Trump administration's mass deportation scheme.

The bill also includes important new oversight measures for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or ICE, detention operations. While some additional detention funding may have been needed to address the surge in border crossings at the end of 2016, it appears that a reduction in ICE's detention budget will be appropriate in fiscal year 2018, given the sharp decline in border crossings this year.

I am disappointed that the bill includes a problematic rider that circumvents regular legislative order to permit the Trump administration to potentially double the number of foreign guest workers who could be admitted to the United States under the H-2B visa program without needed safeguards. I have long advocated for reform of the H-2B program, which in its current form harms both American and foreign workers. We should not increase the size of the H-2B program unless and until the program is reformed to protect workers from exploitation. I am particularly concerned that this rider gives the Trump administration the authority to determine how many additional H-2B visas will be issued since President Trump owns companies that have sought to import more than 900 H-2B guest workers, including 64 in fiscal year 2017 alone, while turning away hundreds of American workers. I will be closely monitoring the administration's implementation of this provision, which only permits additional visas to be issued if the Secretary of Homeland Security, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor, determines that the needs of American businesses cannot be met by qualified American workers.

While not perfect, this bill exemplifies what Congress can do if it puts politics aside to work together and come to a bipartisan consensus for the good of the American people. I support the passage of this Omnibus appropriations bill. While we now face a much shortened timeline to complete the appropriations process for the next fiscal year, I am hopeful that the bipartisan cooperation exemplified by this bill will continue.●

GOVERNMENT FUNDING
LEGISLATION

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, while not perfect, this bill includes important provisions that will benefit Florida, strengthen our national security, increase resources for our national defense and the fight against ISIS, and give our military men and women the largest pay raise in 6 years.

Given the threats our Nation faces from the likes of North Korea and radical Islamic terrorists, a government shutdown would send exactly the wrong message to the world at a time when it is counting on America to lead.

I am pleased to see this bill funds the Department of Defense to levels authorized by Congress and includes increases for ship building, operations and maintenance, and military readiness. It also incorporates the fiscal year 2017 Intelligence Authorization Act, IAA, that provides essential guidance and authorities for our intelligence community. This year's IAA requires the President to establish an interagency committee to counter Russia's active measures against the U.S., maintains resources for our intelligence community's counterterrorism capabilities, and requires the Director of National Intelligence to complete declassification reviews of terrorist activities of each individual who has been transferred or released from the U.S. detention facility in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

This bill will ensure Florida can continue combatting the Zika virus and the opioid epidemic that is devastating so many families in our communities. I am committed to continuing to fight against Zika and have begun working with the Senate Appropriations Committee to establish an emergency health fund to provide funds for infectious outbreaks, like Zika.

This appropriations bill will also support Everglades restoration and improvements to the Herbert Hoover Dike and our State's ports. Florida's citrus growers will get the help they need to counter the terrible greening that is hurting their crops.

The bill also includes my legislation to protect public housing residents and reform HUD's broken inspection process. I saw firsthand the appalling conditions at Eureka Gardens in Jacksonville, Windsor Cove Apartments in Orlando, and Stonybrook Apartments in Riviera Beach, so I am glad this bill will help ensure the people at these properties finally see real changes for the better.

These provisions make the bill worthy of my support, but as I have said before, we cannot continue to run our country in this way, with one temporary bill after another. Republicans and Democrats in Congress must work together with the Trump administration to restore fiscal sanity, set a long-term budget, and address our Nation's unsustainable and growing debt.

TURKEY

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, today I wish to express my concerns about the outcome of the April 16 constitutional referendum in Turkey, when more than 50 million Turkish citizens voted on constitutional amendments to convert Turkey's parliamentary government into a Presidential system.

Turkey is a longstanding friend of the United States and a NATO ally. Our bilateral partnership dates back to the Cold War when Turkey served as an important bulwark against the creeping influence of the Soviet Union. Time has not diminished Turkey's geostrategic importance. Today Ankara finds itself at the intersection of several critical challenges: the instability in Syria and Iraq, the threat of ISIS and other extremist groups, and the refugee crisis spawned by this regional upheaval.

The United States relies on Turkey and other regional partners to help coordinate and strengthen our collective response. I was deeply troubled when renegade military units attempted to overthrow Turkey's democratically elected government last July. Turkey's strength is rooted in the democratic legitimacy of its government—a pillar of stability targeted by the reckless and criminal coup attempt.

As chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, or U.S. Helsinki Commission, I take very seriously the political commitments made by the 57 participating states of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, OSCE. These commitments, held by both the United States and Turkey, represent the foundation of security and cooperation in the OSCE region. They include an indispensable focus on human rights, rule of law, and democratic institutions.

In the OSCE's founding document, the Helsinki Final Act, participating states affirm "the universal significance of human rights and fundamental freedoms" and consider respect for these to be an "essential factor" for international peace and security. This vision is consistent with long-established U.S. foreign policy promoting human rights and democracy as cornerstones of a safer, more stable international order.

With these principles in mind, the United States must pay urgent attention to the current situation in Turkey and the danger it poses to Turkish and regional stability. Eroding respect for fundamental freedoms, rule of law, and democratic institutions in Turkey has proceeded at an alarming pace. The government's planned "executive presidency" will further decrease government accountability.

Since the attempted coup more than 9 months ago, Turkey has operated under a state of emergency that gives the government sweeping authority to curtail rights and silence opponents.

Certain extraordinary measures may have been justified in the immediate aftermath to restore order, investigate events, and bring perpetrators to justice, but the government's actions have stretched far beyond these legitimate aims. The ongoing purge has touched every institution of government, sector of society, corner of the country, and shade of opposition—military or civilian, Turk or Kurd, religious or secular, nationalist or leftist, political or non-political.

An atmosphere of fear and uncertainty has settled over Turkish society as more than 100,000 people have been detained or arrested. Tens of thousands have been fired from their jobs, had their professional licenses revoked, and had their names released on public lists without any recognizable due process. The government removed and replaced thousands of judges and prosecutors within hours of the coup's defeat, compromising the independence of the judiciary at a moment when an impartial justice system had become more important than ever.

The government has also closed more than 150 media outlets. Upwards of 80 journalists are behind bars. The offices of the country's oldest newspaper were raided, and the paper's editor-in-chief and other staff were arrested. The media environment was already under extraordinary pressure before the coup. Last spring, the government seized control of the country's highest circulation paper. Self-censorship is now widely practiced to avoid provoking the government's ire.

Additionally, state of emergency decrees have given regional governors the ability to curtail freedom of assembly rights, harming the ability of civil society organizations to organize rallies concerning the referendum. Since July, the government has detained more than a dozen opposition parliamentarians. Many more continue to face criminal charges for political statements they made before the coup attempt.

It is difficult to overstate the chilling effect these measures have had on political debate in Turkey; yet these are the circumstances under which Turks voted on April 16. These major constitutional changes passed with a slim majority of 51 percent. The OSCE's international observation mission stated in its preliminary conclusions that the vote "took place on an unlevel playing field" and that "fundamental freedoms essential to a genuinely democratic process were curtailed."

Under the revised constitution, the once largely ceremonial position of President will convert into an "executive presidency" and the position of Prime Minister will be abolished. The President will be elected along with the national assembly every 5 years and has the ability to dissolve the assembly and call new elections at will.

The President will also appoint a larger proportion—nearly half—of the country's supreme judicial council. In a report on these new constitutional provisions, the Venice Commission of the Council of Europe concluded that the amendments are a "step backwards" and pose "dangers of degeneration . . . towards an authoritarian and personal regime."

Turkey is undergoing a disturbing transformation, and I am concerned these changes could undermine the strength of our partnership. President Erdogan's government has dramatically repressed dissent, purged opponents from every sector of government and society, and is now poised to consolidate power further under his self-described "executive presidency."

In the short term, the Turkish Government should act swiftly and transparently to investigate credible claims of voting irregularities in the referendum, as well as the legality of a surprise electoral board decision to admit an unknown number of ballots that should be deemed invalid under existing rules. Public trust in the outcome of such a consequential vote is of utmost importance. Sadly, until now, the government has responded to these challenges with dismissiveness and suppression. In the past week, dozens of activists have been detained for participating in protests against the election results.

Furthermore, the government should lift the state of emergency, stop all forms of repression against the free press, release all imprisoned journalists and political activists, and urgently restore public confidence in the judiciary. Only then can it credibly and independently adjudicate the tens of thousands of cases caught up in the government's months-long dragnet operations.

A country where disagreements are suppressed rather than debated is less secure. A country where institutions are subordinated to personalities is less stable. A country where criticism is conflated with sedition is less democratic. Unless President Erdogan moves urgently to reverse these trends, I fear our partnership will inevitably become more transactional and less strategic. It will become more difficult to justify long-term investment in our relationship with Turkey if the future of the country becomes synonymous with the fortunes of one party or one individual.

The United States and Turkey need a solid foundation for enduring cooperation to tackle regional instability, terrorism, migration, and other challenges. The future of this partnership is difficult to imagine in the midst of a prolonged state of emergency, wide-scale purges, and weakened democratic institutions.

WASTE MANAGEMENT NATIONAL CAREER DAY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would like to recognize Thursday, May 4, as Waste Management National Career Day and share with you the importance of hiring and promoting women in non-traditional female positions as drivers and technicians. I believe it is important that we support and encourage women to pursue these career opportunities that have been historically populated by men.

Women comprise only 2 percent of current drivers and technicians. Waste Management National Career Day will provide an opportunity to share stories of women who have held these positions successfully and moved up into management.

I support this initiative because I believe, as we continue to highlight economic opportunities for women, it is imperative that the private sector develop platforms where women can learn about careers they normally would not consider. This national career day is an excellent example of waste management being proactive in creating ways to increase the number of women in these types of careers across the country.

Without a doubt, investment in women in nontraditional careers brings about significant returns. Women contribute every day to our skillful, effective, and talented workforce. I commend waste management for building a platform where you can increase hiring of females as drivers, technician, front-line management, and give them opportunity for advancement.

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT COLONEL LEO THORSNESS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today deeply saddened by the passing of my dear friend and fellow POW, Lt. Col. Leo Thorsness. One of the greatest honors of my life was serving with Leo, a man whose service exemplified selfless duty and devotion to others. Leo earned the Medal of Honor for his heroism in a daring combat mission in North Vietnam in 1967 when he flew directly into hostile territory on dangerously low fuel in an attempt to rescue his comrades who had been downed in an attack. Just 2 weeks after that courageous mission, Leo's aircraft was shot down, and he was taken captive by North Vietnamese soldiers. Leo would spend the next 6 years imprisoned, including a full year in solitary confinement, and endure unspeakable pain and suffering because of his steadfast adherence to our code of conduct. However, Leo never let this experience break his spirit and inspired the rest of us with his patriotism, perseverance, and hope that we would someday be free.

After returning home, Leo continued to live a selfless life of service, as a

volunteer, State senator, and public speaker, with a simple message: "Do what's right—help others." I am forever grateful for Leo's generosity, friendship, and example and, along with Cindy, send my heartfelt condolences to Leo's wife, Gaylee, and their entire family as we bid farewell to a genuine American hero.

TRIBUTE TO NANCY IACOMINI

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to talk about a special member of the Senate family, Nancy Iacomini. Nancy, who has served as the Democratic Secretary's administrative assistant since 1998, is retiring after 34 years of devoted public service. I know I speak on behalf of all of my colleagues when I say I am going to miss Nancy, but she has certainly earned a respite, and I want to wish her all the best in her retirement.

Nancy is a proud Pittsburgh native. She earned her bachelor of arts degree in art history from the University of Notre Dame. She was an excellent student: she was on the dean's honor list, she was a Notre Dame scholar, and she graduated cum laude. Then she earned a master of arts degree in art history with a concentration in museum practice from George Washington University. Armed with her degrees and proven academic success, Nancy went to work for the National Gallery of Art, NGA. She spent 5 years at the NGA, holding positions of increasing responsibility. During this time, she also contributed entries and artist biographies to "La Vie Moderne: Nineteenth Century Paintings from the Permanent Collection of the Corcoran Gallery of Art," Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 1983.

In 1988, Nancy decided to shift her focus from art history to the art of the possible, and she joined the Democratic Policy Committee as a staff assistant. Within a few short months, she was promoted to the position of special assistant to the floor staff and then again a short time later to the position of executive assistant. The art world pulled her back, though, and from 1994 to 1998, she served as deputy congressional liaison at the National Endowment for the Arts, NEA. Some may recall that this was a critical time in the NEA's history when its very existence was at stake. Nancy helped the NEA weather the storm and then returned to the Senate to work in the Democratic Secretary's office.

Since Nancy came to work in Washington, she has lived in Virginia. Nancy has held leadership roles in the Ballston/Virginia Square Civic Association, the Cherrydale Citizens Association, and the Neighborhood Conservation Advisory Committee. She is a past member and chairman of the county's transportation commission, a past

member and chairman of the historical affairs and landmark review board, and past chairman of the towing advisory board. She also chaired the fire station No. 3 relocation task force. Nancy has also participated in the East Falls Church Working Group, the Clarendon Sector Plan Update, neighborhood traffic calming measures ad hoc advisory group, the subdivision ordinance working group, and the joint George Mason University/Arlington County advisory board. She served as Arlington's representative to WMATA's Riders' Advisory Council from 2006 to 2009 and chaired the council in 2008.

Here in the Senate, Nancy has had so many responsibilities that it would be hard to list them all, but I would note a few. Every Tuesday when the Senate is in session, there is a conference lunch. Nancy has been responsible for organizing the lunch, the topics for discussion, and the materials to be distributed. Despite much complaining from Senators whom I shall not name, she singlehandedly made the lunches more nutritious, with healthier entrees and more salads. That is no small accomplishment. My staff and I worked with Nancy and Gary Myrick on updating and revising the conference rules. Nancy's institutional memory and patience and helpful suggestions were crucially important and much appreciated in that endeavor. She helped people find jobs. She answered every imaginable inquiry from Senators and staff. I could go on, but suffice it to say that Nancy Iacomini has kept the "Democratic trains" running on time here in the Senate. She has done so with diligence and grace and good humor and skill. Will Rogers famously said, "I am not a member of any organized political party; I am a Democrat." Well, he didn't know Nancy. Of course, if he did, he would have liked her—just as we all do.

We are going to miss Nancy's quiet competence and her sense of humor. We are going to miss the pumpkin outfits she would put on for Halloween. We are going to miss her wonder dog Flash. I hope Nancy will come back to visit us every now and then and even bring Flash with her, but I know she is looking forward to spending more time with her husband, Dan, and the rest of her family, pursuing her myriad hobbies, interests, and community activities and rooting for the Notre Dame football team.

Nancy Iacomini has devoted 34 years of her life to government service. We are all better off because of that service. As the fictional Inspector Morse reminds us, "To make an end is to make a beginning." I would ask all of my colleagues to join me in thanking Nancy and wishing her all the best as she begins the next chapter in her life.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO J.P. AND TIARA THOMAS

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week, I have the distinct honor of recognizing the Thomas family for giving their time and talent to serve as foster parents for children in Lake County. J.P. Thomas and his wife, Tiara Thomas, have done honorable work by providing structure and consistency in many young lives.

J.P. and Tiara began serving as foster parents in their early twenties. The young couple took a short break from fostering as their own family began to grow, but soon returned to serving as foster parents in order to help their community. They have provided a positive environment for 15 Montana children in their home on the Flathead Indian Reservation. Throughout the challenging journey of serving as foster parents, J.P. and Tiara give credit to the Cornerstone Faith Center in St. Ignace for helping them find the balance to meet the demands of faith, family, fostering, youth sports, and work.

Montanans that provide structure and consistency to youngsters in need are deserving of our support. When those Montanans are like J.P. and Tiara and simply do what is needed in a humble and gracious manner, their service can inspire others. Thank you, J.P. and Tiara, for all you have done and are still doing to help others.●

RECOGNIZING HYDROHOIST

• Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, small businesses play an integral role in Oklahoma's economy. They consist of over 52 percent of all employees in Oklahoma. Additionally, within Oklahoma, over 84 percent of all exports come from small businesses. Today I have the distinct honor of recognizing one of the many successful small businesses in my home State of Oklahoma for National Small Business Week. While there are many businesses worthy of recognition, I am particularly proud of HydroHoist.

For over 53 years, HydroHoist has been not only a leader but an originator and industry innovator of the market for boat lifts, personal watercraft—PWC—ports, and boat protection packages. Their products range from 900-pound drive-on docking platforms for PWCs, to lifts with the holding capacity for 130,000 pound watercraft. HydroHoist launched half a century ago by an Oklahoma marina owner in Grand Lake, OK. By 1971, the company moved into an old World War II munitions plant in Claremore, OK, where it is still located today. HydroHoist's technology revolutionized the boating industry, and remarkably, some of these original hoists are

still in use today. HydroHoist has expanded far beyond America's borders to international waters, too.

I want to congratulate and thank president and CEO Mick Webber of HydroHoist for his outstanding and devoted work in creating a shining business model with over 4 distribution warehouses and over 600 dealers throughout the world. Mr. Webber's dedication to making these products in America should not only make Oklahomans proud, but all Americans. HydroHoist's success should be an example for all businesses, and I am proud to recognize their hard work and dedication.●

RECOGNIZING RED RIVER BREWING COMPANY

• Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as a member of the Small Business Committee, it is my pleasure to recognize Red River Brewing Company from Shreveport, LA, as the Small Business of the Day for National Small Business Week. Small businesses like Red River Brewing Company are the backbone of this country. According to the U.S. Small Business Administration, U.S. small businesses employed 56.8 million people—or 48 percent of the private workforce in 2013. Louisiana small businesses employed 903,281 people, which made up 53.5 percent of the private workforce.

Red River Brewing Company, founded by entrepreneurs Jared Beville, Robert McGuire, and Beau Raines, began like many great small businesses do: as a hobby in Jared's garage. The group decided to turn their home brewing hobby into a business in the fall of 2013, becoming the first brewery in Shreveport since Prohibition. Red River is now a thriving small business that employs more than a dozen employees and offers locally brewed craft beer to the people of Shreveport, LA, and beyond. What makes their beer unique is the Louisiana twist they put on their products. The beer is designed to be indicative of the culture and climate of Louisiana. In addition, Red River often names their beers after the cultural and historic aspects of Louisiana. Session 18 IPA, for example, got its name from Louisiana being the 18th State in the United States.

The fruition of hard work and passion has been the catalyst for many small businesses around the country, including Red River Brewing Company. Those who are able to create successful small businesses create economic stability for their families and their communities, and in doing so, they are carrying out the American dream. I would like to extend my sincerest congratulations to Red River Brewing Company on being recognized during the 2017 National Small Business Week. You make our great State proud, and I look forward to seeing your future success.●

TRIBUTE TO CINDY TURCOT

• Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Cindy Turcot and congratulate her on her term as the chair of the ESOP Association. Cindy has been committed to advancing the employee ownership model in Vermont and around the country. For the last 2 years, Cindy served as chair of the association, working to promote the interests of employee stock ownership plan, ESOP, companies across the country.

In my State of Vermont, we have seen firsthand the many benefits that employee ownership can bring to businesses and employees. Study after study has shown that employee ownership has been proven to spur employment, increase productivity, grow sales, and raise wages. Importantly, data from the General Social Surveys from 2002 to 2014 shows that employee-owned companies have layoff rates that are four to eight times less than conventionally owned companies.

Cindy has been a vital ally in the efforts to expand broad-based employee ownership and bolster middle-class jobs in our communities. As chair, Cindy advocated for the ESOP business model and the benefits of employee ownership all across the country. I know many in the employee ownership community are so appreciative of Cindy's energy, motivation, and empowerment. Over the last 2 years, Cindy dedicated much of her time and energy to expanding broad based employee ownership to help create a sustainable economy that benefits all of us.

In addition to her work as chair of the ESOP Association, Cindy serves as board treasurer of the Vermont Employee Ownership Center. VEOC has provided numerous Vermont companies with assistance in transitioning to employee ownership, and Cindy has been a crucial resource in those efforts. As we continue to work together to help the employee ownership model realize its true potential, I know Cindy will continue to be an invaluable partner. •

REMEMBERING GENERAL AMEDEO C. MEROLLA

• Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, today I join so many Rhode Islanders in honoring the life, service, and gifts of GEN Amedeo C. Merolla. Armie Merolla served his Nation and the State of Rhode Island with distinction, including service in the Marine Corps and more than 30 years in the Rhode Island Army National Guard, where he rose to the rank of brigadier general. He earned numerous awards and decorations, including the Legion of Merit, the Meritorious Service Medal, and the Rhode Island Cross for Valor. A graduate of Harvard Law School, Armie was also an accomplished jurist. In the Guard, he served in the Judge Advocate General Corps. He also worked in pub-

lic service, as assistant solicitor for the city of Providence and legal counsel to multiple Rhode Island State agencies and offices, as well as to my colleague Congressman James Langevin. He eventually established his own firm, Merolla, Accetturo & Lough, where he practiced alongside two of his children until the time of his death.

Armie touched many people's lives through his generous volunteer work in his community, from his church to the Boys and Girls Clubs to the Knights of Columbus, but perhaps his greatest achievement was raising four children with his wife of 64 years, Kitty. My thoughts and prayers are with Armie's family in this time, as we celebrate his good works and kind spirit. •

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:54 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1665. An act to ensure that Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency considers severe local impact in making a recommendation to the President for a major disaster declaration.

H.R. 1678. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act concerning the statute of limitations for actions to recover disaster or emergency assistance payments, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 11:16 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 274. An act to provide for reimbursement for the use of modern travel services by Federal employees traveling on official Government business, and for other purposes.

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

At 3:27 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1644. An act to enhance sanctions with respect to transactions relating to North Korea, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 534) to require the Secretary of State to take such actions as may be necessary for the United States to rejoin the Bureau of International Expositions, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:47 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 244. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

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

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1644. An act to enhance sanctions with respect to transactions relating to North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1665. An act to ensure that Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency considers severe local impact in making a recommendation to the President for a major disaster declaration; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1678. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act concerning the statute of limitations for actions to recover disaster or emergency assistance payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-1482. A communication from the Regulatory Liaison, Office of Natural Resources Revenue, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Monetary Penalty Rates Inflation Adjustments for Calendar Year 2017 and Initial 'Catch-Up' Adjustments" (RIN1012-AA17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 27, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1483. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status of all extensions granted by Congress regarding the requirements of Section 13 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1484. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2017 Marginal Production Rates" (Notice 2017-26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1485. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Additional First Year Depreciation" (Rev. Proc. 2017-33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1486. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2017 Section 43 Inflation Adjustment" (Notice 2017-25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1487. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2016 Section 45K(d) (2)(C) Reference Price" (Notice 2017-24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1488. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Taxation of Fringe Benefits" (Rev. Rul. 2017-10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1489. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 16-135); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1490. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 17-010); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1491. A communication from the Director, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's fiscal year 2016 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1492. A communication from the Acting Director, Employee Services/Recruitment and Hiring, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prevailing Rate Systems; Definition of Kent County, Michigan, and Cameron County, Texas, to Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas" (RIN3206-AN40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1493. A communication from the Acting Director, Employee Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Qualification Determinations" (RIN3206-AL14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1494. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on applications made by the Government for authority to conduct electronic surveillance for foreign intelligence during calendar year 2016 relative to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1495. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1496. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1497. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United

States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1498. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1499. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act Formula Grant Program" (RIN1121-AA83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 27, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. COCHRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled "Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2017" (Rept. No. 115-43).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 585. A bill to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-44).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BURR for the Select Committee on Intelligence.

Courtney Elwood, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

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

S. 1037. A bill to prohibit air carriers from imposing fees that are not reasonable and proportional to the costs incurred by the air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1038. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to submit to Congress a report on the utilization of small businesses with respect to certain Federal contracts; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

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

S. 1039. A bill to indemnify local law enforcement entities for complying with valid detainers issued by immigration officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1040. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for a State-sponsored nonimmigrant pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 1041. A bill to include the State of Florida in the Gulf of Mexico outer Continental Shelf revenue sharing program, to extend the moratorium on oil and gas leasing in certain areas of the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 1042. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exclude Segal Americorps Education Awards and related awards from income; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 1043. A bill to authorize pay-for-success projects designed to incentivize and reward successful efforts to increase postsecondary education retention and completion rates for low-income and first-generation students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1044. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure equal access of Medicare beneficiaries to community pharmacies in underserved areas as network pharmacies under Medicare prescription drug coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TESTER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1045. A bill to guarantee coverage of certain women's preventive services under all health plans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 1046. A bill to facilitate certain pinyon-juniper related projects in Lincoln County, Nevada, to modify the boundaries of certain wilderness areas in the State of Nevada, and to fully implement the White Pine County Conservation, Recreation, and Development Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 1047. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BURR, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1048. A bill to expand patient access to experimental treatments in clinical trials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1049. A bill to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to require that risk evaluation and mitigation strategies for certain drugs include communication plans that provide information about drug formulations or properties described in the drug labeling; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1050. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1051. A bill to encourage visits between the United States and Taiwan at all levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1052. A bill to strengthen the use of patient-experience data within the benefit-risk framework for approval of new drugs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 1053. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to issue new resource management plans applicable to the Beaver Dam Wash National Conservation Area and the Red Cliffs National Conservation Area and a new amendment to the St. George Field Office Resource Management Plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that electrochromic glass qualifies as energy property for purposes of the energy credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1055. A bill to restrict the exportation of certain defense articles to the Philippine National Police, to work with the Philippines to support civil society and a public health approach to substance abuse, to report on Chinese and other sources of narcotics to the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 1056. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to waive the guarantee fee for veterans and spouses of veterans for the Export Working Capital, International Trade, and Export Express programs; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1057. A bill to amend the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998 to address harmful algal blooms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1058. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Manage-

ment Agency to terminate certain contracts on the basis of detrimental conduct to the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 1059. A bill to extend the authorization of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978 relating to the disposal site in Mesa County, Colorado; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 1060. A bill to strengthen prohibitions regarding the Palestine Liberation Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1061. A bill to assure equity in contracting between the Federal Government and small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1062. A bill to increase reporting transparency and accountability with respect to Food and Drug Administration user fees; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1063. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish direct care registered nurse-to-patient staffing ratio requirements in hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 154. A resolution promoting awareness of motorcycle profiling and encouraging collaboration and communication with the motorcycle community and law enforcement officials to prevent instances of profiling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. Res. 155. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should work in cooperation with the international community and continue to exercise global leadership to address the causes and effects of climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DAINES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 156. A resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster-care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster-care system; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr.

SCHATZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. Res. 157. A resolution recognizing that for 50 years, the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and its ten members—Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam—have worked toward stability, prosperity, and peace in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 158. A resolution recognizing the cultural and historical significance of the Cinco de Mayo holiday; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 28

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 28, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the permissible use of health savings accounts to include health insurance payments and to increase the dollar limitation for contributions to health savings accounts, and for other purposes.

S. 261

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) were added as cosponsors of S. 261, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve and clarify certain disclosure requirements for restaurants and similar retail food establishments, and to amend the authority to bring proceedings under section 403A.

S. 319

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 319, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish within the Department of Veterans Affairs a center of excellence in the prevention, diagnosis, mitigation, treatment, and rehabilitation of health conditions relating to exposure to burn pits.

S. 341

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 341, a bill to provide for congressional oversight of actions to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

S. 419

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Louisiana

(Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 419, a bill to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program, and for other purposes.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 569

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 667

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 667, a bill to amend titles 5, 10, 37, and 38, United States Code, to ensure that an order to serve on active duty under section 12304a or 12304b of title 10, United States Code, is treated the same as other orders to serve on active duty for determining the eligibility of members of the uniformed services and veterans for certain benefits and for calculating the deadlines for certain benefits.

S. 722

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 722, *supra*.

S. 733

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 733, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. 836

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 836, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude a loan secured by a non-owner occupied 1- to 4-family dwelling from the defini-

tion of a member business loan, and for other purposes.

S. 925

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 925, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the ability of health care professionals to treat veterans through the use of telemedicine, and for other purposes.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 926, a bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 993, a bill to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from reclassifying broadband Internet access service as a telecommunications service and from imposing certain regulations on providers of such service.

S. 1027

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1027, a bill to extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000.

S. 1035

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1035, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to the scope of employee pension benefit plans.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 75, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, the largest organization of food and nutrition professionals in the world.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

S. 1039. A bill to indemnify local law enforcement entities for complying with valid detainers issued by immigration officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, immigration enforcement is one of the Federal Government's most essential responsibilities. It is also one of the most debated and rightly so. Those of us in this body need to ensure that Federal immigration laws secure our borders

from criminal and terrorist threats and facilitate effective interior enforcement to keep citizens safe.

At the same time, our laws must promote a system of legal immigration that encourages economic growth and opportunity, especially in border communities like those in my home State of Arizona, but while we debate these policies on the Senate floor, local police officers and sheriffs around the country are serving on the frontlines of immigration enforcement. These men and women put their lives on the line every time they go out on patrol. For them, immigration policy is not a hypothetical exercise, it is part of the day in and day out reality of serving in law enforcement. Throughout the country, local officers increasingly find themselves coming in contact with individuals who, after being apprehended for the commission of a crime, are determined to be in the country illegally. This is especially common in border States like Arizona.

Once it is determined an individual in their custody is in the country illegally, that information is relayed to Immigration and Customs Enforcement or ICE. ICE can then send a request to local officials with instructions to hold that individual for up to 48 hours so they can be transferred to Federal custody. This is called a detainer request. The partnership between law enforcement authorities at all levels of government leverages vital information and resources in order to keep dangerous criminals off the streets. The Federal Government has no better partners in this effort than State and local law enforcement agencies from Arizona.

Despite the critical role these entities play in assisting their Federal partners with immigration enforcement, current Federal policy leaves them exposed with the threat of costly litigation. That is because third-party groups that oppose detention have threatened local agencies that choose to comply with valid detainer requests. They are threatened with lawsuits. Using punitive legal action to punish law enforcement for good-faith efforts to keep people safe is simply wrong.

We can have this policy debate without jeopardizing public safety and the ability of local law enforcement officers to do their job. That is why I am introducing the Support Local Law Enforcement Detainer Indemnity Act. This bill will require the Department of Homeland Security to protect State and local law enforcement entities from lawsuits that uphold valid detainer requests from ICE. This is called indemnification. It would allow officers to fulfill their law enforcement responsibilities without second-guessing whether to keep potentially dangerous criminal aliens in custody.

Reforming our Nation's immigration policies is no easy task, let me tell

you. It is slow, frustrating work in the Senate, but as we continue the debate, local law enforcement shouldn't be left to shoulder the burden as a result of Washington's failure to secure our borders and implement a workable enforcement policy.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation that will give State and local law enforcement the certainty of knowing the Federal Government has their back.

I also thank local sheriffs across the State of Arizona who are really shouldering this burden and who came to me with this issue. They want to keep their community safe. They want to do what is right. It pains them to have to release someone they know is dangerous, but they can't expose themselves and their counties to the litigation that would come if something like this legislation is not put in place. So this is a response to a very real problem out there.

I thank those like Sheriff Dannels, Cochise County, and Sheriff Mascher, Yavapai County, Sheriff Clark of Navajo County, Sheriff Wilmot of Yuma County, and many others who have been working on this issue, work on the frontlines, and do a lot of work that we are very appreciative of in Arizona.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 154—PROMOTING AWARENESS OF MOTORCYCLE PROFILING AND ENCOURAGING COLLABORATION AND COMMUNICATION WITH THE MOTORCYCLE COMMUNITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS TO PREVENT INSTANCES OF PROFILING

Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 154

Whereas motorcycle ridership has continued to increase over time with registrations growing from 3,826,373 in 1997 to 8,600,936 in 2015;

Whereas, as of August 2016, the ongoing National Motorcycle Profiling Survey 2016, conducted by the Motorcycle Profiling Project, found that approximately ½ of the motorcyclists surveyed felt that they had been profiled by law enforcement at least once;

Whereas motorcycle profiling means the illegal use of the fact that a person rides a motorcycle or wears motorcycle related apparel as a factor in deciding to stop and question, take enforcement action, arrest, or search a person or vehicle with or without legal basis under the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas complaints surrounding motorcycle profiling have been cited in all 50 States;

Whereas nationwide protests to raise awareness and combat motorcycle profiling have been held in multiple States;

Whereas in 2011, Washington signed into law legislation stating that the criminal justice training commission shall ensure that issues related to motorcycle profiling are addressed in basic law enforcement training and offered to in-service law enforcement officers in conjunction with existing training regarding profiling;

Whereas reported incidents of motorcycle profiling have dropped approximately 90 percent in the State of Washington since the 2011 legislation was signed into law; and

Whereas in the spring of 2016, Maryland became the second State to pass a law addressing the issue of motorcycle profiling: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) promotes increased public awareness on the issue of motorcycle profiling;

(2) encourages collaboration and communication with the motorcycle community and law enforcement to engage in efforts to end motorcycle profiling; and

(3) urges State law enforcement officials to include statements condemning motorcycle profiling in written policies and training materials.

SENATE RESOLUTION 155—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE UNITED STATES SHOULD WORK IN COOPERATION WITH THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY AND CONTINUE TO EXERCISE GLOBAL LEADERSHIP TO ADDRESS THE CAUSES AND EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 155

Whereas the consensus among climatologists and scientists studying the effects of atmospheric change, including the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the National Academy of Science, the United States Geological Survey, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and other agencies within the United States Global Change Research Program, have determined that the impact of climate change will include widespread effects on health and welfare, including increased outbreaks from waterborne diseases, more droughts, diminished agricultural production, severe storms and floods, heat waves, wildfires, and a substantial rise in global sea levels;

Whereas the objective of the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is to stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that will prevent dangerous human interference with the climate system;

Whereas, under the UNFCCC, the United States is obligated to report its progress on reducing emissions;

Whereas the Senate provided its advice and consent to the UNFCCC by division, with two-thirds of Senators present voting in the affirmative, on October 7, 1992;

Whereas, in 2011, at the 17th Conference of the Parties (COP 17) to the UNFCCC in Dur-

ban, South Africa, parties agreed to negotiate an agreement by the end of 2015 to reduce emissions in the post-2020 period;

Whereas the UNFCCC calls on parties to submit intended nationally-determined contributions outlining voluntary individual targets for emissions reductions by the time parties convened in Paris on November 30, 2015, for the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP 21) to the UNFCCC;

Whereas, prior to completing the multilateral Paris Agreement on international cooperation to address climate change, done at Paris December 12, 2015, 187 nations, representing more than 97 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions, voluntarily submitted nationally determined goals and plans to reduce their greenhouse gas pollution;

Whereas independent analyses by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration confirmed that 2016 was the warmest year on record, making 2015 the second warmest year on record and 2014 the third warmest year on record, continuing a 35 year-long warming trend with 16 of the 17 warmest years on record occurring since 2001;

Whereas the United States-China Joint Announcement on Climate Change of November 2014 included a United States goal to reduce its emissions by 26-28 percent below 2005 levels by 2025 and a Chinese goal to peak emissions output by 2030 and increase the use of non-fossil fuels to 20 percent of its overall energy portfolio by 2030;

Whereas, under the United States-India Joint Announcement on Climate and Clean Energy of January 2015, the two countries pledged to increase cooperation on clean energy financing and development and India committed to phase out use of hydrofluorocarbons and increase promotion of energy efficiency tools and reaffirmed its commitment to add 100 gigawatts of solar capacity by 2022;

Whereas small island states, whose people are among the most vulnerable to climate change, are threatened with partial or virtually total inundation by imminent rises in sea level and increased intensity and frequency of storms;

Whereas global greenhouse gas emissions have remained level for the past three years, even while global Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has grown;

Whereas United States international leadership on the global stage throughout the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change's 21st Conference of Parties process resulted in unprecedented international cooperation and engagement on the development of the Paris Agreement;

Whereas the Paris Agreement received consensus approval from the more than 190 delegates to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change's 21st Conference of Parties;

Whereas the Paris Agreement reached its thresholds for entry into force faster than any other multilateral international agreement of comparable size and scope;

Whereas, as of the date of introduction of this resolution, 127 of the 197 parties to the Paris Agreement, representing 81.4 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions, have officially joined the agreement, demonstrating the urgency and importance the global community places on addressing climate change;

Whereas the cost of inaction on climate change will have devastating impacts to the United States economy, costing billions of dollars in lost GDP;

Whereas extreme weather, intensified by climate change, has already cost United States taxpayers billions of dollars each year in recovery efforts, and will continue to increase if climate change is left unaddressed;

Whereas decreased GDP and increased costs of infrastructure repairs and other recovery efforts will significantly increase budget deficits and undermine the fiscal stability of the United States;

Whereas climate change will have devastating public health implications, including increased rates of asthma and other respiratory diseases, especially in vulnerable populations like children and low income communities, the spread of infectious diseases, risks to food and water supplies, and increased premature deaths;

Whereas the emissions reductions pledged by the United States under the Paris Agreement may save nearly 300,000 lives in the United States by 2030 as a result of positive health outcomes corresponding to lower air pollution;

Whereas studies conducted by the NASA Earth Observatory determined that as the oceans have warmed, polar ice has melted and porous landmasses have subsided, global mean sea level has risen by 8 inches (20 centimeters) since 1870, and the rate of sea level rise is faster now than at any time in the past 2,000 years, having doubled in the past two decades, putting 55 to 60 percent of United States citizens who live in counties touching the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, or the Great Lakes at risk from the effects of sea level rise;

Whereas the Department of Defense has identified climate change as a “threat multiplier” that will increase global instability and conflict with the potential to increase terrorism;

Whereas the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review states that “[t]he impacts of climate change may increase the frequency, scale, and complexity of future missions, including defense support to civil authorities, while at the same time undermining the capacity of our domestic installations to support training activities,” and notes that—

(1) climate change may exacerbate water scarcity and lead to sharp increases in food costs;

(2) the pressures caused by climate change will influence resource competition while placing additional burdens on economies, societies, and governance institutions around the world; and

(3) these effects are threat multipliers that will aggravate stressors abroad such as poverty, environmental degradation, political instability, and social tensions—conditions that can enable terrorist activity and other forms of violence;

Whereas the Department of Defense report, “National Security Implications of Climate-Related Risks and a Changing Climate”—

(1) states that global climate change will have wide-ranging implications for United States national security interests over the foreseeable future because it will aggravate existing problems, such as poverty, social tensions, environmental degradation, ineffectual leadership, and weak political institutions, that threaten domestic stability in a number of countries; and

(2) identifies four general areas of climate-related risks: persistently recurring conditions such as flooding, drought, and higher temperatures; more frequent and more severe extreme weather events; sea level rise and temperature changes; and decreases in Arctic ice cover, type, and thickness;

Whereas the Director of National Intelligence’s 2017 Global Trends Report determined that—

(1) changes in the climate will produce more extreme weather events and put greater stress on humans and critical systems, including oceans, freshwater, and biodiversity;

(2) these changes, in turn, will have direct and indirect social, economic, political, and security effects; and

(3) extreme weather can trigger crop failures, wildfires, energy blackouts, infrastructure breakdown, supply chain breakdowns, migration, and infectious disease outbreaks, and will be more pronounced as people concentrate in climate vulnerable locations, such as cities, coastal areas, and water-stressed regions;

Whereas the Department of Agriculture has determined that climate change is likely to diminish continued progress on global food security through production disruptions that lead to local availability limitations and price increases, interrupted transport conduits, and diminished food safety, among other causes;

Whereas, according to the World Bank, 1,600,000,000 people currently live in countries and regions with absolute water scarcity and the number is expected to rise to 2,800,000,000 people by 2025 due to the effects of climate change;

Whereas the transition to a clean energy economy is feasible with existing technology;

Whereas the transition to clean energy will create millions of jobs;

Whereas the transition to clean energy will increase United States GDP and increase household income;

Whereas the transition to clean energy will save billions of dollars in avoided health costs;

Whereas the transition to clean energy will save lives and improve public health;

Whereas the transition to clean energy will lower energy costs for businesses and consumers;

Whereas the transition to clean energy will unlock billions of dollars in private investment; and

Whereas, more than half of all electrical generating capacity added in the world last year was renewable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States should—

(1) work in cooperation with the international community and continue to exercise global leadership in our shared responsibilities, including holding parties accountable for meeting their commitments, and address the causes and effects of climate change;

(2) remain party to the Paris Agreement and the UNFCCC;

(3) continue demonstrating strong leadership in implementing the Paris Agreement;

(4) ensure that the development of the policies and procedures prescribed by the Paris Agreement achieve maximum benefits for the United States; and

(5) implement its commitments under the Paris Agreement and the UNFCCC.

SENATE RESOLUTION 156—RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO RAISE AWARENESS ABOUT THE CHALLENGES OF CHILDREN IN THE FOSTER-CARE SYSTEM, AND ENCOURAGING CONGRESS TO IMPLEMENT POLICY TO IMPROVE THE LIVES OF CHILDREN IN THE FOSTER-CARE SYSTEM

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DAINES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 156

Whereas National Foster Care Month was established more than 20 years ago to—

(1) bring foster-care issues to the forefront;

(2) highlight the importance of permanency for every child; and

(3) recognize the essential role that foster parents, social workers, and advocates have in the lives of children in foster care throughout the United States;

Whereas all children deserve a safe, loving, and permanent home;

Whereas the primary goal of the foster-care system is to ensure the safety and well-being of children while working to provide a safe, loving, and permanent home for each child;

Whereas there are approximately 428,000 children living in foster care;

Whereas there were approximately 269,509 youth that entered the foster-care system in 2015, while over 62,000 youth were eligible and awaiting adoption at the end of 2015;

Whereas children of color are more likely to stay in the foster-care system for longer periods of time and are less likely to be reunited with their biological families;

Whereas foster parents are the front-line caregivers for children who cannot safely remain with their biological parents and provide physical care, emotional support, education advocacy, and are the largest single source of families providing permanent homes for children leaving foster care to adoption;

Whereas children in foster care who are placed with relatives, compared to children placed with nonrelatives, have more stability, including fewer changes in placements, have more positive perceptions of their placements, are more likely to be placed with their siblings, and demonstrate fewer behavioral problems;

Whereas some relative caregivers receive less financial assistance and support services than do foster caregivers;

Whereas an increased emphasis on prevention and reunification services is necessary to reduce the number of children that are forced to remain in the foster-care system;

Whereas more than 20,000 youth “aged out” of foster care in 2015 without a legal permanent connection to an adult or family;

Whereas children who age out of foster care lack the security or support of a biological or adoptive family and frequently struggle to secure affordable housing, obtain health insurance, pursue higher education, and acquire adequate employment;

Whereas foster care is intended to be a temporary placement, but children remain

in the foster-care system for an average of 19 months;

Whereas children in foster care experience an average of 3 different placements, which often leads to disruption of routines and the need to change schools and move away from siblings, extended families, and familiar surroundings;

Whereas youth in foster care are much more likely to face educational instability with 65 percent of former foster children experiencing at least 7 school changes while in care;

Whereas children entering foster care often confront the widespread misperception that children in foster care are disruptive, unruly, and dangerous, even though placement in foster care is based on the actions of a parent or guardian, not the child;

Whereas recent studies show foster children enrolled in Medicaid were prescribed antipsychotic medications at 3 to 9 times the rate of other children receiving Medicaid;

Whereas due to heavy caseloads and limited resources, the average tenure for a worker in child protection services is just 3 years;

Whereas States, localities, and communities should be encouraged to invest resources in preventative and reunification services and postpermanency programs to ensure that more children in foster care are provided with safe, loving, and permanent placements;

Whereas Federal legislation over the past 3 decades, including the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-272), the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-89), the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-351), the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (Public Law 112-34), and the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act (Public Law 113-183) provided new investments and services to improve the outcomes of children in the foster-care system;

Whereas May 2017 is an appropriate month to designate as National Foster Care Month to provide an opportunity to acknowledge the accomplishments of the child-welfare workforce, foster parents, advocacy community, and mentors for their dedication, accomplishments, and positive impact they have on the lives of children; and

Whereas much remains to be done to ensure that all children have a safe, loving, nurturing, and permanent family, regardless of age or special needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of National Foster Care Month;

(2) recognizes National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges that children face in the foster-care system;

(3) encourages Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster-care system;

(4) acknowledges the unique needs of children in the foster-care system;

(5) recognizes foster youth throughout the United States for their ongoing tenacity, courage, and resilience while facing life challenges;

(6) acknowledges the exceptional alumni of the foster-care system who serve as advocates and role models for youth who remain in care;

(7) honors the commitment and dedication of the individuals who work tirelessly to provide assistance and services to children in the foster-care system; and

(8) reaffirms the need to continue working to improve the outcomes of all children in the foster-care system through parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) and other programs designed to—

(A) support vulnerable families;

(B) invest in prevention and reunification services;

(C) promote adoption in cases where reunification is not in the best interests of the child;

(D) adequately serve those children brought into the foster-care system; and

(E) facilitate the successful transition into adulthood for children that “age out” of the foster-care system.

SENATE RESOLUTION 157—RECOGNIZING THAT FOR 50 YEARS, THE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH EAST ASIAN NATIONS (ASEAN) AND ITS TEN MEMBERS—BRUNEI, CAMBODIA, INDONESIA, LAOS, MALAYSIA, MYANMAR, THE PHILIPPINES, SINGAPORE, THAILAND, AND VIETNAM—HAVE WORKED TOWARD STABILITY, PROSPERITY, AND PEACE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 157

Whereas the United States and ASEAN have worked together to advance our shared goals for 40 years, having established dialogue relations on September 10, 1977, with the issuing of the 1977 Joint Communique of the First ASEAN-United States Dialogue, and the United States acceding to the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC) at the ASEAN Post Ministerial Conference Session with the United States in Thailand on July 22, 2009;

Whereas the United States was the first non-ASEAN country to appoint an ambassador to ASEAN on April 29, 2008, and the first dialogue partner to establish a permanent mission to ASEAN in 2010;

Whereas the United States has supported efforts to strengthen the ASEAN Secretariat and expand its role in providing greater coordination between, and enhancing the effectiveness of, regional institutions;

Whereas working together, the Governments and people of the United States and ASEAN can help realize their common vision of a peaceful, prosperous, rules-based Asia-Pacific region that offers security, opportunity, and dignity to all of its citizens;

Whereas ASEAN's 10 members, taken collectively, are the 7th largest economy in the world, with an annual gross domestic product of \$2,400,000,000,000, and represent the United States' fourth-largest export market with total two-way trade in goods and services reaching \$254,000,000,000, allowing over 780,000 visitors to the United States in 2015, which contribute more than \$5,000,000,000 to the United States economy, and accounting for more than 500,000 jobs in the United States;

Whereas ASEAN's 10 members represent a diverse group of nations and dynamic economies with an expanding workforce, a growing middle class, and a diverse set of skills, cul-

tures, and resources, which of the estimated 20,000,000 Asian Americans in the United States, includes over 7,000,000 who identify with an ASEAN ethnicity, including 4,000,000 Filipinos and 1,900,000 Vietnamese;

Whereas ASEAN is home to critical global sea lanes located at the center of the world's strongest economic growth area, with \$5,300,000,000,000 of global trade and more than half of total shipped tonnage transiting through ASEAN's waters each year;

Whereas ASEAN, taken collectively, is one of the fastest growing economies in Asia after China and India, expanding by 66 percent since 2006 and exceeding the global growth average for the past ten years;

Whereas the ASEAN Economic Community aims to create one of the largest single market economies in the world, facilitating the free movement of goods, services, and professionals and engendering a sense of economic community among its member states;

Whereas the United States is the largest investor in Southeast Asia, with total foreign direct investment stock of nearly \$273,500,000,000 in 2014, creating millions of jobs in the United States and in ASEAN Member States, while investment in the United States from Southeast Asia has increased more than any other region's investment in the past decade;

Whereas the United States has helped ASEAN create a Single Window customs facilitation system that will aid in expediting intra-ASEAN trade and make it easier for United States businesses to operate in the region;

Whereas the United States-ASEAN Business Alliance for Competitive Small and Medium Sized Enterprises (SMEs) has already trained more than 4,600 small to medium enterprises, with nearly half of the individuals trained being young women entrepreneurs;

Whereas United States-ASEAN development cooperation has focused on innovation and capacity-building efforts in technology, education, disaster management, food security, human rights, and trade facilitation;

Whereas the Lower Mekong Initiative, established on July 23, 2009, is a multinational effort that helps promote sustainable economic development in mainland Southeast Asia to foster integrated, multisectoral, sub-regional cooperation and capacity building;

Whereas the Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea (DOC) was signed by all members of ASEAN and the People's Republic of China (PRC) on November 4, 2002, committing ASEAN and the PRC to “exercise self-restraint in the conduct of activities that would complicate or escalate disputes and affect peace and stability,” and reaffirming that “the adoption of a code of conduct in the South China Sea would further promote peace and stability in the region and agree to work, on the basis of consensus, toward the eventual attainment of this objective”;

Whereas the leaders of the United States and ASEAN, at their Special Leaders Summit in Sunnylands, California on February 16, 2016, reaffirmed their shared commitment to maintain peace, security, and stability in the region and ensure maritime security and safety, including by respecting the rights of freedom of navigation and overflight and other lawful uses of the seas, and unimpeded lawful maritime commerce as described in the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) as well as non-militarization and self-restraint in the conduct of activities;

Whereas ASEAN is a partner to the United States on key transnational challenges, such

as terrorism, violent extremism, climate change, environmental degradation and pollution, energy, infectious diseases, disarmament, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, cybersecurity, trafficking in persons, illicit trafficking of wildlife and timber, and illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing;

Whereas the United States supports the East Asia Summit (EAS) as the premier leaders-led forum for dialogue and cooperation on political, security, and economic issues in the region and commends the direction set in the Kuala Lumpur Declaration at the EAS' 10th anniversary, including the new exchange mechanism for EAS members' ambassadors;

Whereas the United States, ASEAN, and other Dialogue Partners, through the 2015 East Asia Summit, adopted a statement on transnational cyber issues that emphasizes the importance of regional cooperation to improve the security and stability of cyber networks, setting an important precedent for strengthening practical cooperation, risk reduction, and confidence building in cyberspace;

Whereas the 2016 East Asia Summit in Vientiane adopted a statement on non-proliferation that reaffirmed the United States', ASEAN's, and other Dialogue Partners' leaders' support for efforts at the national, regional, and international level to promote nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation, and peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and reiterated the importance of nuclear security to combating nuclear terrorism;

Whereas North Korea's provocative missile launches and nuclear tests highlights the threat posed by its nuclear and ballistic missile programs and contradicts calls by ASEAN leaders at the 2016 East Asia Summit in Vientiane for North Korea to abide by multiple United Nations Security Council resolutions and international obligations;

Whereas changes in climatic conditions in the ASEAN region over the past four decades have resulted in major loss and damage throughout the ASEAN region with a disproportionate impact on developing countries, with the experiences of Cyclone Nargis in Myanmar and Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines, as well as the impacts that climate-caused ocean acidification has had on fish stocks, coral resources, and coastal agriculture, providing stark evidence of the destructive impacts on the region;

Whereas conservation and sustainable management of forests throughout ASEAN play an important role in helping to mitigate changes in the climate, reduce the risks of extreme weather events and other climate-driven disasters, and provide sustainable economic livelihood opportunities for local communities;

Whereas the United States will pursue initiatives that are consistent with broader sustainable development, including the achievement of food security and poverty alleviation throughout the ASEAN region;

Whereas the United States is a committed partner with ASEAN on the protection of human rights, which are not only essential for fostering and maintaining stability, security, and good governance, but protecting the basic rights and fundamental dignities of the people of ASEAN;

Whereas the United States supports the work and mandate of the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR), including capacity building for the promotion and protection of human rights and the AICHR's priorities programs, and activities;

Whereas the Young Southeast Asian Leaders Program has now engaged over 100,000 people between the ages of 18 and 35 across all 10 ASEAN nations to promote innovation among young people while also providing skills to a new generation who will create and fill the jobs of the future;

Whereas the irregular movement of persons continues to be one of the main security threats in the Southeast Asia region;

Whereas addressing migration flows and combating human smuggling and human trafficking in ASEAN is an important, ongoing challenge requiring increased coordination and shared responsibility;

Whereas, on November 21, 2015, ASEAN Member States signed the ASEAN Convention Against Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, which represents an important step forward in preventing human trafficking, prosecuting the perpetrators, and protecting the survivors;

Whereas the United States supports ASEAN Member States in anticorruption efforts through, among other initiatives, the implementation of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption;

Whereas Vice President Mike Pence traveled to Jakarta, Indonesia on April 20, 2017, where he met with the ASEAN Secretary General and ASEAN Permanent Representatives, congratulated ASEAN on its 50th anniversary, and remarked on the 40th anniversary of the United States' diplomatic relationship with ASEAN, noting that the United States-ASEAN relationship "without a doubt has benefitted both ASEAN and America—diplomatically, economically, and from the standpoint of national security";

Whereas, on this visit, Vice President Pence pledged that the United States would "redouble our cooperation with ASEAN on issues of regional security" and continue to support "increased information sharing and security efforts to protect our people and our way of life across the ASEAN region and across the wider world," and "continue to work closely with ASEAN to promote peace and stability in the South China Sea by upholding a rules-based order, ensuring the lawful and unimpeded flow of commerce, and encouraging the peaceful and diplomatic resolution of disputes";

Whereas, on this visit, Vice President Pence remarked that "by strengthening our economic ties, the United States and ASEAN member nations can foster jobs, prosperity, and growth in new and unprecedented ways" and that "American exports to ASEAN member nations already support more than 550,000 jobs in the United States, and almost 42,000 U.S. companies export more than \$100,000,000,000 in goods and services to ASEAN nations every year"; and

Whereas, on this visit, Vice President Pence announced that President Trump will attend the U.S.-ASEAN Summit, the East Asia Summit in the Philippines, and the APEC Leaders Meeting in Vietnam this November: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) welcomes the leaders of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) to the United States for the meetings with Secretary of State Rex Tillerson and congressional members, and affirms the meeting as the first regular United States-ASEAN meetings;

(2) supports and affirms the elevation of the United States-ASEAN relationship to a strategic partnership and recommitments the United States to ASEAN centrality and to helping to build a strong, stable, politically cohesive, economically integrated, and so-

cially responsible ASEAN community with common rules, norms, procedures, and standards consistent with international law and the principles of a rules-based Asia-Pacific community;

(3) urges ASEAN to continue its efforts to foster greater integration and unity toward the ASEAN community;

(4) recognizes the value of ASEAN working with economic, political, and security partners such as Australia, Canada, the European Union, India, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea, and Taiwan both inside of and outside of Asia, as well as the advantage of strategic economic initiatives like the U.S.-ASEAN Connect that demonstrate a commitment to ASEAN and the AEC and build upon economic relationships in the region;

(5) reaffirms the enhancement of United States-ASEAN economic engagement, including the elimination of barriers to cross-border commerce, and supports the ASEAN Economic Community's goals, including strong, inclusive, and sustainable growth and cooperation with the United States that focuses on innovation and capacity building efforts in technology, education, disaster management, food security, human rights, and trade facilitation, including for ASEAN's poorest countries;

(6) supports efforts by ASEAN nations to address maritime and territorial disputes in a constructive manner and to pursue claims through peaceful, diplomatic, and legitimate regional and international arbitration mechanisms, consistent with international law, including through the adoption of a code of conduct in the South China Sea to further promote peace and stability in the region;

(7) urges all parties to maritime and territorial disputes in the Asia-Pacific region, including the PRC—

(A) to exercise self-restraint in the conduct of activities that would undermine stability or complicate or escalate disputes through the use of coercion, intimidation, or military force; and

(B) to refrain from new efforts to militarize uninhabited islands, reefs, shoals, and other features, including the construction of new garrisons and facilities and the relocation of additional military personnel, materiel, or equipment;

(8) opposes actions by any country to prevent any other country from exercising its sovereign rights to the resources of the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) and continental shelf by seeking to enforce claims to those areas in the South China Sea that have no support in international law;

(9) opposes unilateral declarations of administrative and military districts in contested areas in the South China Sea;

(10) supports efforts to negotiate the joint management of maritime resources through diplomacy and peaceful negotiation;

(11) urges parties to refrain from unilateral actions that cause permanent physical damage to the marine environment and supports the efforts of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and ASEAN to implement guidelines to address illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing in the region;

(12) supports efforts by United States partners and allies in ASEAN—

(A) to enhance maritime capability and maritime domain awareness;

(B) to protect unhindered access to and use of international waterways in the Asia-Pacific region that are critical to ensuring the security and free flow of commerce;

(C) to counter piracy;

(D) to disrupt illicit maritime trafficking activities such as the trafficking of persons, goods, and drugs; and

(E) to enhance the maritime capabilities of countries or regional organizations to respond to emerging threats to maritime security in the Asia-Pacific region;

(13) urges ASEAN Member States to develop a common approach to reaffirm the decision of the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The Hague's ruling with respect to the case between the Republic of the Philippines and the People's Republic of China;

(14) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to continue joint efforts with ASEAN to halt human smuggling and trafficking in persons and urges ASEAN to make increased efforts to create and strengthen regional mechanisms to provide assistance and support to refugees and migrants;

(15) supports the Lower Mekong Initiative, which has made significant progress in promoting sustainable economic development in mainland Southeast Asia and fostering integrated subregional cooperation and capacity building;

(16) urges ASEAN to build capacity for the promotion and protection of human rights by ASEAN member states, and the implementation of related priorities, programs, and activities;

(17) urges ASEAN governments to engage directly with leaders of civil society and human rights, including advocates of religious freedom and victims of human rights abuses, and environmental groups and to prioritize the construction of forums that give these stakeholders a voice to instruct public policy, before, during, and after the February 2016 summit;

(18) encourages the President to communicate to ASEAN leaders the importance of protecting human rights, ending extrajudicial killings, including releasing political prisoners and ending politically motivated prosecutions, strengthening civil society, safeguarding freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and the free flow of information and ideas, and promoting the rule of law and open and transparent government;

(19) supports the Young Southeast Asian Leaders Initiative program as an example of people-to-people partnership building that provides skills, networks, and leadership capabilities to a new generation of people who will create and fill jobs, foster cross-border cooperation and partnerships, and rise to solve the regional and global challenges of the future; and

(20) urges ASEAN governments to fully uphold and implement all United Nations Security Council resolutions and international agreements with respect to North Korea's nuclear and ballistic missile programs.

SENATE RESOLUTION 158—RECOGNIZING THE CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CINCO DE MAYO HOLIDAY

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 158

Whereas May 5, or "Cinco de Mayo" in Spanish, is celebrated each year as a date of

importance by Mexican and Mexican-American communities;

Whereas the Cinco de Mayo holiday commemorates May 5, 1862, the date on which Mexicans defeated the French at the Battle of Puebla, one of the many battles that the Mexican people won in their long and brave fight for independence, freedom, and democracy;

Whereas the victory of Mexico over France at Puebla represented a historic triumph for the Mexican government during the Franco-Mexican war fought between 1861 and 1867 and bolstered the resistance movement;

Whereas the success of Mexico at the Battle of Puebla reinvigorated the spirits of the Mexican people and provided a renewed sense of unity and strength;

Whereas the French army, which had not experienced defeat against any of the finest troops of Europe in more than half a century, sustained a disastrous loss at the hands of an outnumbered and ill-equipped, but highly spirited and courageous, Mexican army;

Whereas the courageous spirit that Mexican General Ignacio Zaragoza and his men displayed during that historic battle can never be forgotten;

Whereas, in a larger sense, Cinco de Mayo symbolizes the right of a free people to self-determination, just as Benito Juarez, the president of Mexico during the Battle of Puebla, once said, "El respeto al derecho ajeno es la paz", meaning "respect for the rights of others is peace";

Whereas the sacrifice of Mexican fighters was instrumental in keeping Mexico from falling under European domination while, in the United States, the Union Army battled Confederate forces in the Civil War;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo serves as a reminder that the foundation of the United States was built by people from many countries and diverse cultures who were willing to fight and die for freedom;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo also serves as a reminder of the close ties between the people of Mexico and the people of the United States;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo encourages the celebration of a legacy of strong leaders and a sense of vibrancy in communities; and

Whereas Cinco de Mayo serves as a reminder to provide more opportunity for future generations: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the historic struggle of the people of Mexico for independence and freedom, which Cinco de Mayo commemorates; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe Cinco de Mayo with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 4, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 4, 2017, at 10 a.m. to hold a hearing entitled "Reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program, Part II."

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate in order to hold a hearing on Thursday, May 4, 2017, at 10 a.m. in Room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 4, 2017, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled "International Development: Value Added Through Private Sector Engagement."

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 4, 2017, at 2 p.m., in S-216 of the Capitol, to conduct an executive business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Thursday, May 4, 2017, at 2 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Thursday, May 4, 2017, from 2 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION OPERATIONS, SAFETY AND SECURITY

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 4, 2017, at 10:30 a.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a Subcommittee Hearing on "Question, Answer, and Perspectives on the Current State of Airline Travel."

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader, pursuant to Public Law 93-415, as amended by Public Law 102-586, announces the appointment of the following individual to the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention: the Honorable David Tapp of Kentucky (3 year term).

RECOGNIZING THE CULTURAL AND
HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF
THE CINCO DE MAYO HOLIDAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 158, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 158) recognizing the cultural and historical significance of the Cinco de Mayo holiday.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 158) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the comeback votes on Monday night are on confirmation of Heather Wilson as Secretary of the Air Force, and cloture on the nomination of Scott Gottlieb to head the FDA. We plan to move on the

U.S. Trade Representative, Robert Lighthizer, as well, next week.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 5, 2017,
AND MONDAY, MAY 8, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until Friday, May 5, at 12 noon, for a pro forma session only, with no business being conducted. I further ask that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, May 5, it next convene at 2 p.m., Monday, May 8; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume executive session as under the previous order.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator TESTER.

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

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

REMEMBERING DON DUNWELL

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise to remember the life of a journalist, a

husband, a father, a community leader, a guy by the name of Don Dunwell. Dunwell was known for his thoughtful interviewing style, creative storytelling, his ability to connect with the thousands of viewers who entrusted him to deliver the news to them.

It was common to find Don teaching and mentoring young reporters about the ins and outs of journalism. He believed fiercely in the free press and strong ethics that were required to be a trusted source of information. He never took his platform for granted, and he used it to make Montana and this Nation a better place.

Outside the newsroom, he was a proud father to John, working hard each day to ensure that his son had every opportunity possible. Don was immensely proud of his wife Mary Ann who charted her own path as a public servant.

Today, we remember the life and the legacy of Don Dunwell and aim to follow in his ever-fervent footsteps. Don was 82 when he passed. He was bitten by a bug that made him look much younger than that, but he was a fine man and a good friend.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 12 noon tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:30 p.m., adjourned until Friday, May 5, 2017, at 12 noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 4, 2017

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

PRAYER

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

Please send Your spirit of peace upon this assembly on a day of great political moment.

The attention of millions of Americans is focused as the House considers legislation impacting the health care and coverage of so many citizens.

On this National Day of Prayer, please attend to the supplications of Your people.

May the deliberations of these days issue forth in legislation that indeed promotes the general welfare, one of the purposes of government articulated in the preamble to our Constitution.

And may all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. McNERNEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. McNERNEY of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

FLEXIBILITY TO PROVIDE LOW-FAT FLAVORED MILK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last Congress I introduced bipartisan legislation to give schools the flexibility to provide low-fat flavored milk as a part of the National School Lunch Program.

I am happy to announce that the omnibus bill we passed yesterday contains language from my legislation and allows the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture to grant exemptions to schools that wish to provide students with flavored, nutritional, low-fat fluid milk at breakfast and lunch.

Mr. Speaker, milk is the number one source of nine essential nutrients in young Americans' diets and provides multiple health benefits, including better bone health, lower blood pressure, and reduced risk of cardiovascular disease or type 2 diabetes.

Consumption of milk in schools has been on the decline for several years, despite the fact that public school enrollment continues to grow. Not only is the declining consumption detrimental to the health of young people, but it is adversely affecting our Nation's dairy farmers.

The bottom line is, if children won't consume milk, there is no way it can be nutritious. I am glad to see flavored milk back in our school cafeterias.

Mr. Speaker, on this National Day of Prayer, there will be today, with the bills being considered, many words and powerful words being spoken here today, but none more powerful spoken on this day, the National Day of Prayer, in our Capitol, than three words: Let us pray.

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the so-called American Health Care Act is up today.

If you are over age 50, insurance companies can charge you five times the normal rate. This couple, 64 years old, \$30,000-a-year income, \$1,700 for a pol-

icy now. After this great bill passes, this big beautiful bill, \$15,000 a year for health care out of a \$30,000 income.

Now, how the heck does that work?

In the next 3 years, 24 million Americans will lose coverage. Among them, 153,000 in my district on the Oregon health plan so-called extended Medicaid. But that wasn't bad enough to get this bill through the House. The rightwing demanded more, so they have done away with the preexisting condition exclusion.

Now they say: Oh, no, it is still in there, but the insurance company can charge you whatever they want. You have cancer? Oh, that will be \$100,000 a year for your policy. Oh, but don't worry, don't worry, they are going to have a risk pool.

A few Members with weak knees went down to the White House to get a deal with the dealmaker, Trump, \$8 billion. A lot of money for people with preexisting conditions. Unfortunately, there are 130 million American adults with preexisting conditions, as described by the insurance industry. Over 5 years, that will be \$1 per month per person. That is going to buy a hell of a lot of health care; right?

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, this is National Small Business Week, and I rise to celebrate the more than 27 million small businesses in the United States of America and the 31,000 that are in my congressional district. The men and women who own these firms are truly the backbone of our economy.

Small businesses create most of the new jobs in the economy, supporting their families, employees, and communities. Small businesses want to grow and create jobs, but have difficulty accessing capital.

Furthermore, too many people remain out of work through no fault of their own. We must do more to fight high unemployment rates by helping to ensure that small businesses have the tools they need to succeed and thrive.

That is why I introduced H.R. 2313, the Small Business Relief and Job Creation Act. My bill provides tax credits for small businesses to hire people who were previously unemployed, and includes additional tax credits for small businesses located in high unemployment areas.

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

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

I welcome my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 2313 to support small businesses across the country.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT WESTON C. LEE.

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor First Lieutenant Weston C. Lee of Bluffton, Georgia, who died on April 29, 2017, in Mosul, Iraq, in support of Operation Inherent Resolve.

First Lieutenant Lee died from injuries sustained while part of a train, advise, and assist mission in support of partner forces.

First Lieutenant Lee was assigned to Charlie Company, 1st Battalion, 325th Infantry Regiment of the 82nd Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

I would like to extend my heartfelt sympathy and condolences to his team, his family, and his friends who have suffered this loss.

Thank you, Lieutenant Weston Lee, for your service and sacrifice to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would use the remainder of my time in a moment of silence in honor of Lieutenant Lee.

OPPOSITION TO THE AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the so-called American Health Care Act. It was a bad deal for America before, and it is a worse deal today. It is an offense to working families. You are going to pay more for your premiums, co-pays, and deductibles, and you are going to get less.

Preventative services, gone. Mental and behavioral health services, no more. Prescription drugs, gone or, at best, a whole lot more expensive.

It is a life-and-death proposition for the 326,000 people in my district with preexisting conditions, segregated into expensive high-risk pools, facing mind-boggling premium increases if you happen to have asthma, diabetes, cancer, or become pregnant.

It is a broken promise to America. President Trump promised not to cut Medicaid; broken. He promised insurance for everybody; broken. He promised preexisting conditions would be covered; broken.

Mr. Speaker, I won't be complicit in this broken promise. I won't un-insure 24 million Americans. I am resisting. I am voting "no."

HONORING ARMY RANGER SERGEANT JOSHUA P. RODGERS

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of our Nation's heroes.

On April 27, Army Ranger Sergeant Joshua P. Rodgers of Bloomington, Illinois, was killed in action serving his third tour in Afghanistan.

At age 22, Sergeant Rodgers had already earned the prestigious Ranger Tab, Parachutist Badge, Marksmanship Qualification Badge Expert-Rifle, and many others.

Sergeant Rodgers leaves behind his parents, Kevin and Vonda; sisters, Emily and Hannah; brother, Ashton; and countless others whose lives have been forever changed by him.

I never had the honor of meeting Sergeant Rodgers, but those who knew him best remember him as a warrior, tenacious, humble, determined, a true inspiration to everyone who knew him.

We are forever grateful to Sergeant Rodgers and the men and women who put country above all else, a debt which we can never repay. It is because of Sergeant Rodgers and many like him that we live in the land of the free. It truly is because of the brave.

On Saturday, Sergeant Rodgers will be laid to rest as his family and friends gather to celebrate his life, a life filled with patriotism, honor, and service. This House and his country will never forget Sergeant Rodgers' sacrifice.

May God bless his family and the brothers and sisters he served alongside.

HONORING NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Small Business Week. Small businesses are the backbone of our economy. This week is dedicated to celebrating and recognizing them and their contributions to our Nation. Because of this, I wanted to take a moment to recognize a few stellar small businesses in north central Florida.

Archer Automotive and Tire, founded in 2004, came about after a fleet mechanic of over 20 years decided he wanted to open his own shop. Thirteen years later, they have expanded into a state-of-the-art facility employing over eight families, allowing them to serve even more of their community.

Eat the 80, winner of the Gainesville Chamber of Commerce's 2016 Leading Women's Enterprise Award, is a meal delivery service specializing in health food that doesn't lack flavor or qual-

ity. They believe that everyone should have access to a healthy diet, and they built a business that could provide meals for working families.

Finally, I would like to recognize Endoscopy Replacement Parts, an aftermarket manufacturer established in 1997. Their 18 years of manufacturing experience, great customer service, and giving back to the community has led them to be recognized as the 2015 Manufacturers Association of Florida's Manufacturer of the Year, and the 2015 Small Business Administration's Small Business Exporter of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, it is businesses like that that keep our communities vital and growing.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2192, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT, AND PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1628, AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 308 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 308

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2192) to amend the Public Health Service Act to eliminate the non-application of certain State waiver provisions to Members of Congress and congressional staff. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. During further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1628) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 228, the further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Poe of Texas). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House

Resolution 308, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee.

Over the past few weeks, the Rules Committee has had the opportunity to hear from numerous stakeholders, from the chairs and ranking members of committees of jurisdiction to the Members who have offered amendments.

Most recently, last night we heard testimony from Mr. MACARTHUR and Mr. UPTON to explain their amendments and address any questions from the committee members, and from Ms. MCSALLY to explain her legislation.

□ 0915

This rule provides for further consideration of H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act, and incorporates three amendments—the Palmer-Schweikert amendment, the MacArthur amendment, and the Upton amendment—that strengthen the underlying bill.

It also provides for consideration of H.R. 2192, legislation authored by Representative MCSALLY, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, all across our country, the Affordable Care Act continues to strip hardworking Americans and families of access to affordable, quality medical care and offer them skyrocketing premiums and anemic provider networks in return.

Democrats smuggled ObamaCare through with little regard for the procedure, left lofty and empty promises that benefit simply a bureaucratic machine. Seven years later, we have seen these promises evaporate as ObamaCare patients lose access to their doctors and lose the very insurance plans they were promised would remain intact.

Our friends across the aisle claim that coverage has been expanded and individuals who never had quality health care before now have access. Mr. Speaker, I wish that were true, but it is not. I wish my colleagues and I didn't hear from neighbor after neighbor who can't find a doctor to accept ACA insurance or who avoids medical care altogether because their deductibles reach higher than the clouds. But we do hear from them because Americans are suffering as insurance providers flee from the not-so-free market.

You see, coverage doesn't mean access to care. Unfortunately, we have heard all too often that individuals may have health coverage, but they can't use it because their premiums

and deductibles are too high for them to actually afford the care.

What good does the coverage do a woman who earns \$22,000 a year and has a \$5,000 deductible?

What good does it do a young family to have insurance that no provider in their community accepts?

What good does it do to say we want to grow the economy and create jobs when American businesses are struggling to keep their doors open due to the ObamaCare mandate?

We have witnessed insurers dropping out of the exchanges and seen premiums climbing while consumers are left with less and less choice. Five States have one option and no choice for health insurance, and nothing guarantees that their residents will keep that much.

ObamaCare has hijacked the free market, and it has taken some Americans' liberties with it. We must remember that exchanging freedom, choice, self-determination for securities at the hands of Big Brother too often leaves us with neither liberty nor security.

We know that ObamaCare was designed to make a single-payer system inevitable. And to the extent that a single-payer system means a zero-choice system, the prophecy has already come true.

Families can no longer choose to save for retirement or pay their mortgages because premiums suck up all the oxygen in their budget. Individuals who want to purchase a PPO cannot because their county only offers HMO plans. Disabled Americans who depend on Medicare find that ObamaCare has given more Federal funding to able-bodied Americans than our more vulnerable neighbors.

In my district, a young mother who wants to take her young son to the family doctor post-ObamaCare can't because she can't find a physician who accepts her new insurance.

Brittany Ivey and her husband have struggled under the consequences of the Affordable Care Act. Mrs. Ivey was working part-time at a small business that provided her family with health insurance until the effects of ObamaCare on the insurance market raised her premiums sharply. This drove the Ivey family into the individual market, where a midlevel plan took 65 percent of her monthly gross income, even after a small Federal subsidy. Unable to afford insurance through her employer, Mrs. Ivey turned to the Federal exchange, where she obtained a plan that neither she nor her children's doctor would accept.

The Affordable Care Act robbed Americans of the ability to choose health care that worked for them, and the Affordable Care Act destroyed the insurance market along with the benefits that competition and innovation offer all of us. The American people deserve better. ObamaCare replaced our

doctors with bureaucrats because that is what socialized medicine does.

The American Health Care Act is our last chance to get off the Federal ferris wheel before we are locked into a healthcare system that takes us nowhere and offers neighbors nothing but heartburn.

The American Health Care Act guts the most egregious provisions of ObamaCare, rolls back the law's taxes, restores flexibility to the States, and helps to make quality care more accessible and affordable.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I came to Congress is to repeal and replace ObamaCare and rein in our Nation's bloated, ballooning entitlement system. The American Health Care Act does that by, for the first time, making major reforms to an entitlement program—Medicaid. It rolls back the Medicaid expansion under ObamaCare, one of the fundamental pillars, and it makes structural changes to the program to ensure it only goes to the individuals it was intended to help.

The American Health Care Act allows States to establish work requirements for able-bodied adult Medicaid enrollees. It lets States choose between the per capita cap and a flexible Medicare block grant, and it increases the growth rate to cover disabled and elderly Medicaid populations.

The bill enacts patient-centered reforms, increases access to healthcare savings accounts, and creates a Patient and State Stability Fund to help stabilize insurance markets that have contracted during ObamaCare.

Over the course of the last several weeks, we have worked in this House to strengthen the bill. We have listened to feedback from constituents, neighbors, stakeholders, and each other.

Importantly, coverage for individuals with preexisting conditions is maintained as a baseline within the bill. An amendment from Mr. MACARTHUR further protects individuals' preexisting conditions from being denied coverage.

While the amendment provides States with additional flexibility by allowing them to seek a waiver, individuals with preexisting conditions will not be left out to dry. In fact, there are conditions attached to the waiver that ensure States use funds provided by the bill, should they receive a waiver, to set up high-risk pools for those very individuals. With the addition of the Upton amendment, the bill provides \$108 billion to help States fund programs such as high-risk pools.

Mr. Speaker, my home State of Georgia has very different needs than California. That is why I think it makes sense to give States more say in what works for their populations. Our plan does this, but it does so in a way that ensures protections exist for vulnerable populations like the elderly, disabled, and children.

The rule also provides for Representative MCSALLY's legislation to ensure

that Members of Congress are treated the same as all Americans. I fully support this bill and firmly believe elected officials should be required to live under the same laws as those they were elected to represent.

President Trump has made his support of the American Health Care Act and its strengthening amendments clear, and I stand with him in supporting this legislation to gut ObamaCare and rescue the American people.

Mr. Speaker, average premiums rose by 40 percent or more in 11 States just this year. The statistics and the stories speak for themselves. We must act to dismantle ObamaCare, and the Affordable Care Act does that.

I support the rule before us today to provide for further improvements to the bill and look forward to supporting both the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, pathetic, that is the word to describe this process and this bill. If the American people could sue Congress for malpractice, my Republican friends would be in deep trouble.

How could you do this? How could you do this to the American people? How can you do this to the people you represent?

You are taking away essential healthcare protections. You are allowing insurance companies to discriminate against people with preexisting conditions. You are supporting a bill that will throw 24 million people off of their health care and cut Medicaid by \$880 billion to give a \$1 trillion tax break to the wealthiest people in this country.

What is wrong with you guys?

Today's rule self-executes three of the newest Republican amendments to the Republican health plan. This means, without any sort of debate or discussion whatsoever, the Palmer, MacArthur, and Upton amendments will magically pass the House.

What I find so hard to believe about this latest backroom deal is that they actually make this bill worse. I didn't think that was possible, Mr. Speaker.

To shore up support amongst this Chamber's most conservative faction, Representative MACARTHUR and others made a deal with President Trump to gut protections for individuals with preexisting conditions and to eliminate essential health benefits like maternity care, mental health treatment, and prescription drug coverage, just to name a few. These are among the most popular provisions of the Affordable Care Act.

The American people were justifiably outraged, and they showed up by the thousands to townhalls to express their

anger. And there were some on the Republican side who actually got it. They listened to their constituents and they had the courage to stand up and say no.

But when Republican leaders came up short in their whip count, Representative UPTON ran to the White House and concocted a deal with President Trump to try to win back votes. His amendment adds a measly \$8 billion spread out over 5 years in a futile attempt to soften the devastating effect that this bill will have on millions and millions of Americans with pre-existing conditions.

Now, \$8 billion over 5 years sounds like a lot, but when we are talking about an entire country, it really isn't. Don't take it from me. Robert Graboyes from the conservative Mercatus Center said:

"The \$8 billion amount is a pittance. Spread over 5 years, it's a fifth of a pittance."

This is not a leftwing organization. This is an organization funded by Koch Industries, the Koch brothers. My friends love the Koch brothers.

What's more, some analysts have already estimated that an additional \$200 billion will be needed over a decade to adequately fund high-risk pools. So this amendment is billions upon billions upon billions of dollars short. And as the Center for American Progress points out, the Upton amendment "will have almost no effect."

Now, my colleagues who have been won over by this should be ashamed of themselves. We are supposed to fix problems and help people, not merely settle for political cover that can be used in a press release. \$8 billion to cover a \$200 billion shortfall? Back where I come from, we call that being a cheap date. I guarantee you, your constituents are going to figure this out, and they will not be happy.

So to so-called moderate Republicans who have contorted themselves this week to try to find a fix to the damage being done to the people with pre-existing conditions, I have breaking news: I have a magic bullet fix if Republicans really want to protect people with preexisting conditions. Are you ready? Brace yourselves. Don't change the law. Everyone is already protected by the Affordable Care Act, including people with preexisting conditions and those who struggle to find affordable care. Let me say to my colleagues that to claim or imply that this Republican plan covers preexisting conditions is a lie, plain and simple.

Now, let me say a few words about the process that has been used to bring this bill to the floor. It has been a disaster from start to finish, with secret negotiations, backroom deals, and bribes to buy off factions within the Republican Conference. There have been no hearings on this bill whatsoever. And the Republican leadership couldn't even slow down long enough to receive a score from the CBO.

I have one simple question: What is the rush? Wait a week and get a CBO score. Why is that such a radical idea?

Mr. Speaker, are Republican leaders jamming this bill through to appease Donald Trump?

Are they concerned that a new CBO score will confirm what we already know is true, that this bill will be devastating to the people of this country, force even more people to lose their health care, especially to older, sick, and low-income Americans.

Or maybe, Mr. Speaker, Republican leaders are worried that their colleagues will go home over this weeklong break and actually hear from their constituents who overwhelmingly oppose this effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Honestly, I don't know how my Republican friends can defend this terrible, closed, authoritarian process. It is an absolute disgrace.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill, or, better yet, I urge my Republican colleagues to do what they did a couple of weeks ago and pull this disastrous bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, the question every Member of Congress should be asking themselves today is: Who in the world is better off because of today's bill?

It is not the 24 million people the CBO says will lose their health coverage if this bill becomes law.

It is not the seniors who will be priced out of the market by an age tax or the millions of families who will see their health care gutted by the more than \$800 billion in cuts to Medicaid.

It is not the 881,000 non-elderly adults in Kentucky with preexisting conditions who would, once again, face staggering health costs with reduced care.

So who is better off? Well, certainly corporations and millionaires who will see nearly \$1 trillion in tax cuts from this bill.

And at least, in their minds, a few Republican Members are so desperate for some type of political victory they are willing to risk the health and well-being of their constituents to ram through a bill without hearings, analysis, or, most alarmingly, any sense of morality. That is the cruel tradeoff my Republican colleagues have decided to make.

Our families deserve far better. I urge my colleagues to exercise better judgment and vote "no" on this bill.

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

□ 0930

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if my colleagues are aware of this since we are moving so quickly here, but I want to flag for everyone an important op-ed in *The Hill* by the executive director of the Boston Area Rape Crisis Center. She points out that in the latest version of this legislation, rape can once again be categorized as a preexisting condition as it often was before the Affordable Care Act.

I include her column, entitled "Health 'reform' will make sexual assault survivors sick," in the RECORD.

HEALTH 'REFORM' WILL MAKE SEXUAL
ASSAULT SURVIVORS SICK

(By Gina Scaramella)

So far, we know that about 24 million Americans stand to lose their health insurance coverage if the Affordable Care Act (ACA) is replaced with the American Health Care Act (AHCA). We know that most of those 24 million people will be low-income.

We also know that groups of people who experience significant health care disparities, such as lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people, and Black and Latino people, will be among those who risk losing the most if the ACA is repealed. To that list, we must add survivors of sexual violence.

Before passage of the ACA in 2010, sexual assault survivors who had sought medical care for their injuries could be denied health insurance coverage at a later date. The reason? Health insurers often categorized rape as a pre-existing health condition.

In one widely reported case, a 45-year-old woman met two men at a bar in Florida who bought her a drink. Hours later, she found herself lying by the side of the road with injuries indicating that she had been raped and that the men had spiked her drink. Her doctor prescribed a treatment of anti-viral, post-HIV exposure drugs to protect against HIV transmission.

When the woman lost her health insurance several months after the attack, she was unable to obtain new insurance due to the health care treatment she had received for the assault. She went without health insurance for three years.

Stories like these prompted the National Women's Law Center to launch a campaign called "Being a Woman Is Not a Pre-Existing Condition." It was so popular that then-House Speaker Nancy Pelosi adopted the phrase in her pro-health reform talking points with media, and the New York Times ran an explainer on the ways in which health insurers treated women as if they were just one giant pre-existing condition.

The AHCA initially retained the ACA's ban on discrimination against people with pre-existing conditions. But an amendment to the AHCA bill offered last week by New Jersey Congressman Tom MacArthur and North Carolina Congressman Mark Meadows would make it easier for health insurers to deny coverage to people with pre-existing conditions.

By letting states waive the ACA prohibition on charging people with pre-existing health conditions higher premiums, protections for those who've previously been medically treated for sexual assault would be gutted.

Perhaps more alarming, though, is the MacArthur-Meadows amendment's provision allowing states to also seek waivers from the

ACA's requirement that essential health benefits be covered by health insurance plans. Essential health benefits include preventive health care services that most of us take for granted. These include tests for blood pressure and cholesterol, mammograms, and vaccinations. Essential health benefits also include coverage for mental health care and substance abuse treatment.

Sexual violence survivors face acute treatment needs in the aftermath of an assault such as care for gynecological injuries, other physical trauma, sexually-transmitted diseases, and pregnancy. But sexual violence takes many forms: incest; ongoing sexual abuse outside of the family, sexual assault, sexual harassment or exploitation, and rape. Each of these types of assault puts the survivor at risk for various potential negative physical health and mental health outcomes.

For example, an adult survivor of childhood sexual abuse is at a higher risk for psychiatric disorders. Women and men who have survived rape as adults are at higher risk of post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, anxiety, and substance abuse—any of which can significantly interfere with daily living. No one can deny that there is a direct line between having survived sexual violence, and an increased risk of physical and mental health problems.

The mental health impacts of sexual violence are deep and often longstanding. Survivors need long-term access to nonjudgmental health and mental health services to reduce their suffering and mitigate as much as possible the stress that recovery from sexual violence puts on intimate family relationships, and obligations related to school and work.

It is hard to see any good coming from this latest attempt to repeal the ACA and all of the care it has brought to survivors of sexual violence.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, this destructive legislation hurts middle class families and threatens massive disruption to our healthcare system. And it has only gone from bad to worse.

Stripping protections from 133 million Americans with preexisting conditions isn't just wrong, it is inhumane. Nobody in this country should go bankrupt trying to afford the medical care they need to stay alive.

This isn't about politics; it is about human decency and who we are as Americans. It is about people like Jackie, a cancer survivor from Snohomish who says the Affordable Care Act saved her life.

She wrote to me saying: "My cancer recurred, but I was covered. I was able to complete my treatments without having to worry about how to put food on the table. Or being left to die. Because of the ACA, I survived."

We all have stories like this in our districts, but some of my colleagues aren't listening. I hope they find the courage and the wisdom to vote "no" on this dangerous legislation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Republicans, over the last few months, have said that they would fundamentally change health care in the United States, and it is clear today that they have. They have made it much worse.

I want to highlight one provision that allows for States to permit insurers to get rid of essential healthcare benefits and charge people more who have preexisting conditions. Think about that for a second.

In my home State of Texas, the Governor and other State leaders have already turned their back on so many people, allowing foster care children to sleep in State offices, allowing sex trafficking and human trafficking victims to go to jail because there is nowhere else to put them.

You should ask yourselves: What will your leaders do? Will they allow insurers to charge you more for preexisting conditions like diabetes and hypertension and cancer and asthma?

Do you think, and do you trust, that they are going to do the right thing by you? Because today, this plan allows them to abandon you.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

At this time, I think one of the interesting things is, as discussed, the criticism of this. I think it was just a reminder, Mr. Speaker, of what happened 7 years ago when our healthcare market, which could have been helped by many good ideas, was decided to be taken on a very unhealthy bent. We are now paying the price for that. We are going to continue to see that unless we change it. We are changing that for the better.

One of the strongest voices that we have had in this body is someone who has actually taken it as his living to take care of people. Dr. BURGESS not only came to this Congress with a strong voice of not only what doctors and the medical profession have, but I think it gives us an insight into what patients need as well. He has been a clarion voice through this whole process, before ObamaCare, during the disaster of ObamaCare, and now as we look to fix the problems that have existed.

I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, how did we get to this point?

The Affordable Care Act is simply not working for the American people. It is limiting choices. It is raising costs. It is leaving millions without access to care. And unfortunately, these are not just talking points but very real issues affecting very real Americans.

The Affordable Care Act has left the individual market in shambles and has driven insurers away from offering coverage. Now, we are seeing one-third of

all counties in the United States of America with only a single insurer. And among the plans that have chosen to remain in these markets, there have been widespread, double-digit premium increases. In Texas, premiums have jumped 29 percent a year, on average, from 2014 to 2017.

The markets are in difficulty. They are failing to live up to the promise made 7 years ago, that Americans would be able to receive “affordable care.”

As we knew then, and we still know now, this was an empty promise and has priced over 19 million Americans out of the market. What is worse, these individuals are forced to pay the individual mandate penalty or seek a hardship exemption because of the cost to purchase and use their health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, 11 months ago, Speaker RYAN released the Better Way plan to save the Nation's healthcare system and to bring relief to the American people. This plan, which served as the blueprint for the American Health Care Act, laid out policies to stabilize the markets damaged by the Affordable Care Act, repeal the burdensome Affordable Care Act taxes and mandates that have hindered innovation and limited access to care. So let's take a look at what the American Health Care Act does.

First and foremost, the American Health Care Act provides immediate relief to the State insurance markets. As Republicans, we know that one-size-fits-all works for no one, and certainly did not work for the individual markets. The States should have the flexibility to support their insurance markets and ensure that plans can continue to provide options for coverage.

To do this, we relax two of the more egregious market regulations that were imposed under the Affordable Care Act: the mandate that premiums cannot vary for younger and older Americans by more than a 3-to-1 ratio and the mandate creating fixed actuarial values for plans.

The mandate limiting a plan's ability to set premiums by age has driven up the cost of coverage for younger and healthier Americans and, subsequently, pushed them away from seeking coverage by the millions. Of the over 19 million Americans who have sidestepped the individual market, it is estimated that as many as 45 percent of these individuals are under the age of 35. Without these younger Americans seeking coverage, the markets have plunged, as insurers have hiked up premiums year after year to compensate for unhealthy risk pools.

To change this, there is relaxation of the 5-to-1 ratio. It will lower premium costs and provide necessary opportunities to stabilize markets. We also give States the option, the choice to go higher or go lower, which honors the spirit of federalism.

Additionally, we are repealing the actuarial values mandate to provide insurers with additional flexibility to offer more coverage options. The requirement for insurers to offer specified Bronze, Silver, and Gold level tiers has limited consumer choice, driving even more individuals away from seeking coverage and further contributing to the collapse of the healthcare markets.

To further supplement these efforts, we are establishing the Patient and State Stability Fund. This fund provides States access to a total of over \$140 billion over 10 years to promote innovative solutions to lower costs and increase access to health care for their unique patient populations.

Mr. Speaker, the goal is simple, to provide States with maximum flexibility in how they address the cost of care for their citizens. The American Health Care Act provides States with options for how to use funds, including providing financial assistance for high-cost individuals, incentivizing insurer participation in those markets, reducing the cost of insurance, promoting access to preventive services, and reducing out-of-pocket costs for patients.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated that a combination of the Stability Fund and other proconsumer changes would reduce premiums by 10 percent below current projections of 2026.

We want patients to have access to high-quality, affordably priced health coverage. The Patient and State Stability Fund can help States lower costs and can increase access to high quality health care for their citizens.

In addition to supporting the insurance markets, the American Health Care Act creates needed reforms to the Medicaid program itself. Without any changes, the current Medicaid expansion is expected to cost \$1 trillion in 10 years' time—\$1 trillion a year in 10 years' time. Medicaid needs reform so that States can continue to provide coverage to children, people with disabilities, and other vulnerable groups, the very populations that this safety net program was created to serve.

To address these concerns, the American Health Care Act first phases out the Medicaid expansion, not traditional Medicaid but Medicaid expansion. The expansion has hurt State budgets and limited States' abilities to ensure that resources will continue to be available for the vulnerable populations for which Medicaid was designed. By phasing out expansion, we are providing States with greater budget autonomy.

Additionally, our bill helps further bend the Medicaid cost curve by shifting the program toward a per beneficiary allotment. Per beneficiary allotments set limits on the annual growth for per capita expenditures for which the States will receive matching

funds from the Federal Government. Per beneficiary allotments create greater fiscal accountability and ensure that the program can continue to exist for years to come.

This is not a new idea. This was an idea put forward by President Bill Clinton and, at one time, supported by every Democratic Member of the Senate in 1995.

Second, the American Health Care Act increases the amount of flexibility that States have in managing their Medicaid program. The bill scales back the Affordable Care Act mandates that have limited a State's ability to tailor plans toward the needs of beneficiaries. States can and States should be trusted to effectively manage the needs of their Medicaid beneficiaries. The American Health Care Act will allow them to do so.

Additionally, the American Health Care Act furthers the goal of providing the States with greater flexibility in managing their Medicaid programs by providing States with the option to implement two additional opportunities: work requirements and block grants for Medicaid.

When the Affordable Care Act was being debated, some of the most consistent complaints that we heard throughout the discussion came from Governors and State representatives expressing concerns about the negative consequences that they saw on the horizon.

This time around, we chose to engage our State counterparts in the discussion and listen to their input as we designed the bill; and at the top of their list was a desire to see the work requirements built into the Medicaid and the expansion populations, and the opportunity to work with Medicaid as a block grant.

Republicans trust that States know what works for their respective populations, and we are not going to stand in the way of States seeking to design Medicaid programs that work for them.

Finally, the American Health Care Act provides additional resources to bolster State safety net providers. The bill provides increases to the Community Health Center Fund, offers enhanced funding to support the safety net providers in States that did not expand Medicaid, and ends the cuts to Disproportionate Share Hospital payments, cuts that are going to occur under current law on October 1 of this year.

We are committed to ensuring that our local providers can continue to deliver lifesaving care and that the American Health Care Act turns this commitment into action. For the millions of Americans in rural and medically underserved areas, these actions will provide needed relief that was undercut by the Affordable Care Act and will allow these Americans to continue to have access to care.

Moving forward, together, these efforts will provide meaningful reform and relief for the States and for the individuals seeking health care. We are stabilizing the markets, reforming Medicaid in the most substantive and consequential way in its 52-year history, and ensuring that all Americans can maintain access to care through local safety net providers.

We do recognize there is still more work to be done in health care, and that is why we only consider the American Health Care Act to be the beginning. It is the key that gets us through the door into additional health reform. From here, we will work with Secretary Price at the Department of Health and Human Services to further deregulate the marketplace and increase consumer choice in the healthcare markets, and we will enhance the American Health Care Act with additional legislative efforts to further the goal of lowering healthcare costs.

Mr. Speaker, this should be a very exciting time in health care. With all of the knowledge that has been gained over the years in the practice of medicine, I am humbled to be here today speaking in support of this legislation.

It will begin the much-awaited process of unwinding the Affordable Care Act and will finally return patients to the center of health care.

□ 0945

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, wow. I yield myself such time as I may consume, and to rebut the gentleman from Texas, let me include in the RECORD a letter from the American Cancer Society, the American Diabetes Association, the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, the March of Dimes, the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, the National Organization for Rare Disorders, and the National Coalition for Women with Heart Disease.

LEADING PATIENT ADVOCACY GROUPS REMAIN OPPOSED TO THE AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT
EIGHT ORGANIZATIONS ISSUE STATEMENT
CRITICIZING UPTON AGREEMENT

WASHINGTON, May 3, 2017.—Earlier today, House Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Greg Walden (R-OR) issued a press release stating that an amendment proposed by Representative Fred Upton (R-MI) to the American Health Care Act (AHCA) provides “protection and certainty for patients with pre-existing conditions.” Eight leading patient groups, listed below, issued the following statement in response:

Despite the Upton amendment, we remain strongly opposed to the American Health Care Act and urge Congress to consider the people at the heart of this decision. The various patchwork solutions offered by lawmakers would still leave the millions of patients we represent, who have serious and chronic health conditions, at risk of not being able to access life-saving treatments and care.

There is no substitute for fundamental, unequivocal protections for people with pre-existing conditions.

The AHCA, including the potential amendment, would undermine vital safeguards against being charged more for insurance based on health status. Increasing funding for risk sharing programs and consumer financial assistance does not address the legitimate challenges built into these proposals.

The other equally important problems with the AHCA remain, including:

Allowing states to waive the guarantee of essential health benefits, which would:

Segment the market into plans for sick people and plans for healthy people, driving up the cost of plans for people with serious health care needs

Undermine the protection against annual and lifetime coverage caps, a critical safeguard for patients

Eliminating Medicaid expansion coverage for millions of Americans and altering the program’s financing structure in a way that jeopardizes coverage of new and innovative treatments

Increasing out-of-pocket costs for many Americans, including some of the sickest and elderly among us

Given the numerous shortcomings of the American Health Care Act in serving the patients we represent, our organizations have no choice but to oppose this legislation and urge all Representatives to vote against it, with or without the Upton and MacArthur amendments.

PATIENT ADVOCACY GROUPS

American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network
American Heart Association
American Lung Association
Cystic Fibrosis Foundation
March of Dimes
National Organization for Rare Disorders
National MS Society
WomenHeart: The National Coalition for Women with Heart Disease

MEDIA CONTACTS

American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, Alissa Crispino.
American Heart Association, Abbey Dively.
American Lung Association, Allison MacMunn.
Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, Jessica Rowlands.
March of Dimes, Cindy Pellegrini.
National Organization for Rare Disorders, Jennifer Huron.
National MS Society, Eileen Curran.
WomenHeart: The National Coalition for Women with Heart Disease, Tom Murphy.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a statement from the American Medical Association in opposition to this bill.

[From the American Medical Association, May 3, 2017]

AMA WARNS THAT PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT DO NOT REMEDY BILL’S SHORTCOMINGS

DESPITE AMENDMENTS TO BILL, MILLIONS OF AMERICANS WOULD STILL LOSE HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE

CHICAGO.—American Medical Association (AMA) President Andrew W. Gurman, M.D., issued the following statement today about proposed changes to the American Health Care Act (AHCA):

“None of the legislative tweaks under consideration changes the serious harm to patients and the health care delivery system if AHCA passes. Proposed changes to the bill

tinker at the edges without remedying the fundamental failing of the bill—that millions of Americans will lose their health insurance as a direct result of this proposal.

“High-risk pools are not a new idea. Prior to the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, 35 states operated high-risk pools, and they were not a panacea for Americans with pre-existing medical conditions. The history of high-risk pools demonstrates that Americans with pre-existing conditions will be stuck in second-class health care coverage—if they are able to obtain coverage at all.

“Not only would the AHCA eliminate health insurance coverage for millions of Americans, the legislation would, in many cases, eliminate the ban against charging those with underlying medical conditions vastly more for their coverage.”

“America should not go backward to the time when our fellow citizens with pre-existing health conditions faced high costs for limited coverage, if they were able to obtain coverage at all. The AMA urges congressional leaders and the Administration to pursue a bipartisan dialogue on alternative policies that provide patients with access and coverage to high quality care and preserve the safety net for vulnerable populations.”

BACKGROUND ON HIGH-RISK POOLS

A January report from the American Academy of Actuaries notes that “enrollment has generally been low, coverage has been limited and expensive, they require external funding, and they have typically operated at a loss . . . Removing high-risk individuals from the insured risk pools reduces costs in the private market only temporarily. Over time, even lower-cost individuals in the individual market can incur high health care costs, which would put upward pressure on premiums.”

According to the Kaiser Family Foundation:

State high-risk pools featured premiums above standard non-group market rates—with most states capping them at 150%–200% of standard rates. Many also featured high deductibles, some \$5,000 or more.

Despite the fact that many individuals were forced into high-risk pools because of a pre-existing condition, nearly all states excluded coverage for these conditions for 6–12 months.

Almost all high-risk pools imposed lifetime limits on covered services, and some imposed annual limits.

Some states capped or closed enrollment. Combined net losses for the state high-risk pools totaled more than \$1.2 billion for 2011, or \$5,510 per enrollee, on average.

Furthermore, a 2010 paper by James Capretta and Tom Miller that appeared in National Affairs estimated that the cost of adequately funded high risk pools would be \$15 billion to \$20 billion per year.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a letter from the American Academy of Family Physicians in opposition to this bill.

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF
FAMILY PHYSICIANS,
May 3, 2017.

JIM MCGOVERN,
Representative, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. JIM MCGOVERN: Despite recent activities and amendments, the American Health Care Act (H.R. 1628) remains a highly flawed proposal that will destabilize our health care system, cause significant loss of coverage, and allow for the discrimination

against patients based on their gender, age, and health status. For these reasons, the American Academy of Family Physicians (AAFP) continues to oppose the AHCA and encourages the House of Representatives to reject this failed policy.

The fact remains that the AHCA will:

Cause more than 24 million people to lose their health care coverage, including more than 7 million with employer-sponsored coverage.

Destabilize the individual health insurance market.

Create a race to the bottom by eliminating any standards with respect to minimum insurance benefits.

Enact draconian cuts in the Medicaid program that will have an immediate negative impact on low-income individuals, children, and millions of senior citizens who rely on the program.

Eliminate community rating and return to medical underwriting, thus allowing insurers to discriminate against individuals based on their gender, age, and health status.

Deny individuals protection against annual and lifetime spending caps, thus threatening the financial stability of millions of individuals and families in the future.

Over the past few days there has been an effort to advance policies that seek to protect individuals with pre-existing conditions from facing discrimination in insurance underwriting as a result of their health status. Despite a willingness to spend more money on these proposals, the current efforts on pre-existing conditions fail to accomplish their goal. High-risk pools are inherently flawed and expensive. The proposals under consideration provide inadequate funding for an inadequate period of time, thus creating an under-funded and temporary solution for the millions of Americans with pre-existing conditions. We find it regrettable that Congress would seek to relegate individuals with high health care needs to a program that has a questionable history and would face uncertain financial stability in the future.

By removing critical consumer protections that collectively ensure that the millions of individuals with pre-existing conditions can continue to purchase affordable health care coverage, the AHCA would result in higher premiums and higher deductibles for millions. Additionally, the negative impact of the AHCA is not limited to the individual insurance market. These policies also may impact the more than 130 million people with employer-sponsored insurance.

Thank you.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a statement from the AARP in strong opposition to this bill.

AARP,
May 3, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Older Americans care deeply about access to and affordability of health care. With the addition of the Upton Amendment, as reported, we once again write to share our opposition to the American Health Care Act (AHCA) and urge you to vote NO. Changes under consideration that would allow states to waive important consumer protections—allowing insurance companies to once again charge Americans with pre-existing conditions more because they've had cancer, diabetes or heart disease—would make a bad bill even worse. This would be devastating for the 25 million Americans 50-64 who have a deniable pre-existing condition. The Upton amendment would do little to reduce the massive pre-

mium increases for those with pre-existing conditions.

Throughout consideration of the AHCA, we have been expressing serious concerns about the impact that this legislation will have on older Americans. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO)'s last estimate further demonstrates the harmful impact of this bill on older Americans and some of our most vulnerable. Specifically, the American Health Care Act will weaken the fiscal sustainability of Medicare; dramatically increase premium and out-of-pocket costs for 50-64 year olds purchasing coverage on the individual insurance market; allow insurance companies to once again discriminate against those with pre-existing conditions; substantially increase the number of Americans without insurance; and put at risk millions of children and adults with disabilities and poor seniors who depend on the Medicaid program to access long-term services and supports and other benefits.

Our members and others 50 years of age and older care deeply about health care and want to know where their elected leaders stand. Recognizing the importance of the upcoming vote on the American Health Care Act, AARP intends to inform our members, and others over age 50, how their elected officials voted. We'll communicate the results of the vote in our widely-circulated publications, in e-mail alerts, in our online channels, and through the media. Again, we urge all Representatives to vote NO on the American Health Care Act in its current form.

MEDICARE

The American Health Care Act repeals provisions in current law that have strengthened Medicare's fiscal outlook, specifically, the repeal of the additional 0.9 percent payroll tax on higher-income workers. Repealing this provision would remove billions from the Hospital Insurance trust fund, hasten the insolvency of Medicare, and diminish Medicare's ability to pay for services in the future.

INDIVIDUAL PRIVATE INSURANCE MARKET

Currently, about 25 million Americans age 50-64 have a pre-existing condition, about 6.1 million purchase insurance in the non-group market, and nearly 3.2 million are currently eligible to receive subsidies for health insurance coverage through either the federal health benefits exchange or a state-based exchange (exchange). Since passage of the ACA, the number of 50-64 year old Americans who are uninsured has dropped by half. We are deeply concerned that the AHCA would be a significant step backwards and result in millions of older Americans who cannot afford their health care, including many simply losing their health care. Based on CBO estimates, approximately 14 million Americans will lose coverage next year, while a total of 24 million Americans would lose coverage over the next 10 years.

Affordability of both premiums and cost-sharing is critical to older Americans and their ability to obtain and access health care. A typical 50-64 year old seeking coverage through an exchange has a median annual income of under \$25,000 and already pays significant out-of-pocket costs for health care. We have serious concerns—reinforced by the CBO estimate—that the bill under consideration will dramatically increase health care costs for 50-64 year olds who purchase health care through an exchange due both to the changes in age rating from 3:1 (already a compromise that requires uninsured older Americans to pay three times more than younger individuals) to 5:1

(or more) and reductions in current tax credits for older Americans. CBO concluded that the bill will substantially raise premiums for older people and force many into lower quality plans.

Age rating plus reduced tax credits equal an unaffordable age tax. Our previous estimates on the age-rating change showed that premiums for current coverage could increase by up to \$3,200 for a 64 year old. In addition, the bill reduced the tax credits available for older Americans to help purchase insurance. We estimate that the bill's changes to current law's tax credits alone could increase premium costs by more than \$5,800 for a 64-year old earning \$15,000. Overall, both the bill's tax credit changes and 5:1 age rating would result in skyrocketing cost increases for older Americans. In their analysis, CBO found that a 64 year old earning \$26,500 a year would see their premiums increase by \$12,900—758 percent—from \$1,700 to \$14,600 a year.

Current law prohibits insurance companies from discriminating against individuals due to a pre-existing condition. The bill would repeal pre-existing condition protections and would once again allow insurance companies to charge Americans more—we estimate up to \$25,000 more—due to a pre-existing condition. As a result, the 40 percent of 50- to 64-year-olds (about 25 million people) who have a deniable pre-existing condition risk losing access to affordable coverage. The Upton Amendment, which would add funds to address the impact of premium increases for those with pre-existing conditions, would do little to mitigate the massive premium increase for some of the most vulnerable Americans. AARP strongly opposes any weakening of the law's pre-existing condition protections which benefit millions of Americans.

MEDICAID AND LONG-TERM SERVICES AND SUPPORTS

AARP opposes the provisions of the American Health Care Act that create a per capita cap financing structure in the Medicaid program. We are concerned that these provisions could endanger the health, safety, and care of millions of individuals who depend on the essential services provided through Medicaid. CBO found that the bill would cut Medicaid funding by \$880 billion over 2017-2026, about 25 percent less than what it projects under current law. Medicaid is a vital safety net and intergenerational lifeline for millions of individuals, including over 17.4 million low-income seniors and children and adults with disabilities who rely on the program for critical health care and long-term services and supports (LTSS, i.e., assistance with daily activities such as eating, bathing, dressing, managing medications, and transportation). Older adults and people with disabilities now account for over sixty percent of Medicaid spending, and cuts of this magnitude will result in loss of benefits and services for this vulnerable population.

Of these 17.4 million individuals: 6.9 million are ages 65 and older (which equals more than 1 in every 7 elderly Medicare beneficiaries); 10.5 million are children and adults living with disabilities; and about 10.8 million are so poor or have a disability that they qualify for both Medicare and Medicaid (dual eligibles). Dual eligibles account for almost 33 percent of Medicaid spending. While they comprise a relatively small percentage of enrollees, they account for a disproportionate share of total Medicare and Medicaid spending.

Individuals with disabilities of all ages and older adults rely on critical Medicaid services, including home and community-based

services (HCBS) for assistance with daily activities such as eating, bathing, dressing, and home modifications; nursing home care; and other benefits such as hearing aids and eyeglasses.

In providing a fixed amount of federal funding per person, this approach to financing would likely result in overwhelming cost shifts to states, state taxpayers, and families unable to shoulder the costs of care without sufficient federal support. This would result in cuts to program eligibility, services, or both—ultimately harming some of our nation's most vulnerable citizens.

The bill also repeals the six percent enhanced federal Medicaid match for states that take up the Community First Choice (CFC) Option. CFC provides states with a financial incentive to offer HCBS to help older adults and people with disabilities live in their homes and communities where they want to be. About 90 percent of older adults want to remain in their own homes and communities for as long as possible. HCBS are also cost effective. On average, in Medicaid, the cost of HCBS per person is one-third the cost of institutional care. Taking away the enhanced match could disrupt services for older adults and people with disabilities in the states that are already providing services under CFC and would result in a loss of about \$12 billion for HCBS over ten years.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

The AHCA would repeal the fee on manufacturers and importers of branded prescription drugs, which currently is projected to add \$24.8 billion to the Medicare Part B trust fund between 2017 and 2026. Rather than repeal this fee for Medicare, AARP believes Congress must do more to reduce the burden of high prescription drug costs on consumers and taxpayers, and we urge action on bipartisan solutions.

AARP remains willing to work with you to ensure that we maintain a strong health care system that ensures robust insurance market protections, controls costs, improves quality, and provides affordable coverage to all Americans. However, the AHCA does not accomplish these goals, and we continue to urge you to vote NO.

Sincerely,

NANCY A. LEAMOND,
*Executive Vice President and Chief
Advocacy and Engagement Officer.*

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if this bill were so great, these organizations would be supporting the Republican bill, not opposing it; and they are strongly opposing it.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the harsh indifference of these Republicans to the well-being of so many Americans is startling. Trump may temporarily bury the lies central to this plan with a tweet storm—with fake news. But these Republicans who follow him will not be able to find an excuse as one family after another suffers.

Today's surprise attack on American health care has been widely condemned by healthcare professionals across the country and those who represent the disabled and sick, like the American Cancer Society and the March of Dimes.

Jimmy Kimmel, know that your baby was fortunate, but others born with a disability will face the barrier of preexisting conditions.

They didn't listen to the AARP, which knows that those Americans too young for Medicare by a few years will get socked with unaffordable premiums. They don't know what this monstrosity of a bill costs to the taxpayer. They don't know how many families will lose coverage or how many jobs will be lost. They don't really know what is in this bill. They know only that the Pied Piper of Trump Tower is playing a tune today and they must dance.

There is much talk about high-risk pools. The real high-risk pool is the one that everyone who votes for this outrageous proposal is about to plunge into.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I was fortunate enough to bring the ACA to the floor after years of working on it and experts writing it. It had such incredible things in it. I think it would behoove us this morning to talk about what every one of us who has health insurance is going to lose because the benefits of the ACA accrued to all of us.

Now, you need to know first that we are going to lose the fact that 85 cents of every premium dollar will go for health care. It will go back to insurance profits. We are also going to lose the fact that families could no longer go bankrupt because of health care.

The largest cause of bankruptcy are families with medical bills, and the ACA took care of that. Nobody ever talks about that much, but if a single person spent \$4,500 a year on health care, a family \$12,500, the insurance companies picked up the rest of it.

How about that? That is a pretty good loss that we are going to face. So why in the world are we rushing into this thing?

Well, the President of the United States, Donald Trump, verified as recently as last Saturday evening in Pennsylvania that we have to do this first because \$800 billion has to come out of health care so that they could do the tax bill with great corporate tax relief for the 1 percent. So as you lose your health care, your ability to go to the doctor, and your preexisting conditions because risk pools don't work, be comforted by the fact that we are in the hands of people who put the needs of corporations and wealthy people ahead of the citizens of the United States.

Just in case you think people aren't paying any attention, for the first time in my life, my office has 185 applications for six seats as interns in the summertime. It is unheard of. Calls in my office have gone from about 10 a

day to 80, all of them talking about this. I have never seen political suicide in my life like I am seeing today. I think our leader put it so succinctly: you are tattooing that on your foreheads.

Now, those people out there who have really gotten sort of used to this, all we have heard all the way through is that this is going to fall apart. The problems going on with the ACA right now are that the insurance companies have uncertainty because of what has been going on here.

I need to bring up one of the greatest hoaxes in America in any institution that passes laws. For over 60 times, you brought to the floor of this House and we debated bills to do away with the health care. "Repeal and replace," you shouted. Millions and millions of dollars' worth of time on this floor were spent on what was absolutely a hoax because you had no repeal-and-replace plan. It was simply all talk, and now you have got to rush through this so you can do your big tax bill.

I am sorry to see this happen. It is a sad day for the United States.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I feel bad for the gentleman because it appears as if he only has one speaker supporting this rule and the bill, and nearly our entire caucus wants to speak on this against the Republican healthcare repeal bill. So I was wondering whether the gentleman might consider sharing some time with us?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding. As a wonderful manager of time, he will be able to parse the time as best he may see fit. I have other speakers who probably will be coming by, so I will just encourage the manager to manage his time well.

Mr. MCGOVERN. It looks kind of lonely over there. It speaks volumes about how much support there is for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, now I have to say to my friends on the other side: You sold out cheap—as we say in New Jersey—all to give a tax cut to insurance companies and the most well off. The Upton amendment is, of course, an admission.

After 7 years, you came up with this? You have got to be kidding me. This is worse than a Fellini movie. At least he didn't take 7 years to distinguish between fantasy and reality.

For a New Jerseyan with asthma, this will mean a \$4,340 premium surcharge; for autism, \$5,510. The list goes on and on—60, \$70,000 if you have cancer.

But less discussed is their attempt to rid the essential health benefits which

removes yet another ACA protection for everyone. So now the Republicans have hit for the cycle.

You hit for the cycle. You jeopardized the health care of nearly every single American—those on Medicare, those on Medicaid, those in the ACA exchanges, and now 150 million people with employer coverage. You sold out. It is a shame. I like most of you, but you are on the wrong path.

It took you 7 years for this?

I will never yield. I will never yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair, not to each other.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American College of Physicians in opposition to the bill.

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS,

April 24, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, AND MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER: On behalf of the American College of Physicians (ACP), I am writing to urge Congress to move away from the harmful changes to patient care that would occur if the American Health Care Act (AHCA) were to become law, and to instead work for bipartisan solutions to improve the Affordable Care Act (ACA) rather than repealing and replacing it. We believe that the AHCA, which would repeal and replace the most important coverage and consumer protections created by the ACA, is so fundamentally flawed that it cannot be made acceptable. We understand that the leadership in the House of Representatives continues to explore ways to bring a modified version of the AHCA to a vote, based on a draft amendment reportedly being developed by Representatives MacArthur and Meadows, a summary of which was made available to the public through news organizations. This amendment would make the harmful AHCA even worse by creating new coverage barriers for patients with pre-existing conditions and weakening requirements that insurers cover essential benefits.

The American College of Physicians is the largest medical specialty organization and the second-largest physician group in the United States. ACP members include 148,000 internal medicine physicians (internists), related subspecialists, and medical students. Internal medicine physicians are specialists who apply scientific knowledge and clinical expertise to the diagnosis, treatment, and compassionate care of adults across the spectrum from health to complex illness.

The draft MacArthur-Meadows amendment would create what is known as the "Limited Waiver Option" that would allow states to eliminate or severely weaken vital ACA Title I consumer protections—specifically, community rating and essential health benefits (EHBs)—returning the country to the

pre-ACA days when persons with pre-existing "declinable" medical conditions in most states were priced out of the market and the insurance products available in the individual market did not cover medically necessary services.

Specifically:

The MacArthur-Meadows amendment would create an option for states to obtain Limited Waivers from certain federal standards that would gut existing law consumer protections. Based on a summary of the draft amendment, states could seek Limited Waivers for:

Essential Health Benefits (EHBs)

Community-rating rules, except for the following categories, which are not waivable: Gender or Age (except for reductions of the 5:1 age ratio previously established) or Health Status (unless the state has established a high-risk pool or is participating in a federal high-risk pool)

To obtain the waiver, states would only need to "attest that the purpose of their requested waiver is to reduce premium costs, increase the number of persons with healthcare coverage, or advance another benefit to the public interest in the state, including the guarantee of coverage for persons with preexisting medical conditions. The Secretary shall approve applications within 90 days of determining that an application is complete." [Emphasis added in italics].

In other words, as long as a state attested that there was a "benefit to the public," insurers would be once again allowed to charge more to people with pre-existing conditions, or decline to cover needed benefits like physician and hospital visits, maternity care and contraception, mental health and substance use disorder treatments, preventive services, and prescription drugs.

This would take us back to the days when people had to fill out intrusive insurance company applications to document their previous health history, even before being advised what the premium would be based on their individual health risk. Unlike community rating, which bases premiums based on the expected costs associated with all persons in the insurance pool (adjusted only by age, tobacco use, and family size), the Limited Waiver would again allow insurers in states that obtain a waiver to again charge people exorbitant and unaffordable premiums for their pre-existing conditions.

Before the ACA, insurance plans sold in the individual insurance market in all but five states typically maintained lists of so-called "declinable" medical conditions—including asthma, diabetes, arthritis, obesity, stroke, or pregnancy, or having been diagnosed with cancer in the past 10 years. Even if a revised bill would not explicitly repeal the current law's guaranteed-issue requirement—which requires insurers to offer coverage to persons with pre-existing conditions like these—guaranteed issue without community rating allows insurers to charge as much as they believe a patient's treatment will cost. The result would be that many patients with pre-existing conditions would be offered coverage that costs them thousands of dollars more for the care that they need, and in the case of patients with expensive conditions like cancer, even hundreds of thousands more.

An amendment to the AHCA reported out of the Rules Committee on April 6th to establish a "Federal Invisible Risk Sharing Program," which would create a fund that states could use to reimburse insurers for some of the costs associated with insuring

sicker patients, would not offset the harm done to patients with pre-existing conditions by allowing the Limited Waiver of community rating and essential benefit protections. The pre-ACA experience with high-risk pools was that many had long waiting lists, and offered inadequate coverage with high deductibles and insufficient benefits. Unless a national high-risk pool is supported with a massive infusion of funding it will not be sufficient to cover the millions of people with pre-existing conditions that would be denied or charged more for coverage under the AHCA. One paper estimates that a national high-risk pool would cost \$178.1 billion a year, roughly \$176.4 billion more than the annual funding provided to the Invisible Risk Sharing Program. Also, shifting people out of the existing health insurance marketplace to a high-risk pool would undermine the assurance that enrollees could keep their existing coverage.

The Limited Waiver Option will also allow states to seek waivers from the essential health benefits required of all plans sold in the individual insurance market, with the result that millions of patients will be at risk of losing coverage for essential services like maternity care, cancer screening tests and treatments, prescription drugs, preventive services, mental health and substance use disorder treatments, and even physician visits, prescription drugs and hospitalizations.

Prior to passage of the ACA, 62% of individual market enrollees did not have coverage of maternity services, 34 did not have substance-use disorder-services, 18% did not have mental-health services and 9% did not have coverage for prescription drugs. A recent independent analysis found that the AHCA's repeal of current law required benefits would result in patients on average paying \$1,952 more for cancer drugs; \$1,807 for drugs for heart disease; \$1,127 for drugs to treat lung diseases; \$1,607 for drugs to treat mental illnesses; \$4,940 for inpatient admission for mental health; \$4,555 for inpatient admission for substance use treatment; and \$8,501 for maternity care. Such increased costs would make it practically impossible for many patients to avail themselves of the care they need. The result will be delays in getting treatment until their illnesses present at a more advanced, less treatable, and more expensive stage, or not keeping up with life-saving medications prescribed by their physicians.

Allowing states to eliminate the EHB will threaten our nation's fight against the opioid epidemic. A study concluded that with repeal of the ACA, "approximately 1,253,000 people with serious mental disorders and about 2.8 million Americans with a substance use disorder, of whom about 222,000 have an opioid disorder, would lose some or all of their insurance coverage." Finally, allowing states to drop important benefits like maternity, substance use disorder treatment, and preventive services will do little to reduce premiums. A report by Millman found that the main drivers of premium costs were ambulatory patient services, hospitalization, and prescription drugs. These are crucial services that form the core of any health insurance plan.

To be clear: while some younger and healthier persons might be offered lower premiums in states that obtained a "Limited Waiver" of community-rating and essential health benefits, it would be at the expense of making coverage unaffordable for those who need it most, older and sicker persons, and result in skimpy "bare-bones" insurance for

many others that does not cover the medical care they would need if and when they get sick.

Finally, even without the Limited Waiver Amendment, ACP continues to believe that the AHCA has numerous other provisions and policies that that will do great harm to patients including:

The phase-out of the higher federal match in states that have opted to expand Medicaid and the ban on non-expansion states being able to access the higher federal contribution if they choose to expand Medicaid;

Converting the shared federal-state financing structure for Medicaid to one that would cap the federal contribution per enrollee;

Providing states with a Medicaid block grant financing option;

Eliminating EHBs for Medicaid expansion enrollees;

Imposing work or job search requirements on certain Medicaid enrollees;

Regressive age-based tax credits, combined with changes that will allow insurers to charge older people much higher premiums than allowed under current law;

Continuous coverage requirements for patients with pre-existing conditions;

Legislative or regulatory restrictions that would deny or result in discrimination in the awarding of federal grant funds and/or Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Program funding to women's health clinics that are qualified under existing federal law for the provision of evidence-based services including, but not limited to, provision of contraception, preventive health screenings, sexually transmitted infection testing and treatment, vaccines, counseling, rehabilitation, and referrals, and;

Elimination of the Prevention and Public Health Fund, which provides billions in dollars to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to prevent and control the spread of infectious diseases.

The College strongly believes in the first, do no harm principle. Therefore, we continue to urge that Congress move away from the fundamentally flawed and harmful policies that would result from the American Health Care Act and from the changes under consideration—including the proposed "Limited Waiver" amendment—that would make the bill even worse for patients. We urge Congress to instead start over and seek agreement on bipartisan ways to improve and build on the ACA. The College welcomes the opportunity to share our ideas for bipartisan solutions that would help make health care better, more accessible, and more affordable for patients rather than imposing great harm on them as the AHCA would do.

Sincerely,

JACK ENDE, MD, MACP,
President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Cancer Action Network against this bill.

CANCER ACTION NETWORK,
AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY,
May 3, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: The American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network (ACS CAN) is deeply concerned about the reports of additional amendments to the American Health Care

Act (AHCA), including one that would allegedly add \$8 billion in new spending for state high-risk pools. This amendment is particularly egregious because it would further incentivize states to apply for waivers from current-law market rules that protect patients with pre-existing conditions.

Historically, state high-risk pools have fallen short of providing coverage of prevention, treatment and follow-up care for cancer patients and survivors. Segmenting people with cancer and other serious illnesses away from the private marketplace and into high-risk pools absent an adequate and permanent source of public funding has never been an adequate solution.

Between 1976 and 2010, 35 states created high-risk pools to cover individuals who could not otherwise purchase insurance in the private market, usually because of a pre-existing condition. Every one of those risk pools experienced net operating losses year after year. Furthermore, high-risk pools did not result in lower premiums. All of them set premiums above the non-group market average or standard rate in the state, usually by 150–200 percent. Only a few states provided additional premium assistance for low-income individuals, leaving many who could not afford premiums priced out of the program. Most states also imposed waiting periods before covering preexisting conditions. An individual with a prior cancer diagnosis often had to wait 6–12 months before the high-risk pool would cover the costs associated with cancer treatment or follow-up survivorship care. Most states imposed limitations on coverage with either lifetime or annual limits. And most plans offered deductibles of \$1,000 or higher. Neither AHCA, nor the new amendment would fully protect patients from any of those conditions.

Cancer patients and survivors need insurance coverage that is affordable, readily accessible, and protects them from pre-existing condition exclusions, annual and lifetime caps on coverage and extraordinary out-of-pocket costs. Past experience has shown that high-risk pools failed to meet these basic needs, yet still were a drain on state budgets.

As we have indicated in our earlier letters, there are reasonable fixes that could be made to the current law. We stand ready to work with you to develop policies that improve the law and encourage a robust health insurance market that provides affordable and comprehensive coverage options.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER W. HANSEN,
President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Society of Clinical Oncology against this bill.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF
CLINICAL ONCOLOGY,
April 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN, On behalf of the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO), I write to express our strong opposition to the American Health Care Act (AHCA), as currently amended. As the leading professional society representing more than 42,000 physicians worldwide who care for people with cancer, ASCO has a unique perspective on the law's potential impact on cancer patients. Our core mission is to ensure every patient with cancer has meaning-

ful access to high quality care. We believe Congress shares this goal and our comments today are in the spirit of advancing that common purpose.

In January 2017, as Congress embarked upon the repeal and replacement of the Affordable Care Act, ASCO shared a set of guiding principles that support improvements to the current health care system. We also put forth specific areas where people with cancer need protections. Our principles rest on the belief that any health system reform must ensure all people affected by cancer receive high-quality care. ASCO's first principle states, "all Americans should have access to affordable and sufficient healthcare coverage regardless of their income or health status. To ensure protected access, the current ban on preexisting condition limitations, elimination of annual and lifetime coverage caps, and maintenance of guaranteed renewability should be preserved." We take the position that "any efforts to reform the healthcare system at the national, state, or local levels should ensure that individuals with healthcare insurance can continue to access affordable insurance without interruption." The amended AHCA violates these principles.

Studies show that when cancer patients do not have adequate insurance they receive less care, receive it later, and have worse outcomes than those with better insurance coverage. Uninsured and under-insured families facing a cancer diagnosis experience significant stress. They often are unable to meet out-of-pocket expenses and even forgo cancer care in order to pay for necessities of daily living. The AHCA as currently constructed will create or worsen these barriers to care. It will add costs to the system, decrease access to appropriate treatment and increase existing disparities in care.

We are especially concerned with provisions allowing state waivers that could erode important protections for patients with cancer, including pre-existing condition safeguards, coverage of essential services, and access to affordable health insurance. Removing these protections from current federal law allows for a weakening of these critical provisions in some states and establishes a system of inequitable protections across state lines for cancer patients. We urge policymakers to ensure that robust requirements are in place to ensure that all insurance products cover the full scope of services and therapies that cancer patients require.

ASCO strongly opposes passage of the AHCA in its current form. We welcome the opportunity to address these issues—and to work toward a better proposal—with you and your staff.

Sincerely,

DANIEL F. HAYES, MD,
FASCO, FACP,
President, American
Society of Clinical
Oncology.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine against this bill.

AMERICAN CONGRESS OF
REHABILITATION MEDICINE,

May 2, 2017.

Re Deep Concerns with the American Health
Care Act and Related Amendments.Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
*Washington, DC.*Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: The American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine (ACRM) writes in reference to the American Health Care Act (AHCA), H.R. 1628, and the MacArthur Amendment to the bill. ACRM is an organization of rehabilitation professionals dedicated to serving people with disabling conditions by supporting research and services that promote health, independence, productivity, and quality of life; and meet the needs of rehabilitation clinicians and individuals with disabilities.

ACRM is seriously concerned that current House proposals will undercut the federal coverage standard for rehabilitation and habilitation services and devices established under the Affordable Care Act (ACA). Access to rehabilitation enables individuals experiencing injuries, illnesses, and disabilities to maximize their quality of life by enhancing their health, function, and independence. We believe that any ACA repeal and replace bill that advances in the House and Senate must maintain access to rehabilitation and habilitation services and devices.

In particular, the AHCA (H.R. 1628, as amended) includes a provision that would allow states to apply for waivers exempting them from compliance with important patient protections that are required by the Affordable Care Act (ACA), including premium rating ratios based on age, protections for consumers disallowing medical status underwriting (i.e., community rating), and requirements for insurers to cover a defined package of essential health benefits (EHBs), which include rehabilitative and habilitative services and devices. We are deeply concerned these EHB changes will curtail access for both children and adults in Medicaid expansion states, as well as private ACA health plans. ACRM believes that these provisions will significantly undermine the health insurance coverage that patients need.

ACRM urges Congress to work in a bipartisan manner to improve access to affordable, comprehensive care for all Americans, including those with disabilities and chronic conditions needing rehabilitation and habilitation services and devices.

DOUGLAS KATZ, MD, FACRM, FAAN,

ACRM President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities in strong opposition to this bill.

CONSORTIUM FOR CITIZENS
WITH DISABILITIES,

April 28, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD) is strongly opposed to the amended American Health Care Act. The amended American Health Care Act retains the original bill's proposals to dramatically cut Medicaid services that are vital to people with disabilities and seniors through per capita caps, which CCD has opposed. The new amendments—including permitting states to seek waivers from the protections for people with pre-existing conditions and from the requirement to provide essential health benefits—makes

the amended AHCA even more harmful to people with disabilities. We urge you to oppose this legislation.

Medicaid provides services and supports that maintain the health, function, independence, and well-being of 10 million enrollees living with disabilities. For many people with disabilities, being able to access timely needed care is a life or death matter. The American Health Care Act changes the way that the Federal Government funds Medicaid—rather than paying states based on the actual costs of healthcare for people in Medicaid, it sets a cap on the amount of federal support, a cap that is totally unrelated to the actual costs of needed care for enrollees. This cap is designed to cut Medicaid, and the bill uses those cuts to pay for unrelated tax cuts. Slashing federal support for Medicaid, which is already a lean program, will force states to cut services and eligibility that put the health and wellbeing of people with disabilities at significant risk.

The newest amendments to the American Health Care Act make the bill even more harmful to people with disabilities. The new amendments would allow states to easily obtain waivers that would allow them to charge higher premiums to people with pre-existing conditions, including people with disabilities. They also would allow states to seek waivers from the Affordable Care Act's requirement to provide essential health benefits, including crucial services for people with disabilities such as mental health and substance use disorder services, prescription drugs, rehabilitative and habilitative services and devices, preventative and wellness services and chronic disease management, and pediatric services. These waivers jeopardize the Affordable Care Act's protections for people with pre-existing conditions, including people with disabilities, and CCD opposes any roll-back of those protections.

The ACA helped millions of people with disabilities and others to gain access to affordable and comprehensive health insurance. The amended American Health Care Act is insufficient to help people with disabilities meet their healthcare needs, and we urge you to oppose the bill should it come to a vote.

Sincerely,

Health Task Force Co-chairs: Bethany Lilly, Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law; Dave Machledt, National Health Law Program; Peter Thomas, Brain Injury Association of America; and Julie Ward, The Arc of the United States.

Long Term Services and Supports Co-chairs: Alison Barkoff, Center for Public Representation; Nicole Jorwic, The Arc of the United States; Sarah Meek, Lutheran Services in America Disability Network; and Laura Weidner, National Multiple Sclerosis Society.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON.)

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, there is only one reason this bill is on the floor today: the President cares more about cutting a deal than keeping his promises.

He promised we would lower costs. That turned out to be a lie. He promised we would expand coverage. That turned out to be a lie. He promised we would protect millions of Americans with preexisting conditions. That, too, was a lie.

Back in Massachusetts at the Agawam Diner, I met a veteran named Cliff,

who told me when I was on my way to Washington for the first time to go to Washington as an American—not as a Democrat or a Republican, but as an American.

To my Republican colleagues, heed Cliff's advice today. Don't vote as a Republican. Vote as an American. Don't throw away your credibility to give a legislative victory to a President who will never stick his neck out for anyone other than himself. For what? To betray the people who trusted them?

I urge my Republican colleagues to put country before party. Vote "no" on this ridiculous bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting today since we would not be here today if there was not the problems that you, Mr. Speaker, and I have seen.

One-third of this country has one insurer, premiums with double-digit increases, people who can afford—maybe even with subsidies the amount of their plan can't afford the deductibles and co-pays. They go to doctors who won't take their insurance.

We are not here by mistake, Mr. Speaker. We are here because ObamaCare is an abject failure.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Children's Leadership Council opposed to this bill.

CHILDREN'S LEADERSHIP COUNCIL,

May 1, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Children's Leadership Council opposes the American Health Care Act (AHCA) because it would jeopardize health care for millions of babies, children, youth and families. We urge you to vote NO on this legislation.

The Children's Leadership Council (CLC) is a coalition of organizations dedicated to improving the lives and opportunities of America's children. Nationwide, CLC members work to advance the health, education and well-being of babies, children and youth in order to prepare them for school, work, and life. The CLC is the only national children's coalition solely dedicated to supporting investments in our nation's children and youth; and collectively, CLC's members have affiliates, partners, and members in every state in the nation.

The Affordable Care Act and Medicaid play a crucial role in the lives of children, including those facing the greatest challenges such as children in poverty; children suffering abuse and neglect; children in foster care, and children with disabilities. Medicaid, for example, provides coverage for approximately 37 million children, including children with disabilities, children in foster care and children from low-income families. Children are the largest group of Medicaid recipients, and nearly 40 percent of all the nation's children rely on Medicaid and CHIP for their healthcare. Medicaid provides health care treatment and preventive services, mental health care, case management and transportation services to and from medical appointments for children who are low-income or

disabled. The AHCA's changes to Medicaid would radically restructure a program that has worked for more than 50 years to support children's health. The Medicaid cap would shift \$839 billion to states, forcing them to cut eligibility, benefits, or provider rates that could have disastrous health consequences.

There is no question that the massive cuts to Medicaid, increased premiums likely for millions of families, and eliminating the Essential Health Benefits requirements under current law will seriously harm children and families. Maternity benefits would be among the many medical services no longer guaranteed if this bill were to become law. The massive Medicaid reductions in substance abuse treatment will add to the increases nationwide in the need for child welfare services because of the surge in opioid addiction. Families caring for children with disabilities will find supports for care at home jeopardized.

With a record 95% of children with health coverage in our country, the AHCA would turn back the clock on progress for children. And recent proposed changes to the bill would further undermine consumer protections that make health care out of reach for low-income children and their families—thus making the already harmful bill worse for children. Polling conducted by the Children's Leadership Council found 71 percent of parents, including 67 percent of Independent parents (of children under the age of 18), want increased investments in programs that help children in the areas of education, health and nutrition, not less as proposed by the AHCA.

Congress has a strong history of working on a bipartisan, bicameral basis on issues, policies and programs important to children. It is our hope and expectation that members of Congress continue this history, as Congress works on improving our nation's healthcare system. This legislation would be a dangerous step backward. We strongly urge you to vote NO.

Sincerely,

RANDI SCHMIDT,
*Executive Director, Children's
Leadership Council.*

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Paralyzed Veterans of America against this bill.

PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: Paralyzed Veterans of America (PVA) urges rejection of the latest version of the American Health Care Act (AHCA). PVA is the nation's only Congressionally-chartered veterans' service organization solely dedicated to representing veterans with spinal cord injury and/or disease. Consequently, we are very concerned about the conflicting information circulating about this legislation and the adverse impact it could have on our members and millions of other people with disabilities.

As we understand it, the AHCA cuts \$880 billion out of the Medicaid program in order to finance tax cuts that will explode the deficit and largely assist upper income individuals, corporations, and providers. The Medicaid changes are particularly devastating to

people with disabilities. Under the cap and cut proposal, the federal government would no longer share in the costs of providing health care services and community services beyond the capped amount. This would eliminate the enhanced federal match for the Community First Choice Option under Medicaid that provides attendant care services in the community. Thanks to this program, many poor veterans with serious non-service-connected disabilities have been able to move from nursing homes into their communities. The AHCA also weakens Medicaid by ending the Medicaid expansion earlier and offering Medicaid block grants to states. Data from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation shows expansion has helped thousands of veterans and their caregivers.

For veterans and PVA members in particular, the AHCA continues several problematic policies of the ACA as well as troubling new provisions that could affect the ability of many veterans and their family members to afford health insurance in the private market. The underlying AHCA bill:

Continues to exclude CHAMPVA beneficiaries—dependents of the most catastrophically disabled veterans—from the dependents' coverage policy up to age 26.

Fails to remove the prohibition on enrollment into the VA health care system for Priority Group 8 veterans, thus denying these veterans access to the principal health care system for veterans.

Denies access to tax credits making health insurance affordable to anyone eligible for a host of other federal health programs, including those "eligible" for coverage under Title 38 health care programs. This would prevent many veterans who may be "eligible for" but not enrolled in the VA health care system from accessing these tax credits intended to help people buy insurance.

Not only do the changes made to the original version of the AHCA continue its failure to protect veterans and people with disabilities, they make these circumstances worse. The latest changes would allow states to seek waivers that would allow insurers to charge higher premiums to people with pre-existing conditions, including people with disabilities. The new amendments also would allow states to seek waivers from the ACA's requirement that certain essential health benefits must be provided, including crucial services for people with disabilities such as prescription drugs, rehabilitative and habilitative services and devices, preventative and wellness services and chronic disease management. The combination of these changes would make it nearly impossible for people with pre-existing conditions to find affordable plans that cover basic health care services.

Throughout these past few months, the American people have been calling for a bipartisan effort to improve the nation's health care system. Congress should heed these voices, stop its pursuit of the flawed American Health Care Act and work together through regular order to strengthen all Americans' access to affordable, high quality health care.

Sincerely,

CARL BLAKE,
Associate Executive Director.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the March of Dimes opposed to this bill.

[From the march of dimes]

UNDER AHCA, OVER 6 MILLION WOMEN OF
CHILDBEARING AGE WILL LOSE HEALTH COV-
ERAGE

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Prior to 2010, low-income adult women could generally only

obtain Medicaid coverage after they were pregnant. By the time they enrolled in this coverage, many of the best opportunities for guaranteeing a healthy pregnancy and healthy baby had already been missed.

Today, states that have expanded Medicaid can extend Medicaid coverage to low-income women of childbearing age, giving them the chance to get healthy before they get pregnant. The March of Dimes estimates that approximately 6.5 million low income women of childbearing age are currently covered under Medicaid expansion, giving them access to treatment for tobacco use, obesity, substance abuse, and other conditions that can have a major impact on future pregnancies. Between 2012 and 2015, the rate of uninsurance among women of childbearing age dropped by 40%, with much of that decline attributable to Medicaid expansion.

The American Health Care Act (AHCA) would do away with these advances by rolling back Medicaid expansion. Its fundamental restructuring of the traditional Medicaid program would also likely lead to significant coverage losses or restriction of services to beneficiaries, including pregnant women. These changes do a serious disservice to low-income women and families by denying them access to the care they need to lead healthy lives and, ultimately, have healthy pregnancies and give birth to healthy infants.

The MacArthur amendment and other proposed changes to the AHCA do not address these issues. Women, infants, families, and communities will bear the longterm cost if health care for women of childbearing age and pregnant women is shortchanged and more babies are born sick as a result. The March of Dimes urges all Representatives to oppose the American Health Care Act.

Sincerely,

STACEY D. STEWART,
President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from AFSCME in strong opposition to this bill.

AFSCME,
May 3, 2017.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.6 million working and retiree members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I am writing to express our continuing opposition to the American Health Care Act (AHCA), notwithstanding the addition of the Upton amendment.

The harm that AHCA will impose on ordinary Americans is breathtaking in scope. As the Congressional Budget Office has detailed, 24 million will lose their health care coverage. The Medicaid program will be cut by \$839 billion and restructured, ending the guarantee that the federal government will fund a specified share of state Medicaid costs. The bill makes coverage more expensive, especially for lower-income families and older workers and it undermines the financial strength of Medicare. And the MacArthur amendment makes a very bad bill worse by allowing states to opt out of Affordable Care Act protections that ensure that people with pre-existing conditions will be able to obtain comprehensive, affordable health care. Moreover, the MacArthur amendment would allow insurance companies to re-impose caps on annual and lifetime limits, even in employer-sponsored coverage, putting the health care of those with catastrophic illnesses or injuries at risk.

Under the Upton amendment, grants to states that could be used for high-risk pools will be increased by 6% or \$8 billion over five years. This is a paltry increase. Even the conservative Mercatus Center described the increase as a "pittance." High-risk pools would still be grossly underfunded, even if states put all of the \$138 billion in grant funding into them. We urge the Congress not to ignore the previous experience with state high-risk pools. By segregating those with pre-existing conditions into separate coverage we know they will face higher premiums, benefit exclusions, annual and lifetime limits on coverage and waiting lists.

It is unacceptable that this bill eliminates \$500 billion in taxes on the wealthiest 2%, health insurers, pharmaceutical manufacturers and medical device makers, while taking health care away from millions. Moreover, the bill retains the 40% tax on high cost health plans, which will undermine employer-sponsored insurance for working families by hollowing out coverage and increasing out-of-pocket expenses, although it delays the implementation for six years.

The bottom line is that this bill would cause millions to lose their health coverage. Most of those with pre-existing conditions would return to the days when even inadequate coverage was unaffordable. The bill would drive up costs for those who are older and lower-income, shift costs to states, fail to protect employer-sponsored coverage, weaken public health and undermine the solvency of the Medicare trust fund—all the while providing tax cuts for the wealthy and well-connected.

The priorities demonstrated by this bill are upside down. We urge you to oppose this bill.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,

Director of Federal Government Affairs.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Farmers Union in strong opposition to this bill.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,

May 3, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: I write on behalf of nearly 200,000 members of the National Farmers Union (NFU) who are engaged in all forms of farming and ranching. NFU has already spoken in opposition of the American Health Care Act (AHCA) because of the estimated 24 million Americans who would lose coverage as a result. The most recent amendment to the AHCA only moves further away from NFU's member-driven policy of affirming "the right of all Americans to have access to affordable, quality health care."

Farming is a dangerous occupation, ranking 6th in occupational fatality rates. The injury rate for agricultural workers is also 40% higher than the rate of all workers. Finally, the average age of farmers in the United States is over 58 years. U.S. health care policy must take into account the unique needs of the men and women who provide food and fiber for our country and much of the world.

Our current health care system is not without its problems, but progress has been made since the passage of the Affordable Care Act (ACA). The current structure of tax credits and premium subsidies help farmers maintain consistent coverage, especially during downturns in the farm economy. The expansion of Medicaid has proven beneficial to rural communities, where the rate of enrollment is higher than in urban America.

The Health Insurance Marketplace, while certainly in need of stabilizing measures, makes coverage more accessible for many farm families.

The correlation between a strong Medicaid program and the success of rural hospitals has become evident during the influx of rural hospital closures over the last six years. Seventy-eight rural hospitals have closed since 2010 with over 80% of those located in states that opted out of the Medicaid expansion. With another 673 hospitals at risk of closure, the AHCA's proposed Medicaid cap could have devastating consequences for rural communities.

In 2012, 75 percent of farms sold less than \$50,000 in agricultural products and 57% had sales less than \$10,000. Young farm families that don't receive additional income or health benefits from off-farm jobs would find it extremely difficult to purchase health insurance. The proposed legislation would also hurt older farmers. Easing restrictions on what insurance companies can charge older customers will leave older farmers facing increased premiums of thousands of dollars, despite the larger subsidies some would receive.

The modified AHCA bill also has a significant negative impact on those with pre-existing conditions. It's estimated that 40 percent of 50- to 64-year-olds would be denied coverage in the individual market without the Affordable Care Act's protections for those with preexisting conditions. The waiver option would mean that a large number of farmers in many states would be forced into high-risk pools. This legislation is woefully short in funding for those high-risk pools, leaving individuals with preexisting conditions to contend with increased premiums, higher deductibles and longer waiting periods for coverage.

Affordable access to quality health coverage is a high priority for all Americans. As you consider how to best improve our health care system, we ask that you give serious consideration to the needs of farmers and ranchers. While there is certainly room for improvement in current policy, the American Health Care Act will only hurt family farmers and rural communities across the country. NFU requests that you oppose the proposed legislation.

We appreciate your efforts to provide all Americans with high-quality comprehensive health insurance. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ROGER JOHNSON,

President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, this procedure that we are witnessing here this morning, based on what happened at the White House for the last 48 hours, has all the charm of a ransom note.

The idea that this is put in front of us so that they can provide a tax cut at the expense of middle class Americans is really what we are voting on today. So that child who is born with diabetes across America can no longer be guaranteed health insurance if we turn this option over to the States. Anybody who comes from local or State government knows this: that money will be

used to balance the budgets in economic downturns at the expense of those who need it for health care.

Another essential point here as I think we go forward, the other side—by the way, there are only two on the other side. What is amazing about this is—when you consider that argument that they had with us yesterday about national defense, understand this: real national defense also includes providing health care for members of the American family. That is a very important consideration. They are about to subtract from guaranteed benefits to the American family for the purpose of offering a tax cut to people at the very top, again, at the expense of middle class Americans.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. The majority thinks they have finally found the right combination of political giveaways to pass their bill, a bill that we have to remember still kicks 24 million Americans off their healthcare coverage. It still charges seniors more. It still takes away some of the most basic protections of your health plan that it should cover. Despite what you hear, this latest Band-Aid amendment is not going to change any of that.

That is just what we know so far. Since this bill was built by backroom deals and haphazard guesses, we don't even know how much this bill will cost America—not just dollars added to the deficit, but the human cost of how much more damaging this bill will be.

It is the height of irresponsible governing, not just rushing something through without full and fair consideration. Frankly, we are getting used to that on our side of the aisle. But to force through a bill that you know is going to hurt 24 million Americans is more than irresponsible; it is just plain wrong.

□ 1000

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Education Association in strong opposition to this bill.

MAY 3, 2017.

Hon. JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCGOVERN: On behalf of our three million members and the 50 million students they serve, we strongly urge you to oppose H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act as amended. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) found that by 2026, the original bill would provide \$883 billion in tax cuts while taking health coverage away from 24 million people, including some of the most vulnerable among us—the poor, the sick, the elderly, and the children who constitute more than half the current Medicaid enrollment. Votes on this issue may be included in NEA's Report Card for the 15th Congress.

The April 25 amendment made the original bill even worse. It allows states to jettison existing essential health benefit requirements, thereby permitting health plans covering millions of people once again to exclude coverage for maternity and newborn care, pediatric dental and vision services, mental health and substance use services, and other crucial benefits. The May 3 amendment is the equivalent of a tiny bandage on a gaping wound. The cost of setting up separate pools or premium assistance programs for people with pre-existing conditions far exceeds the \$8 billion spread over five years the amendment provides—nationwide, at least \$25 billion per year would be required, according to the Kaiser Family Foundation.

Both the original and amended American Health Care Act threaten to return this country to the days when annual and lifetime dollar-based limits on the use of essential health benefits shifted tremendous financial and health risks to working families. Insurance companies could charge people with pre-existing conditions many times more than they charge healthy people—just as they did before the Affordable Care Act. Millions of Americans with pre-existing conditions would be at risk of losing health coverage or face premiums so high only the very wealthy could afford them—the same people who benefit from the massive tax cuts in the original bill.

Specifically, we are concerned that this legislation will: Lead to drastic cuts in Medicaid benefits and eligible beneficiaries. The American Health Care Act radically restructures how Medicaid is funded. Instead of the federal government paying a percentage of actual Medicaid spending, each state will get a set amount. States will choose between a block grant, a lump sum payment, and a “per capita cap,” a flat amount for certain Medicaid beneficiaries. Either way, state budgets will take a big hit: the share of revenue spent on Medicaid will rise from 24.5 percent in 2017 to 28 percent by 2025, according to Moody’s Investors Service. To compensate for the loss of federal support, states are likely to divert money from education to health care as well as limit the number of Medicaid beneficiaries, the scope of Medicaid benefits, or both.

Hit the students most in need the hardest. Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Medicaid reimburses schools for mental health care, vision and hearing screenings, diabetes and asthma management, wheelchairs and hearing aids, and more. Federal support is substantial—for example, in 2015 California schools received about \$90 million from Medicaid, Florida schools about \$63 million, New York schools about \$137 million, Pennsylvania schools about \$131 million, and Texas schools about \$250 million (Source: Centers for Medicare and Medicaid, compilation of 2017 data). Capping federal support for Medicaid will shift costs to the states, jeopardizing services essential for students to learn and thrive, especially those with disabilities.

Increase the cost of health care for those least able to afford it. The American Health Care Act provides largely age-based tax credits ranging from \$2,000 to \$4,000 per year—far less than today’s subsidies. For example, according to Kaiser Family Foundation calculations, a 60-year-old earning \$20,000 a year in Lincoln, Nebraska, now gets \$18,470 to help buy insurance and additional subsidies to help with deductibles and co-payments. Under the American Health Care Act, she would get a \$4,000 tax credit for the premium and nothing for other out-of-pocket health

care costs. By 2026, the average subsidy under the American Health Care Act would be half the average subsidy under the Affordable Care Act, according to CBO.

Tax “high cost” employer-sponsored health coverage. We recognize that the American Health Care Act postpones the effective date of the 40 percent excise tax on such plans until 2026. But this tax—a backdoor pay cut for millions of working families—needs to be fully repealed.

Enhance tax breaks for the rich. The American Health Care Act nearly doubles the amount of money that can be socked away in tax-free health savings accounts—at least \$6,550 for individuals and at least \$13,100 for families in 2018. It also repeals a 3.8 percent investment tax and 0.9 percent surcharge on wages above \$250,000—a savings of about \$195,000 per year for the top 0.1 percent of earners, according to the independent Tax Policy Center.

Weaken the individual insurance market and employment-based coverage. The American Health Care Act eliminates penalties for individuals not buying—and large employers not providing—health coverage. But premiums go up 30 percent if coverage lapses for more than 63 days—for example, when someone loses her job and cannot afford to buy health insurance until she gets another one. Overall, CBO predicts substantial increases in out-of-pocket costs for low- and moderate-income people due to the decline in subsidies and increase in deductibles and other cost-sharing. Some employers may gut their health plans or stop offering coverage altogether, since they will no longer be penalized for doing so.

The American Health Care Act plays Robin Hood in reverse. It reneges on the promise to deliver better, cheaper health coverage for all Americans, giving the richest among us massive tax cuts while causing the number of people without insurance to rise from 28 million today to an estimated 52 million in 2026, according to CBO.

We strongly urge you to oppose the amended American Health Care Act—deeply flawed legislation that is even worse than the original bill.

Sincerely,

MARC EGAN,

*Director of Government Relations,
National Education Association.*

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Nurse-Midwives, American College of Physicians, American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women’s Health, National Partnership for Women & Families, and Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

MAY 1, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of physicians, certified nurse-midwives/certified midwives, and nurse practitioners who provide care for the women of America, along with our patient partners, we stand together for women and families and against House passage of the MacArthur (R-NJ) Amendment to the American Health Care Act (AHCA, H.R. 1628). Rather than support recent gains in women’s access to

healthcare and coverage, the MacArthur Amendment and AHCA turn back the clock and reverse hard-won progress. We stand ready to continue work with Congress to advance legislation that promotes women’s health, healthcare and coverage.

In our letter of March 22, 2017, we expressed opposition to the AHCA because it threatened women’s access to care protected by Essential Health Benefits (EHBs) requirements, eliminated the Medicaid expansion, cut qualified providers at Planned Parenthood from the Medicaid program, and made severe reductions to Medicaid and other programs critical to women and newborns. We said that important health initiatives for women and newborns should be built upon and improved—not rolled back.

However, the MacArthur Amendment to AHCA places women’s health and coverage at even greater risk. The MacArthur Amendment would enable states to waive EHBs including those for maternity and newborn care, preventive services, and services for mental health and substance use disorders; to waive community rating rules; and to shunt patients with costly healthcare conditions or illnesses into unproven government high risk pools. Supporters of the bill claim this bill maintains protections for those with preexisting conditions, but allowing states to waive coverage of EHB and charge people more based on their health status renders the promise of coverage for preexisting conditions to be meaningless. If all that the Secretary may require of a state waiver application is an un-validated attestation that the purpose of their requested waiver is to reduce premium costs, increase the number of persons with healthcare coverage, or advance another benefit to the public interest in the state, including the guarantee of coverage for persons with pre-existing medical conditions, it is meaningless in protecting health, quality healthcare and coverage. Women and families must not be made to suffer, lose access to care and coverage, and pay higher healthcare costs.

EHB is a critical protection that ensures women have guaranteed access to a robust set of health care services. Making certain categories of coverage optional—such as maternity care—would not substantially lower the premiums that people pay for health coverage. For example, the requirement for maternity care as an EHB is not a source of health cost growth. Rather, by sharing risk across a broad population of beneficiaries it provides vital protection for women and families from the risk of tens of thousands of dollars of out-of-pocket costs associated with normal physiologic labor and delivery, cesarean section, and birth complications. In exchange for monthly premium costs of just \$8-14 according to one recent analysis, the maternity care EHB provides significant security for people wishing to grow their families in the U.S. Furthermore, since everyone is at some point a newborn, childbirth affects all of us. Enabling exclusion of maternity care from health coverage denies people access to the care that everyone deserves for the best start in life.

Congress should move to protect and advance health, quality care and coverage, particularly for women and newborns, and not to endanger them as the AHCA and the MacArthur Amendment would do. Americans of both parties agree. A recent Kaiser Family Foundation poll found “relatively few Americans want to see the president and Congress decrease funding for a variety of different health priorities—including spending for reproductive health services for lower-income women (21 percent).”

When women have access to quality, evidence-based, affordable care throughout their lives, they enrich our workforce, achieve higher levels of education, reach their goals, and actively contribute to the success of their families and their communities. We urge the U.S. House in the strongest possible terms to get it right, not fast. The AHCA and the MacArthur Amendment turn the clock back on women's health and should not move forward.

We stand ready to continue assisting Congress in advancing health policy that supports women's access to high quality healthcare and coverage, and is effective at controlling and reducing the costs that people pay for their healthcare.

Sincerely,

American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Nurse-Midwives, American College of Physicians, American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health, National Partnership for Women & Families, Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

MR. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

MS. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want you to look and keep your eyes on who will feel the TrumpCare's mother of all bombs of health care dropped on the American people. God have mercy on your soul.

I am a person living with a pre-existing disease. I am a breast cancer survivor. This heartless and callous bill, with 24 million-plus people being thrown off of health care and the reverse Robin Hood of stealing from the poor and the seniors laying in their beds, and you are doing an age tax that is five times more than any other young person has to pay, is disgraceful, as well as the pittance that you have given for preexisting conditions, which is \$8 billion. They say you need \$25 billion.

Then you are telling the States to get a waiver. They are going to celebrate. And then you are saying to Trump, the king, that we have the votes to drop that mother of all bombs of health care.

Let me just simply say: I want to stand with the people. I want her to live in dignity and to be able to get well. I want to make sure that Medicaid is provided for working families. I don't want the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, to steal bread from the market because they can't get any health insurance.

God have mercy on your soul.

MR. SPEAKER, as a member of the Budget Committee and the representative of a congressional district that has benefitted enormously from the Affordable Care Act, I rise in strong and unyielding opposition to H.R. 1628, the so-called "American Health Care Act," which more accurately should be called "Trumpcare, the Pay More for Less Act."

I oppose this third and latest reincarnation of Trumpcare for several compelling reasons:

1. Trumpcare forces families to pay higher premiums and deductibles, increasing out-of-pocket costs.

2. Trumpcare will take away health care from 24 million hardworking Americans.

3. Trumpcare would gut Essential Health Benefits and protections for Americans with pre-existing conditions.

4. Trumpcare forces Americans aged 50–64 to pay premiums five times higher than what others pay for health coverage, no matter how healthy they are.

5. Trumpcare shortens the life of the Medicare Trust Fund and ransacks funds that seniors depend on to get the long-term care they need.

MR. SPEAKER, 85 months ago, on March 23, 2010, redeemed a promise that had been unfulfilled for nearly a 100 years, when he signed into law the landmark Affordable Care Act passed by the Democratic controlled 111th Congress.

Seven years later, the verdict is in on the Affordable Care Act: the American people have judged it a success.

As reflected in the most recent public opinion polls, 61% of Americans approve of ObamaCare and oppose efforts to repeal it, the highest approval rates on record to date and continuing an inexorable upward trend over the past several years.

MR. SPEAKER, the reason Americans are adamantly opposed to Republican repeal efforts, including the third iteration of Trumpcare now before us is that Obamacare is no longer a bogey cooked up in Republican talking points but a life-saving and life affirming measure that they experienced in their own lives.

Americans think it is beyond crazy to repeal a law that has brought to more than 20 million Americans the peace of mind and security that comes with knowing they have access to affordable, high quality health care.

Before the passage of the Affordable Care Act, 17.1% of Americans lacked health insurance; today nearly nine of ten (89.1%) are insured, which is the highest rate since Gallup began tracking insurance coverage in 2008.

Because of the Affordable Healthcare Act:

1. insurance companies are banned from discriminating against anyone, including 17 million children, with a preexisting condition, or charging higher rates based on gender or health status;

2. 6.6 million young-adults up to age 26 can stay on their parents' health insurance plans;

3. 100 million Americans no longer have annual or life-time limits on healthcare coverage;

4. 6.3 million seniors in the "donut hole" have saved \$6.1 billion on their prescription drugs;

5. 3.2 million seniors now get free annual wellness visits under Medicare, and

6. 360,000 Small Businesses are using the Health Care Tax Credit to help them provide health insurance to their workers;

7. Pregnancy is no longer a pre-existing condition and women can no longer be charged a higher rate just because they are women.

We are becoming a nation of equals when it comes to access to affordable healthcare insurance.

With all of this progress, and the prospect for more through further refinements, who in their right mind would want to go back to how it used to be?

The answer seems to be only the President and House Republicans who call the Afford-

able Care Act and its enviable record of success a "disaster."

Americans know a disaster when they see one and they see one in the making: it is called "Trumpcare," masquerading as the "American Health Care Act," which will force Americans to pay more, get less, decimate the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and give a massive tax cut for top 1 percent.

Americans are right to be alarmed and angered by what the Trump Republicans are trying to do by rushing to vote on a Trumpcare bill before it can be scored by highly respected and nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

What we do know for sure is that this Trumpcare bill is a massive \$900 billion tax cut for the wealthy, paid for on the backs of America's seniors, the vulnerable, the poor, and working class households.

Trump gave the game away on March 20, 2017 in one of his trademark pep rallies:

"We want a very big tax cut, but cannot do that until we keep our promise to repeal and replace the disaster known as Obamacare."

This "Robin Hood in reverse" bill is unprecedented and breathtaking in its audacity—no bill ever tried to give so much to the rich while taking so much from the poor and working class.

When they were forced to pull Trumpcare 1.0 from the floor because they lacked the votes to pass, House Republican leaders responded by adding an amendment (Trumpcare 2.0) that made the original bill even worse.

Trumpcare 2.0 would allow states to jettison existing essential health benefit requirements, thereby permitting health plans covering millions of people once again to exclude coverage for maternity and newborn care, pediatric dental and vision services, mental health and substance use services, and other crucial benefits.

All this accomplished was a hemorrhaging of support from the moderate wing of the Republican Conference who feared the repercussions of leaving millions of Americans with preexisting conditions without health insurance so the Trump Republicans invented Trumpcare 3.0 to provide \$8 billion over five years to offset the cost of setting up separate pools or premium assistance programs for people with pre-existing conditions.

This pittance is not designed or intended to help real people with preexisting conditions, but to provide cover for House Republicans to walk the plank.

According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, at least \$25 billion per year would be required, not \$8 billion spread out over five years as provided for in Trumpcare 3.0.

Trumpcare represents the largest transfer of wealth from the bottom 99% to the top 1% in American history.

This callous Republican scheme gives gigantic tax cuts to the rich, and pays for it by taking insurance away from 24 million people, leaving 52 million uninsured, and raising costs for the poor and middle class.

In addition, Republicans are giving the pharmaceutical industry a big tax repeal, worth nearly \$25 billion over a decade without demanding in return any reduction in the cost of prescription and brand-name drugs.

To paraphrase Winston Churchill, of this bill, it can truly be said that "never has so much been taken from so many to benefit so few."

The Pay-More-For-Less plan destroys the Medicaid program under the cover of repealing the Affordable Care Act Medicaid expansion.

CBO estimates 14 million Americans will lose Medicaid coverage by 2026 under the Republican plan.

In addition to terminating the ACA Medicaid expansion, the bill converts Medicaid to a per-capita cap that is not guaranteed to keep pace with health costs starting in 2020.

The combined effect of these policies is to slash \$880 billion in federal Medicaid funding over the next decade.

The cuts get deeper with each passing year, reaching 25% of Medicaid spending in 2026.

These steep cuts will force states to drop people from Medicaid entirely or ration care for those who most need access to comprehensive coverage.

The Pay-More-For-Less plan undermines the health care safety net for vulnerable populations.

Currently, Medicaid provides coverage to more than 70 million Americans, including children, pregnant women, seniors in Medicare, people who are too disabled to work, and parents struggling to get by on poverty-level wages.

In addition to doctor and hospital visits, Medicaid covers long-term services like nursing homes and home and community-based services that allow people with chronic health conditions and disabilities to live independently.

To date, 31 states and D.C. have expanded Medicaid eligibility to low-income adults, which, when combined with the ACA's other coverage provisions, has helped to reduce the nation's uninsured rate to the lowest in history.

Trumpcare throws 24 million Americans off their health insurance by 2026 according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Low-income people will be hit especially hard because 14 million people will lose access to Medicaid by 2026 according to CBO. Trumpcare massively shifts who gets insured in the nongroup market.

According to CBO, "fewer lower-income people would obtain coverage through the nongroup market under the legislation than current law," and, "a larger share of enrollees in the nongroup market would be younger people and a smaller share would be older people."

The projected 10% reduction in premiums is not the result of better care or efficiency—it is in large part the result of higher-cost and older people being pushed out of a market that is also selling plans that provide less financial protection.

People with low incomes suffer the greatest losses in coverage.

CBO projects the uninsured rate for people in their 30s and 40s with incomes below 200% of poverty will reach 38% in 2026 under this bill, nearly twice the rate projected under current law.

Among people aged 50–64, CBO projects 30% of those with incomes below 200% of poverty will be uninsured in 2026.

Under current law, CBO projects the uninsured rate would only be 12 percent.

Being uninsured is not about "freedom."

Speaker RYAN has argued that people will happily forgo insurance coverage because this bill gives them that "freedom."

The argument makes as much sense as the foolish claim that slaves came to America as "immigrants" seeking a better life.

The freedom to be uninsured is no freedom at all to people in their 50s and 60s with modest incomes who simply cannot afford to pay thousands of dollars toward premiums.

They do not really have a choice.

The claim of our Republican friends that Trumpcare provides more freedom to all Americans calls to mind the words of Anatole France:

"The law, in its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread from the market."

Trumpcare raises costs for Americans nearing retirement, essentially imposing an "Age Tax."

The bill allows insurance companies to charge older enrollees higher premiums than allowed under current law, while reducing the size of premium tax credits provided.

Again, these changes hit low-income older persons the hardest.

A 64-year-old with an income of \$26,500 buying coverage in the individual market will pay \$12,900 more toward their premiums in 2026, on average.

Trumpcare raises costs for individuals and families with modest incomes, particularly older Americans.

A recent analysis found that in 2020, individuals with incomes of about \$31,000 would pay on average \$4,000 more out of pocket for health care—which is like getting a 13% pay cut.

And the older you are, the worse it gets.

An analysis by the Urban Institute estimates that for Americans in their 50s and 60s, the tax credits alone would only be sufficient to buy plans with major holes in them, such as \$30,000 deductible for family coverage and no coverage at all of brand-name drugs or many therapy services.

Another reason I oppose the Trumpcare bill before us is because its draconian cuts in Medicaid funding and phase-out of Medicaid expansion put community health centers at risk.

Community health centers are consumer-driven and patient-centered organizations that serve as a comprehensive and cost effective primary health care option for America's most underserved communities.

Community health centers serve as the health care home for more than 25 million patients in nearly 10,000 communities across the country.

Across the country, 550 new clinics have opened to receive 5 million new patients since 2009.

Community health centers serve everyone regardless of ability to pay or insurance status:

1. 71% of health center patients have incomes at or below 100% of poverty and 92% have incomes less than 200% of poverty;
2. 49% of health center patients are on Medicaid; and
3. 24% are uninsured;
4. Community health centers annually serve on average 1.2 million homeless patients and more than 300,000 veterans.

Community health centers reduce health care costs and produce savings—on average,

health centers save 24% per Medicaid patient when compared to other providers.

Community health centers integrate critical medical and social services such as oral health, mental health, substance abuse, case management, and translation, under one roof.

Community health centers employ nearly 100,000 people and generate over \$45 billion in total economic activity in some of the nation's most distressed communities.

Mr. Speaker, community health centers are on the front lines of every major health crisis our country faces; from providing access to care (and employment) to veterans to addressing the opioid epidemic to responding to public health threats like the Zika virus.

We should be providing more support and funding to community health centers; not making it more difficult for them to serve the communities that desperately need them by slashing Medicaid funding.

Trumpcare Republican plan leaves rural Americans worse off.

Mr. Speaker, health insurance has historically been more expensive in rural areas because services cost more and it is hard to have a stable individual market with a small population.

Under the Affordable Care Act, premium subsidies are tied to local costs, which helps keep premium costs down.

But they are not under the Republican plan.

So, under the Republican plan residents in rural areas, who tend to be older and poorer, will pay much more and get much less health insurance.

What the Affordable Care Act, and its repeal means in the lives of real people:

At the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, the powerful and compelling reasons to reject Trumpcare lie in the real world experiences of the American people.

Let me briefly share with you the positive, life affirming difference made by the Affordable Care Act in the lives of just three of the millions of Americans it has helped.

Joan Fanwick: "If Obamacare is repealed, I don't know if I'll live to see the next President"

"After nearly a decade of mysterious health scares, I was diagnosed with an autoimmune disorder called Sjogren's syndrome last year, when I was a junior at Temple University.

"It's a chronic illness with no known cause or cure, and without close medical surveillance and care, it can lead to life-threatening complications (like the blood infection I frequently experience).

"For me, having this disorder means waking up every morning and taking 10 different medications.

"It also means a nurse visiting my apartment every Saturday to insert a needle into the port in my chest, so I can give myself IV fluids throughout the week.

"Without insurance, my medical expenses would cost me about \$1,000 per week—more than \$50,000 per year. And that doesn't even include hospitalizations.

"My medical bills aren't cheap under Obamacare, but I can afford them.

"Under Obamacare, insurance companies aren't allowed to cut you off when your costs climb so right now, the most I personally have to pay out of pocket is \$1,000 per year."

Brain Norgaard: "I am a small business owner and leadership trainer who Obamacare has helped tremendously."

Brian Norgaard, a Dallas, Texas resident called my office to express his opposition to Trumpcare and to offer share how the Affordable Care Act has helped small business owners like himself:

"I am a small business owner and leadership trainer who Obamacare has helped tremendously.

"My wife and I both own small businesses in the Dallas, Texas area and as a result of the huge savings we received after paying lower [healthcare] premiums under Obamacare, we were able to reinvest those saving into both of our businesses and the community.

"And the healthcare we received was quality, at that."

Ashley Walton: "For cancer survivors, we literally live and die by insurance"

Ashley Walton was 25 when a mole on her back turned out to be melanoma.

She had it removed, but three years later she discovered a lump in her abdomen.

She was then unemployed and uninsured, and so she put off going to a doctor.

She tried to buy health insurance. Every company rejected her.

Ashley eventually became eligible for California's Medicaid program, which had been expanded under the Affordable Care Act.

The 32-year-old Oakland resident credits her survival to the ACA.

Without it, "I would likely be dead, and my family would likely be bankrupt from trying to save me."

Before any of our Republican colleagues supporting this bill cast their vote, I urge them to reflect on the testimony of Joan, Brian, and Ashley, and on this question posed by a constituent to Sen. COTTON of Arkansas at a recent town hall:

"I've got a husband dying and we can't afford—let me tell you something.

"If you can get us better coverage than this [Obamacare], go for it.

"Let me tell you what we have, plus a lot of benefits that we need.

"We have \$29 per month for my husband. Can you beat that? Can you?"

With all the congestive heart failures, and open heart surgeries, we're trying. \$29 per month. And he's a hard worker.

\$39 for me."

Like a horror film of yore with monsters and vampires, both the original Trumpcare and its sequels threaten to return this country to the days when annual and lifetime dollar-based limits on the use of essential health benefits shifted tremendous financial and health risks to working families.

Insurance companies could charge people with pre-existing conditions many times more than they charge healthy people—just as they did before the Affordable Care Act.

Millions of Americans with pre-existing conditions would be at risk of losing health coverage or face premiums so high only the very wealthy could afford them—the same people who benefit from the massive tax cuts in the original bill.

I urge all Members to reject Trumpcare, one of the most monstrously cruel and morally bankrupt legislative proposals ever to be considered in this chamber.

To paraphrase a famous former reality television personality, "believe me, Trumpcare is a disaster."

We should reject it and keep instead "something terrific": and that is the Affordable Care Act, regarded lovingly by millions of Americans as "Obamacare."

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if I had to defend ObamaCare, I would go into hysterics, too.

Since ObamaCare went into effect, the insurance choices and coverage have gotten lower and the costs have gotten higher. Virtually no doctors take the marketplace insurance so I'm left to change doctors who I've seen for over 30 years and switch to "new" doctors who I don't trust, and who cannot provide the same healthcare benefits I've received in the past. I have a brain tumor that I have monitored by a very skilled neuro-oncologist. Not anymore. The three choices I was given via healthcare.gov aren't even honored forms of insurance for this doctor.

Yes, it left them out again.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, despite the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle, today is an exciting day for those of us who have been working and fighting to end ObamaCare's reign over this country.

It is race month in Indiana, and I want to remind my colleagues that, as exciting as today is, today's vote is a green flag, not a checkered flag. It is the beginning of the race, not the end.

Today, the House will vote to move legislation forward that will repeal ObamaCare and replace it with something far better. The bill will surely undergo more changes as we continue this process in the Senate, but it is on its way to the finish line.

There are some really strong policies in this bill. It cut taxes by a trillion dollars on the American people, and government spending by hundreds of billions, too. Despite the rhetoric, it keeps preexisting condition prohibitions. No one with a preexisting condition will be denied coverage because of the policies in this bill. Insurance companies cannot raise premiums on individuals with preexisting conditions as long as they maintain coverage.

The bill will also make sure 26-year-olds continue to stay on their parents' healthcare plans as they enter the workforce. Most importantly, though, the bill unshackles American families from the mandates, taxes, and penalties that are costing these families thousands of dollars each year.

Though ObamaCare helped some, we have to remember that ObamaCare made things worse for millions of America, and that is where the national anger has come from. I have heard from countless Hoosiers who tell me the stories of their premiums going from \$500 a month to \$1,500 a month, with deductibles that are through the roof, at \$10,000-plus a month. They have

to spend \$30,000 out of pocket before they even get to their insurance. For a middle class family, that means they have no meaningful insurance at all.

We can do better, and we will. That starts today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Rural Health Association opposed to this bill.

[From the National Rural Health Association]

VOTE NO TO THE AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

The National Rural Health Association urges a NO vote on the American Health Care Act (AHCA).

Rural Americans are older, poorer and sicker than other populations. In fact, a January 2017 CDC report pronounced that life expectancies for rural Americans have declined and the top five chronic diseases are worse in rural America. The AHCA does nothing to improve the health care crisis in rural America, and will lead to poorer rural health outcomes, more uninsured and an increase in the rural hospital closure crisis.

Though some provisions in the modified AHCA bill improve the base bill, NRHA is concerned that the bill still falls woefully short in making health care affordable and accessible to rural Americans. For example, the modified bill contains a decrease in the Medical Expense Deduction threshold from 10% to 5.8% in an attempt to assist Americans between the ages of 50 and 64 who would see their premiums skyrocket under the current plan. However, this deduction is not a credit and therefore would be of little use to low income seniors that are in very low tax brackets or do not pay income tax at all. Additionally, the new amendments to freeze Medicaid expansion enrollment as of Jan. 1, 2018, and reduce the Medicaid per-capita growth rate will disproportionately harm rural Americans.

The AHCA will hurt vulnerable populations in rural Americans, leaving millions of the sickest, most underserved populations in our nation without coverage, and further escalating the rural hospital closure crisis. According to the Wall Street Journal, the "GOP health plan would hit rural areas hard . . . Poor, older Americans would see the largest increase in insurance-coverage costs." The LA Times reports "Americans who swept President Trump to victory—lower-income, older voters in conservative, rural parts of the country—stand to lose the most in federal healthcare aid under a Republican plan to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act." Let's be clear—many provisions in the ACA failed rural America. The lack of plan competition in rural markets, exorbitant premiums, deductibles and co-pays, the co-op collapses, lack of Medicaid expansion, and devastating Medicare cuts to rural providers—all collided to create a health care crisis in rural America. However, it's beyond frustrating that an opportunity to fix these problems is squandered, and instead, a greater health care crisis will be created in rural America.

Congress has long recognized the importance of the rural health care safety net and has steadfastly worked to protect it. And now, much of the protections created to maintain access to care for the 62 million who live in rural America are in jeopardy. We implore Congress to continue its fight to protect rural patients' access to care. Three improvements are critical for rural patients and providers:

1. Medicaid—Though most rural residents are in non-expansion states, a higher proportion of rural residents are covered by Medicaid (21% vs. 16%).

Congress and the states have long recognized that rural is different and thus requires different programs to succeed. Rural payment programs for hospitals and providers are not 'bonus' payments, but rather alternative, cost-effective and targeted payment formulas that maintain access to care for millions of rural patients and financial stability for thousands of rural providers across the country. Any federal health care reform must protect a state's ability to protect its rural safety net providers. The federal government must not abdicate its moral, legal, and financial responsibilities to rural, Medicaid eligible populations by ensuring access to care.

Any federal health care reform proposal must protect access to care in Rural America, and must provide an option to a state to receive an enhanced reimbursement included in a matching rate or a per capita cap, specifically targeted to create stability among rural providers to maintain access to care for rural communities. Enhancements must be equivalent to the cost of providing care for rural safety net providers, a safeguard that ensures the enhanced reimbursement is provided to the safety net provider to allow for continued access to care. Rural safety net providers include, but not limited to, Critical Access Hospitals, Rural Prospective Payment Hospitals, Rural Health Clinics, Indian Health. Service providers, and individual rural providers.

2. Market Reform—Forty-one percent of rural marketplace enrollees have only a single option of insurer, representing 70 percent of counties that have only one option. This lack of competition in the marketplace means higher premiums. Rural residents average per month cost exceeds urban (\$569.34 for small town rural vs. \$415.85 for metropolitan).

Rural Americans are more likely to have obesity, diabetes, cancer, and traumatic injury; they are more likely to participate in high risk health behaviors including smoking, poor diet, physical inactivity, and substance abuse. Rural Americans are more likely to be uninsured or underinsured and less likely to receive employer sponsored health insurance. Rural communities have fewer health care providers for insurers to contract with to provide an adequate network to serve the community.

Any federal health care reform proposal must address the fact that insurance providers are withdrawing from rural markets. Despite record profit levels, insurance companies are permitted to cherry pick profitable markets for participation and are currently not obliged to provide service to markets with less advantageous risk pools. Demographic realities of the rural population make the market less profitable, and thus less desirable for an insurance company with no incentive to take on such exposure. In the same way that financial service institutions are required to provide services to underserved neighborhoods, profitable insurance companies should be required to provide services in underserved communities.

3. Stop Bad Debt Cuts to Rural Hospitals—Rural hospitals serve more Medicare patients (46% rural vs. 40.9% urban), thus across-the-board Medicare cuts do not have across the board impacts. A goal of the ACA was to have hospital bad debt decrease significantly. However, because of unaffordable health plans in rural areas, rural patients

still cannot afford health care. Bad debt among rural hospitals has actually increased 50% since the ACA was passed. According to MedPAC "Average Medicare margins are negative, and under current law they are expected to decline in 2016" has led to 7% gains in median profit margins for urban providers while rural providers have experienced a median loss of 6%.

If Congress does not act, all the decades of efforts to protect rural patients' access to care, could rapidly be undone. The National Rural Health Association implores Congress to act now to protect rural health care across the nation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Thoracic Society opposed to this bill.

AMERICAN THORACIC SOCIETY,

April 27, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 16,000 members of the American Thoracic Society (ATS), I want to voice my grave concerns with the latest legislative proposal developed to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act (ACA). While CBO estimates are not yet available for the most recent legislation proposal being considered in the House, we remain concerned that the bill, if enacted, will result in a loss of health insurance for millions of Americans. Should the proposal come up for a vote in the near future, we urge you to vote "NO" on the American Health Care Act.

The ATS opposes any legislation that does not ensure affordable health insurance coverage for Americans currently insured under the ACA. We are concerned that allowing states to waive important insurance reforms in the Affordable Care Act will lead to reduced coverage for many Americans and significant price increases for patients with pre-existing conditions. Further, we are concerned that reliance on "high risk pools" will not adequately meet the health insurance needs of many Americans with pre-existing conditions. We note that previous attempts at implementing state-based high risk pools have been largely unsuccessful. Members of the ATS serve a large and diverse patient population, including patients with respiratory diseases, critical illnesses and sleep disorders such as asthma, COPD, pneumonia, sepsis and obstructive sleep apnea. Our patients cannot afford to lose affordable health insurance coverage for any period of time.

The ATS looks forward to working with Congress to improve our health care system and ensure health insurance coverage for all Americans. If you have questions or need additional information, please contact Nuala S. Moore, Associate Director of Government Relations.

Sincerely,

DAVID GOZAL, MD, MBA,

President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics opposed to this bill.

ACADEMY OF NUTRITION

AND DIETETICS,

Washington, DC, May 2, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: Nutrition services save money, improve

chronic disease outcomes and save lives. For this reason, the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, the nation's largest organization of food and nutrition professionals, remains opposed to H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act (AHCA) as amended by the MacArthur amendment.

The Academy and our 75,000-plus members believe that all Americans should have both coverage and access to high-quality health care. The Academy urges Congress to support measures that include nutrition services and prevention that reduces the cost of health care and improve patients' lives.

The new proposal set forth in the AHCA not only fails to improve the health of all Americans, but it will worsen patient care and public health by removing vital resources that are currently effective in improving health across the country.

This legislation continues to eliminate investments in prevention and public health, reverse advancements made in disease prevention and chronic care management, and according to the Congressional Budget Office, would result in the loss of health care coverage for at least 24 million Americans. Allowing states to waive pre-existing conditions and essential health benefits will lead to decreased coverage and utilization of vital nutrition services.

Individuals with chronic disease such as diabetes and hypertension benefit from medical nutrition therapy and nutrition services to lower their blood sugar and blood pressure, while reducing reliance on expensive medications. The cost of these services is inexpensive and replaces more costly interventions that are necessary as chronic disease progresses with many complications.

The Academy holds five key tenets for analyzing any legislation to reform health care:

1. The health of all Americans should improve as a result of our health policy choices. Sufficient resources must be made available to ensure optimal health.

2. Access to quality health care is a right that must be extended to all Americans.

3. Nutrition services, from pre-conception through end of life, are an essential component of comprehensive health care.

4. Stable, sufficient and reliable funding is necessary for our health care system to provide everyone access to a core package of benefits.

5. Health care must be patient-centered.

Affordable access to care is an ongoing challenge that any reform legislation should address. Although this legislation purports to provide access, it fails to make coverage more affordable; unaffordable access to coverage is really not coverage at all. The proposal fails to maintain a core package of benefits that improve the health of Americans, by removing a basic floor of services that should be provided without cost-sharing to the Medicaid population.

Additionally, the new proposal would allow states to opt out of requiring that health plans cover the Essential Health Benefits which help reduce longer term health care costs, allow insurers to charge people higher premiums based on pre-existing conditions like nutrition related diseases like diabetes and heart disease and increase out-of-pocket costs for vulnerable older adults.

By repealing the Prevention and Public Health Fund, the proposal eliminates the sole federal investment in prevention, which will harm our state and local communities that depend on these effective public-private partnerships to improve the health of their communities.

The AHCA as currently drafted fails to meet the Academy's five tenets, and therefore we cannot support the passage of these proposals.

The Academy urges Congress to not hold future votes without an evaluation of the proposed amendments from the Congressional Budget Office estimating the budgetary impact of the amended legislation and the anticipated effect on coverage for Americans. We look forward to continued collaboration to improve the health and nutrition for all Americans.

Sincerely,

LUCILLE BESELER,
President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from The Jewish Federations of North America opposed to this bill.

THE JEWISH FEDERATIONS
OF NORTH AMERICA,
Washington, DC, May 2, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: The Jewish Federations of North America (JFNA) remains staunchly opposed to the American Health Care Act of 2017 (AHCA), even with the recently released amendment proposed by Representative Tom MacArthur (R-NJ). We are disappointed that AHCA retains the devastating cuts to Medicaid included in the earlier version of the legislation, cuts which are the result of the legislation's proposal to dramatically restructure Medicaid's federal financing structure and roll back coverage for 14 million people covered by the state Medicaid expansions. The amendment does nothing to alleviate these concerns.

JFNA represents 148 Jewish federations and 300 network communities that together support 15 leading academic medical centers/health systems, 100 Jewish nursing homes, and 125 Jewish family & children's agencies, providing health care for more than one million clients, Jewish and non-Jewish alike. Medicaid is a lifeline for more than 80 million people, including low-income children, older adults, and people with disabilities nationwide. Medicaid is a vital program for Jewish federations throughout the country and particularly for our communal health and long-term care partners that care for the most vulnerable in our communities.

JFNA is deeply troubled by the findings of the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) that AHCA will cause \$839 billion in reductions—about 25 percent—to federal Medicaid funding and a loss in coverage for more than 14 million Medicaid beneficiaries. We believe that converting Medicaid to a block grant or per capita cap will cause irreparable harm not only to the millions who depend on the program, but also to our large network of providers who care for them.

AHCA would convert the long-standing and fundamental federal-state partnership of the Medicaid program to a block grant or per capita cap system. Under either approach, states would receive a limited amount of federal money for their Medicaid programs. As CBO found, even under a per capita cap system, the federal share is lower than the average annual increase in Medicaid spending and will not be sufficiently flexible to address a variety of key factors affecting Medicaid spending, including major disasters, economic downturns, unexpected health care cost increases, and demographic changes, such as the rapidly aging baby boomer generation. CBO projected that AHCA's \$839 bil-

lion cut in federal Medicaid funding will shift substantial costs to state and local governments, our providers, and our patients, thus exacerbating the existing strain on the program. We agree with CBO's conclusion that, due to these reductions in funding, states will be left with no choice but to reduce Medicaid enrollment, eligibility for Medicaid benefits, and payment rates. Many people who now qualify for Medicaid could end up uninsured or losing access to critical health and long-term care services.

JFNA is concerned by many of the unintended consequences of this legislation, such as:

People who desperately need Medicaid and who are currently eligible will become uninsured;

States will be forced to cut back on crucial Medicaid services, such as home and community-based services, effectively forcing people who are capable of living in the community with proper home and community-based services into nursing homes;

States will be forced to reduce already low provider payment rates, thus further decreasing the pool of providers serving Medicaid beneficiaries and increasing waiting times for services; and,

Health care providers and entities that care for these vulnerable populations will suffer additional financial strain. As a result, these agencies will be forced to lay off staff or close their doors altogether, resulting in significant job losses and further hurting state economies.

For these reasons, we must oppose the legislation as currently written and urge the House of Representatives to reconsider moving forward with it. We stand ready to work with you, in tandem with our Jewish communal health and long-term care providers, to promote more targeted ways to reduce Medicaid spending and develop a new framework of policies to improve Medicaid quality, efficiency, and sustainability.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. DAROFF,
Senior Vice President
for Public Policy &
Director of the
Washington Office.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article in The Wall Street Journal today stating: "... employers looking to lower their costs could impose lifetime limits and eliminate the out-of-pocket cost cap from their plans under the GOP legislation."

[From the Wall Street Journal]

LITTLE-NOTED PROVISION OF GOP HEALTH
BILL COULD ALTER EMPLOYER PLANS

LAST-MINUTE AMENDMENT WOULD ALLOW
STATES TO OBTAIN WAIVERS FROM CERTAIN
AFFORDABLE CARE ACT REQUIREMENTS

(By Stephanie Armour and Michelle
Hackman)

Many people who obtain health insurance through their employers—about half of the country—could be at risk of losing protections that limit out-of-pocket costs for catastrophic illnesses, due to a little-noticed provision of the House Republican health-care bill to be considered Thursday, health-policy experts say.

The provision, part of a last-minute amendment, lets states obtain waivers from certain Affordable Care Act insurance regulations. Insurers in states that obtain the waivers could be freed from a regulation mandating that they cover 10 particular

types of health services, among them maternity care, prescription drugs, mental health treatment and hospitalization.

That could also affect plans offered by large employers, health analysts said.

The ACA prevents employer plans from putting annual limits on the amount of care they will cover, and it bars lifetime limits on the 10 essential benefits. But in 2011, the Obama administration issued guidance stating that employers aren't bound by the benefits mandated by their state and can pick from another state's list of required benefits. That guidance was mostly meaningless because the ACA established a national set of essential benefits.

Under the House bill, large employers could choose the benefit requirements from any state—including those that are allowed to lower their benchmarks under a waiver, health analysts said. By choosing a waiver state, employers looking to lower their costs could impose lifetime limits and eliminate the out-of-pocket cost cap from their plans under the GOP legislation.

The measure would give employers added flexibility to take steps that could lower costs by limiting more-expensive coverage areas. And it would lessen the federal regulation of insurers, a goal of GOP lawmakers who believe the ACA is an example of government overreach.

The impact on employer plans expands the scope of the health bill to affect, potentially, everyone not insured by Medicare or small-business plans, since the bill also includes cuts to Medicaid and changes to the individual market. Employer health plans are the single largest source of health insurance in the country, with about 159 million Americans receiving coverage through their jobs. "It's huge," said Andy Slavitt, former acting administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services under President Barack Obama. "They're creating a backdoor way to gut employer plans, too."

But some experts say the impact could be less.

"The real question is, would employers do this? Many wouldn't," said Larry Levitt, a senior vice president at the Kaiser Family Foundation. "Many employers offer quality benefits to attract employees. But employers are always looking for ways to lower costs."

Fifty-nine percent of employers had a lifetime limit on how much their insurance plans would cover before the ACA, Mr. Levitt said.

The potential impact on large-employer plans was picked up on by health analysts including Matthew Fiedler, a fellow at the Brookings Institution. It is possible the Trump administration could minimize the impact by barring employers from picking plans across state lines, he said, but there is no sign that that would occur.

"The core goal of insurance is to ensure that people are protected if the worst happens, and these protections are crucial to achieving that goal," Mr. Fiedler said.

Potentially, the new provision could play out this way: If a state did away with a requirement to provide mental health and substance abuse services, employer plans using that benchmark could impose lifetime caps on the amount of mental health coverage they are willing to pay for.

One trade group representing employers said the amendment's effects on people with employer-sponsored health coverage would be minimal. Most large employers didn't impose annual or lifetime limits before the ACA was implemented, according to James Gelfand, senior vice president of health policy at the Erisa Industry Committee.

"Even if self-insured health plans are no longer banned from imposing annual or lifetime limits, they're unlikely to attempt to squeeze the toothpaste back into the tube," he said. "The benefits of reimposing limits are questionable."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it has just been said that no one with a pre-existing condition will be denied treatment. That is a cruel falsehood. Roughly 129 million Americans today have a preexisting condition.

Here is what the AMA says to refute what was just said: "The history of high-risk pools demonstrates that Americans with preexisting conditions will be stuck in second class health coverage, if they are able to obtain coverage at all."

Now we have a proposal for \$8 billion. That is a deceitful fraud. I intend going back home to travel the State of Michigan and elsewhere and tell the American people that although those who have said that are simply not being truthful, they essentially are turning their backs on 129 million Americans. We Democrats will never turn our back on the people of the United States of America. When it comes to health care, it is a vital need.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, even with, again, the muddled hysterics, there is nothing in this bill, even if you have preexisting coverage now, there is nothing that says you lose it. Let's at least get the facts straight.

Also, let's talk about families and why we are here.

Despite Obama's promises, my plan was canceled at an affordable \$450 a month when ObamaCare was implemented. My new plan has gone up every year and for 2017 will be over \$1,300 a month. My husband and I cannot keep up with these increases. Soon it will be a choice between food and housing or health care.

Virginia from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, my question today is: How long will the opposition try to hold on to the failing Affordable Care Act? How long will they desperately try to hold on with their fingernails, screaming and thrashing at something that is failing so miserably?

Just this week, it was announced that 94 of 99 counties of Iowa will not have a carrier at all. In Michigan this year, individual policy premiums went up 20 percent, never mind deductibles and copays.

While currently 26 million Americans do not have coverage, 19.2 million either claim a waiver or pay a penalty that last year was \$3 billion. Yet somehow the other side claims the Affordable Care Act is some form of nirvana.

The American Health Care Act guarantees issuance of coverage and targets assistance to those who have health challenges, in contrast to the Affordable Care Act that just thinks we should throw money at it. What amazes me, in my first few months here in Congress, if there is a problem, we will just throw money. The opposition wants a blank check, which will not work in this country. It is going to kill this country.

Let me suggest to my colleague from Michigan, my neighbor, that if he wants to schedule to go around the State and talk about the benefits of this program, the Affordable Care Act, I will go with him. We will go anywhere he would like to go.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a statement from the Children's Hospital Association in opposition to this bill.

[From Children's Hospital Association, Apr. 27, 2017]

CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS URGE HOUSE TO VOTE AGAINST AMENDED AHCA
LAWMAKERS SHOULD KNOW BILL IS BAD FOR KIDS

WASHINGTON, DC.—On behalf of our nation's children's hospitals and the patients and families they serve, Children's Hospital Association (CHA) continues to oppose the newly modified American Health Care Act (AHCA) and strongly urges the House of Representatives to reject the bill. Recently adopted changes only worsen the AHCA by putting children with preexisting conditions at increased risk of losing health care coverage and failing to correct the Medicaid cuts that would impact over 30 million kids.

The legislation the House might consider for a vote as early as the weekend would impose over \$800 billion in cuts on states by fundamentally changing Medicaid—a program over 40 percent of the children across the country depend on for their health care coverage and access to medical care. Under the bill, Medicaid would no longer be able to flex with the needs of enrollees, instead becoming a severely restricted system of per capita caps or block grants.

The block grant option in particular would be devastating to children as it eliminates Medicaid's EPSDT (Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment) benefit which ensures children receive immunizations, mental health assessments and vision, eye and hearing exams as well as other medical services they might need. A block grant would also remove cost-sharing protections for children, essentially creating new barriers to care for low-income, working families.

CHA urgently asks members of Congress to vote against the AHCA. Medicaid must be maintained to ensure children receive the coverage and medical care that return lifelong benefits into adulthood. Investing in children's health advances a better future for our nation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a statement from Families USA in opposition to this bill.

[From FAMILIESUSA]

LATEST HOUSE GOP PROPOSAL—"UPTON AMENDMENT"—STILL LEAVES PEOPLE WITH PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS OUT IN THE COLD
WASHINGTON, DC.—Republicans in the House today are discussing a so-called com-

promise that ostensibly adds \$8 billion to their Affordable Care Act (ACA) repeal bill in an attempt to appease members worried that the bill strips coverage guarantees for people with pre-existing conditions. Below is a statement from Families USA Executive Director Frederick Isasi.

"Despite today's wheeling and dealing, the GOP repeal bill still drops the coverage guarantee for people with pre-existing conditions, strips coverage from millions, and drives up costs for millions more. A measly \$8 billion handout isn't going to change that. The bill also decimates Medicaid—more than \$800 billion in cuts. That hurts seniors, people with disabilities, and children like Jimmy Kimmel's son who he so eloquently spoke of Monday night. Remember, half of the births in America are reimbursed through Medicaid.

"The Upton \$8 billion is a non-solution—money thrown at 'high-risk pools' that experts on both sides of the aisle have warned lead to higher costs, fewer benefits, and waiting lists rationing care for those with pre-existing conditions.

"Republicans in the House can do all the backroom vote-trading they want; their bill will still harm millions and millions of people in America and breaks President Trump's promise to cover everybody and protect people with pre-existing conditions. This isn't what people in America want. It is time for the GOP to drop this deeply flawed legislation and move on to efforts that will help, and not hurt, America's families."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a statement from the Association of American Medical Colleges in opposition to this bill.

[From AAMC, May 2, 2017]

AAMC STATEMENT ON THE MACARTHUR AMENDMENT TO THE AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

AAMC (Association of American Medical Colleges) President and CEO Darrell G. Kirch, MD, issued the following statement regarding the amendment to the American Health Care Act (AHCA) introduced by Rep. Tom MacArthur (R-N.J.):

"This week, the House could vote on a new version of the American Health Care Act that includes the MacArthur amendment. Unfortunately, the amendment does not address the limitations in the original measure, such as making high-quality, affordable health insurance available to all, and maintaining programs to support the health care safety net—at least at current levels—until other comparable coverage expansions are available.

The amendment's treatment of essential health benefits and health status underwriting dilutes protections for many Americans and would leave individuals with pre-existing conditions facing higher premiums and reduced access to vital care.

The shortcomings in the underlying bill remain the same. The original analysis from the Congressional Budget Office indicated that 14 million Americans would lose their health insurance coverage as early as next year, and as many as 24 million by 2024. Nothing in the bill has changed that alters the fact that this legislation would lead to fewer Americans with quality insurance, less affordable coverage for those who have it, and the destabilization of the current Medicaid program.

We continue to urge members of Congress to engage with the nation's medical schools and teaching hospitals and other stakeholders to find ways to achieve high quality health care for all Americans."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ), the vice chair of the Democratic Caucus.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I can't believe we are here again to vote, or not, on the Republicans so-called healthcare bill.

Let me remind my colleagues that we are finally here only after Republicans failed to even hold a vote on March 24, and then offered extreme, multiple amendments to appease the furthest right of their party.

But I have to give it to them: it takes real cojones to stand here and vote on a bill that they know provides nearly zero healthcare benefits for the American people. It takes real fortitude and conviction to stand up for a bill that cuts coverage for 24 million Americans, guts Medicaid, reduces the solvency of Medicare, and segregates the sickest.

The truth is, Republicans lack the bravery to call this bill what it really is: a massive tax cut for the rich on the backs of working moms and dads and the sick. They lack the integrity to do the hard work that it takes to craft an actual healthcare bill that would build upon current law and improve the health of Americans.

I implore my colleagues to come to their senses, vote against this terrible bill, and work with us to continue to improve health care in this country for all Americans.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting also for my friends across the aisle to stand up and say that ObamaCare is a failure. I guess they can't. For the last 7 years, the voters have.

Small business owners and American entrepreneurs:

As an entrepreneur with two special needs children, the ACA is an expensive nightmare. Both my husband and I are small-business owners and must pay for individual insurance. We are on the highest deductible plan offered to us, a monthly premium over \$1,000, and outstanding medical bills that we are struggling to pay off. We have seen our premium go up at least 14 percent and the expenses of care, lab, et cetera. With all exceptions, to the President, he is offering to his corporate friends. We are the ones who get ignored.

That is the true face of ObamaCare.

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, mandates seldom work. Markets do work.

My friends on the Democratic side of the aisle haven't pointed out that 19 million Americans have chosen to pay the tax penalty to the IRS, rather than be forced into one of these ObamaCare plans.

They talk about all the people who have gotten coverage. Most of them got coverage when the bill that is now called ObamaCare expanded Medicaid

to healthy adults and paid 100 percent of the cost to cover those individuals at a cost right now of about \$70 billion a year.

Mandates don't work; markets do. I choose less government mandate, more personal freedom.

Vote for the rule; vote for the bill. Let's restore markets and freedom to health care in America.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU of California.)

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Kate called my office, worried for her son who is 1-year-old and was born with muscular dystrophy. He will need care for the rest of his life.

Without the ban on preexisting conditions, the cost of insurance for her son will be astronomical. She is paralyzed with fear about how she is going to be able to care for him for the rest of his life. Under TrumpCare, the healthcare bill written for Donald Trump and not the American people, insurance companies will be able to charge Kate's son more because he has a preexisting condition.

Imagine that. Her son's health care will be out of reach, his precious life endangered. That is unimaginably cruel, especially when we have a system in place right now that gets Kate's son the treatment he deserves.

That is why I am opposing this bill today. I cannot support a measure that we know will cost sick people more money, will force families to pay higher premiums and deductibles, will force 24 million people off their insurance, and guts essential health benefits.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this horrific bill today.

□ 1015

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I believe probably the reason they won't vote for it is they don't understand it, because preexisting conditions are covered. If you have coverage now, nothing in our bill, no matter what would come from the State or anyone else, would lose the preexisting conditions. I guess it is just easier to talk your talking points and have your poster and go from there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST).

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am a person with preexisting conditions, and I believe it is not just something that I should do; it is a responsibility for me to be the staunchest advocate for people out there who have preexisting conditions. That is why I am such an ardent supporter of this bill.

I think every American and every person out there with preexisting conditions should be asking themselves: How is it that they have coverage if every single insurance provider has pulled out of the market? If there is no entity to go to out there and provide

insurance, how is it that preexisting conditions could possibly be covered?

I have had the question constantly: How is it so difficult for Republicans to get this bill passed, to get this through the floor? The answer is this, and this is again the question that every American should be asking themselves: Who is going out there and saying that preexisting conditions won't be covered? It is the exact same group of people that went out there and lied to the face of every single American, telling them that if they liked their plan, they would keep their plan; if they liked their doctor, they would keep their doctor; that the average American family was going to save \$2,500 or more on health insurance.

That was a bold-faced lie. It was orchestrated by architects who specifically went out with the intention to prey on the American people. That is who is going out there selling these lies against my party. I resent that completely because we have come up with a plan, with a strategy to go out there and save health care for the American people, and I couldn't be more proud of that.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, maybe the gentleman hasn't been listening to all the organizations and healthcare advocates who have come out strongly opposed to the Republican bill, that I have read into the RECORD, who know a lot more about health care than anybody in this House, who spend their lives protecting people and protecting people's healthcare rights. They are all in strong opposition to the Republican bill because you take away the protections for preexisting conditions, plain and simple.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we began this debate listening to my friend from Texas talk about how he was humbled to be here today supporting the Republican bill. Well, frankly, I think he should be embarrassed, embarrassed that my Republican colleagues are afraid to have a full, open, lengthy debate about these impacts. We are taking a consequential piece of legislation, and Republicans are jamming it through without a CBO score so they don't know the impacts, and we don't have the confidence.

We do know, however, my friend from Massachusetts has read into the RECORD item after item, the medical association, disease advocacy groups, the American Association of Retired People, it is an honor roll of people who know about health care, who fought to preserve and protect and enhance, and the Republicans have no answer to refute this litany of experts who are independent, who are professional, who care. Who are opposed. That is something that I think Republicans should be ashamed of.

They have had 7 years chipping away at the Affordable Care Act to try to make it worse, yet it still is supported by people who know. The Republican approach should be rejected.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Public Health Association in strong opposition to the Republican bill.

AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH
ASSOCIATION,

May 4, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Public Health Association, a diverse community of public health professionals who champion the health of all people and communities, I write to express our continued strong opposition to H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act of 2017, legislation to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The amended bill would be even worse for the nation's health than the original proposal and does nothing to improve the health of the American public. Additionally, the bill would have the greatest negative impact on the health of the most vulnerable Americans.

According to the March Congressional Budget Office analysis, the legislation would result in 14 million Americans losing health insurance coverage in 2018. By 2026, CBO estimates 24 million individuals would lose coverage, taking the uninsured rate up to a staggering 52 million, nearly double the number of Americans who would lack insurance under existing law. The bill would cut critical premium subsidies for low- and middle-income families and phase out the ACA's Medicaid expansion. Under the proposal, many, especially low-income and older Americans, would pay higher premiums, receive lower subsidies and be subject to higher out of pocket costs, including higher deductibles and co-pays for plans that provide less coverage. Health insurance coverage is critical to preventing disease, ensuring health and well-being and driving down the use of costlier providers of care. Unfortunately, this proposal will result in a greater number of people losing coverage than the number of people who have gained coverage under the Affordable Care Act, putting many at risk of premature death due to the lack of access to critical health services.

The amended bill would be even worse for public health than the original bill that was pulled from the House floor in late March. The amended bill would allow states to opt-out of requiring health plans to cover the 10 essential health benefits such as maternity care, mental health and substance abuse disorder services and prescription drug coverage. It would also allow insurers to charge significantly higher premiums for people with pre-existing conditions and possibly allow insurers to charge older adults even higher premiums. The inclusion of a mere \$8 billion over five years will do little to help people with pre-existing conditions who could see drastically higher premiums leaving millions in the individual and small group market with no protections from insurer discrimination.

The bill would also eliminate the Prevention and Public Health Fund, the first and only mandatory funding stream specifically dedicated to public health and prevention activities. The fund has already provided more

than \$6 billion to support a variety of public health activities in every state including tracking and preventing infectious diseases like the Ebola and Zika viruses, community and clinical prevention programs, preventing childhood lead poisoning and expanding access to childhood immunizations. Eliminating the fund would devastate the budget of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The fund currently makes up 12 percent of CDC's budget and eliminating this funding stream would force Congress to replace the funding through the regular appropriations process where resources for non-defense discretionary programs are already too low.

Not only would the bill phase out the Medicaid expansion under the ACA, it would also make other troubling changes to the Medicaid program, converting it to a per capita program. The most recent CBO analysis estimated the bill would cut federal spending on Medicaid by \$839 billion over the next decade, drastically cutting resources to states, many of which are already struggling with tight budgets. The bill would also block Medicaid reimbursements to Planned Parenthood for one year—which CBO estimates will lead to less access to care, more unintended births and more costs for the Medicaid program.

While the Affordable Care Act is not perfect, the law has made progress in addressing the biggest challenges facing our health system including the rising costs associated with our health care system, uneven quality of care, deaths due to medical errors, discriminatory practices by health insurance providers and the shrinking ranks of the nation's primary care providers. The ACA has made progress in shifting our health system from one that focuses on treating the sick to one that focuses on keeping people healthy. We ask you to oppose this and future efforts to repeal or weaken the ACA. Instead, we urge you to work on a bipartisan basis to improve and build upon the successes of the ACA and to work to provide health insurance coverage to the more than 28 million who still lack coverage. We look forward to working with you to create the healthiest nation in one generation.

Sincerely,

GEORGES C. BENJAMIN, MD,
Executive Director.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the Republican healthcare bill is reckless and heartless:

It increases the cost of premiums and deductibles;

It imposes an age tax on older Americans;

It unravels protections for patients with preexisting conditions;

It eliminates maternity care, substance abuse treatment, and prescription drug coverage;

It does away with lifetime limits and annual caps.

President Trump's claim that people with preexisting conditions will be covered is false, and it is a betrayal. It will have threatening consequences for millions of Americans. It will cost lives.

If this passes today, the American people should be in the street to call out the immorality of this legislation. They should decry this offense against

humanity and this offense against the American people. I call on the American people: Do not let them get away with it.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republicans' latest plan to dismantle the Affordable Care Act. After Republicans failed to earn the votes to pass their American Health Care Act in March, I thought that we could finally move forward to find bipartisan solutions to improving health care in America. Instead, Republicans have revived their partisan goal of ACA repeal by adding provisions that have made a bad bill even worse.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it; the bill before us today will make Americans' health care worse in this country:

This legislation will cause 24 million people to lose coverage, while drastically increasing healthcare costs on everyday families;

It eliminates Federal safeguards that prevent insurers from charging older Americans higher premiums;

It guts essential health benefits, like maternity care and prescription drugs;

Further, it removes crucial patient protections that prevent discrimination against people with preexisting conditions, leaving our most vulnerable populations with a false promise of sufficient coverage through these failed high-risk pools.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened that so many Republicans appear willing to place hollow partisan victories above the health of their constituents. I oppose the Republican AHCA in the strongest possible terms and urge all of my colleagues to put the health of Americans first.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago, our friends across the aisle put partisan interests above the health of the American people, and we are seeing the results of that today. In fact, a small-business owner from Missouri says:

I recall the days before the ACA when we would receive a 2-inch notebook that contained multiple quotes from different health insurance companies. Now our options are listed on a single legal-sized sheet of paper. We only received three quotes for 2017, and just two of them were adequate for our region. In 2013, our insurance cost \$180,000 for 92 lives with a \$2,000 deductible. In 2016, we paid \$252,000 for just 61 lives who face a \$5,000 deductible. Our options are dwindling, our costs are skyrocketing, and our employees are ultimately suffering because of the ACA.

Again, a defense of the defenseless or a positive solution for America; that is what we are offering.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, analysis of health insurance coverage for the past 30 years, analysis of data from the New England Journal of Medicine shows that, for every 455 people who are insured, one life will be saved. With the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, it is estimated that 43,956 people a year will die.

Long live the Republican Party.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, President Trump was elected by rural America. This bill betrays rural America three ways:

Health care, 24 million-plus are going to lose their health care, many of them in rural America;

Second, it takes healthcare dollars and it turns them into a \$7 million tax cut for the wealthiest 400 families in this country;

Third, the tenet of rural America is: we are in it together. That means if you are born with a preexisting condition, you have a preexisting condition, we are going to be there for you.

This bill turns its back on rural America, the people who stand up for one another and believe we are in it together, you are not on your own.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate it, but it is amazing the concern for rural health care now under ObamaCare when much of rural America has been down to one provider. That is not a choice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I am listening to this debate and I am hearing a lot of demagoguery and no solutions, no solutions for people who have seen skyrocketing premiums, no solutions for people who have lost their healthcare plans, no solutions for people who have lost their doctors, no solutions for people with preexisting conditions who are subject to the same skyrocketing premiums as everybody else, no solutions for people with preexisting conditions who don't even have an insurer in their exchanges.

I, too, have a preexisting condition. I am a cancer survivor. I am in the individual market. I am seeing the same skyrocketing premiums as everybody else. We are moving legislation today that will not only protect those with preexisting conditions, but will work to bring down premiums.

Importantly, those defending the Affordable Care Act had a goal: single-payer, socialized medicine, and this legislation will stop it.

Vote for this legislation, save our healthcare system, and have a much better result for the American people.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I inquire of the gentleman how many more speakers he has?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am still waiting on a couple more speakers, but I am ready to close whenever the gentleman is.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Well, I am not really prepared to close because my side has a ton more to say, but I am out of time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will tell Mr. MCGOVERN, it is his time to manage.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and given the fact there were no hearings or anything else, it would have been nice to have a little bit more time.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would change the rules of the House to prevent this bill or any other healthcare-related legislation from being considered if it does not have a CBO cost estimate or if it would deny health coverage or require higher premiums due to preexisting conditions; impose lifetime limits on health coverage; prevent individuals under age 26 from being covered under their parents' plan; reduce the number of people receiving health care under the Affordable Care Act; increase costs to seniors by reopening the doughnut hole and raising prescription drug costs; require people to pay for preventive services, including cancer screenings; reduce Medicare solvency or change the Medicare guarantee; or reduce Federal taxes on the 1 percent of the population with the highest incomes or increase taxes on the 80 percent of hardworking Americans earning moderate to low incomes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous materials, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, none of us on this side are claiming that the Affordable Care Act is perfect. In fact, for 7 years, we have been prepared to work with our Republican colleagues in a bipartisan way to make it even better, to cover more people, to find ways to lower costs; but for 7 years, my Republican colleagues had no interest in doing that. All they wanted to do was repeal the bill, repeal the bill, repeal the bill and offer no alternative.

Now we see their alternative, and it is an awful alternative. It is a disaster. It is an alternative that came not out of a deliberative process, but out of some back room somewhere. People haven't even read this bill. They don't even know what it does because we are not even waiting for a CBO score. This is a pathetic process that everybody should be ashamed of.

Let me just say, to claim or to imply that the Republican plan covers people with preexisting conditions, it is a lie. It is a lie. Let's be honest about it. This does not cover people with preexisting conditions. To come on the floor and say it does, to try to fool people, well, you may get away with it in the short term, you may get a headline, but I will tell you, people will figure out soon enough when they are denied healthcare coverage, when they see their costs rise and rise and rise.

To have a healthcare bill that throws 24 million Americans off of health insurance, you should be ashamed.

To have a healthcare bill that cuts Medicaid by \$880 billion to give a tax cut to the wealthiest people in this country, you should be ashamed.

I spent a good deal of my time reading letters from organizations like the National Farmers Union, the AARP, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, Paralyzed Veterans of America, March of Dimes, the American Medical Association, on and on and on, organizations that have dedicated their lives to helping people in this country that know something about this subject.

□ 1030

And when it comes down to who do I trust, them or you, on whether or not your bill covers people with preexisting conditions, there is no contest. I trust them. They see what you are trying to do. They understand that this bill is a fraud.

It is unconscionable to not only me and to people on our side, but to people who are watching this debate—Democrats, Republicans, and independents alike—that we would be spending time debating a healthcare bill that will make life worse for people in this country. Any kind of healthcare bill that came to this floor ought to be about expanding coverage and lowering cost. We want to work with you on that. Instead, you come to a bill that is going to rip health care away from tens of millions of people.

How can you do this? How can you do this to the American people? How can you do this to your constituents?

This is a terrible bill. You should vote "no" on it or, better yet, pull it.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What we have seen for the last few minutes, I would probably get up and cheer, too. Because now you look at it this way. What they want to claim as a disaster or recognize as a disaster, they didn't recognize 7 years ago. They chose to cram it down America's throat, and for 7 years the American people have said: No. Stop it. We don't want a healthcare system from government that takes freedom away from us and that removes it from us.

We have been presented with a list of letters from folks who are against this bill. Well, it is just a quick reminder to those, Mr. Speaker, who may be wanting to remember. Some of these same folks were the same folks who said ObamaCare was great, and who gave letters of support. I guess they are trying to cover up for 7 years of their first mistake.

When we understand this—let's go to some experts. I will just clarify them as experts, Mr. Speaker.

President Bill Clinton calling ObamaCare, last year, the craziest thing in the world. He summed it up pretty well. Because what summed up here is they forgot the American people.

Republicans have decided that we are going to put the American people back in control. We are not going to continue to hear from Pam in Nebraska, who is self-employed and lost her insurance four times under ObamaCare and twice because of the Nebraska failed startup.

If we are going to talk about misleading the American people, it started 7 years ago, and it ends today. It ends today. The American people deserve better. They have been thrown under the bus for 7 years. They deserve an insurance market that is open, that is accessible, and that does cover pre-existing conditions.

If you want the deception, follow the other side. If you want the truth, follow this side.

Mr. Speaker, if I had to defend the last 7 years and offer nothing into the faces of these, yeah, I would have been hysterical on the floor this morning, too. And that is exactly what we have seen.

So for those who may be, it is time to vote "yes" on the rule, "yes" on this bill, and start giving back to America the liberty and freedom for a healthcare system that is the best in the world and has been attacked for 7 years. Again, that ends today.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 308 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

RESTRICTIONS ON CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS RELATING TO
HEALTHCARE

13.(a) It shall not be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report which includes any provision described in paragraph (b)."

(b) A provision referred to in paragraph (a) is a provision which, if enacted into law, would result in any of the following:

(1) The denial of health insurance coverage to individuals on the basis that such individuals have a pre-existing condition or a requirement for individuals with a preexisting condition to pay more for premiums on the basis of such individuals having such a pre-existing condition.

(2) The elimination of the prohibition on life time limits on the dollar value of health insurance coverage benefits.

(3) The termination of the ability of individuals under 26 years of age to be included on their parent's employer or individual health coverage.

(4) The reduction in the number of people receiving health plan coverage pursuant to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PL 111-148) and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010 (PL 111-152).

(5) An increased cost to seniors for prescription drug coverage pursuant to any changes to provisions closing the Medicare prescription drug 'donuthole'.

(6) The requirement that individuals pay for preventive services, such as for mammography, health screening, and contraceptive services.

(7) The reduction of Medicare solvency or any changes to the Medicare guarantee.

(8) The reduction of Federal taxes on the 1 percent of the population with the highest income or increase the tax burden (expressed as a percent of aggregate Federal taxes) on the 80 percent of the population with the lowest income.

(c) It shall not be in order to consider a measure or matter proposing to repeal or amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PL 111-148) and the HealthCare and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010 (PL 111-152), or part thereof, in the House or in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union unless an easily searchable electronic estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office is made available on a publicly available website of the House.

(d) It shall not be in order to consider a measure or matter proposing to repeal or amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PL 111-148) and the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010 (PL 111-152), or part thereof, in the House or in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, that is called up pursuant to a rule or order that makes an amendment in order or considers such an amendment to be adopted, unless an easily searchable updated electronic estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office reflecting such amendment is made available on a publicly available website of the House.

(e) It shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a), paragraph (b), paragraph (c), or paragraph (d). As disposition of any point of order under paragraphs (c) through (e), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the order, conference report, or rule as applicable. The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on

the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX,

this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adopting the resolution, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 193, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 252]

YEAS—235

Abraham	Gohmert	Olson
Aderholt	Goodlatte	Palazzo
Allen	Gosar	Palmer
Amash	Gowdy	Paulsen
Amodei	Granger	Pearce
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Perry
Babin	Graves (LA)	Pittenger
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)
Banks (IN)	Griffith	Poliquin
Barletta	Grothman	Posey
Barr	Guthrie	Ratcliffe
Barton	Harper	Reed
Bergman	Harris	Reichert
Biggs	Hartzler	Renacci
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Roe (TN)
Black	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Blackburn	Hill	Rogers (KY)
Blum	Holding	Rohrabacher
Bost	Hollingsworth	Rokita
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Rooney, Francis
Brat	Huizenga	Rooney, Thomas J.
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Roskam
Brooks (IN)	Hurd	Ross
Buchanan	Issa	Rothfus
Buck	Jenkins (KS)	Rouzer
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Royce (CA)
Budd	Johnson (LA)	Russell
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Sanford
Calvert	Jordan	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Carter (TX)	Katko	Scott, Austin
Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Sensenbrenner
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Sessions
Cheney	King (IA)	Shimkus
Coffman	King (NY)	Shuster
Cole	Kinzing	Simpson
Collins (GA)	Knight	Smith (MO)
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NE)
Comer	Labrador	Smith (NJ)
Comstock	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Smucker
Cook	Lamborn	Stefanik
Costello (PA)	Lance	Stewart
Cramer	Latta	Stivers
Crawford	Lewis (MN)	Taylor
Culberson	LoBiondo	Tenney
Curbelo (FL)	Long	Thompson (PA)
Davidson	Loudermilk	Thornberry
Davis, Rodney	Love	Tiberi
Denham	Lucas	Tipton
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Trott
DeSantis	MacArthur	Turner
DesJarlais	Marchant	Upton
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Valadao
Donovan	Marshall	Wagner
Duffy	Massie	Walberg
Duncan (SC)	Mast	Walden
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy	Walker
Dunn	McCaul	Walorski
Emmer	McClintock	Walters, Mimi
Estes (KS)	McHenry	Weber (TX)
Farenthold	McKinley	Webster (FL)
Faso	McMorris	Wenstrup
Ferguson	Rodgers	Westerman
Fitzpatrick	McSally	Williams
Fleischmann	Meadows	Wilson (SC)
Flores	Meehan	Wittman
Fortenberry	Messer	Womack
Fox	Mitchell	Woodall
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Yoder
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Yoho
Gaetz	Mullin	Young (AK)
Gallagher	Murphy (PA)	Young (IA)
Garrett	Noem	Zeldin
Gibbs	Nunes	

NAYS—193

Adams	Gallego	Nolan
Aguilar	Garamendi	Norcross
Barragán	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Halleran
Bass	Gottheimer	O'Rourke
Beatty	Green, Al	Pallone
Bera	Green, Gene	Panetta
Beyer	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Payne
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Heck	Peters
Boyle, Brendan F.	Higgins (NY)	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Polis
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jayapal	Quigley
Capuano	Jeffries	Raskin
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Cardenas	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Jones	Rosen
Cartwright	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Rush
Ciilline	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kihuen	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clay	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kind	Schiff
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Schrader
Connolly	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Correa	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lee	Sherman
Crist	Levin	Sinema
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
Cummings	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Soto
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Speier
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Suozi
DeGette	Lowe	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	Lujan Grisham, M.	Takano
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Demings	Maloney,	Titus
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Tonko
Deutsch	Maloney, Sean	Torres
Dingell	Matsui	Tsongas
Doggett	McCollum	Vargas
Doyle, Michael F.	McEachin	Veasey
Ellison	McGovern	Vela
Eshoo	McNerney	Velázquez
Españat	Meeks	Visclosky
Esty (CT)	Meng	Walz
Evans	Moore	Wasserman
Foster	Moulton	Schultz
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Waters, Maxine
Fudge	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Gabbard	Napolitano	Welch
	Neal	Wilson (FL)
		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—2

Engel Newhouse

□ 1055

Messrs. LAWSON of Florida and FOSTER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. AMODEI and DIAZ-BALART changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 192, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 253]

AYES—235

Abraham	Gohmert	Olson
Aderholt	Goodlatte	Palazzo
Allen	Gosar	Palmer
Amash	Gowdy	Paulsen
Amodei	Granger	Pearce
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Perry
Babin	Graves (LA)	Pittenger
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)
Banks (IN)	Griffith	Poliquin
Barletta	Grothman	Posey
Barr	Guthrie	Ratcliffe
Barton	Harper	Reed
Bergman	Harris	Reichert
Biggs	Hartzler	Renacci
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Roe (TN)
Black	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Blackburn	Hill	Rogers (KY)
Blum	Holding	Rohrabacher
Bost	Hollingsworth	Rokita
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Rooney, Francis
Brat	Huizenga	Rooney, Thomas J.
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Roskam
Brooks (IN)	Hurd	Ross
Buchanan	Issa	Rothfus
Buck	Jenkins (KS)	Rouzer
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Royce (CA)
Budd	Johnson (LA)	Russell
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Sanford
Calvert	Jordan	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Carter (TX)	Katko	Scott, Austin
Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Sensenbrenner
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Sessions
Cheney	King (IA)	Shimkus
Coffman	King (NY)	Shuster
Cole	Kinzing	Simpson
Collins (GA)	Knight	Smith (MO)
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NE)
Comer	Labrador	Smith (NJ)
Comstock	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Smucker
Cook	Lamborn	Stefanik
Costello (PA)	Lance	Stewart
Cramer	Latta	Stivers
Crawford	Lewis (MN)	Taylor
Culberson	LoBiondo	Tenney
Curbelo (FL)	Long	Thompson (PA)
Davidson	Loudermilk	Thornberry
Davis, Rodney	Love	Tiberi
Denham	Lucas	Tipton
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Trott
DeSantis	MacArthur	Turner
DesJarlais	Marchant	Upton
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Valadao
Donovan	Marshall	Wagner
Duffy	Massie	Walberg
Duncan (SC)	Mast	Walden
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy	Walker
Dunn	McCaul	Walorski
Emmer	McClintock	Walters, Mimi
Estes (KS)	McHenry	Weber (TX)
Farenthold	McKinley	Webster (FL)
Faso	McMorris	Wenstrup
Ferguson	Rodgers	Westerman
Fitzpatrick	McSally	Williams
Fleischmann	Meadows	Wilson (SC)
Flores	Meehan	Wittman
Fortenberry	Messer	Womack
Fox	Mitchell	Woodall
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Yoder
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Yoho
Gaetz	Mullin	Young (AK)
Gallagher	Murphy (PA)	Young (IA)
Garrett	Noem	Zeldin
Gibbs	Nunes	

NOES—192

Adams	Bera	Bonamici
Aguilar	Beyer	Boyle, Brendan F.
Barragán	Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)
Bass	Blumenauer	Brown (MD)
Beatty	Blunt Rochester	

Brownley (CA)	Heck	Panetta	[Roll No. 254]	Cohen	Johnson (OH)	Peterson
Bustos	Higgins (NY)	Pascarell		Collins (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Pittenger
Butterfield	Himes	Payne	YEAS—233	Connolly	Jones	Poe (TX)
Capuano	Hoyer	Perlmutter		Conyers	Jordan	Poliquin
Carbajal	Huffman	Peters		Correa	Keating	Price (NC)
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Peterson		Costa	Kelly (IL)	Raskin
Carson (IN)	Jayapal	Pingree		Costello (PA)	Kennedy	Ratcliffe
Cartwright	Jeffries	Pocan		Crist	Khanna	Reed
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Polis		Crowley	Kihuen	Reichert
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)		Cuellar	Kilmer	Renacci
Chu, Judy	Jones	Quigley		Davis, Rodney	Kind	Rice (NY)
Cicilline	Kaptur	Raskin		DeFazio	Kinzing	Richmond
Clark (MA)	Keating	Rice (NY)		DeGette	Knight	Rogers (AL)
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Richmond		Delaney	Krishnamoorthi	Rohrabacher
Clay	Kennedy	Rosen		Denham	LaHood	Rokita
Cleaver	Khanna	Roybal-Allard		DeSantis	Lance	Rouzer
Clyburn	Kihuen	Ruiz		DeSaulnier	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Kildee	Ruppersberger		Diaz-Balart	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Connolly	Kilmer	Rush		Doyle, Michael	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Conyers	Kind	Ryan (OH)		F.	Lawrence	Sanford
Cooper	Krishnamoorthi	Sánchez		Emmer	Lawson (FL)	Sarbanes
Correa	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes		Espallat	Lee	Schakowsky
Costa	Langevin	Schakowsky		Faso	Levin	Schiff
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Schiff		Fitzpatrick	Lewis (GA)	Schrader
Crist	Larson (CT)	Schneider		Flores	Lieu, Ted	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Lawrence	Schrader		Foxx	LoBiondo	Sires
Cuellar	Lawson (FL)	Scott (VA)		Frankel (FL)	Loeb	Slaughter
Cummings	Lee	Scott, David		Franks (AZ)	Lofgren	Soto
Davis (CA)	Levin	Serrano		Fudge	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lewis (GA)	Sewell (AL)		Gaetz	Lujan, Ben Ray	Tenney
DeFazio	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter		Gallagher	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Lipinski	Sherman		Gallego	MacArthur	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Loeb	Sinema		Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (PA)
DeLauro	Lofgren	Sires		Graves (GA)	Marshall	Tipton
DelBene	Lowenthal	Slaughter		Graves (LA)	Mast	Torres
Demings	Lowe	Smith (WA)		Green, Al	Matsui	Trott
DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham,	Soto		Green, Gene	McEachin	Valadao
Deutch	M.	Speier		Grijalva	McGovern	Vargas
Dingell	Luján, Ben Ray	Suozi		Gutiérrez	McKinley	Veasey
Doggett	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)		Hanabusa	Moore	Vela
Doyle, Michael	Maloney,	Takano		Higgins (NY)	Moulton	Visclosky
F.	Carolyn B.	Thompson (CA)		Hill	Murphy (FL)	Waters, Maxine
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)		Holding	Napoli	Watson Coleman
Eshoo	Matsui	Titus		Hoyer	Neal	Welch
Espallat	McCollum	Tonko		Hudson	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Esty (CT)	McEachin	Torres		Huizenga	O'Halleran	Woodall
Evans	McGovern	Tsongas		Issa	Pallone	Yoder
Foster	McNerney	Vargas		Jackson Lee	Panetta	Young (AK)
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Veasey		Jayapal	Pascarell	
Fudge	Meng	Vela		Jeffries	Paulsen	
Gabbard	Moore	Velázquez		Jenkins (KS)	Payne	
Gallego	Moulton	Visclosky		Jenkins (WV)	Perry	
Garamendi	Murphy (FL)	Walz		Johnson (GA)	Peters	
Gonzalez (TX)	Nadler	Wasserman				
Gottheimer	Napolitano	Schultz				
Green, Al	Neal	Waters, Maxine				
Green, Gene	Nolan	Watson Coleman				
Grijalva	Norcross	Welch				
Gutiérrez	O'Halleran	Wilson (FL)				
Hanabusa	O'Rourke	Yarmuth				
Hastings	Pallone					

NOT VOTING—3

Engel Newhouse Pelosi

□ 1103

Mr. SUOZZI changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 186, answered “present” 2, not voting 9, as follows:

Abraham	Garrett	Palazzo
Allen	Gibbs	Palmer
Amodei	Goodlatte	Pearce
Arrington	Gosar	Perlmutter
Babin	Gottheimer	Pingree
Bacon	Gowdy	Pocan
Banks (IN)	Granger	Polis
Barletta	Graves (MO)	Posey
Barr	Griffith	Quigley
Barton	Grothman	Roby
Biggs	Guthrie	Roe (TN)
Bilirakis	Harper	Rogers (KY)
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Rooney, Francis
Black	Hartzler	Rooney, Thomas
Blackburn	Hastings	J.
Blumenauer	Heck	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonamici	Hensarling	Rosen
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Roskam
Brat	Hice, Jody B.	Ross
Bridenstine	Higgins (LA)	Rothfus
Brooks (AL)	Himes	Royce (CA)
Brooks (IN)	Hollingsworth	Ruiz
Brown (MD)	Huffman	Ruppersberger
Buchanan	Hultgren	Russell
Buck	Hunter	Rutherford
Bucshon	Hurd	Scalise
Budd	Johnson (LA)	Schneider
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Schweikert
Bustos	Joyce (OH)	Scott (VA)
Byrne	Kaptur	Scott, Austin
Calvert	Katko	Scott, David
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Sensenbrenner
Cartwright	Kelly (PA)	Serrano
Castro (TX)	Kildee	Sessions
Chabot	King (IA)	Shea-Porter
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Sherman
Cheney	Kuster (NH)	Shimkus
Chu, Judy	Kustoff (TN)	Shuster
Clay	Labrador	Simpson
Cole	LaMalfa	Sinema
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Comer	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Comstock	Lewis (MN)	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Lipinski	Smith (TX)
Cook	Long	Smith (WA)
Cooper	Loudermilk	Smucker
Courtney	Love	Speier
Cramer	Lowenthal	Stefanik
Crawford	Lucas	Stewart
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Cummings	Lujan Grisham,	Suozi
Curbelo (FL)	M.	Takano
Davidson	Maloney,	Taylor
Davis (CA)	Carolyn B.	Thornberry
Davis, Danny	Marchant	Tiberi
DelBene	Marino	Titus
Demings	Massie	Velázquez
Dent	McCarthy	Wagner
DesJarlais	McCaul	Walberg
Deutch	McClintock	Walden
Dingell	McCollum	Walker
Doggett	McHenry	Walorski
Donovan	McMorris	Walters, Mimi
Duffy	Rodgers	Walz
Duncan (SC)	McNerney	Wasserman
Duncan (TN)	McSally	Schultz
Dunn	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Ellison	Meeks	Wenstrup
Eshoo	Meng	Westerman
Estes (KS)	Messer	Williams
Esty (CT)	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Evans	Moolenaar	Wittman
Farenthold	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Ferguson	Mullin	Yarmuth
Fleischmann	Murphy (PA)	Yoho
Fortenberry	Nadler	Young (IA)
Foster	Noem	Zeldin
Frelinghuysen	Nunes	
Gabbard	O'Rourke	
Garamendi	Olson	

NAYS—186

Adams	Bishop (MI)
Aguilar	Blum
Amash	Blunt Rochester
Barragán	Bost
Bass	Boyle, Brendan
Beatty	F.
Bera	Brady (PA)
Bergman	Brownley (CA)
Beyer	Capuano
Bishop (GA)	Carbajal

Cohen	Johnson (OH)	Peterson
Collins (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Pittenger
Connolly	Jones	Poe (TX)
Conyers	Jordan	Poliquin
Correa	Keating	Price (NC)
Costa	Kelly (IL)	Raskin
Costello (PA)	Kennedy	Ratcliffe
Crist	Khanna	Reed
Crowley	Kihuen	Reichert
Cuellar	Kilmer	Renacci
Davis, Rodney	Kind	Rice (NY)
DeFazio	Kinzing	Richmond
DeGette	Knight	Rogers (AL)
Delaney	Krishnamoorthi	Rohrabacher
Denham	LaHood	Rokita
DeSantis	Lance	Rouzer
DeSaulnier	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Diaz-Balart	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Doyle, Michael	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
F.	Lawrence	Sanford
Emmer	Lawson (FL)	Sarbanes
Espallat	Lee	Schakowsky
Faso	Levin	Schiff
Fitzpatrick	Lewis (GA)	Schrader
Flores	Lieu, Ted	Sewell (AL)
Foxx	LoBiondo	Sires
Frankel (FL)	Loeb	Slaughter
Franks (AZ)	Lofgren	Soto
Fudge	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
Gaetz	Lujan, Ben Ray	Tenney
Gallagher	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Gallego	MacArthur	Thompson (MS)
Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (PA)
Graves (GA)	Marshall	Tipton
Graves (LA)	Mast	Torres
Green, Al	Matsui	Trott
Green, Gene	McEachin	Valadao
Grijalva	McGovern	Vargas
Gutiérrez	McKinley	Veasey
Hanabusa	Moore	Vela
Higgins (NY)	Moulton	Visclosky
Hill	Murphy (FL)	Waters, Maxine
Holding	Napoli	Watson Coleman
Hoyer	Neal	Welch
Hudson	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Huizenga	O'Halleran	Woodall
Issa	Pallone	Yoder
Jackson Lee	Panetta	Young (AK)
Jayapal	Pascarell	
Jeffries	Paulsen	
Jenkins (KS)	Payne	
Jenkins (WV)	Perry	
Johnson (GA)	Peters	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Rice (SC) Tonko

NOT VOTING—9

Aderholt Engel Newhouse
Butterfield Gohmert Nolan
DeLauro Meehan Pelosi

□ 1110

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 254.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by States for non-governmental employees.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT
AMENDMENT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 308, I call up

the bill (H.R. 2192) to amend the Public Health Service Act to eliminate the non-application of certain State waiver provisions to Members of Congress and congressional staff, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 308, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2192

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

SECTION 1. ELIMINATION OF NON-APPLICATION OF CERTAIN STATE WAIVER PROVISIONS TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND CONGRESSIONAL STAFF.

If the American Health Care Act is enacted, effective as if included in the enactment of such Act, section 2701(b)(5)(A)(ii) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg(b)(5)(A)(ii)), as added by subsection (a) of section 136 of the American Health Care Act (relating to permitting States to waive certain ACA requirements to encourage fair health insurance premiums), is amended by striking “1312(d)(3)(D),”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 308, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2192.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, after 7 years, we have heard the stories from our constituents, from our patients, from our friends, from our families who have suffered under the Affordable Care Act. Today, we will have a chance to vote on a plan that will rescue and revitalize the market and lower costs and increase flexibility for patients to choose and keep a health insurance plan that works for them and their family. However, before we can do that, we have to pass a bill that will ensure that Members of Congress and their staffs are treated the same way as the rest of America.

So let's be clear. We firmly believe that Members of Congress should live by the same rules as everyone else, period. The bill we are considering now will make a simple technical correction to ensure that the American Health Care Act and its amendments apply equally to everyone when signed into law.

Over the last several months, we have worked thoughtfully and thoroughly with our colleagues in the Sen-

ate to achieve our shared goal of repealing and replacing ObamaCare. Throughout these discussions, we have come to better appreciate and better understand the other Chamber's reconciliation limitations. As a result, we have drafted the American Health Care Act with constant awareness of what the slightest misstep may mean for the legislation's privileged status or that 51-vote threshold in the other body.

Some might say it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than to draft House policy to Senate procedure, but we are confident that we have achieved that challenging feat.

One of the limitations we have come to respect is that no committee other than the Senate Committee on Finance or the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions can receive a jurisdictional referral. For example, if we were to cross-reference multi-State plans established by the Affordable Care Act, we would get a referral to the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee because those plans are under the Office of Personnel Management.

□ 1115

So let's be clear, congressional healthcare operates as a small group plan within the District of Columbia's SHOP Exchange. This was a decision that was made by the Obama administration.

So for waivers impacting the essential health benefits of age rating, which impacts both the individual and small group markets, Members of Congress and our staffs would be treated the same. As far as community rating, this impacts only the individual market, so no group plans, including Members of Congress or our staffs, would be impacted.

Even so, in an attempt to be crystal clear, today we are passing a bill, out of fairness and transparency, to ensure that Congress operates under the same laws as private citizens, a principle that both Republicans and Democrats should support.

My thanks to Representative MCSALLY for her leadership on this issue. Her bill helps deliver us a step closer to fulfilling our promise. Today we will fulfill our promise to provide relief from the higher costs and the dwindling choices for patients under the Affordable Care Act. Today we will repeal and replace ObamaCare with a better solution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I remind my colleague from Texas that his vote for the healthcare bill will take away protections for 4,536,000 people with preexisting conditions in Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I heard my colleague from Texas talk about repeal and replace. This is the myth, the hoax, that

the Republicans and the President are trying to play on the American people. I assure you this is repeal. There is no replacement.

The people are going to lose their insurance. They are going to pay more. They are going to have lousy insurance because they are not going to have any kind of protections.

We passed the Affordable Care Act because the States were not doing the right thing. People couldn't afford insurance. They couldn't pay for a premium. They were too high.

So what did we do? We expanded Medicaid, and we provided generous subsidies for those people who needed it.

We also knew, under the old system where the States were in charge, that people got lousy insurance if they could even find it. Sometimes they didn't have hospitalization, so we insisted there had to be a package that included preexisting conditions.

We also said that, you know, if you were paying a lot for your copays or your deductibles, we are going to put limits on those things as well. And we put limits also on how much you can charge, what we call “community rating.”

Now, what are the Republicans doing here today? They are getting rid of all that. They want to go back to the old days. And when they tell you that somehow they are going to be able to do this, the reason they can't do anything is because they repeal most of the pay-fors that pay for the subsidies that pay for the Affordable Care Act.

So when they tell you: Oh, we are going to give extra money for this, for high-risk pools or to help the States if they decide to have waivers, the bottom line is there is no money left here. There is no money to pay for those subsidies; there is no money to pay for Medicaid expansion; there is not enough money to pay for high-risk pools because they have repealed the underlying pay-fors that we use to pay for the Affordable Care Act.

What they are doing now is going back to the old system, the Wild West of the States. They are allowing States to waive the essential benefits package. They are saying to States that they can charge whatever they want for the insurance because they got rid of community ratings.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself another 15 seconds to say this: Do not buy into this hoax. There is no money left. They want to go back to the old system, and the old system stunk. What we did was correct the problems of the old system. So don't believe this cruel hoax.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), the author of the bill.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 2192, a measure that eliminates double standards by preventing Members of Congress from being exempt from the State waiver provisions of the American Health Care Act, as amended.

Due to very arcane Senate procedural rules within the budget reconciliation process, the MacArthur amendment to the American Health Care Act does not and cannot apply to Members of Congress. To address this, I have introduced this simple, standalone, two-page bill that would appeal the exemption for Members of Congress should the American Health Care Act become law.

In the military, the same code of conduct and standards apply to the entire chain of command. Now, in my role as a lawmaker, I believe that any law we pass that applies to our constituents must also apply equally to Members of Congress. Individuals who are stewards of the public trust must abide by the rules that they make. My bill, H.R. 2192, will ensure that Congress abides by the laws they pass and is treated no differently than other hardworking Americans.

Regardless of your vote on the AHCA, this is a bill that each and every single Member of Congress should support.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague from Arizona that her vote for this bill could increase premiums for people with breast cancer in Arizona by \$42,250.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I think that today is yet another sad day here in the House of Representatives for the people of our country, because what is being brought forward is the same bill that we debated and that went down because of the weight of the problems and the cruelty of that bill. It is the same thing with a few more poison pills in it.

People are going to have to pay higher premiums and deductibles, and it is going to increase what comes out of their pocket; there is going to be less coverage; 24 million people will lose their coverage—that remains in this bill—and key protections are gutted, American people: emergency rooms, maternity care, opioid, mental health care, a string of things that you want in your insurance coverage, a crushing age tax for seniors.

Now, there is a real hypocrisy here. Every single Member of Congress has been enrolled in the Affordable Care Act. I want to know which one of you dropped out of it. It was good enough for you—one person, great. Two people, big deal. It was good enough for you, but it is not good enough for your constituents.

And you know what? Who is standing with you? Not the doctors in our country, not the AARP to seniors, not

nurses, not the cancer association, not anyone. This bill violates the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the vice chairman of the Health Subcommittee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the American Health Care Act.

A constituent of mine from Kentucky personally reached out to share her story. Under ObamaCare, the cost of her family's monthly premium rose to over \$1,000 with a deductible of over \$12,000, in total, almost half her income. When she fell and broke three ribs, she couldn't afford to go to the emergency room because of the astronomical deductible. She suffered for weeks until as she could afford care; and as she said in her own words: "I paid 50 percent of my income for something I am forced to buy and cannot use."

In Kentucky, there are many counties with just one health insurer on the exchange. That is not right. Affordable health care means having real access to health care when you need it. ObamaCare reduces access. It is not there, when they need it, for many Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support the American Health Care Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague from Kentucky that his vote for the healthcare bill will take away protections for 881,000 people with preexisting conditions in Kentucky.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is appalling what is happening today on the House floor. It appears to be: let's just pass a bill, no matter what it does or who gets hurt with it.

TrumpCare is nothing more than broken promises and mean-spirited policy. It would mean higher healthcare costs for more than 24 million hardworking Americans losing their health coverage, key protections are gutted, older Americans are hung out to dry, the end of Medicaid as we know it, and cuts in Medicare.

If TrumpCare passes, Americans with preexisting conditions could be pushed off their insurance and sent in the high-risk pools that are not affordable. High-risk insurance pools do not work when everyone in the pool is a high risk. I was a State legislator when we did that. You have to have high-risk pools that share the wealth, so to speak.

People will be left with soaring costs, worse coverage, and rationed care. It is

a frightening future where millions of Americans who need affordable, dependable health care are left out in the cold.

There is an obvious, irresponsible reason why this vote is being rammed through without even a Congressional Budget Office estimate or an opportunity for Members to even know what is in it. They don't want people figuring out the real-world consequences and the devastation it means to our American families. History will not be kind to the people who support this awful bill.

I urge my colleagues to do what is right and vote "no."

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate never quits. When ObamaCare was passed in 2010, the Senate Democrats refused to use ObamaCare for their personal insurance. Most Americans know that what is good for the goose is good for the gander. My staff, my family, and I have been on ObamaCare since day one.

Incredibly, the Senate is at it again. They don't want the American Health Care Act to apply to them because it is not right. They are special, and so they put a clause to exempt Congress from the American Health Care Act so they could filibuster the healthcare bill. That dog didn't hunt in 2010; it ain't hunting in 2017. If it is good for the American people, our bosses, it is good for their servants, Congress, us.

I urge my colleagues to be true public servants. Vote for H.R. 2192.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague from Texas that his vote for this bill could increase premiums for people with diabetes in Texas by \$5,100.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, the American Health Care Act was pulled from the House floor in March because the American people realized it was a deeply flawed bill. That bill would have ripped healthcare coverage away from 24 million of our constituents.

For those lucky enough to maintain coverage, the bill would have massively raised premiums, deductibles, and out-of-pocket costs. The crushing age tax in this bill would force older adults to pay astronomically high premiums.

So what did the majority do in the last 6 weeks? They made the bill worse.

The MacArthur amendment lets States opt out of the essential benefits of the ACA. Not only would this jeopardize insurance availability for the one-third of Americans who have preexisting conditions, it would let insurance companies deny coverage altogether for maternity, for emergency room, for mental health, and for other essential benefits. And because the

MacArthur amendment eliminates community ratings, everybody's insurance costs would skyrocket.

I am going to tell you something. My Republican colleagues are going to be really, really sorry that they rushed this bill to the floor before they got an amended CBO score. The reason is, when we do get this—and make no mistake, we will get this—they are going to find out that many more millions of people besides the 24 million people, originally, who are going to lose their insurance are going to be shocked to wake up to find out, if this TrumpCare bill passes, many millions more will lose their coverage.

I urge a “no” vote on this poorly conceived legislation.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a valuable member of the Health Subcommittee on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2192 to ensure Members of Congress and staff are not exempt from the American Health Care Act. Making good on our word, this legislation will be passed alongside the American Health Care Act and fixes a technical error made to comply with the Senate rules.

In our country, lawmakers are not above the law. Elected officials and the people we represent should have the same health care, period.

As an original cosponsor of H.R. 2192, I believe this is common sense. It is straightforward legislation, and it is necessary as a companion bill to the American Health Care Act.

□ 1130

It is really quite simple: Congress should live by the same laws it creates.

When the American Health Care Act becomes law, Members of Congress and staff will have the same health care as the American people. I urge passage of H.R. 2192, in conjunction with the American Health Care Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague from Florida that his vote for the healthcare bill will take away protections for 3,116,000 people with preexisting conditions in Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE).

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for the past 7 years we have had 62 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act, but Republicans have never once put a plan on the floor for the American people. Well, today, we all get a chance to go on record of where we stand on this bill, this shameful, cruel bill.

Here are the facts: 24 million Americans are going to lose their insurance if this bill becomes law. Over \$839 billion gets cut out of the Medicaid program. The essential benefit package in

States, wiped out. In my State, it is taking care of people with mental illness and opioid addiction; gone. This takes \$117 billion out of the Medicare trust fund.

This is a healthcare bill—this is really a tax bill masquerading as a healthcare bill. The plan here is to take this money out of the healthcare system and use it for tax cuts. That is what this bill is going to do.

This creates a survival-of-the-fittest health care for America. If you are young, if you are healthy, if you are wealthy, this bill is for you; you are going to do okay. But if you are old, if you are sick, if you are poor, there is no coverage in this bill for you.

If you have a young child with cancer, guess what, those benefits aren't going to be paid. You are going to run out of benefits.

These high-risk pools are a sham. They are not adequately funded. This bill must be defeated. The American people will remember who votes for this bill today.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to now speak to the underlying MacArthur amendment that the McSally bill is here to modify. The MacArthur amendment specifically would allow States to waive three of ObamaCare's costliest mandates. Let me stress that again. It would allow States—not require States; it would allow States to waive three of ObamaCare's costliest mandates, essential health benefits, age ratings, and community rating.

In waiving these Federal mandates, health insurers would not be allowed to discriminate by gender or preexisting condition, and no one would be denied coverage, period.

Here is how it works: a State may apply to waive essential health benefits or to increase the age rating ratio from the bill's underlying 5-to-1 ratio. They may also change the way individuals who have not maintained continuous coverage are charged for their healthcare plan, but only if the State has a risk-sharing program in place, like the Federal Invisible Risk Sharing Program established by the Palmer-Schweikert amendment.

In order to receive a waiver, a State must explain to the Secretary of Health and Human Services how the program will reduce average premiums for patients, increase enrollment for residents, stabilize the State's health insurance market, stabilize premiums for individuals living with preexisting conditions, or increase the patient's healthcare options.

It is important to note that in providing assistance to reduce premiums or other out-of-pocket costs, for individuals who may be subject to an increase in their monthly premiums because they reside in a State with an approved waiver, have a preexisting con-

dition, are uninsured because they have not maintained continuous coverage and they purchase health insurance on the individual market, there will be \$138 billion to assist with premium assistance.

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

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, understand this: the Republicans planned to exempt Members of Congress from the provisions of TrumpCare until they got caught.

So here are five numbers that show just how deadly and dangerous the Republican bill is:

Twenty-four million is the number of children, adults, and veterans whose health insurance will be ripped away.

\$880 billion is the size of the cut to Medicaid, threatening health care and long-term care for 74 million people: children, pregnant women, the elderly, and the disabled.

\$600 billion is the tax cut that goes to millionaires and billionaires and corporations.

758 percent is the premium increase a 64-year-old making \$26,000 a year will pay because of the Republican age tax.

Seventeen percent is the percent of Americans who supported TrumpCare before they made it worse.

The Republicans' attempt to improve TrumpCare is like trying to douse a dumpster fire with gasoline. This bill is a disaster, and anyone who votes for it does so at their extreme peril. The American people are watching, and they will not forget.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that within the State of Illinois, there were eight plans in 2015. There are five plans in 2017 with a 57 percent increase in premiums.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving me time to speak up.

I, too, agree that Members of Congress should be subject to the same rules and laws that the American people are. So I support my colleague, Ms. MCSALLY, in this legislation.

But, you know, I want to speak to the bigger, broader issue here. My colleague from Pennsylvania said: What about that family with that kid that has cancer?

Where was my colleague and the friends on the other side of the aisle when ObamaCare resulted in millions of policy cancellations and millions of Americans losing their coverage because of the broken promises?

Where was my colleague and the Democrats when millions of Americans were forced out of work because of the job-killing policies of ObamaCare?

Let me tell you something. The American people remembered that, and that is what happened in 2010.

We didn't hide in a back room to get what we are doing today done. We have been working on it for 6 years, and we are going to get it done today. We are going to meet the promises that we made to the American people, and starting today, ObamaCare is on its way out the door.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague from Ohio that his vote for this bill will take away protections for 1,919,000 people in Ohio with preexisting conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. So you have been working on it for 6 years. My information is that you posted this bill at 8 last night. The Congressional Budget Office has not given it a score. They have not told the American people how much it is going to cost or how many people it is going to affect.

You have skyrocketed premiums for hardworking Americans who have preexisting conditions, and that is what my colleagues need to understand.

If you are an average 40-year-old adult with a preexisting condition and have diabetes, it is estimated your premiums will rise \$400 a month. If you have rheumatoid arthritis, \$800 a month. And heaven forbid if you have some preexisting condition involving cancer; the numbers just go off of the chart.

You know and I know this bill will not see the light of day in the Senate. This is a political stunt to save face with your rightwing base. You know it and we know it.

If this wasn't so serious, affecting the economy and the affordability of insurance, I would say just go on and do it, because you will lose your opportunity to serve in this House and you will ultimately lose the majority.

Don't do it. Forget about politics. Think about the 24 million Americans who will not be able to afford health insurance coverage.

That is why the American Medical Association, AARP, American Nurses Association, and all of the other stakeholder groups have pleaded with you. They have called your office. They have written you letters. They have written us letters.

Don't do it. I ask you to vote "no" on this ill-conceived legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman and all Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, directed to the Chair, I would just make note of the fact in North Carolina, there were three plans offered in 2015, down to two plans in 2017, premium increase of 82 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from

Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), another member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, regardless of the myths being spun by the other side of the aisle that refused to read 129 pages of a bill, the Affordable Care Act is anything but affordable.

My constituents have been asking for relief from this collapsing law for years. They can no longer afford to pay more for less; and refusing to act is not an option.

Under ObamaCare, out-of-pocket expenses have skyrocketed not just for people on exchanges, but for all patients. Premium increases are nearly four times larger than previously projected.

Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, seem content with the current flawed system which puts the government in charge of people's health and promises coverage that is going away.

Let's vote to increase choice, lower costs, enhance protections, truly cover preexisting conditions, and get Washington out of the way so that patients and their doctors are once again at the center of healthcare decisions.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague from Michigan that his vote for this bill could increase premiums for those who are pregnant in Michigan by \$13,790 per year.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are turning their backs on the American people today. There are no guarantees with this bill. This bill will raise costs for families, penalize people nearing retirement with an age tax, and rip coverage away from millions of Americans.

And if that wasn't bad enough, this revised TrumpCare bill guts protections for people with preexisting conditions; people like Cameron, who was diagnosed with cancer at 24 years old. Because of the Affordable Care Act, he was able to access coverage and attend graduate school. Now, of course, he has a preexisting condition.

This is personal for Cameron and millions more in this country, and they are not going to be silent as Republicans rush this legislation through.

Mr. Speaker, lives are on the line. I urge my Republican colleagues to have the courage to vote "no" on this legislation.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), another valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and a member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the American Health Care Act.

For the last 7 years, I have watched ObamaCare crush the healthcare sys-

tem that I worked in for more than 30 years. Thanks to ObamaCare, we have an insurance exchange that has withered to where a third of the counties in our country have only one insurer. At home in Georgia, 96 counties have only one choice on the exchange. That is not a choice.

ObamaCare has failed, and the American Health Care Act is critical to resuscitate our healthcare system and move it in a direction where patients, families, and doctors are making decisions, not the Federal Government and bureaucrats sitting behind a desk in Washington.

The American people need and deserve better, and that is why we must pass the American Health Care Act. This legislation guts ObamaCare and rebuilds a system that would deliver the choice and control that patients need and deserve all while ensuring that health insurers will not be allowed to discriminate by gender or preexisting conditions, and no one will be denied coverage, period.

□ 1145

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague from Georgia that his vote for the healthcare bill will take away protections for 1,791,000 people with preexisting conditions in Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), who is the vice ranking member our committee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this bill will be devastating to families all across America. The Republican bill rips coverage away from millions of Americans. The last projection was 24 million. They didn't wait for the new projection, which is going to be much higher.

The Republican bill hurts Medicare, and it shortens the life of the Medicare trust fund just when we have more baby boomers retiring and calling on Medicare. It imposes a huge age tax because it makes affordable insurance much less affordable if you are about age 50 or older.

A dirty little secret here that most people have not discussed is the harm it does to the Medicaid guarantee. For over 50 years in America, we have said that if you are disabled, if you have a family member with Alzheimer's, or if you have a child with a complex medical condition, you are not going to be destitute because your health care is so expensive. That is one of the fundamental guarantees of Medicaid for 50 years. They take that away and go to the heart of the medical care that is provided under Medicaid as well. It is shameful.

But it got worse. As we approach this day, they didn't have the votes, so they made it worse by going to the heart of the Affordable Care Act which ended discrimination against our neighbors with a preexisting condition.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. They also said essential health benefits are not going to matter. What good is an insurance policy if you buy it and you can't go to the emergency room? We have got to vote "no" on this bill.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. We have got to fight back against this crass power play that transfers all the wealth in this country. Vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is no longer under recognition.

The Chair would ask Members to respect the gavel and the time yielded.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that, in the State of Florida, there were 10 insurance plans available in the individual market in 2015, down to 5 plans in 2017, with a 24 percent premium increase.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS), who is a very valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, for the past 7 years, the American people have pleaded with their Representatives in Washington to repeal ObamaCare. Today, every Member of this body has the opportunity to do just that. We have the chance to eliminate excruciating mandates and taxes that are suffocating our economy and marketplaces.

Under ObamaCare, premiums have increased by over 37 percent since 2014, one-third of counties in this country have only one insurance provider, and 4.7 million Americans were kicked off the insurance coverage they wanted to maintain despite President Obama's promise that, if you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it.

But today we have the chance to lower premiums, increase competition among insurance providers, and improve access to health insurance for all Americans. We finally have the chance to formally reject an unprecedented government overreach into health care and take the first step towards giving patients control over their own health.

In western New York, this bill will have even more profound benefits. The amendment that I authored with Representative JOHN FASO will relieve county governments in New York of a \$2.3 billion unfunded mandate forced onto county taxpayers by the Governor of New York and will substantially reduce the tax burdens of property owners across New York State. This one provision of the American Health Care Act will save taxpayers in the eight counties that I represent over \$470 million a year.

This is a game-changer for local New York governments and restores a fundamental tenet of representative democracies that the level of government

that makes the decision about spending should be responsible for raising those funds. I am proud to stand up for western New Yorkers whose voices have been silenced for too long, and I am proud to vote for the freedom, fiscal responsibility, and local decision-making this bill guarantees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague from New York that his vote for this bill will take away protections for 3,031,000 people in New York with preexisting conditions.

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

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the American Health Care Act. This dangerous and destructive bill leaves 24 million Americans without coverage. It will cause the uninsured rate for my district in Brooklyn, New York, to skyrocket to over 12 percent and leaves over 400,000 Brooklynites in my district without coverage.

Because of the severe cuts to Medicaid, this bill will also put people in the terrible position of having to choose between being able to eat, being able to obtain life-sustaining medication, or visiting their doctor.

Which one do you, Mr. Speaker, suggest they choose?

For most Americans, Medicaid benefits are not the end goal but, rather, provide temporary support. For seniors, Medicaid can mean the difference between nursing home care and dying alone.

I urge my colleagues to consider the harmful and deadly real-life impact of this legislation, and I vehemently oppose it. I ask that we resist this cynical reverse Robin Hood sham that takes from the poor and gives to the rich.

As President Lincoln said: "You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time." This is a sham, and we need to vote it down.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN), who is a very valuable Member of Congress and a fellow physician.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, once again, in support of the American Health Care Act. I do this as a doctor for the good of my patients. We are here today to repeal ObamaCare, to take healthcare decisions away from Washington bureaucrats and give them back to the people.

The American Health Care Act will create a patient-centered system that will lower the cost of health care and serve patients. This act eliminates ObamaCare's taxes, subsidies, and mandates. It defunds Planned Parenthood. It puts Medicaid on a budget, and it is

the largest entitlement reform in a generation.

Without Washington mandates driving up costs and limiting access to care, Americans will have the freedom to obtain quality healthcare plans that fit their needs at a cost they can afford.

All this talk about preexisting conditions, this bill provides guaranteed issuance.

Let's not break our promise on repealing ObamaCare. Let's be true to our word. We owe it to the people who sent us here.

I support the American Health Care Act, Mr. Speaker, and I urge all Members to do the same.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague from Florida that his vote for this bill could increase premiums for people with asthma in Florida by \$4,090 per year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, what this legislation does on the surface is very clear: it makes health care more expensive. The more you need it—the sicker or older or poorer you are—the further out of reach it will be. That is why doctors, hospitals, nurses, the mental health community, and patients have spoken out, and spoken out against this bill.

But this bill doesn't just cut coverage and hike premiums all for a tax cut for the wealthy. It codifies a worldview by this administration that is dead set on dividing America along the lines of the god of your prayers, whom you love, where you come from, and your fate and fortune. We see it in their tax plan, in their budget cuts, in immigration policy, and now in health care, a worldview that scapegoats the struggling and the suffering, that sees fault in illness, and that rejects the most basic universal truth of the human existence, which is that every single one of us one day will be brought to our knees by a diagnosis we didn't expect, a phone call we can't imagine, and a loss we cannot endure.

So we take care of each other because, but for the grace of God, there go I one day, and we hope we will be shown that mercy, too. It is the ultimate test of the character of this country confronting our Chamber today: not the power we give the strong, but the strength with which we embrace the weak.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 13¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 11¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), who is a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, this bill guarantees access for all. And when I say "access," let me be clear: it is access for all.

When you have insurance companies that are pulling out—today we learned Aetna is pulling out of Virginia—and when you have counties across these United States that no longer have anyone who is willing to provide the ObamaCare insurance, that is not access;

When you have a situation where somebody comes up to you at the local county fair and says, "You have got to get me out of ObamaCare. It is killing me. It is killing our family's finances because we have such a high deductible, because we have such a high copay, and my husband is very sick," he may have a piece of paper, Mr. Speaker, he may have a piece of paper, but it is not really health insurance when you can't really use it without having to sell off what little assets you may have or worry about whether or not you can afford to have a roof over your head any longer.

This is not working. ObamaCare is not working. This bill will bring some sanity back to the system. It will take us a couple of years, but the rates of insurance will, in fact, come down.

This business that we keep hearing that all these people are going to be without availability of insurance, it is just fake news. It is not true. This bill does everything that people want it to do, but it gives them choices—not mandates from the Federal Government, but choices—about their health care.

I have been interested to hear some people saying that you all are just ramming this through because the bill wasn't posted until last night. What wasn't posted until last night was the Long-Upton amendment, or the Upton-Long amendment. It is two pages. I invite my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to read it. The McSally bill is a page and a quarter. The MacArthur amendment, which has been out for over a week, is about 8 pages. They could have read it while we have been standing here debating this bill.

But they don't choose to read the bill, they don't choose to learn the facts, and they don't choose to tell the American people the truth. They want to scare the American people to make them believe that this is a bad bill.

This is a good bill, and I urge everyone to vote "yes."

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague from Virginia that his vote for the healthcare bill will take away protections for 1,344,000 people with preexisting conditions in Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I have seen this bill every step of the way over the short month we have consid-

ered it. I was there for the 26-hour meeting we had at the Energy and Commerce Committee. We didn't have an analysis from the Congressional Budget Office then either. If you want to accuse us of not wanting to know the facts, that is something that is very basic to know. We would like to have that here. Here we are again on the floor without that analysis.

Through all of that time, the sad thing is that we have not heard one real argument for how this bill would make health care more affordable and accessible for families in my district in San Diego or anywhere in the country.

Now, the healthcare system isn't perfect. There are problems with some insurance markets because they are not providing the choice they should. So let's fix them. But that is not what we are doing. What we are doing is we are on the cusp of passing a bill that is opposed by doctors, nurses, hospitals, patients, seniors, and just about everybody because it would make the problems in our healthcare system worse, not better.

This is a bill that, if it were to become law, would rip health insurance coverage away from at least 24 million Americans. That is the Congressional Budget Office. That is not fake news. That is the truth.

The bill would leave many Americans with preexisting conditions with premiums they can't afford or without any coverage at all.

Today's votes take us one step closer to a system where families go bankrupt over an unexpected illness and our emergency rooms are filled with mothers once again seeking basic care for their children.

I refuse to accept that is the best we can do for the American people, and I am voting "no."

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), who is a fellow physician and the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the American Health Care Act in no way changes the existing regulations that allow a veteran who is eligible but not enrolled in the Department of Veterans Affairs' healthcare system from using a tax credit to purchase health insurance. Language that would have codified that legislation into law was removed from an earlier version of the bill to comply with Senate rules.

□ 1200

Removing language in no way changes that existing regulation or a veteran's eligibility to receive a tax credit. By the way, that is the exact same language that was in the ACA. I repeat that: the American Health Care Act in no way affects a veteran's ability to access tax credits.

I am disturbed that our colleagues in the minority, Mr. Speaker, would as-

sert that it does, in an effort to score political points against this legislation. Fear-mongering has no place in this debate or where America's veterans are concerned.

As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, as a medical doctor, and as a veteran myself, ensuring that veterans' health care is protected is my highest priority in this Congress, and I would not stand for language in this bill or any other bill that would compromise a veteran's ability to access care.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to this morally bankrupt bill, and I include in the RECORD a letter of opposition from the National Rural Health Association.

[From the National Rural Health Association]

VOTE NO TO THE AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

The National Rural Health Association urges a NO vote on the American Health Care Act (AHCA).

Rural Americans are older, poorer and sicker than other populations. In fact, a January 2017 CDC report pronounced that life expectancies for rural Americans have declined and the top five chronic diseases are worse in rural America. The AHCA does nothing to improve the health care crisis in rural America, and will lead to poorer rural health outcomes, more uninsured and an increase in the rural hospital closure crisis.

Though some provisions in the modified AHCA bill improve the base bill, NRHA is concerned that the bill still falls woefully short in making health care affordable and accessible to rural Americans. For example, the modified bill contains a decrease in the Medical Expense Deduction threshold from 10% to 5.8% in an attempt to assist Americans between the ages of 50 and 64 who would see their premiums skyrocket under the current plan. However, this deduction is not a credit and therefore would be of little use to low income seniors that are in very low tax brackets or do not pay income tax at all. Additionally, the new amendments to freeze Medicaid expansion enrollment as of Jan. 1, 2018, and reduce the Medicaid per-capita growth rate will disproportionately harm rural Americans.

The AHCA will hurt vulnerable populations in rural Americans, leaving millions of the sickest, most underserved populations in our nation without coverage, and further escalating the rural hospital closure crisis. According to the Wall Street Journal, the "GOP health plan would hit rural areas hard. . . . Poor, older Americans would see the largest increase in insurance-coverage costs." The LA Times reports "Americans who swept President Trump to victory—lower-income, older voters in conservative, rural parts of the country—stand to lose the most in federal healthcare aid under a Republican plan to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act." Let's be clear—many provisions in the ACA failed rural America. The lack of plan competition in rural markets, exorbitant premiums, deductibles and co-pays, the co-op collapses, lack of Medicaid expansion, and devastating Medicare cuts to rural providers—all collided to create a health care crisis in rural America. However,

it's beyond frustrating that an opportunity to fix these problems is squandered, and instead, a greater health care crisis will be created in rural America.

Congress has long recognized the importance of the rural health care safety net and has steadfastly worked to protect it. And now, much of the protections created to maintain access to care for the 62 million who live in rural America are in jeopardy. We implore Congress to continue its fight to protect rural patients' access to care. Three improvements are critical for rural patients and providers:

1. **Medicaid**—Though most rural residents are in non-expansion states, a higher proportion of rural residents are covered by Medicaid (21% vs. 16%).

Congress and the states have long recognized that rural is different and thus requires different programs to succeed. Rural payment programs for hospitals and providers are not 'bonus' payments, but rather alternative, cost-effective and targeted payment formulas that maintain access to care for millions of rural patients and financial stability for thousands of rural providers across the country. Any federal health care reform must protect a state's ability to protect its rural safety net providers. The federal government must not abdicate its moral, legal, and financial responsibilities to rural, Medicaid eligible populations by ensuring access to care.

Any federal health care reform proposal must protect access to care in Rural America, and must provide an option to a state to receive an enhanced reimbursement included in a matching rate or a per capita cap, specifically targeted to create stability among rural providers to maintain access to care for rural communities. Enhancements must be equivalent to the cost of providing care for rural safety net providers, a safeguard that ensures the enhanced reimbursement is provided to the safety net provider to allow for continued access to care. Rural safety net providers include, but not limited to, Critical Access Hospitals, Rural Prospective Payment Hospitals, Rural Health Clinics, Indian Health Service providers, and individual rural providers.

2. **Market Reform**—Forty-one percent of rural marketplace enrollees have only a single option of insurer, representing 70 percent of counties that have only one option. This lack of competition in the marketplace means higher premiums. Rural residents average per month cost exceeds urban (\$569.34 for small town rural vs. \$415.85 for metropolitan).

Rural Americans are more likely to have obesity, diabetes, cancer, and traumatic injury; they are more likely to participate in high risk health behaviors including smoking, poor diet, physical inactivity, and substance abuse. Rural Americans are more likely to be uninsured or underinsured and less likely to receive employer sponsored health insurance. Rural communities have fewer health care providers for insurers to contract, with to provide an adequate network to serve the community.

Any federal health care reform proposal must address the fact that insurance providers are withdrawing from rural markets. Despite record profit levels, insurance companies are permitted to cherry pick profitable markets for participation and are currently not obliged to provide service to markets with less advantageous risk pools. Demographic realities of the rural population make the market less profitable, and thus less desirable for an insurance company with

no incentive to take on such exposure. In the same way that financial service institutions are required to provide services to underserved neighborhoods, profitable insurance companies should be required to provide services in underserved communities.

3. **Stop Bad Debt Cuts to Rural Hospitals**—Rural hospitals serve more Medicare patients (46% rural vs. 40.9% urban), thus across-the-board Medicare cuts do not have across the board impacts. A goal of the ACA was to have hospital bad debt decrease significantly.

However, because of unaffordable health plans in rural areas, rural patients still cannot afford health care. Bad debt among rural hospitals has actually increased 50% since the ACA was passed. According to MedPAC "Average Medicare margins are negative, and under current law they are expected to decline in 2016" has led to 7% gains in median profit margins for urban providers while rural providers have experienced a median loss of 6%.

If Congress does not act, all the decades of efforts to protect rural patients' access to care, could rapidly be undone. The National Rural Health Association implores Congress to act now to protect rural health care across the nation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my colleague from Tennessee that his vote could increase premiums with breast cancer in Tennessee by \$38,550 per year.

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

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this misguided legislation to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

This vote might be the single most important issue our Congress deals with. It literally means life or death for too many people in our country.

What we vote on today is ultimately a reflection of our values as a nation. I believe that we have a moral responsibility to take care of the most vulnerable among us. The nuns taught me that. The Bible teaches us that. They are the sick, the poor, the elderly. This dangerous bill does nothing to protect them. In fact, it will do more harm to our most vulnerable.

There are 129 million Americans who suffer from a preexisting condition. They are our neighbors, our friends, and, for some, our family. They are the people attending their townhall meetings.

For me, I am a caregiver. I spend more time at the hospital and with the doctors than I want to. Person after person comes up to me and tells me their story and begs me not to lose their insurance. Healthy Michigan let them go to the doctor for the first time.

The Affordable Care Act made a guarantee that someone with a preexisting condition could not be charged more than healthy people and that coverage would be available to all.

Please vote against this shameful bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ten-

nessee (Mrs. BLACK), the chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I am always amazed when I start hearing conversations about the Affordable Care Act and how it is working so well today.

I want to talk about two situations in my home State of Tennessee.

When the Affordable Care Act went into place in the State of Tennessee, we had a risk pool. The risk pool covered about 28,000 people. They were happy with their care, they were happy with their providers, and they were happy with the cost. It was patient centered. They determined what best fit their needs. These were people with preexisting conditions, happy with where they were.

In 1 day, because the Federal Government said, You don't meet this and you don't meet that and you don't meet this, they lost their insurance. They were in the marketplace.

I want to tell you about two situations that are very close to me, but they only represent a number of the many calls that I get in my office.

One is a good friend of mine who has lupus. She went on the marketplace. For the first year, she did pretty good. Her premiums were pretty low; her deductible was reasonable. But here is what she found: she couldn't keep her doctor.

Can you imagine someone who has had lupus for a number of years, it is being controlled, and now she is told she cannot keep her doctor? She had to find other doctors. She was not happy with that because she had a relationship. They didn't use the same treatment and care that she had received before. So she has not felt very healthy.

In the meantime, every year that it is renewed, she calls me to say: My premiums have gone up, my deductibles have gone up, and now it is more than what I was paying before when I liked what I had and I couldn't keep it, opposite of what the President told everyone: If you like what you have, you can keep it.

The second one is someone who has myasthenia gravis. Again, on that same risk pool. She lost her opportunity to get the medication that she was receiving, an IV medication. She has myasthenia gravis. She was very controlled, able to work, living a healthy lifestyle.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BLACK. She lost her opportunity to have that medication because that medication was \$400 a month, now it is \$3,400 month, and no longer can she get her medication.

When the other side talks about how wonderful this system is, I implore

them to come to our State and talk to the people in our State.

I am a registered nurse. I know what it is like to take care of people who have healthcare conditions who need to be in a risk pool. But let's do it the right way. Let's give it to our States. Let's allow this now to be used in a way that is patient-centered, the way it was working in my home State of Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, and I am looking forward to the vote later on this afternoon.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague from Tennessee that her vote will take away protections for 1.265 million in her State with preexisting conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump and the Republicans are looking for a win. They want to put points on the scoreboard. But why would you want to win by taking healthcare coverage away from 24 million Americans? Why would you consider it a victory to raise premiums and copayments and deductibles on millions of Americans, including millions of older Americans? Why would you view it as a success to eliminate protections for preexisting conditions?

If I could vote against this bill 100 times, I would do it. If I could vote against it 1,000 times for the thousands of my constituents that will be hurt by this bill, I would.

It is wrong, it is immoral, and it is inhumane.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the vice chairman of the Health Subcommittee on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to talk about is what is underlying in this bill in the traditional reform in Medicaid.

Medicaid currently costs State and Federal Governments \$600 billion. It is estimated in 10 years—a decade—to cost a trillion dollars. It is a system that is set up to implode on itself.

So we want to fix the problem before we get to the critical point where it is going to implode. Let's fix it now, and let's make it right.

What we do is allow States to have the same money they had in 2016—the exact same money—with growth. The growth would be the CPI, medical, and, in some categories, plus one. They also have growth in demographics. We have some people who retire to other States. They have a concern. What if I am from a State where somebody lives in an area and then they move to my State when they are older and typically cost more in the Medicaid sys-

tem? We adjust for that. It is in the per capita allotment. As they move, they would transfer. It is not a traditional block grant, unless the State chooses to do so.

We are here reforming an entitlement program for the first time since the 1990s. It is a very sound, solid way, and a way that preserves and protects the program and prevents the program from imploding on itself within a decade.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague from Kentucky that his vote for the healthcare bill will take away protections for 881,000 people with preexisting conditions in Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ).

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, this bill is worse than a sham. This bill is worse than a sugar pill. This bill is downright ugly. It is poison. As an emergency medicine doctor, I urge you to do no harm. I urge everybody to do no harm.

Let's be clear: a vote for this bill is a vote for 24 million people to lose their insurance. A vote for this bill is to add an age tax to those 55 years old and older. A vote for this bill is raise out-of-pocket costs for everyone, with less coverage. A vote for this bill is to take away guarantees for emergency care, medicine, mental health, and maternity care. A vote for this bill is to allow private health insurance companies to drop patients who have a pre-existing illness.

How, you may ask? Let's say I see a patient with diabetes who doesn't have health insurance. A private health insurance company can say: No, we are not going to cover you. Why don't you go to the high-risk, high-cost State insurance pool that is way too expensive, with no guarantees that they will cover what they need. Therefore, they won't be able to afford it. They won't have coverage. They are going to go into financial ruin. All of this is in order to give \$6 billion in tax cuts to the wealthiest.

I urge everybody to vote "no."

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the chairman of the full Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleagues who have worked so hard on this legislation to try and rescue these failing insurance markets.

We learned yesterday, I think most of Iowa now will not have a single insurer left on the exchanges. If you are one of the people out there in the one-out-of-three counties where people only have one option for insurance, what we are trying to do here is fix this market so you actually have insurance to cover you.

We believe that in going forward with this piece of legislation not only do we give more flexibility to States to innovate, they care about the people in

their States. I know my home State of Oregon does. Yet they are facing a shortfall right now that this legislation would provide over \$320 million to help fill.

One of their proposals is to kick 350,000 people off of Medicaid. This would help fill the gap: \$320 million in the next 2 years to fill an \$882 million shortfall they have.

But this is a problem across the country. What we are trying to do here is reform ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, in a way that will work going into the future. Otherwise, people are going to be left with not only enormous rate increases in the premiums, but also you have seen an explosion in the cost of what they have to pay out of pocket.

I have had people in my district say: Look, I am outside of that area where I get a subsidy, and I am paying full price. Our premiums have gone up 50 percent in the last 2 years. My options have gone down from four or five to maybe one or two, maybe three, and it is getting worse. They are threatening to pull out. My out-of-pocket costs are now so high, I am paying for something I can't even afford to use.

We are trying to fix and rescue this market and bring people in.

You hear all these numbers State by State. I am not buying into that at all. They don't understand what our bill does. We are giving States authority, we are giving protections for people, and we are going to get this straightened out once and for all so that we have an insurance market that works, but, more importantly, that we have a healthcare system that people can afford and that we can get quality health care when they see a doctor, between them and their doctor, without a bureaucrat in between.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to this horrible bill, and I include in the RECORD a letter in opposition from the Children's Hospital Association.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, March 15, 2017.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Finance, U.S.
Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and
Commerce, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN HATCH AND WALDEN: On behalf of our nation's children's hospitals and the patients and families they serve, we believe the American Health Care Act (AHCA) in its current form is a setback to child health on a national level. Over 30 million

children receive their health care coverage through Medicaid. The legislation as written cuts the budget, coverage, and benefits for the care for children, many of whom have significant health care needs, including children with disabilities.

Children's hospitals have identified several provisions in the AHCA that create serious concerns about the bill as passed by the House Energy and Commerce Committee. Foremost among these concerns is that the bill would cut the health care budget for children by converting the Medicaid program to a per-capita cap system beginning in 2020. This limits future funding for the states and risks significant reductions in the Medicaid budgets providing care for over 30 million children. The current Medicaid entitlement financing structure allows for greater certainty for children in the Medicaid program and shifting to a capped environment risks undermining the current health care available to children.

We are alarmed children's health care financing is not considered and protected in the AHCA, and that children are exposed to equal funding risk in the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that AHCA will reduce overall Medicaid funding by \$880 billion or 25%. Medicaid is the largest payer for children's health care in the nation and cuts of this magnitude will have a severe negative impact on children's health care. There are also discrete program changes envisioned in the AHCA posing detrimental effects to children's access to health care. Eligibility policy changes in the bill risk reducing or delaying access to Medicaid coverage. We are concerned by CBO's projections that Medicaid enrollment will substantially decrease under the AHCA and the absence of information on the impact on children specifically suggests that additional examination of these issues is needed.

We support maintaining Medicaid as an entitlement for children as well as retaining essential elements of the program. Every child in America should have access to high quality health care and Medicaid is critical to this aim. Research shows providing Medicaid coverage for children is a smart investment for the nation, resulting in better health outcomes for children into their adult lives and bringing long-term returns for the country.

Children's hospitals cannot support any bill that does not safeguard funding, coverage and benefits for children. With respect to the AHCA, we call on lawmakers to protect kids and recommend, at a minimum, the following:

We must not cut funding for children's care under a per capita cap. Children are already funded at the lowest per beneficiary levels, and ensuring sufficient funding for children's health care into the future is absolutely essential. Accomplishing this under the current proposal requires clear identification of spending for all children, including those eligible based on disability, and exempting funds spent on children from a "claw back" on any spending that exceeds per capita cap target expenditures. We believe spending on all children should be protected from recoupment in the following year. This is critical to ensuring states do not have incentives to restrict children's access to medically necessary care.

Ensure all funding for children, including blind and disabled children, is clearly identified. Accurate information on Medicaid spending is vital to evaluating the program's effectiveness for children and holding states accountable for the delivery of services. We

believe all children, including blind and disabled children, should be included in a single children's 1903A enrollee category and the per capita cap for children should be adjusted accordingly to reflect the higher expenses of children with disabilities. Children are a separate and distinct population from adults. Funding dedicated to children must be identifiable, allowing for an accurate picture of the federal and state investment in kids. This is an important part of ensuring accountability and the availability of sufficient resources to address children's health care needs. We believe it is important to consider protections preventing diversion of resources specifically intended for children. As we work with state governments to innovate and improve care delivery, the nation's pediatric providers are in a better position to help states achieve their goals if all kids are in a common eligibility category.

Continue requirements that all children receive pediatric-specific benefits providing medically necessary care determined by their physicians. The current Medicaid structure includes important protections for all children and ensures they have access to medically-necessary care. It is essential that Congress includes language guaranteeing continued access to pediatric-specific services provided under the Early and Periodic Screening Diagnostic and Treatment (EPSDT) benefit.

Maintain Medicaid coverage levels for children and protect them from potential loss of coverage or delays in eligibility. Changes to eligibility, such as ending hospitals' ability to make presumptive eligibility determinations, limiting retroactive coverage, or reducing children's Medicaid mandatory eligibility levels, directly risk children's coverage and should not be included.

Remove the provision in the bill eliminating hospital presumptive eligibility authority. Hospital presumptive eligibility authority allows hospitals to temporarily enroll children, pregnant women, and other individuals in Medicaid until their full enrollment determination can be made. This means earlier access to needed care for Medicaid eligible children.

Remove the provision in the bill repealing the ability of states to provide retroactive eligibility up to three months prior to the month of application, as allowed under current law. Ensuring retroactive coverage of benefits under Medicaid is very important for children, especially children with complex medical conditions. Without this provision, it will be challenging for families who incur high levels of expense prior to their Medicaid-eligible child being enrolled in the program.

Remove the provision in the bill reducing mandatory eligibility levels for children age 6-18 from 133 percent of federal poverty level (FPL) to 100 percent of FPL. All other children are required to be covered by Medicaid up to 133 percent of the FPL.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide comment on this legislation. We look forward to working with you in this Congress to at least maintain the benefits children have today, and to hopefully strengthen health care for children into the future.

Very best regards,

MARK WIETecha,
President and CEO,
Children's Hospital Association.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I remind the chairman that his vote for the healthcare bill will take away protections for 654,000 people with pre-existing conditions in Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for leading and for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, let's be very clear about where we are with TrumpCare 2.0.

This bill still strips 24 million Americans of health care, cuts \$880 billion from Medicaid, and increases premiums for the majority of Americans. It still has an age tax if you are 50 to 64 years old, and cuts maternity care and coverage for substance abuse disorders.

It still gives \$1 trillion in tax cuts to the wealthiest millionaires, billionaires, and corporations on the backs of working people who will pay more and get less.

TrumpCare 2.0 adds insult to injury because my Republican colleagues would like you to believe that they are going to cover preexisting conditions. That is just not true.

American people, be clear: this will not cover preexisting conditions, and 133 million Americans with those preexisting conditions will suffer. There are kids like James Kish, an 8-year-old in my district who has a brain tumor and literally stands to die if this bill passes.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds across this country are calling our offices and weeping. We should all weep that this bill is coming to the floor. We should vote "no."

□ 1215

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that the information that we are being told, even The New York Times has characterized some of it as being misleading, and it is. When you say Oregonians are going to suddenly be thrown out, that is not true on preexisting conditions because there is no waiver request. You are just making that stuff up. I dispute it. It is misleading. It is wrong. It is fear-mongering, and I am sorry it is happening on this floor.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind my chairman that he represents more people on Medicaid expansion than any Republican in the country, and this bill ends Medicaid expansion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, TrumpCare is another false promise. Actually, it is musical chairs. Millions of Americans will be left out and priced out, especially the sick, the old, the pregnant, and the mentally ill. Health insurance means life or death.

In this concoction, who is eligible? How much will it cost? Who will be left out?

There is no budget score from the Congressional Budget Office. Republicans aren't guaranteeing affordable

coverage. Everybody knows even a one-word change in your insurance policy can make a gigantic difference in your coverage.

Why not give Americans a chance to calculate the bill's true cost and how it will impact them?

As a result of the Affordable Care Act, 1 million Ohioans now have health insurance who didn't have it before. Here we are at the end of our long voting week with a major proposal that will rip away the health insurance benefits or make them unaffordable for millions of Americans. Musical chairs is not the way to run the people's House nor the life-and-death affairs of a great nation. TrumpCare sets up a cruel game of musical chairs. Shame, shame, shame.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that my friends on the other side are defending the ObamaCare age tax, which is a tax on young people. I am the right demographic for it.

This is how it works: people from age 26 to 34 pay more so people from age 50 to 64 pay less.

Think about this: I am 53. In 3 years, I will be 56, my daughter will be 26. What I am asking her to do and what we are asking her to do if we don't repeal this is, as you are wanting to buy a house, get married—she got married—buy a house, start a family, get her family moving forward, we are going to say: But we want you to pay more for your health care so I can pay less.

That is what they are doing. They are having parents have their children pay more so they can pay less. With all of us, I think we want our children, as they start their families, start their life, to have more breaks, not put another burden on them.

I defend the fact that we are giving tax relief to young people, for people from age 26 to 34, who can least afford the premiums that we are putting on them.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time that remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this is the cruelest and most immoral thing I have seen the Republican Party do to the American people. Tens of thousands of Americans will die if this bill passes. That is a fact. Republicans have been deceiving the American people for the last 8 years. They don't care about working people, and this bill proves it. They care about insurance companies

and drug companies that fund their campaigns. They care about the millionaires and billionaires who get huge tax cuts in this bill. Don't try to tell me that they care about factory and construction workers who will be hurt by this bill. Don't try to tell me that they care about single moms who won't be able to put food on the table after you pass this bill. Don't try to tell me that they care about cancer survivors who are going to pay \$140,000 more for health insurance.

I don't know how anyone can look their constituents in the eye if they vote for this bill. Shame on you if you do. If you vote for this bill, there will come a day when you will have to answer for your vote, when you will have to look a friend, a family member in the eye, someone who is sick or dying, and say: I did this to you.

Don't do it. Vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded once again to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE).

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the American people today who are being dragged down by this failing disaster called ObamaCare. Since I first got to Congress, I have consistently heard from people across the Seventh District of South Carolina who have been negatively affected by ObamaCare.

We were told: If you like your plan, you could keep it.

We were told: Your premiums would go down by \$2,500 per family.

We were told it would provide more choice. But what we have seen is exactly the opposite. 232,000 South Carolinians' plans were canceled, premiums have increased by double digits every year and are up by 28 percent this year. There is only one insurer left in South Carolina, and they are threatening to pull out. The law is failing miserably and getting worse.

This bill repeals harmful ObamaCare taxes across the board that drove up healthcare costs and transitions health care to a more competitive, patient-centered insurance market. There are still fixes that need to be made to further improve health care, but this is a dramatic move forward from where we are today and the first step in moving America's health care from an unsustainable system to a sustainable one.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague from South Carolina that his vote for the healthcare bill will take away protections for 822,000 people with preexisting conditions in South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn this

abhorrent legislation that will rip away protections from millions of Americans. I am a breast cancer survivor. President Trump and our Republican colleagues promised Americans like me that we would not be discriminated against based on our preexisting conditions.

I am not sure if any Republicans actually know what it is like to live every single day of your life waiting for the other shoe to drop, but with this bill, you yank that peace of mind that we have with the Affordable Care Act out from under us.

This bill would allow States to segregate sick people into separate, inferior coverage and leave individuals exposed to catastrophic health costs, benefit exclusions, and waiting lists. High-risk pools spin sick people into a death spiral. Premiums go ever higher and coverage is spotty.

I can only hope that my colleagues come to their senses before inevitably handing so many Americans a death sentence. Make no mistake, people will die as a result of this bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has ¾ minute remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I do want to take a minute today to thank the superior team we have in the House Legislative Counsel. They have put in many man hours and woman hours to draft this bill that is being considered here in the House today. Specifically I want to thank Ed Grossman, Jessica Shapiro, Michelle Vanek, and Jesse Cross for their devotion to the people of the United States in helping us draft this legislation.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining time to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, how tragic it is that before House Republicans skip town, they will steal from Medicare, pass an age tax on older Americans, say that children with autism are a preexisting condition, and tell folks: If you have diabetes, you are paying \$5,600 more.

This morning, I heard from many hospitals, doctors, and nurses across Illinois. They know what families need to be taken care of and to be healthy. They do not believe that stripping 24 million Americans of their health insurance is in the best interests of our national health.

To my eight Illinois colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, if you vote "yes" on this bill, the eight of you own its aftermath in our State; you own the 47,000 jobs that you will kill; you own the health of the million-plus Illinoisans who will be stripped of their health insurance.

Let's kill this horrific bill and work together to make health insurance affordable and accessible for all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair again reminds Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to correct a technical problem that exists with trying to draft to Senate rules with the House legislation. Recognizing the problem, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) has introduced a straightforward and practical bill to fix the problem. It is a simple 2-page bill that, when the American Health Care Act becomes law, Members of Congress and congressional staff will be treated the same way as every other citizen. That is only right, and it is only proper.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 308, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 534. An act to require the Secretary of State to take such actions as may be necessary for the United States to rejoin the Bureau of International Expositions, and for other purposes.

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1628) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017, as amended, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 308, the further amendments printed in House Report 115-109 are considered as adopted.

When consideration was postponed on Friday, March 24, 2017, 41¾ minutes of the debate remained on the bill.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) has 19½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) has 22¾ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act of 2017.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of the American Health Care Act, a bill that repeals the worst parts of ObamaCare and begins to repair the damage it has caused. This bill brings choice and competition back into the healthcare marketplace and puts healthcare decisions back into the hands of patients and doctors where it belongs.

It has been a winding road to get to this point, but we are here today to fulfill the promise that we made to the American people. I will point out right now to those who say we should have just moved on from healthcare reform, American families and individuals are suffering from rising costs and barriers to getting the care that they need right now.

Under ObamaCare, the situation is getting worse every day. In Iowa, just yesterday, one of the last remaining insurers announced that it will pull out of the ObamaCare exchanges, leaving nearly all of the State's residents with no—and, yes, I will say again, nearly all of the residents with no available health insurance plan for the purchase under ObamaCare.

□ 1230

And in a few of the Iowa counties which are the remaining insurers, even that company is saying it might stop offering plans, leaving the entire State without an insurance plan available under ObamaCare. That is happening this very week. We can't wait a moment longer than necessary to provide relief for the American people by repealing and replacing ObamaCare.

I applaud the Members of this body who stuck with us during this process and worked hard to make the bill better. I, myself, had concerns about the bill as it was introduced. I worked hard to make sure that the bill truly reflected my ideals and the views and de-

sires of my constituents. And when the bill came before the Budget Committee, which I chair, I urged my members to stay in the fight and work to improve the bill rather than stop it in its tracks.

And do you know what? Our members did just that, making some recommendations that were eventually included in the various amendments. That message was heard loud and clear by all of the members of our Conference who have worked tirelessly to finalize a bill that truly reflects our vision for healthcare reform.

Throughout this process, our commitment to undoing the damage done by ObamaCare has remained steadfast. Day after day, my constituents call my office begging us to do something to save them from ObamaCare, and it is because ObamaCare is collapsing.

In my State of Tennessee, families are suffering. Premiums have increased by 60 percent, while deductibles are so high that, even if someone has an insurance card, it doesn't mean they have guaranteed care.

There are parts of my State in Tennessee that don't have a single insurance provider in the marketplace, and two-thirds of the counties have only one provider. That is not competition. That is called a monopoly.

While no legislation is perfect, this bill makes some important changes to help American families get quality, affordable health insurance: It zeros out the mandates, it repeals the taxes, and it repeals the subsidies; it allows people to choose health insurance plans to meet the unique needs of their families instead of purchasing a one-size-fits-all plan mandated by a Washington bureaucrat; and it modernizes Medicaid, a once-in-a-lifetime entitlement reform.

Ending Medicaid's open-ended funding structure will play an important role in addressing our future budget deficits and our growing national debt.

This is a particularly proud moment for me. I was working as a nurse in Nashville in the 1990s when the Clinton administration pushed a single-payer pilot program in Tennessee called TennCare. I saw firsthand the negative impact government-run health care has on patient care. I saw costs rise and the quality of care fall. It inspired me to get involved in public service.

When in 2009 and 2010 I saw those same principles being debated and, eventually, implemented on the national level, I thought my experience in Tennessee could be valuable in the national debate; so, in 2011, I sponsored the first piece of legislation that repealed a part of ObamaCare. Today, we take the largest step yet in rescuing the American people from this damaging, government-run healthcare system.

I, and many other Members of this body, have worked hard to make sure that this bill truly reflects our visions

for healthcare reform. I, for one, cannot sit idly by and let this opportunity go to waste. Governing is hard, but our constituents did not elect us to do what is easy. They elected us to do what is right.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on the American Health Care Act to rescue the American people from ObamaCare.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I remind my colleague that her vote for this bill could increase premiums for people with breast cancer in Tennessee by over \$38,000.

Mr. Speaker, let's begin with a few facts:

Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, costs have gone up at the lowest rate in 50 years;

Those with preexisting conditions get insurance at the standard rate;

Instead of millions of people losing their insurance every year, 20 million more people have insurance;

Personal bankruptcies are down 50 percent.

Still, all we hear are complaints, press releases, and promises about something better. But CBO has debunked this proposal by pointing out that 24 million fewer people will have insurance, that costs will go up, and insurance will cover less.

So, whatever you think about the Affordable Care Act, this bill makes things worse—except for millionaires, who get a tax cut.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a physician and the chair of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago, I stood right in this well to debate the ACA, which the premise was to increase access and decrease costs. We all agree with that. But that is not exactly what happened.

In my district, in the State of Tennessee, over one-third of the counties have no place they can buy insurance; and multiple counties in my State, including the third largest, have no access. Premiums have soared over 60 percent. Eighteen of the 23 co-ops went bankrupt, including one in my State, which required people to search for other coverage.

No matter what verbiage you hear, nothing in this bill changes how veterans are treated under the law—nothing. The criticisms are flat-out wrong. I am a veteran, doctor, and chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and it ain't gonna happen.

In my State, and where I practiced medicine for over 30 years, listen to this: 60 to 70 percent of the uncollectible debt now are people with insurance.

So why do I support this bill?

One, it protects preexisting conditions;

Two, it puts patients ahead of special interests and restores a physician-patient relationship;

Three, it reforms Medicaid so that first-class people don't get second-class care; and

Four, it repeals individual mandates so that 160,000 Tennesseans don't get fined for a product they cannot afford.

Mr. Speaker, this bill isn't perfect, but it is a huge improvement over ObamaCare, and it is worthy of every Member's support.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague that his vote for this bill could take healthcare protections away from over a million people in Tennessee with preexisting conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), the vice ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, today the House is voting on a harmful bill that puts the most vulnerable members of our community at risk. We know that millions will lose coverage. And the Affordable Care Act protects people with preexisting conditions—this bill does not. High-risk pools don't work.

My constituents are scared, and so are people across this country.

Arden from Gearhart, Oregon, wrote to me, distraught, because she and her daughter, Selah, could lose coverage. Arden took the loving step of adopting a child with special needs, and now the support program they rely on is at risk of being terminated by this bill.

This is a critical vote. I implore my colleagues to think about all of the people like Arden and Selah in their communities. Think about the millions across this country who risk losing coverage.

I implore my colleagues to do no harm. Vote "no" on this harmful bill.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee, who has worked tirelessly on this bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER), my colleague, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I have heard from my Governor, State officials, and providers about the challenges on the ground in Florida and what they are facing. The demographic issues in Florida raise significant challenges for the State of Florida, and it is the Medicaid program.

Particularly, the State Medicaid program and providers face challenges relating to the costs of caring for the most disadvantaged and the elderly in Florida's nursing home program, as

well as the rising costs associated with Florida's aging population.

As the process moves forward, Florida's unique challenges must be recognized and accounted for as we reallocate dollars for this important safety net program.

Mr. WALDEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for not only raising this issue, but being a real partner in this legislation. I met with your Governor as well, who has been very helpful in the discussions.

We believe that accounting for aging demographics of the Medicaid program and broader population is an important factor we must consider to ensure that any Medicaid reform is successfully implemented. I am committed to working with the gentleman from Florida, our colleagues in the Senate, and the Trump administration to ensure Florida's unique challenges related to an aging Medicaid demographic are recognized and accounted for appropriately.

Mr. Speaker, in the remaining part of my time, I would just like to thank my colleagues for their work on this measure.

Making sure that people have access to affordable health care is essential. It is something I would say that we all care about. We all care about family members who have suffered from cancer or other debilitating diseases or afflictions. We are trying to find a place here that works for all Americans, where we have insurance markets that are actually available where you can get an insurance product that works for you that is affordable for you.

We know that today, in America, the insurance market and the individual market—that is a very small segment, 7 percent of insurance in America; that is what we are talking about here today—that that market is collapsing before our eyes. In fact, in Iowa, I think they just announced 94 in 99 counties, people there won't even have an insurance product they can try to purchase on the exchange.

We have met with Governors and we have met with insurers. We have said: What do we need to do to intercede to get this market back to where it works? The proposals contained in our legislation are designed to do exactly that: to get back to where consumers have choices when they are required to buy insurance to take care of their families. Those choices need to be affordable. They are not now, today.

In my own State of Oregon, premiums have gone up 50 percent in the last 2 years. Meanwhile, the number of options that you have to choose from has gone down—and continues to go down. Now, we haven't gone as far as some States where you have either no option in most areas of the State or just one, but how far off is it when insurers are failing, people losing their opportunity to get affordable health insurance?

We take care of the disabled. We take care of the elderly. In fact, we plus-up to medical CPI plus 1 to make sure that we take care of the elderly and the disabled in our Medicaid program.

By the way, that is probably more than most States are spending today.

So we have thought this through carefully. We care about people and their medical condition and their families because we are all in this together as Americans.

I think the bill we have before us today works. It works to take care of those most in need. It works to make sure that the people can get access to insurance.

I will tell you what. It is a first step in a many-step process to also look at families who are dealing with opioid addiction and what we can do there. There are efforts at NIH, which we just supported yesterday, to fund medical research so that we can get cures for those who have diseases and other afflictions. We are fully committed to improving health care not only for Americans, but around the globe, through innovation and scientific discovery.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague that his vote for this healthcare bill will take away protections for over 600,000 people in Oregon with preexisting conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities, which states that this legislation will dramatically cut Medicaid services that are vital to people with disabilities and seniors.

CONSORTIUM FOR CITIZENS
WITH DISABILITIES,

April 28, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD) is strongly opposed to the amended American Health Care Act. The amended American Health Care Act retains the original bill's proposals to dramatically cut Medicaid services that are vital to people with disabilities and seniors through per capita caps, which CCD has opposed. The new amendments—including permitting states to seek waivers from the protections for people with pre-existing conditions and from the requirement to provide essential health benefits—makes the amended AHCA even more harmful to people with disabilities. We urge you to oppose this legislation.

Medicaid provides services and supports that maintain the health, function, independence, and well-being of 10 million enrollees living with disabilities. For many people with disabilities, being able to access timely needed care is a life or death matter. The American Health Care Act changes the way that the Federal Government funds Medicaid—rather than paying states based on the actual costs of healthcare for people in Medicaid, it sets a cap on the amount of federal support, a cap that is totally unrelated to the actual costs of needed care for enrollees. This cap is designed to cut Medicaid, and the bill uses those cuts to pay for unrelated

tax cuts. Slashing federal support for Medicaid, which is already a lean program, will force states to cut services and eligibility that put the health and wellbeing of people with disabilities at significant risk.

The newest amendments to the American Health Care Act make the bill even more harmful to people with disabilities. The new amendments would allow states to easily obtain waivers, that would allow them to charge higher premiums to people with pre-existing conditions, including people with disabilities. They also would allow states to seek waivers from the Affordable Care Act's requirement to provide essential health benefits, including crucial services for people with disabilities such as mental health and substance use disorder services, prescription drugs, rehabilitative and habilitative services and devices, preventative and wellness services and chronic disease management, and pediatric services. These waivers jeopardize the Affordable Care Act's protections for people with pre-existing conditions, including people with disabilities, and CCD opposes any roll-back of those protections.

The ACA helped millions of people with disabilities and others to gain access to affordable and comprehensive health insurance. The amended American Health Care Act is insufficient to help people with disabilities meet their healthcare needs, and we urge you to oppose the bill should it come to a vote.

Sincerely,

Health Task Force Co-chairs: Bethany Lilly, Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law; Dave Machlett, National Health Law Program; Peter Thomas, Brain Injury Association of America; Julie Ward, The Arc of the United States.

Long Term Services and Supports Co-chairs: Alison Barkoff, Center for Public Representation; Nicole Jorwic, The Arc of the United States; Sarah Meek, Lutheran Services in America Disability Network; Laura Weidner, National Multiple Sclerosis Society.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, there are 7 million veterans who are eligible for VA care but not enrolled at the VA. All of them could be denied access to the tax credits in this bill, and each in this Chamber needs to understand how.

On page 10, line 6 of manager's amendment No. 4, it states that an individual is not eligible for tax credits if they are eligible for care, as defined by U.S. Code 5000A(f)(1)(A). This code specifically includes VA care. So this means that those 7 million veterans who are eligible for VA care, even if they are not enrolled, would not have access to the tax credits in this law.

This is not fear-mongering. This is not hyperbole. This is the text of the bill we are voting on today. This bill jeopardizes health care for up to 7 million veterans, and everyone should oppose it.

□ 1245

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, Republicans now control all of our government. Whatever happens to our

healthcare system will be their responsibility, including what has already happened since January with the destabilizing of our insurance markets and health plans announcing rate hikes due to uncertainty.

They will be held accountable for what happens. Today, Americans will have an opportunity to see exactly where their Representatives stand. This vote is a simple one. It votes to kick 24 million Americans off of their health insurance coverage. I don't say that; CBO says that, which is perhaps why we don't have a CBO report on the amendment. It includes 7 million people who are covered through their employers.

It is a vote to make coverage unaffordable for one in four Americans with preexisting conditions and ration care through high-risk pools.

It is a vote to impose an age tax on older Americans, some \$1,700 to \$14,600. That is quite a hike.

It is a vote to force Americans to pay more for less, to raise premiums 24 to 29 percent, on average, over each of the next 2 years. CBO says that, not me.

And no matter how Republicans try to spin it, healthcare advocates from the AMA to AARP, to everybody that follows, have said that it ends protections for those with preexisting conditions.

I repeat: It ends protections for those with preexisting conditions.

I repeat again: It ends protections for those with preexisting conditions.

It takes away essential health benefits, like doctor visits, emergency room visits, and prescription drugs. So this, Mr. Speaker, will be a very instructive vote. It will show the American people if Republicans stand with those who don't want to lose their coverage, some 55 percent now and 75 percent saying fix it, don't repeal it—or if they stand with a President who wants to claim a victory, but doesn't even seem to know what his own TrumpCare bill says.

I recommend, as a political strategist who is concerned about 2018, that you once again withdraw this bill. Instead, we ought to work together to make sure that the Affordable Care Act works for all Americans, and deliver on the promise that President Trump made—and made from that rostrum—when he said that he wanted “insurance for everybody;” not kick 24 million off, “for everybody;” not make seniors pay more, “for everybody;” not to put Medicaid at risk, “for everybody” that is “far less expensive and far better.”

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues: Come to your senses, defeat this bill.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the other side that if they read the bill, they will see under section 137 it says:

No limiting access to coverage for individuals with preexisting conditions. Nothing in this act shall be construed as permitting

health insurance insurers to limit access to health coverage for individuals with pre-existing conditions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank Chairwoman BLACK for her leadership on this effort, as well as Chairman WALDEN of the Energy and Commerce Committee for incredible work.

As chairman on behalf of the Ways and Means Committee who work alongside you, I am honored to speak in support of the American Health Care Act because it guarantees coverage for those with preexisting illnesses.

It guarantees coverage for those with preexisting illnesses. In fact, this bill takes decisive action to repeal all of the bad parts, all of the damage done by ObamaCare, and begin a thoughtful step-by-step process to deliver a patient-centered healthcare system, not a Washington-centered healthcare system, to the American people.

While ObamaCare has helped some, far more have been hurt by this law. And more ObamaCare failures are piling up every day. Just yesterday, Aetna announced it will exit Virginia's individual health market next year. And it is not just the State's ObamaCare exchanges they are leaving behind. Aetna will not offer any plans next year in the individual market in Virginia.

The same thing is happening in Iowa. And my friends on the Democratic aisle have done nothing to stop this—nothing. But today, because of this bill, thousands of people will have hope for a new plan to provide the healthcare coverage they need. Millions of Americans throughout the country are facing just terrible options.

People of Texas have been hit particularly hard. Between last year and this year, nine healthcare insurers have exited ObamaCare exchanges in the Lone Star State. No other State saw more insurers leave. For my family, the failures of this law have come to mean some incredibly tough choices. They have had to accept, under ObamaCare, you can't access affordable coverage that is tailored to what they need. They have had to learn how to get by as their monthly health premiums just skyrocket each and every year—bigger than their mortgage payments. They have had to choose between paying out of pocket for the care they need or not getting care at all.

Under ObamaCare, the ability to receive treatment from a doctor you know and who knows you has become a luxury that too many can't afford. Today, with the American Health Care Act, the Republicans propose we have an opportunity to provide immediate relief from this failing law. More than

that, we can provide Americans with real choices in health care, not the painful decision they are forced to live with under ObamaCare.

Under the Ways and Means Committee area, this starts by repealing the law's crushing taxes and mandates, and that is where Ways and Means takes action. Under ObamaCare, the individual and employer mandate penalties allow Washington to strong-arm you, to strong-arm Americans into ObamaCare plans you do not want and cannot afford.

Not anymore. Under the Republican plan, we repeal the individual and employer mandate tax penalties so Americans have the freedom to make the healthcare choices that are right for them. Under ObamaCare, over \$1 trillion of taxes were imposed on the American people. Under the Republican plan, those taxes are gone that burden American small businesses and families.

Under our plan, we provide increased health savings accounts so Americans can save easier for the out-of-pocket costs that hit them under any health care; and then we create a personal individual tax credit so Americans can buy plans that are right for them, not what is right for government.

Healthcare premiums, they can choose a plan that can go with them from job to job, State to State, home to start a business, or a family, and even into those preretirement years.

Today is about taking on a collapsing ObamaCare and replacing for the American people health care that they want, that they can use, and that they can afford; driven not by what Washington wants, but driven by what American families need in their health care.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague that his vote for this bill could take away protections of over 4.5 million people with preexisting conditions in Texas who might have access to coverage, but if they have diabetes, their rates could go up \$5,000.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

After his latest failed attempt to roll back the ACA, Speaker RYAN declared to the American people "ObamaCare is the law of the land." Less than 50 days later, PAUL RYAN shamefully is going against his word trying to ram TrumpCare down our throats.

It is an embarrassment that we are wasting taxpayer dollars to again consider TrumpCare—or as I called it "Trump don't care"—a reckless plan that does nothing to make health care better.

TrumpCare gives the rich and big corporations a \$600 billion tax break. It

forces families to pay higher premiums and deductions, placing health care out of their reach. TrumpCare forces seniors to pay higher costs and changes Medicare as we know it. It strips essential health benefits and protections for people with preexisting conditions.

What a pitiful display of partisan politics. TrumpCare is so bad, Republicans have exempted themselves from it. They don't want TrumpCare. The medical industry doesn't want TrumpCare. Democrats don't want TrumpCare.

Why don't House Republicans listen?

The people don't want it, and I won't support it.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Common Sense Kids Action that explains that: "This jeopardizes the health and well-being of America's kids and will alarm any parent who understands the importance of health insurance for their children and family."

COMMON SENSE KIDS ACTION,
April 25, 2017.

Re H.R. 1628—OPPOSE.

Hon. DIANE BLACK,
Chairwoman, House Budget Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: On behalf of the millions of American kids and families who rely on comprehensive, dependable health insurance to stay healthy and to get medical treatment when they need it, we are writing to respectfully express our strong opposition to your bill, H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act (AHCA). We have added this bill to our Common Sense Legislative Ratings Tool as an "Against Kids" bill and will communicate our position to our parent and teacher members.

Common Sense is the nation's leading independent nonprofit organization dedicated to helping kids thrive in a rapidly changing world. We empower parents, teachers, and policymakers by providing unbiased information, trusted advice, and innovative tools to help them harness the power of media and technology as a positive force in all kids' lives. The policy arm, Common Sense Kids Action, is building a movement of parents, teachers, business leaders, and others dedicated to making kids our nation's top priority by supporting policies at the state and federal level that contribute to the building blocks of opportunity for kids. Access to affordable and quality medical care for kids is certainly one of those key building blocks.

Thanks to current law, including the Affordable Care Act, Medicaid, and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), 95% of young children in the U.S. today have health insurance. That's a remarkable achievement. With health insurance, parents are more likely to seek medical care for themselves and for their children, helping to prevent illnesses from developing and shortening their duration when they occur. However, the AHCA will result in 24 million fewer Americans having coverage, including millions of children. This jeopardizes the health and well-being of America's kids and will alarm any parent who understands the importance of health insurance for their children and family. The Affordable Care Act certainly needs to be fixed, but if Congress has the goal of making sure that all families

and businesses have access to affordable and comprehensive health insurance, it could improve the law for everyone without forcing millions of kids and their parents to lose access to critical medical care.

As Congress continues to grapple with this issue, health insurance programs, we think these facts about children's health insurance from the Congressional Budget Office and the Georgetown University Center for Children and Families are important to keep in mind:

Ninety-five percent of children age 0-5 are insured today.

Forty-five million of those children access health care through two programs: about 37 million through Medicaid (a federal-state program) and 8 million through CHIP, the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Children are the single-largest group of persons covered under Medicaid.

Under the Affordable Care Act, as you know, many states expanded Medicaid with help from the federal government, increasing coverage for kids and families, including coverage for mental health care.

Changes being considered, including under the AHCA, would cut funding to Medicaid by as much as \$880 billion over the next 10 years.

The AHCA, when compared with current law, would result in 24 million fewer Americans with health insurance by the year 2026.

Even with changes recently suggested to your bill, America's kids will be best served by strengthening the Affordable Care Act and preserving Medicaid and CHIP, not by repealing the Affordable Care Act and block granting or establishing a per capita cap on Medicaid. We urge you to keep our children's future foremost in your thinking, withdraw your bill, and work on a bipartisan basis to support measures that protect and strengthen children's health care. Thank you for your consideration of our views and we would be happy to talk with you at any time about this and other issues that matter to America's children and families.

Sincerely,

DANNY WEISS,
Vice President, Federal Policy,
Common Sense Media/Kids Action.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from SEIU, which states:

This legislation will leave millions without health insurance, and decimate the Medicare program.

SEIU,
May 2, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 2 million members of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), America's largest healthcare union, I write to voice strong opposition to the American Health Care Act (AHCA). New provisions in the legislation manage to make a bad bill worse. Not only does the bill cause millions to lose insurance coverage, face higher costs, and end Medicaid as we know it, but now it also strips essential protections for those with pre-existing conditions. The AHCA will leave millions of men, women, and children without access to high quality, affordable health care. The AHCA legislation unequivocally jeopardizes working families' safety, health, and financial security.

The AHCA will leave millions of Americans without health insurance and therefore without access to healthcare. The last avail-

able estimate from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated about 14 million fewer people will have health insurance in 2018, and by 2026, 24 million fewer people will have coverage compared to the current baseline under the ACA. Unfortunately, we do not have more up to date information. Despite the importance that healthcare plays in the lives of working families, Congressional leaders have indicated that they intend to hold a vote on the legislation without knowing its impact.

The AHCA also decimates the Medicaid program, rationing and endangering healthcare for children, seniors, people with disabilities, and their families as well as for those who have gained coverage as a result of the Medicaid expansion. According to CBO, the legislation will cut federal funding for Medicaid by \$880 billion over ten years. Americans know that Medicaid is working and realize the key role that the program plays in helping families afford care—including nursing home care and home and community-based services for elderly and disabled individuals. Nearly 1 in 5 Americans are covered under Medicaid and rely on it to get health services. Under the AHCA, those Americans would lose access to vital care that may mean the difference between life and death.

Additionally, the AHCA would cap the amount of money states receive in Medicaid funding from the federal government each year, regardless of the cost of providing healthcare to those who qualify. Medicaid is already a lean program especially when measured on a per capita basis, and cuts from capping federal funding will quickly force states to cut services, limit enrollment, and decrease payments to hospitals and other providers. Also, Medicaid is the largest payer for long term care in the country. The program pays for more than 60 percent of all nursing home residents and for more than 3.2 million Americans with home- and community-based care, which allows many older Americans and people with disabilities to remain in their homes rather than move to a more expensive institutional setting. States—which must balance budgets and already face fiscal pressures—will not be able to make up the lost federal dollars and will be forced to deny care. The inevitable result will be that the AHCA will make it much harder and more costly for older Americans, people with disabilities, and their families to get services they need.

In addition, the legislation will effectively end the Medicaid expansion, which provides health coverage to millions of people earning low to moderate incomes. While the bill purports to allow states to maintain the expansion, states will only receive an enhanced match, or additional funding, for people who enroll before 2020 and maintain continuous coverage. It is widely understood that there is significant churn on and off the program in this coverage category, and thus over time the reimbursement rates for states will drop. The resulting large cost shift to states may lead them to eliminate coverage for this group altogether. In fact, seven states have triggers that would end the Medicaid expansion in their state if federal reimbursement decreases.

Lastly, Medicaid provider rates are already extremely low in most states. Cuts to Medicaid, capped funding, and elimination of the Medicaid expansion would lead to further reductions in rates for providers, leading to job and other spending cuts in the health care industry that will have ripple effects on the broader economy. We have serious concerns

that hospitals, especially those that serve communities that may not have access to many providers, could be forced to close or cut back services, further reducing access to care in underserved areas.

Those who purchase coverage in the individual market do not fare much better under the proposed bill. The AHCA provides tax credits ranging from \$2,000 to \$4,000 to individuals to purchase private insurance—substantially lower than the ACA's current levels for the majority of those who receive them. Unlike the ACA, it is unclear that people with access to employer insurance that is unaffordable or inadequate will be eligible for credits, which would mean that they will be left without access to coverage and care. The bill also creates an age tax on older Americans by letting insurance companies charge people over 60 as much as five times what they charge others for the same coverage. CBO found that under the initial bill introduced, premiums for those between age 50 and 65 would sky-rocket. Moreover, it is unclear what coverage will be available on the individual market or if the current healthcare marketplaces will even still exist under this scheme. Between premiums and out of pocket costs like deductibles, especially for those most in need of care due to pre-existing conditions, illness, or age, the result could be higher costs for less coverage.

A bad bill has managed to have been made even worse by the "MacArthur-Meadows Amendment." The amendment guts essential protections for those with pre-existing conditions. It would allow states to charge those with pre-existing conditions higher premiums by allowing states to very easily waive community rating requirements, which currently prohibits this practice. Furthermore it would grant states, through a waiver that is approved by default, the ability to opt out of essential health benefit requirements, a core set of medical services, like hospitalizations, mental health, maternity care and prescription drug coverage, which all insurers are required to cover under the ACA. If states waive requirements, insurers could leave those who are sick or with pre-existing conditions out to fend for themselves and face exorbitant costs to get life-saving care they need. Experts agree that the funding included in the "Upton-Long Amendment" is completely inadequate to protect those with pre-existing conditions. The Administration and Congressional Leaders promised to the American people that those with pre-existing conditions would remain protected—this bill even with added amendments defaults on that promise.

Another failure of the AHCA is that it hurts women by freezing funding to providers like Planned Parenthood, risking the health and well-being of the 2.5 million people who rely on the organization for basic care. One in five women in the United States has visited Planned Parenthood clinics and for many low-income women of color, including many of our members, Planned Parenthood is their essential health provider. For these individuals, healthcare is not an ideological struggle or about the politics of one policy versus another; it is a necessity that could mean the difference between sickness and health.

The real winners of the AHCA appear to be special interests and the wealthy. The legislation repeals most if not all of the ACA tax provisions for special interests like the pharmaceutical and insurance industries, offsetting these costs with the massive cuts to Medicaid described above. The bill also maintains the so-called "Cadillac tax,"

which places a tax on workers who have robust health coverage, merely delaying implementation to 2026. Implementation of the tax will punish people who have decent insurance, and will encourage employers to further shift health costs to workers. Furthermore, the incentives for health savings accounts, which encourage wealthier people to shelter pre-tax income, are of little use to working households earning low-to-moderate incomes.

The AHCA is not care, it is chaos. The legislation creates an environment of uncertainty and unaffordability for Americans and is a bad deal for working families. The bill radically restructures Medicaid as we know it and cuts funding for the program significantly, endangers women's health, and further enriches corporations, special interests, and the wealthiest Americans at the expense of working families' access to healthcare and financial stability. The American people will hold you accountable for how you proceed in this moment. We therefore respectfully ask you vote no on the American Health Care Act and the proposed amendments to the legislation when it comes to a vote in the House of Representatives. We will add this vote to our legislative scorecard. If you need any additional information please contact Ilene Stein, Assistant Legislative Director.

Sincerely,

MARY KAY HENRY,
International President.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, the House majority has once again made clear that, under Republican rule, the system is rigged. The fix is in. The deck is stacked against hardworking Americans, and exhibit A is your reckless Republican healthcare plan. Under TrumpCare, 24 million Americans will lose access to health insurance. Under TrumpCare, a draconian age tax will be imposed on people between 50 and 64. Under TrumpCare, costs will go up, premiums will go up, copays will go up, deductibles will go up. Under TrumpCare, tens of millions of Americans who are living with preexisting conditions will be screwed.

House Republicans are out to destroy the American healthcare system as we know it, but you will be held accountable for the cruel and unusual punishment that you have decided to inflict on the American people.

Vote "no" against this draconian piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to this Chair.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article in Consumer Reports dated May 2, 2017, entitled: "How the Affordable Care Act Drove Down Personal Bankruptcy."

HOW THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT DROVE DOWN
PERSONAL BANKRUPTCY

EXPANDED HEALTH INSURANCE HELPED CUT THE
NUMBER OF FILINGS BY HALF

(By Allen St. John)

As legislators and the executive branch renew their efforts to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act this week, they might want to keep in mind a little-known financial consequence of the ACA: Since its adop-

tion, far fewer Americans have taken the extreme step of filing for personal bankruptcy.

Filings have dropped about 50 percent, from 1,536,799 in 2010 to 770,846 in 2016 (see chart, below). Those years also represent the time frame when the ACA took effect. Although courts never ask people to declare why they're filing, many bankruptcy and legal experts agree that medical bills had been a leading cause of personal bankruptcy before public healthcare coverage expanded under the ACA. Unlike other causes of debt, medical bills are often unexpected, involuntary, and large.

"If you're uninsured or underinsured, you can run up a huge debt in a short period of time," says Lois Lupica, a bankruptcy expert and Maine Law Foundation Professor of Law at the University of Maine School of Law.

So did the rise of the ACA—which helped some 20 million more Americans get health insurance—cause the decline in bankruptcies?

The many experts we interviewed also pointed to two other contributing factors: an improving economy and changes to bankruptcy laws in 2005 that made it more difficult and costly to file. However, they almost all agreed that expanded health coverage played a major role in the marked, recent decline.

Some of the most important financial protections of the ACA apply to all consumers, whether they get their coverage through ACA exchanges or the private insurance marketplace. These provisions include mandated coverage for pre-existing conditions and, on most covered benefits, an end to annual and lifetime coverage caps. Aspects of the law, including provisions for young people to be covered by a family policy until age 26, went into effect in 2010 and 2011, before the full rollout of the ACA in 2014.

"It's absolutely remarkable," says Jim Molleur, a Maine-based bankruptcy attorney with 20 years of experience. "We're not getting people with big medical bills, chronically sick people who would hit those lifetime caps or be denied because of pre-existing conditions. They seemed to disappear almost overnight once ACA kicked in."

The first attempt to repeal and replace the ACA, in March, failed to gain enough Congressional support and never came to a vote.

Then in April, details of a new replacement plan were released. Although President Donald Trump has said that this new version, like the first bill that was pulled from consideration, will cover pre-existing conditions, the revised law gives states broad latitude to allow insurance companies to increase rates for consumers with an existing illness.

A RARE AND COSTLY DIAGNOSIS

Since the start of the year, more than 2,000 consumers have answered an online questionnaire from Consumer Reports' advocacy and mobilization team, sharing their experiences with the ACA. Katie Weber of Seattle was one of them.

In 2011, she had just landed her first job out of college, as a teacher with AmeriCorps, she explains in a phone interview. That's when the unusual numbness in her hand began, which she—and her doctor—at first mistook for a pinched nerve.

Then came debilitating headaches and nausea and, ultimately, a diagnosis of medulloblastoma, a fast-growing cancerous brain tumor.

The treatment for her tumor was straightforward: surgery, radiation, then chemotherapy. Figuring out how to pay for it was

much less clear. She worried that the insurance she had through AmeriCorps wouldn't cover enough of her bills.

"My dad said to me, 'Your health is the most important thing. If you have to declare bankruptcy at age 23, it's no big deal,'" Weber says.

Because of the ACA, she says, it never came to that. After her year with AmeriCorps, the new healthcare law enabled her to get coverage under her parents' insurance plan.

The ACA provisions required that the family's insurance company cover her even though she had already been diagnosed with cancer. That would not have been the case before the ACA, which mandates the coverage of pre-existing conditions for all consumers.

Later, when she aged out of her parents' insurance, Weber was able to enroll in Apple Health, Washington state's version of Medicaid, a program that was expanded once the ACA was passed. That coverage, she says, has been crucial to her financial and medical well-being, especially once the cancer returned last fall.

Weber says she now spends more time discussing treatment options and less time worrying how she'll pay for MRIs and drugs. These are covered in full under her Apple Health policy.

"Cancer is really expensive," she says. "My insurance saved my life."

NUMBERS PLUMMET

If you want further testimony about how much personal bankruptcies have dropped over the past decade, talk to Susan Grossberg, a Springfield, Mass., attorney.

For more than 20 years she has helped consumers push the financial reset button when debt triggered by divorce, unemployment, or a costly illness or medical episode became too much to handle. "Medical debt can get really big really quickly," Grossberg says. "When you're in the emergency room they're not checking your credit score while they're caring for you."

With the advent of the ACA—and before that, expanded state healthcare in Massachusetts—she says fewer clients with large medical debts walked through her door.

Grossberg adds that her bankruptcy business has slowed so much that she has been forced to take on other kinds of legal work—landlord-tenant and housing discrimination cases—to cover her own bills.

The American Bankruptcy Institute suggested that veteran Chicago bankruptcy attorney and trustee David Leibowitz could also help parse the reasons for the decadelong decline.

First, he says, the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 made it more difficult for consumers to file for bankruptcy. The law required credit counseling and income verification and forced many consumers to seek protection under Chapter 13, which restructures, but does not eliminate, most debt. The piles of paperwork also meant most filers needed a lawyer, which made bankruptcy more costly and therefore not an option for many poor consumers.

Then there was the economy. After a slow and steady recovery following the housing crisis of 2008, Leibowitz explains that American consumers generally had fewer problems with their mortgages, better employment prospects, and greater access to credit, which made them less likely to file.

The final factor, according to Leibowitz, has been the ACA, which afforded health coverage to many more consumers and expanded protections for all.

Of course, not everyone sees such a direct connection between the decline in bankruptcies and the emergence of the ACA.

Thomas P. Miller, resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and co-author of "Why ObamaCare is Wrong for America" (HarperCollins, 2011), cautioned against "reaching broad conclusions" because the subject is so complex.

"Certainly there are fewer people declaring bankruptcy, and certainly fewer are declaring bankruptcy because of healthcare spending," he says. But his earlier research suggested that some studies exaggerated the degree to which high healthcare bills cause bankruptcies. "They tended to reflect other problems with credit card balances well beyond healthcare," he says. "It stems from multiple causes."

FIGURING OUT WHY

Over the past decade, determining the cause-and-effect relationship between medical debt and bankruptcy has become a political football, particularly during the years the Obama administration was trying to pass the ACA through Congress.

The truth is that it's not that easy to determine how many bankruptcies are caused by medical debt. Examining the paperwork doesn't always offer insight because debtors often juggle their indebtedness, for example, using a credit card to pay an outstanding medical bill while leaving other debts unpaid.

But a 2014 study from Daniel Austin, a bankruptcy attorney and, at the time, a professor at the Northeastern University School of Law, offers some of the most in-depth research to date.

Austin and his team selected a nationwide group of 100 bankruptcy filers meant to represent a cross-section of the U.S. population, studied their paperwork, then followed up with a survey asking filers, basically, "Why?"

His team's research found that medical debt is the single largest factor in personal bankruptcy. First, Austin analyzed the paperwork of individual case files, which suggested that medical bills were a factor in 18 percent of filings. But when he directly asked the same filers, in a survey, the number was even higher, with 25 percent citing medical bills as a factor in their decision to file bankruptcy.

In addition to the nationwide group, Austin isolated a group of 100 bankruptcy filers from Massachusetts. Why Massachusetts? Because its citizens, starting in 2006, had been covered by a comprehensive state healthcare program similar to the ACA known as Romneycare, after the state's former governor, Mitt Romney.

The differences between the two groups were striking. Even though the Massachusetts filers owed substantially more in unsecured debt (that is, debt not backed by a home, a car, or another asset) than their counterparts in other states, they reported less than half as much medical debt, which is also unsecured.

"The average medical debt in Massachusetts in 2013 was relatively low at just \$3,041 (6 percent of total unsecured debt) compared to \$8,594 (20 percent of total unsecured debt) nationwide," Austin writes in his 2014 study, portions of which were published in the *Maine Law Review*.

"Only about 9 percent of Massachusetts debtors felt their bankruptcy filing was a result of medical bills," Austin explains. "This compares to 25 percent for debtors from [other] jurisdictions." Austin's research found that comprehensive medical coverage

in Massachusetts had all but eliminated medical bills as a cause for bankruptcy.

"Not only in absolute numbers—they had much smaller medical debt—but psychologically, medical debt did not loom nearly as large for people in Massachusetts as it did for other people in other states." And in 2010, four years after Romneycare began, the state had a bankruptcy rate that was about 30 percent lower than that of other states.

IN SEARCH OF CERTAINTY, CONSISTENCY

At its most basic level, health insurance allows consumers to pay for the medical care they need. Each year, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention determines how well the system is working by surveying Americans and asking a simple but powerful question: Did you have problems paying medical bills in the last 12 months?

The percentage of those reporting problems has dropped from 21.3 percent of households when they first asked the question in 2011 to 16.2 percent in 2016. That's almost 13 million fewer Americans no longer facing collection notices from a doctor or hospital.

"It's been happening across the board, by race, by age, by insurance status, by gender," says Robin Cohen, the study's lead author.

But insurance is also about peace of mind. And judging from the consumers who have shared their stories with Consumer Reports, that certainty is in short supply as the fate of the ACA is decided. People are wondering what comes next: Repeal? Replace? Improve? Retain and neglect? No one really knows the answer. Americans are concerned about how the future of healthcare will affect them and their families.

In CR's Consumer Voices survey in January 2017, 55 percent of consumers said they lacked confidence that they or their loved ones would be able to afford insurance to secure that care.

Don Shope of Ocean View, Del., said the availability of ACA coverage gave him the confidence to leave a corporate job and start his own consulting business. But now, with the ACA's future in limbo, he and his wife are watching the action in Washington and worrying that they might have to return to jobs with benefits.

"I'm not a liberal or a conservative, a Democrat or a Republican," Shope said in a phone interview. "Our biggest concern is that with repeal and replace we're going to be left high and dry."

He also believes in expanded health coverage for all. "If any American is sick, we should be willing to take care of them," Shope says. "It's the right thing to do. Economics and profit shouldn't be part of the healthcare equation."

HANGING ON EVERY DIP AND TURN

And then there's Kristin Couch, who has channeled the uncertainty into her own brand of activism.

"I was kind of anxious," Couch says about the day in March when Congress was set to vote on a less robust bill that would replace the ACA.

The 31-year-old public relations executive, of Gainesville, Ga., has started to follow health-care politics in the intense, almost obsessive way some people follow sports. The morning after Election Day, she called the offices of her local congressional representatives, urging them to preserve the protections the ACA offers.

Couch began caring about healthcare as a high school senior when she was diagnosed with lupus and since then has become something of a reluctant expert on how to man-

age not only her treatment but also the insurance that pays for it.

With friends and neighbors she talks about the law in simple but personal terms. "I tell people, 'I have a pre-existing condition, and this has helped me,'" she says of the ACA. Couch follows the healthcare debate in Washington so closely because she knows firsthand what happens when you don't have adequate coverage.

Couch remembers the time, before the ACA, when a new immunosuppressive drug that wasn't covered by her policy became available. "It was expensive," she explained in an interview, "but it worked, and I knew I needed it. Every month I'd just put it on a credit card. When your medication is thousands of dollars a month, that's the start of being in debt." She considered bankruptcy but ultimately worked her way out from under the pile of medical bills.

As a result of the ACA, her coverage shifted again when her employer no longer offered a traditional plan and she had to switch to one with a high \$3,000 deductible. Initially she was stunned by her out-of-pocket costs, but she quickly realized that her total costs would be capped once she'd met that threshold.

"It seemed scary and it seemed different," she explains. "But it actually saved me money." And now, she says, "I don't have to worry about how much a new drug costs."

So on the March day the House of Representatives was supposed to vote on repealing the ACA, she worried that the insurance she'd come to depend on was about to be yanked away. Only after emerging from a client meeting did she learn the vote had been canceled. "I started crying I was so happy," Couch recalls. "It's like a weight has lifted."

But Couch's relief was short-lived. Now she's back to paying close attention to the rhetoric and vote-counting deals in Washington, awaiting another possible vote on the newly revised plan. "I'm still optimistic," she said this week. "I think enough people will stand up and fight for the coverage."

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, a month ago I was ready to speak right here on the floor when this bill was abruptly removed. Apparently, it wasn't bad enough that day, it wasn't harmful enough. But now it is back worse than ever. So bad, it might actually pass.

I don't have a lot of time to explain, but let me tell you two groups that are really going to say thank you: it is the billionaires and it is the undertakers.

This bill will make health care more unaffordable and cause preventable deaths. Meanwhile, it gives \$600 billion—excuse me—\$800 billion to the wealthy, to the billionaires. TrumpCare brings us higher costs, less coverage, guts the benefits, has a crushing age tax, and steals from Medicare. In my district alone, 43,000 people will lose coverage. 9,000 of those are children. The elderly, Medicaid will be lost, close to 2,000.

There is a reason they are trying to jam this down our throats. There is no CBO score because they don't want to hear a score.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it plain. Let's put this bill in a coffin, not Americans. Let's kill and bury this bill.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), our distinguished whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman of the Budget Committee for yielding.

I was in strong support of this bill, Mr. Speaker, that finally provides relief to the American people across this country from the failures of ObamaCare.

Just how bad is it failing?

You don't have to look any further than what happened in Iowa yesterday, where literally they are going to have in 94 out of 99 counties nobody to write insurance for people that are in the ObamaCare exchanges.

So what do the people, Mr. Speaker, that are opposed to this bill say to those millions of people in Iowa who are about to have no place to go to get health care?

What are the people that oppose this bill, Mr. Speaker, going to say to the millions of people with preexisting conditions across the country who are being faced with double-digit increases in their health insurance every year and, oh, by the way, premiums and deductibles as high as over \$10,000, which are creaming those folks that are struggling under the weight of this bill?

So what we are replacing it with, Mr. Speaker, are reforms that actually lower premiums, that actually put patients back in charge of their healthcare decisions so that elitists up here in Washington won't tell you what you have to buy. You actually get to make that choice yourself.

□ 1300

You get to focus on plans that are good for your family at lower costs so that you can be in charge. And, by the way, reforming the Medicaid system, one of the most broken forms of health care so that States actually have the ability to innovate and help low-income families.

This bill is important, Mr. Speaker, to rescue the American people from a law that has failed dismally. Let's end the skyrocketing premium increases. Let's lower costs and put patients back in charge of their healthcare decisions.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague that his vote for this bill can take away protections for over 800,000 people with preexisting conditions in Louisiana. For example, those with breast cancer could see their premiums go up by over \$34,000.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a let-

ter from AARP which makes clear health care will be sabotaged under this bill, and healthcare costs for older Americans will "dramatically increase."

[From the House Democratic Leader's Press Office, May 3, 2017]

AARP PRESS RELEASE: NEW CHANGES TO THE AHCA MAKES A BAD BILL WORSE!

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Older Americans care deeply about access to and affordability of health care. With the addition of the Upton Amendment, as reported, we once again write to share our opposition to the American Health Care Act (AHCA) and urge you to vote NO. Changes under consideration that would allow states to waive important consumer protections—allowing insurance companies to once again charge Americans with pre-existing conditions more because they've had cancer, diabetes or heart disease—would make a bad bill even worse. This would be devastating for the 25 million Americans 50-64 who have a deniable pre-existing condition. The Upton amendment would do little to reduce the massive premium increases for those with pre-existing conditions.

Throughout consideration of the AHCA, we have been expressing serious concerns about the impact that this legislation will have on older Americans. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO)'s last estimate further demonstrates the harmful impact of this bill on older Americans and some of our most vulnerable. Specifically, the American Health Care Act will weaken the fiscal sustainability of Medicare; dramatically increase premium and out-of-pocket costs for 50-64 year olds purchasing coverage on the individual insurance market; allow insurance companies to once again discriminate against those with pre-existing conditions; substantially increase the number of Americans without insurance; and put at risk millions of children and adults with disabilities and poor seniors who depend on the Medicaid program to access long-term services and supports and other benefits.

Our members and others 50 years of age and older care deeply about health care and want to know where their elected leaders stand. Recognizing the importance of the upcoming vote on the American Health Care Act, AARP intends to inform our members, and others over age 50, how their elected officials voted. We'll communicate the results of the vote in our widely-circulated publications, in e-mail alerts, in our online channels, and through the media. Again, we urge all Representatives to vote NO on the American Health Care Act in its current form.

MEDICARE

The American Health Care Act repeals provisions in current law that have strengthened Medicare's fiscal outlook, specifically, the repeal of the additional 0.9 percent payroll tax on higher-income workers. Repealing this provision would remove billions from the Hospital Insurance trust fund, hasten the insolvency of Medicare, and diminish Medicare's ability to pay for services in the future.

INDIVIDUAL PRIVATE INSURANCE MARKET

Currently, about 25 million Americans age 50-64 have a pre-existing condition, about 6.1 million purchase insurance in the non-group market, and nearly 3.2 million are currently eligible to receive subsidies for health insurance coverage through either the federal health benefits exchange or a state-based exchange (exchange). Since passage of the

ACA, the number of 50-64 year old Americans who are uninsured has dropped by half. We are deeply concerned that the AHCA would be a significant step backwards and result in millions of older Americans who cannot afford their health care, including many simply losing their health care. Based on CBO estimates, approximately 14 million Americans will lose coverage next year, while a total of 24 million Americans would lose coverage over the next 10 years.

Affordability of both premiums and cost-sharing is critical to older Americans and their ability to obtain and access health care. A typical 50-64 year old seeking coverage through an exchange has a median annual income of under \$25,000 and already pays significant out-of-pocket costs for health care. We have serious concerns—reinforced by the CBO estimate—that the bill under consideration will dramatically increase health care costs for 50-64 year olds who purchase health care through an exchange due both to the changes in age rating from 3:1 (already a compromise that requires uninsured older Americans to pay three times more than younger individuals) to 5:1 (or more) and reductions in current tax credits for older Americans. CBO concluded that the bill will substantially raise premiums for older people and force many into lower quality plans.

Age rating plus reduced tax credits equal an unaffordable age tax. Our previous estimates on the age-rating change showed that premiums for current coverage could increase by up to \$3,200 for a 64 year old. In addition, the bill reduced the tax credits available for older Americans to help purchase insurance. We estimate that the bill's changes to current law's tax credits alone could increase premium costs by more than \$5,800 for a 64-year old earning \$15,000. Overall, both the bill's tax credit changes and 5:1 age rating would result in skyrocketing cost increases for older Americans. In their analysis, CBO found that a 64 year old earning \$26,500 a year would see their premiums increase by \$12,900—758 percent—from \$1,700 to \$14,600 a year.

Current law prohibits insurance companies from discriminating against individuals due to a pre-existing condition. The bill would repeal pre-existing condition protections and would once again allow insurance companies to charge Americans more—we estimate up to \$25,000 more—due to a pre-existing condition. As a result, the 40 percent of 50- to 64-year-olds (about 25 million people) who have a deniable preexisting condition risk losing access to affordable coverage. The Upton Amendment, which would add funds to address the impact of premium increases for those with pre-existing conditions, would do little to mitigate the massive premium increase for some of the most vulnerable Americans. AARP strongly opposes any weakening of the law's pre-existing condition protections which benefit millions of Americans.

MEDICAID AND LONG-TERM SERVICES AND SUPPORTS

AARP opposes the provisions of the American Health Care Act that create a per capita cap financing structure in the Medicaid program. We are concerned that these provisions could endanger the health, safety, and care of millions of individuals who depend on the essential services provided through Medicaid. CBO found that the bill would cut Medicaid funding by \$880 billion over 2017-2026, about 25 percent less than what it projects under current law. Medicaid is a vital safety net and intergenerational lifeline for millions of individuals, including

over 17.4 million low-income seniors and children and adults with disabilities who rely on the program for critical health care and long-term services and supports (LTSS, i.e., assistance with daily activities such as eating, bathing, dressing, managing medications, and transportation). Older adults and people with disabilities now account for over sixty percent of Medicaid spending, and cuts of this magnitude will result in loss of benefits and services for this vulnerable population.

Of these 17.4 million individuals: 6.9 million are ages 65 and older (which equals more than 1 in every 7 elderly Medicare beneficiaries); 10.5 million are children and adults living with disabilities; and about 10.8 million are so poor or have a disability that they qualify for both Medicare and Medicaid (dual eligibles). Dual eligibles account for almost 33 percent of Medicaid spending. While they comprise a relatively small percentage of enrollees, they account for a disproportionate share of total Medicare and Medicaid spending.

Individuals with disabilities of all ages and older adults rely on critical Medicaid services, including home and community-based services (HCBS) for assistance with daily activities such as eating, bathing, dressing, and home modifications; nursing home care; and other benefits such as hearing aids and eyeglasses.

In providing a fixed amount of federal funding per person, this approach to financing would likely result in overwhelming cost shifts to states, state taxpayers, and families unable to shoulder the costs of care without sufficient federal support. This would result in cuts to program eligibility, services, or both—ultimately harming some of our nation's most vulnerable citizens.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I know in these polarized times we often forget our actual connections to each other, but we are all connected. A sick, uninsured employee affects the bottom line of a small business. Uncompensated care in the emergency room, we all pay the bill. When a child from an uninsured family goes to school with an undiagnosed virus, not only does it impact his or her ability to learn, it impacts other kids and puts them at risk. We are all connected.

As Martin Luther King so powerfully said: "We may have come over on different ships, but we are all in the same boat now."

Mr. Speaker, it is time we start rowing together. Unfortunately, this bill fails to recognize this. It still fails that we are connected, and, instead of bringing us together, this simply divides us by providing less coverage, imposing an age tax, forcing people to pay more, and stripping key protections.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1628.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY).

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Medical Association that states: "Not only would the AHCA eliminate health insurance coverage for millions of

Americans, the legislation would, in many cases, eliminate the ban against charging those with underlying medical conditions vastly more for their coverage."

[From the American Medical Association, May 3, 2017]

AMA WARNS THAT PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT DO NOT REMEDY BILL'S SHORTCOMINGS

DESPITE AMENDMENTS TO BILL, MILLIONS OF AMERICANS WOULD STILL LOSE HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE

CHICAGO—American Medical Association (AMA) President Andrew W. Gurman, M.D., issued the following statement today about proposed changes to the American Health Care Act (AHCA):

"None of the legislative tweaks under consideration changes the serious harm to patients and the health care delivery system if AHCA passes. Proposed changes to the bill tinker at the edges without remedying the fundamental failing of the bill—that millions of Americans will lose their health insurance as a direct result of this proposal.

"High-risk pools are not a new idea. Prior to the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, 35 states operated high-risk pools, and they were not a panacea for Americans with pre-existing medical conditions. The history of high-risk pools demonstrates that Americans with pre-existing conditions will be stuck in second-class health care coverage—if they are able to obtain coverage at all.

"Not only would the AHCA eliminate health insurance coverage for millions of Americans, the legislation would, in many cases, eliminate the ban against charging those with underlying medical conditions vastly more for their coverage."

"America should not go backward to the time when our fellow citizens with pre-existing health conditions faced high costs for limited coverage, if they were able to obtain coverage at all. The AMA urges congressional leaders and the Administration to pursue a bipartisan dialogue on alternative policies that provide patients with access and coverage to high quality care and preserve the safety net for vulnerable populations."

BACKGROUND ON HIGH-RISK POOLS

A January report from the American Academy of Actuaries notes that "enrollment has generally been low, coverage has been limited and expensive, they require external funding, and they have typically operated at a loss . . . Removing high-risk individuals from the insured risk pools reduces costs in the private market only temporarily. Over time, even lower-cost individuals in the individual market can incur high health care costs, which would put upward pressure on premiums."

According to the Kaiser Family Foundation: State high-risk pools featured premiums above standard non-group market rates—with most states capping them at 150%–200% of standard rates. Many also featured high deductibles, some \$5,000 or more.

Despite the fact that many individuals were forced into high-risk pools because of a pre-existing condition, nearly all states excluded coverage for these conditions for 6–12 months.

Almost all high-risk pools imposed lifetime limits on covered services, and some imposed annual limits.

Some states capped or closed enrollment.

Combined net losses for the state high-risk pools totaled more than \$1.2 billion for 2011, or \$5,510 per enrollee, on average.

Furthermore, a 2010 paper by James Capretta and Tom Miller that appeared in National Affairs estimated that the cost of adequately funded high risk pools would be \$15 billion to \$20 billion per year.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, the country will not remember what we say here today, but it will never forget what we do today, especially if we make the wrong choice and adopt this bill.

The 159 million Americans whose employer-sponsored health care could be cut would never forget. Neither would the 24 million Americans who would lose their coverage or the 52 million people with preexisting conditions who would struggle to find health insurance again.

If this bill passes, Mr. Speaker, no cancer survivor denied coverage will forget, no survivor of sexual assault charged more for her ordeal will forget, and no parent struggling to afford emergency surgery for a newborn child could ever forget. They would not have that choice.

But today, we have one. We can choose to vote no and prevent millions of Americans from losing their health care. We can choose the right path rooted in morality, decency, and reason. I implore you, vote "no."

Mrs. BLACK. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from AFSCME which states this bill would cause millions to lose their health coverage and return to the days when even inadequate coverage was unaffordable.

AFSCME,

May 3, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.6 million working and retiree members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I am writing to express our continuing opposition to the American Health Care Act (AHCA), notwithstanding the addition of the Upton amendment.

The harm that AHCA will impose on ordinary Americans is breathtaking in scope. As the Congressional Budget Office has detailed, 24 million will lose their health care coverage. The Medicaid program will be cut by \$839 billion and restructured, ending the guarantee that the federal government will fund a specified share of state Medicaid costs. The bill makes coverage more expensive, especially for lower-income families and older workers and it undermines the financial strength of Medicare. And the MacArthur amendment makes a very bad bill worse by allowing states to opt out of Affordable Care Act protections that ensure that people with pre-existing conditions will be able to obtain comprehensive, affordable health care. Moreover, the MacArthur amendment would allow insurance companies to re-impose caps on annual and lifetime limits, even in employer-sponsored coverage, putting the health care of those with catastrophic illnesses or injuries at risk.

Under the Upton amendment, grants to states that could be used for high-risk pools will be increased by 6% or \$8 billion over five years. This is a paltry increase. Even the conservative Mercatus Center described the increase as a "pittance." High-risk pools would still be grossly underfunded, even if states put all of the \$138 billion in grant funding into them. We urge the Congress not to ignore the previous experience with state high-risk pools. By segregating those with pre-existing conditions into separate coverage we know they will face higher premiums, benefit exclusions, annual and lifetime limits on coverage and waiting lists.

It is unacceptable that this bill eliminates \$500 billion in taxes on the wealthiest 2%, health insurers, pharmaceutical manufacturers and medical device makers, while taking health care away from millions. Moreover, the bill retains the 40% tax on high cost health plans, which will undermine employer-sponsored insurance for working families by hollowing out coverage and increasing out-of-pocket expenses, although it delays the implementation for six years.

The bottom line is that this bill would cause millions to lose their health coverage. Most of those with pre-existing conditions would return to the days when even inadequate coverage was unaffordable. The bill would drive up costs for those who are older and lower-income, shift costs to states, fail to protect employer-sponsored coverage, weaken public health and undermine the solvency of the Medicare trust fund all the while providing tax cuts for the wealthy and well-connected.

The priorities demonstrated by this bill are upside down. We urge you to oppose this bill.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,

Director of Federal Government Affairs.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill. We all should. Protecting ACA is the top issue for my constituents. Constituents like Leslie Gauthier who, without the protections of the ACA, would not have gotten the treatment for leukemia that she was diagnosed just at the age of 22.

Leslie is now in remission thanks to ObamaCare. For Leslie, the ACA protections like essential health benefits were a matter of life and death. This Republican bill would destroy those patient protections.

Under the ACA in my district: a 5-percent drop in uninsured rates; subsidies based on income and region and not on age; Medicaid Expansion covering of 156,000 people will be lost.

The President promised not to cut Medicaid. This bill guts it by \$880 billion. This bill is a gut punch to America. Pregnant women seeking health care, kicked to the curb. Patients with preexisting conditions, kicked to the curb. Senior citizens who will have to pay more for less, kicked to curb. Over 24 million people, including 6.5 million Latinos, kicked to the curb.

Mr. Speaker, we demand Republicans stop kicking to the curb Americans. Stop this bill.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Cali-

fornia (Ms. LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Service Employees International Union's letter voicing strong opposition to the deadly American Health Care Act for their 2 million Members.

SEIU,

May 2, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 2 million members of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), America's largest healthcare union, I write to voice strong opposition to the American Health Care Act (AHCA). New provisions in the legislation manage to make a bad bill worse. Not only does the bill cause millions to lose insurance coverage, face higher costs, and end Medicaid as we know it, but now it also strips essential protections for those with pre-existing conditions. The AHCA will leave millions of men, women, and children without access to high quality, affordable health care. The AHCA legislation unequivocally jeopardizes working families' safety, health, and financial security.

The AHCA will leave millions of Americans without health insurance and therefore without access to healthcare. The last available estimate from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated about 14 million fewer people will have health insurance in 2018, and by 2026, 24 million fewer people will have coverage compared to the current baseline under the ACA. Unfortunately, we do not have more up to date information. Despite the importance that healthcare plays in the lives of working families, Congressional leaders have indicated that they intend to hold a vote on the legislation without knowing its impact.

The AHCA also decimates the Medicaid program, rationing and endangering healthcare for children, seniors, people with disabilities, and their families as well as for those who have gained coverage as a result of the Medicaid expansion. According to CBO, the legislation will cut federal funding for Medicaid by \$880 billion over ten years. Americans know that Medicaid is working and realize the key role that the program plays in helping families afford care—including nursing home care and home and community-based services for elderly and disabled individuals. Nearly 1 in 5 Americans are covered under Medicaid and rely on it to get health services. Under the AHCA, those Americans would lose access to vital care that may mean the difference between life and death.

Additionally, the AHCA would cap the amount of money states receive in Medicaid funding from the federal government each year, regardless of the cost of providing healthcare to those who qualify. Medicaid is already a lean program especially when measured on a per capita basis, and cuts from capping federal funding will quickly force states to cut services, limit enrollment, and decrease payments to hospitals and other providers. Also, Medicaid is the largest payer for long term care in the country. The program pays for more than 60 percent of all nursing home residents and for more than 3.2 million Americans with home- and community-based care, which allows many older Americans and people with disabilities to remain in their homes rather than move to a more expensive institutional setting. States—which must balance budgets and already face fiscal pressures—will not be able to make up the lost federal dollars and

will be forced to deny care. The inevitable result will be that the AHCA will make it much harder and more costly for older Americans, people with disabilities, and their families to get services they need.

In addition, the legislation will effectively end the Medicaid expansion, which provides health coverage to millions of people earning low to moderate incomes. While the bill purports to allow states to maintain the expansion, states will only receive an enhanced match, or additional funding, for people who enroll before 2020 and maintain continuous coverage. It is widely understood that there is significant churn on and off the program in this coverage category, and thus over time the reimbursement rates for states will drop. The resulting large cost shift to states may lead them to eliminate coverage for this group altogether. In fact, seven states have triggers that would end the Medicaid expansion in their state if federal reimbursement decreases.

Lastly, Medicaid provider rates are already extremely low in most states. Cuts to Medicaid, capped funding, and elimination of the Medicaid expansion would lead to further reductions in rates for providers, leading to job and other spending cuts in the health care industry that will have ripple effects on the broader economy. We have serious concerns that hospitals, especially those that serve communities that may not have access to many providers, could be forced to close or cut back services, further reducing access to care in underserved areas.

Those who purchase coverage in the individual market do not fare much better under the proposed bill. The AHCA provides tax credits ranging from \$2,000 to \$4,000 to individuals to purchase private insurance—substantially lower than the ACA's current levels for the majority of those who receive them. Unlike the ACA, it is unclear that people with access to employer insurance that is unaffordable or inadequate will be eligible for credits, which would mean that they will be left without access to coverage and care. The bill also creates an age tax on older Americans by letting insurance companies charge people over 60 as much as five times what they charge others for the same coverage. CBO found that under the initial bill introduced, premiums for those between age 50 and 65 would sky-rocket. Moreover, it is unclear what coverage will be available on the individual market or if the current healthcare marketplaces will even still exist under this scheme. Between premiums and out of pocket costs like deductibles, especially for those most in need of care due to pre-existing conditions, illness, or age, the result could be higher costs for less coverage.

A bad bill has managed to have been made even worse by the "MacArthur-Meadows Amendment." The amendment guts essential protections for those with pre-existing conditions. It would allow states to charge those with pre-existing conditions higher premiums by allowing states to very easily waive community rating requirements, which currently prohibits this practice. Furthermore it would grant states, through a waiver that is approved by default, the ability to opt out of essential health benefit requirements, a core set of medical services, like hospitalizations, mental health, maternity care and prescription drug coverage, which all insurers are required to cover under the ACA. If states waive requirements, insurers could leave those who are sick or with pre-existing conditions out to fend for themselves and face exorbitant costs to get life-saving care they need. Experts agree

that the funding included in the “Upton-Long Amendment” is completely inadequate to protect those with pre-existing conditions. The Administration and Congressional Leaders promised to the American people that those with pre-existing conditions would remain protected—this bill even with added amendments defaults on that promise.

Another failure of the AHCA is that it hurts women by freezing funding to providers like Planned Parenthood, risking the health and well-being of the 2.5 million people who rely on the organization for basic care. One in five women in the United States has visited Planned Parenthood clinics and for many low-income women of color, including many of our members, Planned Parenthood is their essential health provider. For these individuals, healthcare is not an ideological struggle or about the politics of one policy versus another; it is a necessity that could mean the difference between sickness and health.

The real winners of the AHCA appear to be special interests and the wealthy. The legislation repeals most if not all of the ACA tax provisions for special interests like the pharmaceutical and insurance industries, offsetting these costs with the massive cuts to Medicaid described above. The bill also maintains the so-called “Cadillac tax,” which places a tax on workers who have robust health coverage, merely delaying implementation to 2026. Implementation of the tax will punish people who have decent insurance, and will encourage employers to further shift health costs to workers. Furthermore, the incentives for health savings accounts, which encourage wealthier people to shelter pre-tax income, are of little use to working households earning low-to moderate incomes.

The AHCA is not care, it is chaos. The legislation creates an environment of uncertainty and unaffordability for Americans and is a bad deal for working families. The bill radically restructures Medicaid as we know it and cuts funding for the program significantly, endangers women’s health, and further enriches corporations, special interests, and the wealthiest Americans at the expense of working families’ access to healthcare and financial stability. The American people will hold you accountable for how you proceed in this moment. We therefore respectfully ask you vote no on the American Health Care Act and the proposed amendments to the legislation when it comes to a vote in the House of Representatives. We will add this vote to our legislative scorecard. If you need any additional information please contact Ilene Stein, Assistant Legislative Director.

Sincerely,

MARY KAY HENRY,
International President.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I will include in the RECORD a letter from the Association of American Medical Colleges which states: “Treatment of essential health benefits and health status underwriting dilutes protections for many Americans and would leave individuals with preexisting conditions facing higher premiums and reduce access to vital care.”

Mr. Speaker, I rise to caution those Republicans who have allowed themselves to be persuaded by this Presi-

dent into supporting this terrible bill which would leave millions of Americans without health care and raise the cost of care for millions more. You are going to pay a terrible price for not protecting your constituents.

TrumpCare will cause 24 million Americans to lose their health coverage and slash Medicaid by \$880 billion; for older Americans, premiums, deductibles, and copayments will skyrocket. Those between the ages of 50 and 64 will be forced to pay premiums five times higher than what others pay for the same coverage.

This crushing age tax will fall on some of the most vulnerable members of our society, elderly people on fixed incomes who often have serious health issues.

Meanwhile, hidden in this bill is an outrageous tax break for billionaires. TrumpCare gives \$600 billion in tax cuts to large corporations and wealthy people, including \$2.8 billion to the 400 richest families in America. The MacArthur amendment made this bill even worse by jettisoning protections for people with preexisting conditions.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I have been here for five decades, and I can’t recall a time when we have debated something so obviously harmful to seniors and working people in this country. This bill strips health care from 24 million people. It requires seniors to pay sometimes 100 percent or more of their income in premiums.

This legislation drastically and dramatically cuts Medicaid, directly contradicting President Trump’s claim not to.

In Michigan, half of all children rely on Medicaid. In my district alone, 56,000 people will lose coverage, including 16,000 children and 3,200 seniors.

Let’s be clear. If we pass this bill, people will die. Health care is a right and not a privilege.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ), the highest ranking enlisted soldier ever elected to Congress.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Paralyzed Veterans of America urging rejection of the latest version of the American Health Care Act.

PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: Paralyzed Veterans of America (PVA) urges

rejection of the latest version of the American Health Care Act (AHCA). PVA is the nation’s only Congressionally-chartered veterans’ service organization solely dedicated to representing veterans with spinal cord injury and/or disease. Consequently, we are very concerned about the conflicting information circulating about this legislation and the adverse impact it could have on our members and millions of other people with disabilities.

As we understand it, the AHCA cuts \$880 billion out of the Medicaid program in order to finance tax cuts that will explode the deficit and largely assist upper income individuals, corporations, and providers. The Medicaid changes are particularly devastating to people with disabilities. Under the cap and cut proposal, the federal government would no longer share in the costs of providing health care services and community services beyond the capped amount. This would eliminate the enhanced federal match for the Community First Choice Option under Medicaid that provides attendant care services in the community. Thanks to this program, many poor veterans with serious non-service-connected disabilities have been able to move from nursing homes into their communities. The AHCA also weakens Medicaid by ending the Medicaid expansion earlier and offering Medicaid block grants to states. Data from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation shows expansion has helped thousands of veterans and their caregivers.

For veterans and PVA members in particular, the AHCA continues several problematic policies of the ACA as well as troubling new provisions that could affect the ability of many veterans and their family members to afford health insurance in the private market. The underlying AHCA bill:

Continues to exclude CHAMPVA beneficiaries—dependents of the most catastrophically disabled veterans—from the dependents’ coverage policy up to age 26.

Fails to remove the prohibition on enrollment into the VA health care system for Priority Group 8 veterans, thus denying these veterans access to the principal health care system for veterans.

Denies access to tax credits making health insurance affordable to anyone eligible for a host of other federal health programs, including those “eligible” for coverage under Title 38 health care programs. This would prevent many veterans who may be “eligible for” but not enrolled in the VA health care system from accessing these tax credits intended to help people buy insurance.

Not only do the changes made to the original version of the AHCA continue its failure to protect veterans and people with disabilities, they make these circumstances worse. The latest changes would allow states to seek waivers that would allow insurers to charge higher premiums to people with pre-existing conditions, including people with disabilities. The new amendments also would allow states to seek waivers from the ACA’s requirement that certain essential health benefits must be provided, including crucial services for people with disabilities such as prescription drugs, rehabilitative and habilitative services and devices, preventative and wellness services and chronic disease management. The combination of these changes would make it nearly impossible for people with pre-existing conditions to find affordable plans that cover basic health care services.

Throughout these past few months, the American people have been calling for a bipartisan effort to improve the nation’s

health care system. Congress should heed these voices, stop its pursuit of the flawed American Health Care Act and work together through regular order to strengthen all Americans' access to affordable, high quality health care.

Sincerely,

CARL BLAKE,
Associate Executive Director.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons that people may come to the conclusion this is not the piece of legislation for them. I would argue most egregious amongst this is the manner in which it was done. There was clearly an error made on the 7 million veterans you heard about. I do not question a single Member's commitment in here to caring for veterans. You did not do it on purpose. You did it because you had to, to meet the arcane rules of the Senate, so you stripped it out, and you will, by all intents and purposes, fix it in the Senate.

For you, I would say good luck with that. But for the Members who are sitting here: Why would we not debate this? Why would we not fix it? Why would we not go through regular order so all of us would ensure there is not a loophole that would deny coverage to 7 million veterans. This is too important to rush. It is too important to make errors like this. It is darn sure too important to count on the Senate to fix it. And it was our responsibility.

So here we sat with 30 seconds among 15 of us to make points that are important to the American public.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues: reject this. Come back and do it right, and provide the health care our veterans deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Save Medicaid in Schools, a coalition of dozens of organizations. This letter states that this bill jeopardizes health care for the Nation's most vulnerable children: students with disabilities and students in poverty.

MAY 2, 2017.

Re The American Health Care Act Vote

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, SPEAKER RYAN, MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER, AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: The undersigned member organizations of the Save Medicaid in the Schools Coalition are con-

cerned that the American Health Care Act (AHCA) jeopardizes healthcare for the nation's most vulnerable children: students with disabilities and students in poverty. Specifically, the AHCA reneges on Medicaid's 50+ year commitment to provide America's children with access to vital healthcare services that ensure they have adequate educational opportunities and can contribute to society by imposing a per-capita cap and shifting current and future costs to taxpayers in every state and Congressional district. While children currently comprise almost half of all Medicaid beneficiaries, less than one in five dollars is spent by Medicaid on children. Accordingly, a per-capita cap, even one that is based on different groups of beneficiaries, will disproportionately harm children's access to care, including services received at school. Considering these unintended consequences, we urge a "no" vote on The American Health Care Act (AHCA).

Medicaid is a cost-effective and efficient provider of essential health care services for children. School-based Medicaid programs serve as a lifeline to children who can't access critical health care and health services outside of their school. Under this bill, the bulk of the mandated costs of providing health care coverage would be shifted to the States even though health needs and costs of care for children will remain the same or increase. Most analyses of the AHCA project that the Medicaid funding shortfall in support of these mandated services will increase, placing states at greater risk year after year. The federal disinvestment in Medicaid imposed by the AHCA will force States and local communities to increase taxes and reduce or eliminate various programs and services, including other non-Medicaid services. The unintended consequences of the AHCA will force states to cut eligibility, services, and benefits for children.

The projected loss of \$880 billion in federal Medicaid dollars will compel States to ration health care for children. Under the per-capita caps included in the AHCA, health care will be rationed and schools will be forced to compete with other critical health care providers—hospitals, physicians, and clinics—that serve Medicaid-eligible children. School-based health services are mandated on the States and those mandates do not cease simply because Medicaid funds are capped by the AHCA. As with many other unfunded mandates, capping Medicaid merely shifts the financial burden of providing services to the States.

MEDICAID ENABLES SCHOOLS TO PROVIDE CRITICAL HEALTH CARE FOR STUDENTS

A school's primary responsibility is to provide students with a high-quality education. However, children cannot learn to their fullest potential with unmet health needs. As such, school district personnel regularly provide critical health services to ensure that all children are ready to learn and able to thrive alongside their peers. Schools deliver health services effectively and efficiently since school is where children spend most of their days. Increasing access to health care services through Medicaid improves health care and educational outcomes for students. Providing health and wellness services for students in poverty and services that benefit students with disabilities ultimately enables more children to become employable and attend higher education.

Since 1988, Medicaid has permitted payment to schools for certain medically-necessary services provided to children under the Individuals with Disabilities Education

Act (IDEA) through an individualized education program (IEP) or individualized family service program (IFSP). Schools are thus eligible to be reimbursed for direct medical services to Medicaid-eligible students with an IEP or IFSP. In addition, districts can receive Medicaid reimbursements for providing Early Periodic Screening Diagnostic and Treatment Benefits (EPSDT), which provide Medicaid-eligible children under age 21 with a broad array of diagnosis and treatment services. The goal of EPSDT is to assure that health problems are diagnosed and treated as early as possible before the problems become complex and treatment is more expensive.

School districts use their Medicaid reimbursement funds in a variety of ways to help support the learning and development of the children they serve. In a 2017 survey of school districts, district officials reported that two-thirds of Medicaid dollars are used to support the work of health professionals and other specialized instructional support personnel (e.g., speech-language pathologists, audiologists, occupational therapists, school psychologists, school social workers, and school nurses) who provide comprehensive health and mental health services to students. Districts also use these funds to expand the availability of a wide range of health and mental health services available to students in poverty, who are more likely to lack consistent access to healthcare professionals. Further, some districts depend on Medicaid reimbursements to purchase and update specialized equipment (e.g., walkers, wheelchairs, exercise equipment, special playground equipment, and equipment to assist with hearing and seeing) as well as assistive technology for students with disabilities to help them learn alongside their peers.

School districts would stand to lose much of their funding for Medicaid under the AHCA. Schools currently receive roughly \$4 billion in Medicaid reimbursements each year. Yet under this proposal, states would no longer have to consider schools as eligible Medicaid providers, which would mean that districts would have the same obligation to provide services for students with disabilities under IDEA, but no Medicaid dollars to provide medically-necessary services. Schools would be unable to provide EPSDT to students, which would mean screenings and treatment that take place in school settings would have to be moved to physician offices or hospital emergency rooms, where some families may not visit regularly or where costs are much higher.

In addition, basic health screenings for vision, hearing, and mental health problems for students would no longer be possible, making these problems more difficult to address and expensive to treat. Moving health screenings out of schools also reduces access to early identification and treatment, which also leads to more costly treatment down the road. Efforts by schools to enroll eligible students in Medicaid, as required, would also decline.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF MEDICAID PER CAPITA CAPS WILL POTENTIALLY BE DEVASTATING FOR CHILDREN

Significant reductions to Medicaid spending could have devastating effects on our nation's children, especially those with disabilities. Due to the underfunding of IDEA, districts rely on Medicaid reimbursements to ensure students with disabilities have access to the supports and services they need to access a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) and Early Intervention services. Potential consequences of this critical loss of funds include:

Fewer health services: Providing comprehensive physical and mental health services in schools improves accessibility for many children and youth, particularly in high-needs and hard-to-serve areas, such as rural and urban communities. In a 2017 survey of school district leaders, half of them indicated they recently took steps to increase Medicaid enrollment in their districts. Reduced funding for Medicaid would result in decreased access to critical health care for many children.

Cuts to general education: Cuts in Medicaid funding would require districts to divert funds from other educational programs to provide the services as mandated under IDEA. These funding reductions could result in an elimination of program cuts of equivalent cost in "non-mandated" areas of regular education.

Higher taxes: Many districts rely on Medicaid reimbursements to cover personnel costs for their special education programs. A loss in Medicaid dollars could lead to deficits in districts that require increases in property taxes or new levies to cover the costs of the special education programs.

Job loss: Districts use Medicaid reimbursement to support the salaries and benefits of the staff performing eligible services. Sixty-eight percent of districts use Medicaid funding to pay for direct salaries for health professionals who provide services for students. Cuts to Medicaid funding would impact districts' ability to maintain employment for school nurses, physical and occupational therapists, speech-language pathologists, school social workers, school psychologists, and many other critical school personnel who ensure students with disabilities and those with a variety of educational needs are able to learn.

Fewer critical supplies: Districts use Medicaid reimbursement for critical supplies such as wheelchairs, therapeutic bicycles, hydraulic changing tables, walkers, weighted vests, lifts, and student-specific items that are necessary for each child to access curriculum as closely as possible to their non-disabled peers. Replacing this equipment would be difficult if not impossible without Medicaid reimbursements.

Fewer mental health supports: Seven out of ten students receiving mental health services receive these services at school. Cuts to Medicaid would further marginalize these critical services and leave students without access to care.

Noncompliance with IDEA: Given the failure to commit federal resources to fully fund IDEA, Medicaid reimbursements serve as a critical funding stream to help schools provide the specialized instructional supports that students with disabilities need to be educated alongside their peers.

We urge you to carefully consider the important benefits that Medicaid provides to our nation's most vulnerable children. Schools are often the hub of the community, and converting Medicaid's financing structure to per-capita caps threatens to significantly reduce access to comprehensive health and mental and behavioral health care for children with disabilities and those living in poverty. We look forward to working with you to avert the harmful and unnecessary impacts the AHCA would impose on Medicaid, which has proven to benefit children in a highly effective and cost-effective manner.

If you have questions about the letter or wish to meet to discuss this issue further, please do not hesitate to reach out to the co-

alition co-chairs: John Hill, Sasha Pudelski and Kelly Vaillancourt Strobach.

Sincerely,

AASA, The School Superintendents Association, Accelify, American Civil Liberties Union, American Dance Therapy Association, American Federation of Teachers, American Foundation for the Blind, American Occupational Therapy Association, American Psychological Association, Association of Assistive Technology Act Programs, Association of Educational Service Agencies, Association of School Business Officials International (ASBO), Association of University Centers on Disabilities, Autistic Self Advocacy Network, Center for American Progress, Center for Public Representation, Clearinghouse on Women's Issues, Colorado School Medicaid Consortium, Conference of Educational Administrators of Schools and Programs for the Deaf, Council for Exceptional Children, Council of Administrators of Special Education, Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates, Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund.

Division for Early Childhood of the Council for Exceptional Children (DEC), Health and Education Alliance of Louisiana, Healthy Schools Campaign, Healthmaster Holdings LLC, Higher Education Consortium for Special Education, Judge David L. Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, LEAnet, a national coalition of local education agencies, Learning Disabilities Association of America, Lutheran Services in America Disability Network, Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators, Michigan Association of School Administrators, National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners, National Association of School Nurses, National Association of School Psychologists, National Association of Social Workers, National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), National Association of State Head Injury Administrators.

National Black Justice Coalition, National Black Justice Coalition, National Center for Learning Disabilities, National Association of Councils on Developmental Disabilities, National Disability Rights Network, National Down Syndrome Congress, National Education Association, National Health Law Program, National Respite Coalition, National Rural Education Advocacy Collaborative, National Rural Education Association, National School Boards Association, Paradigm Healthcare Services, School Social Work Association of America, School-Based Health Alliance, Share Our Strength, Society for Public Health Education, Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, The Arc of the United States, United Way Worldwide.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the TrumpCare Act. I am fortunate to have been born and raised in Hawaii where we are taught to never forget our seniors, our kupuna.

AARP, with a national membership of 38 million and over 150,000 in Hawaii, remains steadfastly opposed to TrumpCare. The amendment proposed today makes the bill worse. And for our kupuna in Hawaii and nationally, they will have no relief from the age tax.

This chart shows how much more at age 64 a person will pay in premiums, almost \$6,800 in Hawaii where we have one of the best health cares. A 55-year-

old will see a premium increase of almost \$3,600 a year. Why? What did the seniors do that TrumpCare wants to penalize them and pay such a premium when they are moving towards retirement? TrumpCare is out to get those 50 to 64 with this terrible age tax.

Vote against H.R. 1628. These numbers will not be different in your districts.

Mrs. BLACK. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, could you advise us how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Tennessee has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

□ 1315

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from the United Steelworkers, the AFL-CIO, and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters in relation to this bill.

UNITED STEELWORKERS,
May 3, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the members of the United Steelworkers union (USW), I continue to urge you to oppose the American Health Care Act (AHCA), despite proposed amendments. This legislation will adversely affect every American's health insurance benefits including workplace plans, Medicare, Medicaid, and the individual market.

This harmful and partisan legislation will cause tens of millions to lose insurance coverage over the next decade. Deductibles and premiums are expected to rise. In short, rather than reducing costs of health care, this bill will simply shift costs to working Americans and their families while cutting taxes for the wealthy and corporations.

The MacArthur Amendment allows states to opt out of certain protections under the Affordable Care Act such as the requirements that insurers provide plans with a minimum package of services and don't discriminate against people with pre-existing conditions. The amendment also lets states allow insurance companies to charge older people up to five times what they charge younger people. This amendment will allow for an uneven patchwork of insurance coverage across the country and will make insurance cost prohibitive for many working and retired Americans. Although lawmakers are working to address the treatment of individuals with pre-existing conditions, none of the proposals have adequately addressed the costs associated with removal of the Affordable Care Act's protections for those individuals.

Overall, the AHCA is a transfer of wealth from working Americans to the very wealthy and to corporations including the pharmaceutical industry, insurance companies, and medical device manufacturers. It removes taxes on the very wealthy and on corporations, giving the wealthiest 400 household an average tax cut of about \$7 million each. Meanwhile, the bill retains the "Cadillac Tax" which puts the burden of the cost of this legislation squarely on the backs of middle class working families.

Most of our members are covered under employer-negotiated insurance plans. However, the AHCA removes the employer-mandate included in the Affordable Care Act. This dramatically changes the incentive and landscape for employer-sponsored insurance, which threatens the system that provides insurance for millions of hard-working Americans. CBO estimated that 7 million people will lose their workplace coverage as a result of this bill.

The AHCA also undoes protections and assistance for older Americans and our members who are retirees with dramatically increased out-of-pocket costs to Americans who are older but not yet eligible for Medicare. For those who will or currently rely on Medicare this bill reduces the solvency of the program by three years by repealing taxes on the wealthy and on corporations.

Additionally, this bill makes perilous cuts to Medicaid which provides health care to low-income Americans who have been laid off, work at low-paying jobs, are disabled, or are elderly. This will strain already limited state budgets, restrict the needy Americans who are eligible for assistance, and eliminate needed services.

Our members who work in the health care industry may also be affected by job losses and strained budgets caused by the passage of this bill. Providers (our employers) may be subjected to lower reimbursement rates from state Medicaid programs as a result of the federal cuts. Also, the costs of uncompensated care will rise as millions of Americans lose health insurance but still need health care treatment for illnesses and injuries. Once again, hard-working middle class health care workers will have to bear the costs of this harmful legislation.

The amendments to the bill do not change the fundamental flaws in the legislation enough to make it worthy of your support. Harmful tax cuts are retained, and the bill would not do anything to reduce costs or to prevent Americans from losing health insurance—in fact, this bill would make those problems worse.

The American Health Care Act is a harmful piece of legislation that does not solve the problems in our current health insurance system. Despite amendments, the costs of this bill would still be borne by working families, making health care less affordable and less accessible. The United Steelworkers strongly opposes the AHCA and we urge you to vote against it.

Sincerely,

LEO W. GERARD,
International President.

AFL-CFO,
May 4, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 12.5 million working people represented by the AFL-CFO, I urge you to oppose the American Health Care Act (AHCA, H.R. 1628). In a stunning fashion, this bill takes health coverage away from about 24 million people while providing massive tax cuts for the wealthy and large corporations. No one in good conscience can support this legislation.

It is important to understand what is driving Republicans to pursue a massive roll back in health coverage. While it is packaged as health care reform, a straightforward look at this legislation shows that it is fundamentally designed to pare back public commitments to health coverage in order to benefit the wealthy.

House Speaker Paul Ryan publically boasted that the AHCA is a “trillion dollar tax

cut” that will benefit corporations and pave the way for further tax “reform.” He made clear that repealing the Affordable Care Act (ACA) taxes is a major aim of the bill. The tax cuts, however, largely go to higher earners and corporations. The one ACA tax left intact is the only one that predominantly impacts working people—the so-called “Cadillac” tax on workplace health benefits.

There are terrible human costs to this upward redistribution of wealth. Millions of individuals will again face the dilemma of choosing between getting life-saving medical treatment and meeting their families’ basic financial needs.

The AHCA replaces ACA subsidies that support a minimum level of coverage with tax credits so small that at least 3 million people will be unable to afford coverage in the individual market, according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). Millions more will find that they can only afford skimpy coverage that will leave them exposed to substantial costs should they face major sickness, undoubtedly increasing the number of medical bankruptcies. The bill allows insurers to require that seniors in the individual market pay five times as much in premiums as younger adults, imposing an “age tax.”

The bill also decimates Medicaid, ending the program as we know it—placing seniors, people with disabilities, and children in jeopardy of losing access to care. The AHCA slashes the program by \$839 billion dollars over ten years, and CBO estimates that these cuts will result in 14 million people losing their coverage. In using the program as a piggy bank, without efforts to improve the services it provides, the AHCA manages to shift resources away from many of the nation’s most vulnerable people as part of its redistribution project.

Medicare is not spared either. The bill pulls approximately \$77 billion from the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund to provide a tax cut to the wealthy, shortening the lifespan of the fund. An additional \$28 billion is extracted from Medicare’s trust fund for outpatient medical services, to provide a tax break for pharmaceutical companies.

Employer-based health insurance, the nation’s major source of coverage, also gets hit. The AHCA preserves the so-called “Cadillac” tax on workplace health coverage that will impact more than 42 percent of large employer plans when it goes into effect. Economists predict the tax will cause employers to hollow-out the coverage provided in their plans, exposing workers to higher out-of-pocket costs, such as deductibles and copays. In some cases, employers are expected to drop coverage altogether. The bill also eliminates the penalty that employers face when they do not comply with the ACA’s employer shared responsibility requirements. CBO estimates that seven million people will lose employer-based coverage under the AHCA.

These sacrifices in health coverage finance stunning tax cuts for the very wealthy and corporations. The legislation provides the 400 highest-income households with an average annual tax cut of \$7 million each. Large corporations see impressive windfalls. The AHCA gives insurance companies alone \$145 billion in tax relief, while medical device makers get \$20 billion, and pharmaceutical companies benefit by paying less into Medicare.

The reasons for opposing this legislation, which sacrifices health coverage for millions to support tax cuts for the few, are clear. We

hope you stand with working people when you make your choice.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director,
Government Affairs Department.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
OF TEAMSTERS,
May 4, 2017.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.4 million members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and their families, I urge you to vote no on the American Health Care Act (AHCA) today. The Teamsters have long opposed proposals to tax worker health benefits and this legislation retains the 40 percent excise tax on high quality health care plans which would ultimately reduce the health benefits that hard working Americans receive and increase their out of pocket costs. The amendments added to the bill do nothing to allay Teamster concerns nor address the fundamental flaws of the underlying bill. The amendments make the bill worse than before by opening the door to the erosion or elimination of minimum coverage and pre-existing condition protections and by allowing insurers to charge older adults much higher premiums. It does not change the fact that the millions of American families will lose health insurance.

Congress should be looking for ways to strengthen the middle class instead of promoting policies that will ultimately take money from their hard earned paychecks and reduce, and make more costly, the health care benefits they receive.

The American Health Care Act remains fatally flawed. Accordingly, I call on you to oppose and vote no on the American Health Care Act when it comes to the floor today.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,
General President.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, this is not how Washington is supposed to work. We are supposed to improve the lives of hardworking people. Instead, this reckless and dangerous TrumpCare bill would undermine both the health and the economic security of millions of Americans, people like Emily Carlson.

Emily is a small-business owner and mother of two from rural Abingdon, Illinois. She lives with MS, a lifelong and very expensive preexisting condition. Before healthcare reform, Emily and her husband, Kevin, a farmer, often had to sit around the table at night, go over their bills, and decide between sickness or debt from one month to the next. If this bill passes, that is a choice they are going to have to face once again.

For families like the Carlsons, TrumpCare means higher costs, fewer choices, and worse coverage.

TrumpCare is a bad deal for Americans, but it is devastating for rural Americans. Right now, there are nearly 700 rural hospitals at risk of closure. This bill will pull the plug on far too many of them, killing thousands of jobs and ripping the economic heart out of small towns across our Nation.

It is time to put hardworking families first. Do the right thing, and vote against this bill.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Cancer Society, which states cancer patients and survivors need affordable, accessible insurance coverage with no preexisting condition exclusions or annual and lifetime caps and that high-risk pools have failed to meet these basic needs.

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY
CANCER ACTION NETWORK,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: The American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network (ACS CAN) is deeply concerned about the reports of additional amendments to the American Health Care Act (AHCA), including one that would allegedly add \$8 billion in new spending for state high-risk pools. This amendment is particularly egregious because it would further incentivize states to apply for waivers from current-law market rules that protect patients with pre-existing conditions.

Historically, state high-risk pools have fallen short of providing coverage of prevention, treatment and follow-up care for cancer patients and survivors. Segmenting people with cancer and other serious illnesses away from the private marketplace and into high-risk pools absent an adequate and permanent source of public funding has never been an adequate solution.

Between 1976 and 2010, 35 states created high-risk pools to cover individuals who could not otherwise purchase insurance in the private market, usually because of a pre-existing condition. Every one of those risk pools experienced net operating losses year after year. Furthermore, high-risk pools did not result in lower premiums. All of them set premiums above the non-group market average or standard rate in the state, usually by 150–200 percent. Only a few states provided additional premium assistance for low-income individuals, leaving many who could not afford premiums priced out of the program. Most states also imposed waiting periods before covering pre-existing conditions. An individual with a prior cancer diagnosis often had to wait 6–12 months before the high-risk pool would cover the costs associated with cancer treatment or follow-up survivorship care. Most states imposed limitations on coverage with either lifetime or annual limits. And most plans offered deductibles of \$1,000 or higher. Neither AHCA, nor the new amendment would fully protect patients from any of those conditions.

Cancer patients and survivors need insurance coverage that is affordable, readily accessible, and protects them from pre-existing condition exclusions, annual and lifetime caps on coverage and extraordinary out-of-pocket costs. Past experience has shown that high-risk pools failed to meet these basic

needs, yet still were a drain on state budgets.

As we have indicated in our earlier letters, there are reasonable fixes that could be made to the current law. We stand ready to work with you to develop policies that improve the law and encourage a robust health insurance market that provides affordable and comprehensive coverage options.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER W. HANSEN,
President.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this cruel bill on behalf of my constituents, especially those it would hurt the most: people with preexisting conditions, older Americans, veterans, and lower income people.

If this bill passes, we will go back to the days when people with preexisting conditions could be denied coverage or charged more, when insurers could decide whether or not to cover basic care like hospitalization, and when sick babies might hit their insurer's lifetime coverage limit before they could even walk.

Under this bill, older Americans will pay more. In fact, Americans aged 50 to 64 would pay premiums five times higher than others. Veterans will lose access to tax credits that make private coverage affordable, and lower income people will be hurt.

Taking away Medicaid expansion would put affordable coverage out of reach for millions and set us back in the fight against the heroin, fentanyl, and opioid crisis.

Instead of this cruel bill, let's come together to improve health care, not take health insurance away from millions just to give tax credits to the wealthiest. We are better than that.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to myself.

The American Health Care Act has gone through many fits and starts over the last few months. This bill begins to fulfill our promise to the American people by reducing costs for American families. It eliminates ObamaCare's burdens on small businesses and families and protects those with preexisting conditions. We must continue to work to build on this.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCARTHY), our majority leader.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for yielding, but, more importantly, I thank Congresswoman DIANE BLACK for more than four decades as a nurse, for caring for the sick, for her passion for the unborn, and for her work on this legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Americans are a practical people. We know that we can have fair health care that helps those who need it without trapping everyone in a government-run system dreamed up by Washington's central planners.

Now, contrary to our freedom, ObamaCare forced the American people to purchase insurance. Contrary to our

well-being, ObamaCare imposed taxes we cannot bear. Contrary to what is responsible and right, ObamaCare made Medicaid unsustainable for the people most in need. And contrary to common sense, ObamaCare regulations continued to drive up the cost of insurance beyond what people can afford.

You want to know how ObamaCare is working? Just read this week's papers. Now, let me take you all the way back to yesterday. This is the headline: "Medica, the last insurer selling individual health policies in most of Iowa, likely to exit."

Now, 94 of the 99 counties will have no insurer in Iowa. Ninety-four of the 94 counties in Iowa will have no insurer.

Here is another headline from yesterday: "Aetna will exit ObamaCare markets in Virginia in 2018."

Humana left the ObamaCare exchanges. Blue Cross left Nebraska. United Healthcare left all but a handful of markets this year.

Mr. Speaker, we have roughly 3,000 counties in all of America. One-third, 1,022, only have one provider. Soon, more counties will have none.

So do you know what doesn't cover preexisting conditions? A healthcare system that doesn't have coverage. No options means no coverage. That is the road ObamaCare is leading us down, and doing nothing leaves too many Americans out in the cold.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will not stand for that. We tried the ObamaCare way. It is failing remarkably, and the American people are demanding a change.

Now we have a chance to do something great. We could have care without control, stability without centralization, and support without mandates. We have a chance to listen to the American people and repeal and replace ObamaCare.

The American Health Care Act will repeal the individual and employer mandates. It will repeal ObamaCare taxes. It will repeal ObamaCare rules. It will repeal ObamaCare subsidies. And it will do what is right by stopping taxpayer funding for abortion providers and by refocusing Medicaid on those who most need it. We replace all of that with a system that protects those with preexisting conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I heard a lot about this bill, and this bill is not 2,000 pages. It is less than 130. But, Mr. Speaker, I have heard things on this floor that are not true.

So let me state it one more time. We will replace all that with a system that protects those with preexisting conditions and then reduces premiums through the tried-and-true process of fair competition.

As the price of insurance decreases, we give those who still can't quite afford it a step up through tax credits and expanded health savings accounts. This is fundamental and structural reform.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since I have had the honor to stand on this floor and serve in this House, this body has done many good things. We have stood time and again for what was best for our country, struggling against other branches for so long. Many times that required us to dig in our heels and stop something terrible. It is good to stop bad things from happening, but it is great to make good things happen. Finally, after years of waiting, we have the chance to do something good today.

This bill is not perfect. No bill could be. The question is not: Why can't it be made perfect? The question is: Do we retreat or do we act? Do we take this great leap to repeal and replace ObamaCare, extend a hand to our fellow citizens most in need and break free from Washington control, or do we continue to wait for a day that is already here in the hope of a better day that may never come?

We were not sent here to wait. We are called to action. This is our opportunity. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to read another day of headlines of more people going without insurance, without insurance without preexisting conditions, without coverage.

Today we will do something good. That is why today we will act.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleague that his vote for this bill could take away protections for preexisting conditions from almost 6 million people in California who would have access to coverage. Those with diabetes could see their premiums go up by \$5,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, this is a terrible bill. This bill will cut 24 million Americans out of health insurance. This bill will gut Planned Parenthood in the first year, affecting women across the country. And it will cut \$850 billion out of Medicaid hurting the poor and the disabled in our country. It is unconscionable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Virginia yielding for the purpose of debate?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. No. Just for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is engaging in debate. The time of the gentleman will be deducted.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Would the Speaker advise how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill, and I include in the RECORD a statement of the

American Hospital Association against the bill.

I just want to say this bill can have a very simple slogan: American people are going to pay more and get less. That is what this bill does.

STATEMENT ON THE AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

(By Rick Pollack, President and CEO, American Hospital Association, April 27, 2017)

The latest version of the AHCA continues to put health coverage in jeopardy for many Americans. Our top concern is what this change could mean for older and sicker patients, including those with preexisting conditions, such as cancer patients and those with chronic conditions. For these reasons, along with our previously stated concerns about the AHCA, we cannot support the bill. However, we urge Congress to continue to work with stakeholders on a solution that provides meaningful coverage.

The amendment proposed this week would dramatically worsen the bill. The changes included put consumer protections at greater risk by allowing states to waive the essential health benefit standards, which could leave patients without access to critical health services and increase out-of-pocket spending. This could allow plans to set premium prices based on individual risk for some consumers, which could significantly raise costs for those with pre-existing conditions.

Additionally, the Congressional Budget Office has not yet scored the amendment. However, CBO previously projected that the AHCA would result in 24 million fewer people covered in 2026. It is unlikely this amendment would improve these coverage estimates.

As the backbone of America's health safety-net, hospitals and health systems must protect access to care for those who need it and ensure that the most vulnerable patients are not left behind. The AHCA continues to fall far short of that goal.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make one point: It is most shameful to take \$882 billion out of Medicaid to help the poor—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not making a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.—and give it to the wealthy. That is the wrong thing to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, would the Speaker advise again how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican's pay-more-for-less healthcare plan.

I often repeat the 1966 observation of Martin Luther King, Jr., that, of all the inequalities that exist, the injustice in health care is the most egregious and inhumane.

On the day it was passed, I observed that the Affordable Care Act is the Civil Rights Act of the 21st century. Repealing the Affordable Care Act would be inhumane and put egregious forms of discrimination back into our healthcare delivery system.

My Republican colleagues and President Trump have promised more coverage and less cost for everyone. However, this plan would allow all States to eliminate essential health benefits, such as maternity and newborn coverage, prescription drugs, hospitalization, emergency coverage, and mental health services. It would also allow States to tax older Americans five times more than younger Americans.

Republicans are reneging on their promise to protect Americans with pre-existing conditions. Without essential health benefits standards, protections for those with preexisting conditions will exist in name only.

Repeal of the essential health benefits would drive a race to the bottom, with insurers dropping coverage for everything from chemotherapy to high-cost drugs.

It would precipitate a proliferation of junk policies that have historically plagued unsuspecting low-income communities for years. People with pre-existing conditions who need these and other costly services would not be able to find the coverage they need at any price, much less an affordable one. We took a giant step away from this with the ACA, but this Republican bill takes us back to that era where people with preexisting conditions are left in the cold.

Adding money to a State slush fund is not a solution. Repealing the ACA would, once again, institutionalize inhumanity and egregiousness.

□ 1330

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader, for our closing statement.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him, Congressman SCOTT, I thank FRANK PALLONE, JOHN YARMUTH, RITCHIE NEAL, our ranking members, who have done such excellent work on this debate on the values of our country.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Mr. CLYBURN, began his remarks quoting Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, and I want to join him. I think those words bear repeating. Over 50 years ago, Dr. King said: "Of all of the forms of inequality, injustice in health care is the most shocking and the most inhumane because it often results in physical death."

We come to the floor with the moral force of Dr. Martin Luther King's

words in our hearts: Affordable health care is a civil right, a fundamental right for every person in our country, not just the privileged few.

And so, in the spirit of Mr. CLYBURN and Dr. King, let us be prayerful about how we go forward on this very personal issue about the well-being of every person in our country.

Speaker RYAN once called this bill an act of mercy. There is no mercy here. Indeed, inequality and inhumanity is exactly what TrumpCare has in store for the American people. But when he said it is an act of mercy, here is what others said.

From the beginning, TrumpCare was a moral monstrosity that will devastate seniors, children, and hard-working Americans. That was from me. But don't take it from me.

Sister Simone Campbell said: This is not the faithful way forward and must be rejected.

The Catholic Health Association wrote: We strongly encourage the full House to reject this replacement bill.

And the United Methodist Church, opposing TrumpCare, this is what they said: People will die because of efforts like this to roll back health care.

Lutheran Services in America said: TrumpCare will jeopardize the health care and long-term services and supports of millions of Americans.

The Episcopal Church said: TrumpCare falls woefully short of our spiritual calling to care for the least of these, as well as the noble values upon which our great Nation was founded.

And all that was said before the Republicans decided to destroy the protections of Americans with preexisting conditions.

I grant our Republican friends their position. I respect them and their constituents who sent them here. But I reject the wrong priorities in TrumpCare—tax cuts for the rich at the expense of the health insurance for tens of millions of working families across America.

TrumpCare very clearly spotlights the differences in priorities between Democrats and Republicans in Congress. It has stepped forward in the longstanding Republican belief that Medicare should wither on the vine, that Medicaid should be shrunk, and that Social Security should be privatized.

If you believe in the health and well-being of the American people, you must reject this bill before us now. It is what TrumpCare—here is what it means to the American people. You know, much has been said about policy here today and over time. Much has been said about politics, what are the politics of this.

What is really important is what this means to the American people. And they know they are listening. They know what it means to them.

It means, TrumpCare does, it forces families to pay higher premiums and

deductibles, increasing out-of-pocket costs. Higher costs.

Less coverage. TrumpCare will take away health care from more than 24 million hardworking Americans.

A crushing age tax. TrumpCare forces Americans aged 50 to 64 to pay premiums five times higher than what others pay for health coverage, no matter how healthy they are.

It steals from Medicare. TrumpCare shortens the life of the Medicare trust fund and ransacks funds that seniors depend on to get long-term care they need. That is why it is consistent with their wither on the vine for Medicare philosophy.

And then, if that were not bad enough, and they couldn't pass their bill because it was that bad, they moved further away from the American people by gutting key protections. TrumpCare eviscerates essential health benefits such as maternity care, prescription drugs, emergency coverage, prenatal care, and guts protections for Americans with preexisting medical conditions.

As bad as TrumpCare was the first time around, you know, it was dead. It died. It died right here on the floor. Now it has come back to life like a zombie, even more scary than before, and it is even worse.

If Republicans had their way, Americans with preexisting conditions will be pushed off their insurance and segregated into high-risk pools, where they will face soaring costs, worse coverage, and restricted care.

TrumpCare means huge premium increases. It is a frightening future for families who need affordable, dependable care the most.

Now, on the floor, the Republicans have recklessly, and some would say fraudulently, claimed that TrumpCare covers Americans with preexisting conditions. It does not.

As Robert Graboyes at the conservative Mercatus Center said about the Upton amendment: “. . . the \$8 billion amount is a pittance. Spread over 5 years, it is a fifth of a pittance.”

As Karen Pollitz from the Kaiser Family Foundation said, the Upton amendment will cover the costs for only 1 percent of the individual market. Others have given it up to 5 percent; 1 to 5 percent. Does that mean covering? No.

Forcing a vote without a CBO score shows that the Republicans are afraid of the facts. They are afraid of learning the full consequences of their plan to push Americans with preexisting conditions into the cold or, as my colleague from New York said, off the sidewalk.

If Republicans thought they were really protecting people, they wouldn't be afraid of the facts. But they are also afraid of the truth, and the truth that would come forth if we knew the facts. And they are afraid that the American people would find out that this is not a

healthcare bill, this is a tax bill disguised as a health bill.

This is a bill that is one of the biggest transfers of wealth from the middle class to the richest people and corporations in America. This is a tax bill not a healthcare bill. That is why they have to do it now so they can get on with their tax bill.

But the suffering TrumpCare will inflict on the sick is all too clear. That is why this disastrous bill has been condemned by the American Medical Association, the American Cancer Society, the American Diabetes Association, the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, the American Society of Clinical Oncology, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, AIDS United, the Children's Hospital Association, AARP, the March of Dimes. The list goes on and on—the American Cancer Society.

Instead of reading all of these pages, I include them for the RECORD.

Trumpcare—pulled from the House Floor by Speaker Paul Ryan on March 24—already meant higher health costs, more than 24 million Americans losing their health coverage, gutting key protections, a crushing Age Tax, and stealing from Medicare.

Amazingly, Republicans have managed to make Trumpcare even worse. The MacArthur Amendment would completely gut the protections for people with pre-existing conditions by allowing states to waive essential health benefits and community rating rules, which prevent insurers from charging people with pre-existing conditions more. This will make it all but impossible for millions of Americans fighting illness to afford the coverage they desperately need.

As seen below, over the last few days, the number of health care, consumer, seniors, children, disability and other groups that are speaking out against Trumpcare continues to grow.

A Coalition of Patient Advocacy Groups, Including American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, American Lung Association, American Diabetes Association, and March of Dimes: “In March, our patient advocacy organizations collectively urged Congress to ensure that any changes made to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) provide affordable, accessible and adequate coverage and do not result in a loss of coverage for any Americans. The AHCA would do the opposite, causing at least 24 million Americans to lose health insurance, according to the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office. . . . We are alarmed by recent harmful changes to AHCA . . . These changes include allowing states to waive the requirement for essential health benefits . . . Another change allows states to waive protections against health status rating. Weakening these rules would enable insurers to charge higher prices to people with pre-existing conditions, possibly making insurance unaffordable for those who need it most. . . . The individuals and families we represent cannot go back to a time when people with pre-existing conditions could be denied coverage or forced to choose between purchasing basic necessities and affording their health care coverage. Given these factors, we oppose the latest draft of the AHCA. We urge Members of Congress to reject this legislation.” [5/1/17]

American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Physicians, American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health, National Partnership for Women & Families: "Rather than support recent gains in women's access to healthcare and coverage, the MacArthur Amendment and AHCA turn back the clock and reverse hard-won progress. . . . The MacArthur Amendment would enable states to waive EHBs including those for maternity and newborn care, preventive services, and services for mental health and substance use disorders; [and] to waive community rating rules. . . . Supporters of the bill claim this bill maintains protections for those with pre-existing conditions, but allowing states to waive coverage of EHB and charge people more based on their health status renders the promise of coverage for preexisting conditions to be meaningless. . . . Women and families must not be made to suffer, lose access to care and coverage, and pay higher healthcare costs. . . . The AHCA and the MacArthur Amendment turn the clock back on women's health and should not move forward." [5/1/17]

Association of American Medical Colleges: "This week, the House could vote on a new version of the American Health Care Act that includes the MacArthur amendment. . . . The [MacArthur] amendment's treatment of essential health benefits and health status underwriting dilutes protections for many Americans and would leave individuals with preexisting conditions facing higher premiums and reduced access to care. The shortcomings in the underlying bill remain the same. The original analysis from the Congressional Budget Office indicated that 14 million Americans would lose their health insurance coverage as early as next year, and as many as 24 million by 2024. Nothing in the bill has changed that alters the fact that this legislation would lead to fewer Americans with quality insurance, less affordable coverage for those who have it, and the destabilization of the current Medicaid program." [5/2/17]

Children's Hospital Association: "On behalf of our nation's children's hospitals and the patients and families they serve, Children's Hospital Association (CHA) continues to oppose the newly modified American Health Care Act (AHCA) and strongly urges the House of Representatives to reject the bill. Recently adopted changes only worsen the AHCA by putting children with pre-existing conditions at increased risk of losing health care coverage and failing to correct the Medicaid cuts that would impact over 30 million kids. . . . The block grant option in particular would be devastating to children as it eliminates Medicaid's EPSDT (Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment) benefit which ensures children receive immunizations, mental health assessments and vision, eye and hearing exams as well as other medical services they might need. CHA urgently asks members of Congress to vote against the AHCA." [4/27/17]

Children's Leadership Council: "The Children's Leadership Council opposes the American Health Care Act (AHCA) because it would jeopardize health care for millions of babies, children, youth and families. We urge you to vote NO on this legislation. . . . The AHCA's changes to Medicaid would radically restructure a program that has worked for more than 50 years to support children's health. The Medicaid cap would shift \$839 billion to states, forcing them to cut eligibility, benefits, or provider rates that could have

disastrous health consequences. There is no question that the massive cuts to Medicaid, increased premiums likely for millions of families, and eliminating the Essential Health Benefits requirements under current law will seriously harm children and families. . . . This legislation is a dangerous step backward." [5/1/17]

Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities: "The Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD) is strongly opposed to the amended American Health Care Act. The amended American Health Care Act retains the original bill's proposals to dramatically cut Medicaid services that are vital to people with disabilities and seniors through per capita caps, which CCD has opposed. . . . The newest amendments to the American Health Care Act make the bill even more harmful to people with disabilities. The new amendments would allow states to easily obtain waivers that would allow them to charge higher premiums to people with pre-existing conditions, including people with disabilities. They would also allow states to seek waivers from the Affordable Care Act's requirement to provide essential health benefits, including services for people with disabilities. . . . We urge you to oppose the bill should it come to a vote." [4/28/17]

National Education Association: "Apparently, snatching health care coverage from children and families was not enough for House Republican leaders and the Trump administration. To make a terrible bill even worse, a new amendment to the American Health Care Act (AHCA) would allow states to jettison existing essential health benefit requirements and permit insurance companies to charge people with pre-existing conditions more than they charge healthy people. . . . If the AHCA and new amendment are enacted, millions of kids and families would effectively lose the health care coverage they need. The new amendment also threatens to make insurance for people with pre-existing conditions prohibitively expensive." [4/27/17]

American Society of Clinical Oncology: "On behalf of the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO), I write to express our strong opposition to the American Health Care Act (AHCA), as currently amended. . . . Studies show that when cancer patients do not have adequate insurance they receive less care, receive it later, and have worse outcomes than those with better insurance coverage. . . . The AHCA as currently constructed will create or worsen barriers to care. It will add costs to the system, decrease access to appropriate treatment and increase existing disparities of care. We are especially concerned with provisions allowing state waivers that could erode important protections for people with cancer, including pre-existing condition safeguards, coverage of essential services, and access to affordable health insurance. . . . ASCO strongly opposes passage of the AHCA in its current form." [4/27/17]

American Thoracic Society: "On behalf of the 16,000 members of the American Thoracic Society (ATS), I want to voice my grave concerns with the latest legislative proposal developed to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act (ACA). . . . The ATS opposes any legislation that does not ensure affordable health insurance coverage for Americans currently insured under the ACA. We are concerned that allowing states to waive important insurance reforms in the Affordable Care Act will lead to reduced coverage for many Americans and significant price increases for patients with preexisting condi-

tions. Further, we are concerned that reliance on 'high risk pools' will not adequately meet the health insurance needs of many Americans with pre-existing conditions. We note that previous attempts at implementing state-based high risk pools have been largely unsuccessful. Members of the ATS serve a large and diverse patient population, including patients with respiratory diseases, critical illnesses and sleep disorders such as asthma, COPD, pneumonia, sepsis and obstructive sleep apnea. Our patients cannot afford to lose affordable health insurance coverage for any period of time." [4/27/17]

Lutheran Services in America: "Lutheran Services in America continues to oppose the drastic and unnecessary restructure of the Medicaid guarantee to a per capita cap system as proposed in the American Health Care Act (AHCA). Furthermore, we oppose the bill's new provisions that eliminate protections for people with pre-existing conditions as these provisions would be devastating to people with chronic diseases and disabilities. . . . In addition, the modified bill maintains the AHCA's drastic cuts and fundamental restructuring of the Medicaid program, shifting significant risks and costs to states, and to the people who need and provide Medicaid services. . . . Lutheran Services in America respectfully urges members of Congress to reject this or any legislation that would erode Medicaid, increase the number of uninsured and/or decrease protections for preexisting conditions." [4/28/17]

Planned Parenthood Federation of America: "The latest Republican proposal to repeal the Affordable Care Act is the worst legislation for women's health in a lifetime. It eliminates the community rating provision, allowing insurers to charge people with pre-existing conditions an exorbitant amount for coverage. Despite the fact that the proposal claims to maintain the current prohibition on gender rating, it still allows insurers to once again discriminate against women and charge more for being a woman. Eliminating the community rating provision disproportionately affects women, since insurers can claim having given birth, having had a C-section, or having been a survivor of domestic violence is a so-called pre-existing condition. For example, a woman who had breast cancer could be charged more than \$28,000 per year for coverage and a woman who was previously pregnant could be charged more than \$17,000 per year for . . . They took a bad bill that would result in 24 million people losing their insurance and higher premiums and actually made it worse." [4/27/17]

Federal AIDS Policy Partnership: "The undersigned 77 organizations are writing to strongly urge you to oppose the amended American Health Care Act (AHCA) on behalf of the 24 million or more Americans estimated to lose coverage, including tens of thousands of people with HIV. . . . Healthcare coverage can be a life or death issue for people living with HIV, and in the three years that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) coverage has been available it has made a critical difference. . . . We cannot afford to go back to the pre-ACA sick care system that focused on treating disability and disease rather than preventing it. Please support access to healthcare coverage for the more than 52 million Americans living with pre-existing conditions, including 1.1 million living with HIV. We hope we can count on you to oppose the amended American Health Care Act." [5/1/17]

AIDS United: "AIDS United seeks a health care system that will eventually enable the

end of HIV in the United States. AHCA makes major changes to the U.S. health care system that would, if passed, worsen the provision of HIV prevention services for people at risk for HIV and the treatment and care for people living with HIV. . . . AIDS United is especially concerned that the [MacArthur] amendment, far from improving the situation, will make it easier for insurance companies to raise rates on people living with HIV, people with other chronic conditions and the elderly. . . . AIDS United notes that thanks to Congress's strong response over many years, the U.S. has made substantial progress in responding to the HIV epidemic. However, doing so requires a strong health care system that can ensure that people living with HIV are able to access care and treatment. . . . H.R. 1628 will reverse some of the gains that we have made in ensuring coverage for both prevention and treatment. AIDS United urges you to decide to vote no and publicly state your position prior to any vote." [4/28/17]

American College of Nurse-Midwives: "On behalf of the American College of Nurse-Midwives, . . . we strongly urge the House of Representatives to vote NO on the revised American Health Care Act (AHCA). The legislation, in its current form, would further impeded access to healthcare and coverage for millions of women and newborns. Midwives stand for improving access to quality care and coverage for women and newborns . . . including, but not limited to, coverage and access to a full range of preventative, reproductive and sexual health services under state Medicaid programs and coverage and access to essential health benefits (EHBs), including maternity and newborn care. The newly-revised AHCA language will end this guarantee and radically turn back the clock on the progress made in women's health. Specifically, the "MacArthur Amendment" would enable states to apply for the ability to waive EHBs, including those for maternity and newborn care, to waive community rating rules, and to shift patient with pre-existing conditions or illnesses into high-risk pools. These provisions, if adopted, could have dire consequences for women's health and health coverage." [4/27/17]

AARP: "This harmful legislation still puts an Age Tax on older Americans and puts vulnerable populations at risk through a series of backdoor deals that attempt to shift responsibility to states. Older Americans need affordable health care services and prescriptions. This legislation still goes in the opposite direction, increasing insurance premiums for older Americans and not doing anything to lower drug costs. AARP continues to oppose legislation that would impose an Age Tax, eliminate protections for pre-existing conditions, weaken Medicare, erode seniors' ability to live independently because of billions of dollars in Medicaid cuts, and give sweetheart deals to drug and insurance companies while doing nothing to lower the cost of health care or prescription drugs. We intend to let all 38 million of our members know exactly how their Representative votes on this bill in newsletters, in our publications, on social media and in other formats." [4/26/17]

American Medical Association: "After reviewing the MacArthur Amendment to H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act (AHCA), the American Medical Association (AMA) remains opposed to passage of this legislation. As we have previously stated, we are deeply concerned that the AHCA would result in millions of Americans losing their current health insurance coverage. Nothing in the

MacArthur amendment remedies the shortcomings of the underlying bill. The MacArthur Amendment would allow states to apply for waivers for critical consumer protections provided in the Affordable Care Act (ACA), including. . . . the requirements that health insurers must cover certain essential health benefits, and the ban on health status underwriting. The current ban on health status underwriting protects individuals from being discriminated against by virtue of their medical conditions. Prior to the passage of the ACA, such individuals were routinely denied coverage and/or priced out of affordable coverage. We are particularly concerned about allowing states to waive this requirement because it will likely lead to patients losing their coverage." [4/27/17]

American College of Physicians: "The College strongly believes in the first, do no harm principle. Therefore, we continue to urge that Congress move away from the fundamentally flawed and harmful policies that would result from the American Health Care Act and from the changes under consideration—including the proposed "Limited Waiver" amendment—that would make the bill even worse for patients." [4/24/17]

American Hospital Association: "The latest version of the AHCA continues to put health coverage in jeopardy for many Americans. Our top concern is what this change could mean for older and sicker patients, including those with pre-existing conditions, such as cancer patients and those with chronic conditions. For these reasons, along with our previously stated concerns about the AHCA, we cannot support the bill. . . . The amendment proposed this week would dramatically worsen the bill. The changes included put consumer protections at greater risk by allowing states to waive the essential health benefit standards, which could leave patients without access to critical health services and increase out-of-pocket spending. This could allow plans to set premium prices based on individual risk for some consumers, which could significantly raise costs for those with pre-existing conditions." [4/27/17]

America's Essential Hospitals: "This latest version of the AHCA is not an improvement. It's simply bad policy that will cut a lifeline of health care for millions of Americans. The legislation also would leave unchanged more than \$800 billion in Medicaid cuts over the next decade, breaking the nation's safety net and saddling state, local governments, and taxpayers with new costs for indigent care. The nation has spoken on the AHCA: only 17 percent of the public support it and their elected representatives have rejected it once already." [4/26/17]

Catholic Health Association: "It is critically important to look at this bill for what it is. It is not in any way a health care bill. Rather, it is legislation whose aim is to take significant funding allocated by Congress for health care for very low income people and use that money for tax cuts for some of our wealthiest citizens. This is contrary to the spirit of who we are as a nation, a giant step backward that should be resisted." [4/27/17]

U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops: "It is deeply disappointing to many Americans that, in modifying the American Health Care Act to again attempt a vote, proponents of the bill left in place its serious flaws, including unacceptable modifications to Medicaid that will endanger coverage and affordability for millions of people, according to reports," said Bishop Dewane. "Sadly, some of the recently proposed amendments—especially those designed to give states flexibility—lack apparent safeguards to ensure

quality of care. These additions could severely impact many people with pre-existing conditions while risking for others the loss of access to various essential coverages." [4/27/17]

American Nurses Association: "The new bill is an even further departure from our principles; endangers consumer protections put into place by the ACA. [4/26/17]

American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network: "The American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network (ACS CAN) is deeply concerned about a proposed amendment to the American Health Care Act (AHCA) that would create an option for states to obtain waivers from the Essential Health Benefits (EHB) and the community rating rule. These two rules work together to guarantee access to comprehensive and affordable insurance that covers cancer prevention and treatment for patients and survivors with pre-existing conditions. . . . In short, the proposal could lead to bare bones coverage plans that push significant costs onto patients who access care." [4/20/17]

American Lung Association: "The American Lung Association requests that Representatives oppose the American Health Care Act (AHCA) with the new amendment by Rep. MacArthur. The American Lung Association opposes the MacArthur amendment because would allow states to opt-out of the Essential Health Benefits (EHB)—resulting in millions of Americans having inadequate care. . . . All Americans—regardless of the state in which they live—need adequate coverage for the range of essential health services and treatments including life-saving cancer screening." [4/26/17]

March of Dimes: "Women and children need quality, affordable insurance coverage to be born healthy and lead healthy, productive lives. Unfortunately, in its current form, the MacArthur amendment to American Health Care Act will deny millions of pregnant women, babies, and their families the affordable coverage and quality services they need. . . . The MacArthur amendment will offer states and health plans numerous opportunities to charge people with pre-existing conditions higher rates, design plans that explicitly exclude the services they are most likely to need, and erect barriers to care." [4/26/17]

Families USA: "America's families must be heard. By now, it should be clear to House Republicans and the Trump Administration from all the town halls, letters, phone calls and tweets that this is not what people want. They do not want to return to the dark days when insurers were free to charge the sick and old more for coverage and offered policies that covered very little, often leaving people to cope with staggering medical bills. It's time for President Trump and the GOP to drop this harmful effort to undermine the nation's health care system. It's time to move on." [4/26/17]

American Psychological Association: "We are writing on behalf of the American Psychological Association and the American Psychological Association Practice Organization to express our opposition to the American Health Care Act, as recently revised and proposed for floor consideration. Our organizations comprise nearly 115,700 members and affiliates, who are clinicians, researchers, educators, consultants, and students." [4/26/17]

Arc of the United States: "The Arc of the United States is strongly opposed to the amended American Health Care Act. The amended American Health Care Act retains the original bill's proposals to dramatically

cut Medicaid services that are vital to people with disabilities and seniors through per capita caps. The new amendments make the AHCA even more harmful to people with disabilities.” [4/26/17]

Chronic Illness and Disability Partnership: “On behalf of the Chronic Illness and Disability Partnership as well as allied organizations, we are writing to strongly urge you to oppose the American Health Care Act (AHCA), with or without the amendment to allow states to waive community rating and Essential Health Benefits protections (the MacArthur Amendment). If enacted, the amended bill will only increase the 24 million Americans estimated to lose coverage under the AHCA, including millions of individuals living with chronic conditions and disabilities. The MacArthur Amendment seeks to deliver cheaper insurance to healthy Americans by undercutting crucial Essential Health Benefits requirements and excluding the most vulnerable Americans from the private insurance market by allowing states to remove crucial consumer protections.” [4/27/17]

Democratic Governors Association: “This new proposal is nothing more than the reheated leftovers of the failed Trumpcare bill. Just like last month’s bill, this one would slash Medicaid funding, throw millions out of health coverage and leave states holding the bag. The only fresh idea in this proposal is a new way to raise insurance rates on sick people. States are happy to work with the federal government on strengthening health care, but we never asked for the flexibility to jack up premiums on people with pre-existing conditions. Congress should again reject this disastrous proposal that would wreck state budgets and cut millions off of health coverage.” [4/27/17]

National Nurse United: “The original version of the American Health Care Act posed a mortal threat to the health and well-being of our patients, and to the health security of our country. The new version, which incorporates changes negotiated between the House Freedom Caucus and Congressman Tom MacArthur, will be even worse for our patients. This new version has not yet received a score from the Congressional Budget Office, and it should not be considered by the House until a CBO score has been made public.” [4/26/17]

Leadership Council of Aging Organizations: “While LCAO is made up of organizations that often have different perspectives on public policies, as a coalition LCAO strongly opposes the American Health Care Act (AHCA) of 2017, which would cause at least 24 million Americans to lose their health care insurance. We strongly oppose the Medicaid cuts and caps that remain the core of the American Health Care Act. Over six million older adults rely on Medicaid. Among the non-Medicare population, Americans aged 50-64 are the most likely to face health challenges and have pre-existing conditions. The AHCA will expose these older Americans to significantly higher premiums and health care costs, if they can afford to purchase coverage at all. We are also deeply disappointed that there is a push to vote on the bill without a revised estimate from the Congressional Budget Office on how it will impact Americans. We fear and expect that the proposed changes will increase the number of uninsured beyond the current estimate of 24 million. For these reasons, as well as other harms that would result for older Americans and their families, LCAO opposes AHCA and urges members to vote against it.”

Common Sense Kids Action: “On behalf of the millions of American kids and families

who rely on comprehensive, dependable health insurance to stay healthy and to get medical treatment when they need it, we are writing to respectfully express our strong opposition to your bill, H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act (AHCA). Thanks to current law, including the Affordable Care Act, Medicaid, and the Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), 95% of young children in the U.S. today have health insurance. That’s a remarkable achievement. However, the AHCA will result in 24 million fewer Americans having coverage, including millions of children. Even with changes recently suggested to your bill, America’s kids will be best served by strengthening the Affordable Care Act and preserving Medicaid and CHIP, not by repealing the Affordable Care Act and block granting or establishing a per capita cap on Medicaid. We urge you to keep our children’s future foremost in your thinking, withdraw your bill, and work on a bipartisan basis to support measures that protect and strengthen children’s health care.”

American Hospital Association: “The latest version of the AHCA continues to put health coverage in jeopardy for many Americans. Our top concern is what this change could mean for older and sicker patients, including those with pre-existing conditions, such as cancer patients and those with chronic conditions. For these reasons, along with our previously stated concerns about the AHCA, we cannot support the bill. The amendment proposed this week would dramatically worsen the bill. The changes included put consumer protections at greater risk by allowing states to waive the essential health benefit standards, which could leave patients without access to critical health services and increase out-of-pocket spending. Additionally, the Congressional Budget Office has not yet scored the amendment. However, CBO previously projected that the AHCA would result in 24 million fewer people covered in 2026. As the backbone of America’s health safety-net, hospitals and health systems must protect access to care for those who need it and ensure that the most vulnerable patients are not left behind. The AHCA continues to fall far short of that goal.”

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, under TrumpCare, families, seniors, vulnerable children, Americans with disabilities, people struggling to overcome addiction, and the sick will lose their health care. Rural hospitals will be closed. Nearly 2 million jobs will be destroyed across America. Seven million veterans will lose access to tax credits for health care.

And all of this, to give a massive tax cut to the richest in America. TrumpCare is a billionaire’s tax cut, again, disguised as a healthcare bill. It is Robin Hood in reverse, one of the largest, again, transfers of wealth from working families to the rich in our country.

Today, we honor the visions of our Founders, we can, who risked everything. They risked everything, their lives, their liberty, their sacred honor, to advance the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; the life, a healthier life, the freedom to pursue your happiness, the freedom from being job-locked or policy-locked because of what the Republicans want to do today.

Today, we fight to preserve affordable health care as the right of every American, again, not the privileged few.

Today, we fight for children like Zoe Madison Lihn. Zoe was born with a congenital heart defect in May of 2010. She faced her first of three heart surgeries at 15 hours old. By 6 months old, Zoe was halfway to her lifetime limit her insurer had placed on her. She faced a grim future, not only using up her lifetime limit by preschool but by carrying a preexisting condition that will require attention and care for the rest of her life.

Under the Affordable Care Act, Zoe is protected, but TrumpCare puts her future in danger.

I wish that our Members who vote for this bill, I hope you make time to sit down with the parents of a newborn with a heart condition, or a young woman who just learned she had breast cancer, the family of loved ones struggling with a disease or a chronic condition, any of the tens of millions of Americans who are rightfully terrified of what TrumpCare will mean in their lives.

Mr. Speaker, we have, with this bill, a right, a wonderful opportunity. This is one of the best civics lessons we can engage in. Because of what happened following the election, the American people are engaged. They are paying attention. I am not saying in a political way, I am saying in a personal way.

A former Speaker said: All politics is local. In the case of health care, all politics is personal when it comes to health care. And so, this civics lesson will teach the American people a number of things.

As special as we think we are when we come to the floor here, most Americans don’t know who their Member of Congress is. But they will now, when they find out that you voted to take away their health care. They will know when you put an age tax on them, or undermine Medicare and Medicaid and the rest.

Oh, yeah, they are paying attention because it is really personal with them and their families. So I think we have to get ready for that.

I have Members, I have colleagues who have the mantle of being a moderate. You vote for this bill, you have walked the plank from moderate to radical. And you are walking the plank for what? A bill that will not be accepted by the United States Senate. Why are you doing this?

Do you believe in what is in this bill?

Some of you have said: Well, they will fix it in the Senate. But you have every provision of this bill tattooed on your forehead. You will glow in the dark on this one. You will glow in the dark. So don’t walk the plank, especially unnecessarily.

Our responsibility to the sick and the hurt is Biblical. It is fundamental to who we are.

As Pope Francis said: "Health is not a consumer good but a universal right, so access to health services cannot be a privilege."

Today, let us declare, once again, that affordable health care must be the right of every American, not the privileged few.

So I ask you, my colleagues, does TrumpCare lower health costs?

Does TrumpCare provide better health care?

Does TrumpCare protect seniors and families?

Is TrumpCare good for our veterans? Is there any caring in TrumpCare at all?

For the sake of our values, to honor our responsibilities to our Founders, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, to our veterans who protect us, and to our children whose aspirations are our guide, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this disastrous TrumpCare bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, it really is my privilege now to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. First off, there are a few people I would like to thank. I would like to thank the committee chairs. I would like to thank Chairman WALDEN, Chairman BRADY, Chairman BLACK, Chairman SESSIONS.

I want to thank the members of those committees: Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Budget, and Rules.

I want to thank all the Members who made constructive contributions throughout this entire deliberative, bottom-up organic process.

I want to thank the President of the United States for his steadfast leadership.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, in his address in this Chamber, he called on Congress to act; and today we take the next step to repeal and replace ObamaCare.

I want to thank Vice President PENCE, Secretary Price, Director Mulvaney, and all of their teams.

Mr. Speaker, there is a fundamental and urgent choice at the heart of this debate. We can continue with the status quo under ObamaCare, and we know what this looks like. It means even higher premiums, even fewer choices, even more insurance companies pulling out, even more uncertainty, and even more chaos.

Look at what has happened in Iowa this week. As is the case in so many areas in this country, Iowa is down to one insurer. That, of course, is not a choice. But now that one insurer is

saying that it will have to pull out of 94 of the 99 counties in Iowa. This is happening right now. So tens of thousands of Iowans will go from having one option to no options. That is not a choice. This is a crisis, and it is happening right now.

What protection is ObamaCare if there is no healthcare plan to purchase in your State?

This is the direction ObamaCare is rapidly heading. So we can continue with this status quo or we can put this collapsing law behind us and end this failed experiment. Let's make it easier for people to afford their health insurance. Let's give people more choices and more control over their care. Let's make insurance companies come in and compete for your business. Let's return power from Washington to the States. Let's help give people peace of mind. Let's put the patient, not bureaucrats, at the center of this system. This bill does all of those things. This bill delivers the promises that we have made to the American people.

A lot of us have been waiting 7 years to cast this vote. Many of us are here because we pledged to cast this very vote to repeal and replace ObamaCare, to rescue people from this collapsing law.

Are we going to meet this test? Are we going to be men and women of our word? Are we going to keep the promises that we made? Or are we going to falter?

No. After all of this—after seeing what is happening in Iowa and around the country, after seeing this law collapsing while we witness it across the country and knowing all this turmoil that is coming, we will not falter. We will replace; and today is the day that we are going to do this.

Today this House has the opportunity to do more than just fulfill a promise. We have the opportunity to raise our gaze and set a bold course for our country. We have the opportunity to show that we have got the resolve to tackle the big challenges in this country before they tackle us; to stop the drift of arrogant, Big Government policies in our lives, and to begin a new era of reform based on liberty and self-determination, giving people choices and letting them control their own destinies.

That is the day that is before us right here. So let us pass this bill to take the next step to put ObamaCare behind us; let us pass this bill to build a better healthcare system for American families; and let us pass this bill to leave this country better than we found it because that is why we are here.

That is what is at stake today. That is why I am going to be so proud to cast my vote for this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republicans' latest version of Trumpcare.

Trumpcare will cover fewer people, provide weaker protections, and result in higher costs.

Trumpcare will eviscerate essential health benefits and protections for pre-existing conditions and make it all but impossible for millions of Americans fighting illness to afford the health coverage they desperately need.

Trumpcare will mean higher costs for less coverage.

It will result in 24 million hard-working Americans losing health coverage.

It will destroy protections for Americans with pre-existing conditions and gut Essential Health Benefits, such as maternity, prescription drug coverage, and emergency coverage.

Trumpcare will create a crushing age tax—it will force Americans aged 50–64 to pay premiums five times higher than what others pay for health coverage, no matter how healthy they are.

Mr. Speaker, healthcare should be a right for all, not just the privileged few. I will vote against Trumpcare and urge all my colleagues to vote no.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again in strong opposition to H.R. 1628, which is a bill to take away health care from 24 million Americans.

Whether you believe it or not, health care is a basic right.

This shameful bill steals from the most vulnerable among us, including seniors, veterans, people living with HIV, children, and the disabled. And this new bill is even more dangerous and destructive than when they brought it to the Floor last time.

It would, yes, rip away health care from 24 million people. It would reduce benefits, make families pay more for less, and transfer \$600 billion in tax cuts to the very wealthy.

This is outrageous.

Access to women's health is denied by defunding Planned Parenthood. Medicaid, as we know it, will end. Healthcare costs for working families and seniors will skyrocket.

It allows states to eliminate essential health benefits like maternity care, cancer screenings, and emergency care.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a health bill at all. This is a massive tax giveaway to the wealthy.

Let me tell you, as a woman of faith, I am appalled and I am saddened by the hypocrisy displayed in this bill by people who say they are religious.

I want to remind you—in the Scriptures, the Book of Mark, chapter 12:31, we are reminded to love your neighbor as yourself.

I hope Republicans remember to love their neighbor as themselves today and vote "no" on this mean-spirited, evil and morally bankrupt bill.

This is a matter of life and death, and the American people deserve better.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, first of all, the Affordable Healthcare Act is the best thing that has happened to healthcare in the U.S. since the mid 1960's when Congress passed Medicare and Medicaid. More than twenty million people in our country have health insurance coverage now who never had it before.

In Illinois, 36 percent of children receive coverage through Medicaid with approximately 3.1 million people covered overall.

There are 649,000 Illinoisans enrolled under the Affordable Care Act, this bill AHCA would repeal and replace the ACA.

Implementation of the AHCA will lead to a loss of coverage for 24 million people nationwide.

Overall 44,296 Illinoisans covered under the ACA and 252,612 covered under Medicaid expansion will be in danger of curtailed coverage.

Healthcare professionals and activists have worked hard over the past fifty years to improve healthcare access and delivery and it would be a shame to have us go backwards.

Passage of the AHCA would probably cause real estate taxes in Cook County to go up in order to keep Stroger Hospital and its other health services adequately funded to meet the health needs of the medically indigent in Cook County.

Practically every professional healthcare group in America is opposed to the AHCA.

It will spell disaster for residents of Illinois.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have rushed this bill to the floor before they even had a chance to print the text, let alone get a CBO score. They are pushing this bill through without any analysis so that the American people won't know how terrible this bill really is—how many millions of people will lose their health insurance, how much premiums will skyrocket for those with pre-existing conditions, how little money they will actually save. And all to score empty political points or to impress Donald Trump, a man who has demonstrated again and again that he does not know or care what is in this bill, and just wants to “win.”

This bill is the same terrible legislation the Republicans failed to pass in March, but with amendments to make it even more cruel to the American people. The bill will kick 24 million people off their health insurance and eliminate employer-provided coverage for seven million people. The bill creates an “age tax” that would allow insurers to charge older Americans five times as much as a younger person for the same plan. The bill raises premiums 30 percent for people who allow their insurance to lapse for any reason. The bill cuts \$880 billion out of Medicaid and forces states to ration care to the millions of families and children who rely on it, in clear violation of Donald Trump's campaign pledge. The bill gives the wealthiest Americans a trillion dollar tax cut and cuts taxes on drug companies and health insurance companies that pay their CEOs more than \$500,000.

But that bill wasn't terrible enough to get the votes of the right wing of the Republicans in the House, so the Republicans made it even crueler. The amendments the Republicans will add today allow states to waive the essential health benefits requirements for insurance plans, meaning you could lose coverage for services as basic as hospital stays, prescription drugs, or doctor visits. States will also be able to waive the guarantee against discrimination against people with pre-existing conditions. Of course, the Republicans are saying that insurance companies cannot deny people coverage, but insurers will be able to charge people whatever they want. The Center for American Progress estimates that premiums could increase by over \$36,000 per year for

people diagnosed with breast cancer. Pregnancy will result in a \$17,000 increase in premiums. Asthma, a \$4,000 increase. The high risk pools Republicans are touting will do nothing to protect people by sequestering the sickest Americans in pools and then drastically underfunding them. The Republicans are hiding from these numbers behind the so-called Upton Amendment, which provides a paltry \$8 billion to cover some extra costs for those with pre-existing conditions. But even the conservative Mercatus Foundation found that to be less than a pittance compared with the skyrocketing costs for those who need it.

Every day, we are finding new egregious consequences of this legislation. Last night, the New York Times reported that passing this bill will cut special education programs to over 2500 students with disabilities. Yesterday, the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities reported that the tax credits Republicans are proposing in this bill will be totally unusable in states like California and New York because of state laws that require coverage of abortion. Reports have come out that sexual assault and domestic violence would, once again, be considered a pre-existing condition, making insurance unaffordable for survivors. The Wall Street Journal reported that the bill could allow employers to reinstate lifetime caps and eliminate out-of-pocket caps for their employees' insurance plans, leaving the 159 million Americans who get insurance through their employer with no insurance coverage when they need it most. That's right—if you think that because you don't buy insurance on the exchange and therefore don't have to worry about this bill, you're wrong. I have no doubt that in the time it takes to read this statement another round of articles and reports will come out finding even more abhorrent consequences of this contemptible piece of legislation.

So I ask my Republican colleagues—who are you passing this bill for? Are you so out of touch with the lives of real Americans that you no longer understand what it means to struggle to pay your medical bills? Have you traveled so far from the values you claim to uphold that you are willing to force parents to watch their children die of curable diseases because they have reached the lifetime cap on covered costs that your bill reinstates, and they can no longer afford to pay for treatment? Are you willing to gamble away their lives and the lives of their children just to say you passed a bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act?

Shame on any member who votes for this cowardly, cruel bill and tries to sell this bill to their constituents as a win for the American people. Shame on this House for even considering a bill that could leave the most vulnerable in our country—children born with disabilities, women fleeing domestic violence, older Americans too sick to buy insurance but too young to enroll in Medicare—at the mercy of insurance companies and fate. Shame on you for playing political games with people's lives.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the American Care Act. After seven years, the Republicans have released a plan that works to kick people off health insurance very quickly, increases out-of-pocket costs, and punishes

older and sicker Americans. This is not the package that I envisioned.

Some of the key features of the Affordable Care Act that millions of people relied on would be gone under this proposal. Under the Affordable Care Act, states could expand Medicaid, but this proposal would freeze enrollment to expanded Medicaid at January 1, 2020. On that date, enrollees who drop off of Medicaid due to income changes would not be able to return to Medicaid coverage if they dropped on for one full month. The proposal also changes Medicaid funding to a per capita cap system which will lead to deep cuts to Medicaid in my home state of Texas. This punishes low-income Americans who would otherwise have no access to health insurance.

This piece of legislation forces Americans to pay more and get less. The average subsidy under the American Health Care Act will likely be about 60 percent of the average subsidy under current law. Deductibles and out-of-pocket spending in the individual market will have to increase due to the elimination of requirements that insurance plans cover a certain value. Americans will pay more for their premiums, more for their care, more on out-of-pocket expenses and deductibles; all the while giving tax breaks to the wealthy and the tanning industry.

One amendment to this bill would repeal the Essential Health Benefits, the ten coverage rules set up by the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act required insurers to cover ten “Essential Health Benefits” from maternity care, mental health, and prescription drugs, to hospitalization and outpatient care. If this is repealed, comprehensive health insurance will become virtually unavailable in the individual market. This means that individuals with pre-existing conditions would not be protected. Younger and healthier people benefit, older and sicker people suffer.

Another amendment would allow states to waive out of the Affordable Care Act's ban on pre-existing conditions. However, Members of Congress and their staff would be protected from this provision and would be guaranteed coverage of pre-existing conditions.

Mr. Speaker, the public has spoken about this so-called “replacement” bill. People will live or die as a result of this legislation. The Republican leadership has rushed this bill to the floor without any consideration and I urge you all to consider its harmful effects. Your constituents are asking you to work with us to repair the Affordable Care Act. Work with us.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, include in for the RECORD a letter from common sense kids action:

COMMON SENSE KIDS ACTION,
April 25, 2017.

Re H.R. 1628—OPPOSE

Hon. DIANE BLACK,
Chairwoman, House Budget Committee, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BLACK: On behalf of the millions of American kids and families who rely on comprehensive, dependable health insurance to stay healthy and to get medical treatment when they need it, we are writing to respectfully express our strong opposition to your bill, H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act (AHCA). We have added this bill to our Common Sense Legislative Ratings Tool as an “Against Kids” bill and will

communicate our position to our parent and teacher members.

Common Sense is the nation's leading independent nonprofit organization dedicated to helping kids thrive in a rapidly changing world. We empower parents, teachers, and policymakers by providing unbiased information, trusted advice, and innovative tools to help them harness the power of media and technology as a positive force in all kids' lives. The policy arm, Common Sense Kids Action, is building a movement of parents, teachers, business leaders, and others dedicated to making kids our nation's top priority by supporting policies at the state and federal level that contribute to the building blocks of opportunity for kids. Access to affordable and quality medical care for kids is certainly one of those key building blocks.

Thanks to current law, including the Affordable Care Act, Medicaid, and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), 95% of young children in the U.S. today have health insurance. That's a remarkable achievement. With health insurance, parents are more likely to seek medical care for themselves and for their children, helping to prevent illnesses from developing and shortening their duration when they occur. However, the AHCA will result in 24 million fewer Americans having coverage, including millions of children. This jeopardizes the health and well-being of America's kids and will alarm any parent who understands the importance of health insurance for their children and family. The Affordable Care Act certainly needs to be fixed, but if Congress has the goal of making sure that all families and businesses have access to affordable and comprehensive health insurance, it could improve the law for everyone without forcing millions of kids and their parents to lose access to critical medical care.

As Congress continues to grapple with this issue, health insurance programs, we think these facts about children's health insurance from the Congressional Budget Office and the Georgetown University Center for Children and Families are important to keep in mind:

Ninety-five percent of children age 0-5 are insured today.

Forty-five million of those children access health care through two programs: about 37 million through Medicaid (a federal-state program) and 8 million through CHIP, the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Children are the single-largest group of persons covered under Medicaid.

Under the Affordable Care Act, as you know, many states expanded Medicaid with help from the federal government, increasing coverage for kids and families, including coverage for mental health care.

Changes being considered, including under the AHCA, would cut funding to Medicaid by as much as \$880 billion over the next 10 years.

The AHCA, when compared with current law, would result in 24 million fewer Americans with health insurance by the year 2026.

Even with changes recently suggested to your bill, America's kids will be best served by strengthening the Affordable Care Act and preserving Medicaid and CHIP, not by repealing the Affordable Care Act and block granting or establishing a per capita cap on Medicaid. We urge you to keep our children's future foremost in your thinking, withdraw your bill, and work on a bipartisan basis to support measures that protect and strengthen children's health care. Thank you for your consideration of our views and we

would be happy to talk with you at any time about this and other issues that matter to America's children and families.

Sincerely,

DANNY WEISS,
Vice President, Federal Policy.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the American Health Care Act. My colleagues across the aisle tried and failed once before to consider this bill, but they pulled it from the House floor because they didn't have the votes. Today, they seek to pass this amended bill, but it's just as flawed as the first.

The changes will hurt seniors, veterans, the sick, and middle and low-income individuals. Essential health benefits guaranteed in the Affordable Care Act can now be waived, comprising quality health care for those with pre-existing conditions, expectant mothers, and individuals seeking mental health and substance abuse treatment. Ultimately, millions of Americans will be harmed by this bill.

This second attempt to rush a vote on our nation's health care, without a revised Congressional Budget Office score, was quickly and carelessly crafted to meet arbitrary, deadlines and ill-conceived campaign promises.

Protecting the central coast of California's health care, particularly for the most vulnerable among us, is one of my top priorities. I urge my colleagues in the Majority party to focus not on partisan interests but serve the people. I will be voting no on this bill. I urge my colleagues across the aisle to do the same.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again in strong opposition to H.R. 1628, which is a bill to take away health care from 24 million Americans. Whether you believe it or not, health care is a basic right.

This shameful bill steals from the most vulnerable among us, including seniors, veterans, people living with HIV, children, and the disabled. And this new bill is even more dangerous and destructive than when they brought it to the Floor last time.

It would, yes, rip away health care from 24 million people. It would reduce benefits, make families pay more for less, and transfer \$600 billion in tax cuts to the very wealthy.

This is outrageous. Access to women's health is denied by defunding Planned Parenthood. Medicaid, as we know it, will end. Healthcare costs for working families and seniors will skyrocket. It allows states to eliminate essential health benefits like maternity care, cancer screenings, and emergency care.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a health bill at all. This is a massive tax giveaway to the wealthy.

Let me tell you, as a woman of faith, I am appalled and I am saddened by the hypocrisy displayed in this bill by people who say they are religious. I want to remind you—in the Scriptures, the Book of Mark, chapter 12:31, we are reminded to love your neighbor as yourself.

I hope Republicans remember to love their neighbor as themselves today and vote "no" on this mean-spirited and evil bill. Let's defeat this harmful and morally bankrupt bill.

This is a matter of life and death, and the American people deserve better.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the American Health Care Act. As I have said from the beginning, when it

comes to the Affordable Care Act, we should keep what works and change what doesn't. I urge support for the AHCA because it does just that.

The AHCA stops the Washington, DC, one-size-fits-all approach to healthcare and puts choice and freedom back in the hands of states, counties, families, and individuals. With the AHCA's monumental strides in reforming Medicaid to ensure its solvency for our most vulnerable citizens and repealing burdensome taxes on the middle class, it is a win across the board for all Americans, but specifically Upstate New Yorkers.

Upstate New York residents will see additional benefits due to an amendment which Congressman COLLINS and I have included in the bill. This language is one of the greatest pieces of state mandate relief that New Yorkers have ever seen. By normalizing the fashion in which New York State funds Medicaid, those in my district alone will see more than \$224 million in tax relief every year.

The fact is that New York funds its Medicaid program by imposing a portion of the state's funding responsibility on the counties. Home ownership is burdened by lower property values due to high taxes. This also lessens business competitiveness in areas like Upstate NY. The extent to which New York burdens its counties is unlike any other: of the approximately \$9.5 billion in Medicaid costs shouldered by localities nationwide, New York localities account for more than \$7 billion of the total. Albany mandates ensure that New York spends more on Medicaid than Texas and Florida combined. This is simply unsustainable.

The people of Upstate New York demand relief: relief from burdensome Albany mandates; relief from rising property taxes; relief from Washington-controlled, bureaucratic healthcare; relief from ACA-imposed, middle-class healthcare taxes. For these reasons, I support the AHCA and urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1628 is an assault on hard-working Americans and their families.

Trumpcare is sickness care for millions of Americans who will lose their healthcare coverage and have to receive healthcare in hospital emergency rooms.

Trumpcare is tax care for the 400 richest families, who will receive about \$7 million a year ad infinitum if this bill becomes law.

Trumpcare is less care for Americans who will buy cheap health insurance policies and find they are worthless when they get sick and need care.

Trumpcare is insufficient care after the \$8 billion over 5 years for high-risk pools in this bill runs out across the country.

Trumpcare is discriminatory care when states can determine that you deserve unaffordable high risk care.

Trumpcare is no care for Americans with pre-existing conditions who cannot afford their premiums.

Trumpcare is a careless political scheme concocted to win elections and line the pockets of the very wealthy at the expense of the millions who will lose healthcare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 228, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The question on passage of H.R. 2192;

The question on passage of H.R. 1628; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1644.

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

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 2192) to amend the Public Health Service Act to eliminate the non-application of certain State waiver provisions to Members of Congress and congressional staff, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 429, nays 0, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

YEAS—429

Abraham	Bera	Brady (PA)
Adams	Bergman	Brady (TX)
Aderholt	Beyer	Brat
Aguilar	Biggs	Bridenstine
Allen	Bilirakis	Brooks (AL)
Amash	Bishop (GA)	Brooks (IN)
Amodei	Bishop (MI)	Brown (MD)
Arrington	Bishop (UT)	Brownley (CA)
Babin	Black	Buchanan
Bacon	Blackburn	Buck
Banks (IN)	Blum	Bucshon
Barletta	Blumenauer	Budd
Barr	Blunt Rochester	Burgess
Barragán	Bonamici	Bustos
Barton	Bost	Butterfield
Bass	Boyle, Brendan	Byrne
Beatty	F.	Calvert

Gibbs	Lowey	Rouzer
Gohmert	Lucas	Roybal-Allard
Gonzalez (TX)	Luetkemeyer	Royce (CA)
Goodlatte	Lujan Grisham,	Ruiz
Gosar	M.	Ruppersberger
Gottheimer	Luján, Ben Ray	Rush
Granger	Gowdy	Russell
Graves (GA)	MacArthur	Rutherford
Graves (LA)	Maloney,	Ryan (OH)
Graves (MO)	Carolyn B.	Ryan (WI)
Green, Al	Maloney, Sean	Sánchez
Green, Gene	Marchant	Sanford
Griffith	Marino	Sarbanes
Grijalva	Marshall	Scalise
Grothman	Massie	Schakowsky
Guthrie	Mast	Schiff
Gutiérrez	Matsui	Schneider
Hanabusa	McCarthy	Schrader
Harper	McCauley	Schweikert
Harris	McClintock	Scott (VA)
Hartzer	McCollum	Scott, Austin
Hastings	McEachin	Scott, David
Heck	McGovern	Sensenbrenner
Hensarling	McHenry	Serrano
Herrera Beutler	McKinley	Sessions
Hice, Jody B.	McMorris	Sewell (AL)
Higgins (LA)	Rodgers	Shea-Porter
Higgins (NY)	McNerney	Sherman
Hill	McSally	Shimkus
Himes	Meadows	Shuster
Holding	Meehan	Simpson
Hollingsworth	Meeks	Sinema
Huffman	Meng	Sires
Huizenga	Messer	
Hultgren	Mitchell	
Hunter	Moolenaar	
Hurd	Mooney (WV)	
Issa	Moore	
Jackson Lee	Moulton	
Jayapal	Mullin	
Jeffries	Murphy (FL)	
Jenkins (KS)	Murphy (PA)	
Jenkins (WV)	Nadler	
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	
Johnson (LA)	Neal	
Johnson (OH)	Neom	
Johnson, E. B.	Nolan	
Johnson, Sam	Norcross	
Jones	Nunes	
Jordan	O'Halleran	
Joyce (OH)	O'Rourke	
Kaptur	Olson	
Katko	Palazzo	
Keating	Pallone	
Kelly (IL)	Palmer	
Kelly (MS)	Panetta	
Kelly (PA)	Pascarella	
Kennedy	Paulsen	
Khanna	Payne	
Kihuen	Pearce	
Kildee	Pelosi	
Kilmer	Perlmutter	
Kind	Perry	
King (IA)	Peters	
King (NY)	Peterson	
Kinzinger	Pingree	
Knight	Pittenger	
Krishnamoorthi	Pocan	
Kuster (NH)	Poe (TX)	
Kustoff (TN)	Poliquin	
Labrador	Polis	
LaHood	Posey	
LaMalfa	Price (NC)	
Lamborn	Quigley	
Lance	Raskin	
Langevin	Ratcliffe	
Larsen (WA)	Reed	
Larson (CT)	Reichert	
Latta	Renacci	
Lawrence	Arrington	
Lawson (FL)	Babin	
Lee	Bacon	
Levin	Banks (IN)	
Lewis (GA)	Barletta	
Lewis (MN)	Barr	
Lieu, Ted	Barton	
Lipinski	Bergman	
LoBiondo	Bilirakis	
Loebach	Bishop (MI)	
Lofgren	Bishop (UT)	
Long	Black	
Lozano	Blackburn	
Loudermilk	Blum	
Love	Bost	
Lowenthal	Brady (TX)	
	Brat	
	Bridenstine	

Slaughter	Vela
Smith (MO)	Velázquez
Smith (NE)	Visclosky
Smith (NJ)	Wagner
Smith (TX)	Walberg
Smith (WA)	Walden
Smucker	Walker
Soto	Walorski
Speier	Walters, Mimi
Stefanik	Walz
Stewart	Wasserman
Stivers	Schultz
Suozzi	Waters, Maxine
Swalwell (CA)	Watson Coleman
Takano	Weber (TX)
Taylor	Webster (FL)
Tenney	Welch
Thompson (CA)	Wenstrup
Thompson (MS)	Westerman
Thompson (PA)	Williams
Thornberry	Wilson (FL)
Tiberi	Wilson (SC)
Tipton	Wittman
Titus	Womack
Tonko	Woodall
Torres	Yarmuth
Trott	Yoder
Tsongas	Yoho
Turner	Young (AK)
Upton	Young (IA)
Valadao	Zeldin
Vargas	
Veasey	

NOT VOTING—2

Hoyer Newhouse

□ 1410

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 1628) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017, on which a recorded vote was ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 217, noes 213, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

AYES—217

Abraham	Brooks (AL)	Curbelo (FL)
Aderholt	Brooks (IN)	Davidson
Allen	Buchanan	Davis, Rodney
Amash	Buck	Denham
Amodei	Bucshon	DeSantis
Arrington	Budd	DesJarlais
Babin	Burgess	Diaz-Balart
Bacon	Byrne	Duffy
Banks (IN)	Calvert	Duncan (SC)
Barletta	Carter (GA)	Duncan (TN)
Barr	Carter (TX)	Dunn
Barton	Chabot	Emmer
Bergman	Chaffetz	Estes (KS)
Bilirakis	Cheney	Farenthold
Bishop (MI)	Cole	Faso
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Ferguson
Black	Collins (NY)	Fleischmann
Blackburn	Comer	Flores
Blum	Conaway	Fortenberry
Bost	Cook	Fox
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Franks (AZ)
Brat	Crawford	Frelinghuysen
Bridenstine	Culberson	Gaetz

Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

NOES—213

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carlson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney

Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Herrera Beutler

Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray

Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters

Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema

Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Chaffetz
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean

Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise

NOT VOTING—1

Newhouse

□ 1418

Mr. CLEAVER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KOREAN INTERDICTION AND MODERNIZATION OF SANCTIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1644) to enhance sanctions with respect to transactions relating to North Korea, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

YEAS—419

Abraham
Adams
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer

Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)

Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot

Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)

Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean

Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise

Schakowsky	Speier	Walberg
Schiff	Stefanik	Walden
Schneider	Stewart	Walker
Schrader	Stivers	Walorski
Schweikert	Suozzi	Walters, Mimi
Scott (VA)	Swalwell (CA)	Walz
Scott, Austin	Takano	Wasserman
Scott, David	Taylor	Schultz
Sensenbrenner	Thompson (CA)	Waters, Maxine
Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Watson Coleman
Sessions	Thompson (PA)	Weber (TX)
Sewell (AL)	Thornberry	Webster (FL)
Shea-Porter	Tiberi	Welch
Sherman	Tipton	Westrup
Shimkus	Titus	Westerman
Shuster	Tonko	Williams
Simpson	Trott	Wilson (FL)
Sinema	Tsongas	Wilson (SC)
Sires	Turner	Wittman
Slaughter	Upton	Womack
Smith (MO)	Valadao	Woodall
Smith (NE)	Vargas	Yarmuth
Smith (NJ)	Veasey	Yoder
Smith (TX)	Vela	Yoho
Smith (WA)	Velázquez	Young (AK)
Smucker	Visclosky	Young (IA)
Soto	Wagner	Zeldin

NAYS—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—10

Aderholt	Frankel (FL)	Tenney
Bishop (MI)	Higgins (NY)	Torres
Butterfield	Newhouse	
Castor (FL)	Raskin	

□ 1429

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 257, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

U.S. WANTS TO COMPETE FOR A WORLD EXPO ACT

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 534) to require the Secretary of State to take such actions as may be necessary for the United States to rejoin the Bureau of International Expositions, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "U.S. Wants to Compete for a World Expo Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Bureau of International Expositions (BIE) is the organization responsible for governing World Fairs and International Expositions.

(2) Section 1(a) of Public Law 91-269 (22 U.S.C. 2801(a)) found that "international expositions . . . have a significant impact on the economic growth of the region surrounding the exposition and . . . are important instruments of national policy".

(3) The United States has not been an active member of the BIE since 2001.

(4) State and local governments and private entities in the United States have continued to participate in international expositions held in foreign countries as a means of promoting United States exports and creating jobs, but face significantly higher costs for such participation because the United States is not an active member.

(5) State and local governments and private entities in the United States have expressed interest in an international exposition being hosted in the United States, but the bid of a United States city, region, or State to host an international exposition is unlikely to be successful if the United States is not a member of the BIE.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should rejoin the BIE immediately to promote domestic job creation, global branding, and tourism to the United States; and

(2) the Secretary of State, in partnership with the Secretary of Commerce, State and local governments, and private and non-profit entities, should take all necessary steps to facilitate the timely submission of a request to rejoin the BIE.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State is authorized to take such actions as the Secretary determines necessary for the United States to rejoin and maintain membership in the BIE.

(b) AUTHORIZATION TO ACCEPT PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS.—In addition to funds otherwise available to the Secretary to carry out this section, the Secretary is authorized to accept contributions for such purpose.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary of State shall notify the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Foreign Relations and Appropriations of the Senate upon taking any action under subsection (a).

SEC. 5. CONTINUATION OF PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR WORLD'S FAIR PAVILIONS AND EXHIBITS.

(a) CONTINUATION OF PROHIBITION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to authorize any obligation or expenditure prohibited by section 204 of the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001 (22 U.S.C. 2452b) (relating to limitations on the obligation or expenditure of funds by the Department of State for a United States pavilion or exhibit at an international exposition or world's fair registered by the BIE).

(b) PROHIBITION ON SOLICITATION OF FUNDS.—Section 204(b)(1)(C) of the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001 (22 U.S.C. 2452b(b)(1)(C)) is amended by inserting after "expositions" the following: " , except that no employees of the Department of State may, in their official capacity, solicit funds to pay expenses for a United States pavilion or other major exhibit at any international exposition or world's fair registered by the Bureau of International Expositions".

Mr. EMMER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MAY 4, 2017, TO MONDAY, MAY 8, 2017

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Monday, May 8, 2017.

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

There was no objection.

JOHNSON AMENDMENT REPEAL

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

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in light of this morning's long overdue executive order on religious freedom and free speech, I rise today to thank my colleagues in Congress on their support for a thorough reform of the Johnson amendment, which has hindered the ability of faith-based nonprofits and churches from engaging in free speech and exercising freedom of religion.

Since 1954, the Johnson amendment has given the IRS the broad authority to censor the free speech of pastors, churches, and other tax-exempt organizations across America.

The IRS' vague interpretation of prohibited forms of speech under this law has led to uncertainty about what speech constitutes a formal violation.

Furthermore, when the Johnson amendment was originally adopted, it was passed without debate, committee hearings, or any other procedure we use in Congress today.

We need to allow America's churches, pastors, and other faith leaders to speak freely on all spheres of life, including relevant political candidates and elections. We need to return free speech back to our spiritual leaders and faith-based organizations without fear of government censorship.

Thank you, Mr. President, for acting to ensure that America's churches will again be a safe place to discuss all important matters in life. While today's actions are a strong start, there is more work to be done to protect religious freedom in the United States of America.

WE ARE NOT GOING FORWARD IN HEALTH CARE, WE ARE GOING BACKWARDS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, in 2010, I was here and voted for the Affordable Care Act. It passed. It was one of the most proudest moments I have had in Congress.

My father was a doctor who provided health care. I know what health care is like. I suffered from polio at age 5, and have been a constant recipient of health care. Every American should have had that right.

What happened today was cruel, mean, and heartless. It gave \$1 billion in tax breaks to the richest people in this country. It took health care from 24 million people. It made the insurance policies that will be available to people less fulsome if they can waive essential benefits, and that includes parts of insurance that were essential under the Affordable Care Act.

The policies will be nearly worthless. They will have high deductibles, and they will cost people more and more because the credits are not as much as the subsidies.

The poor were hurt, the middle class were hurt, and seniors were hurt. It is a sad day when that was cheered, and a day that will go down as one of the worst days in the history of this House. We are not going forward and providing people with the care they need in health care; we are going backwards. I rue this day.

HEALTH CARE IS A RIGHT, NOT A PRIVILEGE

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago at a townhall in Baltimore, a young lady came forward. She was 28 years old. She said: I have stage IV cancer. I got married just a few years ago. My husband and I were considering having a baby, but now I have discovered that that won't happen. The Affordable Care Act saved my life.

The last thing she said—and she begged—was: You have got to act now because, if you don't, I will be dead.

Mr. Speaker, the last thing I said to her was that I will give it everything I have got.

Just a few moments ago, when I heard the other side of the aisle cheer as the bill was passed, it gave me great pain.

But I want to say to her and to the American people: I will fight until my death to make sure that we get you the care that you need.

Health care is a right, not a privilege.

TRIBUTE TO FATHER GEORGE CLEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 60

minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a true hero in my heart and the hearts of so many in my hometown of Chicago, Illinois: Father George H. Clements.

Father Clements, yesterday, celebrated the 60th anniversary of his ordination into the Roman Catholic Church. His path towards divinity began early in life when he became the first Black graduate of Chicago's Quigley Academy Seminary in 1945. From there, he went on to pursue his education and earned a bachelor of arts degree in sacred theology and a master of arts degree in philosophy from St. Mary of the Lake Seminary.

Mr. Speaker, after ordination, Father Clements continued his role as a trailblazer when, in June of 1969, he became the first Black priest of Holy Angels Catholic Church, which we in the First District of Illinois are proud to claim.

Mr. Speaker, from that position, Father Clements has had a tremendous impact on lives all across the city of Chicago and all across our great Nation. One such incident of tremendous significance to me personally are his actions that he undertook in the aftermath of the assassination of my dear friend and deputy chairman of the Illinois Chapter of the Black Panther Party, Fred Hampton.

On December 4, 1969, Fred Hampton was assassinated. December 4, 1969, is a dark day in the history of the civil rights movement and in the struggle for social justice here in our great Nation. Mr. Speaker, that is the day that Fred Hampton, as I said before, was assassinated by members of the Cook County State's Attorney's Office, who worked in conjunction with the Chicago Police Department and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Speaker, it is only by the grace of God that I escaped that same fate. Knowing that I was being pursued as a target of the FBI, the Cook County State's Attorney's Office, and the Chicago Police Department, this same extraordinary priest, Father George Clements, offered me protection under the very old ecclesiastical right of sanctuary that has been honored throughout many centuries here and all across the world in a church not only in America, but in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Mr. Speaker, if not for the heroic actions of Father Clements on that day, I would not be standing here in the well of the House on this very day.

Father Clements just didn't stop on that infamous day of December 4, 1969. Throughout the years, countless others have also benefited from Father George Clements' boundless love for humanity. In 1980, he started the Catholic church's first One Church One Child program, an effort to increase the adoption rate of African-American or-

phans. He took this noble, gigantic step so to heart that, in 1981 he himself adopted a child; something that had been unheard of in the history of the Catholic church: a Catholic priest adopting a child.

□ 1445

He did not stop there, Father Clements. He has taken personal responsibility for and adopted other children. He has been an excellent father to four wonderful children: Joey, Friday, Stewart, and Saint Anthony.

Father Clements' selfless devotion to humanity did not stop there. After retiring from the Holy Angels Catholic Church in 1994, Father Clements made his way to our Nation's Capital. He came here to Washington, D.C., to establish the One Church-One Addict program beginning here in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, as some of us more seasoned folks in this Chamber may recall, this was a time when our Nation's Capital was known as the "murder capital" of America. This fact did not deter Father Clements from seeking to help those in need, from trying to be a solution to a highly recognized problem. Father Clements' unboundless love was in full effect once again. Even after all of his years of selfless, sacrificial, hard work, Father Clements still had more to give.

In 1999, he established the One Church-One Inmate program, which was a shared effort to help prison inmates and their families by helping inmates transition from incarceration to a life as productive and "spiritually healed," law-abiding citizens.

What a remarkable man Father George C. Clements was, and what a remarkable man he is this very day.

The Nation, Hollywood has recognized this glorious man. They made a movie after him, called, "The Father Clements Story," where the award-winning actor Lou Gossett starred as Father Clements.

In short, Mr. Speaker, Father Clements has been a beacon of light during the dark days of our Nation. He has been a community leader, a selfless advocate for the downtrodden, and above all, he has been a true and loyal friend to those who are in need. He is a religious man who walks the walk just as he talks the talk.

I can speak no better words for this great American hero, Father George C. Clements, no better words than those that are taken from the Bible, from Holy Scriptures. Let me close, Mr. Speaker, with these very words taken from the Book of Proverbs at 22:9. The Bible says: "He who has a generous eye will be blessed, for he gives of his bread to the poor." This is the manner, the mind of the man, Father George C. Clements.

Mr. Speaker, I honor, I love, I am grateful for, and I am indebted to the

remarkable love and work, commitment and dedication of my friend Father George C. Clements.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), my colleague, my comrade, my cohort, my coconspirator, my friend from the Seventh District of Illinois.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know that Congressman RUSH has extolled the virtues of Father Clements sufficiently, and I certainly won't need 45 or 46 additional minutes to do that; but I can tell you that Father George Clements is an exemplary, extraordinary, unordinary man, a priest of the highest order, but a man who adopted four sons, and he has just been tributed not only here, but certainly back in our hometown of Chicago, Illinois.

The thing about his four sons that he adopted, being a single priest, that was not the easiest thing in the world to do. But all four of them have become outstanding individuals everywhere they have been throughout America.

Father Clements not only saved my colleague at a time of great peril, at a time of great need, which demonstrated tremendous courage, but down through the years, he has continued to provide creative leadership and great initiatives, especially as related to children and the needs that they had—One Church-One Child, One Church-One Family, one church helping individuals who were in need of help.

Mr. Speaker, I join with Congressman RUSH in paying tribute to this outstanding humanitarian, Father George Clements.

TRIBUTE TO MS. RUTH LIFE, EDUCATOR, FRIEND,
AND COMMUNITY ACTIVIST

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I also come to the floor to give tribute to a lady, Ms. Ruth Life, an educator, friend, and community activist.

I have been fortunate, Mr. Speaker, to have known many outstanding individuals during my lifetime, but never have I known anyone more outstanding, more passionate, more consistent, more reliable, or more giving of herself than Ms. Ruth Life, whom I met in the 1960s.

I met Ms. Life during the time when community activism was at a serious, high level, especially in the city of Chicago, Illinois, where I come from. Ms. Life, like many of our generation, was involved, actively engaged in efforts to make life for people who lived in the communities where we lived and worked better.

Both of us worked for the Chicago Public Schools system at that time. We were working in District 10, where Mr. Joseph Rosen was superintendent of schools and Ms. Ida Mae "Ma" Fletcher, as we called her, was the leading school activist.

As time went on, I left the teaching profession but continued to run into

Ms. Life at meetings and church activities. When it came to teaching, there were none better.

As she became the assistant principal at the Roswell B. Mason Elementary School, she was creative, encouraging, and imaginative. When you walked into Roswell B. Mason Elementary School, you knew that teachers were teaching and students were learning.

Thirty-eight years is a long time to teach and educate, but Ms. Life spent a lifetime of service to humanity, especially through her church, the People's Church of the Harvest Church of God in Christ, where Michael Eaddy is the pastor and visionary. Their church has just recently developed a \$13 million housing project through their community development association, of which Ms. Life was secretary.

As she passes away and moves to another level of being, I can almost hear the Master speaking to her, saying: "Well done, my good, and faithful servant. You have done exceptionally well here on Earth. Now I invite you to come on up to the bosom of Abraham, where you can rest in peace and spend eternity."

Mr. Speaker, I am so delighted to have had this opportunity to exemplify the life of this outstanding woman, Ms. Ruth Life.

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

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 244) "An Act to encourage effective, voluntary investments to recruit, employ, and retain men and women who have served in the United States military with annual Federal awards to employers recognizing such efforts, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 244.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NEWHOUSE (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for May 3 and the balance of the week on account of a family illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 274. An act to provide for reimbursement for the use of modern travel services by Federal employees traveling on official Government business, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 8, 2017, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1254. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Roseau County, MN, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2017-0002; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8475] received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1255. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2074(a); Public Law 100-702, Sec. 401(a); (102 Stat. 4649) (H. Doc. No. 115—33); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1256. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2074(a); Public Law 100-702, Sec. 401(a); (102 Stat. 4649) (H. Doc. No. 115—34); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1257. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2074(a); Public Law 100-702, Sec. 401(a); (102 Stat. 4649) (H. Doc. No. 115—35); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1258. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075; Public Law 88-623, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 103-394, Sec. 104(f)); (108 Stat. 4110) (H. Doc. No. 115—36); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1259. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Penalties (RIN: 2135-AA40) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1260. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Pipeline Safety, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pipeline Safety: Inflation Adjustment of Maximum Civil Penalties

[Docket No.: PHMSA-2016-0010] (RIN: 2137-AF16) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1261. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Hazardous Materials Safety, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Revision of Maximum and Minimum Civil Penalties [Docket No.: PHMSA-2016-0041 (HM-258D)] (RIN: 2137-AF23) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1262. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tariff of Tolls [Docket No.: SLSDC-2016-0005] (RIN: 2135-AA41) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1263. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Seaway Regulations and Rules: Periodic Update, Various Categories [Docket No.: SLSDC-2016-0006] (RIN: 2135-AA42) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1264. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0755; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-18860; AD 2017-08-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1265. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0252; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-187-AD; Amendment 39-18863; AD 2017-09-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1266. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6928; Directorate Identifier 2016-SW-018-AD; Amendment 39-18864; AD 2017-09-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1267. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GROB Aircraft AG Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0019; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-038-AD; Amendment 39-18861; AD 2017-08-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1268. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1015; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-37-AD; Amendment 39-18859; AD 2017-08-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1269. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFE Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9380; Directorate Identifier 2016-NE-21-AD; Amendment 39-18857; AD 2017-08-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1270. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-7269; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-198-AD; Amendment 39-18862; AD 2017-08-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1271. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0051; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-043-AD; Amendment 39-18858; AD 2017-08-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1272. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2016-4674; Directorate Identifier 2016-SW-001-AD; Amendment 39-18835; AD 2017-06-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1273. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9505; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-155-AD; Amendment 39-18856; AD 2017-08-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1274. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9167; Directorate Identifier 2016-NE-20-AD; Amendment 39-18855; AD 2017-08-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1275. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Direc-

tives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7491; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-39-AD; Amendment 39-18854; AD 2017-08-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1276. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GROB Aircraft AG Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0019; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-038-AD; Amendment 39-18861; AD 2017-08-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1277. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace for the following Idaho towns; Lewiston, ID; Pocatello, ID; and Twin Falls, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0216; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-7] received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1278. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Moses Lake, WA; Olympia, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0217; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-8] received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 1808. A bill to amend and improve the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 1809. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 2350. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to foster greater transparency in and establish standards relating to the administration of construction contracts, to provide prospective construction contractors with information about an agency's policies on the administration of change orders to allow such contractors to make informed business decisions regarding the pricing of bids or proposals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. LEE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CORREA, Mr. VELA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 2351. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to provide treatment for diabetes in minority communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 2352. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 2353. A bill to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BYRNE (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida):

H.R. 2354. A bill to amend the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to provide a definition of recreational vessel for purposes of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LATTI (for himself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SMUCKER, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 2355. A bill to provide for integrated plan permits, to establish an Office of the Municipal Ombudsman, to promote green infrastructure, and to require the revision of financial capability guidance; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2356. A bill to protect broadband users from unfair or deceptive practices relating to privacy or data security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFALAZIO:

H.R. 2357. A bill to provide for the establishment of the United States Employee

Ownership Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE of California (for himself, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MENG, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 2358. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. BUDD, Mr. KING of New York, and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 2359. A bill to amend the civil liability requirements under the Fair Credit Reporting Act to include requirements relating to class actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 2360. A bill to provide for systemic research, treatment, prevention, awareness, and dissemination of information with respect to sports-related and other concussions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2361. A bill to promote energy savings in residential and commercial buildings and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 2362. A bill to assure equity in contracting between the Federal Government and small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 2363. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to reauthorize the predisaster hazard mitigation program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Ms. MENG, and Mr. KNIGHT):

H.R. 2364. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount that certain banks and savings associations may invest in small business investment companies, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 2365. A bill to convey certain Federal land in California to Apple Valley, California, Twentynine Palms, California, Barstow, California, and Victorville, California; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 2366. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to make student loans dischargeable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 2367. A bill to limit the amount of authorization of appropriations for the Department of Defense unless the Secretary of Defense implements cost-saving recommendations contained in a certain study by the Defense Business Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. BIGGS):

H.R. 2368. A bill to authorize the use of experimental drugs, biological products, and devices by patients diagnosed with a terminal illness in accordance with State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 2369. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for a deferral of the payment of a duty upon the sale of certain used yachts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAETZ:

H.R. 2370. A bill to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 2371. A bill to require the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration to establish a pilot project to provide increased transparency for customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 2372. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the rules relating to veteran health insurance and eligibility for the premium tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 2373. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the accreditation of osteopathic residency training programs for purposes of graduate medical education payments under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIHUEN (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. ROSEN, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 2374. A bill to facilitate certain pinyon-juniper related projects in Lincoln County, Nevada, to modify the boundaries of certain wilderness areas in the State of Nevada, and to fully implement the White Pine County Conservation, Recreation, and Development Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself, Ms. HERERA BEUTLER, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mrs. TORRES):

H.R. 2375. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for private lactation areas in the terminals of large and medium hub airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2376. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to protect and strengthen the drug supply chain in the United States by closing several statutory gaps in the penalty provisions of such Act that apply to drug diversion and counterfeiting; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2377. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to include individuals participating in pre-apprenticeship programs offered by employers and provide that such employers may be reimbursed under such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. NOR-
TON):

H.R. 2378. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the American opportunity tax credit to support college savings; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2379. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program of research regarding the risks posed by the presence of dioxin, synthetic fibers, chemical fragrances, and other components of feminine hygiene products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr.

DESAULNIER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2380. A bill to provide for the development and use of technology for personalized handguns, to require that all handguns manufactured or sold in, or imported into, the United States incorporate such technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 2381. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prescribe safety standards for autocycles and related equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 2382. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to eliminate certain Federal nutrition requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. LOEBACK, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 2383. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform and extend the incentives for biodiesel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 2384. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to multiemployer pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2385. A bill to address tariff inversions that create an incentive for United States companies to move production out of the United States, to eliminate the tariff inversion on certain television components, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 2386. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax rate for excise tax on investment income of private foundations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 2387. A bill to establish an Employee Ownership and Participation Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2388. A bill to provide that Poland may be designated as a program country under the Visa Waiver Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 2389. A bill to reauthorize the West Valley demonstration project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 2390. A bill to strengthen prohibitions regarding the Palestine Liberation Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H.R. 2391. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phaseout the Mass Transit Account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2392. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish direct care registered nurse-to-patient staffing ratio requirements in hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 2393. A bill to create a grant program for governmental and other nonprofit organizations that support startup businesses in formation and early growth stages by providing entrepreneurs with resources and services to produce viable businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 2394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include fuel cells using electromechanical processes for purposes of the energy tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. TORRES (for herself, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 2395. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to issue regulations to prohibit any bail bond agent or person who underwrites or insures the provision of a bail bond who require a bonded individual to wear an ankle monitor or other homing device as a condition on issuing such a bond from charging any fee associated with such monitor or device that exceeds the cost to the bail bond agent or person who underwrites or insures the provision of a bail bond of maintaining and operating such monitor or device; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TROTT (for himself and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 2396. A bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to update the exception for certain annual notices provided by financial institutions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 2397. A bill to amend the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 to authorize further actions to promote freedom of information and democracy in North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. LAN-
GEVIN, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SEAN PAT-
RICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. LEE,

Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. TORRES, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. EMMER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BLUM, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. HILL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BACON, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. HECK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KIND, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. REED, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mrs. LOWEY:

H. Res. 314. A resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster care system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GABBARD, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H. Res. 315. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of May 6 through May 12, 2017, as National Nurses Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself and Mr. MEEKS):

H. Res. 316. A resolution celebrating the success of the Marshall Plan in fostering

peace and prosperity in the seven decades since its conception and affirming the continued relevance of the Marshall Plan for the United States and its global allies and the values for which it stood; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H. Res. 317. A resolution calling for the unconditional release of United States citizens and legal permanent resident aliens being held for political purposes by the Government of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

34. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Resolution No. 29, stating the Senate of the state of California hereby designates the year of 2017 as "State of California Year of Commemoration of the Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide of 1915-1923" and in doing so, intends, through the enactment of legislation, that the Armenian Genocide is properly commemorated and taught to its citizens and visitors; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Education and the Workforce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. LOWENTHAL introduced a bill (H.R. 2398) for the relief of Gurmukh Singh; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 2350.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2351.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 2352.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3 states: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes. . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2353.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 2354.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2355.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2356.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2357.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. ROYCE of California:

H.R. 2358.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK:

H.R. 2359.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which gives Congress the power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;"

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 2360.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2361.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Necessary and Proper Clause

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 2362.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 2363.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 2364.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—"The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and welfare of the United States."

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 2365.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2366.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 2367.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2368.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:

H.R. 2369.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution, which respectively grants Congress the power to lay and collect duties and imposts, to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for the execution of those powers.

By Mr. GAETZ:

H.R. 2370.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section III, Clause II

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2371.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3. (Commerce Clause) The Commerce Clause give Congress the power to "regulate commerce . . . among the several States." If the matter in question is not purely a local matter or if it has an impact on inter-state commerce, then it falls within the power of Congress. *National Federal of Independent Business v. Sebelius*, (2012).

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2372.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. KIHUEN:

H.R. 2374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 2375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section I

"All legislative Powers herin granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 2376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states that the Congress has the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing pow-

ers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico:

H.R. 2378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and within Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 2381.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 2382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 2383.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 2384.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which provides that the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2385.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2386.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2387.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 2388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate commerce; as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 2390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 2391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;"

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 2393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 2394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debt and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 2395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 2396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 2397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 2398.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to "establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization". The Supreme Court has long

found that this provision of the Constitution grants Congress plenary power over immigration policy. As the Court found in *Galvan v. Press*, 347 U.S. 522, 531 (1954), “that the formulation of policies [pertaining to the entry of aliens and their right to remain here] is entrusted exclusively to Congress has become about as firmly imbedded in the legislative and judicial tissues of our body politic as any aspect of our government.” And, as the Court found in *Kleindienst v. Mandel*, 408 U.S. 753, 766 (1972) (quoting *Boutilier v. INS*, 387 U.S. 118, 123 (1967)), “[t]he Court without exception has sustained Congress’ ‘plenary power to make rules for the admission of aliens and to exclude those who possess those characteristics which Congress has forbidden.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MAST, and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 24: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 36: Mr. BERGMAN and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 60: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. KEATING, Ms. TITUS, Mr. O’ROURKE, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
H.R. 154: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 179: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 247: Mr. RATCLIFFE.
H.R. 305: Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 392: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MAST, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 490: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 502: Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. MENG, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 544: Mr. CORREA, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 606: Mr. KHANNA and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 611: Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 622: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 747: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 750: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 777: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 785: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 790: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 807: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 822: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 828: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 843: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 846: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. WOMACK, and Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 849: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 851: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr.

CLAY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 880: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 881: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 972: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1057: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 1083: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1095: Mr. EVANS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1102: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1164: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROSS, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. KINZINGER.
H.R. 1179: Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 1226: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1235: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BASS, Mr. VELA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. COSTA, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. KIHUEN.
H.R. 1240: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1243: Mr. CORREA and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1267: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1290: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1354: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 1406: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TAKANO, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1414: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1415: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1438: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1478: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 1491: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1528: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1566: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 1582: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1584: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1664: Mr. WELCH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1677: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1697: Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 1699: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 1706: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1707: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1719: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1863: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 1881: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 1889: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. LEE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KIND, Mr. SIREs, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr.

BROWN of Maryland, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WALZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. O’ROURKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1893: Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 1895: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 1911: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 1953: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1988: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2044: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIMES, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 2061: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2062: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 2091: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2108: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2119: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 2133: Mr. FASO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 2147: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 2176: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2192: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 2215: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2220: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 2228: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COOK, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2272: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2273: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2286: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. OLSON, Mr. TAYLOR, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2292: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2295: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2309: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2327: Mr. RATCLIFFE and Mr. CORREA.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. BABIN.
H.J. Res. 29: Mr. MESSER.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. KING of New York.
H. Con. Res. 44: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. VARGAS.
H. Con. Res. 47: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 30: Mr. DOGGETT.
H. Res. 31: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 128: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H. Res. 136: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. PALLONE.
H. Res. 239: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 268: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H. Res. 283: Mr. O’ROURKE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Res. 307: Mr. BLUM, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. DUNN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

May 4, 2017

7581

43. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Borough of Little Ferry, NJ, relative to Resolution No. 152, strongly supporting programs and full funding of the Community Development Block Grant program; which was referred to the Committee on Financial Services.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—
ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 1 by Ms. ESHOO on H.R. 305: Ms. Slaughter and Mr. McEachin.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING OFFICERS MAURO AND
FRANCEMONE

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic actions of two law enforcement officers from my district, Syracuse Police Department Officers Joseph Mauro and Kelsey Francemone.

Both of these officers put their own lives on the line in protection of our community: Officer Mauro, in October of 2016, when he was confronted by an armed suspect in the University Hill neighborhood and Officer Francemone on Father's Day of 2016, when she approached a fatal riot head on, only to be brutally attacked by an angry crowd.

For their bravery, Officers Mauro and Francemone were each nominated for the National Association of Police Organizations TOP COP Award. Next week, Officer Francemone will be honored as one of only a few nationwide winners of this prestigious award.

As a federal prosecutor, I worked alongside the brave men and women of the Syracuse Police Department for nearly twenty years. I have the utmost respect for these officers and their selfless actions.

Congratulations to Officers Francemone and Mauro, and I thank them for their commitment and dedication to making Syracuse a safer place.

TRIBUTE TO A. H. PARKER HIGH
SCHOOL IN BIRMINGHAM, ALA-
BAMA

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding public high school in my district—the A.H. Parker High School Thundering Herd in Birmingham, AL. Parker High School has been at the cornerstone of education in the Birmingham community for nearly 117 years, preparing students for future leadership and life.

During the school year of 1899, a few Negro citizens of Birmingham called a historical mass meeting to draw up a petition in which they would request the Board of Education establish a tax supported school for blacks. Dr. W. R. Pettiford, president of the Alabama Penny Savings Bank, a black-owned financial institution, and Mrs. B. H. Hudson, a cashier of that bank, were the leading supporters of the effort.

The school officially opened as a high school for African-American children in the fall

of 1900 with a freshman class of 19 students and one teacher. Arthur Harold Parker was appointed by the board to serve as the first principal. In 1939, Parker retired and the school was subsequently renamed in his honor.

The school's first graduation was held June 3, 1904, at the historic 16th Street Baptist Church, which is now part of the Birmingham Civil Rights National Monument. Fifteen students received diplomas at the ceremony.

In September 1910, the school moved to a temporary location—the Lane Auditorium—and began offering skills for women such as sewing, knitting, and child care. By that time the enrollment was about 100 students. Construction of a permanent facility began in 1923, and by 1929, the school had an industrial building, a library, and a gymnasium. By 1937, the school had an enrollment of over 2,700.

The school continued to grow steadily to 3,761 students in 1946. Due to the large number, the school became known as the “Largest High School for Negroes in the World.”

In 2004, acclaimed journalist Michele Norris, host of All Things Considered with National Public Radio, chronicled Parker's story in “Parker High: Integration's Unfulfilled Promise,” a look at the paradoxical effect integration had on all-black schools such as Parker. For Norris, the story is personal as her father and five uncles all attended Parker.

Parker's current principal, Darrell Hudson, assumed leadership of the school in 2013. Principal Hudson is a veteran educator of the Birmingham and Montgomery, AL, public school systems, who truly believes all students can learn through hard work, determination, and the right educational environment. He is a graduate of Alabama State University and Auburn University of Montgomery.

Principal Hudson is a faithful member of Sixth Avenue Baptist Church in Birmingham, AL, and an active member with the Alabama State University National Alumni Association, as well as Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc. Principal Hudson was also recently appointed to the Board of Directors for his Alma mater, Alabama State University.

Notable graduates of Parker include, among others, jazz music legends Sun Ra and Erskine Hawkins; Nell Carter, Tony award-winning actress; Oscar Adams, Jr., the first African American Alabama Supreme Court Justice; Arthur Shores, noted civil rights attorney; Alma Johnson Powell, wife of former Secretary of State Colin Powell; Eric Bledsoe, star NBA player with the Phoenix Suns; and the current Mayor of Birmingham, William A. Bell.

On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama, and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this outstanding educational institution and its 117-year commitment to public education.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVER-
SARY OF THE LASALLE COUNTY
HISTORICAL SOCIETY MUSEUM

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 50th Anniversary of the LaSalle County Historical Society's Museum in Utica, Illinois. The LaSalle County Historical Society was formed in 1907 and acquired their first building, the 1848 Canal Warehouse in 1967. Since then, the museum campus has grown to a one-room school house, a Heritage Center, a blacksmith shop, and a barn from 1875.

Their mission statement says “To search out, procure and preserve in permanent form, facts and data in the history of the County of LaSalle as related to persons, places and all objects therein. In order to meet said purpose, the primary duty of the Society shall be to discover, collect, and preserve any facts or relics pertaining to the history of LaSalle County and to encourage the study of LaSalle County heritage, its times and people.”

The Museum spans the long and varied history of LaSalle County, including artifacts from the Native Americans and earliest settlers of this region to the carriage that Abraham Lincoln used to travel to the famous Lincoln-Douglas debate held in Ottawa, Illinois.

The building itself, a nineteenth century warehouse situated along the historic I&M Canal, served as a warehouse for the local cement mill and a general store before becoming Utica's first post office in 1849. The LaSalle County Historical Society saved the historic warehouse from destruction and now the region is one of the most popular Illinois vacation destinations with 2.2 million annual visitors.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 16th Congressional District, the citizens of LaSalle County, and the millions who have enjoyed learning about the history of LaSalle County at the Museum, I sincerely congratulate them on achieving this milestone. The importance of preserving and appreciating our history cannot be overlooked and the dedication of the LaSalle County Historical Society and all of their volunteers is a key part of this time honored tradition. I look forward to what they will accomplish in the next fifty years.

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

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

IN RECOGNITION OF NORM
ARCHIBALD**HON. JODEY C. ARRINGTON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Norm Archibald, Mayor of the City of Abilene, Texas, "The Key City." Norm is a native Texan from San Benito. He and his wife Nancy have lived in Abilene for more than forty years. When he is not representing Abilene as Mayor, Norm serves as Vice President of the Hendrick Health System in Abilene where he is responsible for the development of the Health System through the Hendrick Medical Center Foundation. He holds a bachelor's and a master's degree from Texas A&M University, a master's degree from Abilene Christian University, and a doctorate degree from Texas Tech University. Norm is the father of two beautiful children, Bryan and Betsy, and grandfather to four grandchildren, Hunter, Hudson, Margaret, and Archer. During his childhood years, Norm achieved the rank of Eagle Scout, the highest rank attainable in the Boy Scouts of America.

Even with his demanding professional career, Norm has always carved out time to serve his community, especially through his work with the Abilene/Taylor County Health Board, the United Way, the YMCA, the Boy Scouts of America Board, Junior Achievement, the Military Affairs Committee of the Abilene Chamber of Commerce, and the Abilene Metropolitan Planning Organization. More recently, Norm has been serving our country through his membership on the EPA's Local Government Advisory Committee.

Norm became Mayor of Abilene in 2004 after four years of serving on the Abilene City Council. He was re-elected in 2005, in 2008, in 2011, and again in 2014. Now, after seventeen years on the Abilene City Council and thirteen years as Mayor, Norm has chosen to step down to make way for new leadership. He has been a strong, effective, and passionate advocate for the values and interests that are important to Abilene and the Big Country. Mayor Archibald devoted his tenure to improving quality of life, long-term water resources, Dyess Air Force Base, and local government.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Abilene and the people of our nation have been fortunate to have a man like Norm dedicate so much of his time, talents, and energy to building a better and stronger city. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Norm as he completes his successful tenure as Mayor of Abilene and in thanking Norm and his wife, Nancy, for all their years of outstanding public service and exceptional contributions to the city of Abilene and the Big Country.

HONORING HUMBOLDT COUNTY
SHERIFF MIKE DOWNEY**HON. JARED HUFFMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sheriff Mike Downey, a longtime member of Humboldt County's law enforcement community, on his retirement.

Sheriff Downey's service to Humboldt County has been exemplary. Mike moved his family to Humboldt County and first became a deputy sheriff in 1986. He was assigned to the Marijuana Eradication Team in 1988, earning several awards for service to the Campaign Against Marijuana Planting. He was promoted to Field Training Officer in 1989, and then to Sheriff's Corporal in 1992. In 1994, Mike was selected as Resident Deputy to Shelter Cove. Three years later, he was assigned as Sheriff's Sergeant to the Garberville station, and was awarded the Outstation Deputy of the Year in 2000. In 2003, Mike was promoted to the rank of Sheriff's Lieutenant in charge of North Area Command patrol operations.

Mike's professional development has been stellar over the tenure of his service. He was awarded every level of certification offered by the CA Commission on Peace Officer's Standards and Training (POST), including Intermediate, Advanced, Supervisory, Management, and Executive Certificates, and graduated from POST Command College. On May 7, 2006, Mike was promoted to Undersheriff under Sheriff Gary Philip. He was elected as Sheriff of Humboldt County and took office on January 1, 2001.

Sheriff Downey has been a role model for excellence in professionalism and community policing throughout his career. In addition to his professional contributions, he has served the Humboldt County community through the Eureka Rotary Club, The Red Cross board of Directors, as the President of the Law Enforcement Chiefs Associations of Humboldt, and through the Board of Directors for the California State Sheriffs' Association.

Mr. Speaker, Sheriff Mike Downey's commitment to the safety and peace of Humboldt County is commendable and worthy of recognition. I urge my colleagues to join me in extending our congratulations to him.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS.
MCCREADY'S 3RD GRADE CLASS**HON. DAVID A. TROTT**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the bright young artists in Mrs. McCready's 3rd grade class at Franklin Road Christian School in Novi, Michigan.

I know that artists get their start long before high school and college, learning to expand their imagination and foster their creativity in classrooms just like Mrs. McCready's.

In an effort to highlight young artists from across Michigan's 11th Congressional District,

this year, I announced the 1st Annual "Color my Capitol" Program.

Brimming with talent, Mrs. McCready's students were eager to showcase their amazing artistic skills and take part in this one-of-a-kind program.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. McCready's 3rd graders did not disappoint. Their creations are unique, innovative, and imaginative. Their colorful artwork embodies our country's bright and promising future with these sharp young minds leading the way.

It is my utmost honor to have their artwork displayed in my Congressional district office in Troy, Michigan for everyone who visits to enjoy. Each and every time I walk into my office, I am reminded of their talent.

Congratulations to Mrs. McCready and the young artists she has the pleasure of teaching.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALL-
EN MISSISSIPPI SOLDIER ARMY
SERGEANT (SGT) JOHN MCCLELLAN
SMITH**HON. TRENT KELLY**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Army Sergeant (SGT) John McClellan Smith who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our great nation on May 12, 2005, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. SGT Smith was killed when an improvised explosive device detonated near his convoy in Iskandariyah, Iraq. During his tour in Iraq, SGT Smith's assignment was to train members of the Iraqi National Guard.

SGT Smith was assigned to the 2nd Squadron, 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment, Fort Irwin, California, which was attached to the 155th BCT of Mississippi. He was a member of the 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg before joining the California unit. SGT Smith was a JROTC cadet at New Hanover High School in Wilmington, North Carolina where he also played football, baseball, and lacrosse before graduating in 2000.

During SGT Smith's funeral, Brigadier General Mike Ferriter of the 82nd Airborne Division presented Smith's mother, Judy Smith, with the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, the Iraqi Campaign Medal, and the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal.

Sergeant First Class Richard Mitchell of the 82nd Airborne Division presented Mrs. Smith with the American flag. He told the Associated Press that SGT Smith was committed to serving his country.

"Smitty was a great soldier," SFC Mitchell said. "He died doing what he wanted to do."

SGT Smith's devotion to his nation will not be forgotten.

IN RECOGNITION OF EDWARD W. STANKS, RECIPIENT OF THE 2017 WYOMING VALLEY CHILDREN'S ASSOCIATION "MAKING A DIFFERENCE" AWARD

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Edward W. Stanks, Jr., CPA who will be honored on May 13 by the Wyoming Valley Children's Association. Ed will receive the 2017 "Making a Difference Award" for his continued involvement in the Children's Association. Ed has served on the WVCA board as treasurer for over fifteen years. He has shared his knowledge, expertise, and countless hours of his time to help the children of northeastern Pennsylvania.

Ed has worked as a Certified Public Accountant for nearly four decades for companies like Coopers and Lybrand (now Price Waterhouse Coopers/PwC) and Baron, Strassmen & Co. (now Kronick, Kalada, Berdy, & Co., P.C.). Today, Ed owns and operates his own accounting office in Kingston, Pennsylvania. In addition to serving the Wyoming Valley Children's Association, Ed is a member of the American Institute of CPAs and the Pennsylvania Institute of CPAs. He is the former president and treasurer of the Rotary Club of Kingston. He was also named a Paul Harris Fellow of the Kingston Rotary Club. Ed also serves as the treasurer of the Exodus Prison & Aftercare Ministry. He belongs to St. Therese's Parish in Shavertown, where he serves on the finance council and helps with the music ministry.

It is an honor to recognize Ed Stanks, Jr. for his service to the Wyoming Valley Children Association, an outstanding organization helping to provide the therapeutic support needed to give all of the children in northeastern Pennsylvania a quality early childhood education. I am truly grateful for his efforts.

HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HEMINGWAY INTERNATIONAL YACHT CLUB, HAVANA, CUBA

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, the Ocean Passages maritime educational program and the state of Maine, home port of the schooner *Harvey Gamage*, would like to congratulate Commodore Lic. José Miguel Diaz Escrich and the Hemingway International Yacht Club of Havana, Cuba, on the occasion of its 25th Anniversary, being celebrated this month.

For 25 years, the Hemingway International Yacht Club has welcomed scores of international visitors from around the world—and consistently promoted stronger ties between Cuba and the United States through cooperative sailing and maritime programs.

Drawing on the long history of shared Cuban-American nautical traditions, symbol-

ized above all by Ernest Hemingway's love of the sea and his adoption of Cuba as his second country, the Hemingway International Yacht Club has sought to keep alive the importance of Cuba's rich marine heritage.

The schooner *Harvey Gamage* first sailed into Marina Hemingway in Havana in February 2016—and members of the Ocean Passages program have worked closely with Commodore Escrich in promoting the participation of American sport fishing boats in the annual Hemingway International Billfishing Tournament.

As Ocean Passages grows its educational and training programs in Cuban waters, we look forward to deepening that cooperation across the ocean we share. As the Maine poet Richard Blanco wrote in *Cosas del Mar* on the occasion of the restoration of bilateral diplomatic relations:

... Today, the sea still telling us,
the end to all our doubts and fears
is to gaze into the lucid blues of our shared horizon,
to breathe together, to heal together.

Ernest Hemingway donated his 1954 Nobel Literature prize medal to the people of Cuba, saying "this award belongs to the people of Cuba, because my works were created and conceived in Cuba, in my village of Cojimar, of which I am a citizen."

It is in that spirit that Ocean Passages and the state of Maine congratulate Commodore Escrich and the Hemingway International Yacht Club and look forward to fruitful cooperation for many years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. DAILY'S
3RD GRADE CLASS

HON. DAVID A. TROTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the bright young artists in Mrs. Daily's 3rd grade class at Garfield Elementary in Livonia, Michigan.

I know that artists get their start long before high school and college, learning to expand their imagination and foster their creativity in classrooms just like Mrs. Daily's.

In an effort to highlight young artists from across Michigan's 11th Congressional District, this year, I announced the 1st Annual "Color my Capitol" Program.

Brimming with talent, Mrs. Daily's students were eager to showcase their amazing artistic skills and take part in this one-of-a-kind program.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Daily's 3rd graders did not disappoint. Their creations are unique, innovative, and imaginative. Their colorful artwork embodies our country's bright and promising future with these sharp young minds leading the way.

It is my utmost honor to have their artwork displayed in my Congressional district office in Troy, Michigan for everyone who visits to enjoy. Each and every time I walk into my office, I am reminded of their talent.

Congratulations to Mrs. Daily and the young artists she has the pleasure of teaching.

CELEBRATING CHARLOTTE
ZIMMERMAN'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Charlotte Zimmerman, who turned 90 years young today. Charlotte is an active member of Hadassah in South Florida and a beloved mother of four, grandmother of six, and great-grandmother of four.

Throughout her life Charlotte is an example to us all, staying healthy and aging with grace. She is a patron of the arts, including ballet, drama, music, and opera. She grew up in Richmond Hill, New York and now lives in Boca Raton, Florida.

I join with Charlotte's friends and family in celebrating her birthday. I wish her good health and continued success in the coming year.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF FIRE CHIEF KEVIN D. SUTTON

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life and legacy of Fairfield, AL, Fire Chief Kevin D. Sutton. Chief Sutton was a native of Birmingham, AL, who tragically passed in an auto accident on April 30, 2017. His seasoned leadership, engaging personality, and heart for his community will certainly be missed.

Chief Sutton attended Birmingham public schools and was a 1981 graduate of Phillips High School. Upon graduation, he pursued higher education at Mississippi Valley State University on an academic and football scholarship. Chief Sutton would later receive a Bachelor of Science degree in Public Safety Administration from Athens State University.

Chief Sutton served with the City of Fairfield, AL, for 23 years, the previous 13 years as Fire Chief. Prior to serving as Fire Chief, he served the city as a firefighter then as the city's Fire Marshal. Under his leadership, Fairfield Fire Department became an integral partner with the Fairfield community. Chief Sutton coordinated several programs in the city for seniors and children, including the annual "Safety is Fun Day," which involves all city and private elementary schools in Fairfield. Chief Sutton also led the department's involvement in charitable works such as the Muscular Dystrophy Association's "Boot Drive," which collects money for Jerry's Kids.

Previously, Chief Sutton served on the Executive Committee of the State Fire Marshal's Association and was the past President of the Central Alabama Fire Chief's Association. He also served on the Executive Committee of the Alabama Fire Chief's Association, and was the immediate past president of the Board of Directors for Better Basics, a nonprofit that

provides literacy intervention, enrichment programs, and educational opportunities for elementary and middle-school students throughout Alabama. Chief Sutton was also a proud member of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc.

Chief Sutton is survived by his wife, Phyllis, and daughters, Tabathia Norman, Karmen Patterson, and Taylor Sutton.

On a personal note, I will also remember Chief Sutton's warm smile, generous heart and servant leadership. Although he left us too soon, his family should find comfort in the exemplary life he led. Chief Sutton made a tremendous impact on our community that will have a lasting significance. Chief Sutton will live on in the hearts and minds of the many people he touched.

On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama, and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Fire Chief Kevin D. Sutton—an outstanding servant leader who faithfully served the Fairfield, AL community.

SUPPORT FOR THE PEOPLE OF ETHIOPIA

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the continued and troubling pattern of repression committed by the Government of Ethiopia against its own citizens, and to express our support to the people of that country in their efforts to bring about peaceful reform to ensure their basic human rights as guaranteed by the Ethiopian constitution. To that end, my colleagues and I have introduced a bi-partisan resolution expressing support for the people of Ethiopia and asking the Ethiopian government to take solid steps to address these many violations.

On March 9th, the House Foreign Relations Subcommittee held hearings to discuss this important issue and what the United States can do to bring about positive change in Ethiopia. Among those who testified is a man from my own district, Deacon Yoseph Tafari of the St. Mary's Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church located in Aurora, Colorado, who grew up in Ethiopia and has seen first-hand the daily struggle of those living in abject poverty and under government oppression. Deacon Yoseph was forced to flee Ethiopia in 1976 and came to the U.S. as a refugee. Since then, both he and all of the courageous members of the Ethiopian community in my district, including the Oromo and Amharas, have worked tirelessly to organize and help those still suffering from repression in their home country, and to bring crucial international awareness to their plight.

Every day, Ethiopian-Americans bring important contributions and valuable diversity not only to my district, but all across America. I want to make clear that we support them and stand by them in these times of hardship. I represent the largest Ethiopian community in Colorado, and I will continue to monitor the situation in Ethiopia closely as well as continue working with local community leaders to raise

awareness of this important issue and bring relief to the Ethiopian people.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALL-EN MISSISSIPPI SOLDIER MARINE LANCE CORPORAL (LCPL) CASEY LYNNE CASANOVA

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Marine Lance Corporal (LCpl) Casey Lynne Casanova who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our great nation on May 2, 2008, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. LCpl Casanova was killed along with three other Marines when a roadside bomb was detonated while they were on patrol in Karmah, Iraq. Also killed were Sergeant Glen E. Martinez of Boulder, Colorado; Corporal James Kimple of Amanda, Ohio; and Corporal Miguel A. Guzman of Norwalk, California.

LCpl Casanova was assigned to the Combat Logistics Battalion 1, Combat Logistics Regiment 1, 1st Marine Logistics Group, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, California. LCpl Casanova served as a field radio operator. This was her first deployment to Iraq.

LCpl Casanova grew up in McComb, Mississippi, where she sang in the chorus at Bass Memorial Academy in Purvis and played multiple musical instruments in the high school band.

LCpl Casanova's mother, Paula Carruth, shared that Casey decided to enlist in the U.S. Marine Corps while she was attending Southwest Community College in Summit, Mississippi.

"Casey had a servant's heart," Paula said. "She wanted to serve, and the military allowed her to do that."

Paula says her daughter's death was a tragedy, but triumph rose out of tragedy during a memorial service attended by more than 1,000 people. The service was held at New Heights Baptist Church in McComb.

"It became so huge and overwhelming," Paula said. "My community was and still is so amazing."

This summer, a portion of Highway 98 in Pike County will be named in LCpl Casanova's honor.

LCpl Casanova is survived by her mother, Paula Carruth, and grandparents, John Paul and Kitty Carruth.

LCpl Casanova devoted her life to military service. Her determination to serve will not be forgotten.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. ROLLINS'S 3RD GRADE CLASS

HON. DAVID A. TROTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the bright young artists in Mrs.

Rollins's 3rd grade class at Garfield Elementary in Livonia, Michigan.

I know that artists get their start long before high school and college, learning to expand their imagination and foster their creativity in classrooms just like Mrs. Rollins's.

In an effort to highlight young artists from across Michigan's 11th Congressional District, this year, I announced the 1st Annual "Color my Capitol" Program.

Brimming with talent, Mrs. Rollins's students were eager to showcase their amazing artistic skills and take part in this one-of-a-kind program.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Rollins's 3rd graders did not disappoint. Their creations are unique, innovative, and imaginative. Their colorful artwork embodies our country's bright and promising future with these sharp young minds leading the way.

It is my utmost honor to have their artwork displayed in my Congressional District office in Troy, Michigan for everyone who visits to enjoy. Each and every time I walk into my office, I am reminded of their talent.

Congratulations to Mrs. Rollins and the young artists she has the pleasure of teaching.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF JOSEPH S. MILLER

HON. PETER A. DEFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the passing of a Capitol Hill icon, Joseph S. Miller, described by The Oregonian in 1987 as the dean of lobbyists in the nation's capital who specialized in Pacific Northwest issues. Joe was a seminal figure in Northwest politics and became well-known in Washington, D.C. His career spanned over 70 years, and he earned a reputation for having great political insight and courage.

Joe was a respected journalist and came from the infamous Class of 1943 at the University of Oregon, which included Les Anderson, Jeff Kitchens, Aaron U. Jones, and Bill Roth, Jr. After serving in the Army in the Aleutian Islands during World War II, he wrote for Northwest newspapers. He covered drama, literature, labor, politics, sports, and music. One weekend, he covered a heavyweight fight, a college football game, and the Seattle Symphony. The next day he ran into the president of the symphony, who said, "Joe, last night I thought I went to a symphony concert, but when I read your review this morning I knew I'd been to a title fight instead." Gradually, politics and labor issues became Joe's focus.

In 1958, Joe moved his wife Rosalie Daggy Miller and their two daughters from Seattle to Washington, D.C., to become the executive director of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. He helped elect many Democratic senators, including Senators Ed Muskie, Gaylord Nelson, Bill Proxmire, and Frank Church. Later he advised the presidential election of John F. Kennedy. The Washington Post once called him the Democrats' answer to Madison Avenue. Senator Dick Neuberger said of Joe

that he "would never base a campaign on personal malice or an appeal to a hate element. His politics are never bitter."

Joe had an almost encyclopedic memory for details and always told it like it was. These talents usually served him well as he represented clients such as the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, United Steelworkers of America, American Association of Railroads, Port of Portland, Western Forest Industries Association, and Association of Oregon and California Land Grant Counties.

A life-long Democrat, Joe had great friendships and professional relationships with many Republicans. As he once said, "We would hash out issues all day long, but when 5 o'clock came, we were all on the same side." Joe and his second wife, Erna Wahl Miller, personal secretary to Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson, were valued friends and hosts to many in their home on Capitol Hill until Erna's death in 2004.

In 2008, Joe's memoir, *The Wicked Wine of Democracy*, was published by the University of Washington Press. The book is a candid look at politics from the 1950s onward. Joe wanted to call his memoir *When Politics Was Fun*, but the UW Press, publishing the book as a potential political-science text, had other ideas.

For over 40 years, Joe met for lunch every Friday at the Irish Times on Capitol Hill with a drop-in group of old and new friends. He respected "the wit and wisdom of his Friday lunch gang," which represented a wide range of political thought. Joe's ability to listen to other points of view and to find common ground kept his voice relevant and in demand throughout his life.

Joe was a great believer in the "American Political Way" and said, "We have overcome many challenges over two centuries and have always emerged a stronger and more democratic nation as a result."

Thanks to Joe Miller for his dedication and contributions to the political process. His positive outlook and ability to adapt to changing times, even in his 90s, will be missed.

OPPOSITION OF TRUMPCARE'S HIGHER COSTS, LESS COVERAGE, AND FEWER PROTECTIONS

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the GOP healthcare bill today marks a disappointing abdication of now more than 50 years of work to invest in the health care of our citizens. The bill strips coverage from at least 24 million Americans. WHAT A SHAME.

This GOP bill is being rushed to passage without an updated CBO score. My Republican colleagues should be ashamed of themselves for playing such silly, political games with the health of the American people and 1/6th of the American economy.

In my home state of Alabama, this GOP bill will exacerbate the cost of uncompensated care, which already exceeds \$694 million annually in Alabama. Alabama's hospitals collec-

tively would see an increase of more than \$97 million (at least) in uncompensated care costs due to the coverage losses in this bill.

This GOP bill will gut Medicaid, which is the single largest insurer for children in America. It is a lifeline for disabled and nursing home patients across my district and across this country yet this GOP bill slashes Medicaid by more than \$800 billion.

This GOP bill will be devastating to America's hospitals. Children's Hospital of Alabama, for example, is projected to lose \$752 million in Medicaid revenues through 2026 under this bill. In 2018, the hospital would lose \$1.4 million in uncompensated care costs. I am honored to represent UAB here in Congress, which is Alabama's largest employer and is set to lose \$613 million in Medicaid revenues. Bad debt would increase by 90 million a year for the hospital. The CEO of UAB health, Dr. Will Ferniany, says the bill is "bad for Alabama, bad for older people, bad for Alabama hospitals, and bad for the poor."

The good, hard-working people of America have much to lose under this GOP bill.

Our rural hospitals can absolutely NOT afford these cuts as this GOP bill will only worsen the rural hospital closure crisis. Almost 80 percent of rural hospital closures since 2010 have occurred in states that haven't expanded Medicaid under the ACA. As Representative of a state with one of the most bare-bones Medicaid programs in the country, I know full well that capping and cutting Medicaid is not the direction we want to go in.

Our sacred responsibility to make strategic investments in the health of every American has the stark and immediate urgency of right and wrong.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this harmful GOP bill, which will result in higher costs, less coverage, and fewer protections.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF DR. JEREMY GREEN

HON. MIKE GALLAGHER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Dr. Jeremy Green of Green Bay, Wisconsin, and his more than five decades of service to the people of Northeast Wisconsin.

When he graduated from at the University of the Witwatersrand in South Africa, he couldn't have known how far his journey as a physician would take him or how many thousands of lives he would touch. From Johannesburg, Dr. Green began his remarkable personal and professional journey by heading to postgraduate work in Belfast and London, then at Boston City Hospital, Jersey City Medical Center, Cincinnati General Hospital and in the City of Melbourne, Australia.

But it was when he reached Green Bay in 1964 that he knew he had found his real home. He and his wife, Elizabeth, a British nurse, raised their family in Green Bay and then joined them as American citizens in 1995.

Over the years, he helped launch the Green Bay Area Free Clinic, UW-Green Bay's stu-

dent health services and health services for the university's athletic teams.

Beyond his medical service, his contributions to community organizations in Northeast Wisconsin are simply too many to recount here.

Dr. Green has been honored by groups ranging from the Northeastern Wisconsin African-American Association to the State Medical Society of Wisconsin, from the Neville Public Museum to Scholarships, Inc. In 1987, he received the Chancellor's Award for Lifetime Service from UW-Green Bay and in 2000, he received the NFL Community Quarterback Award from the Green Bay Packers.

In coming days, Dr. Green will step down from active practice in Green Bay. However, just as he always has, he will continue to serve his community and pursue his many interests. We would expect nothing less from that young South African physician who somehow found his way to Northeast Wisconsin, raising a proud family and lifting the lives of countless Americans along the way.

CELEBRATING FRED RISSE'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise along with my colleague, Rep. GWEN MOORE, to celebrate the 90th Birthday of Wisconsin State Senator Fred Risser on May 5, 2017. Born in Madison, Wisconsin in 1927, Mr. Risser was elected to Wisconsin's Assembly in 1956 and the Senate in 1962. He is currently the nation's longest-serving state legislator, and shows no sign of slowing down anytime soon.

Born and raised in Madison, Senator Risser is the fourth generation of his family to serve in the Wisconsin Legislature. His father, Fred E. Risser, grandfather, Ernest Warner, and great-grandfather Clement Warner, were all dedicated public servants.

Mr. Risser joined the Navy just prior to his 18th birthday. Trained as a medic, Mr. Risser spent time in Newport, R.I., then in Panama before he returned to the United States. Mr. Risser was educated in the Madison public schools, and then used the GI Bill to attend Carleton College and the University of Wisconsin-Madison (where he earned a B.A.), and the law school of the University of Oregon. He then practiced law with his father before entering public service.

Wisconsin is fortunate to have a great leader like Fred Risser. Throughout his extraordinary career, he has served his constituents and his community diligently. It is our great honor to join Fred's wife Nancy, children and grandchildren, his many friends, and our colleagues in the House of Representatives, in wishing Fred a happy 90th birthday—and many more years.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. KUHN'S
3RD GRADE CLASS

HON. DAVID A. TROTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the bright young artists in Mrs. Kuhn's 3rd grade class at Hickory Woods Elementary in Novi, Michigan.

I know that artists get their start long before high school and college, learning to expand their imagination and foster their creativity in classrooms just like Mrs. Kuhn's.

In an effort to highlight young artists from across Michigan's 11th Congressional District, this year, I announced the 1st Annual "Color my Capitol" Program.

Brimming with talent, Mrs. Kuhn's students were eager to showcase their amazing artistic skills and take part in this one-of-a-kind program.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Kuhn's 3rd graders did not disappoint. Their creations are unique, innovative, and imaginative. Their colorful artwork embodies our country's bright and promising future with these sharp young minds leading the way.

It is my utmost honor to have their artwork displayed in my Congressional district office in Troy, Michigan for everyone who visits to enjoy. Each and every time I walk into my office, I am reminded of their talent.

Congratulations to Mrs. Kuhn and the young artists she has the pleasure of teaching.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF
CONGRESSMAN DAWSON MATHIS

HON. AUSTIN SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues, Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON, Congressman SANFORD BISHOP, Congressman BARRY LOUDERMILK, Congressman RICK ALLEN, and Congressman TOM GRAVES, to remember the life of former Georgia Congressman Dawson Mathis, who passed away on April 17, 2017. Today, we honor Dawson's life, remember his spirit, and thank him and his family for their meaningful contributions to the state of Georgia.

Born in Nashville, Georgia, Dawson Mathis attended South Georgia College before he moved to Albany, Georgia in 1964 to work at WALB-TV, where he served as the network's news director until 1970. Even at a young age, it was clear that Dawson had a knack for communicating with and representing all walks of Georgians, a trait that only shined more as Dawson began his political career.

From 1971 until 1981, Dawson served as the Representative for Georgia's Second Congressional District. During his time in Congress, Dawson was known as a witty southern Democrat who could work cordially with Members on both sides of the aisle. As a legislator, Dawson was a gifted politician, but always a true statesman. Despite his success in work-

ing in the highest levels of government, Dawson never grew too proud to forget who he was. He was always known to be open and accessible, willing to talk to local reporters and constituents for hours on end. Amidst the hustle and bustle of Capitol Hill, Dawson never lost sight of advocating for the best interests of the Georgians he represented, and the legacy he left still benefits the people of Southwest Georgia today.

Dawson was one of a kind, and his decade of public service greatly benefitted our state. Our thoughts are with his family and friends during this time as they remember the great man he was.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALL-
EN MISSISSIPPI SOLDIER ARMY
STAFF SERGEANT (SSG) TOMMY
SEARY LITTLE

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Army Staff Sergeant (SSG) Tommy Seary Little who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our nation on May 2, 2005, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. SSG Little died at the Brooke Army Medical Center in San Antonio, Texas from injuries sustained on April 19 when an improvised explosive device detonated near his Humvee outside Iskandariyah, Iraq. Sergeant Terrance A. Elizenberry of Clinton, Sergeant Wyman H. Jones of Columbus, Private First Class Stephen B. Brooks of Columbus, and Sergeant First Class Grayson "Norris" Galatas of Meridian were also injured in the explosion.

SSG Little, an Aliceville, Alabama native and the youngest of 11 children, was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 114th Field Artillery Regiment, Mississippi Army National Guard, Columbus, Mississippi. SSG Little joined the Mississippi Army National Guard after he graduated Aliceville High School.

According to an Associated Press news article, Major General Harold A. Cross, Adjutant General of the Mississippi Army National Guard, said members of the Guard would mourn the loss of this brave soldier. Mississippi Governor Haley Barbour said his family was deeply saddened by another death of a member of the Guard serving in Iraq.

SSG Little's brother, Jack Little says his brother was liked by all.

"He was easy to get along with," Jack said. "If he could help, Tommy always would. He loved the Army."

SSG Little's sister, Ruth Henderson, said her brother was dedicated to the Army.

"He was a hard worker," Ruth said. "He was also a great father."

SSG Little is survived by his wife, Patricia; his daughter, Ashley; his mother Lue Della Little; his siblings, Otis Roosevelt Little, Louise Murray, Alfred Little, Eddie Lee Little, Idella Little, Lillie Hutton, Jack Little, Ruth Henderson, Eddie Dean Little, and Bessie Hinton.

The National Guard Armory in Ackerman, Mississippi was named in honor of SSG Little. His sacrifice will always be remembered.

RECOGNIZING MARY AND DAVID
BOIES

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mary and David Boies, who will be honored by United Way of Westchester and Putnam with the Spirit of Caring Award for their leadership, commitment to community, and willingness to help others.

Mary Boies has had a successful career in law and currently serves as Counsel to Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP, where she specializes in antitrust and corporate commercial litigation. Her prior positions include General Counsel of the U.S. Civil Aeronautics Board, Assistant Director of the Domestic Policy Staff at the White House, and Counsel to the U.S. Senate Commerce Committee. Ms. Boies was also a member of a non-partisan, professional Committee that reviewed federal judicial nominees. In each of these roles, she has always sought to do what is right and best for others.

Outside of her work in law, she has also worked to support children's educational software. She was the founder of MaryBoies Software Inc., which developed Top of the Key and Slam Dunk Typing. Both programs were recognized as some of the top pieces of children's educational software and have been translated into numerous languages for international distribution. Additionally, she has served on the Board of Directors of the Council on Foreign Relations, the Board of Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies, as well as the Board of Visitors that oversees the U.S. Air Force School of Advanced Air and Space Studies, the Air Force Research Institute, the Air War College, the National Security Space Institute, and the Air Force Institute of Technology.

Mr. Boies has also had a distinguished legal career with recognition from many including as one of the "100 Most Influential People in the World" by Time Magazine. Currently Chairman of Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP, he previously served as Chief Counsel and Staff Director of the United States Senate Antitrust Subcommittee and held similar roles on the Senate Judiciary Committee. He was Special Trial Counsel for the United States Department of Justice in its antitrust suit against Microsoft and lead counsel for Vice President Al Gore in litigation following the 2000 Presidential Election. Mr. Boies served as co-lead counsel for plaintiffs in *Perry v. Brown*, which established for the first time the federal constitutional right for gay and lesbian citizens to marry.

Mr. Boies is a member of Phi Beta Kappa; a Fellow of the American College Trial Lawyers and the International Academy of Trial Lawyers; and a Trustee of Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, New York University Law School Foundation, and St. Luke's-Roosevelt Hospital Center.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to their truly remarkable careers in law, Mary and David Boies have also contributed their time, talents, and financially in service of others. I commend their outstanding work, and I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating them on the Spirit of Caring Award.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS.
WECKSTEIN'S 3RD GRADE CLASS

HON. DAVID A. TROTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the bright young artists in Mrs. Weckstein's 3rd grade class at Hickory Woods Elementary in Novi, Michigan.

I know that artists get their start long before high school and college, learning to expand their imagination and foster their creativity in classrooms just like Mrs. Weckstein's.

In an effort to highlight young artists from across Michigan's 11th Congressional District, this year, I announced the 1st Annual "Color my Capitol" Program.

Brimming with talent, Mrs. Weckstein's students were eager to showcase their amazing artistic skills and take part in this one-of-a-kind program.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Weckstein's 3rd graders did not disappoint. Their creations are unique, innovative, and imaginative. Their colorful artwork embodies our country's bright and promising future with these sharp young minds leading the way.

It is my utmost honor to have their artwork displayed in my Congressional district office in Troy, Michigan for everyone who visits to enjoy. Each and every time I walk into my office, I am reminded of their talent.

Congratulations to Mrs. Weckstein and the young artists she has the pleasure of teaching.

IN RECOGNITION OF UNIVERSITY
OF OREGON ASSISTANT VICE
PRESIDENT AND UNIVERSITY
REGISTRAR SUE EVELAND

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize University of Oregon Assistant Vice President and University Registrar Sue Eveland who is retiring after fourteen years of service to the university.

Ms. Eveland has been an invaluable member of the UO community since she was first hired in 2001 and subsequently with her appointment as the Interim University Registrar in 2008 and later University Registrar.

During this time, Ms. Eveland also served as President of both the Pacific Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (PACRAO) and the Oregon Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (ORACRAO), demonstrating her commitment not only to University of Oregon faculty, students and staff, but also to her colleagues nationwide. Prior to her career at the University of Oregon, Ms. Eveland spent 17 years at Iowa State University, serving in various roles in the Offices of Admissions and the Registrar.

Colleagues report that Ms. Eveland has shown herself to be innovative and effective, bringing opportunities for staff development,

growth and collaboration into each of her roles. Alongside her team at the UO, she was able to implement online grading, online course evaluations, an online graduation application and a schedule builder, among other efficiencies. Her work has continually simplified and improved the lives of the students she serves. Her colleagues say she encourages her staff to keep perspective, remain positive, be creative and have fun.

Sue Eveland retires from the University of Oregon having dedicated nearly two decades to improving services for students. I join with the University of Oregon in recognizing Sue Eveland for her contributions to higher education, and I congratulate her for her many years of exemplary service.

IN RECOGNITION OF TOYOTA
MOTOR NORTH AMERICA ON THE
DATE OF ITS SUPPLIER CENTER
GRAND OPENING

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Toyota Motor North America on the date of the Toyota Supplier Center and Prototype Development Facility grand opening. Toyota Motor North America has been a strong partner to southeast Michigan by utilizing our state's automotive expertise to help produce its next generation of automobiles.

Originally established in July 1977, Toyota Motor North America's Research and Development has contributed significantly to the leadership of southeast Michigan as a leader in automotive engineering, driving important breakthroughs in automotive design and safety. Toyota employs approximately 1,440 individuals in its Ann Arbor and York Township facilities whose work has critical input to many of Toyota's most popular vehicles. These facilities collectively have contributed to the vehicle development of many of Toyota's most popular vehicles, including the 2014 Tundra and 2015 Camry designs, and its advanced research and prototype development efforts continue to serve as a critical source of innovation for the company at large.

Toyota Motor North America's significant investment in expanding and upgrading its Ann Arbor and York Township engineering facilities underscores the importance of the groundbreaking research and development being done here. The expansion of the powertrain development facility in Ann Arbor Township, as well as further improvements to the York Township site, will allow a continuation of the successful partnership between Toyota and the State of Michigan. The talented and educated southeast Michigan workforce, combined with Toyota's new facilities and additional resources, will help ensure that Michigan's automotive industry remains a worldwide leader in the coming decades.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Toyota Motor North America and Mr. Toyoda during the grand opening of the Toyota Supplier Center and Prototype Development Facility expansion. This critical invest-

ment will leverage Michigan's talented workforce to conduct cutting-edge automotive research and development.

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY
OF HOLY CROSS
LUTHERAN CHURCH

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Holy Cross Lutheran Church of Ste. Genevieve, Missouri on the occasion of its 150th Anniversary.

The congregation was founded in 1867 and work began that year on its church building which was completed in 1869. In celebrating its momentous anniversary, the congregation is highlighting three words: Survival, Revival and Vital. They want to emphasize all the church at 200 Market Street has overcome to survive this century and a half, to commit to reviving the congregation's presence in Ste. Genevieve and to celebrate how vital the church and the message of Jesus Christ remains.

Known for its historic altar donated to the church in 1950, the congregation now averages about 50 people in its worship services. They remain dedicated to proclaiming the Gospel message and reaching out to the people of Ste. Genevieve.

For continuing its work of proclaiming the Good News of Jesus Christ through 150 years of change and challenge, it is my great pleasure to honor Holy Cross Lutheran Church of Ste. Genevieve, Missouri today before the United States House of Representatives.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF MS. DEBORAH COTTON

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Ms. Deborah Cotton, a New Orleans writer and cultural advocate. Ms. Cotton, affectionately known as "Big Red Cotton," passed away on May 2, 2017, at the age of 52.

Ms. Cotton was raised in Texas and Oklahoma. She attended San Francisco State University, majoring in the field of African-American studies, before moving to Los Angeles, where she worked as a union organizer.

In June 2005, not long before Hurricane Katrina struck, Ms. Cotton moved to New Orleans, Louisiana. She instantly immersed herself in the city's culture and communities. Ms. Cotton became known for her writing about second-lines, brass bands, Mardi Gras Indian practices and many other events in New Orleans. She blogged, tweeted, and filmed nearly every Sunday second-line parade. Though Ms. Cotton was not from New Orleans, her writing helped her to forge better relationships among the city, police, and the parading clubs.

On May 12, 2013, when shooting broke out in the 7th Ward during the annual parade of the Original Big 7 Social Aid and Pleasure Club, Ms. Cotton was filming. Of the 19 people shot that day, Ms. Cotton was among those wounded, suffering grave internal injuries that would ultimately take her life.

Ms. Cotton loved the city and the people of New Orleans enough that, even when the worst happened to her, she responded with compassion and inspired others to do the same. She dedicated herself to continuing to live life with joy and compassion. She forgave the individual who shot her and spent time getting to know him as a person. She also dedicated herself to providing a clear-eyed look at the problem of violence in our communities.

Ms. Cotton's legacy will forever be a part of the city and her dedication to community embodies the spirit of New Orleans. Ms. Cotton's survivors include her mother, Carolee Reed, and two sisters.

Mr. Speaker, I celebrate the life and legacy of Ms. Deborah Cotton, a beloved daughter, sister, and example to aspiring writers everywhere.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS.
MURRAY'S 3RD GRADE CLASS

HON. DAVID A. TROTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the bright young artists in Mrs. Murray's 3rd grade class at Hickory Woods Elementary in Novi, Michigan.

I know that artists get their start long before high school and college, learning to expand their imagination and foster their creativity in classrooms just like Mrs. Murray's.

In an effort to highlight young artists from across Michigan's 11th Congressional District, this year, I announced the 1st Annual "Color my Capitol" Program.

Brimming with talent, Mrs. Murray's students were eager to showcase their amazing artistic skills and take part in this one-of-a-kind program.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Murray's 3rd graders did not disappoint. Their creations are unique, innovative, and imaginative. Their colorful artwork embodies our country's bright and promising future with these sharp young minds leading the way.

It is my utmost honor to have their artwork displayed in my Congressional district office in Troy, Michigan for everyone who visits to enjoy. Each and every time I walk into my office, I am reminded of their talent.

Congratulations to Mrs. Murray and the young artists she has the pleasure of teaching.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN MISSISSIPPI SOLDIER ARMY SERGEANT (SGT) JOSHUA SHANE LADD

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of fallen Mississippi soldier Army Sergeant (SGT) Joshua Shane Ladd who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our nation on May 1, 2004, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. SGT Ladd, a Mississippi Army National Guard soldier, was killed when a rocket-propelled grenade struck his vehicle outside of Mosul, Iraq.

SGT Ladd, a Port Gibson native, was assigned to the 367th Maintenance Company, Army National Guard, Dekalb, Mississippi. SGT Ladd volunteered for service shortly after his unit was mobilized in 2003. According to an article published in The Neshoba Democrat in January 2005, SGT Ladd was honored by an overflow crowd during a memorial service held on May 7 at the McClain-Hays Funeral Home. Outside of the funeral home, many people held flags and lined the streets which led to the Eastlawn Cemetery where SGT Ladd was laid to rest with full military honors.

Major General Harold A. Cross, Adjutant General of the Mississippi National Guard, posthumously presented SGT Ladd with a Bronze Star for meritorious service and a Purple Heart. The newspaper article states that Major General Cross presented the Mississippi Magnolia Cross for meritorious service, saying SGT Ladd distinguished himself by making the ultimate sacrifice. Mississippi Governor Haley Barbour would later award SGT Ladd with the Mississippi Medal of Valor.

"He always wanted to be in the military and shoot big guns," SGT Ladd's cousin, Debbie Chisholm, said to the Associated Press. "He wanted to be a soldier since he was a little boy."

SGT Ladd is survived by his parents, Randy and Deborah Ladd.

SGT Ladd's service will always be remembered.

TRIBUTE TO MS. RUTH LIFE, EDUCATOR, FRIEND, AND COMMUNITY ACTIVIST

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been fortunate to have known many outstanding people during my lifetime, but never have I known a more outstanding, more passionate, more consistent, more reliable or more giving of herself than Ms. Ruth Life, whom I met in the 1960s. I met Ms. Life during the time when community activism was at a seriously high level.

Ms. Life, like many of our generation, were actively engaged in efforts to make life better for the people who lived in the communities

where we lived and worked. Many of the workshops, forums, training sessions and meetings which I attended, Ms. Life would be present and participating. We were working in District 10 where Mr. Joseph Rosen was Superintendent of schools and Mrs. Ida Mae (MA) Fletcher was the leading school activist. As time went on, I left the teaching profession but continued to run into Ms. Life at meetings and church activities. When it came to teaching, none were better, as an Assistant Principal she was creative, encouraging and imaginative. When you walked into the Roswell B. Mason Elementary School, you knew that teachers were teaching and students were learning.

Thirty-eight years is a long time to teach and educate, but a lifetime of service to humanity through church, the Peoples Church of the Harvest Church of God in Christ and the Peoples Community Development Association of Chicago Inc. and other organizations.

I can almost hear the Master speaking to her, well done my good and faithful servant. You have done exceptionally well here on earth, come on up. I welcome you into the bosom of Abraham where you can rest in peace.

INTRODUCING THE PRE-DISASTER
MITIGATION REAUTHORIZATION

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to introduce a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to reauthorize the pre-disaster hazard mitigation program.

First authorized in 2000, the pre-disaster hazard mitigation program has a proven history of saving taxpayer money by investing in cost effective projects that are designed to reduce injuries, loss of life, and damage and destruction of property in the event of a disaster. As the old adage goes: an ounce of prevention is worth its weight in gold.

This is true for the pre-disaster hazard mitigation program. The Multi Hazard Mitigation Council of the National Institute of Building Sciences has found that for every \$1 spent on mitigation, \$4 were saved in potential disaster costs. Other benefits and indirect savings at the local level and within the business sector were also identified. Moreover, the Congressional Budget Office confirmed the cost savings of the program. Using a different analysis, the CBO found in 2007 that for every \$1 spent on mitigation, \$3 was saved in potential disaster costs.

But it is not just empirical studies that have confirmed the benefits of this program. There are numerous examples of flood control projects, voluntary acquisitions of real property located in flood zones, and the construction of safe rooms that have saved lives and prevented future damage. Areas that have experienced flood damage in the past, and have flooded again, experienced reduced or no damage thanks to effective mitigation. For instance, in Iowa, pre-disaster mitigation funds

were used to purchase riverfront homes from homeowners that had suffered flood damage and then converted to green space. When the area subsequently flooded again, there was no new damage, thanks to the pre-disaster mitigation efforts.

With today's ongoing fiscal challenges, increasingly severe storms, and escalating effects of climate change, it makes sense for our country to prepare for these disasters now in order to prevent or reduce damage. Smart planning to mitigate the adverse impact of disasters not only saves lives, but saves money—especially over the long run.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy when there were initial damage estimates in the billions of dollars, many Members from both sides of the aisle streamed to the floor to express sympathy to the victims, as well as decry the extent of the damage and large costs. This program represents an opportunity to curb similar costs in the future while also saving lives and protecting property.

It is time to reauthorize the Pre-Disaster Hazard Mitigation Program at a sufficient level to make an impact. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

PEOPLE'S BUDGET

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to thank my colleagues, Congressman KEITH ELLISON and Congressman RAÚL GRIJALVA, for their tireless leadership of the Progressive Caucus.

I would also like to thank to Congresswoman PRAMILA JAYAPAL and Congresswoman JAMIE RASKIN for hosting this Special Order Hour and for their work on this budget. It truly is a document we all can be proud of. Mr. Speaker, the federal budget is, at its heart, a moral document. It tells a story to the American people, and it tells the world who and what we care about.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump's outrageous budget that he released last month revealed what we've long suspected: President Trump's only concern is for himself and his rich friends.

His budget is both hateful and counter-productive.

Faced with such boldfaced cruelty, it's more important than ever that we present our own vision for the budget.

And what a vision the People's Budget is.

The People's Budget is the most progressive budget ever presented to Congress.

It invests in people and communities, instead of corporations, billionaires, and bombs.

It forces Wall Street executives to pay their fair share by closing the tax loopholes that corporations use to send jobs overseas and give CEO millions in untaxed bonuses. Instead, it invests in small business owners and Main Street to uplift those working in their communities.

Our budget invests in our communities by fixing infrastructure, including the leaded pipes in places like Flint, and bringing broadband to libraries and schools.

It invests over \$1 trillion in the next generation—from universal pre-school to debt-free college—so that every child, no matter what family they're born into, can get a high quality education.

And it fully funds my Computer Science for All initiative, which would increase access to STEM programs for girls and students of color.

Mr. Speaker, as a single mother, I know from experience that no parent working full-time should have to raise their family in poverty.

The People's budget lays out our plan to invest in and lift women, communities of color, and working families out of poverty.

Our budget takes serious steps to end the scourge of poverty in America, including raising the wage to \$15 an hour, offering universal child care, and expanding paid sick leave to all families.

Finally, this budget lays out a plan to curb bloated Pentagon spending and reinvest in diplomacy and humanitarian aid.

It would take long overdue action to reign in waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon, and give us an audit so we can see where our taxpayer dollars are going. And it would prohibit the expansion of US combat troops into President Trump's unauthorized and illegal war in Syria.

Mr. Speaker, this is a budget that we are proud to stand behind. This is a bold statement of our principles and our promise to fight for the American people.

This is our Roadmap for Resistance.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. HILLARD'S 3RD GRADE CLASS

HON. DAVID A. TROTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the bright young artists in Mrs. Hillard's 3rd grade class at Randolph Elementary in Livonia, Michigan.

I know that artists get their start long before high school and college, learning to expand their imagination and foster their creativity in classrooms just like Mrs. Hillard's.

In an effort to highlight young artists from across Michigan's 11th Congressional District, this year, I announced the 1st Annual "Color my Capitol" Program.

Brimming with talent, Mrs. Hillard's students were eager to showcase their amazing artistic skills and take part in this one-of-a-kind program.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Hillard's 3rd graders did not disappoint. Their creations are unique, innovative, and imaginative. Their colorful artwork embodies our country's bright and promising future with these sharp young minds leading the way.

It is my utmost honor to have their artwork displayed in my Congressional district office in Troy, Michigan for everyone who visits to enjoy. Each and every time I walk into my office, I am reminded of their talent.

Congratulations to Mrs. Hillard and the young artists she has the pleasure of teaching.

AMERICAN HELLENIC INSTITUTE LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMP REGARDING TURKEY

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include in the RECORD a letter from the American Hellenic Institute regarding President Trump's upcoming meeting with Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan. As one of the co-chairs of the Congressional Hellenic Caucus, I have advocated for the rights of Greece and Cyprus against the intimidating actions of Turkey. Since Turkey's Presidential referendum vote, Erdogan's government continues to ignore and violate long-standing international law and treaties—a threat to regional security and an impediment to regional interests, stability, and prosperity.

As we have done times before, we must continue to condemn these acts of aggression and renew our call for President Erdogan's government to demonstrate to the international community that it is committed to all international laws and agreements. Additionally, the United States and our strategic regional allies must be better prepared to respond quickly and forcefully to transgression of international law from any nation including NATO ally Turkey through targeted sanctions and foreign aid restrictions.

President DONALD J. TRUMP,
President of the United States,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of the nationwide membership of the American Hellenic Institute (AHI), I write in advance of Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan's visit to Washington to raise the Institute's concern about how Turkey is a significant force of instability. In recent months, Turkey has elevated tensions in the Aegean Sea with NATO ally Greece, threatened Cyprus' sovereign right to explore for natural gas within its exclusive economic zone (EEZ) and has infringed upon Cyprus' EEZ, and President Erdogan has directed alarming rhetoric toward the European Union and its citizens. In February, I wrote to urge the administration to act to uphold the rule of law and to call on Turkey, the provocateur of these tensions, to cease and desist with its actions that have dire implications to U.S. security interests. Now, AHI requests these issues, which demonstrate the instability for which Turkey is responsible, to be placed on your meeting agenda with President Erdogan on May 16.

AEGEAN SEA

Historically, Turkey has violated Greece's sovereignty in the Aegean Sea on an almost daily basis. In 1996, Turkey's claims to the Imia islets nearly led the two NATO allies to war over the islands. In recent years, the Institute notes Turkey's frequent and egregious violations of NATO ally Greece's sovereignty in the Aegean Sea:

In 2014, there were 3,045 total violations of Greek national airspace and infringements of Air Traffic Regulations (ICAO) that resulted in eight engagements with Hellenic Air Force interception fighters, according to the Hellenic National Defense General Staff.

On March 1, 2015, Turkey unilaterally issued a Notice to Airmen (NOTAM), a move

to reserve extensive airspace over the Aegean Sea for military maneuvers that Greece protested. On March 3, 2015, Turkey canceled the NOTAM thanks to pressure from the U.S. and NATO.

On July 15, 2015, six Turkish fighters crossed into Greek airspace 20 times—in a single day.

On February 15, 2016, six Turkish fighter jets and a CN-235 maritime patrol aircraft violated Greek airspace 22 times—again, in a single day.

In sum, 2,573 infringements and violations of Greece's airspace occurred in 2016.

In fall 2016, Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan has elevated tensions unnecessarily by publicly calling into question the integrity of the Treaty of Lausanne. Now, on one day during the week of January 29 to February 4, 2017, Greece's Ministry of Defense recorded 138 violations of Greek airspace over islands in the Aegean Sea, which had to be intercepted. This is unprecedented. On the sea, Greek and Turkish ships were involved in a "faceoff" when a Turkish navy missile boat, and supporting crafts, entered and violated Greece's territorial waters by the Imia islets.

These Turkish provocations have caused Greece's Defense Minister, Panos Kammenos, to state, "The Greek armed forces are ready to answer any provocation."

President Trump, Greece's sovereignty in the Aegean Sea and respect for the Treaty of Lausanne, both of which are in the best interests of the United States, must be respected. Greece must expend immense financial resources to defend its sovereignty—upwards of \$400 million a year—during an economic crisis from which it is in the best interest of the United States for Greece to emerge. Moreover, despite its economic difficulties, Greece continues to be of vital importance for the projection of U.S. strategic interests by its geographic location and its strong, unwavering support for NATO. As home to the most important naval presence in the Mediterranean Sea, NSA Souda Bay, Crete, Greece has been critical to the delivery of U.S. troops, cargo, and supplies, providing access and extending the U.S. and NATO's reach into the Middle East and North Africa. To illustrate, in 2015, more than 70 U.S. Navy and NATO ships and vessels visited Souda Bay and more than 2,830 U.S. Air Force and NATO planes utilized the 115th Combat Wing on Crete. Also, more than 65 U.S. ships and more than 1,200 trainees utilized NMOTC.

In addition, Greece is a top contributor to the defense efforts of NATO, spending an estimated 2.38% of its GDP on defense. Greece is second behind only the United States in this regard.

Greece aspires to achieve complete normalized relations with Turkey, however, the latter, as official policy, continues to threaten Greece with war (*casus belli*) and promotes territorial claims that are unfounded and devoid of any legal basis. These claims disregard all relevant treaties and agreements in force, including the 1947 Paris Peace Treaty under which the Dodecanese Islands and adjacent islets were ceded by Italy to Greece. Because the U.S. is a signatory to the 1947 Paris Peace Treaty, this Treaty is U.S. federal law which the U.S. is bound to enforce. Turkey's ongoing dispute of Greece's sovereignty in the Aegean was reaffirmed by policy analysts following Turkey's National Security Council meeting held in late March 2017, according to a press report. The analysts observed "... fiery rhetoric emanating from Ankara is not just

to win over a domestic audience, saying that it underlines its core policy objectives with regard to the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean."

CYPRUS

In March 2017, the Turkish Foreign Ministry condemned Cyprus' research for natural gas within Cyprus' exclusive economic zone (EEZ). In recent years, Turkey has violated international law by practicing "gunboat diplomacy" in the eastern Mediterranean with an incursion into Cyprus' EEZ. This has led Cypriot President Nicos Anastasiades to express concern about Turkey sparking a "hot incident" in the eastern Mediterranean. He stated, "I fear the period from now until the referendum in Turkey, as well as the effort to create a climate of fanaticism within Turkish society." To further illustrate Turkey's provocative actions are ongoing, Turkey issued a Navtex on April 19, 2017 that according to one press report reserves "an area inside the island's Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), off Famagusta, to carry out seismic surveys between April 30 and June 30." The report elaborates on coverage of the Navtex, stating it not only includes Cyprus' EEZ, but it also extends into a part of Cyprus' territorial waters. Adding to this development is Turkey's intensified military presence in an area stretching south from Rhodes to the coast of Paphos in Cyprus and the issuance of three consecutive Notices to Airmen (NOTAM) for military exercise over Turkish-occupied northern Cyprus. Moreover, these threats in Cyprus' EEZ are an endangerment to U.S. companies, such as ExxonMobil and Noble Energy, who have been, or will be, working to explore for hydrocarbons in the eastern Mediterranean.

The Republic of Cyprus has the sovereign right under international law to explore and exploit its natural resources within its EEZ. The United States has repeatedly stated it supports Cyprus' sovereign right to explore energy in its offshore areas. Cypriot government officials, such as Foreign Minister Ioannis Kasoulides, have stated the island's natural resources belong to all its people and that once a settlement is reached, potential revenues would be shared.

Furthermore, regarding the Cyprus settlement talks, which are at a near stand-still, instead of helping to provide stability by promoting a just settlement supported by both communities, Turkey continues to insist on antiquated and obstructive stances. For example, Turkey's insistence the Treaty of Guarantee allows for future unilateral Turkish military interventions, which is completely unacceptable and contradicts the governing principals of a European Union member state. Moreover, Turkey refuses to withdraw its 40,000 illegally-stationed troops on Cyprus. The withdrawal of Turkish troops would be a significant confidence building measure in the peace process.

Meanwhile, Turkey's relations with the European Union are at low-point. President Erdoğan's consolidation of power following the referendum vote of April 15 is of concern, leading to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) to announce it will begin re-monitoring Turkey and also leading some members of European Parliament to state the EU will have to reassess its position on Turkey. In the lead-up to the April 15 referendum, President Erdoğan called Europe the "center of Nazism." This does not bode well for the fragile EU-Turkey deal on the migrant crisis, which if it falls apart, will have a detrimental effect on Greece, which took the brunt of the crisis in 2015-16 with more than one million arrivals.

Finally, AHI understands fully well that defeating ISIS will be at the top of your agenda with President Erdogan. However, the United States cannot depend on, or trust, Turkey as an ally in this important fight. "Erdogan long played footsie with the Islamic State; his government apparently helped arm, sell oil from, and open Turkish territory for use by ISIS. More recently he has targeted the Syrian Kurds, U.S. allies against ISIS," writes Doug Bandow, senior fellow at the Cato Institute, an April 26, 2017 opinion piece. Bandow concludes, "In the case of Turkey, President Erdogan has abandoned its long-standing affinity for the West." Moreover, in a 2015 article, Robert Ellis cited a UN Security Council report that he states concludes: "Turkey has also provided the primary routes for arms smuggled to ISIL and the Al-Nusrah Front, an Al-Qaida affiliate." Additionally, Turkey only agreed to help after the Turks "forced the U.S. into a yearlong negotiation" to use Incirlik air base to strike the Islamic State, according to Wall Street Journal commentary. As a result, policy analysts have openly questioned whether Turkey should be a NATO member. To further illustrate this point, Turkey undermined the coalition's efforts to combat ISIS when it killed partner forces in a series of airstrikes in Syria and Iraq on April 25th.

Therefore, AHI cautions that whatever future assistance Turkey should grant the United States on ISIS must not come at the expense of true and tried allies who promote and advance U.S. national interests in the eastern Mediterranean region.

President Trump, AHI's perspective on these pressing issues are founded on the rule of law and are based on what is in the best interests of United States security in the region. Given the conduct and policies of the Erdogan regime, it is essential that the U.S. fundamentally re-assess our alliance and overall relationship with Turkey. We hope that you will make this point to President Erdogan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

NICK LARIGAKIS,
President.

31ST ANNUAL DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (VA) NATIONAL VETERANS GOLDEN AGE GAMES

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 31st Annual Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) National Veterans Golden Age Games (NVGAG) that will be held in Biloxi, Mississippi, May 7-11, 2017. The National Veterans Golden Age Games give veterans with and without disabilities an equal opportunity to demonstrate their competitive spirit through multi-event sports. The National Veterans Golden Age Games are open to veterans 55 years of age and older who are enrolled to receive healthcare through the VA. Competition events include air rifle, bowling, cycling, swimming, golf, and table tennis.

The National Veterans Golden Age Games was established in 1983 to inspire older veterans to remain physically active, regardless

of age or ability. Thousands of competitors have achieved personal goals through rehabilitation and competition. It is inspiring to see so many veterans improve their quality of life through the National Veterans Golden Age Games.

As a member of the Mississippi Army National Guard for 31 years, I know the important role physical fitness plays in the lives of our veterans. This program is a continued success as displayed by the many veterans who look to the National Veterans Golden Age Games for fulfillment on multiple levels.

I am proud of all the veterans who are representing the First Congressional District of Mississippi this year and wish them the best of luck.

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. MARCUS'S
3RD GRADE CLASS

HON. DAVID A. TROTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 2017

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the bright young artists in Ms. Marcus's 3rd grade class at Pembroke Elementary in Troy, Michigan.

I know that artists get their start long before high school and college, learning to expand their imagination and foster their creativity in classrooms just like Ms. Marcus's.

In an effort to highlight young artists from across Michigan's 11th Congressional District, this year, I announced the 1st Annual "Color my Capitol" Program.

Brimming with talent, Ms. Marcus's students were eager to showcase their amazing artistic skills and take part in this one-of-a-kind program.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, Ms. Marcus's 3rd graders did not disappoint. Their creations are unique, innovative, and imaginative. Their colorful artwork embodies our country's bright and promising future with these sharp young minds leading the way.

It is my utmost honor to have their artwork displayed in my Congressional district office in Troy, Michigan for everyone who visits to enjoy. Each and every time I walk into my office, I am reminded of their talent.

Congratulations to Ms. Marcus and the young artists she has the pleasure of teaching.

SENATE—*Friday, May 5, 2017*

The Senate met at 12 and 2 seconds p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
MAY 8, 2017, AT 2 P.M.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands

adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, May 8, 2017.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12 and 9 seconds p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 8, 2017, at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, May 8, 2017

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 8, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROBERT B. ADERHOLT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

Send Your spirit of peace, honesty, and fairness to all Members during this week of constituent visits. May their ears and hearts be open to listen to the hopes and needs of those whom they represent—those who voted for them and those who did not.

Bless the people of this great Nation with wisdom, knowledge, and understanding that they might responsibly participate in our American democracy.

Please keep all who work for the people's House in good health that they might faithfully fulfill the great responsibility given them in their service to the work of the Capitol.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 299, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Thursday, May 4, 2017:

H.R. 244, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill and joint resolution were signed by Speaker pro tempore COMSTOCK on Friday, May 5, 2017:

H.R. 534, to require the Secretary of State to take such actions as may be necessary for the United States to rejoin the Bureau of International Expositions, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 66, disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by States for non-governmental employees.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 5, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 5, 2017, at 11:56 a.m.:

Appointment:
Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker on Thursday, May 4, 2017:

H.R. 244. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported and found truly en-

rolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mrs. COMSTOCK, on Thursday, May 4, 2017:

H.R. 534. An act to require the Secretary of State to take such actions as may be necessary for the United States to rejoin the Bureau of International Expositions, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by States for non-governmental employees.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 4, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 244. Making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

HR. 274. To provide for reimbursement for the use of modern travel services by Federal employees traveling on official Government business, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported that on May 5, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill and joint resolution:

H.R. 534. To require the Secretary of State to take such actions as may be necessary for the United States to rejoin the Bureau of International Expositions, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 66. Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by States for non-governmental employees.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(b) of House Resolution 299, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Thursday, May 11, 2017.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 11 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, May 11, 2017, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1279. A letter from the Management Analyst, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States Standards for Barley

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

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

received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1280. A letter from the NIFA Director, Office of Grants and Financial Management, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Competitive and Noncompetitive Non-formula Federal Assistance Programs — General Award Administrative Provisions and Specific Administrative Provisions (RIN: 0524-AA69) received May 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1281. A letter from the Director, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Office of Grants and Financial Management, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities (RIN: 0524-AA39) received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1282. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting designation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism all funding (including the rescission of funds) and contributions from foreign governments so designated by the Congress, pursuant to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017, Sec. 6(b) (H. Doc. No. 115—37); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1283. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting designating as emergency requirements all funding so designated by the Congress, pursuant to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017, Sec. 6(a) (H. Doc. No. 115—38); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1284. A letter from the Comptroller, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the Office's 2016 Annual Report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 14; Feb. 18, 1875, ch. 80, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 106-569, Sec. 1103(c)); (114 Stat. 3031); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1285. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's Major final rule — Federal Reserve Bank Capital Stock [Regulation I; Docket No.: R-1533] (RIN: 7100-AE 47) received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1286. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; New Hampshire; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Correction [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0950; FRL-9959-68-Region 1] received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1287. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; 2016 Nitrogen Oxides Averaging Plan Consent Agreement with Raven Power [EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0562; FRL-9961-17-Region 3] received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1288. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; New Regulations for Architectural and Industrial Maintenance Coatings [EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0454; FRL-9961-25-Region 3] received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1289. A letter from the Acting Chief, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — The Establishment of Policies and Service Rules for the Broadcasting-Satellite Service at the 17.3-17.7 GHz Frequency Band and at the 17.7-17.8 GHz Frequency Band Internationally, and at the 24.75-25.25 GHz Frequency Band for Fixed Satellite Services Providing Feeder Links to the Broadcasting-Satellite Service and for the Satellite Services Operating Bi-directionally in the 17.3-17.8 GHz Frequency Band [IB Docket No.: 06-123] received May 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1290. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau/Policy Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Noncommercial Educational Station Fundraising for Third-Party Non-Profit Organizations [MB Docket No.: 12-106] received May 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1291. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's determination and certification that five countries are not cooperating fully with U.S. antiterrorism efforts: Eritrea, Iran, Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), Syria, and Venezuela, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2781(b); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 40A (as added Public Law 104-132, Sec. 330); (110 Stat. 1258); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1292. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia, that was declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1293. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1294. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1295. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting the thirty-fifth quarterly report to Congress on Afghanistan Reconstruc-

tion, in accordance with Sec. 1229 of Public Law 110-181; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1296. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of a federal nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1297. A letter from the Executive Director, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, transmitting the Commission's Seventy-Sixth Financial Statement for the period of October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016, pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act Reporting Requirements and the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1298. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of a federal nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1299. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's FY 2016 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1300. A letter from the Senior Vice President, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, Potomac Electric Power Company, transmitting the Balance Sheet of Potomac Electric Power Company as of December 31, 2016, pursuant to D.C. Code Ann. Sec. 34-1113 (2001); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1301. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's semiannual report from the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017 along with a separate Management Report containing certain required information; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1302. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Federal Reserve Bank Capital Stock [Regulation I; Docket No.: R-1560] (RIN: 7100-AE 68) received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1303. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7526; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-217-AD; Amendment 39-18852; AD 2017-08-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1304. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Aspen, CO; and Pueblo, CO [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0054; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-2] received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1305. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Elmira, NY [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8128; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AEA-14] received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1306. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Atlantic City, NJ [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9344; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AEA-7] received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1307. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace and Establishment of Class E En Route Airspace; Paso Robles, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9295; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AWP-16] received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1308. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Kill Devil Hills, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9266; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASO-5] received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1309. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, Denver, CO [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9286; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ANM-13] received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1310. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment, Modification and Revocation of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Western United States [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9264; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AWP-1] received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1311. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Restricted Area R-2507W; Chocolate Mountains, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2193; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-8] received May 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1312. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Areas R-4102A and R-4102B; Fort Devens, MA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0307; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANE-1] received May 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1313. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a report entitled "Department of Energy Activities Relating to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Fiscal Year 2016", pursuant to Sec. 316(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Armed Services.

1314. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification to Congress under Sec. 609(b) of Public Law 101-162 Regarding the Incidental Capture of Sea Turtles in Commercial Shrimping Operations; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Appropriations.

1315. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Second Quarter of FY 2017 Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 report, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 4332(b)(2); Public Law 103-353, Sec. 2(a) (as added by Public Law 110-389, Sec. 312(c)); (122 Stat. 4165); jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

1316. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter opposing the inclusion of language in any appropriations legislation that would prohibit the use of Department of Justice funds or in any way inhibit its authority to enforce the Controlled Substances Act; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1039. A bill to amend section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, to grant probation officers authority to arrest hostile third parties who obstruct or impede a probation officer in the performance of official duties (Rept. 115-112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. MACARTHUR):

H.R. 2399. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2400. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow individuals who are not Federal employees to enroll in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico):

H.R. 2401. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to prohibit the stigmatization of children who are unable to pay for meals; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico (for himself, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. COMER):

H.R. 2402. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to retire coal preference right lease applications for which the Secretary has made an affirmative commercial quantities determination, to substitute certain land selections of the Navajo Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. EMMER, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HECK, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SINEMA, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. HILL, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 2403. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to ensure that the reciprocal deposits of an insured depository institution are not considered to be funds obtained by or through a deposit broker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. PLASKETT (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 2404. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the treatment of the United States territories under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. PETERSON):

H. Res. 318. A resolution promoting awareness of motorcycle profiling and encouraging collaboration and communication with the motorcycle community and law enforcement officials to prevent instances of profiling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

35. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6, encouraging the United States to appropriate funds from the Nuclear Waste Fund for the establishment of a permanent repository for high-level nuclear waste or reimburse electric utility customers that paid into the fund; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

36. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8, urging the U.S. Department of Energy and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to fulfill their obligation to establish a permanent solution for handling high-level nuclear waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

37. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 9, urging the President and Congress of the United States to explore and support policies that will lead to the establishment of facilities within the United States for the reprocessing and recycling of spent nuclear fuel; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

38. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 50, urging the Congress of the United States to eliminate the "Widows' Tax" on the surviving spouses of retired U.S. military service members; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

39. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3037, requesting the Congress and the President of the United States enact legislation to expand and extend the current federal tax credit for carbon capture, utilization, and storage under Section 45Q of the Internal Revenue Code; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of, and the Sixteenth Amendment to, the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2400.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 2401.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, "The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico:

H.R. 2402.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 2403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 2404.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 140: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 332: Mr. COOPER and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 367: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 390: Mr. DONOVAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 426: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 489: Mr. SOTO and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 490: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GAETZ, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 632: Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 709: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 771: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 785: Mr. BRAT and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 901: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 931: Mr. SOTO and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 997: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1017: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1034: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1141: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1164: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1379: Ms. PINGREE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1380: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1467: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SIRES, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1550: Mr. POLIS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1554: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 1616: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1730: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1739: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1744: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1885: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1911: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 1924: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1926: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1928: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 2000: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2001: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2052: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2060: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2092: Ms. MOORE, Mr. MARSHALL, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 2158: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2186: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2211: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2289: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2340: Mr. STEWART and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 2351: Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 2353: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 2378: Mr. WELCH and Mr. KILMER.

H.J. Res. 31: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.J. Res. 98: Mr. BABIN.

H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. RUSSELL.

H. Res. 250: Ms. BASS.

H. Res. 279: Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. MOULTON.

SENATE—Monday, May 8, 2017

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TODD YOUNG, a Senator from the State of Indiana.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Almighty God, from the rising of the Sun to the coming of the evening, we lift Your Name in grateful praise.

Surround our lawmakers with the power of Your presence, sustaining them in their challenging world. Lord, strengthen them to do what is right so that our Nation will be exalted by Your love. Empower them to treat one another with respect and honor. Teach them to hate what is evil and to cling to what is good. Remind them of how fleeting are the days of their lives as You give them the wisdom to prepare for eternity.

Eternal Father, we exalt You and praise Your Name, for in perfect faithfulness You continue to expose us to the unfolding of Your loving providence.

We pray in Your marvelous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 8, 2017.

To the Senate:

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

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Heather Wilson, of South Dakota, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 4 hours of debate, equally divided in the usual form.

Who yields time?

If no one yields time, time will be charged equally to both sides.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate will move to confirm Heather Wilson as Secretary of the Air Force. Wilson is a Rhodes Scholar, Air Force Academy graduate—part of the third class ever to admit women, by the way—and a dedicated public servant who served several terms in the U.S. House.

I am sure she will work hard in this new role to strengthen the branch of the military she cares so much about. I look forward to approving her nomination on a bipartisan basis later this afternoon.

After that, we will take a cloture vote on the Gottlieb nomination to head the FDA, which I will come to in a moment. I hope to see robust support for his nomination as well.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, I would like to recognize two important votes that occurred last Thursday. First, let me commend the House for voting to move beyond the pain of ObamaCare. For years, the American people have suffered under this failed law. They watched their premiums soar. They watched their choices dwindle.

Now they are watching as ObamaCare collapses all around them. More than half of our States have counties with only a single insurance option on the exchanges, and a growing number could have no options at all—like, as we saw reported just last week, in nearly every single county in Iowa. That means thousands more Americans

could be left trapped, forced by law to purchase ObamaCare insurance but left without the means to do so. Does that sound like a law that is working to anyone?

To those who would try to defend an indefensible status quo, I ask you to consider what Speaker RYAN said last week:

[T]here is a fundamental and urgent choice at the heart of this debate. We can continue with the status quo under ObamaCare, and we know what that looks like. It means even higher premiums, even fewer choices, even more insurance companies pulling out, even more uncertainty, and even more chaos.

To those who suffered enough already, my message is this: We hear you. Congress is acting.

I commend the House and the administration for making this important advance last week. Now the Senate will do its work. The administration will also continue doing its part to deliver relief and stabilize the healthcare markets as best it can. This process will not be quick or simple or easy, but it must be done. It is the least Members of both parties owe to the countless of Americans who continue to suffer under Obamacare, and the countless more who will be hurt if we don't act.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING LEGISLATION

Mr. President, second, let me commend the Senate for voting last Thursday to pass the funding bill. I mentioned last week some of the many important provisions it contained, all of which the President has now signed into law. The largest border-security funding increase in a decade—now law. The critically needed down payment on restoring our military readiness—now law.

The bill also kept in place an important free speech protection. Yet Democrats are now trying to pressure and intimidate the SEC into ignoring something we just passed on a bipartisan basis. For years, Democrats have pressured the SEC rulemaking process to curb and regulate political speech, despite agreement in our funding bills to prevent the Commission from doing just that.

This is not a new page in their playbook. When we first passed this crucial protection in 2015, Democrats appealed to the SEC to actually ignore the law. This time, however, they have gone in an even more extreme direction. Now the Democrats no longer have the administration to stifle speech through the SEC, the IRS, or HHS. They are trying to intimidate private citizens and public companies by telling those citizens and companies what is in their “best interest.” This kind of bullying

behavior is part of a broader pattern we have seen repeated by the left time and again in similar circumstances—suppression of the viewpoints with which they disagree and forcing Americans into a choice: Tell us your political ideology or be silent.

I have called the left out for intimidation tactics and speech suppression efforts before. I am warning them again today, and I will continue to stay vigilant and defend the First Amendment moving forward.

For now, I would like to highlight a couple of other important provisions in the funding bill that are now law. One is the miners' health provision I was proud to secure, a critical lifeline that will permanently protect healthcare benefits for thousands of retired coal miners in States like Kentucky.

Another is the provision of significant new resources that can be used to combat the prescription opioid and heroin crisis. It is the latest of many significant steps we have taken to tackle this terrible epidemic.

Today, we can take another step forward by advancing the nomination of Scott Gottlieb to head the FDA. I will have more to say on Dr. Gottlieb later, but for now, I will note that he is incredibly qualified for this position, and I am sure he will be an ally for States that continue to struggle with the opioid crisis because the FDA has a critical role to play.

Let's be clear, there is a lot more to be done. States like Kentucky have been hit hard by this crisis, especially our rural communities. In fact, there are a lot of struggles that are particularly pressing in rural America, and several provisions in the government funding bill that can help—provisions to, for instance, advance broadband development, promote safe and clean drinking water, and to help reclaim and develop abandoned mine sites in coal country, among other priorities. Those are just a few of the things that can help rural communities.

There are other actions we can take as well. One is of particular importance to our colleagues from Alaska, Senators MURKOWSKI and SULLIVAN. Majority Whip CORNYN and I have been consulting with them about the Secure Rural Schools Program, which helps rural counties and schools whose economies have been hit hard by steeply declining timber revenues from our public lands. Senators HATCH and WYDEN introduced a bill to reauthorize the program just last week, and it was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, where Senator MURKOWSKI is the chair. This bill is important to Kentucky, as well. I look forward to working with Chairman MURKOWSKI, Senator SULLIVAN, and all the bill's advocates to find a path forward for it this year.

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

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

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first I want to thank the majority leader for speaking about the agreement that the House and Senate came to on the appropriations bills, the spending bills. We may not agree on emphasis and what the most important things are, but we certainly agree that it was a good effort that moved things forward, and I was proud to be part of it.

KENTUCKY DERBY

Mr. President, I note another thing that might tie the majority leader and the minority leader together—pride in Saturday's Kentucky Derby. The majority leader is very proud of the Kentucky Derby. It is one of the leading events in his State. I know he attends religiously.

I am particularly proud because the horse that won was owned and trained and guided by two Brooklynites. I salute them for their success. Vinnie Viola, one of the two, is a close friend of mine. I have known him for a long time, and I know him well. As many of you know, he was being considered for Secretary of the Army. He would have been a good one. He withdrew because of the financial issues that he was too involved in with companies he owned, but he is a good man. He comes from St. Cecilia's Parish on the Greenpoint-Williamsburg border of Brooklyn. We are all proud and hope that his horse goes all the way. Maybe I can be at Belmont and see him win the Triple Crown. Anyway, that is a nice link between the majority leader and the minority leader.

FRENCH PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Mr. President, yesterday, the people of France took part in a time-honored tradition of a democratic people: the election of a new President. We here in the Senate congratulate Emmanuel Macron on his win and look forward to the continuing deep and longstanding friendship between our two countries.

Unfortunately, the elections in France were victim to a malicious attempt to distort the results through a coordinated cyber attack on one of the candidates, much as Hillary Clinton's campaign was targeted in our elections. In the waning days of the French election, according to reports, Macron's emails were hacked and leaked to the public, potentially with some altered information included, by agents believed to originate in Russia.

The hack was then promoted and spread by far-right activists around the globe, some of whom reside here in the United States. It was *deja vu* all over again. Russia elevated old school propaganda tactics and techniques using new school methods, spreading misinformation with an army of paid "trolls" and computer bots, aided and abetted by far-right activists here in the United States.

It seems that Putin and the international far right have formed an unholy alliance. The goal of this alliance is not necessarily to promote one candidate over another, one party over another, though that is part of it. Their true goal is to destabilize and subvert democratic societies, to cast doubt on the outcome of free and fair elections, to hobble democratically elected leaders before they even take office, and to degrade the alliances and international regimes that have created so much stability, strength, and shared prosperity in the post-World War II era.

Despite Macron's win yesterday, we would be foolish to think that this unholy alliance will not use the same tactics again in upcoming European elections and, even more important to those of us in this country, in upcoming American elections.

Make no mistake about it—Mr. Putin has no loyalty to any one person or President. Whatever is good for Russia at the moment, whatever hurts the United States the most, that is what he will pursue. This is an issue that should provoke grave concern in both parties. He may favor one party one day and another party the next. It should compel us, together—Democrats and Republicans—to take action against this new threat.

This afternoon, the Judiciary Committee will hear from former Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates and former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper. Later this week, the Intelligence Committee will hold its annual worldwide threats hearing. I sincerely hope these two committees will cover these issues in their hearings and beyond.

We should begin an extended bipartisan discussion about how to combat foreign information operations campaigns and safeguard the integrity of democratic elections all over the world and, most importantly, in our own country. It is no less serious than this: The integrity of our democracy, which has thrived, blessedly, for over 240 years could well be at stake.

TRUMPCARE

Now, Mr. President, on healthcare, last week House Republicans passed the latest version of TrumpCare after a failed attempt earlier this year. When they see this version, the majority of Americans will think it is even worse than the first version.

This partisan bill will dramatically increase the cost of health insurance

for those who need it most, including older Americans, and lower the quality of coverage.

TrumpCare would mean 24 million fewer Americans will be without health insurance.

It would hike premiums by 20 percent in the first few years, and average costs for the middle class could go up by more than \$1,500 a year. Middle-class people can't afford that kind of money. If you are struggling to make it into the middle class, TrumpCare could raise your costs by up to \$4,000, putting you in an even worse pickle.

It makes it possible for insurers to charge older Americans as much as five times the amount they charge younger people, and States could make this ratio even greater if they wanted. Under the first TrumpCare bill, someone making about \$20,000 could have his or her—someone who is 63 years old—premiums go up from something like \$1,500 or \$2,000 all the way to over \$10,000 a year. This will be devastating for senior citizens, those 50 to 65. At 65, they get Medicare. They are in decent shape. But when they are older and not under Medicare, they could get clobbered by this bill after working so hard. And that is the time when you start getting susceptible to so many serious illnesses.

TrumpCare would devastate our rural areas by decimating Medicaid, which rural areas rely on. Limiting subsidies to lower income Americans, many of whom live in rural areas, TrumpCare would put insurance for rural Americans even further out of reach.

Many rural hospitals are the largest employers in their areas. We have many in New York State, in Upstate New York. They would be shortchanged by this bill. These hospitals—often the largest employers in our rural counties and the only providers of healthcare for scores and sometimes hundreds of miles around—might be forced to lay off thousands of workers. Many of these rural hospital leaders say that if TrumpCare passed, they would have to close. There would be hundreds out of work in an area where it is not easy to find work, and for those who don't work in the hospitals, it would be harder to get to the hospitals. We all know how important it is to get there quickly when, God forbid, a stroke or some other serious illness occurs.

Maybe most troubling of all, TrumpCare would now eliminate crucial consumer protections in our healthcare system, including the ones that protect Americans with pre-existing conditions. Every family in this country knows someone who has a preexisting condition. That sounds like a fancy word. What does it mean? Diabetes, chronic asthma, cancer, things like that. If you live in a State that opts out of this requirement, you will have to jump through so many hoops to maintain access to care, and even then

it likely won't be affordable. It is unimaginable. You are a parent. Let's say you are 40 years old, husband and wife, and your child gets cancer. You can't get the coverage that under present law the insurance company has to give you or keep with you, and you watch your child suffer. That is inhumane.

How, for ideological purposes, the folks in the House could have first eliminated it and now made it almost unattainable for so many millions of Americans—unfathomable. We fixed the problem in our healthcare system because we had heard so many horrible stories. The Republican bill brings it back from the dead.

The way the House bill was put together in such a secretive and slapdash way, it is barely legislation. It well could be a menace to millions of American families. It means that the Senate should not even come close to passing a bill like this. It makes healthcare for working families, rural Americans, older Americans, and veterans much poorer and at the same time gives massive tax breaks to the wealthy. Some say that is the motivation of some in the House. To pay for these tax breaks for people making over \$250,000 a year—and they get a big break—cut back healthcare on everybody else or on so many others. That is wrong. That is wrong.

It does, frankly, exactly the opposite of everything President Trump promised he would do on healthcare. He said: Lower costs, better care, insuring everyone. His words. President Trump said he would not cut Medicare or Medicaid. His bill does both. TrumpCare is a giant broken promise for the working people, the hard-working people of this great country of ours.

House Republicans rushed it through without hearings and without much debate or even a final CBO score. The final version was posted 8 hours before Members had to vote on it. Some of the very same Republicans who during the ObamaCare debate chanted "Read the bill" didn't even look at the final legislation, let alone study it. That is a breathtakingly irresponsible thing to do on a bill that will affect almost one-fifth of our economy and the healthcare of millions of Americans. I am not surprised our Republican colleagues wanted to rush it through. The more the American people see it, the less they will like it, just like with their first bill, which is why the first bill didn't pass and why the second one is in so much trouble here in the Senate.

To borrow Speaker RYAN's catchphrase, there is a better way to reform our healthcare system. Instead of a partisan process, rushing through bills in the dead of night—no hearings, no debate, no score, no input from the other party—both parties could start working together on improving our healthcare system.

Now that the bill is in the Senate's hands, we hope the Republican majority will pursue a bipartisan approach. If they drop their repeal efforts, which are already causing such uncertainty that insurers are pledging to hike rates on Americans next year, we Democrats are willing to work with our Republican colleagues to improve our healthcare system.

In the last few years, we have made a good deal of progress. We have made major improvements in our healthcare system, expanding coverage for over 20 million Americans, bending the cost curve, and protecting folks with pre-existing conditions. Why don't we keep all the good things we have in the system and work on making it even better in a bipartisan way? We want to improve quality, lower costs, reduce the price of prescription drugs, and expand coverage for all Americans. Unfortunately, the House bill does exactly the opposite.

I hope my Republican friends toss this House bill out the window and resist the temptation to follow the same partisan, rushed process. I hope my friends on the other side of aisle drop repeal, which is hurting our healthcare system right now—just the threat of it—and start working with Democrats to make our healthcare better.

PARIS AGREEMENT

Finally, Mr. President, a word on the Paris climate agreement. Reports have indicated that the Trump administration is leaning toward withdrawing the United States from the Paris climate agreement. This would be a historic misstep that would massively disadvantage both American businesses and diplomats. It would damage our standing on the world stage and allow China to take the high moral ground and the economic upper hand in combatting climate change. Most importantly, a great step forward made by President Obama to get the entire world community to work in a coordinated and concerted effort to reduce carbon pollution so that the United States does not have to bear the burden and so that China would do much more than it has done—all that would be undone in one fell swoop.

Europe and other countries have warned the Trump administration that abandoning the Paris Agreement could lead to carbon tariffs on U.S. goods, stymieing access to global markets for our companies and undercutting our trade position. That is why hundreds of American companies, including 28 Fortune 100 CEOs representing 9 million jobs, support the climate agreement.

There is a giant difference between putting America first and making America an international pariah. The latter approach only undermines our power and erodes our standing in the world. Right now, there are only two countries in the world that are not parties to the Paris Agreement—Syria and

Nicaragua, the latter of which objects because they feel the agreement is not strong enough.

Climate change is real. It is driven by human activity. It is happening right now. These are facts. They are not in dispute. Our scientists know it, our businesses know it, the world knows it, and the American people who have experienced such changes in weather and climate know it too. The United States needs to have a seat at the table as the world works together to solve this existential challenge.

I strongly encourage the administration to rethink its position and remain in the agreement.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

REPUBLICAN HEALTHCARE BILL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to talk as well about the Republican healthcare plan and point out why it is moving on very treacherous territory when it will affect the funding of Medicaid by lessening the amount of Medicaid money that will be spent in the States, because so much of that Medicaid money is going to address the opioid crisis.

The opioid crisis, we found last year—you know, there was a lot of talk about it being in New Hampshire when the eyes of America were on New Hampshire in the New Hampshire primary. But the fact is, it is in every State now. It is particularly so in my State of Florida. There are something like 2,600 deaths that have occurred in Florida as a result of opioid overdoses. So the seriousness with which we are addressing this issue ought to be of extreme concern, and we ought to be doing something about it. Yet a bill just passed by the House of Representatives is doing exactly the opposite. It is going to cut Medicaid. It is a fancy term, cutting Medicaid with a block grant. What it means is that it is going to be capped. That means a State is not going to get any more Medicaid once that cap has been hit, unless the State responds. So, in essence, it is going to cost the States more money. I don't think you will find many States that are in such a fiscal condition that, in fact, they could do that.

So what are we doing? We are harming poor people and the disabled who get their healthcare from Medicare and Medicaid. In fact, we are not only harming all of them, but addressing the opioid crisis will be particularly hurt.

What I want to talk about today is the Republican healthcare plan that passed out of the House last week. This plan is going to increase costs for older Americans. Remember, it is going to go on a ratio. Instead of 1 to 3, or older Americans being charged three times as much in health insurance as younger Americans, it is going to go up to a ratio of at least 1 to 5, and maybe

more. So it is going to increase costs for older Americans. It is going to cut Medicaid, and it is going to take healthcare coverage away from tens of millions of people.

Right now as a result of the ACA, there are 24 million people who have health insurance coverage who did not have it before this law was passed in 2010. It is going to reverse that. Do we want to take away healthcare from people who can now have healthcare through Medicaid and/or health insurance because they can now afford health insurance? Is that really a goal the United States wants to do—to take away healthcare through private health insurance? I don't think that is what we want to do, but that is what the House of Representatives' Republican healthcare bill has done.

If we just look at my State of Florida, there are almost 8 million people who have a so-called preexisting condition. This includes something as common as asthma. That is a preexisting condition. As a former elected insurance commissioner of Florida, I can tell you that some insurance companies would use as an excuse as a preexisting condition something as simple as a rash and say: Because you have a preexisting condition, we are not going to insure you. Under the existing law, the Affordable Care Act, an insurance company cannot deny you with a preexisting condition. Just in my State alone, there are almost 8 million people who have a preexisting condition. Are we going to turn them out on the streets because their insurance company says they are not going to carry them anymore? I don't think that is what we want to do.

The bill allows insurers to charge older Americans at least five times more than what they charge younger adults. Is that what we want to do?

What is the principle of insurance? The principle of insurance is that you spread the risk. You get as many people in the pool as you can—young, old, sick, healthy—and you spread that risk.

If you get fire insurance on your home, you are paying a premium every month and the insurance company has calculated in an actuarial calculation what it is going to cost you to insure, and you are part of hundreds of thousands of people in that pool who are also insuring against fire damaging their house. It is the same principle with health insurance. So you get young and old, sick and well, and some people with preexisting conditions, and you spread that risk over a lot of people. One of the fallacies we hear is that we can create this by creating a high-risk pool. In other words, we are going to set up some money for people who have really sick conditions, and we are going to take care of them. That is the most inefficient way to do it because insurance is about spreading risk, not

concentrating risk, which is what a high-risk pool exactly is. So the House of Representatives, which has concocted this thing called the Republican healthcare plan, has come up with exactly the opposite idea of funding—instead of spreading the risk, concentrating the risk, and then saying that they are going out and getting \$8 billion and that is going to pay for it. It is not even going to touch it. It is the most inefficient way to approach the subject of spreading risk, because they don't spread the risk. They concentrate the risk.

What this bill does is that over 10 years it cuts over \$800 billion out of Medicaid. You start doing that, and you are going to lose what we know of as Medicaid, a healthcare program primarily for the poor and the disabled.

By the way, isn't it interesting that they cut over \$800 billion and save it out of Medicaid, and what did they do in the same bill? They give upwards of \$600 billion in tax breaks to those who are at the highest income levels. Let me get this right. It is kind of a reversed Robin Hood. I am going to take from the poor by cutting \$800 billion, and I am going to give to the rich by tax breaks for the highest income folks. Is that what we want to do? I don't think so.

Medicaid is a program that guarantees healthcare for millions of Americans, including children, people with disabilities, pregnant women, and seniors on long-term care. Think about that. What am I talking about? It is seniors in long-term care, seniors in nursing homes, who don't have enough resources or enough assets in order to pay for their care in their twilight years. Therefore, they are being paid by Medicaid, and that is the only source of income to take care of them. Is that what we want to cut in order to give a tax break for the highest income group? It ought to be the reverse. That is upside-down thinking.

Last week the Florida Medical Examiners Commission released new data showing that over 2,600 Floridians have died from opioids in just the first half of 2016 alone. Over the entire year before, 2015, fentanyl, an opioid, killed 705 Floridians. Just in the first half of 2016, almost the exact same number, 704, died. We have a problem in the State of Florida, and there are a lot of other States that have the same.

Last month I went to a research institute down in Palm Beach County. They are using NIH grant money to research new nonaddictive opioid drugs. If they can come up with this, that is certainly all for the better to help people with pain and so that they are not being given an addictive drug. But we are not there yet, and we are using NIH money that is going into that research.

Last month I sent a letter to the Republican leadership pushing for more funding for the opioid fight and for the National Institutes of Health, or NIH.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that letter printed in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2017.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL AND SPEAKER RYAN: As negotiations over the latest stop-gap government funding measure continue, we urge you to focus on securing substantial funding in the appropriations legislation currently being negotiated for two of our most essential national priorities: fighting the opioid epidemic and investing in our nation's biomedical research programs.

Every day, 91 Americans die from an opioid overdose, and despite the tireless work of many in our communities, this public health epidemic is only getting worse. Currently, only 10 percent of individuals who need specialty treatment for substance use disorder actually get it—not because we don't know how to help, but in large part because there aren't enough funds to provide these services. We need substantial additional resources to fight this epidemic and fund prevention, treatment, and recovery activities.

It is also essential that we increase our investment in the National Institutes of Health (NIH), our nation's premier research institution. NIH funding supports innovative, cutting-edge research that plays a critical role in the development of lifesaving cures for diseases. Our ability to fight Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, cancer, heart disease, and many other diseases depends on our willingness to invest in science. While investments in the NIH have consistently produced tremendous value, funding for the NIH has failed to keep pace with inflation over the last several decades.

It is essential to provide new funding to fight the opioid epidemic and support biomedical research at the NIH. This new funding should not fill in for cuts made elsewhere to opioid and NIH funding. It is also essential that opioid funding be distributed to the communities that need it most and that have been hardest hit by this terrible public health epidemic.

While past Congresses have made promises about providing states with additional funding to address the ongoing opioid crisis, appropriations legislation like the pending budget deal is where the bill comes due. Americans are counting on Congress to live up to its commitments by supporting funding for the priorities that matter most in their lives. Funding to fight the opioid epidemic and support research into lifesaving cures through the NIH rank at the top of this list, and we urge you to include substantial additional funding for these areas in the appropriations legislation now being negotiated.

Sincerely,

Senator Elizabeth Warren, Senator Bill Nelson, Senator Benjamin L. Cardin, Senator Tom Udall, Senator Dianne Feinstein, Senator Debbie Stabenow, Senator Sherrod Brown, Senator Jeanne Shaheen, Senator Al Franken, Senator Richard Blumenthal, Senator Edward J. Markey, Senator Chris Van Hollen, Senator Margaret Wood Hassan, Senator Christopher Murphy, Senator Joe

Manchin III, Senator Tammy Baldwin, Senator Cory A. Booker, Senator Tammy Duckworth, Senator Bernard Sanders.

Mr. NELSON. So what we need to do is to take a comprehensive approach to helping our State and local governments respond to this opioid epidemic.

I was very happy to be an early part of putting together and sponsoring a bill called the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016 and of the funding included in the 21st Century Cures Act to start putting more resources into our States right away for this opioid epidemic. Those laws have resulted in Florida's receiving more than \$27 million to help our State respond to the opioid crisis. Yet a lot more action is needed, as you can see by just the first half of last year alone, with 704 people dying from opioid overdoses.

Last week, in Florida a local paper reported about how the opioid epidemic is affecting our Nation's children. In 2015 alone, 167 babies were born in opioid dependency in just one city—Jacksonville—contributing to Duval County's being tapped as having the second highest number of babies born addicted to opioids in the State. Isn't that sad that children come into this world and they are already addicted?

We are dealing with people's lives here. We are dealing with their health. The last thing in the world we ought to be doing is cutting the resources of funding to help people who are in such dire straits. I would urge our colleagues to think twice about supporting this disastrous Republican healthcare bill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PARIS AGREEMENT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, on December 19, 2015, in Paris, France, diplomats representing more than 190 countries finalized the world's most ambitious, comprehensive, and achievable multilateral agreement to combat climate change at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change's 21st Conference of Parties, or COP21.

I led a delegation of 10 Senators to COP21 to bolster U.S. leadership and to provide confidence in the U.S. commitment to the global effort to fight the existential threat of climate change. The result was an agreement that has nearly universal support, with every party committed to reducing carbon emissions. The momentum coming out of COP21 felt unstoppable.

That momentum continued through 2016. On Earth Day, an impressive 175 nations signed the Paris Agreement. Six months later, and in less than a year's time, the Paris Agreement reached the threshold for entry into force. Up until recently, the United States has led this global effort. The strength of our commitment and diplomacy spurred global enthusiasm for the Paris Agreement.

Some have said that we are the first generation to feel the effects of climate change and the last generation who can do something about it. Climate change impacts are apparent in my home State of Maryland. Recently, Annapolis began experiencing routine tidal flooding. Today's generations of Smith Islanders may be the last as a rising Chesapeake Bay encroaches further ashore each year.

Around the world, climate change is expanding the range and duration of regional wildfire seasons, prolonging extreme droughts in the Middle East and Southern Africa, which I have witnessed firsthand, and has caused Bolivia's Lake Poopo to evaporate entirely, and entire island nations are being swallowed up by the South Pacific.

The good news is, acting to prevent the worst effects of climate change holds tremendous economic and job growth opportunities for our Nation. The world looks toward the United States for leadership, not just in terms of domestic emissions reductions but also in our private sector and academia for clean energy solutions to power the world. Maryland is positioned to be at the forefront of U.S. leadership in technology innovation.

For example, the University of Maryland, in partnership with the U.S. Department of Energy and a number of Maryland private sector companies like Redox Energy, are leading the way in developing commercial-scale, in-demand technology that the global energy market is demanding.

In 2015, global investment in renewable energy was nearly \$350 billion, which was more than the global investment in fossil fuel energy. The Department of Energy's 2017 U.S. Energy and Employment Report showed that nearly 1 million Americans work in the energy efficiency, solar, wind, and alternative vehicles sectors. This is almost five times the current employment in the U.S. fossil fuel electric industry, which includes coal, gas, and oil workers. Even though gas and oil have hit record-low prices on the global market, current and projected price per watt for renewables is also low, making clean energy remarkably affordable and competitive in the market.

The United States stands at the crossroads of global clean energy and climate change leadership, and the policy path we take on these issues could not only shape the strength of our economic future but our overall standing

in the world. Forward thinking domestic climate change and clean energy policy, including substantial investments in clean energy R&D and clean energy production incentives, have made the United States an incubator for clean energy investment and entrepreneurship.

We see these things in every State of the Nation—new innovators and investors in the clean energy sector.

Creating a robust domestic market helps U.S. companies develop tested records of accomplishment, skilled workforces, and scalable products to export around the world to a global energy market that is hungry for clean energy solutions. This is where domestic policy intersects with U.S. climate diplomacy, which is priming that export market by building good will and faith in U.S. capacity and commitment.

The United States must not squander the considerable time and effort it took to build the world's confidence in the United States when combating climate change.

The rejection of the Kyoto Protocol by the United States severely strained a wide range of diplomacy issues for the Bush administration. That is not just a Senator saying this. Let me quote Secretary of State Colin Powell, when he stated:

Kyoto—this is not talking out of school—was not handled as well as it should have been, and when the blowback came I think it was a sobering experience that everything the American president does has international repercussions.

That was General Powell warning us about the importance of international diplomacy and that our actions have consequences.

Hindsight on the impact U.S. participation in Kyoto would have had on the protocol's success and on the U.S. economy is another debate entirely—and we will leave that for a different day—but a clear lesson from the episode is that the United States must not underestimate how seriously the world takes the issue of international cooperation to combat climate change.

Should the Trump administration withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement, it will be an incredible insult to our global partners and severely tarnish the trust nations have in the United States. That distrust will bleed over into all areas of U.S. diplomacy and cooperation.

While the Paris Agreement does not have enforceable, binding provisions that would punish parties for missing self-determined mitigation targets, nothing precludes other countries from acting outside the confines of the agreement to create uncomfortable conditions for nonmembers. It is worth noting here that if we were to pull out, we would be in a club with Syria and Nicaragua.

For example, in November of last year, immediately after the election

and during COP22, the New York Times reported that leaders from other countries—so deeply offended by the President-elect's ill-informed rhetoric on climate change and the Paris Agreement—were contemplating implementing border tariffs on goods imported from nations failing to account for carbon emissions.

Staying in the agreement and continuing to advocate for what is in the best interests of the United States could prevent countries from taking such actions.

Many critics of the Paris Agreement sound as though they are stuck in 1997, echoing concerns about the 20-year-old Kyoto Protocol that are simply untrue about the Paris Agreement. The Paris Agreement takes a different approach to international climate change cooperation by creating an action model that allows for ambitious action and accountability through peer review.

The agreement takes a radically different approach to pollution mitigation that incorporates many conservative principles our Republican colleagues routinely espouse: increased transparency and universal reporting requirements for all parties. All parties, both developing and developed nations, commit to reducing greenhouse gas pollution. All parties determine their own greenhouse gas pollution mitigation commitments. Nationally determined commitments are non-binding.

Let me repeat that. The nationally determined commitments are non-binding. It is up to us, our country, to determine how we will meet our targets and when we will meet our targets, and the enforcement is solely within our own means. No international group can enforce any of these commitments on us. That was at the request of many Members of this body, and that was followed in the Paris Agreement.

The Paris Agreement was forged by the lessons the United States learned from the Kyoto Protocol process. Each addressed commonly criticized elements of the Kyoto Protocol.

I cannot stress enough how seriously committed leaders around the world are to the success of the Paris Agreement. For example, it is the top agenda item for both the upcoming G7 and G20 meetings. As such, we absolutely cannot underestimate how thoroughly insulted our friends and allies around the world will be if the United States retreats from the agreement.

Make no mistake, callously disregarding cooperation and partnership with the global community on a crisis that is literally threatening the very physical existence of countries will have consequences for our foreign policy, diplomacy, national security, and U.S. economic opportunity in an undeniably globalized economy. Retreating from the Paris Agreement puts Amer-

ica alone, not America first, and being alone is tantamount to being last.

The expectation among our partners to the Paris Agreement is that the United States will remain engaged, although a common refrain among foreign delegations is that the world is moving ahead regardless. I take that to mean that if U.S. leadership falters, other countries will jump at the opportunity and fill the void we create and receive the gains which should have been ours.

U.S. energy policy should support the goals of the Paris Agreement. We have already seen hundreds of American corporations make commitments in the agreement's name. There is infinite potential from enhanced U.S. production of scalable and exportable clean energy technology that the world is demanding to power our collective future. If we do the opposite and retreat from the global effort to combat climate change, then we can expect to lose out on this economic growth potential because countries like Germany, China, and India will gladly take our place as the world's leader for clean energy innovation and finance. I will do what I can to protect against this loss.

It is in our national security interests for the United States to remain actively engaged with the world community to fight climate change.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, in December of 2015, nearly 200 nations gathered in Paris in order to reach an agreement that each country would make a commitment to the reduction of dangerous greenhouse gases that were warming the planet and causing more and more havoc across this entire world.

That agreement is something that was hard-won. It took the leadership of the United States because so much of the CO₂ that had been sent up into the atmosphere since the dawn of the industrial age was red, white, and blue. It called upon each nation to make a commitment, and they did. The countries making commitments equaled 80 percent of the world's greenhouse gas emitters.

The Trump administration has many advisers telling the President that he should pull out of this Paris Agreement, that he should cede leadership to the Germans, to the Chinese, and to other nations rather than having the United States continue to be the leader. That would be very dangerous for

our country because we would be ceding leadership in this clean energy revolution to other countries around the planet.

There are still many who do not understand the role this clean energy revolution is already playing inside our country. In 2016, we deployed nearly 24,000 new megawatts of wind and solar on our planet. To put it another way, in 2005, the total amount of solar energy that was deployed in the United States was 79 megawatts—79. In 2016, we deployed 14,000 megawatts of new solar power.

Wind—last year, we deployed another 8,000 megawatts in our country. We are heading toward a point where we have an incredible number of people who are working in these industries. Remember, there are no more than 65 to 75,000 people who are still working as coal miners in the United States. In Massachusetts alone, we now have more than 100,000 people who work in the clean energy sector. In wind and solar alone in our country right now, we have 360,000 people who work in those sectors.

By the year 2020, if we just continue at the pace at which we have been moving over the last several years, there will be 600,000 people working in the wind and solar sector. That is the future. That is where we should be going. Those are the goals we should be trying to reach.

Instead, what President Trump is saying is that the United States is a technological weakling, that the United States cannot do it, that the United States can't find the capacity to be able to meet this challenge, that we have to give up.

The President says he is going to revive the coal industry, a 19th century industry, instead of trying to have the United States be the leader in this world on the production of clean energy technologies.

Last night, I was at the Kennedy Library, and we were celebrating the 100th birthday of President John F. Kennedy. On that occasion last evening, the library presented to Barack Obama his Profile in Courage Award. Amongst other things that were cited was his commitment to dealing with this challenge of climate change that is affecting our planet and the role that the United States can and should play in the solving of that problem.

President Obama promulgated last year a Clean Power Plan. That Clean Power Plan was intended to reduce greenhouse gases in the utilities sector by 32 percent by the year 2030. President Trump has already said: We can't accomplish that. We can't figure that out. We don't know how to reduce those greenhouse gases.

In 1961, President Kennedy said that we were going to put a man on the Moon in 8 years and return those pilots

back to Earth safely. We had to invent new metals. We had to invent new propulsion systems. President Kennedy said that we were not going to do it because it was easy but because it was hard.

We were threatened by the Soviet Union for supremacy in outer space. President Kennedy challenged our Nation to respond to the threat of the Soviet Union, and we won.

Here we are, nearly 60 years later, with another challenge, a challenge that threatens this planet. President Trump says that as a nation we are not up to the challenge. As a nation, we can't figure out how to solve this problem, even though the solutions are already out there and being deployed across this Nation.

Another example of solutions like wind and solar: Elon Musk has a new all-electric vehicle that is going to cost \$35,000 and is going to be deployed next year; 400,000 of these vehicles are to be sold. That is a game-changing moment in the history of the automobile, going back to its invention. It is a game changer. To a certain extent, for existing industries, it is a game-over moment unless they get into this all-electric vehicle revolution.

What is Elon Musk doing? Elon Musk is creating a Darwinian, paranoia-inducing environment within which all of the rest of these automotive companies are now going to have to operate—go electric or perish economically as a company.

This is how far it has come: Right now, Tesla has a market value that for all intents and purposes is equal to Ford and to General Motors. That is how much the American people have given in terms of confidence in this company, in this man.

We can do it. It should be the President of the United States who is saying we can do it. The rest of the world expects us to do it.

Why do we continue to import oil into our country from Saudi Arabia? Why do we continue to import oil from other countries around this planet? Why can't the President set as a goal that we are going to have 100 percent renewables in our country by the year 2050, that we are going to accept it as a national challenge in the same way that President Kennedy accepted the challenge in 1961 to put a man on the Moon, to control, to dominate in outer space?

This is a letter to President Trump, which is in today's New York Times. The full-page ad says:

Dear President Trump,

As some of the largest companies based or operating in the United States, we strongly urge you to keep the United States Paris Agreement on climate change.

What are the names of these companies? Adobe, Apple, Danfoss, Facebook, Gap, Google, Hewlett Packard Enterprise, Ingersoll Rand, Intel, Johnson

Controls, Mars Incorporated, Microsoft, Morgan Stanley, National Grid, PG&E Corporation, Salesforce, Schneider Electric, Unilever, VF Corporation.

This isn't the President challenging companies in our country to respond to the challenge. These are the companies in America challenging the President to respond to the challenge. It is the Kennedy era on its head; it is like JFK in reverse. He is saying we can't do it when the private sector is saying we can.

Ultimately, this challenge to our competitiveness globally is something that Donald Trump is going to forfeit for our workers. This opportunity to create jobs and markets and growth is going to be something that we lose.

We need a President who is going to stand up for this stable, practical framework, which is giving an incentive to the private sector to solve this problem. We will be creating jobs while saving all of creation. That is what the winning formula is going to be.

This Paris Agreement is going to lead to increased competitiveness in jobs, in economic growth. By remaining a party to the Paris Agreement, rather than retreating, we will give Americans the opportunity to harness that can-do spirit and technical know-how to create new businesses and jobs. We will give our Nation the opportunity to be a leader in the global effort to address climate change. We will give America the opportunity to lead in this century and into the next.

I urge the United States to remain in the Paris Agreement. We can either be the leader or the laggard internationally in developing the new clean energy technologies that will drive our economy and help combat climate change.

It is a sad day for our Nation when the President of the United States is challenged by the private sector to step up, especially when he calls himself the CEO President of our country. He is turning his back on these innovative companies that want to be able to create jobs here in our country in order to save our planet. I pray for the well-being of our planet and that the President honors this commitment.

I think that the French made a huge statement yesterday in electing their new President, Macron. He was saying to the French people: We must engage the rest of the planet. We must work with the rest of the planet.

The Paris Agreement was signed in France in December of 2015. That election yesterday, I think, should be taken as a signal that we should not be retreating from our global leadership.

I urge this administration to adopt an approach that does unleash further this wind and solar and all-electric vehicle revolution.

With that, I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, last week our colleagues in the House made a first necessary step to delivering on our promise to repeal and replace ObamaCare and to restore individual choice for a health insurance product that people choose that fits their actual needs, rather than one mandated by Washington, DC. They passed the American Health Care Act, a bill that provides relief to Americans all across the country. With the passage of the AHCA in the House, we have a way forward to do away with government mandating one-size-fits-all healthcare.

Now that the House has passed this legislation, it is up to the Senate to do our job and to keep our promises. To be specific, the promise President Obama made when the Affordable Care Act was passed—actually, he made many promises multiple times—proved not to be true. So in many ways, when President Obama promised that if you like what you have, you can keep it; that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor; that if you like your plan, you can keep your plan—none of that was true, we have now learned.

I don't think it is an exaggeration to say that ObamaCare—the Affordable Care Act—was sold under false pretenses. So it is up to us to restore individual choice for healthcare products that people want that fit their needs, not one they buy because the government is holding a gun to their heads or threatens to penalize them unless they observe the government mandate to buy that healthcare.

You know, one of the biggest reasons for passing ObamaCare given at the time, back in 2010, was the number of uninsured in the country. Well, the fact is, there are still 30 million people uninsured under ObamaCare even though it has been the law of the land for the last 7 years.

I believe we can and we must do better to deliver affordable care that people choose, that meets their individual needs, and not healthcare they buy simply because the government is coercing them into doing so. We will work together with all of our colleagues who are willing to work with us. If that means Republicans are going to be working with 52 Republicans to get this bill passed, we will get it done and we will get it passed. Ideally, though, it would be better if our Democratic colleagues work with us. But so far, they have steadfastly refused to work with us even though they know that ObamaCare is in shambles and that people are finding they can't find an insurance company where they live

because insurance companies are pulling out of those individual markets because they are simply losing too much money or people who can buy ObamaCare policies in the individual markets are finding that their premiums are going through the roof and that the deductibles are unaffordable, thus effectively leaving them without effective coverage.

Even though our Democratic colleagues know that ObamaCare is melting down and is not serving the public the way they promised it would or, in fact, is a positive harm to them because of unaffordable premiums and deductibles, still, so far they are standing on the sidelines and unwilling to participate in this process. I hope that changes at some point in the near future in the interests of the people we represent all across the country.

IMMIGRATION LAW

Madam President, I want to spend the rest of my time discussing a specific problem that Texans are all too familiar with; that is, people breaking our immigration laws, and not just breaking our immigration laws but then coming into our local communities and committing additional crimes—assault, murder, rape, you name it—in those communities even after they have entered the country illegally.

This is a difficult issue and one that I don't raise lightly, but it is important that when we talk about sanctuary cities and criminal aliens—these are people who have not just violated the immigration laws, these are people who have doubled down and have no respect for our laws, and, frankly, they have no respect for the communities in which they live. They primarily target the minority community in which they live and work.

We do need to be clear-eyed about this, and we need to treat it seriously. We need to remember that our inaction has some real-life consequences. I have been glad to see the new administration focus on enforcing the law and restoring respect for the rule of law generally and taking quick action to help victims of this type of crime in particular.

I want to take a couple of minutes to tell a story about one particular victim who was really an American hero, one of my constituents who lost his life at the hands of a violent illegal immigrant. That would be Houston police officer Rodney Johnson.

By all accounts, Rodney Johnson was larger than life, standing about 6 feet 5 inches tall, with a smile just as big. He was a dedicated family man, a husband to fellow Houston Police Department officer Joslyn Johnson. They had three daughters and two sons. His wife even called Rodney “the glue that held the family together.”

Rodney was a hero not only to his family but to the local community as

well. He was a hero for our country, too, because he was a veteran of the U.S. military police, the U.S. Army. Of course he was a hero for the State of Texas as a former corrections officer with the Texas Department of Public Safety.

A few years ago, Rodney ran into the flames of a burning building and saved the lives of several children. For that act of courage, he was awarded one of the highest honors a law enforcement officer in Texas can receive, the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement's Medal of Valor.

Sadly, all of that changed in the fall of 2006. At about 5:30 p.m. on September 21, Officer Johnson pulled over a driver for speeding near Houston Hobby Airport. By all accounts, it appeared to be a routine traffic stop, but when the driver, Juan Quintero, could not provide Officer Johnson with a driver's license, he decided to take him into custody. What Officer Johnson did not know is that Mr. Quintero was a hardened criminal illegal immigrant with an extensive record of offenses, as well as deportations and repeated illegal entries into the United States. Even more tragically, Officer Johnson did not know that this career thug was concealing a 9mm handgun in the waistband of his clothing.

Officer Johnson followed protocol. He handcuffed the criminal suspect, placed him in the back of his squad car, and began writing a police report. But just then, Quintero managed to move his cuffed hands in front of him, reached for his concealed weapon, and opened fire in a cowardly surprise attack, literally killing Rodney Johnson by shooting him in the back.

Quintero was a dangerous career criminal who had no respect for our laws. He had no place in our country and had been deported numerous times by the Federal Government. But somehow he was free and on the streets alongside of our families and heroes like Officer Rodney Johnson. That should be an embarrassment to everyone who believes in the rule of law and believes that it is government's responsibility at the local, State, and Federal level to keep our communities safe.

This issue is not going to go away, as much as some of our colleagues would like to ignore it. There are countless other stories across the country of victims and their families who have suffered from some of the worst tragedies imaginable because of criminal illegal immigrants.

I am not talking just about people who have entered the country in violation of our immigration laws; I am talking about hardened criminals who target people in their communities for profit or for other reasons. I have spoken about a number of them from the floor before.

In addition to Officer Rodney Johnson, I could tell you the story of Javier

Vega, a Border Patrol officer killed by two criminal illegal immigrants while fishing with his family. These criminals had been deported numerous times and committed multiple crimes.

I could tell you about Kevin Will, a Houston police officer killed by a drunk driver who had entered and was living in the United States illegally and who had been deported twice before.

I could tell you more about Josh Wilkerson, a teenager brutally killed by a criminal illegal immigrant in 2010, somebody who had been arrested numerous times before.

I could tell you about Kara Willingham, who was beaten to death by a criminal illegal immigrant; Gustavo Burr or Andres Reyes, kidnapped and held at gunpoint in South Texas; and Neri Garcia, killed by an illegal alien who caused a drunk-driving accident in the Dallas area.

I could tell you story after story after story of the tragedies wrought by a Federal policy that did not enforce our borders or make sure that people, once deported, stayed deported because of the danger they posed to our communities. I believe this really is a matter of political will, and we finally, for the first time in the last 8 years, have an administration and a President who believe in securing our borders and keeping the public safe.

There are larger and other additional discussions we need to have about our flawed immigration system, but the first thing we need to do is regain the public's confidence by securing our borders and enforcing our laws. I am glad President Trump is well on his way to beginning that process under the leadership of GEN John Kelly at the Department of Homeland Security.

The entire point of this is to keep the first commitment that the government makes to American citizens: that we will protect you and keep you safe. That is the government's main job, and that includes protecting all Americans and everyone in the country, literally, from those career criminals who commit offenses and who thumb their noses at our immigration laws. As I said, the Trump administration is finally taking our security seriously, and I am grateful for that. By focusing on violent repeat offenders, we are protecting our citizens and making our communities safer places to live. I don't know how anyone could be against that.

I look forward to doing my part here in the Senate to continue working with this administration to make sure that our laws are enforced and not ignored, such as the one signed into law by Governor Abbott in Texas, making sure that sanctuary cities exist no more and that every local, State, and Federal law enforcement agency cooperates in enforcing the law and making our communities safe and regaining the

public's confidence in their own government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, today is a glorious day. It is a great day for this country because we and my colleagues, I believe, will confirm Heather Wilson to be Secretary of the Air Force.

There are many reasons why it is appropriate for Heather Wilson to be Secretary of the Air Force. She has Air Force in her DNA. Her father Doug was an Air Force veteran and commercial pilot. Her grandfather flew for Britain's Royal Flying Corps in World War I before coming to the United States and serving as a courier pilot during World War II.

Heather was to be no different. She was a junior in high school when the Air Force Academy started accepting women. She applied and was appointed there to be part of the Academy's third class with women. She also became the first woman to command basic training and the first woman vice wing commander.

After college she thought she was going to flight school, but those plans changed because she answered the call and was awarded the very prestigious Rhodes Scholarship. It was only the sixth year that women were permitted to apply for a Rhodes Scholarship, and she was a collegiate rower there and earned a master's degree and a doctorate in international relations.

Heather's assignments and accomplishments are many. During her service she was a negotiator and political adviser to the U.S. Air Force in England and a planning officer for NATO in Belgium, where she worked on arms control negotiations.

Heather left the Air Force because she heeded another call to serve as the Director of European Defense Policy and Arms Control on the staff of the National Security Council. I know she worked very closely with former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice during the Presidency of George H.W. Bush, the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the collapse of the Warsaw Pact.

Heather has always been on an upward trajectory. She left government and started her own company advising defense and scientific corporations, but public service has always called Heather back. In 1995 she was asked to be the cabinet secretary of the New Mexico Children, Youth and Families Department, where she oversaw foster care, adoption, early childhood education, children's mental health, and the juvenile justice system. From there, again, public service kept calling her, and she was elected to the House of Representatives in 1998, becoming the first woman to represent New Mexico since the 1940s and the first female veteran elected to a full term in the U.S. Congress.

I met Heather Wilson in the House of Representatives. Her time on the Hill included service on the U.S. House Committee on Armed Services and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I was lucky enough to serve with Heather, to learn from her and from her incredible depth of knowledge, her certainty—Heather is so certain—and her ability to cut through the politics to do what is right for the country. I heard Heather give many speeches on the House floor, and they were always through the frame of what is in the best interests of the United States.

So after she left Congress she founded another company before she was selected as president of the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, and she is there now serving as the school's first female President. My condolences go to the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology because duty is calling Heather Wilson back to Washington to be our Secretary of the Air Force.

There are a lot of firsts in Heather's life. Senator Pete Domenici, to whom Heather felt very close, once called Heather "the most brilliantly qualified House candidate anywhere in the country."

I say Heather is a brilliantly qualified designee to be Secretary of the Air Force. She has always been not only an incredible intellectual and a strong leader, but she is also a very warm, welcoming, and kind person. We became good friends and remain so to this day. She is a leader. She is a spouse. She is a mother of two wonderful children, a pilot, and a veteran. So I am excited about the prospect of Heather's returning to Washington to become our Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, Heather Wilson was one of the first women to graduate from the U.S. Air Force Academy and the third generation of her family to serve in the Air Force. She was one of the pioneers of gender integration of the modern Air Force. Even so, her track record in public service and the private sector after her Air Force career raises concerns.

While serving as the Representative from New Mexico's First District, Ms. Wilson admitted to telephoning the U.S. Attorney in Albuquerque to pressure him on an ongoing corruption investigation of State Democrats, in violation of House ethics rules.

Ms. Wilson was paid \$450,000 between 2009 and 2013 through a Lockheed Martin subsidiary for consulting work for Sandia National Laboratory. The Government Accountability Office criticized the lab for not having adequate documentation of the work that she performed, and Lockheed Martin ultimately paid \$4.7 million to settle charges that it had paid a lobbyist with taxpayer funds. Ethics laws prohibited

Ms. Wilson from lobbying within a year of serving in Congress. Ms. Wilson failed to list her business relationship with Sandia Labs in her financial disclosure filings. In spite of this, she claims that she did nothing wrong.

During her unsuccessful run for the Senate, Ms. Wilson claimed that legislation intended to reduce bullying of LGBTQ children was a violation of religious freedom. She argued that the correct response was not to punish bullies, but to “strengthen our children to be more comfortable with themselves.” She has steadfastly refused to support Federal nondiscrimination protections for the LGBTQ community.

The core values of the Air Force are, integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all we do. In spite of her career as an Air Force officer, Ms. Wilson has not demonstrated the unflinching commitment to integrity that we demand of our men and women in uniform. She has compromised ethics rules in Congress, accepted pay for questionable work that was ill-defined and can’t be fully documented, and failed to show that she is willing to stand up for all serving in uniform, regardless of their sexual orientation.

For these reasons, I cannot support Ms. Wilson’s nomination to be 24th Secretary of the Air Force.

Mrs. CAPITO. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to use 10 minutes of the Republicans’ allotted time because my side has used all of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the nomination of Dr. Heather Wilson to be Secretary of the Air Force.

The Secretary of the Air Force is an important and influential position within our national security structure. As the head of the military Department, the Secretary of the Air Force oversees recruiting, organizing, training, and equipping of the force. The next Air Force Secretary will oversee the Defense Department’s most complex and costly acquisition programs in history. The Secretary will also lead 495,000 Active-Duty, Guard, and Reserve members through the challenges of rebuilding long-term sustainable readiness, while contending with ongoing operational demands around the globe.

Dr. Wilson has the knowledge and expertise to serve in that role. She is a

graduate of the U.S. Air Force Academy and a Rhodes scholar. She served in the House of Representatives and on the House Armed Services Committee and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Currently, Dr. Wilson is president of the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology.

Without question, Dr. Wilson has notable credentials, but I have significant concerns about certain of her past actions. First, Heather Wilson & Company, LLC, founded by Dr. Wilson following her tenure in Congress, had contracts with four National Nuclear Security Administration, or NNSA, laboratories—Sandia National Laboratories, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and Nevada National Security Site. From January 2009 through part of 2011, Dr. Wilson’s company received \$464,000 in payments from these laboratories for consulting services.

However, due to claims of contracting irregularities involving the company, the Department of Energy inspector general conducted two investigations into this matter. As a result, the contractors that operated the laboratories on behalf of the government paid back at least \$442,877 to the Department of Energy with respect to payments made to Dr. Wilson’s company. The rationale for the repayments was the absence of any appreciable evidence of work product. Furthermore, Lockheed Martin, which operated Sandia National Laboratories, agreed to an overall settlement of \$4.7 million for their management failures.

Let me be clear. Dr. Wilson was not found culpable of wrongdoing. Nevertheless, the allegations that were levied are serious and directly involved her company. As such, during her confirmation hearing, I asked Dr. Wilson about these contracts and the allegations of impropriety. Unfortunately, I did not receive a satisfactory response. Dr. Wilson deflected any suggestions that she bore any responsibility for these contracting irregularities.

As concerning as these allegations are, there was another incident that I found even more problematic as we reviewed Dr. Wilson’s qualifications to serve as Secretary of the Air Force. In October of 2006, while serving as a Member of the House of Representatives, Dr. Wilson contacted a sitting U.S. attorney, David C. Iglesias, who was appointed by President George W. Bush, regarding the status of Federal corruption cases in New Mexico. This action was highly unusual and contrary to guidance in effect at the time from the House Ethics Committee. In fact, the House Ethics Manual provided that a request for background information or a status report from a U.S. attorney “may in effect be an indirect or subtle effort to influence the substantive outcome of the proceedings.” The guidance provided by the manual

stated that the best way to communicate any inquiry or question was in writing, in order to make it part of the proceedings.

As a former Member of the House myself, I have deep concerns about this action in terms of House ethics rules and the possibility that a Federal prosecutor may have felt pressured by Congress in an ongoing investigation.

In September of 2008, a joint report by the Department of Justice inspector general and the Department of Justice Office of Professional Responsibility, which investigated the removal of nine U.S. attorneys, including Mr. Iglesias, concluded that “the evidence we have developed so far shows that Wilson . . . in fact called Iglesias before the election, and that the substance of the call led Iglesias to believe he was being pressured to indict the courthouse case before the upcoming election.”

During her nomination hearing, Dr. Wilson testified that she called Mr. Iglesias because, in her words, “an individual or constituent with knowledge of ongoing investigations told me that the U.S. Attorney was intentionally delaying corruption prosecutions, and I felt as though I had to address that allegation in some appropriate way.” However, as I previously mentioned, contacting a U.S. attorney in this manner was clearly contrary to the ethics rules that govern the conduct of Members of the House of Representatives.

Perhaps Dr. Wilson, though, does deserve the benefit of the doubt. Maybe her intention, when she called Mr. Iglesias, was not to pressure him. However, when I asked Dr. Wilson the name of the individual who made the allegation about Mr. Iglesias’s intentionally delaying corruption prosecutions, she refused to provide the person’s name. Dr. Wilson argued that she had an obligation not to reveal who it was who made a highly politicized and unusual charge against Mr. Iglesias.

I think providing the name of the person is important because it helps us to understand the purpose of Dr. Wilson’s call to Mr. Iglesias. It is one thing if a concerned constituent with no ties or interests in corruption cases under investigation innocuously contacted Dr. Wilson. Perhaps her subsequent call to Mr. Iglesias could be excused. But because we do not have the name, we have no way to verify the motive. It remains very possible that the person who contacted Dr. Wilson wanted to pressure Mr. Iglesias to move forward with these pending corruption cases. If that is the case, it casts Dr. Wilson’s call to Mr. Iglesias in a much different light. Unfortunately, without further information from Dr. Wilson, I will not be able to resolve my concerns about this incident.

The two issues I have just discussed have reluctantly led me to conclude that while Dr. Wilson has excellent

academic and professional qualifications, I must vote against her nomination before the full Senate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a month ago, I spoke in strong support of Dr. Heather Wilson to be the 24th Secretary of the Air Force. I am pleased that it appears that her nomination will be confirmed today.

In the many years I have known Dr. Wilson, I have always been impressed by her intellect and especially by her leadership skills. Her qualifications and character are beyond dispute. Throughout her life, she has used her many talents not for personal gain or self-aggrandizement but for the public good.

Dr. Wilson was one of the first female graduates of the Air Force Academy, which is a pretty impressive accomplishment unto itself, but she set an even higher standard when she earned a Rhodes scholarship to study at Oxford University.

Upon being awarded her Ph.D., she went to work for the National Security Council and then ran for Congress. I got to know Dr. Wilson through her insightful work on the House Intelligence and Armed Services Committees. Make no mistake—Dr. Wilson made a difference during her service in the House. As a well-respected member of the Intelligence Committee, she built a reputation as a no-nonsense legislator who was deeply committed to upholding our national security. In all things, she proved herself to be exceptionally competent, and I have to say that she proved herself to be worthy of the highest trust.

After her service in the House, Dr. Wilson became the president of the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology. There, she again set a high bar by leading a school whose alumni, I have been informed, make a higher average starting salary than do Harvard graduates.

For over 20 years, our Nation's Air Force has been involved in conflicts all over the world. Now more than ever, the Air Force needs a proven leader who can modernize the service and lead us to victory. I believe Dr. Wilson will provide that leadership. I have every confidence that she will serve with honor and integrity and make a lasting difference as the next Secretary of the Air Force. I have known her for a long time. I have gone to her State and worked with her and campaigned with

her. All I can say is that she is a very top-notch woman leader, one of the best I have seen in all of my time in the U.S. Senate, and I know she is going to do a terrific job. I am going to help her every step of the way, and I am sure everybody else here will.

I hope everybody on this floor will vote for Dr. Heather Wilson for this position. We cannot lose. We are all going to be ahead because she is willing to serve and serve more, and she is willing to leave what really is a very comfortable position in order to take one that is not so comfortable and is very demanding, and I respect her for that and think the world of her.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering the nomination of Heather Wilson to be Secretary of the Air Force.

The time runs out in 37 minutes.

Mr. MCCAIN. What is the time of the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time concludes at 6:03 p.m.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the nomination of Heather Wilson to be the next Secretary of the U.S. Air Force.

Dr. Wilson is a proven leader and a dedicated public servant. She is a distinguished graduate of the U.S. Air Force Academy and Oxford University, where she earned master's and doctorate degrees as a Rhodes Scholar. If confirmed, Dr. Wilson will be the first Air Force Academy graduate in history to serve as Secretary of the Air Force.

Dr. Wilson served 7 years as an Air Force officer. During the Cold War, she served in the United Kingdom and at the U.S. Mission to NATO in Brussels. As the Cold War came to an end, she served on the National Security Council staff under President George H.W. Bush, working on issues concerning NATO and arms control.

Dr. Wilson later moved west to marry her husband, Jay, who is also an Air Force veteran. After a few years in the private sector, Dr. Wilson once again answered the call to service, first as the head of the New Mexico Child Welfare Department and later as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

In Congress, Dr. Wilson was the leading voice on national security. She took on the tough issues, from surveillance programs to sexual assault at the Air Force Academy, and she earned the

deepest respect of her colleagues on Capitol Hill, including mine.

For the last 4 years, Dr. Wilson has been the president of the South Dakota School of Mines, enhancing its reputation as a premier engineering, science, and research institution.

Now America's Air Force needs her leadership.

The next Secretary will lead America's Air Force in confronting the most diverse and complex array of global crises since the end of World War II. The world is on fire, and now more than ever our Nation is counting on the global vigilance, global reach, and global power that are the hallmarks of the U.S. Air Force capabilities.

The next Secretary will also inherit the oldest, smallest, and least ready Air Force in its history. Twenty-five years of continuous deployments, troubled acquisition programs, and frequent aircraft divestments have aged and shrunk the Air Force's inventory. The combination of relentless operational tempo and the self-inflicted wounds of the Budget Control Act and sequestration have depleted readiness. Meanwhile, potential adversaries are rapidly shrinking America's technological advantage and holding our aircraft at greater risk over greater distances.

In short, we have asked a lot of our Air Force over the last 25 years, and the demands placed on the service continue to grow. Congress has only added to the problems with the Budget Control Act and sequestration. We are placing an unnecessary and dangerous burden on the backs of our airmen, and we cannot change course soon enough.

We owe our airmen the resources, equipment, and training they need to succeed. We also owe them proven leadership. That is why the Senate should confirm Dr. Wilson to be the next Secretary of the Air Force. From the Air Force Academy to the Air Force, to the National Security Council, to the House of Representatives, Dr. Wilson has proven herself as a leader. She understands the missions of the Air Force and the capabilities it brings to the defense of our Nation. I am confident she will uphold the Air Force's core values: integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all the Air Force does.

Heather Wilson is the right person to lead the Air Force to a stronger future, and I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

Mr. President, I yield back all time.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Wilson nomination?

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 122 Ex.]

YEAS—76

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Baldwin	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Risch
Boozman	Heinrich	Roberts
Brown	Heitkamp	Rounds
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Capito	Hoeven	Sasse
Carper	Inhofe	Schatz
Casey	Johnson	Scott
Cassidy	Kaine	Shaheen
Cochran	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	King	Stabenow
Coons	Klobuchar	Lankford
Corker	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McCain	Tillis
Cruz	McCaskill	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Murphy	
Fischer	Nelson	

NAYS—22

Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Reed
Booker	Harris	Schumer
Cantwell	Hassan	Van Hollen
Cardin	Hirono	Warren
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Markey	Wyden
Feinstein	Merkley	
Franken	Murray	

NOT VOTING—2

Isakson	Sanders

The nomination was confirmed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Scott Gottlieb, of Connecticut, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, Dan Sullivan, Shelley Moore Capito, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, Orrin G. Hatch, Bill Cassidy, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, John Thune, Jerry Moran, James E. Risch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination

of Scott Gottlieb, of Connecticut, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 123 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Nelson
Bennet	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Graham	Portman
Burr	Grassley	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Carper	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Cochran	Hoeven	Sasse
Collins	Inhofe	Scott
Coons	Johnson	Shelby
Corker	Kennedy	Strange
Cornyn	King	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Udall
Donnelly	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	

NOT VOTING—2

Isakson	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 41.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Scott Gottlieb, of Connecticut, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

CONFIRMATION OF HEATHER WILSON

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I am honored to speak tonight after casting my vote to confirm Dr. Heather Wilson as Secretary of the Air Force. I have known Heather for nearly 20 years and submit that President Trump could not

have selected a more qualified candidate to lead the Air Force in these demanding times. I am pleased that the Senate was finally able to confirm her nomination, and I wish her great success.

As an Air Force veteran, former Member of Congress, and most recently the leader of one of the top science and engineering schools, the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, Dr. Wilson has repeatedly demonstrated leadership abilities that will serve her and the Air Force well in this next chapter.

Her commitment to duty links back to her time as a cadet at the Air Force Academy, where she was a distinguished graduate. In fact, she will be the Academy's first graduate in history to serve as a Secretary of the Air Force. Dr. Wilson went on to serve as an Air Force officer in Europe during the Cold War, where she was based in the United Kingdom and at the U.S. Mission to NATO in Brussels. Upon leaving the Air Force, she served on the National Security Council staff of President George H.W. Bush, working on NATO and conventional arms control.

At a time when America's partnerships are being challenged by threats around the world, I am confident that her experience will lend a steady hand to our military decisionmaking.

Dr. Wilson will also bring with her great experience honed in the Halls of Congress. At the start of her decades-long representation of New Mexico's First Congressional District, she quickly became one of the go-to Members on national security issues. Heather took on tough issues not unlike the ones she will surely face as Secretary of the Air Force. Whether on issues of strategic objectives and readiness or personnel matters, such as military sexual assault, she is prepared to have frank discussions on the issues and will contribute insightful proposals on how to best tackle the many challenges facing the Air Force. She understands not only the Air Force's key capabilities but the perilous outcomes we may face as a nation if we do not properly train and fund our military. She knows that rising to meet the challenges of the day must be done with an eye to the future so we may also deter and defeat the threats of tomorrow.

At a time when national security is of foremost concern, Dr. Wilson understands the Air Force's tremendous responsibility in keeping Americans safe and will be guided by the core values of the Force: integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all that the Air Force does.

I could not be happier for my friend, Dr. Heather Wilson, and wish her and her husband Jay the best of luck. South Dakota and the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology are losing an asset, but I am confident that

the new era of excellence Heather helped usher in leaves the school well-positioned to remain a foremost engineering, science, and research institution. We are proud of Heather's continued success and trust she will represent us well as the 24th Secretary of the Air Force.

I would like to thank my colleague, Chairman MCCAIN, for his work to advance Dr. Wilson's nomination through the Senate Armed Services Committee and for granting me the opportunity to introduce Dr. Wilson at her confirmation hearing. It was my honor to endorse her before the committee and to cast my vote in support of her nomination this evening. I am glad the Senate has advanced another of President Trump's nominees and wish Dr. Wilson, our next Secretary of the Air Force, continued wisdom and success as she continues her outstanding leadership in service to our country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL "MICKEY" GORAL

Mr. DURBIN. Today, Mr. President, I want to honor my friend Michael "Mickey" Goral. For nearly four decades, Mickey has held elected office in Rockford, the county seat of Winnebago County, IL. I have had the pleasure of knowing and working with him to serve Rockford and Winnebago County for many years.

A lifelong resident of Rockford, Mickey Goral grew up on Rockford's west end graduated from Boyland High School and Northern Illinois University with a B.A. in political science. He served on the county board for 18 years before being elected Rockford township supervisor and has held that post for 20 years.

At 63 years young, Mickey decided not to seek reelection, but refuses to use the word "retirement." He said: I hesitate to use the 'R' word because I don't play golf, I don't fish, and I have no other hobbies." Public service is all that is in Mickey's blood.

Oftentimes, public service becomes about accolades—not for Mickey. He simply aimed to make a difference in people's lives. Overseeing a \$1.6 million general assistance office, Mickey led a

nine-person team responsible for providing assistance to the communities most vulnerable: those with no other source of income. His mission was always clear and simple: treat all people with respect, dignity, and compassion in providing basic human needs to families while they are on the road to self-sufficiency, and that is what he did. Mickey's years of service to the people of Rockford show that public service can make a real difference in people's lives. Following the great recession of 2008, his general assistant office dealt with more than 150 open cases every month. Today, that number in a typical month is cut in half. That is the king of progress Mickey delivered for real working folks in Rockford.

Mickey Goral also had the privilege of serving as the president of the Township Officials of Illinois, bringing professionalism and training for township governments throughout my home State of Illinois, but for all his accomplishments, Mickey was most proud to be the Rockford township supervisor because his government role was one that was closest to the people, which meant he had the opportunity to help his friends and neighbors. We need more people like Mickey Goral.

I especially want to thank Mickey's wife, Tami, and twin daughters, Karley and Kiley, for sharing so much of their husband and father with the community. I am honored to congratulate him on a job well done and wish him and his family all the best in the next chapter of their lives.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, the United States is a world leader in innovation, science, and technology; promoting democratic and humanitarian values; and maintaining international security and economic stability. The United States should play no less of a global leadership role combating climate change.

Climate change is the defining issue of our time. It is our greatest environmental, political, and moral challenge. History will judge our generation by what we do—or don't do.

I call on this body to pass S. Res. 155, affirming in no uncertain terms the U.S. responsibility to work cooperatively with the international community to aggressively and effectively fight climate change.

There is no need to debate whether manmade climate change is occurring. The scientific evidence is clear. Greenhouse gases emitted through human activity are having a profound effect on Earth's climate, and 2016 was the warmest year on record, beating the record of 2015, which beat 2014's. The international community is no longer debating the science of climate change, and there should be no further debate in the halls of Congress.

Instead we must agree how the United States—as part of the international community—will take all steps necessary to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to preserve our environment and way of life for future generations.

We are seeing species extinction and reduction in record numbers. We are seeing our landscapes changing, especially in the American West and in our colder climates like the Arctic. We are seeing extreme weather events devastate communities.

As a dry, arid State in the Southwest, my home State of New Mexico is right in the bull's eye of climate disruption. New Mexico is the country's sixth-fastest warming State: the annual temperature has increased about 2.7 degree Fahrenheit since 1970. Droughts are becoming more intense. We have decreased snowfall in the winter and decreased runoff in the spring. All this has negative consequences for our land and communities.

Climate change not only threatens our environment, it threatens our economic stability and international security.

More than 1,100 U.S. businesses, corporations, and organizations, many of which operate internationally, are on record supporting the Paris Agreement. The businesses include Arch Coal, BP, Chevron, ConocoPhillips, Dow Chemical, and DuPont. Business leaders agree that the Paris Agreement is good for business.

Support for the accord is broad based within private industry, from electricity generators such as PG&E and National Grid, to oil companies such as Exxon Mobil and Shell, to mining companies such as Rio Tinto, and to manufacturers such as General Motors. Even some of the largest coal producers, such as Cloud Peak Energy and Peabody Energy, support remaining in the agreement. This broad support is due to a simple reality: leaders of successful businesses make decisions based on the available science, not ideology.

Business leaders are telling Congress and the President to stay in. Last November, over 360 businesses and investors called on U.S.-elected leaders to support the Paris Agreement and other domestic low-carbon policies. The letter was signed by more than a dozen Fortune 500 companies, as well as small family-owned businesses across more than 35 states. All these businesses want the U.S. economy to be energy efficient and powered by low-carbon energy. They are concerned that a failure to build a low-carbon economy puts American prosperity at risk.

Despite this overwhelming support from the business community, the President has not decided whether the U.S. should continue as a member of the Paris accord. He is undecided despite the fact that his Secretary of

State, former CEO of the world's largest oil company, says we should stay in, so we have a "seat at the table."

While sufficient resources and attention must be given to carbon-intensive industries and their workforces to ensure that transitions are not disruptive, we must look forward to supporting a new energy economy, that addresses climate change and produces good jobs.

We should not underestimate the threat climate change poses to national security. Secretary of Defense Mattis does not. He has testified before Congress that climate change poses as a national security threat. Indeed, the Pentagon has considered climate change a national security threat for over a decade.

Secretary Mattis wrote to the Senate Armed Services Committee that, "[c]limate change is impacting stability in areas of the world where our troops are operating today." He observed that, "[c]limate change can be a driver of instability, and the Department of Defense must pay attention to potential adverse impacts generated by this phenomenon." To prepare for this threat, Secretary Mattis stated that "... climate change is a challenge that requires a broader, whole-of government response. If confirmed, I will ensure that the Department of Defense plays its appropriate role within such a response by addressing national security aspects."

According to the American Security Project, climate change serves as an "accelerant of instability" or a "threat multiplier" that makes already existing threats worse. "The threat of global warming for security will manifest through a range of effects: resource scarcity, extreme weather, food scarcity, water insecurity, and sea level rise will all threaten societies around the world. Too many governments are not prepared for these threats, either because they do not have the resources or because they have not planned ahead. How societies and governments respond to the increase in instability will determine whether climate change will lead to war."

The President should not disregard the advice of his Secretary of Defense and the established position of the Pentagon. The challenge of climate change requires a broad response from the entirety of the Federal Government. The President should meet this challenge head on.

Across the globe, people are suffering from the effects of climate change. U.S. businesses and the military feel those threatening impacts as well. U.S. elected officials must listen to these businesses and our Armed Forces. The United States should not only have a seat at the international table, we should be leading the global community. I urge passage of S. Res. 155, affirming our commitment to work with

the international community to effectively address climate change.

PARIS AGREEMENT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I wish to speak in strong support of the U.N. Paris climate change agreement and in opposition to efforts to undermine this international agreement that is vital to the environmental and economic well-being of New Hampshire, the Nation, and the world.

In 2015, I joined nine of my Senate colleagues in Paris to attend the 21st U.N. Climate Change Conference, also known as COP 21, where the climate agreement was negotiated. What we witnessed at COP 21 was monumental: 195 countries representing more than 95 percent of global carbon emissions worked together to adopt the first universal climate agreement that calls for international cooperation on addressing the causes of global warming and helping poorer nations most affected by it. The following year, on Earth Day, the United States and more than 170 nations signed the international climate agreement in New York; and on November 4, 2016, the Paris Accord entered into force.

I am proud to say that the U.S. was a big part of that effort. That is why I am so disappointed to see that President Trump is currently considering whether to pull the United States from this historic agreement. This would be a huge mistake.

No country is insulated from the increasingly present and escalating effects of climate change. In the United States, we are seeing it throughout the country, and this is certainly true in New Hampshire. Rising temperatures are shortening our fall foliage season, which is so important to our State's tourism economy. Milder winters have led to increases of insect-borne diseases that endanger our wildlife. In New Hampshire, we have already seen a 40 percent decline in our moose population. The changing climate is also putting more stress on sugar maples, and this is already affecting syrup production.

The Paris Agreement establishes a long-term, durable global framework for countries to work together to reduce carbon emissions and keep the global temperature rise well below 2 degrees Celsius in order to avoid some of the worst consequences of climate change. For the first time, countries have committed to putting forward ambitious, nationally determined climate targets and reporting on their progress towards those targets using a standardized process of review. The Paris Agreement encourages transparency, accountability, and collaboration among nations not only to meet their climate targets, but to encourage innovation while doing so.

That is why American business leaders are strongly in favor of continued

U.S. participation in the Paris accord. From oil giants to tech firms, corporate leaders understand that the transition to clean energy presents one of the biggest economic opportunities of this century to create jobs and build wealth in this country. In fact, the International Energy Agency projects that, over the coming decades, more than \$60 trillion will be invested in energy efficiency and clean energy technologies as countries address the threat of climate change. The United States stands in a unique position to be the leader of the clean energy revolution. This would be jeopardized if the President decides to remove the United States from the international climate agreement.

Climate change represents an enormous challenge, but the solutions are within reach if we put into place policies that allow for swift action. The United States must help ensure that the goals of the Paris Agreement are realized. That is why I joined with my colleagues to introduce a resolution stating that the United States should work in cooperation with the international community and continue to exercise global leadership to address the causes and effects of climate change. We have a responsibility to help protect our children and grandchildren from the most severe consequences of global warming by reducing emissions now. This President must not remove the United States from this important agreement.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING FLEWELLING FAMILY FARMS

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Flewelling Farms, who has been designated family farm of the year and McCain's "Grower of the Year." Farms and farm families are essential assets to my home State of Maine—not just for the tremendous economic benefits the agriculture industry has, but also for the rich heritage and work ethic that makes up the communities where generations have plowed the lands. Maine agriculture is more diversified than in many States, and on any given day, you can drive past acres of potatoes, grains, large dairy farms, small truck farms, and even smaller value added farms producing cheese, breads, and maple syrup, as well as conventional farms, organic farms, and even farms raising oysters, seaweed, and salmon.

From now until the farm bill is passed, I want to take the opportunity to talk about Maine farms and farmers, their creativity, ingenuity, perseverance, and ability to grow amazing food and fiber on what can often be hard scrabble land with a solid crop of rocks and trees always watching for the opportunity to creep back on to land that was cleared long ago by hard work.

I want to begin in the agricultural county of Maine, Aroostook County. The potato is king in Aroostook County, ME—the large farms and relatively flat fertile land produce 16 million pounds of seed, chip, and table stock potatoes on nearly 50,000 acres, generating thousands of jobs and infuse millions of dollars into the economy of the State of Maine.

While agriculture is indeed valuable and essential to tables across the Nation and the world, community and farm families are what really makes northern Maine a special place. I am pleased to honor one such family today, the Jerry and Bruce Flewelling family of Easton. The Flewelling family was named the “2016 Farm Family of the Year” by the Maine Potato Board and the McCain’s “Champion Grower of 2016” as well. These recognitions are given for the quality of product and commitment to the industry, but also for the heart and hardiness of the family who, through trials and tribulations of unpredictable weather and markets, keeps their drive for excellence at the forefront of every day. The Flewellings have been doing this for six generations. The first Flewellings arrived in this country from Wales in the late 1800s, entering the United States near where the family farm is today.

They have experienced tremendous change in how potatoes are grown, harvested, and stored, but by being ready to implement best practices, new technologies, and innovation, they have grown the farm and its quality and productivity and are able to carry on the strong tradition of agriculture in Maine.

In addition to being an exceptional small business, the family members are active community members as well. They serve on municipal boards, Maine Pesticide Control Board, Agricultural Bargaining Council, as well as Maine Potato Growers. They are a strong voice for future generations of farmers and are mentors to other farmers, as well always encouraging others and sharing their expertise.

For these reasons and many more not listed here, I offer my congratulations to Jerry and Bruce and their family on the continuation of an exceptional farm and best wishes as they continue to instill a legacy of hard work and exceptional crops for future generations to come.●

REMEMBERING DR. CYNTHIA “CYNDI” RAY AND TRIBUTE TO SEAN ENGLISH

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the heroic actions of Dr. Cynthia “Cyndi” Ray and Mr. Sean English. On Sunday, April 2, 2017, Dr. Ray and Mr. English stopped to assist six passengers trapped in an overturned SUV on Interstate 96 near Fullerton,

MI, when a second vehicle lost control and struck them. Dr. Ray was on her way to work at Henry Ford Hospital, while Mr. English and his parents were headed to St. Peter and Paul Jesuit Church in downtown Detroit, where he was expected to sing in the choir. The accident left Dr. Ray, Mr. English, and the driver of the second vehicle in critical condition, and, on April 5, 2017, Dr. Ray succumbed to her injuries, tragically passing away. Mr. English suffered a broken pelvis and lost part of his foot.

Dr. Cynthia Ray was born on August 28, 1970, in Kansas City, KS, to parents Floey—Collier—and the late Dr. Fred Ray. Growing up in the State of Oklahoma, Dr. Ray followed her father into the field of medicine. After graduating from Ross University School of Medicine in 1999 and completing her residency at St. Joseph Mercy Health System, Dr. Ray went on to practice interventional pulmonology at Henry Ford Hospital’s department of pathology and radiology, in Detroit, MI. Highly regarded as a compassionate colleague and physician, Dr. Ray was part of the Henry Ford family since 2005.

Dr. Ray’s talents extended far beyond medicine. As a former Henry Ford Hospital “Campus Idol” contestant, Dr. Ray was a gifted singer, as well as a former ballerina and admirable cook. She also cared deeply about rescuing dogs. Dr. Ray will be greatly missed in the city of Detroit, as well as across the State of Michigan.

Mr. Sean English, a junior at University of Detroit Jesuit High School, is admired by his peers and his teachers. An active member of his school community, Mr. English is a star student-athlete on University of Detroit Jesuit’s cross country and track team and is the reigning Catholic League champion in the 1-mile run. He is also involved in student government and serves on the student senate selection committee. In stopping to assist others in a time of need, Mr. English exemplified the mission of University of Detroit Jesuit, “Men for Others.” In a telling testament to his character and the impact he has made, both on his fellow students and the broader University of Detroit Jesuit community, there has been an incredible outpouring of support to both him and his family. I know the administration, faculty, parents, and students of University of Detroit Jesuit have offered their praise of Mr. English, for serving as an example of faith and perseverance, as well as his great sense of humor.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the incredible selflessness of these two good Samaritans: Dr. Cynthia Ray and Mr. Sean English. Our communities are made stronger by the actions of everyday heroes, like Dr. Ray and Mr. English. I know that Dr. Ray’s passion, dedication, and compassion will be deeply missed. I also com-

mend Mr. English for his dedication to helping others, as well as his bravery in the face of adversity, and I wish him a full and speedy recovery. My thoughts and prayers are with everyone impacted by this incident, and I know the actions and sacrifices of both Dr. Ray and Mr. English will continue to inspire others to serve their community and make a difference in the lives of others.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2017, the Secretary of the Senate, on May 5, 2017, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. COMSTOCK) had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

H.R. 534. An act to require the Secretary of State to take such actions as may be necessary for the United States to rejoin the Bureau of International Expositions, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by States for non-governmental employees.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2017, the enrolled bill and joint resolution were signed on May 5, 2017, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-1500. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the report on activities of the National Guard Counterdrug Schools for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1501. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility (Rouseau County, MN, et al.)" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2017-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1502. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; NH; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9959-68-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1503. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; 2016 Nitrogen Oxides Averaging Plan Consent Agreement with Raven Power" (FRL No. 9961-17-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1504. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; New Regulations for Architectural and Industrial Maintenance Coatings" (FRL No. 9961-25-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1505. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-50, "Williams Alley Designation Act of 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1506. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-51, "Land Disposition Transparency Temporary Act of 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1507. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-52, "Business License Technology Fee Reauthorization Temporary Amendment Act of 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1508. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-53, "Interior Design Regulation Temporary Amendment Act of 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1509. A communication from the Acting Director, Employee Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Access to Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) for Employees of Certain Indian Tribal Employees" (RIN3206-AM40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2017; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-1510. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-1511. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1512. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; Second Quarter of Fiscal Year 2017"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1513. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace for the following Idaho towns; Lewiston, ID; Pocatello, ID; and Twin Falls, ID" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0216)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1514. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace: Aspen, CO; Pueblo, CO" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0054)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1515. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Elmira, NY" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-8128)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1516. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Moses Lake, WA; Olympia, WA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0217)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1517. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Atlantic City" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9344)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1518. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Denver, CO" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9286)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1519. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace and Establishment of Class E En Route Airspace; Paso Robles, CA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9295)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1520. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Kill Devil Hills, NC" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9266)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1521. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-7269)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1522. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-7526)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1523. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9167)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1524. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-7491)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1525. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-1015)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1526. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2010-0755)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1527. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0252)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1528. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; GROB Aircraft AG Gliders" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0019)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1529. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Learjet, Inc., Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9505)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1530. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-6928)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1531. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; GROB Aircraft AG Gliders" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0019)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1532. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-4674)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1533. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; CFE Company Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9380)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1534. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0051)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1064. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to prohibit the stigmatization of children who are unable to pay for meals; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. McCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1065. A bill to designate Union Station in Washington, DC, as "Harry S. Truman Union Station"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1066. A bill to provide for the removal of default information from a borrower's credit report with respect to certain rehabilitated education loans; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1067. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award competitive grants to enhance collaboration between State child welfare and juvenile justice systems; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. COONS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KING, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HASSAN, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 1068. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for increased investment in clean energy; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1069. A bill to establish pilot projects in order to provide timely and reliable information on the safety and effectiveness of cleared or approved devices; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. BURR):

S. 1070. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the appropriate, risk-based classification of device accessories based on intended use; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. ERNST):

S. Res. 159. A resolution recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness Month; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 44

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 44, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to improve non-retaliation provisions relating to equal pay requirements.

S. 175

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 175, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the Multiemployer Health Benefit Plan and the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes.

S. 200

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 200, a bill to prohibit the conduct of a first-use nuclear strike absent a declaration of war by Congress.

S. 352

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Rodrick "Roddie" Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II.

S. 374

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 374, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 407, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 445

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 445, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 500

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 500, a bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, and for other purposes.

S. 504

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 504, a bill to permanently authorize the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program.

S. 527

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 527, a bill to improve access to emergency medical services, and for other purposes.

S. 534

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 534, a bill to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 563

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 563, a bill to amend the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 to require that certain buildings and personal property be covered by flood insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 573

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 573, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachu-

setts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 623, a bill to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of assistance provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to promote quality basic education in developing countries, to better enable such countries to achieve universal access to quality basic education and improved learning outcomes, to eliminate duplication and waste, and for other purposes.

S. 708

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 708, a bill to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants.

S. 881

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 881, a bill to reduce risks to the financial system by limiting banks' ability to engage in certain risky activities and limiting conflicts of interest, to reinstate certain Glass-Steagall Act protections that were repealed by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, and for other purposes.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to permanently reau-

thorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 907

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 907, a bill to authorize the modification of the Second Division Memorial, and for other purposes.

S. 976

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 976, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 980

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payments for certain rural health clinic and Federally qualified health center services furnished to hospice patients under the Medicare program.

S. 992

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 992, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct an independent review of the deaths of certain veterans by suicide, and for other purposes.

S. 1008

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 1008, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude cannabidiol and cannabidiol-rich plants from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes.

S. 1035

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1035, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to the scope of employee pension benefit plans.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. CON. RES. 12

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 12, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that those who served in the bays, harbors, and territorial seas of the Republic of Vietnam during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and

ending on May 7, 1975, should be presumed to have served in the Republic of Vietnam for all purposes under the Agent Orange Act of 1991.

S. RES. 106

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 106, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate to support the territorial integrity of Georgia.

S. RES. 109

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 109, a resolution encouraging the Government of Pakistan to release Aasiya Noreen, internationally known as Asia Bibi, and reform its religiously intolerant laws regarding blasphemy.

S. RES. 136

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 136, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the 102nd anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

S. RES. 155

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 155, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should work in cooperation with the international community and continue to exercise global leadership to address the causes and effects of climate change, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 159—RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. ERNST) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 159

Whereas, according to the Department of Justice, there were an estimated 90,185 rapes reported to law enforcement in 2015, which is a 6.3-percent increase as compared to 2014;

Whereas, according to the National Sexual Violence Resource Center, 1 in 5 women and 1 in 71 men will experience an attempted or completed rape at some point in their lives;

Whereas, according to the Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network, an individual is sexually assaulted every 98 seconds in the United States, but for every 1000 rapes committed, on average only—

(1) 310 rapes are reported to law enforcement;

(2) 57 reported rape cases lead to an arrest;

(3) 11 rape cases are referred for prosecution;

(4) 7 rape cases lead to a felony conviction; and

(5) 6 convicted rapists are sentenced to some form of incarceration;

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, more than ½ of all female rape victims reported being raped by an intimate partner;

Whereas sexual violence is a burden for many individuals who serve in the United States Armed Forces, and the Department of Defense estimates that in 2015, over 16,000 service members intervened in situations they believed to be at risk for sexual assault;

Whereas sexual assault does not discriminate on any basis and can affect any individual in the United States;

Whereas sexual violence may take many forms, including acquaintance, stranger, spousal, and gang rape, incest, child sexual abuse, commercial sex trafficking, sexual harassment, and stalking;

Whereas, according to the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, in addition to the immediate physical and emotional costs, sexual assault can have numerous adverse consequences for the victim, which may include post-traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse, major depression, homelessness, eating disorders, and suicide;

Whereas many sexual assaults are not reported to law enforcement agencies, which enables many perpetrators to evade punishment for their crimes;

Whereas sexual assault survivors suffer emotional complications long after their physical scars have healed;

Whereas advances in deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) technology have enabled law enforcement agencies to identify and prosecute the perpetrators in tens of thousands of unsolved sexual assault cases;

Whereas incarceration of sexual assault perpetrators can prevent perpetrators from committing additional crimes;

Whereas national, State, territorial, and tribal coalitions, community-based rape crisis centers, and other organizations across the United States are committed to—

(1) increasing public awareness of sexual violence and the prevalence of sexual violence; and

(2) eliminating sexual violence through prevention and education;

Whereas important partnerships have been formed among criminal and juvenile justice agencies, health professionals, public health workers, educators, first responders, and victim service providers;

Whereas thousands of volunteers and staff at rape crisis centers, State coalitions against sexual assault, and nonprofit organizations across the United States play an important role in making crisis hotlines and other services available to survivors of sexual assault;

Whereas free, confidential help is available to all victims and survivors of sexual assault through—

(1) the National Sexual Assault Hotline (800-656-HOPE and online.rainn.org); and

(2) more than 1,000 sexual assault service providers across the United States;

Whereas the DoD Safe Helpline, Safe HelpRoom, and Safe Helpline mobile app each provide support and help to members of the Department of Defense community—

(1) by telephone at 877-995-5247; and

(2) online at SafeHelpline.org;

Whereas individual and collective efforts reflect the dream of the people of the United States—

(1) for individuals and organizations to actively work to prevent all forms of sexual violence; and

(2) for no sexual assault victim to be unserved or feel that there is no path to justice; and

Whereas April 2017 is recognized as “National Sexual Assault Awareness Month”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) National Sexual Assault Awareness Month provides a special opportunity to educate the people of the United States about sexual violence and to encourage the prevention of sexual assault, improvement in the treatment of survivors of sexual assault, and the prosecution of perpetrators of sexual assault;

(B) it is appropriate to properly acknowledge survivors of sexual assault and to commend the volunteers and professionals who assist those survivors in their efforts to heal;

(C) national and community organizations and private sector supporters should be recognized and applauded for their work in promoting awareness about sexual assault, providing information and treatment to survivors of sexual assault, and increasing the number of successful prosecutions of perpetrators of sexual assault; and

(D) public safety, law enforcement, and health professionals should be recognized and applauded for their hard work and innovative strategies to ensure perpetrators of sexual assault are held accountable; and

(2) the Senate supports the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness Month.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues that April is National Sexual Assault Awareness Month. We commemorate it each year to bring public awareness to the staggering problem of sexual violence.

Tens of thousands of people in the United States and hundreds of my fellow Iowans annually fall victim to this heinous crime. Sexual assault occurs at least every minute and a half, according to law enforcement statistics. These same figures reveal an increase in rape cases since 2011, contrary to claims by the former Obama administration that the violent crime rate had declined in recent years. But up to two-thirds of sexual assaults are never reported to police, say crime victim advocates. This means that the average perpetrator strikes multiple times before being brought to justice. Equally as troubling, the incarceration rate is less than one percent of all sexual assaults reported to law enforcement.

The FBI ranks rape as one of the two most violent crimes, second only to murder in its effects. Survivors suffer not only physical consequences, but sometimes life-shattering emotional effects as well. According to the Rape Abuse and Incest National Network, as well as the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, post-traumatic stress disorder is typical. Depression or even suicide is not uncommon. The healing process is often slow and painstaking.

Today, I introduced a bipartisan resolution to commemorate Sexual Assault Awareness Month and honor the

survivors of this heinous crime. I thank Senators FEINSTEIN and ERNST for joining me as cosponsors of the resolution.

During my time as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, we have made crime survivors rights a top priority. Two years ago, we passed, and the President signed, major legislation to benefit the survivors of human trafficking. Last year, the President also signed the House version of a survivors' bill of rights that our committee reported as part of the Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act and we approved legislation to extend programs that support the analysis of sexual assault evidence by the Nation's crime labs.

Supporting and protecting survivors of sexual violence will continue to be a focus for our committee in 2017. Last month, I convened a hearing to examine allegations that dozens of young athletes experienced sexual abuse at

the hands of coaches, instructors, and others. I recently joined our committee's ranking member, Senator FEINSTEIN, in introducing the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act. The bill's purpose is to ensure that sexual assault allegations by young athletes will be reported and investigated promptly. This year we will also make it a priority to extend and update programs that are authorized under the Trafficking Victims Protection Act.

Mr. President, I will close by reaffirming my support for survivors of sexual violence and expressing my continued commitment to advocate for them. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of the resolution I have introduced today.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have one request for a committee to meet during today's session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committee is authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND TERRORISM

The Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on May 8, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH-216 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Russian Interference in the 2016 United States Election."

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Carlisle Clarke:									
Egypt	Pound		627.00						627.00
Jordan	Dinar		1,421.64						1,421.64
Italy	Euro		902.27						902.27
United States	Dollar				7,832.06				7,832.06
Patrick Carroll:									
Egypt	Pound		627.00						627.00
Jordan	Dinar		1,421.64						1,421.64
Italy	Euro		902.27						902.27
United States	Dollar				7,832.06				7,832.06
Rachel Santos:									
Egypt	Pound		627.00						627.00
Jordan	Dinar		1,421.64						1,421.64
Italy	Euro		902.27						902.27
United States	Dollar				7,832.06				7,832.06
Jessica Schulken:									
Egypt	Pound		627.00						627.00
Jordan	Dinar		1,421.64						1,421.64
United States	Dollar				11,516.56				11,516.56
Fitzhugh Elder:									
Jordan	Dinar		627.00						627.00
United States	Dollar				7,900.76				7,900.76
Jason Wheelock:									
China	Renminbi		1,119.18						1,119.18
Taiwan	Dollar		259.96				11.33		271.29
South Korea	Won		1,038.27						1,038.27
United States	Dollar				4,508.16				4,508.16
Laura Friedel:									
Colombia	Peso		1,578.00						1,578.00
United States	Dollar				3,697.16				3,697.16
Adam Sullivan:									
Colombia	Peso		1,578.00						1,578.00
United States	Dollar				3,697.16				3,697.16
Allen Cutler:									
Chile	Peso		1,080.60						1,080.60
United States	Dollar				13,118.00				13,118.00
Michael Bain:									
Jordan	Dinar		810.82						810.82
United States	Dollar				10,581.37				10,581.37
Patrick Magnuson:									
Jordan	Dinar		810.82						810.82
United States	Dollar				10,497.06				10,497.06
Senator Patrick Leahy:									
Cuba	Peso		1,313.50						1,313.50
Colombia	Peso		637.00						637.00
John Dowd:									
Cuba	Peso		1,313.50						1,313.50
Colombia	Peso		637.00						637.00
Senator Thad Cochran:									
Cuba	Peso		1,313.50						1,313.50
Colombia	Peso		637.00						637.00
Paul Grove:									
Cuba	Peso		1,313.50						1,313.50
Colombia	Peso		637.00						637.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
United States	Dollar						35.00		35.00
Tim Rieser:									
Cuba	Peso		1,313.50						1,313.50
Colombia	Peso		637.00						637.00
Kay Webber Cochran:									
Cuba	Peso		333.00						333.00
Colombia	Peso		210.00						210.00
Linda Good:									
Cuba	Peso		1,313.50						1,313.50
Colombia	Peso		637.00						637.00
Adam Yezerski:									
United Kingdom	Pound		449.50						449.50
Germany	Euro		194.00						194.00
France	Euro		269.00						269.00
Senator Jerry Moran:									
United Kingdom	Pound		499.50						499.50
Germany	Euro		194.00						194.00
France	Euro		269.00						269.00
Senator Roy Blunt:									
United Kingdom	Pound		499.50						499.50
Germany	Euro		194.00						194.00
France	Euro		269.00						269.00
Senator Richard Durbin:									
Poland	Zloty		549.84						549.84
Lithuania	Euro		233.00						233.00
Ukraine	Hryvnia		241.00						241.00
United States	Dollar				12,741.06				12,741.06
Chris Homan:									
Poland	Zloty		272.50						272.50
Lithuania	Euro		236.00						236.00
Ukraine	Hryvnia		324.05						324.05
United States	Dollar				10,256.66				10,256.66
Delegation Expenses:*									
Colombia	Peso						1,794.10		1,794.10
Cuba	Peso						4,055.87		4,055.87
Delegation Expenses:*									
Jordan	Dinar				147.61		157.04		304.65
Delegation Expenses:*									
Chile	Peso				668.65		21.00		689.65
Delegation Expenses:*									
Colombia	Peso						3,784.00		3,784.00
Delegation Expenses:*									
South Korea	Won						450.48		450.48
China	Renminbi						385.34		385.34
Taiwan	Dollar						11.33		11.33
Delegation Expenses:*									
Italy	Euro						299.97		299.97
Egypt	Pound						2,310.62		2,310.62
Jordan	Dinar				546.64		331.75		878.39
Delegation Expenses:*									
United Kingdom	Pound						516.00		516.00
France	Euro						2,586.99		2,586.99
Delegation Expenses:*									
Poland	Zloty						256.61		256.61
Lithuania	Euro						297.62		297.62
Ukraine	Hryvnia						637.84		637.84
Total			36,743.91		113,373.03		17,942.89		168,059.83

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR THAD COCHRAN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, May 3, 2017.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				12,376.16				12,376.16
Estonia	Euro		127.67						127.67
Latvia	Euro		166.57						166.57
Lithuania	Euro		281.29						281.29
Ukraine	Hryvnia		484.19						484.19
Georgia	Lari		288.39						288.39
James B. Hickey:									
United States	Dollar				12,376.16				12,376.16
Estonia	Euro		127.67						127.67
Latvia	Euro		120.41						120.41
Lithuania	Euro		401.07						401.07
Ukraine	Hryvnia		483.45						483.45
Georgia	Lari		354.05						354.05
ThucMinh Nguyen:									
United States	Dollar				12,375.56				12,375.56
Estonia	Euro		147.67						147.67
Latvia	Euro		286.02						286.02
Lithuania	Euro		321.31						321.31
Ukraine	Hryvnia		431.65						431.65
Georgia	Lari		274.05						274.05
Mikayla Mowzoon:									
United States	Dollar				12,376.16				12,376.16
Estonia	Euro		137.67						137.67
Latvia	Euro		155.41						155.41

May 8, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 163, Pt. 6

7619

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Lithuania	Euro		301.29						301.29
Ukraine	Hryvnia		527.13						527.13
Georgia	Lari		279.05						279.05
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
United States	Dollar				12,376.16				12,376.16
Estonia	Euro		162.75						162.75
Latvia	Euro		173.05						173.05
Lithuania	Euro		281.29						281.29
Ukraine	Hryvnia		343.27						343.27
Georgia	Lari		254.40						254.40
Matt Rinkunas:									
United States	Dollar				12,376.16				12,376.16
Estonia	Euro		128.17						128.17
Latvia	Euro		262.02						262.02
Lithuania	Euro		277.85						277.85
Ukraine	Hryvnia		549.01						549.01
Georgia	Lari		329.06						329.06
Delegation Expenses: *									
Estonia	Euro				417.54		688.94		1,106.48
Latvia	Euro				388.66		415.39		804.05
Lithuania	Euro						729.54		729.54
Ukraine	Hryvnia				5,979.91		750.54		6,730.45
Georgia	Lari				870.00		640.70		1,510.70
Denmark	Krone				1,520.82				1,520.82
William Greenwalt:									
United States	Dollar				4,895.59				4,895.59
Canada	Dollar		698.04						698.04
Senator James M. Inhofe:									
Czech Republic	Koruna		330.02						330.02
Israel	New Shekel		561.27						561.27
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		345.96						345.96
Ethiopia	Birr		715.04						715.04
Uganda	Shilling		333.25						333.25
Benin	Franc		214.54						214.54
Ghana	Cedi		274.60						274.60
Spain	Euro		298.11						298.11
Anthony Lazarski:									
Czech Republic	Koruna		307.69						307.69
Israel	New Shekel		553.88						553.88
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		345.96						345.96
Ethiopia	Birr		662.56						662.56
Uganda	Shilling		324.25						324.25
Benin	Franc		169.76						169.76
Ghana	Cedi		264.60						264.60
Spain	Euro		256.38						256.38
Mark Powers:									
Czech Republic	Koruna		286.49						286.49
Israel	New Shekel		515.49						515.49
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		378.61						378.61
Ethiopia	Birr		663.76						663.76
Uganda	Shilling		321.25						321.25
Benin	Franc		189.43						189.43
Ghana	Cedi		244.60						244.60
Spain	Euro		256.38						256.38
Luke Holland:									
Czech Republic	Koruna		251.25						251.25
Israel	New Shekel		544.03						544.03
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		435.61						435.61
Ethiopia	Birr		666.44						666.44
Uganda	Shilling		321.25						321.25
Benin	Franc		160.02						160.02
Ghana	Cedi		244.60						244.60
Spain	Euro		256.38						256.38
Senator Mike Rounds:									
Czech Republic	Koruna		282.69						282.69
Israel	New Shekel		521.46						521.46
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		345.96						345.96
Ethiopia	Birr		663.72						663.72
Uganda	Shilling		354.72						354.72
Benin	Franc		209.04						209.04
Ghana	Cedi		274.60						274.60
Spain	Euro		318.15						318.15
Gregg Rickman:									
Czech Republic	Koruna		272.69						272.69
Israel	New Shekel		521.46						521.46
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		345.96						345.96
Ethiopia	Birr		659.23						659.23
Uganda	Shilling		301.30						301.30
Benin	Franc		165.40						165.40
Ghana	Cedi		244.60						244.60
Spain	Euro		242.74						242.74
Delegation Expenses: *									
Czech Republic	Koruna						108.92		108.92
Israel	New Shekel				1,125.00		8,816.90		9,941.90
United Arab Emirates	Dirham						809.20		809.20
Ethiopia	Birr				732.83				732.83
Benin	Franc						822.90		822.90
Ghana	Cedi				1,297.00		3,514.00		4,811.00
Spain	Euro				532.04				532.04
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				14,979.36				14,979.36
Turkey	Lira		274.58						274.58
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		408.48						408.48
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		27.20						27.20
Elizabeth O'Bagy:									
United States	Dollar				14,642.07				14,642.07
Turkey	Lira		316.58						316.58
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		470.48						470.48
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		27.20						27.20
Mikayla Mowzoon:									
United States	Dollar				14,601.06				14,601.06

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Turkey	Lira		147.20						147.20
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		310.33						310.33
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		421.83						421.83
Christian Brose:									
United States	Dollar				14,642.07				14,642.07
Turkey	Lira		315.58						315.58
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		470.48						470.48
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		27.20						27.20
Delegation Expenses: *									
Turkey	Lira				412.45				412.45
Saudi Arabia	Riyal					646.01			646.01
United Arab Emirates	Dirham				309.16				309.16
Senator Roger Wicker:									
Italy	Euro		572.38						572.38
Jordan	Dinar		564.41						564.41
Israel	New Shekel		1,136.00						1,136.00
Hall Carter:									
Italy	Euro		572.38						572.38
Jordan	Dinar		564.41						564.41
Israel	New Shekel		1,136.00						1,136.00
Austria	Euro		1,702.17						1,702.17
Delegation Expenses: *									
Italy	Euro					136.83			136.83
Jordan	Dinar				257.12	505.82			762.94
Israel	New Shekel				824.75	6,287.00			7,111.75
Austria	Euro				1,890.58	2,383.35			4,273.93
Ozge Guzelsu:									
United States	Dollar				4,859.39				4,859.39
Guatemala	Quetzal		498.22						498.22
Honduras	Lempira		411.00						411.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Guatemala	Quetzal					912.00			912.00
Jason Potter:									
United States	Dollar				12,644.56				12,644.56
United Kingdom	Pound		1,197.38						1,197.38
Spain	Euro		124.54						124.54
Delegation Expenses: *									
United Kingdom	Pound				2,000.00				2,000.00
Spain	Euro				245.55				245.55
Cord Sterling:									
United States	Dollar				10,446.06				10,446.06
Jordan	Dinar		852.43						852.43
Delegation Expenses: *									
Jordan	Dinar				101.55				101.55
Senator James M. Inhofe:									
United States	Dollar				10,939.00				10,939.00
Germany	Euro		187.10						187.10
Anthony Lazarski:									
United States	Dollar				2,285.36				2,285.36
Germany	Euro		195.51						195.51
Matt Donovan:									
United States	Dollar				12,212.16				12,212.16
Germany	Euro		189.39						189.39
Qatar	Riyal		66.17						66.17
Samantha Clark:									
United States	Dollar				12,216.16				12,216.16
Germany	Euro		188.39						188.39
Qatar	Riyal		66.17						66.17
Delegation Expenses: *									
Qatar	Riyal		84.51						84.51
Senator John McCain:									
Germany	Euro		830.20						830.20
Christian Brose:									
Germany	Euro		898.55						898.55
Elizabeth O'Bagy:									
Germany	Euro		898.55						898.55
Mikayla Mowzoon:									
Germany	Euro		922.20						922.20
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
Germany	Euro		1,506.19						1,506.19
Alice James:									
Germany	Euro		751.78						751.78
Matt Rimkunas:									
Germany	Euro		830.32						830.32
Senator Ben Sasse:									
Germany	Euro		756.20						756.20
Senator Jeanne Shaheen:									
Germany	Euro		732.20						732.20
Senator Dan Sullivan:									
Germany	Euro		148.32						148.32
Senator Gary Peters:									
Germany	Euro		131.25						131.25
Delegation Expenses: *									
Germany	Euro				11,483.00	20,804.53			32,287.53
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
France	Euro		379.18						379.18
United Kingdom	Pound		460.61						460.61
Alice James:									
France	Euro		454.10						454.10
United Kingdom	Pound		424.68						424.68
Matt Rimkunas:									
France	Euro		437.53						437.53
United Kingdom	Pound		410.34						410.34
Delegation Expenses: *									
France	Euro				720.88	1,003.77			1,724.65
United Kingdom	Pound					442.28			442.28
Senator Jeanne Shaheen:									
United States	Dollar				5,184.26				5,184.26
Poland	Zloty		249.92						249.92
Delegation Expenses: *									
Poland	Zloty					244.14			244.14

May 8, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 163, Pt. 6

7621

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas Goffus:									
United States	Dollar				14,376.66				14,376.66
Cyprus	Euro		279.04						279.04
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		754.67						754.67
Qatar	Riyal		387.45						387.45
Jordan	Dinar		880.84						880.84
Lebanon	Pound		165.00						165.00
Adam Barker:									
United States	Dollar				15,321.96				15,321.96
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		753.45						753.45
Qatar	Riyal		361.76						361.76
Jordan	Dinar		820.20						820.20
Lebanon	Pound		136.64						136.64
Mariah McNamara:									
United States	Dollar				13,472.96				13,472.96
Cyprus	Euro		296.49						296.49
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		864.85						864.85
Qatar	Riyal		385.62						385.62
Jordan	Dinar		844.73						844.73
Lebanon	Pound		71.92						71.92
Delegation Expenses: *									
Cyprus	Euro						173.08		173.08
United Arab Emirates	Dirham				381.16				381.16
Qatar	Riyal						31.25		31.25
Jordan	Dinar				125.01		40.56		165.57
Lebanon	Pound						6,722.76		6,722.76
ThucMinh Nguyen:									
United States	Dollar				11,107.55				11,107.55
South Korea	Won		503.02						503.02
Japan	Yen		743.71						743.71
Delegation Expenses: *									
South Korea	Won				544.74				544.74
Japan	Yen				1,182.00		174.00		1,356.00
Total			61,277.98		296,424.34		57,804.41		415,506.73

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR JOHN McCAIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, May 2, 2017.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES AMENDED FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Joe Donnelly:									
United States	Dollar				10,332.50				10,332.50
Kuwait	Dinar		340.97						340.97
Iraq	Dinar		70.00						70.00
South Korea	Won		469.91						469.91
China	Renminbi		245.59						245.59
Rachel Lipsey:									
United States	Dollar				10,332.50				10,332.50
Kuwait	Dinar		332.97						332.97
South Korea	Won		599.91						599.91
China	Renminbi		241.77						241.77
Total			2,301.12		20,665.00				22,966.12

SENATOR JOHN McCAIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, May 2, 2017.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES AMENDED FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2016

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Joe Donnelly:									
United States	Dollar				13,115.16				13,115.16
Israel	New Shekel		436.00						436.00
Pakistan	Rupee		21.69						21.69
Afghanistan	Afghani		23.26						23.26
Total			480.95		13,115.16				13,596.11

SENATOR JOHN McCAIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, May 2, 2017.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES AMENDED FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2016

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Joe Donnelly:									
United States	Dollar				13,200.96				13,200.96
Georgia	Lari		380.70						380.70
Slovakia	Euro		403.70						403.70
Rachel Lipsey:									
United States	Dollar				13,024.56				13,024.56
Georgia	Lari		380.70						380.70
Slovakia	Euro		403.71						403.71
Total			1,568.81		26,225.52				27,794.33

SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, May 2, 2017.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Thune:									
Germany	Euro		269.00						269.00
France	Euro		315.00						315.00
United Kingdom	Pound		499.50						499.50
Senator Roy Blunt:									
Canada	Dollar		312.00						312.00
Sean Farrell:									
United States	Dollar				814.81				814.81
Canada	Dollar		200.00						200.00
Melissa Brickell:									
United States	Dollar				4,434.90				4,434.90
Colombia	Peso		843.22						843.22
Chile	Peso		288.00						288.00
Peru	Sol		924.34						924.34
Bryan Gulley:									
United States	Dollar				4,894.90				4,894.90
Colombia	Peso		865.57						865.57
Chile	Peso		288.00						288.00
Peru	Sol		1,029.75						1,029.75
Delegation Expenses: *									
France	Euro					705.54			705.54
United Kingdom	Pound					526.51			526.51
Canada	Dollar					330.81			330.81
Colombia	Peso					457.20			457.20
Chile	Peso					622.70			622.70
Peru	Sol					981.12			981.12
Total			5,834.38		10,144.61		3,623.88		19,602.87

SENATOR JOHN THUNE,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, May 1, 2017.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Michael Bennet:									
Cuba	Peso		1,162.17						1,162.17
Colombia	Peso		544.02						544.02
Maria Mahler-Haug:									
Cuba	Peso		1,156.67						1,156.67
Colombia	Peso		544.02						544.02
Douglas Petersen:									
Chile	Peso		417.80						417.80
United States	Dollar				11,580.16				11,580.16
Anderson Heiman:									
Chile	Peso		417.80						417.80
United States	Dollar				8,947.16				8,947.16
Delegation Expenses: *									
United States	Dollar					11.49			11.49
Everett Eissenstat:									
Ireland	Euro		1,463.39						1,463.39
United States	Dollar				9,995.96				9,995.96
Shane Warren:									
Ireland	Euro		1,467.87						1,467.87
United States	Dollar				10,332.26				10,332.26
Anmol Khosla:									
Ireland	Euro		1,355.42						1,355.42
United States	Dollar				9,995.96				9,995.96
John Coughlan:									
Ireland	Euro		1,332.99						1,332.99
United States	Dollar				10,332.26				10,332.26
Delegation Expenses: *									
United States	Dollar					5,362.00			5,362.00
Christopher Campbell:									
United Kingdom	Pound		864.00						864.00
United States	Dollar				6,874.60				6,874.60
Delegation Expenses: *									
United States	Dollar					420.00			420.00

May 8, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 163, Pt. 6

7623

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Tyler Brace:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		1,607.15						1,607.15
United States	Dollar				9,341.46				9,341.46
Delegation Expenses: *									
United States	Dollar						1,002.71		1,002.71
Total			12,333.30		77,399.82		6,796.20		96,529.32

* Delegation Expenses include Embassy overtime, transportation, as well as official expenses in accordance with the responsibilities of the host country.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, May 3, 2017.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Ben Cardin:									
Mexico	Peso		857.93						857.93
Debbie Yamada:									
Mexico	Peso		984.22						984.22
Sean Bartlett:									
Mexico	Peso		896.67						896.67
Brandon Yoder:									
Mexico	Peso		958.00						958.00
Senator Edward Markey:									
Mexico	Peso		846.37						846.37
Mark Gallagher:									
Mexico	Peso		815.92						815.92
Senator Jeff Merkley:									
Mexico	Peso		858.05						858.05
Jeremiah Baumann:									
Mexico	Peso		874.81						874.81
Delegation Expenses: *									
Mexico	Peso						3,298.00		3,298.00
Senator Bob Corker:									
Kuwait	Dinar		291.46						291.46
Lebanon	Lebanese Pound		171.13						171.13
Italy	Euro		307.91						307.91
United States	Dollar				12,910.56				12,910.56
Todd Womack:									
Lebanon	Lebanese Pound		153.00						153.00
Italy	Euro		403.53						403.53
United States	Dollar				9,416.06				9,416.06
David Kinzler:									
Kuwait	Dinar		465.56						465.56
Iraq	Dollar		36.00						36.00
Lebanon	Lebanese Pound		705.00						705.00
Italy	Euro		453.53						453.53
United States	Dollar				12,942.76				12,942.76
Delegation Expenses: *									
Kuwait	Dinar						281.06		281.06
Iraq	Dollar						4,150.00		4,150.00
Lebanon	Lebanese Pound						15,224.10		15,224.10
Senator Tim Kaine:									
Italy	Euro		478.77						478.77
United States	Dollar				574.40				574.40
Nicole Porreca:									
Italy	Euro		645.51						645.51
England	Pound		523.00						523.00
United States	Dollar				2,213.86				2,213.86
Delegation Expenses: *									
Italy	Euro						110.22		110.22
Senator Christopher Murphy:									
Germany	Euro		748.30						748.30
United States	Dollar				5,521.56				5,521.56
Jessica Elledge:									
Germany	Euro		890.30						890.30
United States	Dollar				7,346.66				7,346.66
Delegation Expenses: *									
Germany	Euro						7,044.75		7,044.75
Senator Tom Udall:									
Cuba	CUC		1,365.50						1,365.50
Colombia	Peso		716.00						716.00
Matthew Padilla:									
Cuba	CUC		1,365.50						1,365.50
Colombia	Peso		671.00						671.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Cuba	CUC						1,158.83		1,158.83
Colombia	Peso						512.60		512.60
Brooke Eisele:									
Norway	Krone		619.00						619.00
United States	Dollar				1,684.26				1,684.26
Heather Flynn:									
Kenya	Shilling		819.86						819.86
Tanzania	Shilling		1,027.00						1,027.00
United States	Dollar				6,943.56				6,943.56
Delegation Expenses: *									
Tanzania	Shilling						288.00		288.00
Damian Murphy:									
Romania	Romanian New Lev		526.03						526.03
Bulgaria	Lev		734.03						734.03
United States	Dollar				1,942.96				1,942.96
Delegation Expenses: *									
Romania	Romanian New Lev						265.00		265.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Bulgaria	Lev						65.89		65.89
David Andrew Olson:									
Ireland	Euro		384.00						384.00
United Kingdom	British Pound		855.58						855.58
Belgium	Euro		782.21						782.21
United States	Dollar				3,330.46				3,330.46
Ben Purser:									
Ireland	Euro		384.00						384.00
United Kingdom	British Pound		855.58						855.58
Belgium	Euro		824.21						824.21
United States	Dollar				3,330.46				3,330.46
Delegation Expenses: *									
Ireland	Euro						1,062.00		1,062.00
United Kingdom	British Pound						872.55		872.55
Belgium	Euro						1,978.03		1,978.03
Michael Phelan:									
Uganda	Shilling		730.00						730.00
Kenya	Shilling		1,149.99						1,149.99
United States	Dollar				3,703.00				3,703.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Kenya	Shilling						1,050.00		1,050.00
Sarah Ramig:									
Colombia	Peso		787.02						787.02
Chile	Peso		251.50						251.50
Peru	Sol		251.50						251.50
United States	Dollar				4,398.90				4,398.90
Delegation Expenses: *									
Colombia	Peso						228.60		228.60
Chile	Peso						306.03		306.03
Peru	Sol						424.00		424.00
Total			28,464.48		76,259.46		38,319.66		143,043.60

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Apr. 26, 2017.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Lamar Alexander:									
Italy	Euro		976.06						976.06
Jordan	Dinar		405.41						405.41
Israel	Shekel		1,136.00						1,136.00
Austria	Euro		1,720.81						1,720.81
Sarah Fairchild:									
Italy	Euro		581.46						581.46
Jordan	Dinar		405.41						405.41
Israel	Shekel		1,136.00						1,136.00
Austria	Euro		1,720.81						1,720.81
Delegation Expenses: *									
Italy	Euro						136.83		136.83
Jordan	Dinar						763.09		763.09
Israel	Shekel						7,016.65		7,016.65
Austria	Euro						3,799.04		3,799.04
Total			8,081.96				11,715.61		19,797.57

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384 and S. Res. 179, agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR LAMAR ALEXANDER,
Chairman, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions,
Apr. 13, 2017.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Joske Bautista:									
United States	Dollar				4,894.90				4,894.90
Peru	Sol		1,094.00						1,094.00
Chile	Peso		288.00						288.00
Colombia	Peso		884.00						884.00
Lydia Westlake:									
United States	Dollar				4,533.90				4,533.90
Peru	Sol		352.56						352.56
Chile	Peso		311.74						311.74
Colombia	Peso		865.57						865.57
Delegation Expenses: *									
Peru	Sol						2,120.00		2,120.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Chile	Peso						1,530.19		1,530.19
Delegation Expenses: *									
Colombia	Peso						1,143.00		1,143.00

May 8, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 163, Pt. 6

7625

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Ron Johnson:									
United States	Dollar				13,018.66				13,018.66
Belgium	Euro		705.67						705.67
Lydia Westlake:									
United States	Dollar				13,018.66				13,018.66
Belgium	Euro		705.67						705.67
Total			5,207.21		35,466.12		4,793.19		45,466.52

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR RON JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security & Governmental Affairs,
Apr. 24, 2017.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Amy Klobuchar:									
United States	Dollar				12,375.56				12,375.56
Estonia	Euro		243.83						243.83
Latvia	Euro		220.93						220.93
Ukraine	Hryvnia		851.63						851.63
Georgia	Lari		226.35						226.35
Lithuania	Euro		281.29						281.29
Lindsey Kerr:									
United States	Dollar				12,375.56				12,375.56
Estonia	Euro		243.83						243.83
Latvia	Euro		220.93						220.93
Ukraine	Hryvnia		851.63						851.63
Georgia	Lari		226.35						226.35
Lithuania	Euro		349.13						349.13
Delegation Expenses: *									
Estonia	Euro						276.62		276.62
Latvia	Euro						760.04		760.04
Ukraine	Hryvnia						1,682.62		1,682.62
Georgia	Lari						419.03		419.03
Denmark	Krone						380.20		380.20
Lithuania	Euro						33.04		33.04
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse:									
Germany	Euro		740.30						740.30
Senator Amy Klobuchar:									
Germany	Euro		740.30						740.30
Christopher Mewett:									
Germany	Euro		779.30						779.30
Delegation Expenses: *									
Germany	Euro						10,567.14		10,567.14
Total			5,975.80		24,751.12		14,118.69		44,845.61

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR CHUCK GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, May 3, 2017.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Meridith West:									
United States	Dollar				23,729.02				23,729.02
South Africa	Rand		1,576.56						1,576.56
John Sandy:									
United States	Dollar				24,731.22				24,731.22
South Africa	Rand		1,576.55						1,576.55
Delegation Expenses: *									
South Africa	Rand						331.82		331.82
Total			3,153.11		48,460.24		331.82		51,945.17

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship,
Apr. 26, 2017.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Richard Burr:			530.00		4,320.06				530.00
Chris Joyner:			530.00		4,320.06				530.00
Christian Cook:			530.00		4,320.06				530.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Hayden Milberg:							500.00		500.00
Jon Rosenwasser:			1,051.00						1,051.00
			708.65		13,568.36				708.65
									13,568.36
Ryan Tully:			1,051.00		13,533.36				1,051.00
			708.65						708.65
									13,533.36
Delegation Expenses: *			1,051.00		13,568.36				1,051.00
							1,847.03		1,847.03
Senator Richard Burr:			407.00						407.00
			499.50						499.50
Senator Marco Rubio:			407.00						407.00
					4,042.56				4,042.56
							600.00		600.00
Senator Mark Warner:							600.00		600.00
Matt Pollard:			407.00						407.00
			499.50						499.50
Senator Mark Warner:			2,067.01		15,606.66				2,067.01
									15,606.66
Mike Pevzner:			1,978.00		15,235.06				1,978.00
									15,235.06
Delegation Expenses: *							204.95		204.95
Tara McFeely:			298.19						298.19
			327.00						327.00
			472.00		18,297.26				472.00
									18,297.26
Ryan White:			295.19						295.19
			327.00						327.00
			472.00		17,805.76				472.00
									17,805.76
Randy Bookout:			350.19						350.19
			327.00		17,787.66				327.00
									17,787.66
Delegation Expenses: *							13,287.88		13,287.88
John Matchison:			296.00						296.00
			526.10		24,361.82				526.10
									24,361.82
Nate Adler:			396.00						396.00
			626.00		23,265.48				626.00
									23,265.48
Nick Basciano:			289.10						289.10
			370.50		8,053.86				370.50
									8,053.86
Ryan Kaldahl:			285.60						285.60
			368.00		8,053.86				368.00
									8,053.86
Delegation Expenses: *							614.85		614.85
Senator Richard Burr:			405.41						405.41
			125.00						125.00
			568.00		2,993.80				568.00
									2,993.80
Senator Tom Cotton:			305.41						305.41
			25.00						25.00
			564.70		2,993.80				564.70
									2,993.80
Senator James Lankford:			405.41						405.41
			125.00						125.00
			568.00		2,993.80				568.00
									2,993.80
Senator Marco Rubio:			405.41						405.41
			125.00						125.00
			380.00		6,594.38				380.00
									6,594.38
Senator John Cornyn:			405.41						405.41
			125.00						125.00

May 8, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 163, Pt. 6

7627

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Christian Cook:					7,028.26				7,028.26
			405.41						405.41
			125.00						125.00
			568.00						568.00
					2,993.80				2,993.80
David Hanke:			315.41						315.41
			125.00						125.00
			559.20						559.20
					2,993.80				2,993.80
Ryan Tully:			405.41						405.41
			220.00						220.00
			568.00						568.00
					2,904.00				2,904.00
Brian Walsh:			405.41						405.41
			220.00						220.00
			568.00						568.00
					2,993.80				2,993.80
Emily Harding:			381.61						381.61
			160.00						160.00
			568.00						568.00
					2,904.00				2,904.00
Delegation Expenses: *							20,456.75		20,456.75
Total			28,578.38		243,533.68		38,111.46		310,223.52

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR RICHARD BURR,
Chairman, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, May 3, 2017.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Roger Wicker:									
Italy	Euro		976.00						976.00
Jordan	Dinar		440.00						440.00
Israel	Shekel		1,136.00						1,136.00
Austria	Euro		1,720.81						1,720.81
Ambassador David Killian:									
Italy	Euro		1,094.82						1,094.82
Jordan	Dinar		440.00						440.00
Israel	Shekel		1,136.00						1,136.00
Austria	Euro		2,294.71						2,294.71
United States	Dollar				11,656.46				11,656.46
Paul Massaro:									
Italy	Euro		581.46						581.46
Jordan	Dinar		440.00						440.00
Israel	Shekel		1,136.00						1,136.00
Austria	Euro		1,720.81						1,720.81
Alex Tiersky:									
Italy	Euro		964.01						964.01
Austria	Euro		2,868.00						2,868.00
Everett Price:									
Jordan	Dinar		1,216.23						1,216.23
Israel	Shekel		1,136.00						1,136.00
Austria	Euro		1,720.81						1,720.81
United States	Dollar				2,781.08				2,781.08
Robert Hand:									
Austria	Euro		2,703.00						2,703.00
United States	Dollar				1,746.16				1,746.16
Delegation Expenses: *									
Italy									
Jordan	Dinar						1,770.37		1,770.37
Israel	Shekel						24,895.78		24,895.78
Austria	Euro						17,095.70		17,095.70
Erika Schlager:									
Austria	Euro		1,230.30		12,227.06				13,457.36
Delegation Expenses: *									
Austria	Euro						80.25		80.25
Mischa Thompson:									
Belgium	Euro		2,312.00		2,058.06				4,370.06
The Netherlands	Euro		351.00						351.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Belgium	Euro						235.80		235.80
Total			27,618.02		19,977.82		44,077.90		91,673.74

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR ROGER F. WICKER,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe,
Apr. 18, 2017.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), MAJORITY LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas Hawkins:									
United States	Dollar				18,652.26				18,652.26
Egypt	Pound		222.00						222.00
Jordan	Dinar		810.82						810.82
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		473.00						473.00
Thomas Hawkins:									
United States	Dollar				2,993.80				2,993.80
Lebanon	Pound		212.90						212.90
Jordan	Dinar		358.31						358.31
Israel	New Shekel		520.90						520.90
Total			2,597.93		21,646.06				24,243.99

SENATOR MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, May 4, 2017.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), DEMOCRATIC LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2017

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Dr. Brian Monahan:									
Cuba	Peso		1,252.40						1,252.40
Colombia	Peso		637.00						637.00
Total			1,889.40						1,889.40

SENATOR CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Democratic Leader, Apr. 12, 2017.

AMENDING THE WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 20, S. 140.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 140) to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 140) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 140

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

SECTION 1. USE OF FUNDS IN WMAT SETTLEMENT FUND FOR WMAT RURAL WATER SYSTEM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF WMAT RURAL WATER SYSTEM.—Section 307(a) of the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-291; 124 Stat. 3080) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “, (b)(2),” after “subsections (a)”.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 312(b)(2)(C)(i)(III) of the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water

Rights Quantification Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-291; 124 Stat. 3093) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, including the planning, design, and construction of the WMAT rural water system, in accordance with section 307(a).”.

PROVIDING THAT THE PUEBLO OF SANTA CLARA MAY LEASE FOR 99 YEARS CERTAIN RESTRICTED LAND

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 22, S. 249.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 249) to provide that the pueblo of Santa Clara may lease for 99 years certain restricted land, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 249) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 249

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

SECTION 1. EXPANSION OF PUEBLO OF SANTA CLARA LAND ELIGIBLE FOR 99-YEAR LEASE.

Subsection (a) of the first section of the Act of August 9, 1955 (commonly known as the “Long-Term Leasing Act”) (25 U.S.C. 415(a)), is amended—

(1) by striking “Indians,” and inserting “Indians,”;

(2) by inserting “Ohkay Owingeh pueblo,” after “Cochiti,”;

(3) by inserting “the pueblo of Santa Clara,” after “Pojoaque,”;

(4) by striking “the lands” and inserting “the land”;

(5) by striking “lands held in trust for the Pueblo of Santa Clara,”; and

(6) by striking “lands held in trust for Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo”.

RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NA- TIONAL SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 159, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 159) recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness Month.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered

made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 159) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 9, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, May 9; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Gottlieb nomination, with the time until 12:30 p.m. equally divided in the usual form; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings; finally, that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postclosure on the Gottlieb nomination.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators Thune and Sullivan.

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

The Senator from South Dakota.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it has been said that nothing is certain but death and taxes. To that, nowadays, we might add bad news about ObamaCare because if there is one thing we can count on, it is bad news about this fatally flawed law—high premium costs, huge deductibles, customers losing health plans, customers losing doctors, fewer choices, failed co-ops, unraveling exchanges, and I could go on.

There is no question that our healthcare system had problems before ObamaCare was passed. Clearly reforms were needed. But as the past 7 years have made clear, ObamaCare was not the answer, and this law is rapidly collapsing under its own weight.

Here is a sampling of recent ObamaCare headlines.

This is from Bloomberg: "Thousands of ObamaCare Customers Left Without Options as Insurers Bolt."

This is from CNBC: "Aetna will exit ObamaCare markets in Virginia in 2018, citing expected losses on individual plans this year."

From the Arizona Republic: "Consumers seek relief as 'ObamaCare' rates rise."

From USA TODAY: "Iowa may be without individual health plans if insurer pulls out."

In February of this year, Mark Bertolini, the CEO of health insurance company Aetna, asserted that ObamaCare is in a death spiral. There is good reason to think he is right in that significant losses are driving health insurers out of the exchanges. Last year, Aetna announced that it would withdraw from 11 of the 15 States in which it offered exchange plans, Humana said it would exit several exchanges, and mega-insurer UnitedHealthcare announced that it was pulling out of most of the 34 States in which it offered exchange plans.

Roughly one-third of U.S. counties have just one choice of health insurer on their exchanges for 2017, and the situation looks likely to get much worse next year. In February, health insurer Humana announced its decision to completely withdraw from the ObamaCare exchanges for 2018. Aetna is pulling out of two of the four States in which it will still offer plans in 2018, and it has indicated it may pull back even further. Wellmark is leaving Iowa. UnitedHealthcare is leaving Virginia. Other insurers are contemplating similar exits.

The New York Times reported in March that "ObamaCare Choices Could Go from One to Zero in Some Areas."

"Parts of the country," the Times notes, "are in jeopardy of not having an insurer offering ObamaCare plans next year." The quote goes on: "Many counties already have just one insurer offering health plans in the ObamaCare marketplaces, and some of those solo insurers are showing signs that they are eyeing the exits." That is from the New York Times.

What that means is that tens of thousands of Americans may have ObamaCare subsidies next year without insurance plans to spend them on. As my colleague Senator ALEXANDER, who does so much good work on healthcare as the chairman of the HELP Committee, has said, it is like having a bus ticket in a town with no buses running.

While Americans' health insurance options dwindle, their premiums are rising. Midlevel ObamaCare plans saw an average 25 percent premium increase for 2017—a 25-percent increase for just 1 year, which is on top of years of premium increases under ObamaCare. And what are Americans with those plans paying for? The odds are good that they are paying for plans with limited choices of doctors and hospitals. A 2016 study of 18 States and Washington, DC, found that 75 percent

of their exchange plans for 2017 would likely be health maintenance organizations or exclusive provider organizations—two types of plans that tend to offer narrow provider networks.

In his joint address to Congress at the end of February, the President said of ObamaCare: "Action is not a choice—it is a necessity." He is exactly right. ObamaCare is collapsing, and the status quo is not sustainable. Unless we want millions of Americans to face healthcare disaster, we have to repeal and replace this law.

Last week, the House passed an ObamaCare repeal and replacement bill. This legislation repeals ObamaCare's tax increases, penalties, and mandates and starts the process of restoring control of healthcare to States and individuals.

The House has made a good start, and I am looking forward to getting to build on their bill here in the Senate. I want to make sure we amend the House tax credit to ensure that assistance is better targeted to those who need it the most. I am looking forward to working with my colleagues—Chairman ALEXANDER, Chairman HATCH on the Finance Committee, Policy Committee Chairman BARRASSO, and many others—to make sure we have a bill that will provide the American people with real relief.

ObamaCare was founded on the premise that government knows best when it comes to individuals' healthcare and that a one-size-fits-all solution is somehow the best solution, but we know now that is not the case. Individuals know best, and their doctors know best. Government does not know best. It is absurd to think that a massive Federal bureaucracy can hand down one comprehensive solution that will somehow meet the needs of hundreds of millions of individuals in this country. We need to move control from Washington and give it back to the States so they can embrace healthcare innovations and solutions that work for the individuals and the particular needs in their States.

Republicans are working to implement the kind of healthcare reform the American people are looking for—more affordable, more personal, more flexible, and less bureaucratic. Americans have had enough of ObamaCare's problems. They are ready for healthcare reform that actually works, and we are committed to giving it to them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MINISTERIAL OF THE ARCTIC COUNCIL

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak on a couple of important foreign policy issues.

I begin by talking about what is going to be happening in Alaska in just a few days. Really, the eyes of the world are going to be on Fairbanks, AK—the Golden Heart City in the middle of Alaska's interior—for a major foreign policy event. The United States will be hosting the Ministerial of the Arctic Council and will be passing the chairmanship of that Council over to Finland.

The Arctic Council is an important foreign policy body. It consists of the Arctic countries of the world—the United States, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, and Russia. In just a few days, all of the Foreign Ministers of all of those countries will be in Fairbanks, AK.

This is not the first time in recent memory that the Golden Heart City of Fairbanks has been on the world stage in its hosting of a critical foreign policy meeting of world leaders. In fact, almost exactly 33 years ago to this very day in 1984, on May 2, in Fairbanks, AK, Pope John Paul II and President Ronald Reagan met in Fairbanks. It was a great meeting. You could see the chemistry between these two great world leaders. Right now, some historians believe that it was at the Fairbanks meeting of these two great leaders when the Pope and the great President Ronald Reagan laid out their vision and plans to vanquish global communism.

America is an Arctic nation because of Alaska, and we have very significant, strategic interests in the Arctic—economic opportunity, transportation routes, sea routes that are now beginning to open because of receding sea ice, responsible natural resource development—enormous natural resources of all types, including oil and gas—protecting the environment, and respecting the culture and way of life of the peoples in the Arctic, particularly of the indigenous peoples, including their subsistence hunting rights. After a substantial discussion I had just a couple of days ago with Secretary of State Tillerson about the upcoming ministerial, I am confident this ministerial will focus on these important issues.

In going forward, it is important to remember that right now in the Arctic, there are real people with real lives, real families, and real needs who live in this part of the world. They are my constituents. These are the people I represent. They are resilient, tough, hard-working, and very generous. The world is going to see them this week in their hosting of the Ministerial of the Arctic Council in Fairbanks. I thank all of them for their hard work in preparing for this event, and I thank Secretary Tillerson for rallying all of the

world's Arctic Foreign Ministers to Alaska in the next few days. I will be there to support this very important event.

U.S.-CHINA RELATIONS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, in addition to the Ministerial of the Arctic Council, as I mentioned, the eyes of the world are on this—clearly on the important issue of U.S.-China relations.

We had the recent President Trump and President Xi meeting in Mar-a-Lago, and this week Madam Fu Ying, who is one of the top Chinese Foreign Minister officials, is going to be in Washington to meet with a number of us. It is something I believe this body needs to focus on more, this important issue of U.S.-China relations.

Our country faces a lot of significant national security challenges around the world. In my view, however, the most significant long-term, geostrategic challenge we face is not ISIS, not al-Qaida, not Iran, Russia, or even North Korea. Those are very serious and immediate concerns, but the most significant long-term challenge we face as a country is the rise of China and the threat it poses to the post-World War II international order, led by the United States.

This has been made clear in a series of writings by the well-known and respected Harvard professor, Graham Allison, beginning 2 years ago in 2015. In an article in *The Atlantic* magazine, he started to write about what he called the Thucydides Trap. Professor Allison is set to publish a book this month on the same topic. In the book, he writes that the defining question of global order for this generation is whether China and the United States can escape the Thucydides Trap.

I have had the privilege over the last few weeks to review the book, and I believe it will be a “must read” for those who care about the long-term security and economic interests of the United States.

What is he talking about? What is this issue, the Thucydides Trap? Why has Professor Allison been so focused on writing about it and addressing it?

Thucydides is the famed Greek historian. Many actually view him as the father of all history, who wrote an epic historical work about the Peloponnesian War between Athens and Sparta. In that 30-year war, which devastated both of those Greek city states, the rising power, Athens, challenged the established order of the ruling power, Sparta.

The “Thucydides Trap” is the term Professor Allison describes when he talks about the strategic dilemma and danger that occurs when a rising power threatens a ruling power in the international system. As his new book explores, in the last 500 years when this has happened—because it does happen a

lot in history, and he reviews the last 500 years—of the 16 times this has happened in the last 500 years, 12 of those times ended up having extensive war between the two countries. That is not good. Those are not great odds. Indeed, in his Atlantic article just 2 years ago, he concludes by saying that because of the seismic shifts and friction that is occurring between China and the United States, war between these two countries is more likely than is recognized at the moment. That is not good news.

There is some good news on this because it is not just Harvard professors who are talking about this, such as Professor Allison, who is talking about the Thucydides Trap; so, too, are the Chinese.

I, with a number of Senators, had the opportunity a few years ago, when President Xi Jinping visited the Senate, to meet with him. I went down to the Senate floor to talk about some of the issues, some of the ways in which we need to think about the long-term challenges with regard to the United States and China. The article in the Atlantic had just come out, so I talked about it, the Thucydides Trap, and how we need to avoid it. Then I literally walked into a meeting with the President of China and some other U.S. Senators. In his opening remarks, he talked about the Thucydides Trap and how China and the United States need to avoid it. So that is the good news. At least on that issue, we are on the same sheet of paper.

There is other good news, and that is that this body—the U.S. Senate—in many ways, is the ideal place where we should be discussing, debating, developing, and, yes, implementing the kind of long-term strategic policies we need to address as a country and develop with regard to the rise of China.

In “*The Federalist Papers*,” Madison talks about one of the important roles of the Senate, with its Members having 6-year terms and having significant powers in foreign policy, is to be able to ensure stable and lasting relations between the United States and other nations. Indeed, perhaps more than any other part of the Federal Government, this institution—the U.S. Senate—has the opportunity to act and think and debate and implement policies—strategic policies—for the long-term interests of our Nation.

Contrary to some conventional wisdom, where we only hear about American “short-termism,” in terms of long-term foreign policy issues, our country actually has a history of developing long-term strategic frameworks that address significant challenges to America's security and economic interests. Just think of the Monroe Doctrine in the 19th century or George Kennan's strategy of containment in the 20th century, dealing with the threat posed by the rise of the Soviet

Union and global communism. These were long-term, successful strategies for the United States in response to significant challenges facing our Nation, in part developed here in the U.S. Senate and implemented here, and we can do it with regard to the challenges we are facing now with China.

So as we work with the executive branch on developing an American strategy to address the rise of China and to avoid the Thucydides Trap, how should we be thinking about it? What principles should we be focused on? Let me suggest four that we should be focused on as a nation.

First, we must recognize and emphasize that the United States is an Asia-Pacific power; second, we must strengthen, deepen, and expand our comprehensive alliances with the Asia-Pacific region; third, we must engage with, not try to contain, China; and fourth—and perhaps most importantly—we must renew America's strength, particularly the economic power and vitality of this great Nation.

I will turn to each of these principles in a bit more detail. As I mentioned first, America is an Asia-Pacific power, and we must push back on narratives or counterstrategies being developed in the region that talk about Asia for Asians, which are veiled attempts to try to exclude the United States from this dynamic region in the future, in the orders being developed in the Asia-Pacific.

Just look at this map. Geographically, we clearly are an Asia-Pacific nation. A few of us, about a month and a half ago, had the opportunity, when Prime Minister Abe was visiting, to have breakfast with him, and I reminded the Prime Minister at the breakfast that not only are they a key ally of ours in the Asia-Pacific, but for me, as an Alaskan, they are also a neighbor. Just look at this map. I reminded the Prime Minister that my hometown of Anchorage is actually closer to Tokyo than it is to Washington, DC, and having just gotten off the plane from Anchorage, I can tell you it is a lot closer.

When we think of our forces, whether in Alaska or Guam or Hawaii, we look at this map, and on U.S. territory, Alaska forces, based in my great State, are, for the most part, closer to the Korean Peninsula than forces based in Australia. So, clearly, geographically, we are an Asia-Pacific country.

Of course, American history has been embedded in the Asia-Pacific for centuries. During World War II, the United States led the effort to win the war in the Pacific after the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the bombing of Alaska, which was bombed, invaded, and occupied by the forces of Imperial Japan. Many Americans are not familiar with that history of the war.

It is not just geographic proximity and the battles we fought to win World

War II in the Asia-Pacific, just as important, in terms of our heritage as an Asia-Pacific nation, are the policies we implemented after World War II because it is now clear the United States has underwritten the peace, prosperity, and security of this entire region through our continued military presence, our alliances, and our economic engagement and power in the region.

No country has done more than the United States to make the Asia-Pacific the world's most dynamic and economically vibrant region, and it has been the policies of our great Nation over 70 years that have led to that. By the way, no country has benefited more from the established order that we put forward and established in this region than China, with the rise of China, in many ways, helped, encouraged, and moved forward by the peace and prosperity we brought to the region.

Let me provide just one example of how the U.S. military forces in the region have played the key role in helping keep the relative peace. Our enduring naval presence has helped to keep the sealanes, where all of this transportation and commerce and economic growth has occurred, in the Asia-Pacific. That has been the U.S. Navy, for decades, doing that. As I mentioned, all nations of the region—ours included—have benefited from this order, and from our policies, and our commitment and our sacrifice. All nations—including and particularly true, China has.

So we must flatly and completely reject policies being developed in the region or in Washington that forget our geography and our history. The United States is an Asia-Pacific power. The United States is the preeminent Asia-Pacific power, but many of America's core national interests are at stake in the region, and we will be an enduring presence in this part of the world for decades and centuries to come.

Second, with regard to how to address the rise of China and the principles we need to think about, we must continue to strengthen, deepen, and expand our comprehensive set of alliances in the Asia-Pacific region that have been built over decades. Now, the United States faces many global challenges, but one of the most critical strategic advantages that we have as a nation, in terms of security, is that we are an ally-rich nation and our adversaries and potential adversaries and competitors are ally-poor. Just think about it. Look at this map. Look through and think through all of the countries that are either treaty allies of the United States or wanting to get closer, and then think of other countries, including China, Russia, North Korea, Iran—all ally-poor. This is particularly the case in Europe and the Asia-Pacific. As I mentioned, these alliance systems have been built over decades by Democratic and Republican administrations, and what we need to

emphasize now is we should not squander them.

It is also the case—and we are seeing and hearing about it literally almost every day, whether it is countries like Russia or, yes, China that are constantly looking for opportunities to create schisms and tensions between the United States and its longstanding allies. We need to resist that, we need to be aware of that, and we need to focus on our allies. As Winston Churchill famously said, the only thing worse than going to war with allies is doing so without them. With regard to the Asia-Pacific, we have an opportunity to not just deepen existing alliances with critical countries like Japan and Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, Philippines, and Thailand, we also have a unique opportunity to expand our alliances in the region of the Asia-Pacific with countries like Vietnam and India.

In my first couple of years in the Senate, I have had the opportunity to travel in the region several times—in fact, every time I go home, I travel in the region—and meet with many of the leaders in the Asia-Pacific when they come to Washington or when we are in the region. It is clear to me there is a deep interest in many countries to strengthen their economic and security relationships with the United States. This is driven, in part, by the role we have played over decades as the force in the region that has kept the peace and promoted prosperity, but this is also driven by concerns of almost every country in the region about China's increasingly aggressive actions, particularly in the South China Sea, where, despite pledges from senior Chinese leaders not to militarize that part of the world—not to militarize that critical crossroads of commerce for the entire world—they clearly are doing it. For a country that in many ways is renowned for taking the long view—for having the ability to see around the corners of history—China's actions are having the effect of driving more and more countries into the American sphere. We should seize this opportunity, while recognizing that the productive work, the hard work of maintaining our alliances in the region takes time, takes patience, perseverance, respect, and consistency.

To be honest, I was a bit concerned—and I gave some speeches last year about this—that given some of last year's campaign rhetoric, the Trump administration would not emphasize the importance of our allies and not undertake the hard but necessary work of deepening and expanding key strategic relationships, but I think, to the contrary, they are off to a very good start. The Secretary of Defense, General Mattis, in his first trip overseas as the new Secretary of Defense, could have gone anywhere, including NATO, the Middle East, where we have critical

strategic interests, but he chose to go to Japan and Korea to cement these critical alliances. The Vice President just got back from a 10-day trip to Japan, to Korea, to Australia, and to Indonesia, with stops in the States representing the Asia-Pacific, including my home State of Alaska and Hawaii, along the way.

I had a good discussion with the Vice President recently over dinner. We talked mostly about this and how focused he and the administration were on maintaining and deepening our alliances in the region, but still we can always improve, especially in terms of making sure we are coordinating closely with all of our allies on critical decisions and that we keep surprises, especially on sensitive strategic issues, to a minimum with regard to our allies. In this regard, President Trump's recent statement that South Korea would have to pay for the THAAD missile system that we are deploying in South Korea, after the U.S. had previously stated we would pay, was an unforced error that I hope the administration will be learning from.

Of course, this body, the U.S. Senate, also has an important role to play, not only in emphasizing and helping maintain our alliances by meeting with leaders around the world and working with them but also in bolstering the capabilities of our partners in the region, economically and militarily.

Right now, there are initiatives that are doing just that, coming out of the Armed Services Committee on which I sit. One is the Asia-Pacific Stability Initiative, led by Senator MCCAIN, which would do that—increase our capabilities with our partners in the region to deepen our alliances.

Our alliances clearly matter. They matter in our long-term strategy to address the rise of China. But, of course, so does our relationship with China. That is the third principle I would like to discuss.

We must continue to engage with China, not seek to contain it, as some have argued. In fact, when we look at the U.S. relationship with China, ever since Secretary of State Kissinger and President Nixon in the early 1970s began having discussions with China's leadership, America's policy toward China has always been about engaging. It has never been about containing, as our strategy was with regard to the Soviet Union.

Of course, it has taken different forms. We had the One China policy, which we are still focused on, and the Taiwan Relations Act, which was developed by this body in the U.S. Senate in the late 1970s. We had recently initiated by President Bush and continued by President Obama the strategic economic dialogue where senior leaders in the United States and China met every 6 months. I had the opportunity to participate in that as an Assistant Sec-

retary of State under Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice.

There are all kinds of different approaches to our engagement. In my view, the most strategic concept since the One China policy was the policy developed during the Bush administration by former Deputy Secretary of State Bob Zoellick, who went on to be the president of the World Bank. What he called the responsible stakeholder model was very well-received initially in 2006. He laid it out in a big speech, then went to China and focused on this.

Essentially, the essence of that strategy was that China has greatly benefited from the U.S.-led international order, from the U.S.-led international system; therefore, it is in China's interest to become a responsible stakeholder in that system, to strengthen the international system that has so greatly enabled its own economic success.

In the early days of the strategy, when it was launched, there was a lot of promise. I remember having the opportunity to go to China with Secretary Paulson when he was leading the strategic economic dialogue in the Bush administration. We would meet with all the leadership of China, from the President on down. At that time, every leader in these meetings used the term "responsible stakeholder." They talked about it; they talked about this American concept as a framework for our relationship.

Unfortunately, it doesn't seem to be working out so well now. Chinese officials no longer talk about being a responsible stakeholder. In fact, on many military and economic issues, they seem focused on undermining the U.S.-led international order. Professor Allison's book mentions this specifically, where he says an increasingly powerful China is unraveling the American-led order, throwing into question the peace that generations in the region have taken for granted.

When we look at the long arch of history with regard to China, this notion that maybe they wouldn't accept this idea of becoming a responsible stakeholder in our system that we created—that might not happen. Indeed, this was foretold by one of the wisest men in Asia, Lee Kuan Yew, who was the father of Singapore. Decade after decade as he built that country into an economic powerhouse, American leaders—military leaders, political leaders, Presidents, Democrats, Republicans—would meet with Lee Kuan Yew to get his advice and wisdom.

I had the opportunity as a young National Security Council staffer to be invited to a meeting with Lee Kuan Yew when I was in Singapore—one of the most interesting meetings of my career—with Deputy Secretary Bob Zoellick and our Ambassador. Lee Kuan Yew talked about Asia and about America's role for 2 hours.

But in another book about Lee Kuan Yew by Professor Allison, he was asked about whether China would accept this idea of being a responsible stakeholder in the American-led international order. His answer was: Of course not.

Why not? How could they aspire not to be No. 1 in Asia and in time No. 1 in the world?

When asked about this concept of being a responsible stakeholder in this system which has benefited them, Lee Kuan Yew was complimentary of the concept that the Americans were trying to lay out, but he said: China wants to be China and, as such, not an honorary member of the West and their international system.

So even though it is clear that the responsible stakeholder framework is not working with China, we still need to stay engaged at all levels—senior leaders, economic officials, military leaders. I want to compliment the President on how he started the relationship with President Xi Jinping. They seem to be off to a good start.

At the same time, we need to continue to look at different concepts, different frameworks of how we continue to engage with China. Let me suggest one idea that I have termed "true reciprocity."

As China has rejected the responsible stakeholder model, it is also clear they are increasingly rejecting the idea of a reciprocal relationship with the United States across a number of sectors. Let me give a couple examples.

We look at issues like intellectual property theft. The United States has been raising this issue for decades. As a matter of fact, I had the opportunity to sit in a meeting with former President Bush, Condoleezza Rice, and senior Chinese officials in the Oval Office. We talked about this issue. The President pounded the table on this issue. The Chinese committed not to steal our intellectual property. Yet that continues unabated, now often through cyber attacks.

We look at foreign direct investment, how Chinese companies invest in Europe and the United States, how they are buying companies such as advanced robotics, biotech, media, high-tech companies, internet companies. But if an American company or a Western European company wanted to do the same in China, we know what the answer would be. It would be no.

This lack of economic reciprocity extends beyond the trading relationship. I attended a briefing a few weeks ago in the Senate by the Asia Society, which is putting out an important strategy document with regard to China—ideas for the Trump administration, a very thoughtful policy recommendation piece.

One thing they noted in terms of diplomacy: Right now in Beijing, our U.S. Ambassador is typically getting only deputy minister-level access, deputy minister-level meetings, while

back here we give much higher access to ministers to the Secretary of State. This was essentially confirmed by former President Obama's own Ambassador, former Senator Max Baucus, who, in a remarkable exit interview about his time as Ambassador to China—a job he loved—talked about how, in many ways, in terms of reciprocity, we were too weak, not firm enough, pushed around. These are his quotes. It was an interview that actually didn't make a lot of news but was quite remarkable—how we had no strategy to deal with this, how we needed to draw our own redlines.

As we develop a long-term strategy toward China to avoid the Thucydides Trap, we need to institute an engagement policy which looks at true reciprocity. I will be speaking about this more in the coming weeks, and I am going to be offering legislation with regard to reciprocity in the economic and trade relationship. But I will say, diplomatically speaking, this should be a no-brainer. If our Ambassador in Beijing gets only deputy minister-level access to Chinese officials in China's capital, then that is what we should provide China's Ambassador here. It is simple, easy.

The final principle we need to focus on in developing our long-term strategy to address the rise of China is the imperative to renew America's strength, particularly the economic power and vitality of the United States. We have to be strong at home again, and we haven't been.

I have a chart here that says it all. Over the last, really, 10 to 15 years, we have a lost decade of economic growth. We have not been able to hit 3 percent GDP growth in almost 15 years. Some have called this the new normal; this is what we should expect. But in many ways, when we look at this chart—Republican, Democratic administrations—the 3-percent line here is not a great number. It is an OK number. The traditional numbers of economic growth are closer to 4 percent for our country. But literally, in almost 15 years, we haven't hit it—not once. President Obama was the first President who never hit 3 percent GDP growth in a year, ever.

This is not a healthy economy, and in many ways people are starting to question the American dream, the idea that each generation will be better. We have to get back to a strong economy. I certainly hope the Trump administration will be focusing on this. I know that many Members of this body are focused on this issue.

Last quarter we didn't have a good start with the new administration—0.7 percent GDP growth, less than 1 percent growth. Economic growth, even more than military might, in many ways is the coin of the realm in Asia. We must get back to a robust economy.

Many experts at home and abroad say we can't do it. They say our demo-

graphic challenges are too great, but I disagree. If we look at U.S. history, every time we are dismissed, every time someone talks about the decline of the great American engine of growth, whether in the 1930s or in the 1970s or beginning in the 1980s when Japan was going to overtake us—every time that has happened and the naysayers are out there, the U.S. economy comes roaring back. It is critical that we do this now.

We have so many strategic advantages, even relative to China, with regard to our economy. So many of our challenges, in my view, are self-inflicted problems that we can solve.

Strong economic growth—at least about 3 percent—will more closely bind our allies to the United States in the Asia-Pacific region.

Strong economic growth will help us rebuild our military, which has been drastically cut over the last 8 years. Strong economic growth will be critical to tackling our challenges at home, such as skyrocketing deficits and debt levels and crumbling infrastructure. Perhaps, most importantly, strong economic growth will enable us to view the future, including the rise of China, with confidence and not fear.

Our great Nation succeeds when we look to the future with opportunity, not with trepidation. In Professor Allison's upcoming book, currently titled "Destined for War: Can America and China Escape Thucydides's Trap," he notes that fear was the driving force that propelled Athens and Sparta into the Peloponnesian War. "What made war inevitable," Thucydides tells us, was the rise of Athens and the fear this instilled in Sparta.

In the 12 of 16 cases he reviews in his book where a rising power challenged an established power leading to war, fear was a key driving force that often precipitated war. The more our policies at home can renew America's strength, vitality, and confidence, the more likely in my view it is that we will develop clear, long-term foreign policies that can help us avoid the Thucydides Trap.

I have had the opportunity in my career to view the U.S.-China relationship over the past two decades from a variety of different lenses and perspectives. Over 20 years ago, I was deployed as a young marine infantry officer as part of an amphibious task force to what later became known as the Third Taiwan Strait Crisis, defending U.S. interests in the region and those of our ally Taiwan.

Later, I was an NSC staffer and an Assistant Secretary of State under Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, and I spent a lot of time in China working on these issues. I became a State of Alaska official, traveling for my State as the commissioner of natural resources and energy. I have traveled to China to pursue the promise of better economic relations. China is now the

No. 1 market for my very export-oriented State, for Alaska exports. Now, as a U.S. Senator, I am focused on this issue and cochairing the U.S.-China working group with my good friend Senator DAINES and getting out to the region as often as possible.

I have seen the promise, opportunity, and challenges of the U.S.-China relationship as it has matured over the last 20 years, and I have deep respect for China, its history, and all that it has recently accomplished. I know some of the leaders there and consider them colleagues.

This body, the Senate, and our country need to do more to focus on how to make sure that the rise of China is compatible with U.S. economic and national security interests and, most importantly, with the interests of the people we represent.

I have laid out some core principles this evening on how we might begin to develop a coherent, long-term strategy and address the challenges and opportunities of China's rise. I hope my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans—will work together over the years on this incredibly important issue. There is so much at stake and a lot of work to do by many in the governments, the private sector, and the military—both in the United States and in China and in the countries of the region.

The gravitational pull of history might be working against us. There is a lot riding on how we address this pre-eminent geostrategic issue.

Let me conclude by reading how Professor Allison, in his book, sums up the challenge. He states:

The return to prominence of a 5,000-year-old civilization with 1.4 billion people is not a problem to be fixed. It is a condition—a chronic condition that will have to be managed over a generation. Success will require not just a new slogan, more frequent presidential summits, or additional meetings of departmental working groups. Managing this relationship without war will demand sustained attention, week by week, at the highest levels in both governments. It will require a depth of mutual understanding not seen since the Henry Kissinger-Zhou Enlai conversations that reestablished US-China relations in the 1970s. Most significant, it will mean more radical changes in attitudes and actions by leaders and the public alike than anyone yet has undertaken. To escape Thucydides's Trap, we must be willing to think the unthinkable—and imagine the unimaginable. Avoiding Thucydides's Trap in this case will require nothing less than bending the arc of history.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:31 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 9, 2017, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
MATTHEW BASSETT, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE JIM R. ESQUEA.

THE JUDICIARY

AMY CONEY BARRETT, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT, VICE JOHN DANIEL TINDER, RETIRED.

JOHN KENNETH BUSH, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT, VICE DANNY J. BOGGS, RETIRED.

JOAN LOUISE LARSEN, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT, VICE DAVID W. MCKEAGUE, RETIRED.

KEVIN CHRISTOPHER NEWSOM, OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT, VICE JOEL F. DUBINA, RETIRED.

DAVID C. NYE, OF IDAHO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO, VICE EDWARD J. LODGE, RETIRED.

SCOTT L. PALK, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA, VICE STEPHEN P. PRIOT, RETIRED.

DAMIAN MICHAEL SCHIFF, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE GEORGE W. MILLER, RETIRED.

DAVID RYAN STRAS, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT, VICE DIANA E. MURPHY, RETIRED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624, 3037, AND 3064:

To be brigadier general

COL. SUSAN K. ARNOLD
COL. JOSEPH B. BERGER III
COL. ROBERT P. HUSTON

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. RICHARD J. LEBEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. TODD W. LEWIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be brigadier general

COL. GEORGE N. APPENZELLER
COL. TELITA CROSLAND

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEVEN R. RUDDER

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

JAMES E. THOMPSON

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

PABLO F. DIAZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

CRAIG A. NAZARETH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

BRIAN C. MCLEAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

RAYMOND C. CASTELINE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DANIEL J. SHANK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

CHRISTOPHER W. DEGN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JASON T. KIDDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

TITO M. VILLANUEVA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 4333(B) AND 4336(A):

To be lieutenant colonel

PHILIP J. DACUNTO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

STEPHEN R. NOVEMBER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

LUISA SANTIAGO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBERT J. BONNER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

JUANITO F. BOYDON, JR.
MICHAEL J. MONAGHAN
DANA M. MUCHOW
MICHAEL S. RICHMAN
ELMER L. ROMAN
SURESH K. THADHANI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

ANTHONY L. BAYUNGAN
TASYA Y. LACY
MICHAEL A. LEACHMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

TODD M. BOLAND
DEWUAN L. BOOKER
TODD M. BRUEMER
JOHN S. CHRISTENSEN
JOHN P. V. COLLINS
MARK E. CROWE
GEORGE F. GLAZE
JEFFREY T. GRANT
MICHAEL J. HANSON
JAMES A. HAYES
WILLIAM J. MCCABE
REINALDO J. MORILLO
KANAN C. OTT
BARRY R. PARKER
BRIAN J. SHEAKLEY
JASON W. STICHT
KAIL C. SWINDLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

JAMES G. ADAMS
ROBERT E. ASMANN
FRANK J. BANTELL
PAUL A. BARNETT
JEFFREY T. BEARDEN
STUART H. BLANCHETTE
LANE A. BOLAND
DAVID E. BOWEN
ROBERT C. BURDEAUX
RANDY J. BURLESON II
ISEL CARO
MICHAEL CHIN
PETER J. DALVE
MICHAEL J. DARCY
ZACHARY J. EVANS
STEPHEN A. EVERAGE
PATRICK W. FINNEY
SCOTT P. FITZSIMMONS
MATTHEW I. GERMANN
ROBERT C. GERSTEMEIER
BRIAN J. GIRACCA
STEVEN C. GOFF
ABIGAIL D. GOSS
ELIZABETH L. GREENWOOD
JONATHAN D. GRUEN
MARK A. HAMMOND
JARED M. HANNUM
WALLACE T. HARRISON
MATTHEW A. HAWKINS
TRAVIS W. HAYES
RUSSELL A. HERRELL
WILLIAM HOLMGREN
BRYAN M. HOOKS
POUL H. JENSEN
JEREMY M. KOMASZ
CORDELL R. KOOPMAN
SUZANNE J. KRAUSS
CHARLES D. KUBA
TREVER L. LANGE
DAVID M. LANGLEIE
MICHAEL P. LOHAN
DAVID C. LUNDAHL, JR.
REGINALD L. MACKAY
STEPHEN R. MELVIN
PERRY D. MEYER
JOHN E. OUELLETTE
SCOTT M. PATTERSON
GREGORY K. PAVLYAK
MAURICIO PEREZ
ERIC R. PIHL
CHRISTOPHER A. RAKOV
MATTHEW R. RITCHEY
BRAD W. ROCKWELL
JARRET L. ROTH
PAUL M. SCHALLER
ARCHIBLE W. SHERMAN
DANIEL M. SHIN
ADRIAN SIEBENHAAR
CHRISTOPHER T. SLAYMAN
DAVID J. SMITH
WILLIAM M. SULLIVAN
WILLIAM L. WALTON, JR.
THOMAS J. WILEY IV
CHARLES C. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

SHAWN G. DENIHAN
CHAD A. RUNYON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

KELVIN J. ASKEW
ERIKA L. BERRY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

KATHLEEN A. ALLEN
CHRISTOPHER FRYE

CONFIRMATION

Executive Nomination Confirmed by the Senate May 8, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

HEATHER WILSON, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF ST. ROSE-MCCARTHY CATHOLIC SCHOOL

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 2017

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my alma mater, St. Rose-McCarthy Catholic School on its 100th anniversary.

In 1911, the school's founder, Father Philip Scher, became pastor of St. Brigid Church, with hopes of eventually expanding to build a hospital and a Catholic parochial school near the church. The hospital was established two years later in 1913 and was staffed by Dominican Sisters of Kenosha. Four years later, on August 31, 1917, St. Rose Catholic School, named after St. Rose of Lima, the first American Dominican saint, was established and was staffed by three teaching sisters.

The first location of the school was in a Holy Names Society hall behind the church. The school consisted of three classrooms, separated by folding partitions where seventy-five eager students came to learn. By 1919, the teaching staff increased to five sisters and a porch was enclosed to create more classrooms and a garage was used as a kindergarten. In 1921, Father Peter H. McNellis improved the school aesthetically, added two more class rooms, and added a kitchen. Enrollment then doubled and in the following years more improvements were made to the school.

In 1941, Thomas McCarthy, a parishioner, donated a generous gift to the parish in his will with the purpose of constructing a new parochial school. The new school was constructed and renamed Thomas McCarthy School in his honor. Enrollment continued to increase to 450 students, leaving the teaching sisters with their hands full.

In 1997 the school was renamed from Thomas McCarthy School to a combination of its former name and its current name to create St. Rose-McCarthy Catholic School. Currently, there are 135 students in grades preschool through 8th grade. The school remains an excellent educational institution in the Central Valley; it was built by, and continues to be successful due to, faithful volunteers, generous donors, and the Dominican Sisters of Kenosha.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating St. Rose-McCarthy Catholic School on their 100th anniversary, and wish them continued success for many years to come.

HONORING MAJOR EFRAIN REYNA, JR.

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 2017

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Major Efrain Reyna Jr. of the United States Army for his extraordinary dedication to duty and service to the Nation. After four years of faithful service in the nation's capital, Major Reyna will transition from his present assignment as a Budget Liaison at Department of the Army Headquarters to civilian life back in the Great State of Texas.

Major Reyna has demonstrated the invaluable service that Army Congressional Liaisons provide Congress. He enabled countless Members and staff in developing a better understanding of Army policies, operations, and requirements. His first-hand knowledge of military needs, culture, and tradition were of tremendous benefit to Congressional offices. Prior to service as a Liaison, Major Reyna was assigned to my office as a Military Fellow where he quickly became an indispensable asset to my team. His performance was superb and he earned my utmost respect. His ability to build relationships and create opportunities aided me greatly in securing legislative language in support of the 2009 Fort Hood shooting victims, an effort that had been a priority of mine for 5 years.

A native Texan from the Rio Grande Valley, Major Reyna is a distinguished military graduate from Saint Mary's University where he earned a commission in the Army Aviation branch. He served with the 101st Airborne Division as a Chinook helicopter pilot and platoon leader. From here, he deployed on his first combat tour to Afghanistan as a flight platoon leader in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. Efrain also served with the 1st Cavalry Division at Fort Hood, Texas, "the Great Place." While there, he served in various leadership positions to include Chinook company commander and support battalion operations officer. Efrain conducted his second combat deployed to Afghanistan with the 1st Air Cavalry Brigade as a company commander.

His dedication to excellence has not gone unnoticed. Major Reyna's awards and decorations include the Bronze Star Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Air Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and numerous others. He has earned the Senior Aviator Badge, Ranger Tab, Airborne Wings, and Air Assault Wings. Efrain is a graduate of the Marine Expeditionary Warfare School. He also completed a Master's Degree from George Washington University during his time here, demonstrating his commitment as a Warrior and a Scholar.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to recognize the selfless service of Major Efrain Reyna

and the support and dedication of his wife Kelly Ann and their two sons, Isaac Lee Reyna and Zachary Miers. I wish them the very best as they complete over twelve years of honorable service to our great nation and proceed to the next chapter in their lives.

RECOGNIZING JESSICA NALEPA

HON. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 2017

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jessica Nalepa, an outstanding member of my staff who is transitioning out of my office after seven years to share her talents with the administration.

A Virginia native, Jessi interned in my office while she was in school at George Mason University where she earned her Bachelor of Arts in Government & International Politics and Communications, graduating cum Laude. Despite her East Coast upbringing, Jessi soon became an honorary Texan through and through.

Her outstanding work as an intern swiftly led her to become a permanent part of my team as the Director of Scheduling. Continuing to demonstrate her talents and work ethic, she moved through the ranks of my office fast: first from Scheduler to Deputy Chief of Staff and then ending her service to me as my Chief of Staff.

Jessi has been an integral part of my team and has served dutifully as a public servant to Texas—10 and the entire state. She also played an instrumental role in my personal growth here in Congress when she helped me in my campaign to become Chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee during the 113th Congress.

Possibly the toughest part of Jessi's job was balancing my duties to serve Texans through my personal office and simultaneously ensure the safety of all Americans through my work on the committee. Despite the challenges this posed on a daily basis, Jessi always went above and beyond. She managed these dynamics with professionalism, integrity, and a high degree of respect for the people who we serve. And, I'll add she accomplished all of this while earning a Master's Degree in Public Policy Analysis from George Mason University.

Jessi's dedication to Texas' 10th Congressional District and the U.S. House of Representatives is an extraordinary example of her strong commitment to her country and fellow citizens. Even though she is departing my office, Jessi will always be part of Team McCaul and I will be forever grateful for her work.

Jessi is possibly the hardest worker I have had the honor to know, and she will be sorely missed by all.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in thanking Jessi for her service to the great state of Texas and our nation, and wish her the very best of luck as she sets forth on the next chapter of her life.

HONORING MR. TED HALL

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Ted Hall, who is being honored as the 2017 Napa Valley Grower of the Year at the Napa Valley Grapegrowers' 42nd annual dinner.

Mr. Hall has a long and successful history of management and leadership within the wine industry in California and throughout the nation. A native of Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania, Mr. Hall received his undergraduate degree from Princeton University and went on to earn his MBA from Stanford University.

Before coming to Napa Valley, Mr. Hall developed his true love of the land while living on his family's farm in the township of Potter, Pennsylvania. He served in the U.S. Marine Corps and is an active jazz trombonist and piano player.

Mr. Hall exemplifies the values of the Napa Valley Grapegrowers. He is dedicated, shows good judgement, and pays attention to the details that matter. He has served as President & CEO of Long Meadow Ranch since 1989. Additionally, Mr. Hall serves on the board of directors for numerous educational, charitable, and arts organizations. Drawing on his knowledge and success in the vineyard industry, Mr. Hall represents and advocates on behalf of growers as Chairman of the Napa Valley Grapegrowers and as a member of the Industry Issues Committee.

As someone who shares his great community pride for Napa Valley, Mr. Hall looks to the region's future by sharing his expertise with the next generation of growers and farmers. He is the current Chairman of the St. Helena High School Agriculture Education Committee and the Napa County Agriculture Protection Advisory Committee (APAC). Mr. Hall supports multiple conservation easements in Napa County and is a member of a variety of public and private organizations involved in food and agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, Ted Hall has had a remarkable career as a business leader in our Napa Valley community. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor him here today.

PROVIDING RELIEF FROM THE
FAILED OBAMACARE EXPERIMENT

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 2017

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I promised the people of the Thirty-Sixth District of Texas that I would repeal Obamacare and replace it with conservative solutions. President Donald J. Trump was elected on this same platform.

Last week we came together to fulfill that promise.

After years of speeches, debates, elections and "show votes" that we knew would be vetoed or go nowhere in the Senate, last week's vote was the real deal.

This was perhaps the most important and consequential domestic policy legislation any of us will ever see.

To begin with, it serves as the largest entitlement reform of the Medicaid program in the program's history and eliminates the individual and employer mandate penalties. It also stops mandatory spending on large abortion businesses, such as Planned Parenthood, for one year.

It isn't the exact bill I would have written, but I am proud to say that I voted YES on the AHCA. While Republicans alone provided the votes to pass this bill, it was still the product of finding common ground to provide the American people with relief from Obamacare.

Members of our conference from every ideological stripe and every type of district came together to improve the bill and to secure its passage.

While we could certainly write a better one that allows for insurance sales across state lines, gives consumers better choices about the plans and benefits they want, and tears down the anti-trust exemption for insurers—the absurd tightrope we must walk to comply with the Senate's reconciliation rules has forced us to write this bill with one hand tied behind our back.

Like their colleagues here, Senate Democrats have made clear that preserving the failed experiment of Obamacare matters more than anything else, and that they would launch a fake, phony filibuster if anything came to the Senate that did not comply with the Senate procedure known as the "Byrd Rule."

I was extremely pleased to be part of House passage of AHCA last week and now look to the Senate to move the road blocks that continue to threaten our conservative agenda.

IN HONOR OF PATRICK LEONARD

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 2017

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Patrick Leonard of Dubuque, Iowa for his year of service as President of the Iowa Funeral Directors Association.

A fellow graduate of my own alma mater, Loras College, Mr. Leonard has successfully owned and operated his funeral home in Dubuque since 1990. His year as President of the Association has been marked by faithful leadership of the IFDA Board of Governors as they pursued IFDA's mission of promoting and supporting funeral service excellence.

Since coming to Congress in 2014, I have seen firsthand the dedication, enthusiasm, and passion that Mr. Leonard brings to his profession every day. Last summer, we were honored to have Mr. Leonard represent the IFDA at my congressional office's Dubuque Senior Wellness Fair. He understands that leadership is about stepping up and getting involved personally in service of the mission.

Mr. Leonard also finds time to give back to his community. Just last year, after months of preparation and coordination with the U.S. Navy, Mr. Leonard oversaw the return of a WWII veteran's remains back to Iowa. Mr. Leonard expressed to me how much of an honor this was for him, and how this project signified the importance of funeral services to those who pass, and their loved ones.

On behalf of the nearly 700 licensed funeral directors in Iowa, I want to again thank and recognize Mr. Leonard for his exemplary service as President of the IFDA.

HONORING THE TREFETHEN
FAMILY

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Trefethen family, John, Janet, Lorenzo, Hailey and, posthumously, Eugene and Catherine, for their hard work, dogged perseverance and community involvement.

The Trefethen family first restored their historic McIntyre Winery, which is on the National Register for Historic Places, in 1973. In August of 2014 the largest earthquake in the Bay Area since 1989 caused significant damage to the winery. Rather than scrapping their winemaking operations and moving elsewhere, they stayed and rebuilt the winery and will hold a celebratory re-opening this week.

Led largely by Hailey, the McIntyre building has been resurrected and now includes a new base that is earthquake resistant. The McIntyre building today contains 85 percent of the original building material and will use the same 19th century pipes to distill the famous Trefethen family wine.

When Gene moved to the Napa Valley 50 years ago, the Trefethen family began a long tradition of community involvement. The family donates wine to many community events annually to be auctioned for charitable causes including children at risk and the environment, two of the family's passions.

The Wine Community is integral to our way of life in my district. The Trefethen family has done more than their part to support our community. John was the founding President of the Napa Valley Grapegrowers and has served multiple terms on the Napa Valley Vintners Board. Janet served on the Board of Directors for the Queen of the Valley Foundation and founded the Oak Knoll District of Napa Valley, where she led the effort to have it recognized as an American Viticulture Area in 2004. Hailey recently finished serving terms on the Board of California Institute and the Napa Valley Vintners.

Mr. Speaker, on May 7, the Trefethen's will host their winery's grand re-opening. True to their love of community, it will feature local high school choirs, vocalists and a barbershop quartet. They have worked hard to preserve their winery. It is fitting and proper that we honor them here today.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, May 9, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 10

10 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities

To receive a closed briefing on United States special operations capabilities to counter Russian influence and unconventional warfare operations in the "Grey Zone".

SVC-217

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on National Security and International Trade and Finance

To hold hearings to examine secondary sanctions against Chinese institutions, focusing on assessing their utility for constraining North Korea.

SD-538

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine state views on the need to modernize the Endangered Species Act.

SD-406

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues

To hold hearings to examine emerging external influences in the Western Hemisphere.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 934, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biosimilar biological products, and S. 1028, to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National Family Caregiving Strategy.

SD-G50

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine cyber threats facing America, focusing on an

overview of the cybersecurity threat landscape.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Steven Andrew Engel, of the District of Columbia, and Makan Delrahim, of California, both to be an Assistant Attorney General, and Noel J. Francisco, of the District of Columbia, to be Solicitor General of the United States, all of the Department of Justice.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine growth policies for the new Administration.

SD-608

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Water and Power

To hold hearings to examine S. 440, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, S. 677, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, S. 685, to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System and the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System in the States of Montana and North Dakota, S. 930, to require the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration to establish a pilot project to provide increased transparency for customers, S. 1012, to provide for drought preparedness measures in the State of New Mexico, S. 1029, to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to exempt certain small hydroelectric power projects that are applying for relicensing under the Federal Power Act from the licensing requirements of that Act, and S. 1030, to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to submit to Congress a report on certain hydropower projects.

SD-366

Committee on Indian Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 458, to support the education of Indian children, and S. 691, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine S. 772, to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants, and S. 825, to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska.

SD-628

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism

To hold hearings to examine law enforcement access to data stored across borders, focusing on facilitating cooperation and protecting rights.

SD-226

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Veterans Choice Program and the future of care in the community.

SR-418

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine aging with community, focusing on building connections that last a lifetime.

SD-562

3 p.m.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Althea Coetzee, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

SR-428A

MAY 11

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine pesticide registration under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, focusing on providing stakeholders with certainty through the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act.

SR-328A

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine cyber policy, strategy, and organization.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the status of the housing finance system after nine years of conservatorship.

SD-538

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 139, to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, S. 534, to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, S. 583, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and S. 867, to provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforcement officers.

SD-226

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine worldwide threats.

SH-216

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine the Choice 2.0 veterans program, focusing on what worked, what didn't, and what needs to happen next.

SD-124

1:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine worldwide threats.

SH-219

	MAY 17	cusing on assessing and addressing the challenge.	3:30 p.m.
9:30 a.m.			Committee on Armed Services
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe		SVC-208	Subcommittee on Airland
To hold hearings to examine the growing Russian military threat in Europe, fo-	2:30 p.m.		To hold hearings to examine United States military small arms require-
	Committee on Indian Affairs		ments.
	To hold hearings to examine the Govern-		
	ment Accountability Office's high risk		SR-232A
	list for Indian programs.		
		SD-628	

SENATE—Tuesday, May 9, 2017

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's opening prayer will be offered by Rev. Harold D. Mathena from Oklahoma City, OK.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we bow before You in Jesus's Name to ask Your blessing upon this place, to ask Your blessing upon His people. What a joy it is to have access to the throne of God and be able to intervene on behalf of these.

We trust, Lord, in Jesus's Name that You would give Godly wisdom and discernment to the men and women who serve in this place. We ask You to give them an unusual power and ability to perform and to do the things that are pleasing to You.

We pray, Lord, that You sanctify every person in this room to salvation, that You would enlighten us, enable us to comprehend and know better the mind and heart of God.

Lord, we pray that You would convince us of our sin, of righteousness, and of judgment to come. We pray, Lord, that You would draw an imaginary circle—if we could do that—about this room and that You would get in this circle with us, empowering us and enabling us, equipping us, if You will, to do the work that You called us to do. This certainly isn't a difficult job; it is an impossible job, apart from Divine wisdom, Godly wisdom.

I trust, Lord, even now, that every person who is responsible for the leadership of this Nation would be under the guise and under the leadership of God. We thank You so much for all the blessings of life and for Your goodness to us.

I pray, Lord, even now that You will continue to bless America. In Jesus's Name we pray. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF SCOTT GOTTLIEB

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the heroin and prescription opioid epidemic is taking a heartbreaking toll on families and communities across our country. Experts estimate that as many as 2 million Americans are struggling with prescription drug addiction, with heroin and opioid overdoses claiming an average of 91 lives every day.

We continue to read the devastating headlines, too, like one article published by CNN entitled "A Generation of Heroin Orphans." It told the story of five Kentucky children living with their grandparents due to their mother's addiction. Sadly, this family is not unique. Nearly 3 million grandparents or other relatives across the country are caring for grandchildren. According to experts, this uptick in children left without their parents is due, at least in part, to this epidemic. It is one of the many reasons the heroin and prescription opioid crisis requires continued action.

Americans across the country—law enforcement, nurses, family members, and many others—have dedicated themselves to reversing this crisis. Congress has taken significant steps to combat this growing problem on a bipartisan basis. Through legislation like the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, CARA, and the 21st century cures bill, we authorized important ways to help fight the opioid epidemic through things like expanded education and prevention initiatives, improved treatment programs, and we bolstered law enforcement efforts. Implementation of these initiatives is already helping to tackle this crisis.

I was proud to support these pieces of legislation because I knew they could make a real impact in the fight against opioid abuse, and they are. We were able to take another positive step just last week. Congress passed an important piece of funding legislation, now law, that is helping advance and support many of the programs Congress authorized in CARA and the 21st century cures bill last year—programs that can advance medical innovation and promote research and treatment development.

That funding legislation dedicated significant new resources to the fight against the opioid epidemic. It helped fund groundbreaking research into the field of regenerative medicine. With its passage, Congress took one more critical step forward in the advancement of medical research and addiction treatment.

The Senate will soon have another opportunity to move ahead in the fight

against this devastating disease by voting to confirm Dr. Scott Gottlieb to oversee the Food and Drug Administration.

The FDA plays a central role in the approval of new drug treatments and therapies. An important part of the 21st Century Cures Act provided an accelerated pathway for the FDA to approve regenerative medicines. I look forward to having a Commissioner like Dr. Gottlieb, who is committed to the development of groundbreaking medicines and treatments to combat serious illnesses.

Additionally, the FDA will continue to be a crucial partner as States like Kentucky continue their fight against the opioid epidemic. The FDA plays an important regulatory and oversight role in combating this crisis.

I have encouraged the agency to incentivize the approval of safer, more abuse-deterrent formulations of drugs, and I am glad when they have concurred. These types of constructive policy decisions show an FDA that is ready to join the fight against heart-breaking disease and opioid abuse, and I am proud to support that kind of rigorous oversight from the agency.

Dr. Gottlieb has the necessary experience to serve in this key role. Not only has he worked in hospitals, interacting directly with those affected by disease and treatment, but he has also developed and analyzed medical policies in both the public and private sectors. He formed his perspectives on the dynamic public health sector by overseeing medical research and innovation projects.

In 2005, Dr. Gottlieb was appointed the FDA's Deputy Commissioner for Medical and Scientific Affairs. He also has served as senior adviser to the FDA Commissioner and as the agency's Director of Medical Policy Development.

As a practicing physician with a wealth of policy experience, Dr. Gottlieb has the necessary qualifications to lead the FDA at this critical time. The Senate voted to advance his nomination last night on a bipartisan basis, and I look forward to his confirmation.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Gottlieb nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Scott Gottlieb, of Connecticut, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this weekend we saw a peaceful democratic election in France, one of our key Western allies in the bedrock of European stability after two terrible wars in the last century. What happened just before the Sunday election in France? There was a massive cyber attack on the leading candidate, the one who prevailed, Emmanuel Macron. Whom do experts suspect was behind this cyber attack trying to manipulate another Western election, trying to foster mistrust in that nation's democratic institutions? Not surprisingly, Russia.

Yet none of this should surprise anyone. Not only had Russia been subsidizing Mr. Macron's opponent, Marine Le Pen, who is seen as more sympathetic to Moscow, not to mention trying to interfere in Dutch and German elections as well, but we were warned about this by our own intelligence agencies 6 months ago.

In early October last year, the U.S. intelligence community detailed Russia's attack on America's election and warned us that other attacks would follow. During a recent trip to Eastern Europe, a Polish security expert warned me that if the United States didn't respond to an attack on its own Presidential election by the Russians, Putin would feel emboldened to keep up the attacks to undermine and manipulate elections all through the free world.

What has this administration and this Congress done to respond to the cyber act of war by the Russians against America's democracy? Has President Trump clearly acknowledged Russia's attack on the U.S. and forcefully condemned the actions? No. Has President Trump warned Russia to stop meddling in the United States and other democratic elections in France, Germany, and other countries? No. Has President Trump proposed a plan to

help the United States thwart any future attack on the next election and to help our States protect the integrity of their voting systems? No. Has the Republican-led Congress passed sanctions on Russia in response to this attack on our democracy? Has it passed meaningful cyber security legislation? No.

Quite simply, the failure of this President and Congress to address the security threat is a stunning abdication of responsibility to protect the United States and our democratic values.

As if the conclusions of 17 U.S. intelligence agencies weren't enough to raise concerns, let's review what emerged just over the recent April recess. For example, Reuters reported that a Russian Government think tank, controlled by Russian dictator Vladimir Putin, developed a plan to swing our 2016 Presidential election to Donald Trump and undermine voters' faith in our electoral system.

The institute, run by a retired senior Russian foreign intelligence official, appointed by Putin, released two key reports, one in June and one in October of last year.

In the first, it argued that "the Kremlin launch a propaganda campaign on social media and Russian state-backed global news outlets to encourage US voters to elect a president who would take a softer line toward Russia than the administration of then-President Obama."

The second warning said:

[P]residential candidate Hillary Clinton was likely to win the election. For that reason, it argued, it was better for Russia to end its pro-Trump propaganda and instead intensify its messaging about voter fraud to undermine the US electoral system's legitimacy and damage Clinton's reputation in an effort to undermine her presidency.

It was also recently disclosed that the FBI obtained a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court warrant to monitor the communications of former Trump campaign foreign policy adviser Carter Page on the suspicion that he was a Russian agent. Add this to the ever-growing list of suspicious relationships between those in the Trump circle and Russia, from Michael Flynn to Paul Manafort, to Roger Stone, to Felix Sater.

In fact, just last month, the Republican House Intelligence Committee chair, JASON CHAFFETZ, and the ranking Democratic member, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, said General Flynn may have broken the law by failing to disclose on his security clearance forms payments of more than \$65,000 from companies linked to Russia. Yet, incredibly, the White House continues to stonewall requests for documents related to General Flynn.

White House ethics lawyer during the George Bush administration, Richard Painter, wrote of this stonewalling: "US House must subpoena the docs. . . . Zero tolerance for WH [White House] covering up foreign payoffs."

Is it any wonder why, in recent testimony to Congress, FBI Director Comey acknowledged an investigation of Russian interference in our election, which he said included possible links between Russia and Trump associates.

Finally, over the recess—on tax day, to be precise—there were nationwide protests calling on President Trump to take the necessary step to dispel concerns by releasing his taxes once and for all. The concern over his taxes goes to the serious question as to how much Russian money is part of the Trump business empire. In 2008, Donald Trump, Jr., said Trump's businesses "see a lot of money pouring in from Russia." This was despite his father incredibly saying this just a few months ago: "I have nothing to do with Russia—no deals, no loans, no nothing!"

It appears that the Russians were some of the few willing to take on the financial risk required to invest in Trump's precarious business deals. Any such Russian money, combined with the President's refusal to formally separate himself from his business operations during his Presidency, demand the release of his tax returns. Trump's response to the mounting calls to release these returns—the usual—is to attack everyone asking questions and blindly dismiss the issue as being irrelevant.

Of course, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee had compelling testimony yesterday from former Acting Attorney General Sally Yates and former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper. Miss Yates discussed the urgent warning that she delivered to the White House Counsel on January 26 that the National Security Advisor to the President of the United States, General Flynn, had been compromised and was subject to blackmail by the Russians. It was a warning she repeated in two meetings and a phone call.

What did the White House do in response to the Acting Attorney General warning them that the highest adviser in the White House on national security could be blackmailed by the Russians? Nothing. For 18 days, General Flynn continued to staff President Trump for a phone call with Vladimir Putin and other highly sensitive national security matters.

Think of that. After being warned by the Attorney General that the man sitting in the room with you, the highest level of National Security Advisor, could be compromised by the Russians, President Trump continued to invite General Flynn for 18 days in that capacity. White House Press Secretary Sean Spicer said:

When the President heard the information as presented by White House Counsel, he instinctively thought that General Flynn did not do anything wrong, and that the White House Counsel's review corroborated that.

Let's be clear. It is bad enough to have a National Security Advisor who

is subject to blackmail by the Russians. The fact that the Trump White House didn't see that as an urgent problem is deeply troubling.

I am glad the Senate Crime and Terrorism Subcommittee held this hearing yesterday, but the occasional subcommittee hearing is not enough. Let's make sure we know for the record that this subcommittee—chaired by Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, a Republican of South Carolina, and Ranking Member SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, a Democrat of Rhode Island—did a yeoman's duty—not just yesterday but in a previous hearing, without being allocated any additional resources for this investigation, without being given additional staff. They have brought to the attention of the American people some important facts about what transpired in the Trump White House after it was clear that General Flynn had been compromised by the Russians.

But the occasional subcommittee hearing like this is not enough. We need an independent, bipartisan commission with investigative resources and the power necessary to dig into all of the unanswered questions. Until we do, the efforts of this committee or that committee are not enough. It has to be a conscious effort on a national basis by an independent commission.

For President Trump, these issues do not appear to be relevant, yet there is a simple way to resolve the many questions that are before us.

First, disclose your tax returns and clear up, among other questions, what your son said in 2008 about a lot of Russian money pouring into your family business.

No. 2, answer all the questions about campaign contacts with the Russians, including your former campaign manager Paul Manafort, former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn, and former policy advisor Carter Page.

No. 3, quite simply, explain the reports of repeated contacts between your campaign operatives and Russian intelligence.

No. 4, answer all the questions about your close friend Roger Stone's comments that suggest he had knowledge of Wikileaks' having and using, in strategically timed releases when your campaign was struggling, information that had been hacked by the Russians from your opponent's campaign.

No. 5, explain your ties to Russian foreign businessman Felix Sater, who worked at the Bayrock Group investment firm, which partnered with your business and had ties to Russian money.

No. 6, provide all requested documents to Congress related to Michael Flynn, who concealed his payments from the Russian interests. If there is nothing to hide, this is your chance to clear up things once and for all.

To my Republican colleagues I say again that these Russian connections

may constitute a national security crisis. We need to have the facts. How long will we wait for these desperately needed answers before we establish an independent commission investigation, as we have done when faced with previous attacks on America?

Finally, how long will we sit by before passing additional sanctions on Russia for their cyber attack on the United States of America? That attack makes November 8, 2016, a day that will live in cyber infamy in America's history. It is time for the Republicans and the Democrats to show the appropriate concern for this breach of our national security.

We have a bipartisan Russian sanctions bill ready to go to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. What are we waiting for?

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in opposition to the nomination of Dr. Scott Gottlieb to lead the Food and Drug Administration.

The FDA Commissioner is our Nation's pharmaceutical gatekeeper, but for years the FDA has granted unfettered access to Big Pharma and its addictive opioid painkillers to the American public. The result is a prescription drug, heroin, and fentanyl epidemic of tragic proportions and the greatest public health crisis our Nation currently faces.

At a time when we need its leader to break the stronghold of big pharmaceutical companies on the FDA, Dr. Scott Gottlieb would be nothing more than an agent of Big Pharma. Dr. Gottlieb's record shows that he doesn't support using the tools that the FDA has at its disposal to minimize the risks to public health from the misuse of prescription opioids.

The current opioid epidemic is a man-made problem. It was born out of the greed of big pharmaceutical companies and aided by the FDA, which willfully green-lighted supercharged painkillers like OxyContin. But, in order for us to understand this public health emergency and the critical role that leadership at the FDA has played and will continue to play in this crisis, we need a brief history lesson. We need to understand where these opioids come from.

In 1898, a German chemist introduced heroin to the world—a reproduction of an earlier form of morphine believed to be nonaddictive. The name "heroin"

was derived from the German word "heroisch," which means "heroic." That is how men described the way they felt after taking the new drug.

In the first decade of the 20th century, doctors were led to believe that heroin was nonaddictive and prescribed it for many ailments. But heroin addiction soon became prevalent, so the government began to regulate its use, including arresting doctors who prescribed it to those who were already addicted, and the medical community began to stop prescribing it. Inevitably, the addicted turned to illegal markets to feed their dependence.

Wariness toward prescribing opioid-based painkillers for anything other than terminal illnesses continued through the 20th century, all the way up until the late 1970s and the early 1980s. At that time, the international debate broke out on pain management. The question was asked: Was it inhumane to allow patients to suffer needlessly through pain when opioid-based medications were available?

Many advocates for increased use of painkillers pointed to a 1980 letter to the New England Journal of Medicine, which concluded that only 1 percent of patients who were prescribed opiate-based painkillers became addicted to their medication. Known as the Porter and Jick letter because it was named after the two Boston researchers who conducted the research and authored the letter, it fueled a belief that opiate-based prescription drugs were not addictive. It was a belief that began to permeate the medical community.

But there was a problem with Porter and Jick's conclusions. They had only collected data on patients who were receiving inpatient care. As you can imagine, the percentage of patients who became addicted to opiates while in the hospital was only a tiny fraction of the patients who received opiate prescription drugs in an outpatient setting.

But the medical community was not the only group espousing theories that opiates were not addictive. With the FDA's 1995 approval of the original OxyContin, the original sin of the opiate crisis, we can literally point to the starting point of this epidemic. The FDA approved the original version of OxyContin, an extended-release opioid, and believed that it "would result in less abuse potential since the drug would be absorbed slowly and there would not be an immediate 'rush' or high that would promote abuse."

In 1996, Purdue Pharma brought OxyContin to the market, earning the company \$48 million in sales just that year alone. Purdue Pharma claimed OxyContin was nonaddictive and couldn't be abused, and the FDA agreed. Neither of those claims turned out to be true.

Purdue Pharma built a massive marketing and sales program for

OxyContin. From 1996 to 2000, Purdue Pharma's sales force more than doubled, from 318 to 671 sales representatives. In 2001 alone, Purdue gave out \$40 million in sales bonuses to its burgeoning sales force. These sales representatives then targeted healthcare providers who were more willing to prescribe opioid painkillers.

As a result of these sales and marketing efforts from 1997 to 2002, OxyContin prescriptions increased almost tenfold, from 670,000 in 1997 to 6.2 million prescriptions in 2002.

Then, in 2007, Purdue Pharma paid \$600 million in fines and other payments after pleading guilty in Federal court to misleading regulators, doctors, and patients about the risks of addiction to OxyContin and its potential for abuse. The company's president, top lawyer, and former chief medical officer also pled guilty to criminal misdemeanor charges and paid \$34 million in fines.

In many cases, the FDA approved so-called "abuse-deterrent" opioids, despite warnings from the medical community about the potential for abuse. And when it wasn't turning a blind eye to the warnings of experts, the FDA simply didn't engage them at all in approval of opioids with abuse-deterrent properties. With numerous approvals of so-called abuse-deterrent opioids in 2010, the agency convened advisory committees of outside experts for less than half of them.

Mr. President, I note the presence of the minority leader on the floor. At this time I ask unanimous consent to suspend this portion of my statement and to return to it when the minority leader has concluded speaking to the Senate.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first I wish to thank my friend and our great Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, for the great work he has done on the opioid issue. He was one of the first to sound the alarm when prescription drugs just began to be overprescribed and has worked very, very hard, with many successes, in trying to deal with this problem. We have a long way to go. Things would have been a lot worse without the great work of the Senator from Massachusetts.

I see my colleague from New Hampshire on the floor, as well, and the same goes for her. She has done an outstanding job. She has worked and campaigned on this issue and is keeping her promises, working very hard here in the U.S. Senate. We know that their States are among the top States with opioid abuse problems.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, at yesterday's Judiciary Committee hearing, we heard from former Deputy Attorney General Sally

Yates and former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper. In their testimony, both of them confirmed what we already know—that Russia tried to interfere in our elections and likely will do so again. Underline "likely will do so again."

In particular, Deputy AG Yates made the point that General Flynn misled the Vice President about his contact with the Russian Ambassador and was vulnerable to blackmail since the Russians knew about those conversations.

It is still an open question whether or not the Trump administration will hold General Flynn accountable under our criminal law. Needless to say, his presence in the administration and the length of time it took to dismiss him raise serious questions about why the President brought him onboard to begin with and why the President and his staff did not respond more quickly to protect our national security.

Both parties in Congress should be focused on the threat posed by Russia's hacking activities and Russia's attempt to influence foreign elections, especially ours. Make no mistake about it. These cyber attacks will not be limited to any one party or any President. Anyone who draws the ire of President Putin—President, Senator, Member of Congress, elected official—could be subject to these dark attacks. Whatever is good for Russia at the moment, whatever hurts the United States the most, that is what he will pursue.

Director Clapper testified that Russia likely feels "emboldened" to continue its hacking activities, given their success at disrupting our 2016 elections. He said:

If there has ever been a clarion call for vigilance and action against a threat to the very foundation of our democratic political system, this episode is it.

Those are his words, not mine.

I hope the American people recognize the severity of this threat and that we collectively counter it before it further erodes the fabric of our democracy.

I couldn't agree more with Mr. Clapper. I hope these hearings are just the start of a bipartisan discussion on how to combat these efforts and safeguard the integrity of our elections. Democrats and Republicans should join together and figure out what Russia had done to us in the past and how we prevent it from happening in the future. Again, as Director Clapper said, the very foundation of our democracy is at stake.

The Founding Fathers, in their wisdom, wrote in the Constitution that we had to worry about foreign interference. It is happening now in a way that has never happened before, and in a bipartisan way we must act.

TRUMPCARE

Mr. President, now a word on healthcare. The bill the House of Representatives passed last week is dev-

astating in so many ways and to so many groups of Americans—to older Americans, who would be charged five times as much as others; to middle-class Americans, who will be paying on average \$1,500 a year more for their coverage in the next few years; to lower income Americans, who are struggling to make it into the middle class and who will be paying thousands of dollars more per year; to women, for whom pregnancy could now become a preexisting condition—amazing.

Why are they making these cuts? For all too many on the other side of the aisle, it is for one purpose: to give a massive tax break to the wealthy—folks making over \$250,000 a year. God bless the wealthy. They are doing well. They don't need a tax break at the expense of everyone else, especially when it comes to something as important as healthcare.

Amazingly, this bill is even devastating to our veterans. That is what I would like to focus on for the remainder of my time this morning.

You would think that when the House of Representatives was writing its bill, the House Members would be more careful to make sure that our veterans, who put their lives on the line for our country, wouldn't be hurt by their legislation. In their haste to cobble together a bill that could pass the House, the Republican majority actually prohibited anyone who is eligible for coverage at the VA from being eligible for the tax credits in this bill.

I am sure my Republican friends who rushed to draft this bill thought that was a perfectly fine policy. After all, our veterans can get care at the VA. In fact, many veterans don't get their care from the Department of Veterans Affairs. Yes, they are eligible, but many live in rural communities that don't have a VA facility. Many can't go to the VA because of means testing. Some get treated at the VA for a specific injury related to their service but rely on private insurance for the rest of their healthcare. I am sure some veterans would simply prefer the choice to have private insurance rather than go through the VA.

Under TrumpCare, any veteran who falls into one of these categories would be denied the tax credits they need to get affordable coverage. Let me repeat that. As many as 7 million veterans, possibly more, who qualify for VA healthcare wouldn't be eligible for the tax credits they need to get affordable insurance on the private market.

For the sake of perspective, under TrumpCare, folks who make over \$250,000 a year get a massive tax break while taxes and costs would go up for so many of our brave veterans.

I am not sure it is possible for a bill, and for the party that passed it, to get its priorities more wrong than that. It is the shameful consequence of a slapdash, partisan bill that was thrown

together at the last minute—a bill whose purpose, it seems, is not to provide better coverage or lower costs or even to provide better care for our veterans. Its purpose seems to be to provide tax breaks to the very wealthy.

For the President, who lobbied for this bill down to the individual Member, it is another giant broken promise to the working people and, in this case, to our veterans.

President Trump made improving the healthcare of our veterans a theme of his campaign. Just a few weeks ago, he said that “the veterans have poured out their sweat and blood and tears for this country for so long and it’s time that they are recognized and it’s time that we now take care of them and take care of them properly.”

His healthcare bill, TrumpCare, would deny the means of affording private insurance to as many as 7 million veterans and maybe more—another broken promise, saying one thing and doing another. Many of the people who support Donald Trump don’t want to embrace that idea, but it is happening in issue after issue. They will see it—saying one thing and doing another. That is another reason for Senate Republicans to scrap this bill, scrap repeal, and start working with Democrats on bipartisan ways to improve our healthcare system.

Today, we Democrats will be sending a letter to the Republican leadership laying out our position on healthcare. All 48 Democrats and the two Independents who caucus with us have signed it. It has been our position all along: We are ready to work in a bipartisan, open, and transparent way to improve and reform our healthcare system.

Look, we have made a lot of progress in the last few years. Kids can now stay on their parents’ plan until they are 26. Women are no longer charged more for the same coverage. There are more Americans insured than ever before. These are good things. We ought to keep them and then build on our progress.

To our Republican friends we say this. Drop this idea of repeal. Drop this nightmare of a bill, TrumpCare, which raises costs on our veterans, and come work with us on ways to reduce the cost of premiums, the cost of prescription drugs, and other out-of-pocket costs. We can find ways to make our healthcare system better if we work together. TrumpCare is not the answer.

I want to thank my friend from Massachusetts for the courtesy.

I yield the floor back to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I thank our leader for his great leadership on all of these national security and healthcare issues. I think he has injected some common sense into how the American people should be viewing

each and every one of those very important issues. His national leadership is greatly appreciated.

Let me turn now and yield to the great Senator from the State of New Hampshire, where this opioid epidemic has hit hardest of all, Senator HASSAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. I thank Senator MARKEY.

Mr. President, I, too, want to thank Leader SCHUMER for his remarks and his work on national security and on healthcare and, in particular, on the opioid, heroin, and fentanyl epidemic, which is the greatest public health and safety challenge that the State of New Hampshire faces and which I know many other States face as well.

I rise today to oppose the nomination of Dr. Scott Gottlieb to serve as the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration. It is the responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration, starting with its Commissioner, to protect consumers and stand up for public health.

I have serious concerns about Dr. Gottlieb’s record. I also have additional concerns from his nomination hearing about his stances on critical priorities for people in New Hampshire and across the Nation.

As I mentioned, and as Senator MARKEY has detailed, as well, the most pressing public health and safety challenge facing New Hampshire is the heroin, fentanyl, and opioid crisis. I want to thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his leadership and work in helping to identify the root causes of this terrible epidemic.

Yesterday, I was in New Hampshire, and I met with the Drug Enforcement Agency leaders and personnel there. I heard updates from those on the frontlines about the latest developments in the substance misuse crisis. We discussed the spread of the dangerous synthetic drug carfentanil, which is 100 times stronger than the already deadly drug fentanyl.

A report released this week by New Futures showed the economic impact of alcohol and substance misuse costs. It costs New Hampshire’s economy now over \$2 billion a year. It is clear that we need to take stronger action to combat this crisis.

We have to continue partnering together with those on the frontlines and at every level of government. We need to be developing new tools and leveraging the ones we have to combat this crisis.

What we cannot afford to do is to institute policies that would take us backward. Unfortunately, Dr. Gottlieb has been opposed to the creation of one of the key tools that the FDA has at its disposal—risk evaluation and mitigation strategies, otherwise known as REMS. The agency uses REMS—including, as a strategy, prescriber training—

to try to stem the risks associated with certain medications.

The FDA should be making REMS stronger and making sure that all opioid medications have REMS. We don’t need a Commissioner who opposed the very creation of the REMS program, as Dr. Gottlieb did. In the midst of a public health challenge as serious as this epidemic, we should be taking—and we have to take—an all-hands-on-deck approach. The fact that Dr. Gottlieb was opposed to the very creation of REMS raises questions about what strategies the FDA would support under his leadership.

There is another issue involved in this nomination of deep concern to the people of New Hampshire. I am concerned about Dr. Gottlieb’s record of putting politics ahead of science when it comes to women’s health. To compete economically on a level playing field, women must be able to make their own decisions about when and if to start a family. To fully participate not only in our economy but also in our democracy, women must be recognized for their capacity to make their own healthcare decisions, just as men are. They must also have the full independence to make their own healthcare decisions, just as men do.

Unfortunately, this administration has made clear that it is focused on an agenda that restricts women’s access to critical health services, including family planning.

Dr. Gottlieb’s record has demonstrated that he supports this backward agenda. During his time in the Bush administration, Dr. Gottlieb was involved in a controversial and unscientifically based delay in approving the emergency contraceptive Plan B for over-the-counter use.

I am concerned that under his leadership, the FDA will play political games with women’s health once again. I am afraid that he will disregard science-based decisions under pressure from this administration. Dr. Gottlieb’s nomination raises too many questions about whether he will put political interests ahead of science and ahead of the safety of consumers.

I hope that he has learned about the priorities of Senators and the constituents they represent throughout the nomination process and that he proves to be a stronger Commissioner than his record suggests. But in voting today, I cannot overlook that record, so I will vote against his nomination, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank Senator HASSAN for all of her great leadership as Governor of New Hampshire and now the Senator from New Hampshire. The epidemic has hit

New Hampshire very hard, harder than any other place. Her leadership is absolutely outstanding. I thank her for all of her leadership on this nomination as well.

As we look at this issue, we realize that a whole epidemic was being created, but that epidemic was being created because of approvals of “abuse-deterrent” opioids since 2010. I put “abuse-deterrent” in quotes because it was extremely deceptive because too many people felt “abuse-deterrent” meant they could not ultimately become addicted to the medicine. The damage has now been done. The prescription painkiller abuse became rampant across the country. We had become the United States of Oxy, and the opioid issue was well on its way to becoming an opioid epidemic because when those who were addicted to Oxy could no longer afford \$60 for a 60-milligram pill, they opted for low-priced heroin, which is why we should not be surprised that of those individuals who began abusing heroin in the 2000s, 75 percent reported that their first opioid was a prescription drug.

Taking advantage of the new demand for heroin, an incredibly sophisticated network of drug traffickers from Mexico set up franchises in the United States, and now they are responsible for nearly half of this Nation’s heroin supply and are branching out from large urban areas into our suburbs. These systems collided in a perfect storm that has caused the epidemic we are experiencing today: the over-prescription of opioid painkillers that were approved by the FDA, the over-the-top sales and marketing programs by a deceptive and deep-pocketed pharmaceutical giant that went unimpeded for years, and an overabundance of heroin flowing into the United States from Mexico and South America. All of that has led us here.

We know that nationally opioid overdoses kill more people than gun violence or auto accidents. Every single day in America, we lose more than 91 people to an opioid-related overdose. Nationally, nearly half of all opioid overdose deaths involve a prescription opioid that was approved by the FDA and often prescribed by a physician. In Massachusetts, in 2016, 2,000 people died from an opioid overdose.

Who is the typical victim of an opioid overdose? Who is the typical substance abuser? The answer is that there is none. This epidemic does not discriminate on the basis of age or gender or race or ethnicity or economic status. It does not care if you live in a city or in the suburbs. It does not care if you have a white-collar or a blue-collar job. The 50-year-old White male attorney is just as likely to become addicted to prescription drugs or heroin as the 22-year-old Latina waitress. Opioid addiction is an equal opportunity destroyer of lives.

Those addicted to opiates are too often stealing from their friends, their families and neighbors, or complete strangers to fuel their addiction. Cars are broken into, and valuable stereo systems are left intact, while a few dollars in change are stolen. Homes are broken into, and flat-screen television sets remain untouched, while children’s piggy banks go missing.

The impacts of opioid addiction are also causing immeasurable harm to the families of those in the unbreakable grip of opioids. Too often, I hear the stories of parents who have drained their entire life savings to provide the treatment and recovery programs necessary to beat this addiction. Many times, it results in bankruptcy filings that were unimaginable only a few short years ago.

The opioid crisis is robbing people of their friends and their families. It is robbing them of their livelihood. It is robbing them of their freedom as they look out from behind prison bars. All too often, it is robbing them of their lives.

If we don’t act now, we could lose an entire generation of people. As this opioid crisis explodes in my State of Massachusetts and in every State in the country, we need an FDA leader who will understand that universal healthcare does not mean that every American should have access to a bottle of prescription opioids.

Last year, more than 33,000 mothers, fathers, children, and loved ones were robbed of their potential when they died of an opioid overdose, but Dr. Scott Gottlieb has openly questioned the value of the Drug Enforcement Administration’s enforcement against doctors and pharmacists to prevent prescription opioids from entering the illicit market. The DEA is our prescription drug cop on the beat, but Dr. Gottlieb wants to give that role to bureaucrats at the Department of Health and Human Services, an agency that has consistently failed at any kind of enforcement.

At the same time, Dr. Gottlieb has also publicly stated his opposition to the FDA’s risk plans, so called REMS—meaning risk evaluation and mitigation strategies—for the use of these opioids. That is what is used to address the safety of opioid painkillers. These vital tools that the FDA has to manage the risk should be made stronger, but Dr. Gottlieb argues that they should not exist at all. Risk evaluation and mitigation strategies—he says they should not exist at all. With the overwhelming majority of heroin users reporting that their addiction began with prescription opioids, Dr. Gottlieb believes drug safety does not need strong oversight. That is simply irresponsible.

We are suffering this public health epidemic because Big Pharma pushed pills they knew were dangerous and addictive. The FDA approved them, often

without expert counsel, and doctors, because they do not have mandatory education on these drugs, prescribed them to innocent families all across our country. It is a vicious and deadly cycle that has turned this Nation into the United States of Oxy, and it must stop.

Dr. Gottlieb’s Big Pharma formula is simple: Take away the DEA oversight over prescription opioids and give that authority to the FDA. Then, at the same time, limit the FDA’s ability to utilize its full oversight authority over these addictive products. That would leave a mostly unregulated marketplace for big pharmaceutical companies and their opioid painkillers to thrive, while American families pay the highest price they can: the life of someone in their family.

Perhaps most alarming is Dr. Gottlieb’s connection to a specific pharmaceutical company called Cephalon. Last month, a Washington Post story was published that detailed Dr. Gottlieb’s work on behalf of one company, Cephalon, to raise the amount of the addictive opioid fentanyl that the company could market at the same time the prescription painkiller epidemic was exploding. The Washington Post story detailed how Dr. Gottlieb advocated for the DEA—the Drug Enforcement Administration—to raise the quota of fentanyl that Cephalon could manufacture and put on the market, even while the company was under investigation for pushing doctors to prescribe the addictive painkiller for headaches and back pain when it was meant for late-stage cancer patients.

These aggressive and off-label promotion tactics were out of the Purdue Pharma playbook that got us into this opioid crisis in the first place.

Cephalon ultimately pleaded guilty in 2008 to illegally promoting the fentanyl drug and paid a \$425 million fine. This relationship is deeply disturbing.

Dr. Gottlieb seems to believe that pharmaceutical profits are more important than the public’s health. When the prescription opioid epidemic was taking deadly hold, Dr. Gottlieb advocated to put even more addictive fentanyl onto the market when it was not appropriate or necessary.

Dr. Gottlieb said during his confirmation hearing that the FDA unwittingly fueled the opioid epidemic, but he is guilty of intentionally pushing an addictive prescription opioid onto the American public just to benefit one company instead of working to prevent this massive public health crisis. Dr. Gottlieb’s actions could have made the opioid crisis worse.

Serious questions remain about Dr. Gottlieb’s association with Cephalon, which was fined hundreds of millions of dollars for violating FDA rules.

After his tenure at the FDA, Scott Gottlieb was then hired by a law firm

as an expert witness used to defend the actions of Cephalon in court.

In advance of this floor vote, I and a group of other Senators questioned Dr. Gottlieb on this work and the extent of his historical and financial relationship with Cephalon, but we received nothing that shed any light on his relationship with the company.

We cannot have a leader at the FDA who has worked on behalf of a company that aided and abetted the prescription drug and heroin epidemic.

Sadly, Dr. Gottlieb is yet another example of President Trump's lack of commitment to address the opioid crisis. President Trump believes that if we just build a border wall, well, we will end this opioid crisis.

We don't need a wall, President Trump, we need treatment.

President Trump's support for the repeal of the Affordable Care Act and the legislation the House passed just last week means coverage for opioid-use disorders for 2.8 million people could be ripped away. President Trump has proposed slashing the research budget of the National Institutes of Health by 18 percent, undercutting our ability to better understand addiction and come up with alternative, less addictive pain medication.

If President Trump and his Republican allies are committed to combating the opioid crisis, they should release their plan for addressing this crisis, including committing to quickly release the remaining \$500 million authorized last year in the 21st Century Cures Act, and plan for investing more Federal dollars into understanding, preventing, and treating this debilitating disease of addiction. The crisis is wearing families down to the bone and we need to give them hope. That is what a comprehensive strategy to address this crisis is all about, and strong leadership at the FDA is a critical component of any plan.

We need the FDA to be a tough cop on the beat, not a rubberstamp approving the latest big pharma painkillers that are the cause of this deadly scourge of addiction in overdoses. We need to stop the overprescription of pain medication that is leading to heroin addiction and fueling this crisis. The United States has less than 5 percent of the world population, but we consume 80 percent of the global opioid painkillers and 99 percent of the global supply of hydrocodone and the active ingredients inside of Vicodin.

We also need to ensure that prescribers are subject to mandatory education responsible for prescribing practices. Anyone who prescribes opioid pain medication and other controlled substances must undergo mandatory medical education so we are sure these physicians know what they are doing. The FDA would be in a position to be the primary enforcer of this critical education.

We also shouldn't allow companies to continue to promote their opioids as abuse deterrents. It is misleading. Fifty percent of all physicians believe the "abuse deterrent" that is on the label means the drug is not addictive. Physicians don't even know this is addictive, and we know through Purdue Pharma that this is just not the case.

The FDA is in a prime position to ensure the terminology used for promoting a drug is not confusing or misleading. At this time of crisis, we need a leader at the FDA who recognizes the dangers of prescription painkillers, who will stand up to big pharma and reform the FDA to prevent addiction before it takes hold. Dr. Scott Gottlieb is not that individual.

Dr. Gottlieb's nomination signals a continuation of FDA policy that has cultivated and fueled the opioid epidemic. I strongly oppose Dr. Gottlieb's nomination and call on my colleagues to join me in voting no.

Mr. President, I yield back the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I join my colleague in opposing the nomination of Dr. Gottlieb and thank him for laying out the case.

The FDA, of course, is an important part of our healthcare system, and just last week we saw the House of Representatives jam through a piece of legislation that would wreak havoc on the healthcare system. In fact, many people are appropriately calling what they did "wealthcare" because it represents a huge transfer of wealth away from caring for patients to the very wealthiest in our country, including many powerful special interests.

I think everybody understands—Republicans, Democrats, Independents alike—the Affordable Care Act is not perfect and specifically that we need to address the issues within the Affordable Care Act exchanges. We need to address those issues to lower the deductibles, lower the copays, and make it more affordable. There are some very straightforward ways of doing that.

One good idea is to create a public option within the Affordable Care Act exchanges, a Medicare-for-all-type choice. What will that do? It will create more competition. That will drive down the price of insurance within the Affordable Care Act exchanges, and it will ensure that you have a provider everywhere in the United States in every community of this country. Even better, the Congressional Budget Office, the last time they looked at it, concluded that it would save taxpayers \$160 billion over 10 years, so it would reduce our deficit.

The House Republican wealthcare bill doesn't try to fix the exchanges. What it does is blow up the Affordable Care Act and in the process wreaks

havoc on our entire healthcare system. You don't have to take my word for it. Just take a look at the long list of groups that have come out strongly opposed to the House bill, starting with patient advocacy groups, such as the American Lung Association, the American Diabetes Association, the American Heart Association, the American Cancer Society, and the list goes on. These aren't Democratic groups. They don't have only Democratic patients. They have patients who are Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and people who aren't participating in the political process. These are groups that care about patients, they don't care about politics, and they are strongly opposed.

How about those who are providing care to those patients? Well, here is a partial list of the groups that are strongly opposed: the American Academy of Family Physicians; the American Medical Association, the doctors; the American Academy of Pediatrics, the folks who look after the care of our kids; the American Nurses' Association.

Let's look at the hospital groups. The American Hospital Association strongly opposes this; the Children's Hospital Association opposes this, and the list goes on. It is opposed by those who are spending all their time advocating for patients and opposed by those who provide care to patients.

Then you have a long list of senior groups, including AARP, that strongly oppose this because the House bill discriminates against older Americans—people over 50 years old—because it allows insurance companies to charge them a whole lot more for their healthcare than they currently have to pay.

These groups don't care about party. They don't care about politics. They care about patients in our healthcare system, and it should tell us all a lot that they are opposed and strongly opposed to this bill. Now, why is that?

This House bill is rotten at its core. Its foundation was rotten when the Congressional Budget Office first looked at it, and then they made it even worse. Let's look at the foundation of this, which the Congressional Budget Office did have a chance to look at. I do want to remind the Presiding Officer that the head of the Congressional Budget Office was selected by the chairman of the House Republican Budget Committee, the House Budget Committee, the Republican chairman, and the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, a Republican chairman. They took a look at that first foundation of the House bill, and here is what they concluded. This is right in their report; that 24 million Americans would lose their access to affordable healthcare. That is on page 2 of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office report.

Why is that? It is because they take a wrecking ball to Medicaid and a

wrecking ball to the exchanges. They don't make the exchanges better. They don't drive down the prices. They make the exchanges worse, and they take a big whack at Medicaid. In fact, they also take a cut at Medicare. In fact, if you go to the table in this CBO chart, I will just refer people to table 3. Sometimes you just have to dig deep in these reports to get to the bottom line. There is an \$883 billion cut that consists of about \$840 billion cuts to the Medicaid Program, \$48 billion cut to the Medicare Program, and I should emphasize that will actually make the Medicare Program somewhat more insolvent. You add it up, you have \$880 billion in cuts to Medicare and Medicaid combined.

I remind people that the Medicaid funding not only went to provide more access to people for healthcare through expanding Medicaid, which many States have talked about and Governor Kasich has been talking about recently, but this bill also cuts the core Medicaid Program to the States, and two-thirds of that money goes to care for seniors in nursing homes and people with disabilities. So it puts all of them at risk. That is \$880 billion in cuts to Medicaid and Medicare and people who need healthcare.

What is the other big number in the House bill? Well, \$900 billion is the amount of the tax cuts in what is being described as a healthcare bill. That is why people are calling this a healthcare bill because you are cutting \$880 billion out of Medicaid and Medicare and transferring those dollars that are currently being spent to provide healthcare to tens of millions of Americans, transferring that money back primarily to the wealthiest people in this country and corporate special interests.

Under this \$900 billion tax cut, if you are earning over \$1 million a year, you are getting an average tax cut of \$50,000 a year. If you are in the top one-tenth of 1 percent of income earners—we are talking about the wealthiest people in this country—you are getting an average annual tax cut of \$200,000.

Do you know what they did for insurance companies? They used to say the bonuses that were paid to the CEOs of insurance companies would be taxed, but they took that away. So now insurance companies can essentially pay bonuses and deduct those. They can deduct those now from their bottom line, which drives up the profits of insurance companies by allowing the deduction of CEO bonuses. So we have \$900 billion in tax cuts that primarily go to the wealthiest, and \$880 billion in cuts to the Medicaid Program and Medicare that goes to care for people. That is why this bill is rotten at its core, because it is going to hurt our healthcare system, according to all those patient advocacy groups and all those patient provider groups, and for what? To give

this windfall tax break to the wealthy and powerful interests.

That is why it is probably no surprise that when the American people were asked about that original House bill, only 17 percent said: Yes, that is a good idea. Everybody else said: Uh-uh, we don't like what we are seeing. That is the bill I was just describing.

Then the House took that rotten foundation and put even worse stuff on top of it. They added a provision that would eliminate the essential benefits package. These are the provisions that ensure that when you are buying an insurance policy, you are getting something that will be there when you need it rather than a junk policy—the policies people used to get, where they found out after they got sick, “Uh-uh, we are not paying for that,” said the insurance companies “because look here at the back of page 100, last paragraph, fine print, you are not covered for that.” That is why we had an essential benefits package for things like maternity care, mental health care, coverage for substance abuse.

I hear a lot of talk about the problems with the opioid epidemic. Those are real problems that are hurting families around the country. That was part of the essential health benefits—not there in the House bill.

Then, to add insult to injury, they took out the requirement that you have coverage for preexisting conditions in an affordable way. You know, people can play word games all they want. You can say that you have to provide coverage for someone with preexisting conditions, but if the policy you propose is \$200,000 a year, \$300,000 a year, we all know that is a false promise. That is a hoax. That is playing games with the American people. So you can write in any kind of requirement you want that preexisting conditions be covered, but if they are unaffordable, it is not real. That is why the Affordable Care Act put everybody into a pool together, to help reduce the costs so we could make sure we protected people with preexisting conditions—asthma, diabetes or whatever it may be. The House bill pulls the plug on that. Maybe that is why the House didn't want to wait for the next Congressional Budget Office report to tell them what their bill would do to the American people.

I have already read a little from the original Congressional Budget Office report that was based on the foundation of this House bill. That hasn't changed. That bill is rotten at its core, and as the Congressional Budget Office says, it is going to knock 24 million people off of affordable healthcare, going to apply big tax breaks to wealthy people, but then they added other provisions as well—getting rid of the essential health benefits, getting rid of protections for preexisting conditions. Then it was let's see no evil, let's

hear no evil. We are not even going to wait for the next Congressional Budget Office report. I am looking forward to hearing what they have to say.

For the American people, I think the greatest danger is that here in the Senate we are going to hear from a lot of Senators that they don't like the House bill just as it is; yes, we are going to have to make some changes. What I would say to the American people is to beware of people who say they are going to make a change that is meaningful to the Affordable Care Act that the House bill passed—their version of the bill. Beware of people who say they are making a change that is meaningful when it is really only a cosmetic change, when it is really only a small change that then provides some kind of rationale or excuse for supporting a House bill that is rotten at its core.

For example, someone may say: Well, let's do a little more by way of covering opioid addiction. That would be a good idea. But that doesn't salvage a bill that is fundamentally flawed. That doesn't salvage a bill that at its core cuts \$880 billion from Medicaid and Medicare to provide a tax cut of over \$900 billion, most of which goes to wealthy people and corporate special interests.

I would say to all the other people who are on employer-provided healthcare, which are the majority of Americans: Beware, because that House bill will affect you too.

I just want to read a portion from something that appeared in *TheUpshot* public health section of the *New York Times*—“G.O.P. Bill Could Affect Employer Health Coverage, Too.” They write:

About half of all Americans get health coverage through work. The bill would make it easier for employers to increase the amount that employees could be asked to pay in premiums, or to stop offering coverage entirely. It also has the potential to weaken rules against capping worker's benefits or limiting how much employees can be asked to pay in deductibles or co-payments.

So for someone who is getting coverage through their employer, beware because this is going to have harmful effects on you.

I want to close with one of the many stories that I have received—and I know many of us have received from our constituents—about how that House bill would wreak havoc in their lives. Here is one that I received:

I'm 29 years old and was just diagnosed Feb. 24th with breast cancer. . . . I buy insurance myself, and did so with the assistance from the ACA. Without that program in place, I might not have gone in when I felt this lump. I might have waited much longer, just to be told that it was too late. Without this program, I would be bankrupted by the screenings alone just to find out I am dying. . . . Someone told me not to make this political—but this is my life. It will literally be life or death for so many of us.

This is a life-or-death issue for tens of millions of our fellow Americans. I

urge the Senate to flatly reject the House healthcare-wealthcare bill, which is rotten to its core.

Let's focus on fixing the issues in the exchanges. We can do that if people of good faith want to work from scratch to address that issue, but let's not blow up the Affordable Care Act and hurt our constituents and tens of millions of other Americans in the process.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I particularly appreciate the comments of my colleague from Maryland about the Affordable Care Act. The fact is, they are taking insurance from 200,000 Ohioans right now who are getting opioid treatment because of the Affordable Care Act, and the vote in the House of Representatives would turn those 200,000 families upside down. They should be ashamed of themselves. Then to go to the White House and celebrate—that is just the ultimate despicable, political act. I just can't imagine that in the 21st century people would actually do that.

The FDA has incredible influence over Americans' lives, and the Commissioner of the Federal Food and Drug Administration will lead the agency dedicated to ensuring that our medicine and food supplies are safe.

It is the job of the FDA Commissioner, and has been for decades, to be an independent check on big pharmaceutical companies, to crack down on Big Tobacco, and to oversee the safety and efficacy of new prescription drugs, including, most essentially in the last few years, opioid painkillers. Unfortunately, Dr. Scott Gottlieb's record gives me serious concern, as Senator MARKEY has pointed out so well, that this Commissioner will fall short on all of these measures.

We know the havoc that opioid painkillers have wreaked on communities across the country. My State of Ohio has had more overdose deaths from heroin, OxyContin, oxycodone, Percocet, opioids, morphine-based opioids; we have had more deaths than any other State in the United States of America. In my State and across this country, people die because of the opioid epidemic; 91 Americans, including 12 Ohioans, will die today—91 Americans, 12 Ohioans will die today—from opioid overdoses.

The Commissioner will have a lot of tools to fight this epidemic that is ravaging our families and our communities. We need all hands on deck to fight this crisis. We need the FDA.

Unfortunately, Dr. Gottlieb's record indicates he would not take the epidemic and the FDA's authority to rein in prescription painkillers and other drugs seriously, which is why I cannot support his nomination.

I don't want to point fingers, but there are a whole host of reasons for

this epidemic. One of them clearly is the proliferation of prescriptions and the manufacture of so many of these opioids. They are getting to market, and doctors are prescribing them, and pharmacists are filling them.

I don't point fingers at individual people and even individual industries; we are all at fault and not doing this right. But Dr. Gottlieb has had a cozy relationship with big drug companies for decades as an investor, as an adviser, and as a member of the board for a number of these companies. He supported allowing those same companies to rush their drugs, including potentially addictive opioid painkillers, onto the market before we were sure they were safe—more on that in a moment.

He has called into question the Drug Enforcement Administration's authority to police opioids, despite the fact that these drugs are often sold on the black market. He has defended industry's efforts to market new drugs and devices with minimal safety oversight. He has refused to answer questions about his previous work for pharmaceutical companies that make the opioid fentanyl. We know he participated in a meeting on their behalf at the time that the company was under FDA investigation for pushing off-label uses of fentanyl.

Anyone who thinks we need more fentanyl on the market in many of Ohio's 88 counties should visit the coroner's office. Imagine this: In some counties, the coroner's office has had to bring in refrigerated semitrailers to keep up with the growing body count from the lives lost to overdoses. Think of that; just think of that picture bringing in refrigerated semitrailers to keep up with the growing body count from opioid deaths.

Let Mr. Gottlieb explain himself to the parents, the children, and the friends who have lost loved ones to this deadly drug. A friend of my wife's, a woman she knew growing up, lost her son to fentanyl. He had a 2-year-old child. He was starting to come clean. My understanding is that he relapsed, and he passed away just a few days ago.

We need a leader at the FDA who will step up the agency's efforts to fight this addiction epidemic, which is tearing families upside down. It rips up communities. We need a Commissioner who will fight the addiction epidemic, not one who will roll over for his Big Pharma friends. We need a strong public health advocate to address probably the worst public health crisis of my lifetime, a public health advocate who will continue to stand up to Big Tobacco with strong rules for all tobacco products, including newer products like e-cigarettes, which are particularly appealing to kids.

The opioid crisis is certainly a bigger health crisis that we face right now, and tobacco is an ongoing public health crisis. We have made huge victories; we

have made huge strides and have had huge victories in this country. Young people smoke in significantly lower numbers than they used to. Tobacco companies don't much like that, so they have introduced e-cigarettes. Tobacco companies are buying more and more of the manufacturing capabilities of these e-cigarettes. The FDA hasn't stepped up the way it should. I implore Dr. Gottlieb to do that, but there is no evidence so far that he cares enough to.

Once again, his extensive business dealings call into doubt whether he can seriously serve as the people's cop on the beat when it comes to policing Big Tobacco. Dr. Gottlieb himself invested in an e-cigarette company—the new FDA Commissioner. He probably will be confirmed today. I accept that because for every Trump nominee, no matter their ethics, no matter their background, no matter their inability to serve well, no matter their lack of qualifications for a whole host of their responsibilities, almost every Republican—it is sort of like when one bird flies off a telephone wire, they all do, and they have voted for almost every one of these nominees.

But think of this: Dr. Gottlieb's job is public health, his job is to police Big Tobacco. His job is to stand between these multimillion-dollar marketing executives and the 15-year-old who is attracted to these e-cigarettes with the flavors and the colors and the marketing, and he has invested in the past in e-cigarette companies. What does that tell you? Can we really trust him to impose tough rules on these potentially dangerous products? Can we trust him to protect our children?

Whoever is in charge of the FDA—whoever is in charge—must put the people's safety over drug company profits, whether it is addictive painkillers or e-cigarettes.

I don't think Dr. Gottlieb is the right person for this. I hope I am wrong. I plan to vote no. I hope he proves me wrong. If he does, I will come back to the floor and applaud him. But from his background, from his statements, from his qualifications, from his investments, from his business background, I don't think he fits the bill.

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

Mr. President, I withdraw the suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So noted.

RECESS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:29 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise to speak on an issue that is vitally important to the well-being, safety, and security of Nevadans; namely, Yucca Mountain. I have said it before—and I will say it again—that Yucca Mountain is dead. Let me repeat myself. Yucca Mountain is dead, and I will continue to come to the floor until we, as a country, move past this ill-conceived project.

Last week, I had the opportunity to testify before the House Energy and Commerce Committee's Environment Subcommittee regarding draft legislation to effectively restart the licensing process for Yucca Mountain. While I appreciate having had the opportunity to testify in order to ensure that Nevadans' voices on this issue are heard, I am concerned that we are using valuable time and taxpayer resources to hold a hearing on a closed issue.

Let me say this one more time. Yucca Mountain is dead.

Instead of focusing our efforts on reviving failed proposals of the past, I will continue to encourage my colleagues and the administration to focus on policies of the future. The failure to do so will have real economic, environmental, and national security implications for all Nevadans. This afternoon, I will focus on the economic impact that resuming licensing activities, with regard to Yucca Mountain as a nuclear waste repository, will have on my home State.

As many of you know, Yucca Mountain is located just 90 miles from the world's premier tourist, convention, and entertainment destination—Las Vegas, NV. Last year, Las Vegas welcomed nearly 43 million visitors. Over the past decade, the Greater Las Vegas area has been one of the fastest growing in the United States, with a population that now exceeds 2.1 million people, according to an estimate from the U.S. Census Bureau. Any issues with the transportation of nuclear waste to the site or issues with storage there would bring devastating consequences to the local, State, and national economies.

It begs the question, Would you want to go to Las Vegas knowing that high-level nuclear waste was being transported, very likely, through the heart of the strip?

Let me outline the vitally important role tourism plays in the Greater Las Vegas area.

This industry accounts for close to 44 percent of the local workforce and provides close to \$17 billion in local wages. Moreover, tourism has an estimated \$60 billion in local impact. Without tourism, every household in Southern Nevada would pay close to \$3,000 more in taxes. That is a significant amount of

money to individuals and families who are working to make ends meet. People visit not only as tourists but as business professionals who attend conferences, meetings, and trade shows, which generate another \$12 billion in local economic impact. Las Vegas has 3 of the 10 largest convention centers in North America, and it has been the No. 1 trade show destination for 23 consecutive years.

This economic driver within the State is a critical component of another related industry that is vitally important to the State of Nevada; namely, the gaming industry. In Nevada, this industry alone supports more than 430,000 jobs, pays more than \$18 billion in wages, and generates close to \$8 billion in Federal, State, and local tax revenues. The reason I draw the Presiding Officer's attention and our colleagues' attention to these numbers is due to the fact that Yucca Mountain will have very real negative economic consequences for Nevadans.

I am proud to come to the floor to stand with the many concerned citizens, many small business operators, and casino operators in opposition to any attempt to restart the repository licensing process. I will continue to work tirelessly to ensure that radioactive waste is never stored anywhere near the world's entertainment capital, also known as Las Vegas. Rather, I encourage my colleagues to partner with me on identifying viable alternatives for the long-term storage of nuclear waste in areas that are willing to house it.

I come to the table with a solution to our Nation's nuclear waste program and am proud to have introduced bipartisan legislation on this issue. My legislation would allow for the construction of a nuclear waste repository only if the Secretary of Energy has secured written consent from the Governor of the host State, affected units of the local government, and affected Indian Tribes.

This is consistent with the consent-based siting initiative to site waste storage and disposal facilities that was initiated by the Department of Energy in late 2015. This open process ensures that a State has a meaningful voice in the process and that no State will be forced to accept nuclear waste against its own will.

Identifying communities that will be willing hosts for long-term repositories rather than forcing it upon the States that have outright opposed such a site for decades is the only viable solution to our Nation's nuclear waste problem. The failure to do so will just result in decades of more litigation and in the wasting of more taxpayer dollars without solving the problem at hand.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, the topic before us is clearly the repeal and replacement of the Affordable Care Act, and that is what I rise to speak about today. In part I will speak as a Senator, and in part I will speak as a doctor, as I am a physician. My wife is also a physician. I worked in a hospital for the uninsured for many years.

First, let's just describe the state of play. It is so interesting, President Obama's healthcare law, the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare.

I had two different communications yesterday, one from a sister-in-law in San Francisco. I think her husband voted for BERNIE SANDERS. She is, you know—but she said: This is incredible. Speaking of herself, she said: I am paying \$20,000 a year in premiums, and each of my family members has a \$6,000 deductible.

They have to pay San Francisco prices for everything, and they make good money but not exorbitant money. They are paying \$20,000 a year for a premium, for a young couple in good health, with a family deductible probably of \$13,000.

The next communication was in a phone call with a consultant here in Washington, DC, who does healthcare. He knows his stuff, and at some point, he breaks out of sort of a professional kind of "this is the way I talk," and he says: You don't see my insurance. I am paying \$24,000 a year for premiums, and I have a \$13,000 family deductible. If my family gets in an accident, it will be \$37,000 my family puts out before we see any benefit from our insurance.

I reminded him he would have preventive services, such as a colonoscopy, but that was cold comfort for him.

The reality is that middle-class America can no longer afford the now-ironically named Affordable Care Act. So where does that leave us?

President Trump—I like to say because I think he would say it—established a contract with the American voter. President Trump said that he wanted to continue the number of folks who were covered under ObamaCare, he wanted to take care of those with pre-existing conditions, he wanted to eliminate mandates because Americans hate to be told what to do by the Federal Government, and lastly, he wanted to lower costs. I think the average voter took lower costs to mean lower premiums, not a better CBO score, and lower premiums are really what those two communications are about.

The second thing I will note is that he was very passionate about a particular preexisting condition that the

Presiding Officer here in the Senate cares about, which is opioid addiction. And he would go to counties where there was a high incidence of opioid addiction and speak to how he wished to address their needs.

So I think President Trump's proposals—his contract with the voter—really give us hope. The question is, How do we achieve that? Well, first we have to acknowledge a couple of things.

Rich Lowry is a conservative author for *National Review*, and he wrote a column: Basically, coverage is important. We cannot deny—no one can deny that it is important to have coverage. And if we speak—as the Presiding Officer did at lunch—about the family whose son is addicted to narcotics and the fact that now he has coverage and he is able to get off of the opioids instead of either dying, living in a gutter, or being incarcerated—that is a sign of hope. And when President Trump spoke of the forgotten man or the forgotten woman, in my mind, I think in his mind, he was referring to someone such as that.

So we have to acknowledge, as Rich Lowry did, that coverage is important. My own experience as a physician supports that. I am actually going to quote somebody from my wife's experience. My wife is a retired breast cancer surgeon, and she once told me about a patient who lived in a nice section of my hometown, Baton Rouge, had a nice car and children in parochial school, paying tuition. But her husband died. He always managed the family affairs, and he died, and she ended up uninsured. She had a nice car and nice home and kids in parochial school, but she didn't have insurance.

Going back to coverage being important, she began to develop breast cancer—something that is described in medicine as fungating, which means the cancer begins to eat through the skin on the chest—and she didn't know where to go because she didn't have coverage. And when the breast cancer was actually coming out of her skin is when she came to see my wife. My wife operated on her for free. The hospital wrote off the cost. But that is not the end of it because then she needed radiation therapy, she needed breast reconstruction, and she needed chemotherapy. And her only hope for survival is if she had this coverage.

So we can acknowledge two things—that coverage is important but also that premiums under the Affordable Care Act have become unaffordable.

I will go back to what President Trump said. President Trump said he wants everyone to be covered, care for those with preexisting conditions, without mandates, and lower premiums. That is something, whether Republican or Democratic or Independent, we should be able to get behind.

How do we have a path forward? Some folks say: Well, President Trump's promise cannot be kept. There was a good article recently by Jim Capretta, a conservative economist, and he says that, basically, we can achieve these goals. The way we do it is we automatically enroll folks in the insurance program so that if you are a young person, you get a credit, and that would be sufficient enough to pay for your annual premium. You don't have to take it, but if you do, you are automatically enrolled in insurance. By automatically enrolling these young people, we expand the risk pool, which is to say that we now have a lot of healthy young folks, most of whom will not get sick, but the fact that they are in the insurance pool means that those who are older and sicker will have lower premiums because the cost of their care is spread out over the many. That is a good thing. That would increase coverage and it would lower premiums without mandates, taking care of those with preexisting conditions.

I think Candidate Trump's genius was to recognize that the only way you get to lower premiums is if you expand coverage, and the only way to care for those with preexisting conditions is to expand coverage.

I am pleased to say we have a proposal that is called the Patient Freedom Act, which I have cosponsored and introduced with SUSAN COLLINS, and four other of our Republican Senators have cosponsored it. The six of us propose this: that every State be given the right to choose their path forward. If you are a blue State, you can continue with the status quo; you just have to reimpose penalties and mandates. If you are a red State, you can go in a different direction where folks in your State get a tax credit, again, sufficient for the premiums. Not everybody will be eligible—typically, lower income folks—and this credit can only be used for health insurance or healthcare. If you do nothing, you end up with a health savings account, prefunded. You have first-dollar coverage.

If you have to take your daughter to the urgent care center—instead of an ObamaCare \$6,000 deductible, when your daughter has her earache, you have first-dollar coverage to pay that \$150 to get your child seen and to buy the antibiotics. If the mother instead wishes to pool her family's health savings accounts together, their tax credits together, she could buy a richer family policy or she could assign it to her employer as the employee's contribution on employer-sponsored insurance. The patient has the power.

I should say, in my medical practice, I found that if the patient has the power, the system lines up to serve the patient.

By the way, just a rule of thumb: If you ever go to a hospital that delivers

babies and you walk in, it is clear who has the power. The walls are painted mauve or powder blue or pink. There is a concierge to park your car because women don't like to walk in parking lots at night. And if you are pregnant, you really don't want to walk at all, so someone parks your car for you. There is a coffee shop as you walk in, and a floral shop. It is all a therapeutic experience that addresses not just the physical need but the emotional and psychological need, and that is because that system is lining up to serve her, that patient. The Patient Freedom Act incorporates that.

By the way, we also have a third option. If a State doesn't want to have anything to do with this, the State can say: Take a hike; we don't want you. But generally, States have three options, and that recognizes a conservative principle that States should have the right to do what they want to do and what works best for the State. But we do require the patient have the power.

Now, I will be frank. I am not sure we are going to pass meaningful reform as good as it could be with only the Republican side of the Senate. So aside from asking my Senators to join with me and my Republican Senators to promote something that fulfills President Trump's pledge, I ask my Democratic colleagues to look beyond partisanship and to say: Wait a second; wouldn't it be good if a blue State could do a blue thing and a red State could do a different plan for themselves? Wouldn't it be good if President Trump, in his contract with voters, said: Eliminate mandates but also lower premiums, which are so much of a problem for so many Americans now, while at the same time covering and caring for those with preexisting conditions.

I ask my Democratic colleagues to move beyond partisanship—or perhaps they are not liking the results of the election—and into a spirit of cooperation that puts patient before party. We don't need a red plan or a blue plan, a Democratic plan or Republican plan. We need an American plan.

I will finish by saying this. There is another way to lower premiums, and that is to give lousy coverage. I coined the phrase, and I didn't realize it would become so instantaneously recognized, but we should also have the Jimmy Kimmel test. I think people understand that Mr. Kimmel's child was born, and instead of being a celebration as a new life emerges into the world, all of a sudden it quickly became that the child was blue and would die. The whole medical staff comes in, recognizing that the child has a rare cardiac condition that, if not immediately operated on, would be fatal. The child was transferred, and after several surgeries already in its first week of life, apparently, is doing well.

I raise that because, again, we can lower premiums by having lousy coverage. But whatever we do to lower premiums, it should pass what I call the Jimmy Kimmel test, which is that someone you love has adequate coverage for the care he or she needs when they need it. In that way, I think we can be fiscally responsible, and we can help someone like my family or the man I talked to yesterday, paying \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000 for their insurance. We have to do something about that and at the same time fulfill the rest of President Trump's contract with the voters which is to care for those with preexisting conditions, to continue coverage, and to eliminate mandates.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, after some chaotic weeks of hush-hush deliberating, a lot of arm-twisting, and more than a few obvious buy-offs, the House has handed the Senate a healthcare bill that will plunge tens of millions of Americans into suffering. With it, the debate now comes to this side of the Capitol, and my Republican colleagues seem to be competing to find out who can put the most distance between themselves and the House bill.

The message is that they are starting from scratch with a partisan working group and a new bill under construction. But I want to make sure that everybody is realistic about where this debate stands. There is not a shred of actual hard evidence that the Senate Republican conference is objecting to nearly \$1 trillion in tax breaks for the wealthy and the special interests, paid for by slashing middle-class tax benefits and cutting more than \$800 billion out of Medicaid. The dates, the numbers, and the waivers might look a little different when Senate Republicans write a bill, but the underlying framework will be the same.

This process, in short, is leading America back to the days when healthcare worked only for the healthy and wealthy. It is clear, when we look at the particulars, that the bill passed by the other body doesn't care whether you are young or old. It poses a threat of pain across all generations.

So this afternoon, as I begin what will be a series of discussions here on the floor in the days ahead to discuss these issues, I want to talk about what we are dealing with now.

Under the House bill, the youngster who needs special education services could see that set of opportunities dis-

appear with cuts to Medicaid, a key source of funding for special ed school programs.

Are the tax breaks in this bill for the wealthy worth depriving kids of the opportunities they need to get ahead in life?

Under this bill, the young adult at 18 or 20 who has been through a cancer scare could wear that preexisting condition like a scarlet letter. They could face discrimination by insurance companies for life if their coverage ever lapses for more than a few weeks.

Are the tax breaks in this bill worth exposing Americans with preexisting conditions to this danger?

The 45-year-old who thought she was home free with an employer-sponsored plan that avoids the worst insurance company abuses could once again face a lifetime limit on certain health coverage. They would be at risk for personal bankruptcy if they suffer the wrong kind of injury or come down with the wrong kind of illness.

Are the tax breaks in this bill worth putting insurance companies back in the driver's seat? The 60-year-old, still years from retirement, would get clobbered by what I call the age tax, charged up to five times as much as a young person for insurance coverage. Are the tax breaks in this bill worth reviving insurance company abuses like this?

Not even the most vulnerable seniors are spared under this bill. Medicaid helps cover the tab for nearly two out of three seniors in nursing homes. They are people who have done everything right. They worked hard, they scrimped, and they saved. They raised their kids and put them through school. You see them in Ohio communities, and you see them in Oregon communities. But colleagues, growing older in America is not cheap, and these are people who spend down their savings, and that is when Medicaid steps in. But if Medicaid funding is slashed, the nursing home benefit and other critical long-term care services like home-based care are going to be in danger.

Every one of us wants their loved ones to be cared for. But the fact is most families are already walking an economic tightrope in this country, balancing their mortgage and their gas bills and struggling to save for college and retirement. Where would working mothers and fathers today possibly find the money to pay for nursing home care for their elderly parents, perhaps \$90,000 or more? Are the tax breaks in this bill worth putting seniors' nursing home care at risk?

I spent this weekend holding town-hall meetings in Oregon, holding healthcare roundtables at home in Oregon. It would be hard to overstate the fear and the tears I heard in conversations about this legislation.

Oregonians recognize that in many ways, this proposal is a return to an

era when insurance companies had more power and the typical American had less, when women were penalized simply because of their gender, when for many a preexisting condition was a death sentence, when insurance companies deciding what preexisting conditions they would cover constituted a real death panel. Even worse, the system would invite young and healthy people not to buy insurance unless they needed it at that particular moment, which would drive up costs for everybody else.

Bottom line: You cannot revive a failed, abusive health insurance system and expect Americans to be very pleased and excited about it, especially when it is part of a scheme to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy. That is what my Republican colleagues are attempting. I understand why they are doing it. What they want to do is, in effect, get these tax breaks for the wealthy in a health bill so they can have it teed up to get more tax breaks for the wealthy in a tax bill. That is what this is really all about. Even casual watchers of the debate understand that this bill—the tax cuts, in particular, are stacked in favor of the fortunate few.

Every time you get a paycheck in North Dakota or Oregon or anywhere in America, a little bit for Medicare is taken out of that paycheck. Working people can see it; it is right there on their paychecks. A little bit is taken out. Under this bill, the only people who get a break on that contribution are at the very top of the income scale.

Furthermore, the tax break on investment income will be swallowed up by the wealthy almost in its entirety. People with incomes over \$1 million will get an average break of more than \$50,000—almost as much as a typical family earns in an entire year. Most of that tax break goes not to just the millionaires but to those at the uppermost slice of the income scale. They are the fortunate individuals who make money from wealth, not from wages like most Americans.

The 120,000 wealthiest families in the United States—those who bring in around \$2 million a year, mostly from capital gains, interest, and dividends—would get an average tax handout under the House bill of \$207,000. This is according to the Tax Policy Center, a well-respected group who analyzes these matters. I can tell you, even conservative health policy experts are looking at this bill and scratching their heads, trying to determine how this constitutes an improvement over the system that is on the books today.

Aside from the wealthy individuals and corporations lining up for these tax handouts, it is hard to see who will be helped by this approach Republicans have taken.

It is a worrying sign for anybody who believes in bipartisanship to see that

Republicans in this body have decided they don't want any Democratic input. I have been involved in writing bipartisan health bills in the past, and there are more than a few cosponsors of those bills in the Republican conference today. A number of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have joined me in efforts, for example, to have loophole-free, air-tight protection against discrimination against those with a preexisting condition.

It is important to understand that a lot of us on this side of the aisle—and my colleague, the President of the Senate, knows it from our work on infrastructure—would very much like to work with colleagues on the other side on bipartisan issues. It can be done. In fact, just today, under the leadership of Senator SCHUMER, our whole caucus said to the Republicans: Drop reconciliation so we can all come together and get serious about working in a bipartisan way on an issue that ought to be tackled in a bipartisan way for the American people and that I have a long history, in particular, of wanting to be part of.

For the next several weeks, I will be on the floor drawing on our past experiences and underlining why the partisan approach underway right now is wrong.

People ought to know that TrumpCare is a betrayal of the promises they have heard time and time again. They heard it through hundreds of TV commercials all through the election period, and what they are now seeing is a betrayal of those promises they watched on campaign advertisements over the last year.

People ought to know that this is not a real effort at fixing our healthcare system. This is a masquerade. It is a masquerade to try to pretend that what is going on is about healthcare when it really is about making sure taxes can be cut for the most fortunate, while healthcare benefits for the middle class are slashed. TrumpCare is the opposite of good health policy. There is no grassroots campaign I know of clamoring for the Congress to pass another round of the same old handouts to special interests, donors, and powerful individuals.

The American people are counting on the Congress to improve the health system and make their care more affordable. Congress ought to be working together on injecting more competition into the insurance markets and reducing out-of-pocket costs for families. We ought to be working especially on bringing down prescription drug prices. In my view, you can't really build a modern health system unless you address the challenges posed by chronic conditions such as diabetes, cancer, and Alzheimer's.

We want it understood that Democrats want to work in a bipartisan way to improve the Affordable Care Act.

That is the heart of the letter that all Senate Democrats signed today—we all went together—making it clear that we would like to see Republicans drop reconciliation and come together so we can find common ground. That would be in the country's interests, rather than using this go-it-alone process that is called reconciliation but specifically rejects bipartisanship.

I am going to be on the floor a lot over the next several weeks. I promised my constituents night and day over the course of last weekend—and people kept saying night and day, day and night—because the country feels that strongly about this.

I and others are going to hold our colleagues on the other side of the aisle accountable because we all ought to agree that this country cannot go back to the days when healthcare was for the healthy and the wealthy. Those preexisting conditions could be a death sentence. And that is because if you were healthy, you had no problem. If you were wealthy, you could write out the checks. But if you had a preexisting condition, you were in very serious straits. People told us about losing their homes and everything they had. We are not going back to the days in America when healthcare was for the healthy and wealthy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

DRUG EPIDEMIC

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to continue a discussion we have had on the floor over the last year or so on the issue of opioids—that would be addiction to heroin, prescription drugs, and now this new form of synthetic heroin coming into our communities called fentanyl or carfentanyl.

Sadly, I must say that things are not getting better. In fact, in the States we represent, in our communities, we see more and more evidence of not just addiction but overdoses and deaths. Fentanyl, in particular, is more deadly than heroin—30 to 50 times more powerful—and is resulting in not just more overdoses but more deaths per overdose. This has become a crisis to the point that it is the No. 1 cause of death in my home State of Ohio and across the country, surpassing car accidents.

This is the 35th time I have come to the floor to talk about this issue and what we ought to do. We have made progress. In the last year alone, we passed legislation, including the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, to help with prevention, treatment, and recovery, and to help our law enforcement and other first responders, with Narcan, be able to reduce the number of deaths—this miracle drug that reverses the overdoses—to be able to save lives.

We also passed the Cures legislation, which sent money straight back to the States that would help to provide the

treatment that is so badly needed. Probably 8 out of 10 people who are addicted are not receiving treatment. Sadly, there is a revolving door where people are coming under the grip of this addiction, committing crimes, going to prison, getting out, getting into the addiction again, and going back into the criminal justice system once again.

This legislation we passed is now starting to be implemented. It takes a little while for things to get moving around here. I am happy to say that the States have now received some of this funding. Some of the programs—about half of those in the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act are now implemented. I urge the administration to implement the other half of the programs, and I have done that every time I have come to the floor over the last few months.

Unfortunately, I also have to come to the floor today to talk about something that is going to make it harder to address this issue should it become reality. As some of you may know, recently it was reported that there was a document from the White House Office of Management and Budget saying that the White House is considering cutting funding dramatically for the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the ONDCP. This is the office that coordinates the drug issue for the White House, the administration. The proposal that was leaked to the media said that it would be a cut from \$388 million a year to \$24 million a year. That is a cut of 95 percent. What does that mean? It means the staff would be, obviously, reduced dramatically. They have 33 people who would lose their jobs, people who are out there every day on the frontlines, trying to use a relatively small number of people to expand this effort all over the country. It would eliminate a lot of grant programs, office administrators, including what is called the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, or HIDTA, and a program called the Drug-Free Communities Support Program.

I want to touch on those two programs quickly and make the point as to how important they are, hoping that the administration is hearing us and hoping my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will help us ensure that this proposal does not become reality, that we don't end up, at a time when we have an unprecedented drug crisis in this country—the worst drug epidemic we have had in our lifetime—pulling back on these important programs.

Why does this matter? Again, having a drug czar, which is what the Director of the Office of National Drug Policy is called, is very important to coordinate the efforts. In fact, it is cost-effective to have a drug czar rather than having different agencies and departments

competing and sometimes in duplication with each other, to have one person in the White House in charge, talking about the importance of this.

President Ronald Reagan and First Lady Nancy Reagan established the drug czar. The reason they did it was they wanted to be sure America and the White House were speaking with one voice on this issue. I have known every drug czar since then. I have known every one of them over the last—what would that be?—30 years. I think it is incredibly important to have this job filled with the right person to get out there and deliver this message that it is important that we work together on prevention and education to try to keep people out of drugs altogether, and should people become addicted, how do we maximize the chances of their success by getting them into treatment and recovery?

The program I mentioned a minute ago, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, is one that pretty much every Senator knows about. Why? Because in pockets of every State, there are areas in which there is a particular problem with drugs. This program, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, does something unique. It says: OK, we are going to put Federal law enforcement together with State law enforcement and local law enforcement to intensely focus on this issue at the local level. As you know, that is necessary because so much of this is interstate, even international, and by having this intense focus, there has been enormous success in my State and States around the country.

Under the program, you have to have one full-time law enforcement officer at the Federal level, State level, and the local level. What I have found back home is that typically you have a sheriff or a police chief who runs this locally and has a lot of his officers involved but really is able to maximize what he or she can do because you have this involvement from the State highway patrol, you have this involvement from the FBI, you have this coordination.

The Ohio HIDTA alone has removed \$90 million worth of illicit drugs from our streets. It has apprehended more than 4,000 fugitives involved in drug trafficking operations. Think about the difference that makes. It makes our communities safer; ultimately, of course, it is going to save a lot of lives.

So I think this is one that is really working. If you ask your law enforcement locally about it, they will tell you that if they don't have a HIDTA grant, they probably wish they did. It is very competitive; not everyone can get one. But if you can show that you can use the money effectively and if you have a really serious drug problem in your area, having that HIDTA program is important.

The second program I mentioned is called the Drug-Free Communities Support Program. What does this do? This supports community anti-drug coalitions all around the country. Often, people ask me: What is the solution to this problem? Why are we in the situation we are in? I turn to prevention and education because, if you think about it, once you get into that funnel of addiction, it is very costly and very difficult.

Wouldn't it be better if we had better programs out there? Frankly, we did back in the 1980s and even the 1990s—to tell young people and to tell others why it is such a mistake to get into this drug issue, why they must do everything they can to avoid, in the case of heroin and prescription drugs and other opioids, taking these painkillers, these prescription drugs that are addictive, to the point that you become addicted, which is so often where the heroin addiction and the overdoses start.

Four out of five heroin addicts in the country started with prescription drugs, they say. Getting that information out there, that awareness, is incredibly important. That is what this Drug-Free Communities Program is about.

I got involved in this program early on through a personal experience. I was a first-year Member of the House of Representatives 23 years ago. A woman whose son had died of an overdose came to see me. She came to see me because she wanted to talk about her experience and what were we going to do about it.

At the time, Bill Clinton was President. I went to an event where both President Clinton and I were given a gold ID bracelet by a young man. The young man's name was Jeffrey Gardner. I put Jeffrey Gardner's ID bracelet on, and then I prepared for my meeting with this mother, who was obviously very upset.

She was there with her younger son. She came to my office. I was prepared for her. My staff had done all the research, and we knew there was about \$15 billion a year being spent on drug interdiction, interdicting drugs coming from other countries, incarcerations and prosecutions, and the eradication of drugs overseas in places like Colombia, where a lot of cocaine was being grown at that time. So I told her that. I said: Your tax dollars are being used well to fight this battle. This is what is happening with your dollars.

She looked at me and said: How does that help me? She said: I went to my church. I went to my school to get them to help, to mobilize people, to provide more prevention and education resources, to get the word out. They were in denial. They said: This does not happen here.

She said: I went to my neighbors and tried to get a community meeting together, and people did not show up.

She said: How does interdicting drugs help me? How does the work on eradication overseas help me?

I did more research and looked into it further and talked to people around the country who were experts on this and found out where there was this community-of-support network, bringing in all sectors of the community. It really made a difference to reduce drug abuse.

So we started this program. This program, the Drug-Free Communities Act, has to be made up of all sectors of the community. We are talking about the religious community, faith leaders—very important—but also teachers, police officers, parents, doctors, other community leaders who come together with this intense focus on education and prevention.

The program we put together has real accountability. You know, I am a Republican. I believe in accountability. I want to be sure tax dollars are being used wisely. To receive funding under this program, coalitions are required to be in existence for 6 months before they can even apply—get on their feet, be sure they are working. It is the only Federal drug abuse prevention program that requires that, by the way.

The coalition is required to go through a year-long training academy to ensure they have the skills necessary to effectively reduce drug rates, and they have to have data to show that their efforts are actually working. There have to be performance measures in place. In these coalitions, there are surveys done in schools to see what the results are.

These coalitions are made up of people who are on the front lines. They know their communities better than anybody else does. That is why they are more effective than anybody else. They know how to reach people in that setting, know how to respond quickly when problems begin.

In communities with these coalitions, use of alcohol, tobacco, prescription drugs, marijuana, and cocaine by our young people have declined: alcohol, 32-percent decline; tobacco, 38-percent decline; other drugs, including prescription drugs, 21-percent decline. So these things work.

I must say, I have seen it firsthand because, before drafting the legislation, I started my own coalition called the Coalition for a Drug-Free Greater Cincinnati. Twenty-three years ago, we started this coalition, and we did it with, again, all members of the community.

In my case, I reached out to the first lady, Hope Taft of our State; also to a religious leader in our community, Damon Lynch, Jr., one of the most respected community leaders and at that time head of the Baptist Ministers Conference; and the former CEO of Procter & Gamble, John Petter, so we brought in the business community as well.

We established this coalition not thinking that we were going to end up applying for Federal grant money because there was no Federal grant program then, but that we would focus on how to ensure we could actually make a difference. We set up a survey that went to two-thirds of the schools in our community and asked questions about drug use, so we would know if our efforts were working or not working, as the case might be, and how to target our efforts toward parents and teachers. We spent a lot of time in the faith community, but also with coaches and athletic directors.

This program is still going. It is called Prevention First. I chaired it for 9 years. I was on the board of the coalition again before I ran for the Senate. I know it works because I have seen it. We have gotten good results. The coalition tells me that since 2000, alcohol use among young people they worked with in Cincinnati has gone down 46 percent; tobacco use, 61 percent; marijuana use, 22 percent.

Since 2012, which is when we started focusing on the prescription drug issue, there has been a decline by 29 percent in the use of prescription drugs by our young people. So, I think, this program, which by the way, cost about 90 million bucks last year—as someone who was a distinguished military officer told me recently: That is about what we charge to keep the lights on in part of the Pentagon every day, not that I am not for more and smarter defense spending; I am, but \$90 million is what we are talking about for this program during the time of the worst drug crisis in the history of our country.

I just think this impact, which I have seen, really works. It means less crime, less strain on our healthcare system, more productivity in school, more people who can pass a drug test and go to work. That benefits all of us, and it saves taxpayer dollars.

The success we had in this coalition, again, led me to the legislation. A Democratic Representative from Michigan, SANDY LEVIN, and I introduced the legislation, bipartisan in the House.

Here in the Senate, the leaders who were the leaders of this legislation are still here and continue to support it; that is, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY and Senator PATRICK LEAHY—again a bipartisan group. The bill, the Drug-Free Communities Act, is, again, based on these lead documents from the administration, one of the programs they have proposed defunding altogether.

I am hopeful that this legislation, the Drug-Free Communities Act, which has really worked—it has provided funding that has spawned over 2,000 community coalitions around the country. Today, it currently mobilizes 9,000 community volunteers all around the country. I am hopeful that we will not

be defunding this program but, instead, focusing more on the issues of prevention and education. That is going to be the long-term solution to this drug problem. Yes, we have to get treatment to those who need it, but if we are not working on prevention and awareness and education, the issues of drug addiction and drug abuse are going to continue to get worse, in my view.

I am a former Budget Director. I understand it is a tough job to look at all the different competing priorities when you are trying to save taxpayer dollars. I get that. But I also get that we don't want to take a program like this that is actually working, that has all of these accountability measures in place to be sure that taxpayer dollars are being spent right, and then get rid of it at a time that we have this growing crisis in our country.

When I first got involved in this issue 22 years ago, I became convinced pretty quickly that one reason the drug issue had raised its ugly head in the 1990s is that we took our eye off the ball. I think in the 1980s, under the leadership of President Reagan and First Lady Nancy Reagan and Bill Bennett, who did an awesome job as drug czar, we made real progress, particularly on the issue of cocaine.

I think there was sort of a sense that we had solved that problem, and it was time to focus on other things. So we took our eye off the ball. That is why you saw, in the 1990s when the Drug-Free Communities Act legislation was necessary, there was a big increase in drug use, particularly among our young people. So I was always worried that we might do that again, that when there was a reduction in drug use, we might say: Well, that problem is behind us; let's move onto the next one.

The problem was never behind us, sadly. It is like the tide. It just keeps coming in, so you have to keep your focus on it. But I will tell you, I never expected that at a time when we would have a substantial increase in drug use, in crime, in overdoses, in deaths—which is what we have experienced in this country over the past few years—that we would cut these programs. I just did not imagine it. So I am concerned about it. We can't take our eye off the ball, particularly at a time like this. We have to be sure that we are supporting these programs that work.

Let me show you a chart that tells you where we are today. This is the number of drug overdose deaths in our great country from 1999 to 2015, the most recent year for which we have data. Look at this line here. This is opioid painkillers, this is fentanyl, and this is heroin. You see this incredible increase. Sadly, I will tell you that in 2016 and 2017, it keeps going up.

This year, we have had more opioid overdose deaths over the first few months than we had in the same period last year. In fact, here is one example.

In Cleveland, OH, in the last 10 months, we have had more overdose deaths from fentanyl than we had in the previous 10 years. So it is sad that it is not getting better; it is getting worse.

Drug overdoses are now the leading cause of accidental death in the United States, surpassing car accidents. This is, again, a troubling chart, but we need to look at it. We hear a lot about homicides, and gun homicides, in particular. We hear about car crashes. Here is an example of HIV/AIDS in 1995, a time that was the height of the HIV/AIDS crisis, when all of us reacted appropriately.

Here we are in drug overdoses in 2015—far worse than any of these. So between prescription painkillers, heroin, and synthetic forms of heroin, drug overdose is now the leading cause of accidental death in the United States of America.

According to CDC, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, more Americans died from drug overdoses in 2015, again, than died in the AIDS epidemic in 1995. A recent story in the New York Times said there are more than four times as many people dying every day from this epidemic than were dying at the peak of the crack epidemic.

Another way to look at it, sadly, is that more people died in the last 3 years than died in the Vietnam War. Those are tough things to compare, but the point is, this is not a time for us to be gutting these programs. Fortunately, we have these programs in place to help. Let's use them to try to encourage more prevention and more education.

Here is a chart that just shows where heroin and fentanyl are. Again, from 1999 to 2015, this is heroin, this is fentanyl. Look at the rise of this over the last few years. That is what we are dealing with. That is the reality. That is what is happening in the communities and in our streets.

You might ask yourself, why do we want to cut this back at this point? My understanding is that some have argued we don't need the program. They said this program is duplicative because we have other programs now, including great legislation passed last year that I mentioned earlier called the 21st Century Cures Act. In fact, the author of that legislation just joined us on the floor, Senator ALEXANDER of Tennessee.

They have said the Drug-Free Communities Act may be a duplication of that CURES Program. That is an entirely different program—again, \$90 million a year. CURES is \$500 million a year needed right now.

I was a strong supporter of the CURES Act, and I again thank my colleague for working with some of us who have been focused on this issue, as he has, to get that legislation passed on a bipartisan basis.

The 21st Century CURES Act provides \$500 million, but it provides that funding over this year and next, over 2 years. It is a temporary increase in funding to deal with the real crisis. This will help fill the gaps, but it does not ensure that \$1 of that money goes toward this evidence-based prevention we talked about today.

Second, these programs have distinct goals. The CURES grants can be used however a State wants, and that is appropriate. In Ohio, I know Governor Kasich and the State legislature are focused on using it in a smart way, focused mostly on treatment which is badly needed. As I noted, 8 out of 10 people who are addicted and need treatment are not getting the treatment they need. We need more treatment facilities in some communities where the treatment is not available.

The Drug-Free Communities Act is specifically focused on this prevention through education at the community level. Funding goes directly to these coalitions I talked about and their focus is on prevention. It is not duplication. One is a prevention program focused on the community level, and one is an open-ended grant to the States. There is no other Federal program that funds evidenced-based prevention at the community level and has these measures except this one.

The accountability measures we talked about are important, and that distinguishes it from CURES or anything else. We require that communities provide matching funds, a one-to-one match. So if a dollar of Federal tax dollars goes out, it has to be matched by a dollar of non-Federal tax dollars just to get the funding.

We put a cap on administrative expenses of 8 percent to ensure that we maximize the amount of funding going into these programs. If you want funding in your coalition, you have to keep your funding below 8 percent. That ensures that a maximum amount of funding goes into these programs. We specifically included strict accountability measures to ensure the highest level of support in solving the substance abuse crisis every community faces. These programs are effective. They use taxpayer dollars well, and cutting them doesn't make sense.

One of the reasons I believe President Trump was elected was that he had the courage and foresight to talk about this issue on the campaign trail. He talked about addiction, whether he was in New Hampshire, Ohio, or other States where we have a high level of heroin, prescription drug, and fentanyl abuse and addiction. He spoke with a passion about this and the toll it has on our citizens and devastation to our communities. I think that was one reason he was elected. He focused on how we would stop this epidemic. This proposal apparently put forward by Members of his administration runs counter

to what he talked about during the campaign.

Earlier today, my original House cosponsor of the Drug-Free Community Act, Congressman SANDY LEVIN, and I sent a letter to the Office of Management and Budget Director, Mick Mulvaney, encouraging him not to pursue this course of action.

More importantly, more than 219 nonpartisan public health groups—experts like the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Public Health Association, the Northern Ohio Recovery Association, the Community Anti-Drug Coalition of America, and other groups sent a letter to the White House expressing their support for the work of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

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

MAY 8, 2017.

Re Revise OMB's proposed budget slashing drug control funding

Mr. REED CORDISH,
*Senior Adviser to the President,
The White House.*

DEAR MR. CORDISH: We are thankful to the Trump Administration for prioritizing the reduction of drug use, drug trafficking, and its consequences. We represent former and current federal, state, and local officials, hundreds of community-based organizations, and tens of thousands of people working in drug prevention, drug treatment, drug treatment courts, mental health, recovery, medicine, law enforcement, and millions of individuals in recovery from alcohol and drug use disorders. Like the Administration, we believe drugs are a serious issue.

In light of the Administration's prioritization, we write in strong support of the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) and the critically important Drug Free Communities (DFC) program, which provides funding directly to communities to prevent drug use. DFC-funded coalitions are proven to effectively reduce alcohol, tobacco, marijuana and prescription drug misuse among middle and high school-aged children. The High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) program, which coordinates federal, state, and local law enforcement, streamlines efforts to dismantle drug trafficking organizations and brings drug traffickers to justice.

As we have written before, ONDCP brings essential expertise to the table on complex drug issues, expertise that would otherwise be missing or dispersed across multiple agencies. ONDCP holds all federal, state, and local agencies accountable for achieving specific goals to reduce drug trafficking, use, and other consequences.

At a time when drugs now kill more people than firearms or car crashes, it is more important than ever for ONDCP to remain a strong voice in the White House and a visible presence nationally. As plans are finalized for the Administration's proposed FY 2018 budget, we once again ask the Administration to maintain a strong commitment to ONDCP by proposing the highest level of funding possible for the agency and its pro-

grams given the importance of ONDCP's mission and the current opioid crisis.

Sincerely,

A New PATH, Addiction Haven, Addiction Medicine Foundation, Addiction Policy Forum, Advocates for Recovery Colorado, Alabama Citizens Action Program, Alano Club of Portland, American Academy of Addiction Psychiatry, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Association for the Treatment of Opioid Dependence, American Association of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American Correctional Association, American Osteopathic Academy of Addiction Medicine, American Osteopathic Association, American Psychiatric Association, American Psychological Association, American Public Health Association, American Society of Addiction Medicine.

AmerisourceBergen Corporation, Association for Behavioral Health and Wellness, Association of Persons Affected by Addiction (APAA), Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, Association of Recovery Community Organizations, Association of Recovery Schools, Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health, Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, Bangor Area Recovery Network, Inc., Big Cities Health Coalition, California Academy of Family Physicians, California Consortium of Addiction Programs and Professionals, Capital Area Project Vox, Caron Treatment Centers, Catholic Charities Maine, Center for Recovery and Wellness Resources, Center for Substance Abuse Research, University of Maryland, Chicago Recovering Communities Coalition (CRCC), Collaborative for Effective Prescription Opioid Policies, College on Problems of Drug Dependence.

Communities for Recovery, Community Alliances for Drug-Free Youth, Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America, Community Oriented Correctional Health Services, Connecticut Certification Board, Connecticut Community for Addiction Recovery (CCAR), Council on Prevention and Education: Substances, DarJune Recovery Support Services & Café, DC Recovery Community Alliance, Delaware Certification Board, Detroit Recovery Project, Inc., Dorchester Recovery Initiative, Drug Free America Foundation, Drug Free Schools Coalition, DUID Victim Voices, Easy Does It, Inc., El Paso Alliance, Engaged Recovery Community Services, Entertainment Industries Council, Inc., Faces & Voices of Recovery.

Facing Addiction, FAVOR Greenville, FAVOR Mississippi Recovery Advocacy Project, FAVOR Pee Dee, FAVOR Tri-County, FED UP Coalition to End the Opioid Epidemic, Fellowship Foundation Recovery Community Organization, Florida Coalition Alliance, Floridians for Recovery, Foundation for Recovery, Friends of Recovery—New York, Friends Research Institute, Inc., Gem County Recovery Community Center, Georgia Council on Substance Abuse, Gerontological Society of America, Greater Macomb Project Vox, Hazelden Betty Ford Institute for Recovery Advocacy, HOPE for New Hampshire Recovery, Illinois Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Professional Certification Association, Institute for Behavior and Health.

International Certification & Reciprocity Consortium, International Nurses Society on Addictions, Jackson Area Recovery Community, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Juneau Recovery Community, Kentucky Office of Drug Control Policy,

Latah Recovery Center, Legal Action Center, Life of Purpose Treatment, Lifeshouse Recovery Connection, Long Island Recovery Association (LIRA), Lost Dreams Awaken Center, Inc., Lotus Peer Recovery/Sober Kerrville, Louisiana Association of Substance Abuse Counselors & Trainers, Inc., Maine Alliance for Addiction Recovery, Maine Immigrant and Refugee Services, Major Cities Chiefs Association, Major County Sheriffs of America, Maryland Recovery Organization Connecting Communities (M-ROCC), Massachusetts Organization for Addiction Recovery (MOAR).

Message Carriers of Pennsylvania, Inc., MIHOPE—Michigan Heroin & Opiate Prevention and Education, Michigan Recovery Voices, Milestone Foundation, Minnesota Recovery Connection, Missouri Recovery Network, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, Mothers Against Prescription Drug Abuse, National Alliance of State Drug Enforcement Agencies, National Alliance for Medication Assisted Recovery, National Association for Children of Alcoholics, National Association for Rural Mental Health, National Association of City and County Health Officials, National Association of Clinical Nurse Specialists, National Association of Counties, National Association of County Behavioral Health and Developmental Disability Directors, National Association of Drug Court Professionals, National Association of Police Organizations, National Association of Social Workers.

National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors, National Athletic Trainers' Association (NATA), National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, National Council for Behavioral Health, National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence, Inc. (NCADD), National Criminal Justice Association, National District Attorneys Association, National Families in Action, National Fusion Center Association, National HIDTA Directors Association, National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization, National Minority AIDS Council, National Narcotics Officers Association Coalition, National Safety Council, National Sheriffs' Association, Navigate Recovery, New Evangelical Partnership for the Common Good, New York Association of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Providers, Inc., Northern Ohio Recovery Association (NORA), NAADAC, the Association for Addiction Professionals.

Nurse Practitioner Healthcare Foundation, Oklahoma Citizen Advocates for Recovery & Treatment Association (OCARTA), Oklahoma Drug and Alcohol Professional Counselor Association, P.E.E.R. Wellness Center, Inc., Partnership for Drug-Free Kids, PEER360 Recovery Alliance, Pennsylvania Certification Board, Pennsylvania Recovery Organization—Achieving Community Together—(PRO-ACT), Pennsylvania Recovery Organizations Alliance (PRO-A), People Advocating Recovery—PAR, Phoenix House, Phoenix Multisport Boston, Physicians for Responsible Opioid Prescribing, PLR Athens, Proove Biosciences, RASE Project, Recover Project/Western MA Training, Recover Wyoming, Recovery—Friendly Taos County, Recovery Allies of West Michigan.

Recovery Cafe, Recovery Communities of North Carolina, Recovery Community of Durham, Recovery Consultants of Atlanta, Recovery Data Solutions, Recovery Idaho, Inc., Recovery is Happening, RecoveryATX, RecoveryNC (Governors Institute on Substance Abuse), Regroup, Rhode Island Certification Board, Rhode Island Communities for Addiction Recovery Efforts (RICAREs),

ROcovery Fitness, Rosenthal Center for Addiction Studies, Safe Kids Worldwide, SAM Action, Save Our Society from Drugs, Shatterproof, Smart Approaches to Marijuana, SMART Recovery.

Solano Recovery Project, Spiritworks Foundation, Spread Hope Like Fire, Springs Recovery Connection, STEP Industries, Strengthening the Mid-Atlantic Region for Tomorrow (SMART), Substance Abuse Librarians and Information Specialists, T.O.R.C.H., Inc., Tennessee Overdose Prevention, Texas Association of Addiction Professionals, The Addict's Mom, The Alliance for Addiction and Mental Health Services, Maine, The Bridge Foundation, The DOOR—DeKalb Open Opportunity for Recovery, The Friends of NIDA, The MARS Project, The McShin Foundation, The Moyer Foundation, The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, The Police Foundation.

Tia Hart Recovery Community Program, TASC of Illinois (Treatment Alternatives for Safer Communities), Treatment Communities of America, Trilogy Recovery Community, Trust for America's Health, Utah Support Advocates for Recovery Awareness (USARA), Verde Technologies, Vermont Recovery Network, Virginia Association of Recovery Residences, Virginia Certification Board, Voices of Hope for Cecil County, Voices of Recovery San Mateo County, WAIAM, Inc. and RISE Recovery Community, Washtenaw Recovery Advocacy Project (WRAP), WestCare, Inc., WholeLife Recovery Community/Arizona Recovery Coalition, Wisconsin Recovery Community Organization (WIRCO), Wisconsin Voices for Recovery, Young People in Recovery, Zoe's Story Fund.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, these groups know that the proposed cuts would undermine our anti-drug efforts at a time when we need them more than ever. So I ask my colleagues to join me in urging the OMB Director and the folks in the White House who are making these decisions not to take this course of action but rather to support our proven community anti-drug coalition, to support ONDCP in doing the important work at a time of a growing epidemic. We have never needed these programs more than we do right now.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Ohio not just on his speech and his remarks but on his leadership on the opioid epidemic in our country and its progression into other areas. He speaks passionately about it publicly and privately to his colleagues, just as he did today at our lunch as we discussed healthcare. He was a leader last year when we passed the 21st Century Cures Act to try to move these medical miracles that we know are coming through the regulatory and investment process more rapidly and into medicine cabinets and doctors' offices.

Senator PORTMAN and Senator WHITEHOUSE and others, in a bipartisan way, worked to add at least \$1 billion more funding for States to deal with opioids after they had passed the Com-

prehensive Addiction and Recovery Act earlier that year. So the opioid epidemic and the families who suffer from it have no more effective spokesman and advocate than the Senator from Ohio, and I am glad I had an opportunity to hear his remarks today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 4:30 be equally divided in the usual form; further, that all postcloture time on the Gottlieb nomination expire at 4:30 p.m. today; and that, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, while the Senator from Ohio is here, one more word on opioids.

Dr. Francis Collins, the head of the National Institutes of Health, has testified before the Senate that in the next decade we could have—we should have a discovery of a nonaddictive pain medicine.

I cannot think of anything that over the long run could deal more with opioid addiction than to find a substitute for opioids that wasn't addictive. So we have discussed that with the President, with the new head of the FDA—after today, Dr. Gottlieb, I hope—with Dr. Price, Senator PORTMAN, and with others, and, hopefully, in a bipartisan way, we can lean forward into accelerating the discovery of a nonaddictive pain medicine, and we can make that contribution in this effort.

Mr. President, the Senate will vote shortly at 4:30 p.m. on the President's nomination of Scott Gottlieb to serve as Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration. He is the right person to lead the FDA in this vital mission and move the agency forward so America's patients can benefit from the remarkable discoveries—one of which I was just discussing—that our Nation's researchers are working on.

Dr. Gottlieb has impressive qualifications from every perspective. He was a practicing physician and hospitalist for many years, received his medical degree at Mount Sinai School of Medicine and completed his residency there. He held three positions in the Department of Health and Human Services, including two at the FDA as Deputy Commissioner, from 2005 to 2007, and before that, in 2003 to 2004, as a senior adviser to Commissioner Mark McClellan, and as the FDA's Director of Medical Policy Development.

Dr. Gottlieb has studied health policy as a resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. He is a prolific writer and speaker on medical innovations. He has testified in front of Congress 18 times on a variety of issues, including the drug approval

process, drug costs, drug shortages, importation, and healthcare reform.

Dr. Gottlieb is also a cancer survivor. He knows firsthand how medical treatments affect patients and their families.

Dr. Gottlieb, like others who were nominated by Presidents, has been through an exhaustive vetting process. The President announced the Gottlieb nomination on March 10. We received the nomination March 27. On April 5, Dr. Gottlieb testified for 2½ hours in our Senate HELP Committee. I offered Senators an opportunity to ask any questions they wished. Following his hearing, he answered 189 follow-up questions. If you count all the subquestions, it was 372 questions.

On April 27, our committee approved his nomination by a vote of 14 to 9, readying that nomination for consideration by the full Senate today.

On March 28, more than a month ago, the independent Office of Government Ethics concluded that Dr. Gottlieb “is in compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing conflicts of interest.”

Let me read from the Office of Government Ethics’ website about what that agency does. It says: “OGE provides an independent review of the financial disclosure reports of candidates for Senate-confirmed nominees. OGE makes sure that these individuals have complied with the extensive requirements for financial disclosure under the Ethics in Government Act. OGE ensures compliance with financial disclosure requirements and assists in the resolution of potential conflicts of interest. It carefully evaluates nominees’ financial disclosure reports and works with agency ethics officials to prepare individualized ethics agreements.”

The website continues: “After confirming with the agency that there are no unresolved conflicts of interest, OGE then transmits the financial disclosure report, the ethics agreement, and a cover letter directly to the Senate.”

That all arrived at our committee on March 28. So that should answer any questions about whether Dr. Gottlieb has a conflict of interest because the independent agency Congress set up to resolve that question says he has none—or if he has any, he will resolve them according to an agreement with that office.

I believe Dr. Gottlieb will help to move the FDA forward so patients can benefit from the remarkable medical discoveries that researchers are working on. The FDA affects nearly every single American and regulates about a quarter of all consumer spending in our country, over \$4 trillion annually.

It is responsible for areas as diverse as prescription drugs for humans and animals, medical devices, biologics, dietary supplements, cosmetics, over-

the-counter medications, food, and tobacco products. In addition to drugs and medical devices, the FDA is responsible for protecting our Nation’s food supply and working to reduce the number of people who get sick from foodborne illnesses.

Some of my Democratic colleagues have expressed concern about Dr. Gottlieb’s prior work with companies that are regulated by the Food and Drug Administration, but the fact is, it is not so unusual to have an FDA Commissioner who has consulted with the food and drug industry. Dr. Califf, the distinguished former FDA Commissioner under President Obama, consulted for many companies prior to his confirmation from the Senate. That didn’t disqualify Dr. Califf. I supported him. So did 89 other Senators. He was confirmed 89 to 4.

I think we should recognize the obvious fact that it is a good idea to have people serving in government with some experience in the types of industries they are in charge of. The other day we confirmed a Secretary of Agriculture. I think it helps that he is a farmer and a veterinarian. We confirmed the Secretary of Commerce. I think it helps that he has some background in business. Some of the same people who are criticizing Dr. Gottlieb for having a background in working with companies that manufacture drugs criticized President Trump’s Secretary of Education because she had never been on the payroll of the people she was about to be in charge of. So you can’t have it both ways.

I believe Dr. Gottlieb’s background in understanding how drugs are manufactured, how they can be manufactured safely, how they can be moved through the regulatory and investment process more rapidly is vitally important to the opportunity we have in America—more than we have ever had before—of finding these new medical miracles and putting them in our medicine cabinets and our doctors’ offices.

Dr. Gottlieb has broad support from an array of patient, industry, and research organizations. The supporters include three former FDA Commissioners and President Obama’s Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

On Friday, I received a letter of support for Dr. Gottlieb from 10 State attorneys general who particularly praised the nominee as “a leader in the fight against opioid abuse,” the subject Senator PORTMAN spoke on a moment ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of 93 groups that support Dr. Gottlieb’s nomination at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, here are a few examples of what some of these groups had to say.

Dr. Jeff Allen, the President and CEO of Friends of Cancer Research, said:

“Through his knowledge and experience, we have no doubt that Dr. Gottlieb will be the right person to ensure FDA keeps pace with science and innovation without sacrificing the safety and efficacy gold standard established by FDA.”

The Healthcare Leadership Council said: “Dr. Gottlieb’s qualifications to lead the FDA are extensive and indisputable. . . . Dr. Gottlieb has consistently demonstrated his vision for accelerated medical innovation in this country and greater patient access to the drugs and devices that improve lives.”

Dr. Mark McClellan, FDA Commissioner from 2002 to 2004, said: “He’s a very good nomination,” adding “he is very dedicated to finding better ways to protect and improve the health of the public, all of which are great prerequisites for FDA Commissioner.”

Andy Slavitt, who just stepped down as the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services under President Obama, said that Dr. Gottlieb is “a very good choice.”

The FDA has always been important, but there never has been a more important time for this agency. It is responsible for making sure patients benefit from the promising research driven by significant funding Congress has given to medical research in last year’s 21st Century Cures Act, which the majority leader called “the most important legislation of the year.”

I don’t want it to go unnoticed that last year Congress increased funding for the National Institutes of Health by \$2 billion. Last week, Congress increased funding for the National Institutes of Health by another \$2 billion. The 21st Century Cures Act, which Congress also passed last year, authorized a \$4.8 billion increase in funding for the National Institutes of Health for President Obama’s Precision Medicine Initiative and for the Cancer Moonshot the Vice President worked on. Speaker RYAN and Majority Leader MCCONNELL, President Obama, Vice President Biden, all of us want to see these medical miracles move forward, and having competent leadership in the FDA is absolutely essential to that effort.

I am very excited about the prospect of having Dr. Gottlieb and Dr. Francis Collins, who is the head of the National Institutes of Health, at the head of these two lifesaving agencies, which are important to every single American family.

The reason 21st Century Cures is such an important bill is that it will drive forward this extraordinary research, and Dr. Collins talked about some of the discoveries that will be possible in the next decade. I mentioned the possibility of nonaddictive pain medicine. Dr. Collins said that we will also have hearts that will be rebuilt from our own stem cells. We will have a universal flu vaccine. Did you know that

the flu kills between 12,000 and 56,000 Americans a year? There will be a universal flu vaccine. There will be an HIV/AIDS vaccine and an artificial pancreas for patients with diabetes who have spent decades injecting themselves with insulin. These are the discoveries that are just over the horizon, not to mention medicine that will identify Alzheimer's before there are symptoms and then slow the progression of the disease. Think of the grief it would save families and the billions it would save the country. We have invested in that.

We have competent leadership to be approved by the Senate today, in working with Dr. Collins and Dr. Price, who can make sure those dreams become a reality perhaps even more rapidly.

The FDA plays a key role in this. At the committee hearing, I asked Dr. Gottlieb about the subject Senator PORTMAN and I just talked about. I asked him how the FDA can be forward-leaning in accelerating the finding of new nonaddictive pain medicines—the ultimate cure for the opioid epidemic. It is a heartbreaking issue that almost every Senator knows about. Dr. Gottlieb said that the opioid epidemic is “having staggering human consequences.”

He also said:

I think it's the biggest crisis facing the agency. It's going to require dramatic action by whoever steps into the agency. I think it's going to require an all-of-the-above approach that does include reevaluating the framework for how we can develop alternatives to opioid drugs. I think it also includes looking at device alternatives to opioid drugs and looking at devices in the context of drugs.

Dr. Gottlieb's first order of business will be to work with us on the reauthorization of the FDA user fee agreements, which experts at the FDA told members of our HELP Committee at one of the two bipartisan hearings on the agreements, are integral to helping patients and continuing the implementation of the 21st Century Cures Act.

Before September 30, four different agreements need to be reauthorized. They fund \$8 billion to \$9 billion over the next 5 years, which is about a quarter of the Food and Drug Administration's budget. If we do not move quickly to pass these agreements in late July, the FDA will be forced, by law, to send layoff notices to more than 5,000 FDA employees and notify them that they may lose their jobs in 60 days.

A delay in reauthorizing these agreements would delay the reviews of drugs and devices that were submitted after April 1—1 month ago. For example, if we do not pass these user fee reauthorizations on time, an FDA reviewer who gets started in reviewing, say, a cancer drug that was submitted to the agency in April would be laid off on October 1, which would be before the reviewer is able to finish his or her work.

In addition to harming patients and families who rely on medical innova-

tion, a delay in reauthorization would threaten America's global leadership in biomedical innovation.

After reviewing the recommendations from industry and the FDA, I believe these are good agreements for patients. The sooner we pass the legislation, the better so as to give patients, doctors, FDA reviewers, and companies' certainty.

At this moment, Washington, DC, is not a very bipartisan town on many issues, but on this issue—the issue of user fees to support the Food and Drug Administration—it has been.

I compliment Senator PATTY MURRAY and her staff. Senator MURRAY is the ranking Democrat on the HELP Committee. Our staffs have been working together for 15 months in a bipartisan way and working with the House of Representatives to try to make sure we can present to the full Senate our FDA user fee agreements. We have had two bipartisan hearings. Tomorrow, we have a markup at which we hope those agreements will be reported to the Senate floor.

The FDA has a vital and important mission, and I am confident Dr. Gottlieb is the right person to be leading the agency. We are fortunate that he is willing to serve. I look forward to the Senate's approving Dr. Gottlieb's confirmation this afternoon.

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

Dr. Gottlieb's nomination has received support from 93 groups—including a broad array of patient, industry, and research organizations.

Full list of supporters: Advanced Medical Technology Association (Advanced); Aduro Biotech; Alliance for Aging Research; Alliance for Patient Access; Alliance for Regenerative Medicine; Alliance of Specialty Medicine; American Academy of Facial & Plastic Reconstructive Surgery; American Association for Cancer Research; American Association of Neurological Surgeons; American Bakers Association; American Beverage Association; American Enterprise Institute; American Frozen Food Institute; American Society for Radiation Oncology; American Society of Cataract and Refractive Surgery; American Society of Echocardiography; American Society of Plastic Surgeons; Association for Accessible Medicines (AAM); Association of American Cancer Institutes (AACI).

Association of Black Cardiologists; Association of Clinical Research Organizations; Calorie Control Council; Can Manufacturers Institute; CancerCare; Cancer Support Community; CEO Roundtable on Cancer; The Children's Cause for Cancer Advocacy; Cigar Association of America; CNF Pharma LLC; Coalition of Cancer Cooperative Groups; Coalition of State Rheumatology Organizations; Community Oncology Alliance; Congress of Neurological Surgeons; Corn Refiners Association; EveryLife Foundation; FasterCures, a center for the Milken Institute; Fight Colorectal Cancer; Food Marketing Institute.

Friedrich's Ataxia Research Alliance (FARA); Friends of Cancer Research; Global Genes; Global Healthy Living Foundation;

Grandparents in Action; Grocery Manufacturers Association (GMA); Healthcare Leadership Council; Healthcare Nutrition Council; Healthy Women; Hematology/Oncology Pharmacy Association; Independent Bakers Association; Infant Nutrition Council of America; International Bottled Water Association; International Dairy Foods Association; International Food Additives Council; International Premium Cigar and Pipe Retailers; Kids v. Cancer; Kidney Care Association; The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society.

Lung Cancer Alliance; LUNGevity; Lupus and Allied Diseases Association, Inc.; Lymphoma Research Foundation; Manhattan Institute; Men's Health Network; National Association of Chemical Distributors; National Automatic Merchandising Association; National Coalition for Cancer Research (NCCR); National Coalition for Cancer Survivorship; National Confectioners Association; National Consumers League; National Fabry Disease Foundation; National Grocers Association; National Health Council; National Infusion Center Association (NICA); National Kidney Foundation; National Pasta Association; National Patient Advocate Foundation (NPAF).

National Restaurant Association; Natural Products Association; The Nicholas Conon Institute; North American Millers Association; Ovarian Cancer Research Fund Alliance; Personal Care Products Council; Pharmaceutical Manufacturers and Manufacturers Associations of America (PhRMA); Prevent Cancer Foundation; Produce Marketing Association; Research!America; Sarcoma Foundation of America; SNAC International; Society of Hospital Medicine; The Sugar Association; Susan G. Komen; Swifty Foundation; United Fresh Produce Association.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, before I discuss why the nominee before us, Dr. Scott Gottlieb, is the wrong choice to lead the Food and Drug Administration, I want to take a minute to talk about the FDA's impact on the health and safety of patients and families nationwide and how that impacts my perspective on this nomination.

Our constituents rely on the FDA's work every single day. They trust that the food they buy from the grocery store is safe. They trust that when they go to the emergency room, the drugs and medical devices that are used in their care have been held to the highest standards of approval and that the FDA's decisions are based on science, not politics or ideology. In other words, they trust in FDA's gold standard of approval. So it is critical that the FDA continue to have strong, independent leadership, especially in light of President Trump's radical priorities.

Like many, I am deeply concerned by this administration's efforts to roll back the progress we have made to strengthen the FDA and to improve public health. Let me give two recent examples from last week alone. First, the FDA delayed the implementation of a rule on menu labeling requirements, which would have provided families access to critical nutritional information about the food they buy and

eat. These requirements have been worked on for years by several Senators and the Obama administration, with the support of public health groups and restaurants. The rule was less than 1 week away from going into effect. On the very same day, the FDA announced that it would delay the enforcement of a rule to ensure greater oversight over tobacco products, including cigars, pipe tobacco, and e-cigarettes. Now is not the time for the FDA to be taking its foot off the gas when it comes to protecting our children and youth from harmful marketing and flavoring tactics. These are significant steps in the wrong direction.

Families have every reason to be worried about this administration, and they are making it clear that they want leaders who are prepared to stand up for them, which brings us back to Dr. Gottlieb.

At our HELP Committee hearing, after scrutinizing his past record, asking where he stands on key policy issues, and reviewing his answers to many of my questions, it has been made clear to me that Dr. Gottlieb is not that leader. He has not convinced me that he can withstand political pressure from this administration or that he will be truly committed to putting our families' health first. For these reasons, I will be voting no on Dr. Gottlieb's nomination today.

In reviewing Dr. Gottlieb's professional history and background, I have grown increasingly concerned about whether he can lead the FDA in an unbiased way given his unprecedented industry ties. On numerous occasions, Dr. Gottlieb has invested in or advised a company and then used his public platform to promote policies that will benefit that company in the future.

I know that, if confirmed, Dr. Gottlieb has agreed to recuse himself for 1 year from decisions involving some companies in which he has invested or held positions, but Dr. Gottlieb will still be allowed to weigh in on matters that involve other companies in which he had been previously invested. His complicated relationships with a venture capital firm and an investment bank specifically raise many questions, and he will not be recused from matters that involve a number of their clients. Companies Dr. Gottlieb has invested in have more than 60 drugs in development that could come before the FDA for approval, and the companies Dr. Gottlieb will be recused from have over 120 drugs in development.

The extent of these entanglements is unprecedented, and they are particularly troubling given this administration's clear willingness to skirt ethics rules and pressure Federal employees in order to jam their agenda through. Yet, as troubling as these entanglements are, they are not my only problems with this nomination. I am equal-

ly concerned about where Dr. Gottlieb stands on key policy issues.

For one, I do remain unconvinced that Dr. Gottlieb will ensure independent, science-based decisionmaking at the FDA if he is confirmed. While Dr. Gottlieb was at the FDA under the Bush administration, I was working very hard to ensure that, consistent with expert recommendations, emergency contraception known as Plan B would be sold over the counter to all age groups. Yet the Bush administration ignored the science and made a decision, based on purely ideological grounds, on a so-called behind-the-counter option for Plan B, which allowed politics to interfere directly with women's access to the healthcare services that they need, and that was a position which Dr. Gottlieb defended.

I have had the opportunity to discuss this matter with Dr. Gottlieb on several occasions now, but regrettably my concerns remain unchanged. When I asked Dr. Gottlieb about this at our hearing—whether he would allow this administration to use the FDA to further its political agenda against women's health—Dr. Gottlieb said he would “not relitigate settled approval decisions” on this matter. When I made clear that I was asking about the future and how he would respond to future pressure from this administration to undermine women's health, Dr. Gottlieb did not give a clear answer. Given the Trump administration's commitment to undermining women's reproductive rights, which we have seen so clearly in these past 100 days, I find this aspect of Dr. Gottlieb's professional history especially troubling.

I have also raised concerns regarding Dr. Gottlieb's published positions on a number of important issues that focus on drugs and medical devices.

As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, I find the administration's recent decision to delay oversight on tobacco products to be especially concerning, which makes it all the more important that the next FDA Commissioner have a clear position on this issue. I asked Dr. Gottlieb about this at our hearing, specifically as it relates to flavored e-cigarettes that have flooded the markets in recent years. I have to say that I was disappointed by his response. I think it is clear that a line has been crossed when tobacco companies prey on children by coming out with e-cigarette flavors like gummy bear and cookies and cream. Yet, during his hearing, when I asked Dr. Gottlieb about this, he said he was not quite sure where that line gets drawn. That speaks volumes to me, and it is a pattern I have seen in Dr. Gottlieb's answers, whether I have asked him about off-label communications by drug companies or combating the opioid epidemic and what the FDA can do to help rein in drug costs.

I could go on, but I want to make one related point, which is that we still

have many questions about where Dr. Gottlieb stands on pressing policy questions he will have to confront when he is confirmed.

As I said during our HELP Committee markup, we submitted many questions to Dr. Gottlieb following his hearing, and I was encouraged that in his answers to these questions, Dr. Gottlieb committed to upholding the gold standard and working with me on a number of priorities, like improving the postmarket surveillance of medical devices. Yet, in large part, I have to say we were left disappointed with the lack of specificity in his answers. Many of them were vague, and some questions were flatout ignored.

I just came back from hearing from families in my home State, and I can tell you that people are looking at what President Trump is doing. They are appalled, and they are looking for leaders to step up. Whether it is Dr. Gottlieb's unprecedented financial entanglements, his inability to withstand political pressure from the Bush administration in order to ensure science and not ideology drives decision-making at the FDA, or whether he will truly prioritize patient and consumer safety and the public health over the interests of corporations that stand to gain financially, I continue to doubt whether Dr. Gottlieb will be able to stand up to President Trump.

I believe that families and patients, rightly, expect more. They want independent, science-based leadership at the FDA. I stand with them and will oppose this nomination.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to express concern with President Trump's nominee to serve as next Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, FDA.

The FDA Commissioner is responsible for overseeing our Federal agency tasked with protecting and promoting the public health through the regulation of food, tobacco products, dietary supplements, drugs, medical devices, cosmetics, and veterinary products. I am not convinced that Dr. Scott Gottlieb is the right person for this job, based primarily on his less than impressive record of defending women's access to healthcare, his association with an ecigarette—or vaping—company that has produced and marketed tobacco products to youth, his stated desire to expand “off-label” communications between drug companies and health providers, and his long-standing and vocal opposition to the Affordable Care Act, ACA. If confirmed, I hope he proves me wrong.

Of particular concern to me is protecting our Nation's food safety. I was pleased that, in 2001, then-President Obama signed into law the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act, marking the most comprehensive reform of our Nation's food safety system in decades. Every year, 48 million Americans suffer

from preventable foodborne illness. More than 120,000 people are hospitalized each year because of food contamination and 3,000 die. Every 4 minutes, someone is rushed to the hospital because the food they ate made them sick, and at the end of the day, eight will die—which is why I have spent much of my career working on various bills to strengthen food safety structures at FDA and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, to create a single food safety agency, and to support increased inspection and protection of foreign food imports. Even with passage of the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act, more work remains to be done. We must further beef up both foreign and domestic facility inspections. We must ensure the FDA has sufficient staff and resources to carry out their responsibilities. We must do a better job of effectively tracking and tracing high-risk foods in the event of a foodborne illness outbreak.

In addition, the FDA can and must do more to better regulate dietary supplements. I was pleased that, in 2015, the FDA announced creation of the Office of Dietary Supplement Programs to increase focus on and regulation of the ever-growing dietary supplement industry. It is my hope that this FDA office continues to receive the funding they so desperately need to carry out their mission of regulating a \$35 billion dietary supplement industry and aggressively pursue wrongdoing.

Finally, ecigarette products continue to be a growing threat to our Nation's youth. Last year, then-Surgeon General Vivek Murthy released a report, calling the skyrocketing use of ecigarettes among youth "a major public health concern." Ecigarettes are now the most commonly used form of tobacco among young people in the United States. Over the past 5 years, the number of middle school and high school students who have used ecigarettes has tripled. Among young adults aged 18 to 24, the number has doubled. While some research indicates that ecigarettes contain fewer toxic substances than ecigarettes, vape from ecigarettes is not harmless, and these products are a gateway to smoking. The popularity of ecigarettes stems in part from aggressive marketing and products aimed at youth, including the marketing of bubble gum, tutti frutti, and marshmallow flavorings. The FDA must aggressively oversee these products and ensure that they are not being marketed to children or young adults. Any attempt to exempt these products from FDA regulation will be met with extreme resistance from me.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as the Senate continues to consider nominees to lead our Nation's top agencies, we are once again faced with the difficult decision to confirm an individual whose interests run counter to the mission of the agency he or she will be

tasked to lead. Dr. Scott Gottlieb, the nominee for Commissioner of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, FDA, is another such nominee.

Dr. Scott Gottlieb is a physician and current medical consultant for pharmaceutical, medical device, and other healthcare companies. From 2003 to 2007, Dr. Gottlieb was a senior adviser to the FDA Commissioner for Medical Technology. He was also the Deputy Commissioner for Medical and Scientific Affairs under two different FDA Commissioners. In 2013, Dr. Gottlieb served on the Federal Health IT Policy Committee for the Department of Health and Human Services. He also worked as an adviser to Mitt Romney during his 2012 Presidential campaign.

While I appreciate that Dr. Gottlieb has qualifying experience, I remain concerned about his policies and conflicts of interest. For instance, while serving as the FDA's Deputy Commissioner, Dr. Gottlieb defended the Bush administration's position to deny the availability of certain contraceptive care drugs over-the-counter, despite the science that pointed to lifesaving benefits from such drugs. Additionally, while serving with Kure, a company that operates vaping and ecigarette products, Dr. Gottlieb was noncommittal in supporting regulations over commerce in such products, which directly targets young kids through marketing, when there is a lack of appropriate medical science to suggest vaping and ecigarettes are less harmful than tobacco products. He has also historically sought ways to ensure that the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act of 2009 can better support the industry instead of better protecting patients and their families. This is especially problematic, given that the law provided the FDA with the authority to regulate tobacco in order to further curb smoking.

I am also concerned with Dr. Gottlieb's public disagreement with proposals that would allow patients to access affordable medications through drug importation. I have always supported policies that would allow patients to access safe and affordable medications from Canada because this is a cost-effective method to provide patients with the resources they need to manage their health needs. Of course, Dr. Gottlieb has long been an outspoken critic of the Affordable Care Act, ACA, making troubling assertions along the way. He has been quoted as opposing the ACA's medical loss ratio, which ensures that the dollars consumers pay on their healthcare go to just that and not to CEO salaries and overhead costs. He has also publically opposed the individual mandate and has supported converting the ACA's premium tax credits from an income-based to an age-based rating system, which would significantly bar patient access to quality, affordable care.

Most concerning are Dr. Gottlieb's undeniable ties to some of the largest pharmaceutical companies in the marketplace. As an adviser for New Enterprises Associates, Dr. Gottlieb currently manages more than 40 drugs now in development that could come before the FDA for approval. He has also received compensation from many of these companies, earning more than \$400,000 from multiple pharmaceutical and medical device companies from 2013 to 2015 alone. Dr. Gottlieb also served on six pharmaceutical company boards, two insurance company boards, one medical laboratory company board, and several other similar boards, all of which have hundreds of drugs currently awaiting FDA approval. Without proper recusal, which Dr. Gottlieb has not committed himself to in full, these conflicts are in direct contradiction to the ethics and objective work required of the Commissioner of the FDA.

The leader of the FDA has a firm responsibility in promoting policies and overseeing drug development with the purpose of enhancing the health and well-being of the American people. We should put ourselves in the shoes of the American people, our constituents, in evaluating nominees to head agencies that bear directly on the public's healthcare needs. Given Dr. Gottlieb's significant conflicts of interest, combined with his ideological approaches to public health policy, which suggest that he would rather deny patients access to lifesaving resources than support ways to improve healthcare and promote prevention efforts for all, I cannot in good conscience support his nomination.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTION

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, now is the time to get back to basics. The Federal Government doesn't exist for its own sake, it exists for the people, and if Federal regulation serves no useful function for the people, then it only serves to hold back our Nation's prosperity and growth.

With so many Americans hungry for good-paying jobs, now is the time to unleash our Nation's economic potential by getting government out of the way. It is just plain common sense to eliminate regulations that are duplicative, costly, and unworkable. We need to get back to the basics by getting rid of those kinds of regulations, and one

of those regulations is the BLM methane rule.

Now, the BLM methane rule is one of those midnight regulations that the Obama administration put out as they were walking out the door. This new regulation from the Bureau of Land Management—or BLM—imposes new rules and royalty rates on methane emissions from oil and gas production on Federal and Indian lands.

For those wondering why methane emissions aren't already regulated, there is a simple explanation: They are. Under the Clean Air Act, the Environmental Protection Agency, in partnership with individual States, is tasked with regulating air quality, which includes methane emissions. In fact, States like my State of North Dakota and the State of Texas, where the Presiding Officer resides, currently have regulatory systems in place to govern oil and gas emissions. Critically, the North Dakota Industrial Commission has put in place flaring requirements that have successfully reduced the flaring in our State from 35 percent down to 10 percent as a result of their work, and they have a goal to take it even further. This flaring reduction is a big deal because to reduce methane emissions you need to reduce flaring.

Flaring sounds complicated, but it is very simple. When excess gas is produced along with oil and it can't be captured, then it gets burned off, or flared. Neither industry nor State officials like flaring because it wastes natural gas—it wastes a natural resource—of which methane obviously is the main component. As most Americans know, obviously, natural gas is a valuable commodity that is used to heat our homes and power our factories. That is why both industry and the States have worked hard to make big improvements. They want to capture that natural gas and that methane. That is not just in North Dakota. That is in other energy-producing States across the country.

Nationally, methane emissions from the oil and gas industry have been on the decline for a number of years. So we are already actively working at the State level under a regulatory regime where States have primacy to spend, authorized by EPA, to reduce natural gas flaring.

With methane emissions already being regulated and reduced by the States and industry, it is tough to figure out why this new BLM regulation has been passed and what it is accomplishing. This rule has been calculated to cost up to \$279 million each year. So the cost of this rule is \$279 million a year—a duplicative rule. That is in addition to the redtape. BLM estimates that the rule will impose an additional 82,000 hours of paperwork.

These numbers just might sound like the cost of doing business, if you will,

but America's job creators know it is really costing us business, it is costing us economic growth, and it is costing us jobs. These aren't really numbers. There are livelihoods at stake.

What makes the BLM methane rule particularly burdensome is the fact that it is simply unworkable. The rule sets a maximum volume that each well can flare, which will lead to curtailment and shut-in wells, meaning actually having to shut down the wells. Of course, that decreases oil production and reduces royalty payments. So that means less energy, the owners get less revenue, and we have less jobs. Meanwhile, this rule treats all drilling spacing units the same, regardless of whether they have minimal Federal ownership. Remember, a lot of these wells they are trying to regulate are on minerals owned by the Federal Government, but they may also be on minerals owned by private individuals. So, once again, we have one of these Federal one-size-fits-all regulations that just does not work in practice.

That is why regulating the natural gas and methane emissions has been delegated to the States by EPA and why it should be up to the States.

So the States are fighting back. Wyoming, Montana, and North Dakota filed a legal challenge to the rule in the U.S. district court in Wyoming.

The good news is that the States and our economy will not have to wait until this lawsuit makes its way through the court system. We can provide regulatory relief right now, and we should do so through the Congressional Review Act—the CRA—which provides Congress with a tool to rid the Nation of burdensome, duplicative regulations like this one, and that is what our schedule is for tomorrow—to take up this CRA.

I am a cosponsor of this CRA, and we need to pass it. I wish to thank the chairman of the EPW Committee, Senator BARRASSO, for his work on this issue, and others. The House has already passed this CRA. This has already been passed by the House. The President has expressed his support for it. We need to pass it tomorrow. We need to get this done.

Every week I meet with North Dakotans and others who are working so hard to produce energy for this country, to create jobs and a better future for their families. They need and deserve a Federal Government that will not stand in their way. This is a basic but fundamental objective and a good place to reduce that regulatory burden to get our economy going. The way to create more economic growth, more jobs, and higher income levels is by reducing the regulatory burden, and this is a great example.

Again, it is just about common sense. It is about empowering the States to take a States-first approach, a State's primacy approach in terms of this kind

of regulation. How we produce energy in Texas or North Dakota or Ohio or Pennsylvania or Washington State—it is different across the country. We can't have a Federal one-size-fits-all rule. That is why it needs to be left up to the States.

We have a chance tomorrow to pass this measure, and it is exactly the kind of measure that will help reduce that regulatory burden, help us grow our economy, and help us create good jobs.

I urge my colleagues to join with us and pass this CRA.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SPIRIT AIRLINES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, most everybody has seen the news of another disturbance with regard to an airline in an airport terminal. Indeed, what has happened at the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport just in the last day has been a disturbance where they had to call in the Broward County Sheriff's Office to put down the disturbance because there were some upset people.

I have just gotten off the phone with the CEO of Spirit Airlines, as well as the head of the Air Line Pilots Association, and basically have told them that they should get this thing fixed and get it fixed quick. There is not so much a labor dispute, because they are in negotiations and I think are reaching final conclusions, but, as a result of some things with the schedule, it caused a number of flights to be canceled and, unfortunately, canceled right at the last before they could let the passengers know ahead of time before they ever came to the airport. Even much more of an irritant, they load them on the airplane as if they are ready to go and then tell them they don't have a crew of pilots and, therefore, the flight has to be canceled. Those problems are going to go through today and tomorrow.

I am given to believe—having talked to the head of the pilot's union, as well as the CEO of the airline—that they will have this straightened out over the next several days. It has been costly, and it has certainly been an irritant and an inconvenience to the passengers because 300 flights have been canceled already in the past several days, and we are going to see some more canceled in the next couple of days.

Now, this all culminated in what the American television viewer has seen—a chaotic scene at Spirit's front ticket counter at the Fort Lauderdale airport after passengers had to get off of the

airplane and the canceled flight. Many people have seen this video. It is now circulating online. Obviously, these passengers were very frustrated, and it took, unfortunately, the deputies coming in to put down the disturbance.

Having said that, this is just the latest. Doesn't that recall something else that has happened in the last few weeks—a passenger being dragged off of an airplane, beaten, and bloodied? Then, who has to come and get him but an element of the airport authority of Chicago. Haven't we also seen on another TV episode—and isn't this telling us something—that passengers are now recording evidence of how passengers are being treated because they have cell phones and cell phones have video cameras. So we saw an airline employee kind of go off on passengers in the case of another airline. Well, airlines, you had better start fixing this because the passengers are not going to tolerate it.

On the instant circumstance, having talked with the CEO and the head of the union, they are in these discussions. I think they are going to get it fixed. But they need to fix it fast because the traveling public only has so much patience. What happened at Fort Lauderdale was unacceptable and deeply unfair to the affected passengers, the overwhelmed airline employees, and local law enforcement. It was unfair. Let's not forget, also in dealing with the Fort Lauderdale airport, that memories are still fresh of the shooting that took place in January at the baggage claim.

Now, what happened just last night in Fort Lauderdale is just another example of passengers becoming sick and tired of what they perceive as mistreatment by airlines, be it that circumstance in Chicago with the forcible removal of a passenger, or be it failing airline IT systems and airline fees run amok. So the airlines had better start paying attention to this.

It appears airlines are giving the impression that they have forgotten their customers must come first. So what is it? I know the airline companies don't intend to do this, but it is happening. It is being recorded on video, and it is all the more causing people to express their frustrations.

I have no trouble in putting the airlines on notice. If they can't get their act together and start treating the flying public with respect rather than making them think they are self-loading cargo, then this Congress is going to be forced to act, and that time is going to come soon as the Senate begins work this year on what will be a bipartisan long-term bill to reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration. That bill is coming later this year.

I just want to say in conclusion that we have had a hearing in our Commerce Committee on this. I thought that would be enough and this Senator

wouldn't have to speak out anymore, but here, again, we have another incident. My heart goes out, for example, to some of the CEOs who are trying to change a culture of treating passengers with disrespect or ignorance. It is important they change that culture because we will continue to see these kinds of circumstances arise if passengers do not feel like they are getting the proper respect they deserve. After all, they are customers. They are paying customers of the airlines.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

All postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Gottlieb nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) would have voted "yea."

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

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 124 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Nelson
Bennet	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Graham	Portman
Burr	Grassley	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Carper	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Cochran	Hoeven	Sasse
Collins	Inhofe	Scott
Cooms	Johnson	Shelby
Corker	Kennedy	Strange
Cornyn	King	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Duckworth	Kaine
Blumenthal	Durbin	Klobuchar
Booker	Feinstein	Leahy
Brown	Franken	Manchin
Cantwell	Gillibrand	Markey
Cardin	Harris	McCaskill
Casey	Hassan	Menendez
Cortez Masto	Heinrich	Merkley
Donnelly	Hirono	Murphy

Murray
Peters
Reed
Sanders
Schatz

Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall

Van Hollen
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Isakson

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The Senator from Florida.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

The Senator from Florida.

VENEZUELA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly this afternoon on the ongoing crisis in Venezuela. There is a growing interest in the matter here among my colleagues in the Senate and the White House and other places—certainly, in the press—and thankfully so. This has been going on now for a significant period of time.

Just to put it in context, a lot of times, when we talk about these sorts of showdowns around the world—these sorts of internal strife—there is this notion that there is this government in place and there is this group that does not like the government and that they are arguing with each other about the future of the country. What is interesting in Venezuela is that both the opposition and the ruling party are in government. The government, obviously, at the Presidential level is controlled by someone who has turned himself into a dictator. He is a successor of Hugo Chavez's—he is the President, Nicolas Maduro—and those who surround him. Then there is the National Assembly that is elected by the people of Venezuela, the majority party in their legislative branch.

What has happened over the last year and a half is that the President of Venezuela, Maduro—the now dictator—has nullified the legislative branch. He basically refuses to recognize the laws they have passed and has stopped allowing transfers. So, basically, today, those in the National Assembly in Venezuela are not getting paid. They have no funds for offices, and they have no funds for material. They will pass a law, and those laws are ignored. That is the ongoing crisis.

The second part of it is that, under their Constitution, Venezuela's Constitution, if you had collected a certain number of signatures by December of this year, by the end of the year, they had to hold a referendum on the President, a recall referendum. They refused to certify the signatures even though the people who collected them turned in four times as many signatures as were necessary.

The third is that they are supposed to have a Governor and legislative elections this year in Venezuela. Maduro has canceled those, and there is no telling, but it does not seem as though they are going to have a Presidential election either.

Here is the bottom line: The strife in Venezuela that is going on today can be solved by having an election of the people of Venezuela, by basically following their existing Constitution, but that is not what they have allowed to have happen. On the contrary, not only are they not allowing these elections to happen, but anyone who protests against them has been jailed; press has been kicked out of the country; CNN has been kicked out of Venezuela, as an example. Now we are seeing reports of there being escalating violence in the streets, and it is extraordinary. What is interesting, though, is that fissures are beginning to develop.

The message we send here today—first of all, to those who are in the streets who are fighting for democracy and for following the law and having elections in Venezuela—is that we stand with you. We will never let your cause fall, and we will never accept these ridiculous moves that Maduro is now taking to rewrite the Constitution, yet again, through a flawed and fraudulent process.

The second message we have is to the people in the Venezuelan Government who do not want to be a part of what is happening. We now see examples of the Attorney General, Luisa Ortega, who is part of the Maduro government and has been largely friendly but who, lately, has begun to break away from the government, going so far as to criticize the government's escalating repression.

You see it increasingly among the rank and file in the National Guard of Venezuela, who are all armored up like G.I. Joe, facing down these unarmed protesters, but on the other side of the protests are their mothers, their fathers, their brothers, their sisters, their wives, their husbands, and their friends and neighbors. What is really troubling now is that these armed groups—irregular groups, these militias—that Maduro has armed and trained with the help of Cuban intelligence have spun completely out of control.

These groups are going around randomly beating people up, setting up roadblocks, and committing all sorts of acts of violence. They are not uni-

formed. These are collectives, as they call them—basically, these armed militias—outside of the government who are funded, created by Maduro and who have now begun to spin out of control, even to the point at which they, themselves, I believe, are potentially threatened by these groups who, in addition to funding themselves through the government, have found other ways to fund themselves through illicit means, including through street crime.

This situation is reaching a breaking point, and I think it is an important moment to remind the men and women in uniform in the National Guard of Venezuela that their job is to protect the people of Venezuela, not to oppress them; that their job is to protect and uphold the Constitution of that country, not to cancel it out; to remind them that the men and women on the other side of these protests are their families and their fellow Venezuelans.

Now the time has come to tell the men and women in the Venezuelan Government—many who, perhaps, sympathize with Hugo Chavez and Maduro up to a point—that they do not want to go down with this ship, that they do not want to wind up on the list of people who have participated in this crackdown and in this oppression.

I hope that my colleagues here will continue to work hard. I am encouraged by the amount of bipartisan support that we have begun to create on the issue of Venezuela. I know my colleague, Senator CARDIN, and I have worked out bipartisan legislation that urges the Maduro regime to release all of its political prisoners and express support for a solution to the crisis. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in cosigning this bipartisan legislation.

We also support the administration's efforts at the OAS to continue to work with regional governments in Argentina, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, Chile, Brazil, and others who have taken heed of this issue and have played an extraordinary leadership role in raising this in international forums.

Beyond that, I encourage the administration to continue to look for names to sanction. They have the authority under the law—passed not once but twice by this Congress—that allows them to identify specific individuals within the Venezuelan Government who are stealing the money of the Venezuelan people and committing grotesque human rights violations and have real estate and other personal property and cash deposits and bank accounts around the world from what they have illicitly stolen from the people of Venezuela.

Here is my closing point: Maduro's government is now relying on credit from all parts of the world in order to continue to sustain itself.

To any private investment banks and any of these large global banks that are thinking about lending money to

Venezuela, you are abetting this regime and its repression, and you will be singled out and named if you participate in continuing to lend them money to fund this.

To the Russian Government, I say that you are not going to get your money back. These guys cannot pay you back.

It is the same for the Chinese Government.

If you continue to lend money to the Maduro regime, they will not be able to pay you back, and you are going to be embarrassed.

The Chinese Government is going to be embarrassed if it continues to loan money to Venezuela.

They cannot and will never pay you back.

The Russians cannot afford to continue to lend money to a government that will not pay them back either.

I urge them to look at that very carefully before they continue to embarrass themselves by lending out their people's money that they will never get back.

This is an important issue. It is in our own hemisphere, and the answer lies one election away. If only the Maduro regime would follow its laws and its Constitution, Venezuela would be on a better path that its people would choose. The alternative to this situation will continue to spiral out of control.

We in this Chamber and in this country will continue to be on the side of the men and women who seek nothing but democracy and seek nothing but peace and reconciliation and a way forward for this nation, which has a deep history of democratic order.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING URBANDALE, IOWA

• Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the city of Urbandale, IA, which was founded 100 years ago.

The city of Urbandale was incorporated on April 16, 1917. Early denizens worked primarily in local coal mines, many of which closed by the late 1940s. Urbandale was also a so-called street car suburb, where residents could commute to their jobs in the city—Des Moines—via a street car on the Urbandale Line until they were replaced by buses in the early 1950s. Over the years, the community saw homes go up, restaurants and business flourish, and people from all corners of the world pass through, from Presidential candidates to Pope John Paul II, who held mass at Living History Farms in 1979. Urbandale is one of those quintessential Iowa towns where you would want to raise a family. Though the community had only 298 residents in the 1920s, today over 40,000 people call Urbandale home.

I would like to congratulate the city of Urbandale on their centennial year, and I ask that my colleagues in the U.S. Senate join me in congratulating them and wishing them another prosperous century.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF McCORMICK COUNTY

● Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, November 2016 marked the 100th anniversary of the founding of McCormick County, the smallest and second youngest county in South Carolina. Known as the Gem of the Freshwater Coast, McCormick's rich history dates back to before our Nation's founding. The first overt act of the American Revolution in South Carolina occurred in McCormick County, at Fort Charlotte near Mount Carmel on July 12, 1775. McCormick continued to grow after the discovery of gold in 1850 and the expansion of the railroad. Today McCormick is known for its "Natural Pace of Life," with ample outdoor recreation opportunities and hospitable citizens.

On behalf of South Carolina and all of us here in the Senate, I offer congratulations to the entire McCormick County community on reaching this milestone. Best wishes for continued success and prosperity.●

REMEMBERING JOHN C. "SKEFF" SHEEHY

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Justice John C. Sheehy, whose life was a Montana story, eulogized with these words from his family.

The material follows:

John C. "Skeff" Sheehy, 99, lawyer, jurist, and family patriarch, died Friday, April 7, 2017, at his home in Helena.

Skeff was born Jan. 27, 1918, to Cornelius and Anna Sheehy in Butte, the first of seven children. Although he lived in other Montana towns for 80 years of his life, he believed, along with his brother Joe, that "if you're not in Butte, you're camping out." He was educated at Catholic schools in Butte, attended the Montana School of Mines (now Montana Tech) and then the University of Montana School of Law. He obtained his law degree in 1943 and went to work in Helena for insurance commissioner J.D. Holmes.

Skeff married Rita Ann Schiltz in 1945, and only death would part them. In 1947, they moved to Billings, Rita's hometown. Skeff began a 30-year law practice with his brother-in-law and great friend, Jack Schiltz. They tried all manner of cases and represented all sorts of clients. They also had a lot of fun. Schiltz and Sheehy were responsible for most of the skits, songs and frivolity at the Billings Bar meetings for decades. Over time, Schiltz and Sheehy joined others in the practice, including George Hutton, R.G. Wiggenhorn, and Brent Cromley. Skeff's professional accomplishments were recognized by the State Bar of Montana in 2005 with the Jameson Award and by the Montana Trial Lawyers Association in 2016 with its first lifetime achievement award.

Between 1959 and 1970, Skeff served in both houses of the state legislature. He was the

first Democrat to break the "straight eight" Republican legislative block in Yellowstone County during those decades of county-wide ballots. In 1978, Gov. Tom Judge appointed Sheehy to the Montana Supreme Court. He was elected to his seat twice before retiring in 1991. Justice Sheehy was the author of the decision rejecting the challenge to Montana's coal severance tax. The United States Supreme Court upheld his decision. Throughout his tenure on the court, Sheehy was known as a champion of the powerless who recognized the role the constitutions of his state and nation played in ensuring that the least among us was accorded the same rights and privileges as those more fortunate.

After his death, clients he represented and lawyers he influenced made sure his family knew about his quiet influence. The child of one client, whom he represented without compensation, told the family how much it meant to their family just to have a man like Sheehy at their side in a dispute with the Internal Revenue Service. "It wasn't a fairy tale ending," she noted. "We still had to pay something. But we had our dignity back. And from that time forward, your father's name was spoken in our house with a reverence otherwise reserved for God."

The family also heard from judges and lawyers throughout the state, echoing common themes:

"Your dad was the number one hero and inspiration in the law to me."

"Your dad set the standard for what a supreme court justice should be. He cared about people, he cared about fundamental rights, and he was a master of the language."

"Your dad was a great mentor. He had a way of teaching without preaching. And he made the work fun. He always lightened the occasion with a song or a poem. We all loved him so." A devoted Catholic, Sheehy attended Mass every morning and said the rosary every night. His faith guided him through the Great Depression, a near-fatal car wreck in 1936, Montana politics in the 60s and 70s, an armed assailant in his Supreme Court office in 1984, the death of his beloved Rita in 2012, and everything in between.

Skeff and Rita raised eleven children long before "parent" was a verb. In those days without cell phones and texts, Dad communicated with full voice, songs, prayer, jokes, and sometimes long silences. He imparted much wisdom, ranging from "Trust everyone, but cut the cards," to "you'd starve to death with a ham on your back." He rarely said good-bye, preferring "tap 'er light" or "don't go with the old feeling."

Engagement was Skeff's distinguishing characteristic. His children's greatest fan, he drove all over Montana to their events. Though he liked to quote J.D. Holmes that "Human beings are a lousy arrangement," he loved human arrangements: parades, games, weddings, and funerals. In the last years of his life, he and Rita and assorted family and friends ate dinner at the Motherlode every Tuesday, and Friday noons were reserved for lunch at Benny's Bistro. He liked the bustle of people. At home, he read and watched the news every day and night; he did the crossword and sudoku; and he didn't often miss Jeopardy. He was engaged in the world to his last day on earth.

Sheehy was preceded in death by his wife Rita; brothers Tom, Edmund, Joseph, and Jim Sheehy; by his sister Margaret, known as Sister Serena Sheehy, SLC; and by his granddaughter Rita Mary. He is survived by his 11 children, Anne (Peter) Yegen of Park City, Tom Sheehy of Helena; Mary (Duane) Moe of Great Falls, Patrick (Debbie) Sheehy

of Billings, Kate (Dirk) Whitney of Helena, Eileen Sheehy (Bob Maxson) of Billings, Rosalie (David) Cates of Missoula, Margaret Sheehy (Ralph Johnson) of Albany, NY, Jenifer Sheehy of Billings, Martha Sheehy (Sid Thomas) of Billings and John Sheehy (Jill Golden) of Marlboro, VT. His lone surviving sibling, Sister Eileen Sheehy, SLC, lives in Grand Junction, CO. He is also survived by 19 grandchildren, nine great-grandchildren, and many treasured nieces and nephews, their spouses and their children.●

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 280. A bill to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties, Colorado, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-45).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 644. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Medgar Evers House, located in Jackson, Mississippi, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-46).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 729. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, for inclusion in the John Muir National Historic Site, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-47).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 88. A bill to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-48).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

H.R. 267. A bill to redesignate the Martin Luther King, Junior, National Historic Site in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-49).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 538. A bill to redesignate Ocmulgee National Monument in the State of Georgia and revise its boundary, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-50).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

H.R. 560. A bill to amend the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to provide access to certain vehicles serving residents of municipalities adjacent to the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-51).

S. 225. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to modify provisions relating to certain land exchanges in the Mt. Hood Wilderness in the State of Oregon (Rept. No. 115-52).

S. 285. A bill to ensure adequate use and access to the existing Bolts Ditch headgate and ditch segment within the Holy Cross Wilderness in Eagle County, Colorado, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-53).

S. 289. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Arapaho National Forest, Colorado, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-54).

S. 617. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-55).

H.R. 618. A bill to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties, Colorado, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-56).

H.R. 688. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Arapaho National Forest, Colorado, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-57).

H.R. 689. A bill to insure adequate use and access to the existing Bolts Ditch headgate and ditch segment within the Holy Cross Wilderness in Eagle County, Colorado, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-58).

H.R. 699. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to modify provisions relating to certain land exchanges in the Mt. Hood Wilderness in the State of Oregon (Rept. No. 115-59).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Terry Branstad, of Iowa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of China.

Nominee: Terry E. Branstad.

Post: Beijing, People's Republic of China.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, date, amount, donee:

1. Self: 7/11/2016, \$100.00, #40009 Kim Reynolds for Lieutenant Governor; 6/30/2016, \$100.00, #2330 David Kerr State House; 2/17/2016, \$100.00, #9015 Boone County Republican Central Committee; 9/3/2015, \$100.00, #2232 Rene Gadelha for Iowa Senate, #6234 Iowa Farm Bureau Federation Political Action; 7/13/2015, \$50.00, Committee; 2/2/2015, \$100.00, #9015 Boone County Republican Central Committee; 7/11/2014, \$500.00, #5165 Iowans for Sam Clovis; 7/11/2014, \$500.00, #5163 Adam Gregg for Iowa; 6/25/2014, \$500.00, #5158 Pate for Iowa; 5/21/2014, \$30.00, #9158 Pottawattamie County Republican Central Committee; 1/16/2014, \$100.00, #9015 Boone County Republican Central Committee; 12/3/2013, \$250.00, #2137 Gustafson for Iowa House; 11/6/2013, \$500.00, #1654 Garrett for Statehouse Committee; 10/29/2013, \$500.00, #9167 Scott County Republican Central Committee; 7/13/2013, \$250.00, #5123 Northey for Iowa Agriculture; 6/13/2013, \$250.00, #5154 Mosiman for State Auditor; 6/5/2013, \$250.00, #5137 Friends of Matt Schultz; 1/17/2013, \$100.00, #9015 Boone County Republican Central Committee; 12/6/2012, \$100.00, #2107 Schneider for State Senate; 5/25/2012, \$100.00, #2048 Schweers for Senate; 5/18/2012, \$100.00, #1654 Garrett for Statehouse Committee; 4/17/2012, \$100.00, #2048 Schweers for Senate; 3/10/2012, \$50.00, #18851 Lampe for Sheriff; 3/10/2012, \$100.00, #18801 Chet Hollingshead for Supervisor; 3/10/2012, \$40.00, #9015 Boone County Republican Central Committee; 1/25/2012, \$100.00, #9015 Boone County Republican Central Committee; 07/11/

14, \$500.00, Blum, Rodney VIA Blum for Congress; 03/31/12, \$2,500.00, King, Steve Mr. VIA King for Congress; 06/13/12, \$240.00, King, Steve Mr. VIA King for Congress; 07/16/14, \$500.00, Young, David VIA Young for Iowa, Inc.; 06/30/15, \$500.00, Ernst, Joni K VIA Joni for Iowa; 10/03/16, \$1,000.00, Trump, Donald J VIA Trump for President, Inc.

2. Spouse: Christine Branstad; 7/11/2016, \$100.00, #40009 Kim Reynolds for Lieutenant Governor; 12/6/2012, \$100.00, #2107 Schneider for State Senate.

(Note: Both were joint with Governor Branstad)

3. Children and Spouses: Eric David Branstad; 6/28/2015, \$50.00, #14089 John Mickelson for City Council; 10/9/2014, \$10.00, #5140 Governor Branstad Committee; 8/21/2014, \$100.00, #5165 Iowans for Sam Clovis; 7/14/2014, \$50.00, #5158 Pate for Iowa; 6/29/2014, \$50.00, #14089 John Mickelson for City Council; 11/22/2013, \$50.00, #1711 Cownie for Statehouse; 5/22/2013, \$150.00, #9156 Polk County Republican Central Committee; 10/22/2012, \$8.00, #9640 Winnebago County Republican Women; 4/11/2012, \$135.00, #18491 The Committee to Elect Chad Airhart; 10/01/15, \$250.00, Growth Energy PAC. Eric David Branstad and Adrienne Branstad (joint); 8/8/2015, \$50.00, #14287 Friends of Eric Johansen; 9/30/2014, \$25.00, #14093 Committee to Elect Michael McCoy. Marcus Andrew Branstad; 8/11/2015, \$100.00, #14287 Friends of Eric Johansen; 7/3/2014, \$100.00, #5163 Adam Gregg for Iowa; 6/23/2014, \$25.00, #5158 Pate for Iowa; 06/10/16, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 06/24/16, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 07/08/16, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 07/22/16, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 08/05/16, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 08/19/16, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 09/02/16, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 09/16/16, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 10/14/16, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 05/15/15, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 06/12/15, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 06/26/15, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 07/10/15, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 07/24/15, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 08/07/15, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 08/21/15, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 09/04/15, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 09/18/15, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 10/02/15, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 10/16/15, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 11/13/15, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 11/27/15, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 12/11/15, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 12/24/15, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 10/28/16, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 11/11/16, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 11/25/16, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 12/09/16, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 12/23/16, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC; 05/27/16, \$21.00, American Chemistry Council PAC. Nicole Branstad (married to Marcus Branstad)—not applicable. Allison (Branstad) Costa and Jerry Costa—not applicable.

4. Parents: Edward Branstad (father)—deceased; Rita Branstad (mother)—deceased; Enolia Branstad (stepmother)—not applicable.

5. Grandparents: Helmer Branstad—deceased; Hazel Branstad—deceased; Louis Garland—deceased; Gertrude Garland—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Monroe Branstad; 5/11/2016, \$250.00, #19430 Hepperly for Sheriff.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Not applicable.

*Todd Philip Haskell, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class

of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo.

Nominee: Todd Philip Haskell.

Post: Republic of the Congo.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Todd Haskell: none.
2. Jennifer Conn Haskell: \$50, 6/2012, DNCC.
3. Michael Jonathan Conn Haskell (son): \$50, 2/2016, Hillary Clinton.
4. Jonah Alexander Conn Haskell (son): none.
5. Seth Thomas Conn Haskell (son): none.
6. Walter Haskell (father, deceased); Gloria Haskell (mother, deceased).
7. Grandparents: Edward Smoller (deceased); Henrietta Smoller (deceased); David Haskell (deceased); Elsie Haskell (deceased).
8. Brothers and Spouses: Marc Haskell (deceased); Walter Haskell (deceased).
9. Sisters and Spouses: Jackie Grando (deceased).

*Tulinabo Salama Mushingi, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guinea-Bissau.

Nominee: Tulinabo Mushingi.

Post: Senegal and Guinea-Bissau.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, date, amount, and donee:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: Rebecca Mushingi; 2016, \$200.00, Hillary Victory Fund; 2015, \$100.00, Hillary for America.
3. Children and Spouses: Furaha Mushingi, none.
4. Parents: Bahiga & Namazi F. Mushingi—deceased.
5. Grandparents: Bahiga & Mwandaunga—deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: None ever visited/lived in the USA.
7. Sisters and Spouses: None ever visited/lived in the USA.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

*Foreign Service nomination of Alexander Dickie IV.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Joel Justin Agaloff and ending with Iva Ziza, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 25, 2017.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Edward Francis Acevedo and ending with Benjamin D. Zinner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 25, 2017. (minus 1 nominee: Kenneth W. MacLean)

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Jim Nelson Barnhart, Jr. and ending with Anne N. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 25, 2017. (minus 1 nominee: Tanya S. Urquieta)

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Jeffery S. Austin and ending with Jeffrey G. Willnow, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 25, 2017. (minus 1 nominee: David A. Ashford)

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mrs. McCASKILL):

S. 1071. A bill to require the evaluation and consolidation of duplicative green building programs within the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1072. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 1073. A bill to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 1074. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide uniform standards for the use of electronic signatures for third-party disclosure authorizations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1075. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a study of the feasibility of establishing an ethane storage and distribution hub in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1076. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to multiemployer pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 1077. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to amend the

mission statement of the Food and Drug Administration; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. McCASKILL, and Mr. KING):

S. 1078. A bill to establish procedures regarding the approval of opioid drugs by the Food and Drug Administration; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 1079. A bill to require the Food and Drug Administration to revoke the approval of one opioid pain medication for each new opioid pain medication approved; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. McCASKILL (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1080. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect employees in the building and construction industry who are participants in multiemployer plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. Res. 160. A resolution honoring the service to United States Armed Forces provided by military working dogs and contract working dogs, also known as "war dogs"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 324

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 324, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans.

S. 422

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 422, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 447

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 447, a bill to require reporting on acts of certain foreign countries on Holocaust era assets and related issues.

S. 473

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 473, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make qualification requirements for entitlement to Post-9/11 Education Assistance more

equitable, to improve support of veterans receiving such educational assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 569

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 656

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 656, a bill to help individuals receiving disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act obtain rehabilitation services and return to the workforce, and for other purposes.

S. 712

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 712, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 765

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 765, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for penalties for the sale of any Purple Heart awarded to a member of the Armed Forces.

S. 838

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 838, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to include retrofit loans such as property assessed clean energy loans, and for other purposes.

S. 916

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 916, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with regard to the provision of emergency medical services.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 926, a bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 976

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 976, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 978

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 978, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish an award program recognizing excellence exhibited by public school system employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through higher education.

S. 985

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 985, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from revising the approved oil and gas leasing program for fiscal years 2017 through 2022.

S. 992

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 992, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct an independent review of the deaths of certain veterans by suicide, and for other purposes.

S. 1034

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1034, a bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1055

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Massachu-

setts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1055, a bill to restrict the exportation of certain defense articles to the Philippine National Police, to work with the Philippines to support civil society and a public health approach to substance abuse, to report on Chinese and other sources of narcotics to the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 109

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 109, a resolution encouraging the Government of Pakistan to release Aasiya Noreen, internationally known as Asia Bibi, and reform its religiously intolerant laws regarding blasphemy.

S. RES. 139

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 139, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 155

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 155, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should work in cooperation with the international community and continue to exercise global leadership to address the causes and effects of climate change, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 160—HONORING THE SERVICE TO UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES PROVIDED BY MILITARY WORKING DOGS AND CONTRACT WORKING DOGS, ALSO KNOWN AS "WAR DOGS"

Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 160

Whereas March 13, 2017, marks the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the United States Army military working dog program, which officially began on March 13, 1942;

Whereas each military working dog (referred to in this preamble as a "war dog") and its handler is currently trained at the 341st Training Squadron at Lackland Air Force Base, which is also home to the Mil-

tary Working Dog Teams National Monument;

Whereas war dogs have provided service to each branch of the United States Armed Forces and in each conflict involving the United States since and including the Revolutionary War;

Whereas war dogs are credited with saving countless lives, while alerting service members to danger on patrol, detecting improvised explosive devices, identifying weapons caches, performing search and rescue, and providing other specialized mission functions;

Whereas in conflicts before and including the Vietnam conflict, some war dogs were left behind in conflict areas, but war dogs are no longer considered merely equipment and are now required to be retired in the United States;

Whereas, in recognition of the unique bond between a war dog and its handler team, handlers are given preference in adopting their war dog teammate after the war dog's retirement;

Whereas the service of war dogs has been recognized by senior military leaders, who have stated that the capability of war dogs in combat cannot be replicated by humans or machines and by any measure of performance, war dogs outperform any other asset in the inventory of the United States Armed Forces; and

Whereas numerous war dogs have given their lives in service to the United States Armed Forces, both in active conflict and in retirement, while providing companionship and comfort to veterans and wounded warriors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the United States Army military working dog program, the Senate—

(1) recognizes the service that military working dogs and contract working dogs (referred to in this resolution as "war dogs") have provided to the United States Armed Forces;

(2) acknowledges that not all war dogs were given due recognition by being allowed to honorably retire from their service in the United States;

(3) assures the members of the United States Armed Forces that war dogs will continue to be treated with the deference commensurate with their service and rank; and

(4) honors the sacrifices made by war dogs in combat and the services war dogs provide in retirement to members of the United States Armed Forces.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have seven requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 9, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in open and closed sessions, to receive testimony on United States Cyber Command.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 9, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in open session to consider nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 9, 2017, at 10 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 9, 2017, at 10:15 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Nominations."

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Tuesday, May 9, 2017 at 2:30 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND MERCHANT MARINE INFRASTRUCTURE, SAFETY AND SECURITY

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 9, 2017, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold Subcommittee Hearing on "Maritime Transportation: Opportunities and Challenges for the Maritime Administration and Federal Maritime Commission."

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 9, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in Room 406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, "Water Resources: The Role of the Public and Private Sectors."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 52, Robert Lighthizer to be U.S. Trade Representative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Lighthizer, of Florida, to be United States Trade Representative, with the

rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Robert Lighthizer, of Florida, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Mike Rounds, Orrin G. Hatch, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Thad Cochran, Luther Strange, John Thune, Richard C. Shelby, John Hoeven, John Boozman, Rob Portman, Jerry Moran, David Perdue.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 10; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, we expect to have a rolcall vote on the motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 36, the methane CRA resolution of disapproval, at approximately 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator SULLIVAN.

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

The assistant Democratic leader.

TERMINATION OF JAMES COMEY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the termination and removal of James Comey as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation raises a critical question as to whether the FBI investigation of

Russian interference in the last Presidential campaign will continue and whether the investigation into any collusion or involvement by the Trump campaign will be investigated by the FBI. Any attempt to stop or undermine this FBI investigation would raise grave constitutional issues.

We await clarification by the White House as soon as possible as to whether this investigation will continue and whether it will have a credible lead so that we know it will have a just outcome.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO SHERRY BESS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, every week I have been coming to the floor to recognize someone in my State who has made a difference, someone who has devoted time and energy to making my State a better place to live for others. We call these individuals our Alaskan of the Week.

As I have said repeatedly, I believe my State is the most beautiful State in the country. We have visitors. We want to welcome more and more visitors. Come on up. I guarantee it will be the trip of a lifetime.

When you go to Alaska, one town that nobody should miss is Homer, AK. It is surrounded by the glistening waters of Kachemak Bay, jagged mountains, glaciers, and snowcapped volcanoes. Some people call it the Halibut Fishing Capital of the World. Others call it the Cosmic Hamlet by the Sea. Some, like me, call it a slice of Heaven.

I was there a few weeks ago holding a community meeting. I thanked them then, and I want to thank them all today for the very warm welcome I received.

I also wish to thank Homer for the very warm welcome they gave to Navy destroyer USS *Hopper*, which spent a few days in Homer before participating in a joint naval exercise with the Army in the Gulf of Alaska. The 300-member crew of the USS *Hopper* was greeted by hundreds of cheering, flag-waving Homer residents. The commander of the *Hopper*, J.D. Gainey, wrote that in his 24 years of naval service, "I have never seen as much patriotism as we enjoyed in Homer." Thank you, Homer, from all of us. Alaskans love Homer.

They see it for the landscape but also for the people. It is a tight-knit community. They might not always agree with one another, particularly with regard to politics, but they look out for each other. Like any community with

a heart, they look out for their animals.

This week I want to recognize a special person as our Alaskan of the Week, Sherry Bess, who spent nearly 30 years—three decades—taking care of Homer's animals as the manager of the Homer Animal Shelter. In 1989, when Sherry began to volunteer at the pet shelter in Homer, there was one building, no phone, and only four cages to hold cats. "It was basically a shack," she said. The snow would come in through the dog door. The drains in the water bowls would freeze. Sherry's hands and feet were always cold, and it was infested with mice. There was no bathroom. Oftentimes, when the shelter was too busy and when the animals needed extra care, Sherry would take them to her home, where she would care for them.

Sherry and a handful of residents cared for over 1,200 animals each year in that little shelter. Along the way, she gathered both happy stories and heartbreaking stories about the animals she found that were abused and the ones she found homes for. In fact, one of the members of my team in

Alaska took a puppy that had been abandoned in a crate in the woods near Homer, took him home, fed him, and Mick Fleagle on my staff now has a dog. His dog Sookie, 8 years old, has the full reign of the house. He is loved.

Thanks to Sherry, stories like that abound throughout Homer. For 26 years, she has worked night and day, 7 days a week, for the pets in that community. She recently stepped down from that job. She is taking care of her own pets, lots of them—her family she calls them—but she will always be known to so many people in Homer for what she has done for their pets and their animals.

"Over the years, those animals that came to me," she said, "... unwanted and sad and depressed, and then you help them and you love them and they go to a home and they're loved. That's the most rewarding thing about what I did."

Sherry said over the years she has noticed that the residents of Homer and throughout the country have been kinder to their pets. Part of that is the result of what Sherry and others like her across the country do to educate

the public on taking care of animals through vaccinations, neutering. Some of it is more and more because people like Sherry are considering pets as their families.

So I want to thank Sherry, as our Alaskan of the Week, for all she has done and for all she has done for pets in our great State. Great job.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:17 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 10, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 9, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

SCOTT GOTTLIEB, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF FOOD AND DRUGS, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

SENATE—Wednesday, May 10, 2017

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Almighty God, You are our strength and always ready to help us. Uphold our lawmakers with Your powerful hands. Lord, let Your presence be felt by them as You guide them in these challenging times.

Give them the wisdom to do Your will, finding nourishment and reassurance in their fellowship with You. Help them to do their best in life's daylight, for the night comes when no one can work.

Empower our Senators to grow in grace and in a deeper knowledge of You. May they continue to prosper and be in health, even as their souls prosper. Inspire them to be strong and full of courage, ever confident in Your grace and mercy.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION**PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE OF THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT—MOTION TO PROCEED**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.J. Res. 36.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] moves to proceed to H.J. Res. 36, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Bureau of Land Management relating to "Waste Prevention, Production Subject to Royalties, and Resource Conservation."

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Democratic

leader and I be allowed to give our leader remarks at this time.

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

WELCOMING KENTUCKY VETERANS TO OUR NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today it is my privilege to welcome a distinguished group of Kentuckians to our Nation's Capital. Because of the incredible work of the Honor Flight Program, over 80 World War II, Korea, and Vietnam veterans from across my home State will travel to Washington. Here they will see the memorials built to honor their service.

The Bluegrass Chapter Honor Flight has brought hundreds of veterans, most of them Kentuckians, to Washington for this purpose. Despite the significant logistical and financial planning that goes into these trips, Honor Flight works to make sure veterans have the opportunity to travel at no cost to themselves.

The program organizes travel and food for these veterans, many of whom would never be able to visit our Nation's Capital or see the memorials at all without Honor Flight.

The national monuments built on the Mall pay tribute to those who sacrificed for the cause of freedom. I wish to add my voice to those who welcome these veterans and thank them for their service to our country.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, on another matter, I am glad to see many of our Democratic friends here with us today. Yesterday they sent me a letter indicating they want to participate as we work on legislation that can bring relief from ObamaCare. In that letter, they acknowledged the need to "improve and reform the health care system."

After 8 years of defending this failing law and its higher costs, reduced choices, and dropped coverage, I am glad to hear that Senate Democrats are finally willing to concede that the status quo is simply unsustainable. I appreciate their willingness to acknowledge that ObamaCare hasn't lived up to its promises.

That is certainly a reality that Senate Republicans entirely agree with. It is why we are working to keep our commitment to the American people to move beyond the failures of ObamaCare.

If our friends on the other side of the aisle want to join us in replacing ObamaCare with commonsense reforms, I welcome their input. It is disappointing that it has taken our Democratic colleagues this long to come around, but I look forward to hearing

their ideas now, and I look forward to joining in a robust debate on the Senate floor as we pursue smarter healthcare solutions.

As we continue working to address this critical issue, it is important to remember why we need to act in the first place. Across the country, more and more Americans are feeling the pain of ObamaCare. Listen to these recent headlines.

Thousands of ObamaCare Customers Left Without Options As Insurers Bolt.

More Insurers Abandon ObamaCare: Who Might Be Next?

ObamaCare Choices Could Go From One to Zero in Some Areas.

ObamaCare is failing the American people, and it keeps getting worse. Families face skyrocketing premiums, fewer choices, and the risk of losing the doctors or plans they like. Just this week, we saw even more troubling news out of States like Maryland, where one major insurer proposed a premium increase of more than 50 percent, warning that the ObamaCare market is "in the early stages of a death spiral."

We saw similar stories out of Connecticut too. There, insurers have also requested double-digit increases, which could top out at 52 percent amid worries that the last two insurers on the exchanges "may leave."

These States aren't alone. I continue to hear from Kentuckians who are desperate for relief from ObamaCare. Take this Campbellsville woman who purchased insurance on the ObamaCare exchanges after researching the best policy to fit her needs. Only then did she find out how hard it would be for her to actually get care. Here is what she had to say.

Today I am making payments for a health care plan that does not cover my doctors, [and] does not cover all my prescriptions. It is almost totally useless.

I am only one person but I'm sure I speak for many people who are finding themselves in this difficult situation.

ObamaCare is a failed law that continues to hurt Americans every single day. It is taking a bigger bite out of their budgets while, as too many have discovered, covering fewer services they actually need.

We have all received letters from our constituents like the one I just shared. These families are the ones shouldering the burdens of ObamaCare. They are the ones counting on us to act and move past the failures of ObamaCare. If we don't, this situation will only get worse.

That is why we continue to engage in productive conversations with each Member of our caucus on the way forward on providing relief from

ObamaCare. I look forward to continuing these talks and welcoming our Democratic colleagues to the conversation if they are ready to join us. It certainly is an important step for the entire Democratic caucus to acknowledge that the status quo is failing the American people and that Congress cannot sit by while Americans suffer the consequences of this failed law.

REMOVAL OF JAMES COMEY

Mr. President, one final matter, whatever one thinks of the manner in which Director James Comey handled the investigation into Secretary Clinton's unauthorized use of a private server and her mishandling of classified information, it is clear what our Democratic colleagues thought of it—both at that time and consistently thereafter.

Last year, the current Democratic leader said it appeared to be an “appalling act,” one that he said “goes against the tradition of prosecutors at every level of government,” and the prior Democratic leader, when asked if James Comey should resign given his conduct of the investigation, replied “[o]f course, yes.”

It is also clear what our Democratic colleagues think of the man who evaluated Mr. Comey's professional conduct and concluded that the Bureau needed a change in leadership. The Democratic leader just a few weeks ago praised Mr. Rosenstein for his independence and said he had developed a reputation for integrity.

What we have now is our Democratic colleagues complaining about the removal of an FBI Director whom they themselves repeatedly and sharply criticized; that removal being done by a man, Rod Rosenstein, whom they repeatedly and effusively praised—when Mr. Rosenstein recommended Mr. Comey's removal for many of the very reasons they consistently complained about.

Two investigations are currently ongoing: The Senate Intelligence Committee's review of Russian active measures and intelligence activities and the FBI investigation disclosed by Director Comey.

Today we will no doubt hear calls for a new investigation, which could only serve to impede the current work being done to not only discover what the Russians may have done but also to let this body and the national security community develop the countermeasures and warfighting doctrine to see that it doesn't occur again. Partisan calls should not delay the considerable work of Chairman BURR and Vice Chairman WARNER. Too much is at stake.

Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein was just confirmed on a bipartisan vote, 94 to 6—94 to 6—and that sort of fair consideration should continue when the Senate receives an FBI Director nominee. As I said yesterday, once

the Senate receives a nomination to fill this position, we will look forward to a full, fair, and timely confirmation process. This is a critical role that is particularly important as our country continues to face serious threats at home and abroad.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

FIRING OF JAMES COMEY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday the President fired the Director of the FBI, Jim Comey, who was leading an active investigation into the Trump campaign's possible collusion with Russia.

The President provided no reasoning for the firing other than he had the recommendation of his Attorney General—who has already had to recuse himself from the Russia investigation for being too close to the President—and his Deputy Attorney General, Rod Rosenstein.

There is little reason to think Mr. Rosenstein's letter is the true reason President Trump fired Director Comey. Why? Because if the administration truly had objections to the way Director Comey handled the Clinton investigation, they would have had them the minute the President got into office, but he didn't fire Director Comey then.

The question is, Why did it happen last night? We know Director Comey was leading an investigation into whether the Trump campaign colluded with the Russians, a serious offense. Were those investigations getting too close to home for the President?

The dismissal of Director Comey establishes a very troubling pattern. This administration has now removed several law enforcement officials in a position to conduct independent investigations of the President and his administration—from Acting Attorney General Sally Yates to Preet Bharara and now Jim Comey.

What should happen now, what must happen now is that Mr. Rosenstein appoints a special prosecutor to oversee this investigation. Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein sat in the Judiciary Committee and promised to appoint a special prosecutor at the appropriate time. He said: “I'm willing to appoint a special counsel whenever I determine that it's appropriate.”

My colleague Senator COONS asked him: “Would you agree that it's vital to the assurance of confidence in our democracy and law enforcement system that any investigation into these matters be fair, free, thorough and politically independent?”

Mr. Rosenstein answered: “Yes, I do.”

If there was ever a time when circumstances warranted a special prosecutor, it is right now.

Mr. Rosenstein already expressed concern that Director Comey damaged the integrity of the FBI. The Attorney

General has already had to recuse himself from the investigation for being too close to the President.

If Mr. Rosenstein is true to his word, that he believes this investigation must be “fair, free, thorough and politically independent,” if he believes, as I do, that the American people must be able to have faith in the impartiality of this investigation, he must appoint a special prosecutor and get his investigation out of the hands of the FBI and far away from the heavy hand of this administration.

Mr. Rosenstein has the authority to appoint a special prosecutor right now. He needs no congressional authorization. This would simply be a step that he could take, as outlined in the Department of Justice guidelines and in a law passed after Watergate, to get an independently minded prosecutor who would be insulated from various pressures.

A special prosecutor is not subject to day-to-day supervision by the Attorney General or anyone else at the Justice Department. That means the special prosecutor would have much greater latitude in whom he can subpoena, which questions they can ask, and how to conduct an investigation. The special prosecutor can only be removed for good cause, such as misconduct, not to quash the investigation.

Third, there is built-in congressional oversight. Congress is notified whenever a special counsel is appointed, removed, or has finished with the investigation. The appointment of a special prosecutor would be a welcome step in the right direction, but it is not the only action that should be taken.

There are a great many outstanding questions about the circumstances of Director Comey's dismissal, the status of the executive branch investigation into the Trump campaign ties to Russia, and what the future holds for these investigations.

So I will be requesting that the majority leader call a closed, and if necessary, classified, all-Senators briefing, with the Attorney General separately at which, and the Deputy Attorney General separately, at which they can be asked questions.

Some of the questions: Why was Attorney General Sessions, who had recused himself from the Russia investigations, able to influence the firing of the man conducting the Russia investigation? Did Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein act on his own or at the direction of his superiors or the White House? Are reports that the President has been searching for a rationale to fire the FBI Director for weeks true? Was Director Comey's investigation making significant progress in a direction that would cause political damage for the White House? Why didn't the President wait for the Inspector General's investigation into Director Comey's handling of

the Clinton email investigation to conclude before making his decision to fire him? Was this really about something else?

No doubt, we will have an opportunity to question Mr. Comey, now a private citizen, about what happened, but we need to hear from this administration about what happened and why, and what is going to happen next. That is why, again, I am requesting that the majority leader call a closed, and if necessary, classified, all-Senators briefing with the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General separately, at which they can be asked these questions.

I hope the majority leader agrees with me that we need to get to the bottom of this and get a handle on all the facts so that we can grapple with them. I remind him and my Republican friends that nothing less is at stake than the American people's faith in our criminal justice system and the integrity of the executive branch of our government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 125 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alexander	Flake	Portman
Barrasso	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hatch	Rounds
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Capito	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Strange
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Perdue	

NAYS—51

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murphy
Bennet	Graham	Murray
Blumenthal	Harris	Nelson
Booker	Hassan	Peters
Brown	Heinrich	Reed
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Sanders
Cardin	Hirono	Schatz
Carper	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	King	Shaheen
Collins	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Udall
Donnelly	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskey	Warren
Feinstein	Menendez	Whitehouse
Franken	Merkley	Wyden

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 52, Robert Lighthizer to be United States Trade Representative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Lighthizer, of Florida, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 13 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They include the Armed Services Committee briefing on capabilities to counter Russian influence in cyberspace, a Banking Committee hearing on North Korea, and a Homeland Security Committee hearing on cyber threats facing America. These committees and all the other committees are doing important work; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the 13 committees be allowed to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, because of the decision last night of the President of the United States to terminate the Director of the FBI and the questions that has raised, we gathered together—the Democratic Senators—on the floor and listened as our leader at least suggested a path for us to follow as an institution facing this constitutional question. We believe it is timely, and as a result of that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTION

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to speak against the Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn an important rule that has been put in place to protect the American taxpayer and to protect the health of American citizens.

For almost 100 years, the Federal Government has regulated undue waste in oil and gas fields. The story of oil and gas waste is as old as the story of oil and gas.

Early oil gushers, like Spindletop in Texas, revealed two things about oil as an emerging source of energy: First, there was a huge amount of it. Second,

without rules in place, it could be easily wasted. That is why, way back in 1915, Attorney General Thomas Gregory issued a report to the public about this issue. Gregory wrote that the law at the time allowed oil companies to "occupy and operate any number of tracts of public oil land without restraint upon the quantities of oil produced or the methods of production and without rendering to the . . . government anything in return." One can imagine that concern. Gregory went on to point out that "the incentives to speculative occupation, negligent and wasteful operation, and excess production become obvious."

Some of my colleagues who are not on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee may not be familiar with the law Congress passed after Attorney General Gregory put his finger on the waste problem. The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 established our modern leasing program for oil and natural gas. More than anything else, the leasing act enshrined the principle that the public should benefit from mineral production on public lands. This seems like a no-brainer today, but it took over a decade of debate to pass the leasing act.

One of the main parts of the leasing act was a requirement to avoid wasting oil and gas. There are many environmental reasons to avoid wasting this resource, but let's be clear: It was dollar signs that led to the waste provision. Overproduction would glut the market and damage the oil reserves, and wasted oil provided no return to the owners—the taxpayers.

The leasing act is still the law, and the law says that oil and gas operators must "use all reasonable precautions to prevent waste of oil or gas developed in the land." The law says that Federal leases must include "a provision that such rules . . . for the prevention of undue waste as may be prescribed by [the] Secretary shall be observed." The BLM's methane rule is entirely in keeping with that history. The rule says that the outdated 1979 version of this rule needed to be updated.

The rule was put in place before the fracking took place that revolutionized the industry, before the shale plays opened, and before infrared imaging became commonplace. What has not changed since 1920 is that oil and gas companies cannot waste public resources on public lands.

When equipment is leaky or old, oil and gas producers vent natural gas directly to the sky. If they do capture the gas but have nowhere to send it, the gas just gets burned on site. This venting and flaring causes a big problem. This photograph shows that actual problem happening.

I am sure there are many citizens across the United States who have witnessed this and have been concerned about what pollutants might be entering the atmosphere. The hazardous

health impacts of this are tremendous—benzene, which causes cancer—and I will talk more about that in a minute.

The amount of venting that is happening is enough gas to supply 6.2 million American households for a year. According to more recent research, even higher estimates are coming in. That is enough gas to supply every home in the interior West—Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico—with gas left over for the Dakotas. Every home. The amount of gas we waste every single year on Federal lands would be enough to supply Tennessee forever, and there could be some left over for West Virginia.

On Federal lands, operators have more than doubled how much gas they have flared and wasted between 2009 and today, and that is the practice we are trying to stop. Under the old 1979 rule, operators had to apply to BLM every time they wanted to vent or flare. In practice, BLM, because they did not have a new rule in place, basically just had a “yes” or “no” answer. In 2014, the Bureau of Land Management received 25 times more applications to vent or flare than in 2005.

What was happening was that we as a Federal Government were failing in our responding and updating the act to make sure producers were living up to the intent of that earlier law, so government watchdogs got on the issue and started calling for a solution.

The Government Accountability Office and the Interior Department's inspector general concluded that the Bureau of Land Management needed to change these rules. The Government Accountability Office concluded in 2010 that about 40 percent of wasted natural gas on Federal leases could be economically captured with existing technology.

Some States had already taken action into their own hands. In Colorado, the State passed a strong venting and leak detection regulation, which really became the model for the national Bureau of Land Management, and oil and gas production has since increased.

There was a notion that in making sure that waste was not promulgated—that it somehow was going to slow down the industry, but it has been just the opposite. In fact, some of my colleagues and some ranchers and others in these areas have talked about how the United States should lead the way on new technology to stop the leakage and to prevent these flarings as a way for the industry to show technology leadership.

Also, in North Dakota, a Republican administration passed flaring restrictions after years of there being uncontrolled flaring in the Bakken. States took action, and various watchdog groups and investigators here in Washington said the Bureau of Land Man-

agement needed to act. The BLM finally acted, and its final rule is similar to the North Dakota approach. So States have already been leaders on this methane issue. But this patchwork of State rules is not what we need; we need a Federal baseline.

It is bad enough that wasted natural gas will never have an economic use. Making the issue worse is that every cubic foot that is vented or flared is another cubic foot we have to produce somewhere else. What does that mean for our wallets? Research by ICF International shows that \$330 million of natural gas is wasted intentionally on Federal lands every year. Over time, the public is losing billions of dollars. Over a decade, the lost royalties that have been calculated by the Government Accountability Office on wasted gas will add up to \$230 million. While the final amount, of course, depends on the price of natural gas, we cannot afford to give up this revenue.

A vote for disapproving the resolution will let the oil and gas industry roll back the clock to 1979. This resolution lets people continue avoiding giving the taxpayers their fair share. It is another example of special interests trumping the public interest.

Even worse than the taxpayer issue, though, is that wasted natural gas harms public health. That is why those States took action. One of the most prevailing problems on this issue is in the Four Corners States, and my colleague from New Mexico will be talking about this shortly.

When one looks at the entire United States on a map that shows the amount of waste of flaring, one can see all of this yellow coloring in the Midwest—in Ohio—and in other States, but one can see the hotspot in the Four Corners area. The Four Corners States have tried to take action—places like Colorado and New Mexico, with, obviously, Arizona and Utah being affected—because wasted natural gas basically releases a volatile organic compound. It creates ozone and smog. It also can make people sick. This pollution worsens asthma, emphysema, and increases the risk of premature death. It releases toxins, like benzene, that cause cancer. And the methane, the main constituent of the natural gas, is 25 times more powerful at trapping heat than carbon dioxide.

That is why a recent analysis by the Clean Air Task Force found that over 9 million people are exposed to these dangerous levels of air pollution from oil and gas production. That is why my colleague Senator BENNET of Colorado has been such an outspoken advocate of keeping this rule in place. It is because that corner of Colorado has faced so many impacts that they want to make sure their citizens are protected.

With the rolling back of this Federal rule, basically what one would be saying is that it is OK to continue this

level of pollution—an anathema to what the people of Colorado have been asking for.

Oil and gas pollution can make rural areas seem like the middle of a city. A few years ago, NASA scientists discovered a massive cloud of methane over the Four Corners region. This is the highest concentration of methane in the Nation. After aerial surveys, NASA found that over half of the methane is from natural gas equipment, including tanks, wells, pipelines, and processing plants. The ozone pollution in the Four Corners is almost as bad on some days as in the city of Los Angeles—a city with 300 times as many people.

As bad as methane waste is on Federal land, this rule only targets 10 percent of that wasted by the oil and gas industry because we are targeting Federal land. It only affects a small minority of the oil and gas production. Ninety-five percent of that production is in other areas. But this rule is important to put in place because we cannot ignore the impacts on pollution, and we cannot ignore the costs to our Federal lands.

The Bureau of Land Management compared the costs and benefits of this rule without factoring in the reductions in ozone, particulate matter, or smog, and the BLM ignored the value of reducing carcinogens. We know that this particular conservative analysis shows a net benefit of between \$46 million and \$204 million each year. This makes economic sense to implement.

Under the very obsolete 1979 regulation that the methane rule replaces, oil and gas operators had to apply to the BLM whenever they wanted to vent or flare natural gas. The old rules also had no specific equipment requirements in place.

As I said earlier, the world has changed dramatically since 1979 when it comes to oil and gas production. The new rule takes commonsense approaches to stepping up our attempts to reduce this waste and prohibit the venting, except in emergencies and in some circumstances. They estimate that it will cut the venting by 35 percent. It also sets capture targets for flaring, allowing operators flexibility on how to meet those targets. The BLM estimates they will reduce flaring by 49 percent.

The rule requires operators to inspect their wells and their equipment. People may have heard unbelievable stories from California about a huge methane leakage that caused unbelievable amounts of damage. We know that we want the best equipment, that we want the best detection, and that we want a strong rule in place to stop wasting this natural gas, give the taxpayers a fair deal, and protect the American people from harmful levels of pollution. That is why we want this rule to stay in place.

With America's increased natural gas production, now is not the time to take

a very solid rule off the books—a rule that protects the American people. The technology to conduct these inspections already exists. Infrared imaging and other technology has been sold commercially for decades. What we are really saying is that people just do not want to spend the money to implement them.

Fourth, the rule requires operators to replace leaky equipment, like the pneumatic controllers and pumps, and it is trying to make sure that we eliminate the methane waste.

So the final rule is in step with what the Government Accountability Office told us 7 years ago—that about 40 percent of the waste can be captured economically. BLM took those best practices and State examples, as I mentioned, including North Dakota and Colorado, and implemented a new rule.

It includes Colorado's venting and inspection and retrofitting requirements, and regulation 7. It includes North Dakota's capture targets for flared gas in it, and it includes Wyoming's venting and inspection requirements in the Upper Green River Basin.

Not only did the Bureau of Land Management adopt the best practices of States, but it also included a variance provision in the final rule. Any State or Tribe with equally effective regulation in place can minimize their methane waste and can apply for a variance from the Department of the Interior. There is a lot of flexibility there, I would say, for States that are trying to lead the way. But based on this careful approach, the final rule and its benefits are estimated, as I said earlier, to be \$204 million a year.

So the public in these States that are most affected certainly want this rule. As more Americans understand the level of natural gas production and the wasteful venting that continues to take place, they want this rule in place as well.

Passing the resolution just after a few hours of debate and trying to undermine this rule would go against the 330,000 public comments that were collected during the process of establishing this rule. So we certainly don't want to overturn what was a very long and elaborate process to put this very important rule in place.

Proposing more waste is not going to solve our economic challenges. Proposing more pollution is not a solution. We know that in the most recent annual poll by Colorado College, western voters said that 81 percent of them supported making sure that the Bureau of Land Management had strong methane rules. My colleagues appear not to understand how much the public wants to get this implemented. I hope my colleagues will continue to support the effort to turn down the Congressional Review Act resolution and instead keep this very, very important public health and economic taxpayer solution on the books.

As Mark Boling, an executive with Southwestern Energy, a major natural gas producer, said, this resolution and trying to turn back the rule is "a huge mistake." He pointed out that it could have "unintended consequences for oil and gas technology."

So I want to make sure this rule stays in place. Let's keep a strong rule on the books, as I said, for the health of the American people and to make sure that taxpayers get a fair deal with these companies that are producing on Federal lands.

I thank the Chair.

I yield to my colleague from New Mexico, who has been outspoken on this issue in making sure that Congress addresses the flaring and leakage of natural gas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, if I sound a little hoarse, it is because my allergies are acting up, but I feel just fine.

Let me start out by thanking Senator CANTWELL. Her leadership on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee is pretty incredible.

For this Congress, I think this is the very first CRA that has been turned down. We have been voting on many of them since the Congress came back in session in January. This is the very first victory we have had on denying the CRA.

When we talk about what a CRA does, it is a very blunt instrument that has only been used once until this Congress, and what it does is just blow out an entire area of the law. So if you talk about this BLM methane rule and you have a part of the law that says the government shall try to prevent waste, well, if you blow that provision of the law out, the agency can do nothing until we get to the point that the Congress acts again, and sometimes we move very slowly.

So I really appreciate the leadership of Senator CANTWELL, and I want to thank her so much and all of the members of her committee, in particular, Senator HEINRICH. Senator HEINRICH serves on that committee and has been very outspoken on this rule, and I believe his leadership has always been acknowledged by Senator CANTWELL as well.

This issue that we are debating and that we had this good vote on is about three things. First of all, it is about the waste of a natural resource that the public and the Tribes own. Let's talk about the resource here for a second. We are talking about, to start with, natural gas. So when we think of natural gas, as many people know, what we are talking about is when you turn on your stove, and it is a natural gas stove, that is how we cook our food. Many houses run and heat on natural gas, and we know now that many of our powerplants are converting over to natural gas because it is a very good

fuel in terms of lowering carbon emissions. So natural gas is a big part of our energy economy. It is actually going up as coal is going down.

Look at this photograph which shows more than \$330 million of natural gas wasted. This just shows us the huge power of natural gas. What was happening is that natural gas was being flared. This depicts the top at one of these oil and gas operations. They are just burning that up. So rather than that energy being used at home or used in industry, it is just being wasted. On top of that, we know it has a massive climate impact.

This was a very commonsense rule. I think the thing people should understand is that several Western States, including Colorado and Wyoming, passed an almost identical rule to deal with this issue. All BLM tried to do was to use that common sense from the West, where it had already happened in several States, and put it in place for the Nation. So this is a good, solid rule, and it is a commonsense rule, and I think it prevents waste, just like it was laid out to do.

The second point is that when we talk about this issue, it is about job creation. What we are talking about here is, when you have this kind of waste, how do you prevent the waste? Well, the thing we have seen in New Mexico that occurs is that many of these oil and gas industries reach out to people who maybe haven't been in business, and they say: How do we prevent this waste? Well, actually, we use infrared to focus on the oil and gas operations and all of their pipes, and we can detect the natural gas waste, and then we can go about actually fixing it at all the various fittings and places where that happens. Guess what. A lot of jobs are created in that process. This is growing in New Mexico, growing in Colorado, and with this rule in place, over time, it is going to continue to grow. So this is going to create some small businesses. It has already created small businesses, and it is going to be pretty dramatic on that front.

The third thing that we are here about has to do with public health. Obviously, if you are venting all of this—and as Senator CANTWELL showed, you have a methane cloud the size of Delaware over the Four Corners area; so it is really impacting New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Arizona—what is the impact in terms of methane? Well, we know there are serious public health impacts. We know that asthma is impacted by this, as well as other respiratory diseases—the kinds of things that occur on a regular basis as we have that kind of methane pollution that goes into the air. As I mentioned just a little bit earlier, methane is a very, very powerful and potent greenhouse gas. So we know that by releasing it—the flaring that we talked about—we are wasting it and we are

putting that methane into the atmosphere. We are also adding to the greenhouse gases, which are warming the planet and creating, in the Southwest, as we know, catastrophic forest fires, extreme weather events, impacts on water, and impacts on agriculture. So we know that it is here now and that the Western States are in the bull's-eye.

So let me just say that these are three commonsense things that we have done today by asserting this rule. We are preventing waste, we are moving job creation, and we are acting on the part of public health.

When we have a victory like this, there are just so many people that should be congratulated—people that pulled together. First of all, just to start, Senator CANTWELL just finished, and she is our ranking member on the committee. Senator BENNET, I think, was actually the 51st, and I hope he tweeted that out. When he came over, we were at 50, and it went to 51. So he and all of the Democrats hung together on this—every single one of the Democrats. It just shows that when we get Democratic unity—and with our Independents—we come right up on about 48 votes. If we get a couple of Republicans—if we work in a bipartisan way—to come with us, we can have a big impact. Who are the Republicans who voted with us? They should be called out and congratulated for having courage, for having common sense, and for stepping forward. I would just like to say about my three friends on the Republican side—Senator MCCAIN, Senator COLLINS, and Senator GRAHAM—thank you so much for stepping forward and seeing the commonsense nature of this issue and standing to make sure that we didn't head in the wrong direction on this.

Thinking a little bit about some of the groups that voted with us and worked with us and helped us and advised us out in the field, the groups that stood with us shoulder to shoulder include the Environmental Defense Fund, the Wilderness Society, and the Ceres business group. We had a lot of businesses—understanding that this is a business issue and a job creator—like Taxpayers for Common Sense. We don't always see them weigh in on regulations like this. The Center for Methane Emissions Solutions, and so many environmental and public health groups, including Earth Justice, the National Parks Association, the League of Conservation Voters, the Sierra Club, and many, many others, including the Western Environmental Law Center, are also a part of that.

I thought we should talk for a second about—in addition to all of those groups—some other groups that joined us, and they are these medical and public health groups that abhor natural gas waste. Look at all of these groups in addition to the ones I mentioned.

These are people who have real expertise in public health: Allergy & Asthma Network, American Lung Association, American Public Health Association, Center for Climate Change and Health, and Physicians for Social Responsibility. I have always been impressed by that group. Here you have docs who are stepping up, wanting to be socially responsible on things. There are many wonderful physicians like that in New Mexico and across the Nation, and they have organized themselves as PSR. We also have the Public Health Institute and the National Medical Association.

So we have a lot of these medical and public health groups that have stepped forward and said: We are not going to waste natural gas. Let me thank them.

Also, the Western Environmental Law Center, which is in New Mexico and works on this issue, has been a pretty incredible group, hard-working, headed up by a gentleman by the name of Doug Meiklejohn, and Doug really makes a difference on all of these issues in New Mexico and, in particular, really helped us out here.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention some of the groups that have pulled together—groups of ranchers, Tribes, and public health groups. We just talked about the public health groups. But there is one rancher in New Mexico whose sole focus has been this issue. His name is Don Schreiber. He appeared at a press conference yesterday here in Washington with Senator BENNET and Senator CANTWELL. I was at my own press conference, and more or less as a Senator there, speaking out on methane. I know if Don is ever at a press conference, he is going to say what I would have said on this methane issue, which is that we have to prevent waste. Don Schreiber is his name. He is a rancher from Northwestern New Mexico. He is actually up under that methane cloud, and he talks about his family and his ranching operation and what the impact is.

We also have Tribes in that area. I want to congratulate and thank President Begaye of the Navajo Nation. He sent in a very persuasive statement and made a very strong statement against wasting natural gas.

We also had the Western Organization of Resource Councils. This is another group that has been very active in the West. They stepped forward on this natural gas waste issue, and we are incredibly thankful to them.

Also, we never get anything done around here on the Senate floor without our wonderful staff. I want to thank Jonathan Black, who has worked on this issue for many years. Jonathan actually worked for Senator Bingaman on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, so he brought a lot of that expertise. We have a young man from the office sitting here with me on the floor, Sean MacDougall, helping me with these charts. Sean is a

congressional fellow in our office on loan from the Bureau of Land Management, and he has brought a lot of knowledge to the table.

Mr. President, to reiterate, I oppose H.J. Res. 36—the Congressional Review Act resolution to disapprove the Bureau of Land Management's methane and waste prevention rule. BLM's rule prevents the unnecessary waste of a public resource and makes sure New Mexicans—and all American taxpayers—get fair value in return for commercial use of that public resource.

The rule requires oil and gas facilities operating on public and Indian lands to prevent unnecessary flaring, venting, and leaking of methane. Rigorous analysis shows that the overall benefits to the American public far outweigh the costs, and technology to implement the rule is readily available and cost-effective to industry.

The current BLM rules on natural gas waste are over 35 years old, issued in 1979. Federal watchdog agencies have been issuing reports for almost a decade—recommending that the BLM update its rules and prevent waste wherever possible.

With new technologies like horizontal drilling, the amount of gas wasted in recent years has increased significantly. From 2009 to 2013, the total amount of natural gas flared on BLM land doubled.

We throw the phrase “common sense” around a lot these days when we talk about laws or regulations we like, but the BLM's waste prevention rule really is a commonsense rule.

Over the past 4 months, Congress has repealed 13 Federal rules using CRA authority. These regulations involved years of work by the agencies and were developed transparently through the public notice and comment process. Congress overturned these rules without public input, hearings, or debate.

I understand repeal of “burdensome” Federal regulations is a strong rallying cry, and I wholeheartedly agree that Federal regulations should not be overly burdensome.

The BLM's waste prevention rule is good for the American public, and the cost to industry is de minimus. In fact, there is benefit to industry from increased production and the resulting increase in revenues. The BLM's rule is one rule that should not get swept up in the political tide of CRA repeal.

Congress has spoken loud and clear that the BLM has an obligation to prevent waste of oil and gas on public and tribal lands starting with the 1920 Mineral Leasing Act.

That act—governing leases on BLM lands—requires every lease to contain provisions for “the prevention of undue waste. . . .”

Federal law obligates the BLM to make sure the public gets a fair return from profits generated by oil and gas leases on public lands. The 1976 Federal

Lands Policy and Management Act requires that “the United States receive fair market value of the use of the public lands and their resources. . . .”

The 1982 Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act obligates these same oil and gas companies to pay the Federal Government “royalty payments on oil or gas lost or wasted.”

Congress has determined that oil and gas companies extracting resources on public lands can’t waste the resource, and, if they do, they must pay fair market value to the American public.

Despite Congress’s prohibition against waste, tremendous volumes of oil and gas under BLM lease are wasted each year through flaring, venting, and leaks.

Operators do not always use best practices when they flare and vent. Some even abuse the practice. As a result, operators vent and flare significant amounts of oil and gas that are economically recoverable.

Natural gas is colorless and odorless, so you can’t see leaks with the naked eye. Operators do not always use best practices to detect and prevent leaks either, but we now have readily available technology, like infrared cameras, that quickly and easily identify leaks. We don’t let leaky pipes in our homes go unattended. For-profit companies shouldn’t be given a free pass to let gas leak on public lands.

Oil and gas operators under BLM leases reported flaring and venting 462 billion cubic feet of natural gas from 2009 through 2015. That is enough gas to supply over 6.2 million households for one year. That is every household in the States of New Mexico, Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.

An independent study by ICF International estimates that, in 2013 alone, 65 billion cubic feet of gas was wasted. That includes over 18 billion cubic feet from tribal lands, with an estimated loss to the American public of \$27 million in royalties.

The amount of oil and gas waste is rising dramatically. Oil and gas operators report flaring has increased over 1,000 percent between 2009 and 2015. The number of applications to vent or flare royalty free has gone from 50 in 2005 to 622 in 2011 to 1,246 in 2014.

The BLM’s outdated rules and the loss of royalties caught the attention of the Government Accountability Office years ago.

A 2010 GAO report estimated that approximately 128 billion cubic feet of natural gas was vented or flared from Federal leases in 2008 and that approximately 50 billion cubic feet was economically recoverable. That recoverable gas represented \$23 million in lost royalties in 1 year.

The 2010 GAO report highlighted real world experiences, where operators made money by putting in technologies to recover gas instead of venting or

flaring. One large producer in the San Juan Basin installed equipment that reduced venting by 99 percent. That same company reported increased revenues of \$5.8 million, from a \$1.2 million investment in technology to reduce emissions during well completion. That is money well spent.

The San Juan Basin is one of the oldest and most productive gas-producing areas in the United States. It lies in the Four Corners area, where my home State of New Mexico touches Arizona, Colorado, and Utah.

That area is home to a methane “hot spot,” with the highest concentration of methane in the Nation.

In 2010, the GAO pointed out what was obvious, that the BLM’s decades-old guidance did not take account of current technology to reduce venting and flaring. The GAO recommended that the BLM update its regulations to address the avoidable loss of gas on public lands.

There are other GAO reports, but I will talk about one more.

In 2016, the GAO issued a report entitled, “Interior Could Do More to Account for and Manage Natural Gas Emissions.” It detailed the BLM’s highly inconsistent practices approving royalty-free venting and flaring incidents.

Looking at a random sample of operator requests to vent or flare from fiscal year 2014, the GAO found that fully 90 percent had inadequate documentation, but, despite the bad documentation, the BLM approved 70 percent of the requests, almost half of which were for royalty-free venting or flaring. That is a lot of Federal, State, and tribal royalties lost based on incomplete records.

The GAO is charged with helping Congress make sure Federal agencies are doing the best job they can for the American public. We should not disregard repeated GAO recommendations—spanning almost a decade—for the BLM to modernize its oil and gas royalty program.

If we pass this disapproval, the BLM is foreclosed from updating these rules. In the face of the GAO report after another telling us that the BLM must do better, that would be just irresponsible to taxpayers.

Secretary Zinke has been charged to review the BLM rule as part of the President’s “Energy Independence” Executive order. If, after review, the Secretary concludes that the BLM rule should be modified, the Department of the Interior can proceed to amend the rule through the public rulemaking process, but, when we have been told time and time again that there is unnecessary waste and the BLM rules need updating, Congress should allow the DOI review to go forward and not permanently prevent DOI from considering how to prevent unnecessary waste by oil and gas facilities.

Let’s not forget that half the royalties from Federal leases go to State treasuries. States use these royalties for schools, roads, and infrastructure projects.

My home State of New Mexico has the second highest number of acres under BLM lease in the country, after Wyoming—over 4.6 million acres—and the second highest number of BLM oil and gas leases—over 8,000.

New Mexico has a lot at stake in the BLM’s waste prevention rule.

ICF International estimates that the natural gas in New Mexico that could have been captured and marketed under the BLM’s rule between 2009 and 2013 would have been worth more than \$100 million a year and would have produced \$43 million in royalty payments for our State.

In New Mexico, those royalty payments are used in part for educational materials in the public schools. That is textbooks, digital materials, science supplies, art supplies, and accessible materials for students with disabilities. That \$43 million would have gone a long way for New Mexico schoolkids.

Many of you may be aware of the methane “hot spot” over the Four Corners area that I talked about earlier. The hot spot covers about 2,500 square miles—the size of the State of Delaware.

This single cloud comprises nearly 10 percent of all methane emissions from natural gas in the United States. The San Juan Basin is ranked No. 1 in per capita methane pollution in the U.S.

Scientists have been researching the sources of this methane plume. When the hot spot was discovered, oil and gas companies claimed the high concentrations were caused by “natural” sources, but researchers have found out this is wrong. They have identified 250 sources—the majority of which are oil and gas operations and include gas wells, storage tanks, pipelines, and processing plants.

Of the four States, only Colorado has robust rules to prevent methane emissions. Colorado’s rules are proving successful, and the BLM incorporated provisions from those rules.

It is important for my State that the BLM’s waste prevention rule stay on the books. We don’t need that methane hot spot in our backyard and New Mexico sorely needs the royalty payments owed.

The BLM’s rule is also important for tribes. As vice-chair of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, I work to make sure the Federal Government upholds all its trust responsibilities. One of those responsibilities is making sure tribes get the royalties they are entitled to from private oil and gas companies operating on Indian lands.

Tribes receive 100 percent of the royalties from the oil and gas leases on their lands. The BLM estimates tribes will get up to \$12 million more in royalties over 10 years under the rule.

That is money we have a trust responsibility to make sure tribes get.

The BLM estimates the rule would reduce emissions of volatile organic compounds, or VOCs, by 310,000 tons over 10 years on tribal lands. Reducing VOC emissions means cleaner air for tribes.

The Federal Government will not be upholding its trust responsibility if the BLM rule is repealed.

I have a statement from the Navajo Nation president, Russell Begaye, detailing the reasons the tribe supports the BLM's rule. President Begaye states, "It would be contrary to BLM's trust responsibility to allow Navajo Nation resources to be unreasonably wasted, particularly when best practices can be cost-effectively employed and are not overly burdensome to industry."

A really important cobenefit of the rule is protection of public health. Toxic chemicals like benzene—harmful to the public, carcinogenic—are emitted with methane. Reducing methane emissions will reduce these toxic emissions.

Similarly, other VOCs—that contribute to ozone or smog—are emitted with methane. Reducing methane emissions will reduce smog formation. Smog irritates the respiratory system, reduces lung function, and aggravates asthma—among other public health problems.

Without the Rule, not only do we lose royalties for hospitals, schools, and roads, but citizens pay more for their hospital visits and healthcare.

Industry arguments against the rule do not hold up.

Industry argues the rule costs too much and will kill jobs.

That is not true. Here are the facts.

First, the rule will result in increased production and increased revenues, and the technologies and practices to prevent waste are economically feasible.

In fact, many oil and gas operations will see a net benefit. Like the company in the San Juan Basin that got almost a fivefold return on its investment.

The BLM conducted an exhaustive cost-benefit analysis of the rule.

Looking at the average cost to a company to implement the rule, the BLM found that profits would be reduced by only 0.15 percent, a bit over one-tenth of 1 percent. That is minimal.

That cost does not even count the savings to industry from increased production and increased revenues.

In fact, the BLM found that net economic benefits to industry could be as much as \$47 million per year—taking into account the savings from increased revenues.

If the benefits of reducing methane are included, the overall net benefit is huge—up to \$204 million annually.

That number does not even count the public health benefits from reduced ozone and hazardous pollutants.

Opponents have exaggerated the costs to industry, and they have not taken into account the benefits to States, tribes, and the public.

Finally, there is no evidence anywhere that the rule will cost even one job.

In fact, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has recorded 2,700 new jobs since November 2016, while the price of oil has stayed flat. This month, the Baker Hughes rig count showed 300 more rigs drilling for oil and gas since the BLM rule came into effect. This is an increase in production of over 50 percent.

Colorado issued the most comprehensive rules to date to decrease methane emissions, and not only have no jobs been lost, but jobs have been gained as new companies and technologies focused on inspection, monitoring, and compliance have opened. These are good American jobs.

In New Mexico, we have at least 11 new companies in the methane mitigation business, and I want to see that number grow.

Even if the rule were to force an operator to shut down, that company would be eligible for exemption from the requirements.

So job loss is not an issue.

Second, we hear that the BLM's rule is duplicative and unnecessary, that the EPA's methane rule is adequate, and that States are already regulating methane.

Here are the facts.

The EPA's rule only applies to new and modified oil and gas operations. The BLM's rule applies also to existing facilities. This is a big difference between the rules. Making sure all current operations prevent waste is critical to making sure taxpayers get the benefit owed.

The BLM's rule covers areas not covered by other Federal or State rules, like wasteful routine flaring.

Not all States have passed methane waste prevention rules. My home State of New Mexico has not. New Mexico needs to reduce methane emissions.

Also, States and tribes may get a variance if they have similar rules that achieve the same results.

The BLM worked with the EPA and States to ensure the rule works for them and does not impose conflicting or redundant requirements.

Just last week, the EPA announced a 90-day delay on its own methane control rule based on industry's objections to regulation. More concerning, the EPA withdrew its information request from industry that was intended to help EPA determine how to address methane emissions from existing oil and gas sources. These EPA actions mean the BLM rule is needed more than ever to reduce natural gas waste and the proper collection of royalties.

Third, we hear that the BLM lacks the authority to regulate methane waste.

In January of this year, the U.S. District Court of Wyoming denied a preliminary injunction to block the rule. The court found that the rule "unambiguously" was within the BLM's authority.

The Congressional Review Act is a blunt tool, and it is the wrong tool for Congress to use to change provisions in BLM's methane waste prevention rule. Disapproval under the CRA would permanently block the BLM's authority to reform outdated rules, reforms that the GAO began recommending almost a decade ago.

The BLM should not be prevented from making sure the Federal Government meets its obligations to States, tribes, and taxpayers—the obligation not to waste public resources and to make sure the public gets a fair return on the for-profit use of public resources.

For these reasons, I oppose the CRA to disapprove the BLM's waste prevention rule.

Just as a final word to summarize why we are here and why this victory was so important and why we need to hang tough on this: This could be changed if they decide to do another vote or if they try to do another piece of legislation or something. The core of this needs to be protected. We are here because we don't want to waste our natural resources, which belong to the people of America and belong to the Tribes. We want to create jobs, which is what this BLM methane waste prevention rule does. It creates jobs, and it protects the public health.

I believe we are going to have a couple other speakers. I know Senator HEINRICH is going to be here.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET REQUEST

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, all of us, every Member of the U.S. Senate, all 100 of us, whether we are Republicans or Democrats, want the U.S. Senate to function. We ought to want the Senate to be able to accomplish its work. It is a challenge all the time but learning what transpired this morning on the Senate floor, in my view, reaches another low for the Senate.

It is hard to explain, but it takes unanimous consent for committees to

meet while the Senate is in session, and that is a request that is made on an ongoing basis when the Senate convenes, and it happened again this morning. Almost without exception, it is routine. The rules require that 2 hours after the Senate convenes, no committee can then meet unless there is agreement. So the majority leader today requested that the unanimous consent be granted, just like in almost every other day in the Senate, but what was different today was an objection was raised by the minority whip, and apparently the explanation is it is because of the firing of the Director of the FBI last night.

Now, how the Senate is functioning or not functioning seems to me to be unrelated to what transpired last night relating to the Director of the FBI. So in this place, where we are trying to do the people's work and make decisions and do good for America, the spillover over partisan politics, the spillover about playing a political game, highlighting a point has now caused the Senate to not be able to conduct hearings today. In fact, the minority Members of the Senate were instructed, requested, on their own volition—all left the hearings that were already being conducted this morning in protest over what transpired last night.

I am of a view that this is a diverse country. I am of a view that people of the U.S. Senate represent folks from across the country with different philosophies, different political parties, different people, different backgrounds. We all bring to the Senate a set of characteristics that are different, one from another, but I have great regard and respect for every Senator's point of view, and I would say that every Senator ought to have the ability to express their views on behalf of their constituents, but we can only do that if we allow the Senate to function.

I was on the Senate floor not long ago praising the fact that we finally were successful in the appropriations process; that we passed the fiscal year 2017 appropriations bill. For too long, the appropriations process has been broken down, and we have conducted business in the United States by continuing resolution. I thought we were back on a path in which there was enough agreement, respect among Members, enough setting aside of partisan differences to actually accomplish legislation. I was pleased that we did that, but today we fall back into the pattern of when something happens we want to make a political point. We then obstruct the ability of others in the Senate to conduct their work, to express their opinion, to gather the information they need.

This came to my attention—what transpired today—because this afternoon at 2:30 was scheduled a hearing by the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee. That hearing has absolutely

nothing to do with the FBI. We have the new Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs scheduled to testify about the Department's plan for modifications to a program called Choice that is important to me, my constituents, and to the veterans of Kansas. I was so pleased the hearing had been scheduled, and I was looking forward to the questioning and having a conversation with the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs about how to make this system of Choice work for veterans who live in Kansas, from the rural side of our State to the suburban and urban side of our State, but because of a pique of anger, political posturing, and partisanship, the hearing is apparently no longer able to take place. The hearing this morning, which could only last for an hour and a half and which I guess the minority members walked out—seemed to me, at least sounded like, to be things that would be very important for us to pursue.

The Armed Services Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities was to have a closed briefing this morning. The Homeland Security Committee was to examine cyber threats facing America, focusing on an overview of the cyber threat landscape. The list is significant in the things that we ought to be paying attention to, and yet, because of an objection, those hearings will not take place or were shortened or disrupted by only one party's participation.

I am not here trying to create further partisanship between Republicans and Democrats. I am here trying to remind ourselves that there is value in allowing cooperation between the minority and majority, not for our own benefits but for the benefit of the country and the citizens we represent. Everything does not have to be partisan. Everything does not have to be political.

Today we see the Senate sliding back into the habit of making things that we have really nothing to do with and weren't the cause of taking place—apparently to make a political point and perhaps to score votes for support in a political way. We ought to all, as U.S. Senators, respect the opinions, values, and the positions of others, but we do that in a setting in which we all come together, not in which we cancel meetings as a result of a political statement.

I appreciate the opportunity to express my concerns about what has transpired and to ask for us to go back to the time in which we worked together on a daily basis and we don't use an excuse to shut down the committee hearing process.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly about the American Health Care Act that was passed last week in the House of Representatives. I thought a lot about this bill over the past few days and over the weekend. I talked to friends, I read about it, and I did as much analysis as I possibly could, given the fact that we don't have a Congressional Budget Office analysis of this complicated and important piece of legislation. I have concluded that it is the most ill-conceived, damaging, and downright cruel piece of legislation that I have ever seen a legislative body pass in my adult life.

It drastically cuts support for Americans' ability to obtain health insurance. In Maine—again, as near as we can tell, because we don't have the final analysis—the preliminary numbers are this. Maine, under the Affordable Care Act, through the payments to individuals and other support, is receiving about \$354 million a year coming via the Affordable Care Act. After this bill, it appears that the number is \$80 million a year—\$364 million to \$80 million. That is almost an 80-percent cut. No one can tell me the people of Maine are going to have better healthcare with an 80-percent cut in the funds going to support their ability to do so. It just doesn't make sense.

The way this bill works is, it is a tax on the elderly. Under the Affordable Care Act, there is a rule that policies for older people, 50, 55, 60, cannot exceed three times the rate of policies for younger people. We all know that younger people's policies do in fact cost somewhat less because they tend to be healthier, but the rule was no more than 3 to 1. Under the bill that was passed by the House last week, it is now 5 to 1. That is an elder tax, and Maine happens to be the most elder State in the United States. If they had taken a blank sheet of paper and said: We want to write a bill to harm the people of Maine, it would have been this bill.

There also is a massive cut to Medicaid—\$880 billion—and the sponsors to this bill claim that they are helping the deficit. How are they doing it? By shifting the cost to the States—shift and shaft. Balancing the Federal budget by simply taking costs that are now borne by the Federal Government and passing them off to the States is not responsible fiscal policy.

Why don't we just have the States fund the U.S. Air Force? That would save us billions of dollars a year—probably \$100 billion a year. Shift that to the States—and \$880 billion shifted to the States.

Then there is what I call the figleaf—the preexisting condition provision which talks about the Maine plan, which was a plan that preceded the Affordable Care Act, which did give protection for preexisting conditions, but it was adequately funded. It cost about \$64 million a year to fund our preexisting plan. Again, because we don't have the precise figures—but it looks like under this new bill, that \$64 million would be \$20 million, one-third as much, a two-thirds reduction. It is not a real preexisting condition plan; it is a figleaf. It is to say to people: We are covering preexisting conditions—nonsense, not true.

Of course, the final piece of this bill is a massive tax cut for the top one-tenth of 1 percent of people in this country. They will not even notice it, but the people who lose their healthcare will notice.

Now, under the Affordable Care Act, there is a list of essential benefits which includes mental health and substance abuse. That is a big deal. That allows and assures people to have coverage for these very damaging and dangerous, in the case of substance abuse, conditions. Under this bill that passed in the House, States can waive those provisions and the waiver is very easy. The standards for the waiver are very easy, and if the Federal department doesn't respond in 60 days, the waiver is automatically provided. In those States when they have a waiver, mental health and substance abuse services could be covered under a specialized plan which would be very expensive. By the way, this waiver covers both the individual market and employer-based coverage. How many people will be impacted? We do not know because we do not have an analysis from the Congressional Budget Office.

I want to talk for the remainder of my time about opioids and what this bill would do on that.

We are in the midst of a crisis in Maine and across the country. It is the most serious public health crisis in my adult life. In Maine, with regard to substance abuse and overdose deaths, you can see what has happened in the last 5 years. More than one person a day is dying of an overdose. Across the country, it is four an hour. We have turned ourselves inside out in this country in order to deal with the threat of terrorism, for example, which was entirely appropriate. Yet what if we had a terrorist attack that was killing 37,000 people a year across our country, and we were just sort of going along, business as usual?

I have been working on this issue since I got to the Senate. I have been meeting with people throughout Maine—in hospitals and in recovery—and meeting with families and parents and law enforcement. The one thing that comes through loud and clear is that treatment works and that we need

it and that we do not have enough available beds in Maine and across the country.

This is a terrible disease, but the most tragic thing of all is when someone finally reaches the point at which he is ready to ask for help and he is told “Sorry, there is a 3-week wait” or “There is a 3-month wait.” That is when lives are lost and families are destroyed.

Treatment does work. I have met with people for whom it has worked and changed their lives. I have a friend in Portland named Andrew Kiezulas, who I believe is graduating this weekend from the University of Southern Maine. He has been through this. He has been to the bottom, and he is now on the mountaintop. He knows treatment works, and it has made a difference in his life. Without it, he would not be where he is today. Justin Reid, another young man from Southern Maine, was in the throes of addiction and escaped. He now runs a sober house and volunteers for a program with his local police department.

Access to treatment is much easier with health insurance and with sufficient Medicaid support. The House bill simply makes it more difficult to access treatment. It penalizes the very people who have taken the hard step to say that this is what they need.

Let me tell you a story. Matt Braun is from Cape Elizabeth, ME, right outside of Portland. In 2009 Matt entered treatment for opioid addiction. His parents, who were strong, middle-class, professional people, purchased what they thought was good health insurance for their family. After 5 days of treatment, they received a call that the insurer was not going to pay for any more. We have decided your son only needs 5 days. His parents argued, and the medical staff argued. They finally won. They got 7 days of treatment. Those extra 2 days made a difference.

The insurance company said that it was not going to help, that he was going to be a chronically relapsing, drug-addicted person, so they were going to stop at 7 days. They said he would not make it. His parents did not give up.

Matt stayed in treatment and has been sober ever since 2009. He is successful. He is getting ready to take the MCAT. He wants to go to medical school. His goal is to approach addiction from the perspective of a health professional and offer care and support to people who are struggling in the way he did.

“It is frustrating how insurance companies dictate what treatment looks like and what a life is worth,” said Matt.

Getting treatment for substance abuse disorder is not easy, but this bill, the American Health Care Act, which is a misnamed bill—it should be the

American Take Away Health Care Act—only makes it worse.

On top of all of this, the administration has recently indicated that it is talking about essentially dismantling the Office of National Drug Control Policy—the highest level to be working on this problem in a coordinated way in the Federal Government. Here we are, in the midst of the most serious drug crisis in the history of this country, and the administration is talking about gutting the very office that is supposed to lead the fight. It would have been as if, in the middle of World War II, we had abolished the Department of Defense. It makes no sense. It is moving in absolutely the wrong direction.

By supporting this healthcare bill—or non-healthcare bill—in the House of Representatives, which will drastically cut Medicaid, drastically cut reimbursements for health insurance, drastically limit the availability of coverage for preexisting conditions—by the way, drug addiction could be one—and drastically eliminate the essential benefits provisions of the Affordable Care Act, we are just making it worse.

The Office of National Drug Control Policy has things like the Drug-Free Community Support Program, which administers small grants to small towns. That can make a real difference. Last fall, 18 Maine programs each received \$125,000, and the DFC's 2014 national evaluation report said that there was a significant decrease in the 30-day use of prescription drugs for youth in communities with one of these programs.

Prevention is one of the things we need to work on, and it is one of the things we need to understand. Yet talking about this problem is not going to solve it. Treatment is going to solve it. Money for treatment is going to solve it. Beds for treatment are going to solve it. Detox centers are going to solve it. More resources to law enforcement are going to solve it. More resources to the Coast Guard, in order to interdict drug shipments coming into this country, are going to solve it.

There is no single answer, but at the core is commitment. Passing this bill from the House, which drastically undermines all of those elements of treatment and prevention, and then talking about dismantling the office that has led this fight in the entire Federal Government, is beyond comprehension in the midst of where we are.

If this graph were doing this, if it were going down, I would be OK with it. But it is not going down; it is going up. It is getting worse, and we have to deal with it.

As we work through this issue of healthcare—hopefully we are going to start with a blank sheet of paper over here—I hope we will bear in mind that one of the most serious health problems in the country today is opioid

abuse. This is not all about ideology, and it is not about policy. It is about people. It is about Matt, and it is about Andrew. It is about the thousands and millions of people across this country who are struggling, who want to lead productive lives, and who want to contribute to their communities. All they need is to have that moment when treatment is available, when a helping hand is available, when caring is available to help them escape the throes of this terrible disease and rejoin their communities and their families. That is what we have to keep in front of us as we work here in this body. We can make a difference in people's lives, but in leaving them behind, we will certainly not do so.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering the Lighthizer nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chair.

FIRING OF JAMES COMEY

Madam President, I couldn't help but think, with the discussions earlier today, that the President's dismissal of FBI Director James Comey is so inappropriate that it is hard to know where to begin.

In less than 4 months, this President has pushed our country to the edge of a constitutional crisis—a crisis that in many ways seems more complex, and potentially more threatening, than the one instigated by President Nixon's order to fire the special prosecutor who was investigating Watergate.

First, I think we can easily dismiss President Trump's transparent pretext for dismissing FBI Director Comey.

President Trump claims to have removed the FBI Director because of his unfair treatment of Secretary Clinton. This does not pass the laugh test, and we know it is not true. President Trump celebrated Director Comey's mistakes in handling the Clinton email investigation. He encouraged leaks from the FBI. He pressed Director Comey to release more embarrassing evidence. He even praised Director Comey after the Director's misguided letter to Congress last October. Yet, now, the President would have us believe that these same events compelled him to fire the FBI Director more than 6 months after it occurred. This unbelievable claim, if it was not so sad, would be laughable.

The truth is that the President removed the sitting FBI Director in the

midst of one of the most critical national security investigations in the history of our country and, certainly, one of the most critical in my 42 years in the Senate—a sprawling inquiry that implicates senior officials in the Trump campaign and administration.

The press is now reporting that President Trump weighed firing the FBI Director for more than a week, after he became enraged at Director Comey's statements and actions in the Russia investigation. There are even reports that his firing may have been precipitated by grand jury subpoenas issued to associates of President Trump's former National Security Advisor. I have no doubt that we are going to learn more disturbing details as to the President's true motivations. I am willing to bet anything that none of them will be because of the feeling that the FBI was too tough on Secretary Clinton.

I am also troubled that Attorney General Sessions played a role in Director Comey's firing. The Attorney General had supposedly recused himself from the Russia investigation—and for good reason: He was a central figure in the Trump campaign that is now under investigation. And he provided false testimony to the Judiciary Committee to hide his own contacts with Russian officials. Having done that, it is beyond inappropriate for him to then recommend the firing of the official overseeing the Russia investigation.

I ask: Does anyone really believe that President Trump is interested in getting to the bottom of Russia's interference with our elections? Based on his past performance, does anyone believe the Attorney General is interested in getting to the bottom of Russia's interference with our elections? Does anyone believe that the White House will allow investigators to follow the facts without interference or obstruction at every turn?

In fact, a quick review of President Trump's Twitter account, where he does most of his deep thinking, would dispel any such illusions.

This is the same White House that interfered with the House Intelligence Committee's investigation—interference so strong that the Republican chairman in the House investigation had to recuse himself.

This is the same White House that reportedly sought access to the highly classified FISA Court surveillance order that purportedly authorized surveillance of Trump associates.

This is the same White House that demanded the FBI Director and the Department of Justice issue perfunctory statements to clear President Trump's name.

Even the President's letter informing FBI Director Comey of his dismissal indicated the President had directly asked the FBI Director whether he was under investigation—three times. That

should never happen. No President should be asking such a question. It is stunning, but it should also be informative. It is clear that any credible investigation must take place outside the political chain of command.

That is why I and others have said for months that a special counsel must be appointed to lead the Russia investigation. A special counsel, unlike an FBI Director or a Deputy Attorney General, cannot be fired by the President. The American people must have confidence that ours is a government of laws, not of the whim of a President—any President.

Frankly, our Nation is at a precipice. There is a counterintelligence investigation into the campaign and administration of a sitting President. There is evidence that that campaign colluded with a foreign government that is an adversary of ours to sway our Presidential election. Now the President has fired the lead investigator, FBI Director Comey, under what any fairminded person would say is absurd and false pretenses.

There are several inquiries underway into Russian interference and collusion with Russia in the elections, but the President has fired the head of the only investigation that could bring criminal charges. In fact, it has just been reported that this came just days after Director Comey asked for additional funding for the investigation. None of this is normal—it is something I have never seen in Republican or Democratic administrations—and we cannot treat it as such.

President Putin's goal, as we now know, last year was to undermine our democratic institutions, to corrode Americans' trust and faith in government, and to sway the outcome of the election in favor of Donald Trump. If we do not get to the bottom of Russia's interference in our democracy, Putin will be successful. The President appears to be content with that result. But I know, in talking with many Republican Senators as well as Democratic Senators, that they are not content with it.

We have to understand, in our great democracy, in the greatest Nation on Earth, that we cannot allow any country to try to interfere in our elections. We know the Russians wanted to do that. We know President Putin wanted to do that. We know he wants to do it in many other countries. I think we owe it, not only to ourselves but all these other countries, to stand up and say: We know what you are trying to do; here is how you tried to do it. America won't stand for it, and we hope none of our democratic allies will.

We 100 Senators may disagree on policy matters and we may have supported different candidates last November, but I respect all Senators, and I believe we all agree on the supremacy of the rule of law. No person, no President should be above the supremacy of

the rule of law. I believe we fulfill our duty to the country if we stand united in calling for a truly independent investigation. There simply is no avoiding the fact that this cascading situation demands the prompt appointment of an independent special counsel to pick up the pieces of these investigations. How we respond at this moment is a test of our commitment to the separation of powers. It is a test of whether the Senate can truly be the conscience of the Nation, as it should. This is not just a scandal. The President's actions are neither Republican nor Democratic. They are authoritarian. This is an effort to undo the ties that bind our democratic form of government. All of us—both sides of the aisle—must now put country over party.

In my years here, I have worked with both Republican and Democratic Presidents. I have worked with them and supported them, notwithstanding their parties, in what I felt was in the best interest of this country. I feel privileged that Vermont has allowed me to serve long enough to become, as my predecessor was, dean of the Senate. But I have also, in deciding to stay here as a Senator, always had the abiding faith that you can and should be the conscience of the Nation. This great Nation deserves no less. That means we set aside party labels and adopt just one label—United States Senator.

With that, let us make sure there is a clear, full, credible, honest investigation of how Russia tried to influence our elections; a full, clear, thorough, honest investigation into if Russia has ties to anybody in our government; and, a full, clear, honest understanding of how we make sure that never happens again, to either Republicans or Democrats.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO MEET

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this afternoon, the Senate Special Committee on Aging is scheduled to hold the second part of a two-part series of hearings that we are holding to explore the impact of isolation and loneliness on the health and well-being of our seniors. The name of our hearing for this afternoon is Aging With Community: Building Connections that Last a Lifetime.

In other words, under the first hearing that we had 2 weeks ago, we

learned that isolation of our seniors is associated with a greater incidence of depression, diabetes, and heart disease. We also learned that the health risks of prolonged isolation are comparable to smoking 15 cigarettes today.

Well, this afternoon is the second part of our investigation of this issue, and we had planned to hear from four experts who were going to tell us how you can build a better sense of community for our seniors, how you can make sure that our seniors are connected to community. I want to indicate that we have four witnesses who, at their own expense, have flown in to participate in this hearing this afternoon. One of them, Lindsay Goldman, is the director of healthy aging from the Center for Health Policy and Programs from Rye Brook, NY. Another is from Dover-Foxcroft, ME. A third is from Spring Grove, PA. The fourth is from Miami, FL.

Each of these witnesses was chosen in connection with my staff's consultation with the Democratic staff of the committee. As you can see, they represent the States of New York, Maine, Pennsylvania, and Florida, and they incurred great expense in order to come here.

I am very disappointed to learn that, due to issues that are totally outside the purview of the Aging Committee—completely disconnected with this non-partisan, bipartisan look at an issue that ought to concern all of us—we are going to be prohibited from holding this official hearing this afternoon. I am baffled by this. This has nothing to do with the firing of Jim Comey. It has nothing to do with the Intelligence Committee's ongoing and successful investigation of Russian influence on our investigations. It has nothing to do with the healthcare debate that is roiling this Congress.

This is a hearing that has to do with the health and well-being of America's seniors. It is not political in any way, and to ask these four witnesses, who have come from four different States, including the State of the Democratic leader, to go back home and waste all this travel money and not help us better understand how we can deal with an issue that affects the health and well-being of our seniors is just plain wrong.

Therefore, Mr. President, I make a request that the Aging Committee be permitted to meet at 2:30 p.m. today for its hearing, Aging With Community: Building Connections that Last a Lifetime. I ask unanimous consent that the committee be allowed to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Given that we have no path forward on the horrible and momentous events of last night from the majority, I am constrained to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I see the Democratic leader is rapidly leaving the floor, so he obviously does not want to hear anything more about our hearing, but this makes no sense whatsoever.

This is an example of the dysfunction of the Senate. How does it make sense that the Aging Committee, which operates in a completely bipartisan manner, is being prohibited from holding a hearing that is important to our seniors and that has nothing to do with the issues that are in the news today?

I just don't understand why we are being prohibited from proceeding to do our work, to do our important jobs on an issue where we have four experts from four different States, including the State of the Democratic leader, including a witness chosen by the ranking member of the committee, and none of that matters. We are being prohibited from holding this hearing.

Mr. President, it is a great disappointment to me—and I am sure it is going to be a great disappointment to our witnesses and our committee members—that we are going to have to cancel this hearing for reasons that are totally unrelated to the subject of this hearing.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Seeing no one seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FIRING OF JAMES COMEY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I was, to say the least, shocked last night when I heard that President Trump had dismissed FBI Director Comey from his position as the Director of the FBI. To me, this decision by President Trump crossed the line. I have tried to understand what was going through the President's mind at the time he dismissed Mr. Comey. It is clear that he had memorandums written by the Department of Justice that were released at the time, but there is also a clear indication that President Trump had been considering this decision for over a week and that after he had reached the decision to fire Mr. Comey, he needed grounds from the Department of Justice and that that information was supplied to Mr. Trump for his decisionmaking. This was Mr. Trump's decision.

At the time he dismissed Mr. Comey, President Trump's associates had been involved in the investigation being done by the Department of Justice. This is a criminal investigation that is being done by the Department of Justice because of Russia's interference

that involved Mr. Trump's associates in the U.S. election system. We do not know where that investigation is going—we do not—but we do know now that the President of the United States has compromised the ability of that investigation by firing Mr. Comey. That should not happen in American politics. No one is above the law.

The timing of Mr. Comey's firing is extremely suspicious. If the President were really concerned about the FBI Director's conduct in the Hillary Clinton email investigation, why didn't the President fire Director Comey when he took the oath of office in January? It just does not add up. No one is above the law.

According to news reports, President Trump was also upset over the amount of media coverage that the FBI Director and the investigations were attracting, and the White House asked DOJ officials to come up with reasons.

It is clear to me that the decision to fire Mr. Comey was a personal decision that was reached by President Trump and that it was known by him at the time that it would compromise the investigation that is being done by the Department of Justice.

I have been approached by others in their saying that Mr. Comey was not popular with Democrats or Republicans and that he had done things during his term as Director that had upset a lot of us, which is true, but the Director of the FBI has a 10-year term for a reason—a term that is longer than the two terms of the President of the United States. This is not a partisan position. The FBI is not required to be popular with either Democrats or Republicans. What he is required to do is to uphold the law of the land for all Americans, and no one is above the law. That is what we expect from the Director of the FBI.

President Trump has compromised the integrity and independence of the FBI. At this point, what can we do? I would suggest, with regard to the criminal investigation that is being done by the Department of Justice, that there is only one course of action that will maintain the credibility of that investigation, which is that it is incumbent upon the Department of Justice to name, as soon as possible, a special prosecutor to take over that role.

If that is not done, in my view, it will be difficult to have the confidence of the American people that that investigation is not being directed by those who were supposed to be the subject of that investigation.

I think it would also compromise the nomination process of the next Director of the FBI. If we do not have a special counsel named, then there will be so much focus on how that next Director will handle this investigation that we really will not have attention paid to the other responsibilities and tal-

ents of that individual to be able to handle the FBI's broad jurisdiction.

If that is not resolved—the investigation and the appointment of a special prosecutor—it is difficult to see how we are going to have a truly bipartisan process for maintaining support for the FBI.

I urge the Deputy Attorney General to name, as soon as possible, a respected person as an independent prosecutor to take over this investigation.

There are deeper concerns than just the President of the United States' hampering a criminal investigation in which associates of his are involved because it also involves a country that is not a friend to the United States. All of this was triggered by Russia's involvement in our democratic election system. We know that Russia was directly engaged in trying to compromise our election system by calling into question the confidence of our system and trying to tilt the scales in favor of one of our candidates. Russia made contact with Americans in order to further its game at bringing down our democratic system of government.

This is not unique to the United States. Russia has used similar tactics in other elections of democratic countries. In the Montenegro election, we saw that Montenegrins were voting on their government's accession into NATO and that Russia exported individuals into that country to try to disrupt that election. They were not successful, but they tried. Just recently, in the French election, we saw how Russia got directly involved in trying to help one of the candidates who it believed would help pull France away from the EU and create a vacuum for Russia's influence, but the French voters turned that down. It was not successful, but that does not mean Russia will not continue to try to bring down democratic systems of government.

Mr. Trump's casual and consistent dismissal of the facts, as laid out by the entire Intelligence Committee, about Russia's engagement in the United States should set off alarm bells. It cannot be business as usual. Yet, today, President Trump and Secretary Tillerson met with Foreign Minister Lavrov. Today of all days, they decided to meet like nothing has happened, but a lot has happened. Did we see any indication that the purpose of that meeting was to raise our strong objections to Russia's interference in our election system or Russia's compromising Americans to try to help in regard to its campaign against our free election system or Russia's engagement and encroachment into other countries? Did we really hear a commitment by the President of the United States that we would not tolerate that type of behavior by Russia? No. Business as usual. The President wants to establish a friendlier relationship with Russia.

Russia has not just tried to bring down free elections systems; they have invaded other countries. We know about the active campaign in Ukraine, the annexation of Crimea, the Russian presence in Moldova and Georgia. I met with the Prime Minister of Georgia with Senator WICKER earlier today, and he can tell you firsthand about how their country is trying to deal with the Russian presence in their sovereign country.

We all know about Russia's engagement in other parts of the world. Their engagement in Syria is bringing about serious challenges to trying to resolve the crisis in that country. The Russian Government supporting the Assad regime, war crime activities targeting humanitarian convoys, targeting hospitals, the use of chemical weapons—all of that is facilitated by Russia. That is well known, but it might be not as well known that Russia is ambitious in going into many more parts of the world. Russia is now engaged in Afghanistan. We have had one of our longest wars ever in Afghanistan and our commitment to the people of Afghanistan to have a democratic government. So Russia is now engaged with the Taliban, trying to upset our ability to bring all of the parties together in unity in the government.

That, to me, is totally counter to history. We know about Russia's presence in Afghanistan. Does anyone believe Russia is really sincere in maintaining peace in that country?

Then we see Russia's fingerprints in Yemen, trying to get a naval base on the Yemeni coast, showing no concern for the humanitarian crisis that has been created in that country. We see Russia's presence in Libya, supporting General Haftar, who has committed his own human rights violations and war crimes and has disrupted the Government of National Accord, which is our best chance for peace in Libya.

We see Russia's presence in Nicaragua, sending troops and equipment to that country and now building a major compound that many believe is being built to spy on the U.S. compound. That is Russia.

So to President Trump: It is not business as usual with Russia. There is a reason we need an independent commission to investigate what Russia was doing in the United States because Russia is trying to create space where they can expand their influence, and expanding their influence is for values that are just the opposite of ours—a corrupt government, no respect for human rights, no respect for democratic institutions, and opposition to a free press. That is what Russia is trying to expand. We know that in their involvement in the United States, they are trying to find a way to expand that opportunity.

So it is for all of those reasons it cannot be business as usual, and when the

President of the United States interferes with a criminal investigation that was precipitated by Russia's engagement in the United States, every American should be alarmed. Every American should be asking what we can do to make sure we have an independent review so we can take steps to protect our national security.

It is not acceptable for the Senate to say business as usual. We need to come together and facilitate the independent review of potential criminal involvement of Americans in facilitating the Russians and what they were doing, and we need to have an independent review of all of what Russia was doing in this country so we can take the necessary steps to protect our national security.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to display water samples from the State of Montana on the Senate floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO MEET

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today our friends across the aisle have decided to hold up Senate committee meetings. Because the Democrats object to the dismissal of James Comey from the FBI, they have chosen to play politics and prevent scheduled hearings from occurring. That means everyone who has taken time to fly to Washington, DC, to testify before Congress—per our request—and update us on important issues that face the Nation will not be heard.

One of those scheduled hearings is in the Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee on Water and Power, of which I am a member. This hearing was going to investigate the Dry-Redwater and the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water Systems. This is a critically important issue to Montana.

This hearing was going to focus on water from Circle, MT. These are water samples from different families in the Circle, MT, area. This is from the Arensons' tap. This yellow-tinted water here is from the Goods' tap. This cloudy sample here is from the Hances' tap.

These are all from Circle, MT. This is from the Carlsons' tap. You probably can't see it—perhaps on camera and on the floor—but there is particulate in here, floating, something you wouldn't

want to drink. This is water from the Rosaaens' tap. These samples all came from a small town in Eastern Montana, Circle, MT, and the image here to my left is from Roundup, MT. This unacceptable, unclear tap water is in the homes of Montanans and North Dakotans right now as we speak.

The mayor of Harlowton, MT, a town of about 1,000 in rural central Montana, is here today to testify. I met with him just yesterday. He came to our Montana coffee this morning. He spent over \$1,000 on a flight. He spent almost \$600 on hotel accommodations, not to mention the cost of other incidentals. Now the Democrats will not let him speak.

Why? As the chairman of the Senate Western Caucus, it is shameful—as other witnesses have flown and spent thousands of dollars—to prevent improving water quality in our States. The Arizona witness, for example, spent \$2,400 and 3 days out of the office to come back and testify today. The North Dakota witness spent \$1,300.

Yes, the FBI needs to regain the trust of the American people. In fact, Senator SCHUMER on November 2 said: "I do not have confidence in [Comey] any longer," and on that very same day, House Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI said: "Maybe he's not in the right job."

But this water, as we can see these samples in front of me, has nothing to do with the FBI. There are over 36,000 Americans spread across Montana and North Dakota without access to clean water. If the mayor of Flint, MI, flew here to testify about the quality and challenges facing their water system, no one would have blocked that hearing. Frankly, this is just another sign of the marginalization of rural Montana and rural America. I was sent here to fight for rural Montana, to stand for rural America, and that is what I will continue to do. This hearing needs to happen today.

Mr. President, I have a request for the Energy Committee to meet at 2:30 p.m. today. I ask unanimous consent that the committee be allowed to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, these are not usual times. Representing the State of Hawaii, of course, we care about clean water. So with all due respect to my colleague from Montana, we understand the importance of this issue to the people of his State. However, as I said, these are very unusual times, and, on the President's decision to fire Director James Comey in this manner, under this pretext, and at this time, it is also a total disservice to the American people.

This attempt, intended to derail and disrupt the FBI's ongoing investigation into Russia's attempt to disrupt or

interfere with our democracy and the Trump team's ties to those attempts, should be a matter of national concern, not a Republican or Democratic concern. We need a bipartisan call for a special prosecutor who will conduct an impartial, thorough investigation, untainted by political consideration.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, if I could respond to my colleague from Hawaii.

The folks who have been derailed today are the men and women who have traveled thousands of miles to be here from very small communities across our country. They have taken time away from work and their families to be here to show our committees what is going on in rural America and the unacceptable quality of water.

Water is a basic need. We have water samples here that I think would be shocking to most Members in this body. I am just saddened to see that Democrats are going to derail these hearings this afternoon. Yes, let's have a fight about the FBI and the firing of Comey. We can have a good-spirited debate about that. But why are we preventing these folks from rural America, who have traveled thousands of miles, to testify today at our request.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO MEET

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I have a request for the Indians Affairs Committee to meet today at 2:30 p.m.

First, we have a markup in the Indian Affairs Committee. The two bills we are marking up are Democrat-sponsored bills. The first one is Senator TESTER's bill, from the State of Montana, which would provide support for Native languages. I guess the summary is that it would support the education of Indian children. I believe it relates to Native languages in that educational capacity. So that is one of the bills, Senator TESTER's bill.

The other bill we are marking up is Senator TIM KAINE's bill, also a Democrat-sponsored bill. The short narrative I have is this: To extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

The reason that is significant, that is something that both Senator KAINE and Senator WARNER—both Senators from Virginia—have been working on for some time. The reason it is timely is that they have Pocahontas's birthday celebration coming up, which I think is going to be a large celebration in the Commonwealth of Virginia. They were hoping to have these Tribes recognized before this birthday celebration for Pocahontas. It is a timely issue.

Obviously, we can't advance the bill to the Senate floor unless we mark it up. At the request of those two Democratic Senators from the Commonwealth of Virginia, we are scheduled to mark up those bills and get them to the floor and try to do it in a timely way because of the celebration they are trying to get prepared for. Everybody knows the story of Pocahontas and why that would be a big celebration and certainly a big deal in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Again, as we debate this on the Senate floor, I think Senator DAINES made some strong points, and I would certainly appeal to our colleagues across the aisle to consider what I just described as far as those markups.

In addition to those markups, we also have a hearing on several bills. The first one is a McCain bill, and it is to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian Tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants.

Everybody knows what the AMBER Alert Program is and how important that program is to protect our young people when they get abducted. The reason Senator MCCAIN, from Arizona, is bringing this bill forward is because there was an abduction in Arizona, and the AMBER Alert went out late. I think the AMBER Alert went out a day late.

Senator MCCAIN has this PROTECT Act so we can make sure the AMBER Alert is working in Indian Country, and you certainly can understand how important it is that we do that. We have to have a hearing on the bill again so we can advance the bill to the Senate floor for consideration.

The final bill that we would have a hearing on in committee, if we are allowed to meet, is a Murkowski bill, Senator MURKOWSKI from Alaska. It would provide the conveyance of certain property in this State.

You have to realize that the witnesses—and I think certainly the good Senator from Hawaii will appreciate this—had to come here from Alaska, which is quite a lengthy trip. When the Senator travels back home to Hawaii, that is a long trip. It is certainly a beautiful place but a long trip to get there. Of course, it is not inexpensive to travel from Alaska to Washington, DC.

Those witnesses will be out their costs to come here if we are not able to have the hearing, and we would have to reschedule it. That certainly creates a cost burden for them, which is certainly unfair and not what they would want to have had happen on the part of their government.

I am putting that in human terms. Again, we are talking about two Democratic bills, and we are talking about two Republican bills. We are talking about constituents who have traveled a long way to come here to have the hearing and the markup.

Again, these are issues we should be able to work on in a bipartisan way. I would certainly ask for that consideration. At this point, I ask for unanimous consent that our committee be allowed to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, of course we acknowledge the importance of the matters raised by my colleague from North Dakota and, representing my State, the State of Hawaii, yes, there is support for education of Native people, of Native children, which I hope will include Native Hawaiian children. That is important as well as recognizing various Indian Tribes and the other matters that were raised by my friend from North Dakota.

However, as I mentioned, these are not business-as-usual times. The untoward firing of the FBI Director, who was conducting an ongoing investigation into Russian attempts to interfere with our Democracy and the Trump team's ties to those attempts, should be a matter of national concern, should be a matter of concern to every single Member of the Senate.

This is not a Republican or a Democratic concern. This is a threat to our democracy. We know Russia did this. We know we need to get to the bottom of this. We need to get to the bottom of the Trump team's ties to these efforts, and this thinly veiled attempt by President Trump to derail or disrupt these investigations cannot be sustained or supported.

We continue to ask for a bipartisan call for a special prosecutor who will conduct an impartial, thorough investigation, untainted by political considerations into the Russia-Trump matter. Therefore, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Minnesota.

FIRING OF JAMES COMEY

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to address President Trump's stunning dismissal of FBI Director Comey yesterday evening. We know the Russians interfered in the 2016 election. We know the Russians did so in order to undermine confidence in our democracy. We know the Russians carried out this attack with the goal of benefiting the campaign of Donald Trump, whom the Kremlin preferred to see win the election. These facts have been confirmed by our intelligence agencies.

What we don't fully yet understand is all of the reasons why, all the reasons why the Russians favored Donald Trump and whether associates of the President or members of his campaign assisted in the Russian operations to sway the election in his favor.

These questions are the subject of an ongoing counterintelligence investigation, an investigation conducted by the

Federal Bureau of Investigation and, until last night, an investigation led by James Comey.

As former Director Comey recently testified to the House Intelligence Committee, "[T]he FBI, as part of [its] counterintelligence mission, is investigating the Russian government's efforts to interfere in the 2016 presidential election—and that includes investigating the nature of any links between individuals associated with the Trump campaign and the Russian government and whether there was any coordination between the campaign and Russia."

The timing of Director Comey's dismissal raises serious questions, and President Trump's decision to abruptly fire the man leading an investigation that could implicate the Trump administration should shock the conscience of every American who believes that no man or woman is above the law and who has faith in the fair and impartial pursuit of justice.

The White House attempted to preemptively dispel any suspicion by announcing that President Trump fired the Director "based on the clear recommendations" of Attorney General Jeff Sessions and Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein. The White House released several documents to back up that claim: a letter from President Trump to Director Comey, firing him; a letter from Attorney General Sessions to President Trump, recommending that Comey be fired; and a memo written by Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein, which cited the Director's handling of the Hillary Clinton email investigation as damaging the FBI's reputation and credibility. These documents create more questions than they answer.

First, the letter from President Trump to Director Comey firing him. President Trump, ever eager to put distance between the Russian inquiry and himself, wrote: "While I greatly appreciate you informing me, on three separate occasions, that I am not under investigation, I nevertheless concur with the judgment of the Department of Justice that you are not able to effectively lead the Bureau."

Again, we know the FBI is conducting a criminal investigation into whether members of the Trump campaign coordinated with the Russians in their efforts to influence the election. Director Comey confirmed that before he was fired. Whether President Trump is personally under investigation by the Bureau or whether investigators are merely scrutinizing his advisers and associates, the President's clumsy attempt at misdirection does little more than remind us of the many unanswered questions about his and his people's connections to Russia.

Second, Attorney General Sessions' letter to President Trump. The Attorney General writes that based on his

review of Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein's memo, which cites the Director's handling of the Clinton email investigation, that Attorney General Sessions has concluded that the FBI requires new leadership and a fresh start. Attorney General Sessions recommended that Director Comey be fired.

Attorney General Sessions should not have had any involvement in this decision at all. On March 2, the Attorney General called a press conference to announce: "I have now decided to recuse myself from any existing or future investigations of any matter relating in any way to the campaigns for president of the United States."

The reason Attorney General Sessions made that announcement was because news reports revealed he had provided misleading testimony in response to a question that I asked during his confirmation hearing; that Attorney General Sessions had falsely stated: "I did not have communications with the Russians." In fact, he did meet with the Russian Ambassador during the campaign twice.

Having provided misleading testimony under oath about a matter that could potentially be the subject of a criminal investigation by the FBI, Attorney General Sessions was forced to recuse himself.

I find it deeply troubling that Attorney General Jeff Sessions—who misled the Judiciary Committee about his own communications with the Russian Ambassador and who pledged to recuse himself from this investigation as a result—betrayed that pledge by involving himself in the decision to fire the Director of the FBI, who was leading the investigation into Russia's interference in our elections, including whether members of President Trump's campaign were involved in that interference. Attorney General Sessions was a member of that campaign, and he misled the committee on whether he had met with the Russians, and he did that under oath. That is why he recused himself, and yet he inserted himself in this firing.

Finally, there is Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein's memo, which asserts that Director Comey's handling of the Clinton email investigation caused the public to lose confidence in the Bureau. Director Comey spoke publicly about the Clinton email investigation twice, in July and October of last year.

Setting aside whether Director Comey's decision to discuss the investigation was unorthodox or broke with Justice Department and FBI protocols, his actions were well known to both President Trump and Attorney General Sessions, and both of them celebrated his actions at the time. After Director Comey wrote to Congress on October 28, informing us that the FBI had discovered additional emails and would

therefore reopen its investigation into Secretary Clinton, then-Candidate Trump praised his decision. He said: "What [Comey] did was the right thing," and "It took guts for Director Comey to make the move that he made in light of the kind of opposition he had."

Appearing on FOX Business Network, then-Senator Sessions said that Director Comey "had an absolute duty, in my opinion, 11 days [before an election] or not, to come forward with the new information that he has and let the American people know that, too."

If President Trump or Attorney General Sessions truly objected to the way that Director Comey conducted the investigation into Secretary Clinton's emails, I suspect they would have said so at the time rather than heap praise upon him. But their previous statements lauding Director Comey's handling of the Clinton email probe cast suspicion on the extent to which they relied on the Deputy Attorney General's purported rationale.

Further, and this is important, if Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein were truly concerned that Director Comey's handling of the Clinton email investigation had damaged the reputation of the Bureau, then why not wait for the conclusion of an investigation by the very respected DOJ inspector general into Comey's decision during the election—his decisions—an investigation that had been underway since January?

The shifting positions of President Trump and Attorney General Sessions lead me to believe something else is going on here, that this is not about Hillary Clinton's emails but about turning the page on Russia. In fact, last night, a White House spokesman said so. Appearing on FOX News, White House Deputy Press Secretary Sarah Huckabee Sanders was asked how Director Comey's firing would affect the Russia investigation. She replied:

When are they going to let that go? It's been going on for nearly a year. Frankly, it's getting kind of absurd. There's nothing there. It's time to move on. Frankly, it's time to focus on the things the American people care about.

The American people care about whether a hostile foreign government influenced our election. They care about whether advisers and associates of the President helped that foreign government do that.

The events that have occurred over the past 24 hours are deeply, deeply unsettling. As my Republican colleague Senator FLAKE said last night:

I've spent the last several hours trying to find an acceptable rationale for the timing of Comey's firing. I just can't do it.

And I can't either. In my view, the timing and the circumstances surrounding Director Comey's dismissal are very suspicious. For example, just this morning, it was reported that Di-

rector Comey recently asked the Justice Department to provide additional resources for the Russian investigation—a request that purportedly he made personally to Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein. This raises grave concerns about the Trump Justice Department's ability to conduct a full, fair, and impartial investigation. In order to address these concerns, Attorney General Sessions and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein should come to the Senate and explain their involvement to all of the Senators in this body.

In the wake of what I believe was a politically motivated decision to remove Director Comey, I no longer have confidence that the Department of Justice can fulfill its obligation to resolve this matter impartially. The situation now calls very clearly for the appointment of a special prosecutor to oversee the investigation into whether associates of the Trump organization or former members of the Trump campaign had knowledge of or participated in the Russian attack on our democracy.

I join my colleagues' calls for an independent inquiry so the American people can have confidence that the individuals who conduct this investigation will follow the facts no matter where they lead.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

MR. BENNET. Mr. President, I am here today to speak on a different topic, but before the Senator from Minnesota leaves, I want to thank him for his statement and for his observations, which are dead-on about the need now more than ever to have an independent special counsel take a look at what has happened here. I am very grateful for that, and I believe that is the conclusion others in this Chamber, Republicans and Democrats working together, will reach as well, as they let sink in what has actually transpired over the last 24 hours.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTION

Mr. President, earlier today, in a piece of good news around here, a bipartisan majority voted to block an effort that would have wasted taxpayer resources, polluted our air, and accelerated climate change. I thank my colleagues who voted that way, in particular the Republican Senators who crossed the aisle to join us in this vote. Today, we showed that Washington can still come together to put the public above the powerful. Today we showed that, in the Senate at least, a majority still exists for common sense, for public health, and for good stewardship of public resources.

Before this morning, the Trump administration and some Members of Congress sought to undo a rule from the Bureau of Land Management that had been a win for taxpayers, for businesses, and the environment. Across

the country, oil and gas companies pay royalties to extract from Federal and Tribal lands. Each year, these companies waste around \$330 million worth of gas because of inefficient operations, from leaky pipes to excess burning, to faulty vents.

By preserving this rule, we will give taxpayers roughly \$800 million in new royalties over the next decade—resources our communities could use to invest in schools or to build roads, bridges, and tunnels. Actually, the idea that we are giving the money is not right. The taxpayers will earn the royalties to which they are entitled as a result of these public lands.

This is a win all the way around. For public health, it reduces toxic pollutants in the air we breathe. For businesses, it cuts waste and expands their bottom lines. For the planet, it curbs leaking methane, which is up to 80 times more potent than a greenhouse gas and accelerates climate change. In fact, without the proper protections, natural gas can burn as dirty as coal, and the benefits that we have gotten from natural gas would be dramatically reduced.

Thanks to bipartisan cooperation, this rule will remain in place. I want to recognize Colorado's leadership in bringing us to this moment. In Colorado, we led the Nation to adopt the country's first-ever rule to reduce methane waste and pollution. The rule enjoys support from environmental groups, the oil and gas industry, and 83 percent of Coloradans.

Our approach was so successful that the Bureau of Land Management drew on it as a model for all Federal and Tribal lands. In my State, when we were thinking about passing this rule, critics said that it would stifle energy production, but the opposite has happened. Colorado's natural gas production has continued to rise, while oil production has nearly doubled.

Critics also argued that Colorado's rule would kill jobs. Once again, the facts tell a very different story. In Colorado alone, 41 different companies put people to work to repair pipes, monitor pollution, and develop technologies to reduce emissions. Our experience showed that the rule spurred new jobs and technologies, reduced pollution, and protected the planet, all while failing to reduce energy production as critics alleged. Those facts were critical in preserving the rule this morning.

Because of what we did this morning, the national standard we preserved, our State will not suffer from higher methane pollution coming across the border from other States. That would have hurt Colorado's economy. That would have hurt tourism in one of the most visited States in the country, and it would have been deeply unfair to the people of Colorado, to kids with asthma and seniors who need clean air to

breathe, to the next generation of Americans, of Coloradans who deserve a healthy planet.

Now that Congress has spoken, the administration should listen. My colleagues and I will vigorously oppose any attempts by the Department of the Interior to bypass, somehow administratively, the decision that has been made today. All of us need to remain vigilant to ensure that this common-sense protection remains in place, protecting Americans, protecting our environment, and I am grateful that today, at least, we can come together and put fact over ideology and put the public good over narrow interests.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. President.

First, I want to thank my colleague from Colorado for his outstanding remarks and, even much more important, the work on the methane CRA. Much is happening today, and not many people paid much attention, I guess, because they were so busy, but this is the first CRA to go down, and it is probably the most important one that came before us. So the fact that it wasn't voted on means the people of America and the people of the world can breathe a sigh of relief because methane—one of the great causes of global warming—will not be released into the atmosphere as easily.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, now on the topic of the day, this morning the Democratic caucus met to discuss the circumstances of Mr. Comey's dismissal by the White House. There are many questions to be answered and many actions to be taken. We will be pursuing several things in the coming days and weeks that we decided in our caucus, and we will have more to say about those next steps in the days ahead, but there are three things our caucus agreed must happen right away.

First, Mr. Rosenstein should not be the one to appoint the special prosecutor. That responsibility should go to the highest serving career civil servant at the Department of Justice.

Second, Mr. Comey is needed more than ever to testify before the Senate.

Third, Attorney General Sessions and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein should brief all Senators on these events separately and in a classified setting, if necessary, and they should do it soon because the questions are just swirling about, and there are more every day, almost every hour.

Let me go over each.

First, it is the overwhelming view of my caucus that a special prosecutor should now be appointed to conduct the investigation into the Trump campaign's ties to Russia. Mr. Rosenstein cannot be the person to appoint him.

Serious doubts have been cast on Mr. Rosenstein's impartiality for two reasons: First, there are many reports that Director Comey met with Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein last week to make a request for more resources or help with the investigation into the Trump campaign's ties to Russia. That would make the timing of this firing even more suspect. Second, Mr. Rosenstein signed his name to a highly political memo arguing for Director Comey's dismissal and made no complaint about the involvement of the Attorney General, who had recused himself from all matters relating to the Russia investigation, in recommending the firing of the man who was leading it.

It is hard to believe that a seasoned prosecutor without bias would have allowed Sessions to be a part of this. It is also hard to believe that a seasoned prosecutor would write such a memo, which seems highly political—not in the kind of language and not with the kind of annotation that prosecutors normally write.

These facts make it clear that the decision to appoint a special prosecutor should go to the highest ranking civil servant at the Department of Justice. Mr. Rosenstein and other political appointees appointed by the President, whom they are supposed to investigate, should not be the ones making a special call on a prosecutor, lest that decision be seen as influenced or, worse, made at the direction of the administration.

We need to assure the American people that they can have confidence in our criminal justice system to conduct the Russia investigation impartially. The best and only way to do that now would be for a career civil servant at the Department of Justice to be the person who decides on a special prosecutor. It should not be a political appointee who makes such a decision.

My friend, our great senior Senator from the State of California, brought this up in our meeting. Senator FEINSTEIN's call that the appointment be made by someone who is a career civil servant, not a political appointee, has the widespread support of our caucus and is the only fair thing to do.

Second, we have also learned that Mr. Comey will no longer be appearing before the Intelligence Committee tomorrow. In his stead will be the Acting FBI Director, Andrew McCabe. There are so many unanswered questions that only Mr. Comey can answer. We Democrats hope and expect that he will still come before the Senate in some capacity.

I for one salute Senator BURR and Senator WARNER for inviting him to testify next week before the Intelligence Committee. It is the right thing to do. We ought to hear from Mr. Comey. At this moment of profound doubt about the reasons and timing of FBI Director Comey's firing by the President and about the status and progress of a very serious investigation into the Trump campaign and Russia by his agency, we require answers.

Third, the recent revelations about the Rosenstein and Comey meeting demand that the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General—Attorney General Sessions and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein—brief the Senate and answer questions because of so many things swirling about from last night's firing. That briefing could be classified if necessary—it may be part classified, part not—and each briefing should be done separately.

Let me speak plainly. The prospect that a campaign for the Presidency of the United States colluded with a foreign power in order to win our Nation's highest office is as grave a topic for an investigation as there could be. It gets right to the heart of the pillar of our democracy: the fair and free elections of our representatives. And the fact that Mr. Rosenstein and Attorney General Sessions were involved in this firing when there are so many questions swirling about means they must come before us to answer questions. I hope Leader MCCONNELL will understand the need for that and answer the plea I made this morning about this.

Furthermore, the fact that Mr. Rosenstein—which came out after I made my request—the fact that Mr. Rosenstein, by all reports, had a meeting with Director Comey where Comey asked for more resources makes it all the more important for Rosenstein to come because that might be the reason Comey was fired—because he was pursuing the investigation in an accelerated way that was very much needed.

So what we are seeking—the only thing we are seeking—are assurances that this investigation will be carried out in an impartial, independent way; that we get all the facts; that we get to the very bottom of this. All we are seeking is some assurance that the subject of this investigation is not able to influence it or, God forbid, quash it. The topic of this investigation itself is very serious. The possibility that the investigation is being impeded or tampered with is even worse. That threatens the integrity of our criminal justice system and the hallowed American belief in rule of law. I believe this rises far above party labels. I believe it rises far above partisan politics.

I have been heartened that several Republicans have expressed concerns. I hope and expect our Republican friends will join us in these efforts to make sure this investigation is conducted in

the manner it deserves. We want Congress's role to be nonpartisan, looking at the good of neither political party but, rather, the good of our dear country.

These are tough and serious times. We cannot shirk from our responsibilities, neither Democrats nor Republicans. I hope everyone in this Chamber will rise to the occasion.

I thank my good friend from Minnesota for allowing me to speak.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

FIRING OF JAMES COMEY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I join in the minority leader's remarks and his plan for moving forward, which is a bipartisan plan and a plea for our colleagues to work together.

America is not like some countries where people are all of the same ethnic background or practice the same religion. America is an idea. America is an ideal. America is something that is grounded in our democracy.

Way back centuries ago, our Founding Fathers were concerned about foreign influence on our democracy. They were concerned at the time about Great Britain. Well, now we have another concern, and that concern is Russia. It is not just the Democrats' concern. As one of our colleagues, Senator RUBIO, has noted in the past, maybe this election was an attack on one political candidate in one party, but next time it will be the other party. That is why we must join together and handle this correctly and in the spirit of our democracy and our Constitution.

I have known Director Comey for a long time. We were classmates at the University of Chicago Law School. He was well liked in our class, and he earned the respect of the agents he supervised and the law enforcement he worked with. I made it clear to him that I didn't agree with how he handled the email investigation regarding Secretary Clinton, but nevertheless this man is a hard worker and someone of integrity. Just because someone doesn't agree with how an investigation is handled, even if it is in a big way, doesn't mean this person should be fired.

FBI Directors have 10-year terms for a reason; that is because we want them to be independent from political influence.

All Americans, including those who have criticized Director Comey for whatever reason in the past, should be very troubled by the timing of this firing.

Let's look at the past week. We started the week on Monday, when Former Director Clapper testified in great detail about the Russian threat to our democracy and the fact that the Russians feel empowered and that he believes they will do it again and again. We also were on the heels of the

French cyber attack, where their elections were attacked and where Russia was trying to get involved in their elections.

Former Acting Attorney General Sally Yates testified, and she made very clear that she had not just given a heads-up to the administration that their National Security Advisor was compromised by the Russians—no. She had two formal meetings over at the White House. She outlined in detail how she had gone over to the White House and voiced her concerns.

When I asked both Former Director Clapper and former Acting Attorney General Yates whether this was material for blackmail—when you have a high-ranking official saying one thing on a tape recording that the Russians knew he had said and then another to the Vice President of the United States—if that was material for blackmail, they said yes, definitively yes, that he had been compromised.

Yet, as it became clear, the White House then allowed the National Security Advisor, General Flynn, to stay on for 18 days, including being part of an hour-long conversation between the President of the United States and Vladimir Putin. So that is what happened on Monday.

We know what was going to happen tomorrow, Thursday, which is that Director Comey was going to testify in his capacity as the FBI Director in front of the Senate Intelligence Committee. We know questions were going to be asked about Russia. Of course, I commend Senators BURR and WARNER for inviting him again next week in his capacity now as a private citizen.

Yet, when you look at what has happened here—the Yates and Clapper testimony on Monday, the Comey testimony expected on Thursday—what is sandwiched in between? It is the firing of the FBI Director. By the way, this is the same FBI Director who had the audacity to tell the truth before Congress when he was asked whether President Obama had wiretapped the Trump Tower, as alleged by President Trump in a tweet at 6 in the morning. The FBI Director truthfully answered, no, that it did not happen. That is also something that has happened in the past month.

Today we learned that just days before he was fired, Mr. Comey asked senior officials at the Justice Department for more resources in order to carry out the Russia investigation.

Now, what are my colleagues saying about this? I think it is very important to note that the two Senators who are privy to the most classified information—Senator MCCAIN, as chair of the Armed Services Committee, and Senator BURR, as chair of the Intelligence Committee—have both expressed serious concerns about what has happened.

Senator MCCAIN said he was disappointed, and Senator BURR, the Republican chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee, said:

I am troubled by the timing and reasoning of Director Comey's termination. I have found Director Comey to be a public servant of the highest order, and his dismissal further confuses an already difficult investigation by the Committee.

Senator FLAKE said:

I have spent the last several hours trying to find an acceptable rationale for the timing of Comey's firing. I just can't do it.

The reasoning the White House is using for Director Comey's firing is bizarre, and that is why I believe Senator BURR said that his dismissal further confuses an already difficult investigation.

The memo provided by Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein cites old justifications. These are quotes from letters that I remember from the Presidential campaign, and they are used in the letter as a justification.

If the administration found Director Comey's conduct during the election to be so problematic, why now—right, smack in the middle of the advancements of this Russia investigation?

The answer, I believe, is that the justification that is provided in the memo is a pretext. The fact that President Trump's termination letter to Director Comey strangely discusses the fact that Director Comey informed the President that he was not under investigation in the context of the Russia investigation sheds light on what this is really about; that Director Comey was seeking the truth.

Senator BURR said that Director Comey has been more forthcoming with information than any FBI Director he can recall in his tenure on the congressional intelligence committees. In firing Comey, President Trump has cast doubt about the independence and viability of any further investigation into the foreign interference of our democracy.

Why was Attorney General Sessions, who had recused himself from the investigation on Russian interference, able to influence the firing of the man at the helm of the Russia investigation?

That is one of the questions we want answered and why, by the way, we believe it is important to have a closed-door briefing with the Deputy Attorney General and his predecessor.

Did Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein act on his own or at the direction of Attorney General Sessions or the White House?

Are reports that the President had been searching for a rationale to fire the FBI Director for more than a week true?

Was his firing influenced by any recent developments in the investigation, like the issuance of grand jury subpoenas or Director Comey's recent

request for more resources for the Russia investigation?

Why didn't the President wait for the inspector general's investigation into Director Comey's handling of the Clinton email investigation to conclude before making his decision to fire him?

I am a former prosecutor. I believe in facts, and I believe in evidence. These decisions should not have been made without these facts and without this evidence and while in the middle of a major investigation of Russian influence in our election. Answers to these questions are essential in getting to the truth and in ensuring that an independent investigation at the FBI can continue.

For months, U.S. intelligence agencies—17 of them—have said that Russia used covert cyber attacks, espionage, and harmful propaganda to try and undermine our democracy. Reports show it. The facts prove it. When former Director of National Intelligence Clapper testified, he said Russia will continue to interfere in our election system.

This is what he said exactly:

I believe [Russia is] now emboldened to continue such activities in the future, both here and around the world, and to do so even more intensely. If there has ever been a call for vigilance and action against a threat to the very foundation of our democratic political system, this episode is it.

I was in that hearing and asked questions of Clapper when he said this: "Vigilance." That is what he said—vigilance.

How can we call it vigilance, when the FBI Director, who is conducting the investigation, has been fired? What message does that send to Russia? Does that make them think we are serious about this investigation; that we want to get to the bottom of it and that we do not want it to happen again? No. It sends the opposite message.

Aides and surrogates of the Trump administration, during the campaign and the transition, were in contact with officials from a foreign government that was actively working to tear our democracy apart. We need to know why and when and how. In the first question, that is what I really want to know—the "why."

This week, former Acting Attorney General Sally Yates, as I mentioned, and Director Clapper reminded us that on the very day President Obama imposed sanctions on Russia for its unprecedented attacks on our democracy, a member of the Trump transition team spoke to a senior Russian official regarding those sanctions. Michael Flynn, the National Security Advisor—the person charged with the most sensitive matters of U.S. national security—was not truthful with the Vice President. He lied to the Vice President about contact with Russian officials. In turn, the American people were misled.

After the Department of Justice warned the administration that the

National Security Advisor had lied and may be vulnerable to blackmail by the Russian Government, what did the administration do? It continued to allow General Flynn to handle top secret information for 18 more days. They let him participate in an hour-long phone call between President Trump and Vladimir Putin. In fact, decisive action was not taken until the Washington Post revealed what was happening.

We have now seen two people resign—Trump's campaign manager and his National Security Advisor. The one thing they have in common is Russia and the President. We have also seen three people fired—Sally Yates, the Acting Attorney General of the United States, who was simply doing her job; Preet Bharara, the U.S. attorney in New York City; and Jim Comey, the FBI Director. The one thing they have in common is that they were all investigating links, and they were doing their jobs.

Think about that. Let that sink in. The independent government officials who were or could have been charged with getting to the truth, no matter where it led, were fired.

We owe it to the American people to get to the bottom of what is going on here. It is our job to get to the bottom of this because the President of the United States—President Trump—cannot fire Congress. We need to know the full extent of the Trump campaign's contact with the Russian Government during the campaign and transition, including what was said and what was done and who knew about it.

That is why, on January 4, I stood with Senator CARDIN and with ADAM SCHIFF and ELIJAH CUMMINGS, of the House of Representatives, and called for an independent commission. Now, this is different than the special prosecutor whom we need to handle the criminal investigation. This is also different than the good work that is being done by the Senate Intelligence Committee under the leadership of Senators BURR and WARNER.

To me, an independent commission would help us because it could get to the bottom of what has happened, with the intent of making sure it does not happen again, in order to protect our democracy. It could have recommendations, just like the 9/11 Commission had, on how we could improve our laws. It could have recommendations on what we could do if the media gets hold of information that is the result of a cyber attack from a foreign government. It could have recommendations of what political parties and campaigns could do—perhaps even in agreement—when they get access to information that is a result of a cyber attack against the opposite party.

It was not that long ago when campaigns would come upon debate information and other things and would simply put it in an envelope and send it

back to the other side. We can do this, but that is not going to come out of some simple piece of legislation or from the work that the Intelligence Committee is doing.

That is why I believe we need this independent commission as well as a special prosecutor to look into all contacts between Trump aides and surrogates and Russian officials during the campaign, transition, and administration. This prosecutor must be fair and impartial and completely unattached to either political party.

In addition to the independent commission, we also need our congressional committees, as I mentioned, to continue to exercise their oversight authority.

Since the election, we have heard a lot about the three branches of government and our system of checks and balances. One of Congress's fundamental jobs, as I told a group of students in my office today, is to closely oversee the executive branch in order to ensure that the law is being properly followed and enforced. This shouldn't just be things that students learn from their Senators when they come in during school trips or be what they learn from a textbook. This is actually our job.

This means that in addition to this independent, 9/11-style Commission, we must make sure our congressional committees continue to investigate Russian interference in our political system. We have subpoena power. We need to use it.

Some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand the importance of doing our jobs in order to get to the bottom of this. As I mentioned, we have the Intelligence Committee investigation, but we also have the Judiciary subcommittee, on which I serve, led by Senators GRAHAM and WHITEHOUSE. They are the ones who held the hearing with Sally Yates and Director Clapper this week.

This is an unprecedented time in our country's history. We are witnessing a singular moment of constitutional and democratic unease. In recent months, foundational elements of our democracy, including the rule of law, have been questioned, challenged, and even undermined.

Several of my colleagues have compared the President's action to President Richard Nixon's firing of special prosecutor Archibald Cox, who was investigating Watergate. Even then, Mr. Cox was replaced by a new special prosecutor. Today, we have no special prosecutor to determine whether the President's campaign colluded with a hostile foreign power. Some in Congress are continuing to resist any serious investigation. For that reason, our democracy may be in even greater peril. The night he was fired, Mr. Cox defended his decision to conduct the Watergate investigation as he saw fit rather than to yield to the President's order that

he limit his request for tape recordings.

Cox said: "Whether ours shall continue to be a government of laws and not of men is now for Congress and, ultimately, the American people."

He is right. The American people deserve a thorough, independent investigation into the extent of Russia's interference in the 2016 Presidential election.

This is not a partisan issue. Americans deserve answers now. And where should they get those answers? They should get those answers from this Chamber, because we, as Members of the Senate, cannot be fired.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from Texas.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I was listening with interest to our friend and colleague from Minnesota talk about the Russia investigation. I agree with her 100 percent that it is our responsibility to get to the bottom of what exactly happened with respect to Russian involvement in our elections, much as they got involved in the elections in France, using the combined process commonly known as active measures. Active measures are a combination of cyber espionage, propaganda, and a use of social media through paid trolls who can then actually try to raise the visibility of some of this propaganda such that it then becomes part of the mainstream media and becomes accepted as part of the debate in democratic societies.

I believe we share a bipartisan and universal commitment to get to the bottom of what happened in our last election.

I would note that there are two members of the Senate Judiciary Committee who actually serve as members of the Senate Intelligence Committee, which is actively involved in a rigorous bipartisan investigation. That would be myself and Senator FEINSTEIN, the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, who is also the former chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee.

Senator FEINSTEIN has said recently that there is no evidence of collusion between the administration and Russia. I think she would share with me a commitment not to stop there but to find out where the facts take us. Indeed, thanks to Chairman BURR and thanks to Vice Chairman WARNER, our bipartisan Senate Intelligence Committee has unprecedented access to raw intelligence, from the National Security Agency, the CIA, and from all sources of the intelligence community. We have access to some of the most sensitive intelligence gathered by the U.S. Government. I think that is due to the credit and leadership of Chairman BURR and Vice Chairman WARNER that our committee has remained bipartisan

and we are leaving no stone unturned to get to the bottom of what exactly happened.

So I know people are concerned, and I share that concern. We need to come up with a program of countermeasures to deal with this because the Russian Government has been amping up their game for some time now, and now they are operating at certainly dangerous levels when it comes to trying to interfere in our most basic democratic institutions, like our elections.

I would say, as far as the Department of Justice is concerned, that Rod Rosenstein was confirmed by this body by a vote of 94 to 6. That is probably the only Trump nomination so far since he has been President that has enjoyed such broad bipartisan support. It is because of his distinguished record, most recently as the U.S. attorney in Baltimore.

I remember hearing from our Senators from Maryland, for example, Democrats who were praising Rod Rosenstein and saying he was exactly the kind of person we needed in this sensitive job as Deputy Attorney General.

But now our colleagues seem to forget their very own conviction and vote on Rod Rosenstein, and now they say that he can't be fair, that he has somehow an appearance of a conflict of interest, making it necessary to appoint a special counsel, which, by the way, also then reports to the leadership at the Department of Justice.

I think we ought to give Mr. Rosenstein a chance to demonstrate that he is capable of leading that investigation at the Department of Justice, understanding that our role here in the Congress is not to pursue a criminal investigation and case. That is the job of the Department of Justice. Our job, in parallel fashion, is for oversight reasons and to let the American people and ourselves know exactly what happened. That is why the investigation of the bipartisan Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is so important, in addition to the hearings we are having in the Judiciary Committee, on which the Senator from Minnesota and I happen to serve as well.

So we do need to get to the bottom of what happened, and I am confident we will. It is our duty, and we will get the job done.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

On another topic, Mr. President, last week our colleagues in the House took the first necessary step to deliver on our campaign promises for the last three elections to repeal and replace ObamaCare. Why is that important? Well, because of the impact of ObamaCare on premiums and deductibles for many people, millions of people, literally, are now being priced out of the insurance market, and their insurance, even though they have the policy, is really unavailable

to them because they have, for example, such high deductibles. We know insurance companies continue to pull out of the marketplace, and people are reduced to little or no choices when it comes to where to buy their insurance, because, frankly, ObamaCare was over-sold and underdelivered.

The President said: If you like your policy, you can keep it. Well, that proved to be false. He said: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Well, that didn't turn out to be true, either. He said that a family of four would save an average of \$2,500 on their premiums, and that didn't prove to be true, either.

So like most command and control from Washington, DC—notwithstanding, perhaps, the aspirations of our colleagues across the aisle to deliver affordable healthcare to the American people—it simply failed to do so, and it is in serious distress—even a meltdown.

So we would invite our colleagues across the aisle—our Democrat friends—to join with us to help rescue the American people from this failure of the Affordable Care Act.

The House passed a bill last week—the American Health Care Act. It is not a perfect bill. I dare say the Senate is going to take up a bill of its own, and we will try to work with our House colleagues to try to get legislation to the President and signed into law that will rescue the American people and will finally deliver on our promise of more affordable premiums, better access, and real choice.

But it is really not enough to just stand back and criticize those who are actually trying to rescue those who are in harm's way as a result of the failures of ObamaCare. That, so far, is what our friends across the aisle are doing. They are not lifting a finger to help the people hurt today by ObamaCare. We would challenge them to get involved and to work with us.

Many of our colleagues have come to the floor and talked about stories they have heard from their constituents back in their States and the harm that the Affordable Care Act has caused. Premiums have skyrocketed. Millions have been kicked off their healthcare plans. The economy is saddled with billions of dollars in new regulations. Employers are laying people off or not hiring new people because, frankly, they don't want to suffer the additional financial burdens of ObamaCare.

Instead of having more access to more health insurance options, Texans—the people I represent—have less of both.

The bottom line is ObamaCare has failed, and it is up to us to provide some relief to the people who are being hurt by the failure of ObamaCare. We invite our colleagues to work with us to do that.

Since the creation of ObamaCare, I have been hearing regularly from my

constituents back home in Texas how they need relief from the healthcare law and they need it now. Every letter, phone call, or conversation produces similar themes. One of my constituents, for example, is a woman who was paying about \$300 a month for her health insurance, but under a span of just a few months, that premium skyrocketed to \$800—\$300 to \$800. I don't know many people who can withstand that kind of increase in their expenses for healthcare.

She wrote to me and said: “This has to stop—and quality, flexible plans need to return for individuals.”

I agree with her.

Another wrote in to say that before ObamaCare her daughter was getting what she considered to be adequate healthcare insurance for about \$190 a month with just a \$500 deductible. Now that has gone up to a payment of almost \$400 a month—roughly, doubled—with a deductible of more than \$6,000. What are people supposed to do with a deductible of \$6,000 which says you have to pay \$6,000 before your insurance pays a penny? It is essentially no good to most hard-working, middle class families.

So ObamaCare does not equal healthcare that is affordable or better for Americans. It is simply not working.

In fact, in Texas, if you have a gross income of about \$24,000 a year, under ObamaCare, you could end up spending about 30 percent of your total income on healthcare costs alone—30 percent of your gross income on healthcare and related costs.

Fortunately, thanks to the passage of the American Healthcare Act, or the AHCA, which passed the House last week, we have the beginning of a path forward to provide a lifeline to those people who are simply priced out of the market today—the 30 million people who don't have insurance—and those who simply can't use the health coverage they have under ObamaCare.

So I look forward to working with our Senate colleagues—hopefully, all of our Senate colleagues, if they are willing—to help improve the House bill and to get it passed in this Chamber and signed by the President.

This is not something we can do without the support of every Republican Senator, but my hope is that we would do this with the help of more than just Republicans.

Our goal to repeal and replace this bill has been, of course, no secret.

We need legislation that will reform Medicaid. With the American Healthcare Act, we have the first major healthcare entitlement reform in a generation, without eliminating anybody who is currently covered by Medicaid today.

We also need to do away with ObamaCare's job-killing taxes, like the individual and the employer mandate. I

remember, in Tyler, TX, a few years ago, meeting with a single mom who worked in a restaurant who told me that her hours had been cut from 40 hours a week to less than 30 hours a week because her employer didn't want to pay the employer mandate and so basically had to cut people from full-time work back to part-time work. So what did she do? She had to get another job as a single mom, working in a restaurant in Tyler, TX. That is the sort of unintended consequence of ObamaCare.

Then there is the medical device tax—something the Presiding Officer has led on—which is a tax on innovation. This isn't even a tax on income. It is a tax on gross receipts. I have had some medical device companies from my State tell me they have had to move their operations to Costa Rica in order to avoid the medical device tax, which has crippled their ability to innovate and invest in their business. Then there is the tax on investments and the tax on prescription drugs. Middle-income Americans and our job creators need and will get massive tax relief when we repeal and replace ObamaCare.

So that is what 52 Members of the Republican conference are working on and what we would like to work on with our colleagues across the aisle, if they are willing to help. We welcome their ideas. Actually, a bipartisan solution would be preferable to one done strictly along party lines. But all Members of the Republican conference are at the table working on that today. There is no denying that our country can't afford another one-size-fits-all approach to healthcare. The American people need relief from the unworkable, unsustainable system that President Obama promised—or delivered, which is very different from what he promised. I am confident that we can get there by working together to responsibly provide relief and, in doing so, empower individuals to deliver more options and competition and responsibly help those who need care to have more access to it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 37, Jeffrey Rosen

to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, Dan Sullivan, Shelley Moore Capito, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, Orrin G. Hatch, Bill Cassidy, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, John Thune, Jerry Moran, James E. Risch.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 35, Rachel L. Brand to be Associate Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rachel L. Brand, of Iowa, to be Associate Attorney General.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Rachel L. Brand, of Iowa, to be Associate Attorney General.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, Jeff Flake, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, John Barrasso, Chuck Grassley, Mike Rounds, John Kennedy, John Thune, Pat Roberts, James E. Risch, Orrin G. Hatch, Shelley Moore Capito, Lindsey Graham, John Cornyn.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTION

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I am proud that the Senate voted to reject an effort to overturn commonsense protections to reduce methane waste. It was 3 years ago that satellite images from NASA revealed that there is a giant cloud of methane—about the size of the State of Delaware—sitting over the Four Corners region in Northwestern New Mexico and Southwestern Colorado.

Although evidence had shown that there was methane air pollution in the Four Corners as early as 2003, the image of NASA data is truly striking. This is a warning of a potentially major threat to public health for communities in the region.

The San Juan Basin in the Four Corners region has long been a leading producer of oil and natural gas. With the natural gas boom of the mid-2000s, production in the basin grew by leaps and bounds, and that created hundreds of new high-paying jobs and a major new domestic source of an important energy resource.

Unfortunately, amid all this growth, some producers developing natural gas on our public lands and on Tribal lands released harmful air pollution and wasted these publicly owned resources by allowing methane to leak into the air from faulty equipment and pipes, and even by burning off valuable natural gas in the process called flaring.

Following the discovery of the methane hotspot, researchers at NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory joined Caltech and University of Michigan scientists to conduct a detailed study into the cause of the methane cloud. Some producers claimed that the hotspot was caused primarily by natural seeps of gas from underground geologic formations and by gas venting out from an old coal mine in the region.

The NASA researchers, using instrumentation mounted on aircraft that flew close to the ground and throughout 1,200 square miles of airspace in the Four Corners region, identified leaks from natural gas wells as the major methane emitters contributing to the methane air pollution.

As greenhouse gas, methane has over 80 times the global warming potential as carbon dioxide over the short term. We have a moral obligation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to mitigate our contributions to climate change.

Even absent its consequences for climate change, methane leaks waste valuable energy resources, and they harm public health. When methane leaks from oil and gas wells, harmful carcinogens such as benzene leak into the air alongside it.

Because of the air pollution over the Four Corners region, the American Lung Association gave San Juan County in New Mexico an F rating for ozone pollution in 2016. That means children suffer more asthma attacks and seniors have more difficulty breathing.

I want it to be clear that this is not a case of pitting development of our energy resources against human health. We have a golden opportunity to apply innovative, existing technologies to this problem, grow our economy, and improve air quality for the people of the Four Corners region. That is because minimizing the amount of methane that leaks, vents, or flares out of the oil and gas wells isn't just good for air quality, it is good for business and the bottom line.

When oil and gas companies modernize their equipment to reduce leaks, they are able to capture more gas that they can sell, as well as increase worker safety at their wells. When we capture more gas, that also means we see more royalties and revenues for States, Tribes, and local communities. By updating oil and natural gas production equipment and infrastructure to reduce wasted natural gas, we create new jobs for energy workers and manufacturers.

When we reduce wasteful leaks, it means that instead of having a giant methane cloud over the northwest corner of New Mexico and over the Navajo Nation—a major public health hazard—we put our publicly owned natural gas resources to beneficial use. That is the definition of a win-win situation.

I say all this because that is exactly what the Bureau of Land Management's methane waste prevention rule is designed to do. These commonsense and cost-effective protections in the rule were put in place to reduce harmful methane and benzene pollution and to ensure that oil and gas operations are using technological advances that minimize emissions and maximize the amount of natural gas we produce.

Between 2009 and 2015, the BLM estimates that oil and gas producers on

our public and Tribal lands vented, flared, and leaked 462 billion cubic feet of methane. They wasted enough natural gas to supply over 6 million American households for a year. Instead of heating our homes or fueling powerplants, powering buses, that gas was leaked into the atmosphere, wasting millions of dollars of this limited resource.

It is estimated that the oil and gas industry wastes about \$100 million worth of natural gas every year. That also means \$6 million each year of lost State revenue, revenue that pays for schools, roads, and emergency services in New Mexico. That is quite a figure.

A recent report found that New Mexico taxpayers have lost out on over \$42 million of royalty revenues since the year 2009—\$42,728,949 to be exact. The BLM's methane waste prevention rule will help put a stop to this wasted resource.

While developing the rule, the BLM held public meetings, it held Tribal consultations, and it factored in feedback from over 300,000 comments submitted during the public comment period. The agency also coordinated with States like Colorado, Wyoming, and North Dakota that have already created similar protections to reduce methane leaking and flaring at the State level.

The BLM rule will have minimal costs for oil and gas producers, and, in fact, leak detections and repairs required by the rule will help companies make more money selling the gas that they save. Meanwhile, this rule will grow our economy by investing in innovative companies that have developed the technologies to minimize leaks and protect our public health. This rule should not have been controversial.

The overwhelming majority of my constituents in New Mexico support reducing wasted natural gas. A recent poll by Colorado College conducted after the election found that 74 percent of New Mexicans support the BLM's methane waste reduction rule.

I am proud that enough Senators shared that view and voted to reject an attempt to repeal this commonsense protection of public health, air quality, and responsible development of our natural resources. There is nothing conservative about making it easier to waste a precious public energy source.

We should be focused on reducing waste, capturing critical royalties for New Mexico communities, and putting our natural gas resources to beneficial use. This repeal effort of the methane rule would have represented a major step backward.

Today's vote was a major victory for responsible development of our natural gas resources and our Nation's decades-long commitment to protect the air we breathe. On behalf of my constituents and theirs, I want to say a special

thank-you to all 51 Senators who supported our efforts today. Thank you very much.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FIRING OF JAMES COMEY

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss President Trump's decision to fire FBI Director James Comey. During his campaign, then-Candidate Trump regularly talked about how he would be the law and order President. "Law and order" means different things to different people, but all of us should be able to agree that we cannot have law and order without the rule of law.

The rule of law is not a new or even uniquely American idea. It dates back to the Magna Carta of 1215. This document—a pact between King John of England and his barons—established that the Nation's people have certain rights and that even the monarch is subject to the laws of the land. Centuries later, as we cast off the British monarchy, declared our independence, and established our own form of government, our Nation's founders enshrined the rule of law in our Constitution.

Our system of checks and balances was designed to hold all levels of the Federal Government accountable but especially the President. Without the rule of law, law and order becomes merely order imposed by an unaccountable government. We know what order without the rule of law looks like. Last century it looked like the regimes of the Axis Powers. Now it looks like North Korea, Egypt, the Philippines, and, yes, Russia. These are all nations led by strongmen whom our President has praised in some manner, strongmen who hold democratic institutions in contempt and exercise disproportionate control over their nations' military, government institutions, and the media.

While the press here in the United States remains independent, we have a President who has chosen to regularly do battle with what he derides as the "fake news media." He has even called our cherished, constitutionally protected free press "the enemy of the American people."

It is often said that the news is the "first rough draft of history." While the President can attempt to wage war with the news media, none of us can truly fight history. But here in the Senate, we can help shape it. History has its eyes on our Chamber now.

Some of my colleagues across the aisle have said they are "troubled" or "disappointed" by the President's decision to fire Director Comey, but it appears that many are taking a wait-and-see approach. They are taking a wait-and-see approach to Director Comey's firing. They are taking a wait-and-see approach to how the administration replaces him. They are taking a wait-and-see approach to the ongoing investigation into the Trump campaign's potential collusion with Russia. The problem here is that this administration won't let us see anything. The Trump administration is actively working to cover up everything that we, as the independent legislative branch, need to see to get to the bottom of the Trump campaign's potential collusion with Russia.

Director Comey was investigating this potential collusion at the time that he was fired, and it has been reported that Director Comey recently asked Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein for an increase in money and personnel for this very investigation. Within a matter of days, the Deputy Attorney General wrote a memo recommending that President Trump fire Director Comey for actions he took last year. So was Director Comey fired on May 9, 2017, for his actions back in 2016? Are we to believe the President and the Attorney General were carefully weighing the merits of Director Comey's service since the inauguration, or was he fired because he was ramping up his investigation into Russian collusion? Let's not forget that this is the same collusion investigation from which Attorney General Sessions recused himself before recommending to the President that he fire Director Comey.

This is clearly a President who is more than happy to fire people, and he does so in a hasty fashion. Director Comey is not the first public servant to be fired while investigating this administration. In fact, he is in pretty good company. Acting Attorney General Sally Yates was fired while overseeing the collection of intelligence related to meetings between the Russian Ambassador and members of the Trump team. The U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York was fired while investigating HHS Secretary Price's financial investments, in addition to leading a separate investigation into corrupt Russian businessmen and officials. One firing is an incident, two is a coincidence, but three is a pattern.

The past 4 months suggests that our President thinks he can simply tweet and fire his way out of this problem, while continuing to cozy up to the Russians. Earlier today, less than 24 hours after firing Director Comey, President Trump hosted the Russian Ambassador and the Foreign Minister in the Oval Office.

I am deeply concerned that the President is unable or unwilling to grasp

what the underlying problem here actually is. When the President hears Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle discuss the Russian attack on our election and the very foundations of our democracy, he hears sour grapes stemming from people who would have liked the Republican primary or the general election to have ended differently. But let me be very clear: This is not about scoring political points. This is not about winning the news cycle or the back-and-forth on Twitter. This is not the newest iteration of partisan politics.

Now is the time for all of us to put country above party. Throughout our Nation's history, Senators have come together to tackle some of the Nation's most difficult problems. Our Union has survived other challenges, and I am confident we can navigate this together, but we need to know exactly what we are up against. This is about properly diagnosing and curing a possible Russian infection in the White House and inoculating our government and elections for the future. Firing your doctor won't take your illness away, and taking a wait-and-see approach won't do that either.

We need an independent special prosecutor to diagnose potential collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia. We cannot wait for the President to handpick a new FBI Director who will owe his or her nomination for this unexpected job opening to the very people he or she will be charged with investigating.

Our democracy is resilient and our democracy is strong, but if we have a festering foreign infection that is left untreated, our democratic system will certainly weaken. We need a special prosecutor to either identify and address any malfeasance or issue this White House a clean bill of health.

Democracies are built on trust in civic institutions—a trust that has eroded in recent years, and I am deeply concerned that this erosion is accelerating. As Americans and as elected officials, we must come together and restore our constituents' trust in the Federal Government. We cannot just wait and see any longer. Now is the time for an independent special prosecutor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, this is a critical moment in our Nation's history—a moment when partisanship should be set to the side, politics should be put on hold, and every Member of this Chamber should focus on what they can do to ensure the integrity of our justice system and the integrity of our executive branch. Nothing less is at stake, and none of us here should forget that.

For months, the questions surrounding President Trump's campaign's ties to Russia—what happened, who was involved, and why—have gone unanswered. The more information that comes out, the more suspicious it all looks. And the more that President Trump tries to douse the flame by firing the people looking at where the smoke is coming from, the more we are going to keep paying attention, because the bottom line is that there are so many questions—real questions, legitimate questions—that absolutely need to be answered.

Many of us have pushed for these answers. We have called for an independent investigation. We had hoped that President Trump would resist the urge to slow them down or stop them or cover anything up. But the time for the back-and-forth is over. The time for hoping is behind us, and the time for all of us to come together and speak with one voice for truth and against any kind of coverup is now.

What happened yesterday was truly shocking, and this is coming from someone who didn't think that was possible anymore with this President.

But if anyone was wavering before, if anyone wanted to give this administration just a bit more time, I am hoping they have been paying attention to the events of the past 24 hours because it is hard to stay on the fence now.

President Trump's firing the head of the FBI like that—in such a haphazard way—in the middle of an investigation into his own campaigning activities should be the last straw for anyone. So right now it could not be more clear.

It is time for a special prosecutor who can run an independent investigation, far from the reach of President Trump and his administration, to take the case and finally get the answers the American public deserves.

At the same time, our efforts here in Congress—especially the investigation in the Intelligence Committee—have to continue, and they need to continue in an independent and bipartisan way.

As I mentioned before, this isn't about politics. It shouldn't be, anyway. This is about the integrity of our election, of our national security, of our justice system, of our Presidency, of America's standing in the world.

No Member of Congress, no matter what their political affiliation, should stand in the way of a thorough investigation, and neither should the President of the United States.

Mr. Trump may think he can bully his way to a lucrative real estate deal or bully the press or bully his way into the White House; that he can fire anyone, including the Deputy Attorney General, a U.S. attorney, or the FBI Director, if they dare to get in his way or investigate his wrongdoing, but President Trump should not—he cannot—bully his way out of an investigation, especially not when so much is at stake.

More than 100 days into his term, President Trump may have forgotten that he promised to be a voice for millions of people across our country. But I haven't forgotten whom I represent, and I stand here today to lift up the voices of so many people in my home State of Washington who are calling on us to get the answers—people who care about our country, who know we can do better, who hate to see us spiraling toward situations we have not seen since President Nixon.

As of noon today, my office had been flooded with hundreds of calls. The phones are ringing off the hook. On the other end of the line are the people we represent. They are picking up the phone and trying to get through to every one of us in the Senate. They want answers, and they deserve them.

So let's get to the bottom of this, once and for all, for the people we represent and for the integrity of our elections and our very democracy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this is a photograph taken today of our President Donald Trump and Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov. This photograph was taken in the Oval Office today, where President Trump met with Mr. Lavrov. The meeting was closed to the American press. The photo was released by the Kremlin in Moscow.

The second photo is of Mr. Trump and the Russian Ambassador to the United States. His name is Sergey Kislyak. He was also in the Oval Office today to meet with President Trump, and this picture was also released by Moscow and the Kremlin.

Ambassador Kislyak's name is familiar to many Americans now—it is familiar to me—because President Trump's National Security Advisor, Michael Flynn, resigned because of communications he had with Ambassador Kislyak which he tried to keep secret and misrepresented not only to the American people but to the Vice President of the United States.

The warm smiles and hearty handshakes President Trump gave to these Russian officials stand in stark contrast to the way the White House has treated three American Department of Justice officials: Sally Yates, Preet Bharara, and James Comey.

After President Trump was elected President, he asked Ms. Yates to serve as Acting Attorney General, and he asked Mr. Bharara to stay on as U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York and indicated that Mr. Comey could stay on as Director of the FBI. But then it appears that each of these three Justice Department officials were in charge of investigations that started to become a concern in President Trump's White House.

We heard on Monday from Sally Yates how she had informed the White House Counsel's office on January 26 this year that Michael Flynn, the National Security Advisor to the President of the United States, had been compromised and could be blackmailed by the Russians for lies he had told publicly. President Trump kept Michael Flynn on for 18 days after that express warning by the Acting Attorney General to the White House Counsel. He only asked for his resignation hours after the Washington Post reported on General Flynn's false statements about his Russian communications.

The President fired Sally Yates, the Acting Attorney General, on January 30—4 days after she warned the White House about this connection between General Flynn and this Ambassador.

Then there was Preet Bharara, whom the President invited to Trump Tower to tell him he wanted him to stay on as U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York. Mr. Bharara's jurisdiction, of course, included Trump Tower. The President then, in a sudden Friday evening announcement on March 10, fired all the U.S. attorneys, including Mr. Bharara. Mr. Bharara said he was blindsided. Why was he fired? We don't know. But we do know that Mr. Bharara was well known as a dogged and independent prosecutor. News reports indicate that Mr. Bharara was investigating one of President Trump's Cabinet members, HHS Secretary Tom Price, for insider trading.

Yesterday, President Trump fired FBI Director Comey while the Director was in Los Angeles giving a speech to FBI agents. The Director was not told directly of his firing. He thought initially it was a joke.

At the time he was fired, Director Comey had confirmed that the FBI was conducting an investigation into Russia's interference in the 2016 election and possible connections between the Russians and individuals in the Trump campaign and administration. Last night, CNN reported that Federal prosecutors have begun a new phase of this Russian investigation, issuing grand

jury subpoenas to associates of Michael Flynn's, seeking business records.

Director Comey was supposed to testify before the Senate Intelligence Committee later this week.

According to news reports, last week Director Comey went to the Justice Department and requested more money and resources to devote to the Russian investigation.

Sally Yates, Preet Bharara, James Comey—three Justice Department officials who led investigations that appeared to be getting close to the President and his inner circle. All three were then fired by President Trump.

President Trump's firing of Director Comey made history. Not since Watergate, on the evening of October 20, 1973—a Saturday, known affectionately as the Saturday Night Massacre—has a President dismissed the head of an investigation into his own administration. In its 190-year history, only one FBI Director had been fired. FBI Director William Sessions was dismissed for serious ethical violations, and the FBI at that time was not investigating the Clinton administration.

I have had my disagreements with Director Comey, judgments he has made, statements he has made. I am not exactly his greatest fan. But I didn't question his competence when it came to investigating. I never called on him to be fired.

There are so many questions that need to be answered: Why was Director Comey fired now, just as the FBI investigation of the Russian interference of the Presidential campaign seemed to be reaching a critical point?

Today, the White House spokesperson said that the President has been considering firing Director Comey since the day he took office. Did the President or anyone else in the White House ask or direct the Justice Department to recommend the firing of Director Comey? Press reports quote Trump administration aides saying Attorney General Jeff Sessions was charged with coming up with the reasons why the President should fire Comey. President Trump told my colleague Senator FEINSTEIN he had asked the Justice Department to review Comey's performance. And Sarah Huckabee Sanders, Deputy Press Secretary to the President, acknowledged today that the President asked the Justice Department to put the recommendation in writing.

Why was Attorney General Sessions involved in this decision at all? Remember, Attorney General Sessions was forced to recuse himself from the investigation of Russian collusion with the Trump administration because of his close connections with the Trump campaign and communications he himself had with Mr. Kislyak and other Russian officials.

When they made the decision to fire Director Comey, was the White House

aware that Director Comey had reportedly just asked the Justice Department for more resources for an adequate investigation?

Perhaps the most important question of all: When will Republicans in Congress agree to support a special prosecutor and an independent commission to get to the bottom of this Russian collusion in our last Presidential election?

November 8, 2016, is a day that will live in cyber infamy. It was that election in which the Russians set out to change the results. It is the first time we have seen an overt effort by a foreign power to do this, and many on the other side of the aisle have taken a hohum attitude—it is just another example of kids being kids. I don't think so. When one of our major adversaries in the world decides to try to impact the choice of the leader of the free world, the United States should stand up take notice, and fight back. Let's not forget that a week ago there was a hacking attack on another democratic election in France and that all signs point again to Russia as perpetrator.

Russia has acted with impunity since its attack on our election, in part due to the administration's refusal to acknowledge Russia's responsibility for an act of cyber war on America and to respond accordingly and the majority party's refusal to take serious actions here in Congress.

In these pictures, President Trump is shaking hands with Russians, and the Kremlin is gleefully tweeting these pictures around the world. The President kept out the American press, but it turns out the Russians got the photos they needed to send around the world.

The American people need some answers about what is going on here. When will the Republicans join us in a bipartisan effort to have an honest investigation, to follow the facts and follow the evidence wherever it may lead, and to hold those accountable who may have been guilty of collusion with a foreign government trying to impact the outcome of an election?

If we read the memo that has been prepared by Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein giving the reasons for the dismissal of James Comey, it focuses almost exclusively on Comey's treatment of Hillary Clinton in the last Presidential campaign. I am incredulous to think that some 10 months after the fact, the Trump administration took such pity on the treatment of Hillary Clinton, they couldn't wait to fire the Director of the FBI. That is the so-called good reason they are giving us, but there is a real reason. The real reason is that it seems that James Comey was engaged in an investigation into the Russian collusion in the last election; that he was looking at members of the Trump administration—specifically, General Flynn in this circumstance—and he was also looking at

whether any other individuals, involved with the Trump campaign or not, were engaged in this activity. He clearly needs more resources, and he wants to get to the bottom of it, and for that, he was fired last night.

The question obviously is, What happens next? Will the American people sit still for this? Will they accept this kind of effort to close down an investigation that might reach into the President's own White House? If they are willing to step back and let that happen, then we have surrendered an important principle.

In 1973, President Nixon tried to make it clear that he could not be held accountable to the rule of law when it came to the Watergate break-in and coverup. He fired Archibald Cox. Others resigned because of that firing, and the public sentiment across America was so strong against President Nixon for trying to intervene in this legal process that ultimately he paid a heavy price for his conduct.

I don't know whether there is any involvement by President Trump in this collusion. I am not going to assume that. I shouldn't. In fairness, there should be an investigation—a credible investigation—by professionals. But shutting down the investigation by the FBI at this point closes the door to gaining valuable information so that we understand who was involved in this effort to undermine the American Presidential election.

I am not standing here in defense of James Comey as a person. I do stand here in defense of this Director of the FBI who believed, as our intelligence agencies believed, that this was a credible threat to the democracy of the United States and deserves a professional prosecutor's investigation. For that reason, Comey's efforts should continue. But, having dismissed him, let's at least hope that Mr. Rosenstein will stand up for the integrity of the Department of Justice and do two things:

First, give a public assurance that the investigation of Russian collusion in our last Presidential election will continue, and at the time, name a Department of Justice career official who will be in charge of it until a new Director of the FBI is found.

Second, Mr. Rosenstein, as well as Senator Sessions—now Attorney General Sessions—should not be party to choosing a special prosecutor. Let's have career Department professionals choose someone from outside government, without a party label, who has demonstrated the expertise necessary to prosecute such challenging situations as this. Put them in charge, let them investigate, and let the facts lead us to a conclusion.

To try to stop this or short-circuit it by dismissing Mr. Comey is ineffective in terms of serving justice and, sadly, is a sad reflection on American ideals and values.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, as you know, last night President Trump fired FBI Director James Comey. He did this in the middle of an active FBI investigation into possible links between the Trump campaign, Trump associates, and the Russian Government. This action should worry every Member of the Senate. I know it worries the people we represent. My office has been flooded with calls since this decision became public. Americans are asking why this firing happened now, why the firing happened at all—and they are right to ask.

Officially, President Trump said the FBI Director's dismissal was necessary to restore the "public trust and confidence" in the FBI. That is laughable. Anybody who knows Director Comey or knows the FBI knows that statement is completely false. I had my issues with the decisions that Director Comey had made over the past months. I never called for his removal, but I know that he did not have a negative effect on morale at the Justice Department or in the FBI.

I worked for a Deputy Attorney General of the United States. I am so disappointed in the tone of the letter written by this Deputy Attorney General—we learned this afternoon—at the request of the President of the United States. This is not a letter that came up through the chain at DOJ, but a conversation—as the public reports are tonight—that happened at the White House, where the Deputy Attorney General and the President agreed mutually that it was time for Director Comey to go.

The President, apparently, asked the Deputy Attorney General to put it in writing. Then he wrote a letter, the type of which I have never seen come from the Deputy Attorney General's office. I worked on reports that we made with the Office of Professional Responsibility at the Department of Justice. I never saw a report like this before. But what I really find amazing about this decision—and I don't know why the decision was made; I am the first to say that I don't know—is that, having been in the Senate, having worked in the Deputy Attorney General's office at the Department of Justice, that nobody at the White House said to the President: Maybe the best thing to do is not to fire the FBI Director when he is in the middle of an investigation about ties of your campaign to Russia, because maybe that will undermine

Americans' confidence in the rule of law, and maybe that will undermine Americans' confidence in this administration and worry people that the FBI isn't treating this fairly. The idea that not a single member of the administration was successful in making that case to the President is really worrisome to me tonight, and it is one of the reasons why people think the answer to why this firing occurred is simply not credible.

President Trump, unlike some, has repeatedly praised Director Comey over the past months. He said he had guts. He said: "I respect him a lot." Now, overnight, based on a completely nonroutine letter written at the request of the President, he has turned 180 degrees.

The American people deserve an explanation for this unprecedented action. They deserve an explanation tonight. They deserved one this afternoon. They know this isn't how our government is supposed to work. I think the reason why people in Colorado and in other parts of the country, I am sure, are concerned is that this dismissal is not the first action the President has taken that raised concerns about his commitment to the rule of law or his commitment to the independent judiciary or to the freedom of the press under the First Amendment when he doesn't like the scrutiny he or his administration are getting from a free press. He does not have a fundamental appreciation for the basic institutions and traditions of this country.

It is a great irony, I think, at this moment in our politics, that the President represents a radical view of American history and American traditions. It is my hope that this Senate—Republicans and Democrats working together—can express together a conservative view of those traditions, a view that says: We need to preserve the sanctity of the rule of law. We need to preserve and elevate the idea that the judicial branch is an independent judiciary, separate from the legislative branch, separate from the executive branch.

The Founders knew that when they wrote the Constitution. One of their biggest concerns was that somehow the judiciary and the executive branch might reach some sort of unholy alliance that would all of a sudden call the rule of law into question.

I think that is why people are worried. They are worried because they remember this President slandered a judge because of his ethnicity and said that he wouldn't be able to decide a case fairly because of where his parents came from. They remember his attacks on the free press, as well, when he doesn't like their reporting, and his resorting to talking about fake news when he doesn't like the reporting.

I have had to talk with so many high school students and middle school students in Colorado over the last 4 or 5 months about this whole question of fake news and what the importance of edited content is to our society and, again, to our commitment to the rule of law—the importance that middle school students and high school students place on edited content and on curated content; their ability to distinguish between something that is science or something that is real, something that is edited versus somebody shooting their mouth off on the internet.

The President has a hard time making that distinction, as well. He has shown little regard for the traditions and norms that our Founders established when they created this separation of powers.

So I say to my colleagues tonight, the Senate must stand firm and speak with one voice—Democrats and Republicans. We now have a vacancy in the FBI Director, and we need to make sure that whoever that is, whoever replaces James Comey, pledges to continue the ongoing investigation and reinforce the FBI's independence from undue influence from the White House. That needs to be nonnegotiable. In my view, that is the least that must happen.

In order for the American people to learn the full truth, the Deputy Attorney General must immediately appoint an independent special prosecutor to investigate Russian interference in the 2016 election, which, by the way, everybody I know up here believes happened. But the President continues to say: Maybe it was the Chinese; maybe it wasn't the Russians. No intelligence agency in America believes that. No Senator believes that.

The President, who has access to all of that intelligence, is saying: It might not have been the Russians; it might be the Chinese.

We need to know. I am not prejudging the result, but we need to know what these links were, if there were links, between the Trump campaign and the Russian Government. These are serious questions that need answers. I worry a lot about what the President has said about our allies in Europe, what the President has said about NATO, what the President has said about the European Union—none of which serves the national security interests of the United States but is an invitation to the Russians to continue to meddle in elections, not just here but in Western Europe and in Eastern Europe as well. It is hard for me to see how that is in anybody's national security interest, except for the Russians or President Putin.

Our intelligence agencies have been crystal clear to the Members of Congress that the Russian Government tried to influence the 2016 election in

President Trump's favor. The American people deserve to know what the truth is. What is the extent of these relationships? It goes to the core of our security. It goes to the heart of our democracy. That is why preserving this investigation's integrity is so vital.

I can tell you that the American people are not going to relent. I understand there will be some time here when people want to collect their thoughts and gather their thoughts. The American people are not going to relent. They are going to want an independent investigation here. For all Americans and, I would say, most of the time, but certainly at moments like this—this is a moment in the course of our politics when they say to us: Partisanship needs to give way to patriotism. This is one of those moments.

I urge every Member of this body, every Member of Congress, to rise above the pressure of the moment and see this not as just another skirmish in our endless and often pathetic feuding but as a test of the resilience of these institutions and of our Republic, a test of whether we as Congress stand for something more than winning praise from our base in a cable news cycle or in the next election or whether we take seriously our oaths to put our institutions, our security, and our country first.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTION

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I oppose this blatant giveaway to the oil and gas industry at the expense of public health and the environment. We are now at the eleventh hour of expedited consideration of resolutions to overturn Obama-era rules, and the majority is bringing forward this legislation to overturn a Bureau of Land Management rule on methane waste.

The BLM methane rule is a reasonable, achievable way to limit emissions of methane—a particularly potent greenhouse gas—and save taxpayer money. The rule would prevent the oil and gas industry from excessive venting and flaring of methane into the air and ensure that they work more quickly to address methane leaks. As we

have seen in Colorado, which has a similar rule, the technology to meet these requirements exists and is not prohibitively expensive.

The BLM rule is a tremendously effective way to address greenhouse gases. Simply limiting these methane emissions would be the equivalent of taking nearly 1 million cars off the roads. Reducing methane leaks also prevents the leak of volatile organic compounds and other pollutants that contribute to ground-level ozone and damage public health.

By overturning this rule, the Senate would not just have given the oil and gas industry the green light to keep polluting, it would essentially be paying them to do it. Right now, companies don't pay royalties on wasted gas from public lands. If we allow them to continue their inefficient practices, they will avoid more than \$800 million in royalties over the next decade. Because States where operations are located get a large share of the royalties, western States like Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and Montana would lose out on millions of dollars. Oil and gas companies will be taking public resources, wastefully venting them into the atmosphere, and avoiding any cost for that behavior.

Stakeholders like sportsmen, conservationists, tribal leaders, and consumer groups support the methane rule. The only voices asking for its repeal are the oil and gas industry and the Koch brothers. We should stand for our constituents and taxpayers instead.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of

the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-21, concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the United Arab Emirates for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$2.0 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXLEY,

Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-21

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of the United Arab Emirates (UAE).

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment * \$1.0 billion.

Other \$1.0 billion.

Total \$2.0 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Sixty (60) Patriot Advanced Capability 3 (PAC-3) Missiles with canisters.

One hundred (100) Patriot Guidance Enhanced Missile-Tactical (GEM-T) Missiles.

Non-MDE includes:

Also included are canisters, tools and test equipment, support equipment, publications and technical documentation, spare and repair parts, U.S. Government and contractor technical, engineering and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (AE-B-ZUG, Amendment 8).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: AE-B-ZUG.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: May 10, 2017.

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Government of the United Arab Emirates (UAE)—Patriot PAC-3 and GEM-T Missiles

The Government of the United Arab Emirates has requested the possible sale of sixty (60) Patriot Advanced Capability 3 (PAC-3) missiles with canisters and one hundred (100) Patriot Guidance Enhanced Missile-Tactical (GEM-T) missiles. Also included are canisters, tools and test equipment, support equipment, publications and technical documentation, spare and repair parts, U.S. Government and contractor technical, engineering and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated cost is \$2 billion.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the security of an important ally which has been, and continues to be, a force for political stability and economic progress in the Middle East. This sale is consistent with U.S. initiatives to provide key allies in the region with modern systems that will enhance interoperability with U.S. forces and increase security.

The proposed sale will enhance the UAE's capability to meet current and future aircraft and missile threats. The UAE will use the capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen its homeland de-

fense. The UAE has fielded the Patriot system since 2009 and will have no difficulty absorbing these additional missiles into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of these missiles will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor for the PAC-3 Missile is Lockheed-Martin in Dallas, Texas. The prime contractor for the GEM-T missile is Raytheon Company in Andover, Massachusetts. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require additional contractor representatives to the UAE. It is not expected additional U.S. Government personnel will be required in country for an extended period of time. U.S. Army Aviation and Missile Life Cycle Management Command (AMCOM) currently maintains a field office in UAE in support of UAE Patriot systems.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-21

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The Patriot Advanced Capability-3 Missile Segment Enhancement/Configuration-3 Ground Support Equipment (PAC-3 MSE/C-3) Air Defense System. The Patriot Advanced Capability-3/Configuration-3 Ground Support Equipment (PAC-3/C-3) Air Defense System contains classified CONFIDENTIAL hardware components, SECRET tactical software, and critical/sensitive technology. The PAC-3 Missile Four-Pack and Guidance Enhanced Missile (GEM-T) hardware is classified CONFIDENTIAL and the associated launcher hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. The items requested represent significant technological advances for UAE. The PAC-3/C-3 Air Defense System continues to hold a significant technology lead over other surface-to-air missile systems in the world.

2. The PAC-3/C-3 sensitive/critical technology is primarily in the area of design and production know-how and primarily inherent in the design, development and/or manufacturing data related to the following components:

a. Radar Enhancement Phase III (REP-3) Exciter Assemblies

b. Radar Digital Processor

c. Modern Adjunct Processor

d. REP-3 Traveling Wave Tube

e. Classification, Discrimination, and Identification-3 (CDI-3) Digital Signal Processor

f. CDI-3 Analog/Digital Converters

g. Hardware-in-the-Loop and Digital Simulations

h. Surface Acoustic Wave (SAW) Oscillators

i. PAC-3 Missile Guidance Processor Unit

j. PAC-3 Seeker

k. PAC-3 Missile Software

l. PAC-3 MSE Software

m. GEM-T Fuze

n. GEM-T SAW Oscillator

o. Selected areas of the Patriot Ground Equipment software

p. Multiband Radio Frequency Datalink (MRFDL)

3. Information on vulnerability to electronic countermeasures and counter-countermeasures, system performance capabilities and effectiveness, survivability and vulnerability data, PAC-3 and GEM-T Missile

seeker capabilities, non-cooperative target recognition, low observable technologies, select software/software documentation and test data are classified up to and including SECRET.

4. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapons systems effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

5. A determination has been made that the Government of the UAE can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sustainment program is necessary to the furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the policy justification.

6. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of the UAE.

DEFENSE SECURITY

COOPERATION AGENCY,

Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-08, concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of India for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$75 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXLEY,

Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-08

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of India.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment * \$0 million.

Other \$75 million.

Total \$75 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): None.

Non-MDE include:

Thirty-eight thousand thirty-four (38,034) M50 General Purpose Masks.

Joint Service Lightweight Integrated Suit Technology (JSLIST) consisting of: Thirty-eight thousand thirty-four (38,034) Suits, Thirty-eight thousand thirty-four (38,034) Pairs of Trousers, Thirty-eight thousand thirty-four (38,034) Pairs of Gloves, Thirty-eight thousand thirty-four (38,034) Pairs of Boots, Thirty-eight thousand thirty-four (38,034) NBC Bags, Eight hundred fifty-four (854) Aprons, Eight hundred fifty-four (854) Alternative Aprons, Nine thousand five hundred nine (9,509) Quick Doff Hood, One hundred fourteen thousand one hundred two (114,102) M61 Filters.

Also included is training, technical data, U.S. Government technical assistance, staging/consolidation, and transportation line.

(iv) Military Department: Army.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Annex Attached.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: May 10, 2017.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Government of India—CBRN Support Equipment

The Government of India (GoI) has requested a possible sale of 38,034 M50 general purpose masks; Joint Service Lightweight Integrated Suit Technology (JSLIST), which consists of 38,034 each: suits, pairs of trousers, pairs of gloves, pairs of boots and NBC bags; 854 aprons; 854 alternative aprons; 9,509 Quick Doff Hoods; and 114,102 M61 filters. Also included in the potential sale is training; technical data; U.S. Government technical assistance; staging/consolidation; transportation; and other related elements of logistics support. The estimated cost is \$75 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States, by helping to improve the security of a friendly country which has been, and continues to be, an important force for political stability and economic progress in South Asia.

The GoI intends to use these defense articles and services to modernize its armed forces. This will contribute to the Indian military's goal to update its capability while enhancing the relationship between India and the United States. The GoI will have no difficulty absorbing these defense articles into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor involved in this program is Avon Protection Systems, Inc., Cadillac, MI. At this time, there are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-08

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The Joint Service Lightweight Integrated Suit Technology (JSLIST) is a chemical and biological protective garment meant to be worn over the operational uniform of the user. It has an outer shell made up of a 50% nylon and 50% cotton poplin blend material with a water repellant finish. The liner layer consists of a nonwoven front laminated to activated carbon spheres and bonded to a tricot knit back that absorbs chemical agents. When the JSLIST coat and trousers are combined with boots, gloves, and a chemical protective mask, JSLIST provides protection against chemical and biological agents, radioactive fallout particles, and battlefield contaminants. The highest level of information that could be disclosed by the transfer of the JSLIST Suit is UNCLASSIFIED. JSLIST is considered a U.S. military uniform item, and as such, any unit being sold to Foreign Military Sales customers will not utilize an actively used U.S. military camouflage pattern in accordance with the Security Assistance Management Manual (SAMM), Chapter 4, paragraph 4.5.6. and 10 USC §771.

2. The M50 Joint Service General Purpose Mask is the U.S. Armed Forces' field protec-

tive mask. The system used two M61 filters integrated into the air inlet system to protect against nuclear, biological and chemical threats including select toxic industrial chemicals. The highest level of information that could be disclosed by the transfer of the M50 is UNCLASSIFIED.

3. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of India.

NOMINATION OBJECTION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am placing a hold on the nomination of Sigal Mandelker to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence. I will maintain that hold until the Treasury Department provides the Senate Intelligence Committee and Senate Finance Committee information and documents related to Russia and its financial dealings with President Trump and his associates. As announced by Senate Intelligence Committee Vice Chairman WARNER on Tuesday, May 9; the Intelligence Committee has made a request to the Treasury Department's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, FinCEN.

I have stated repeatedly that we must follow the money if we are going to get to the bottom of how Russia has attacked our democracy. That means thoroughly reviewing any information that relates to financial connections between Russia and President Trump and his associates, whether direct or laundered through hidden or illicit transactions.

The office which Ms. Mandelker is nominated to head is responsible for much of this information. The Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence marshals the Treasury Department's intelligence and enforcement functions to combat financial crimes and threats, including money laundering.

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL K. AKAKA

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, today I wish to honor our former colleague, Senator Daniel K. Akaka, for his lifetime of distinguished leadership, service, and contributions to our Nation's veteran and Native Hawaiian communities.

Daniel Kahikina Akaka dedicated his life to serving the people of Hawaii. He served as a Member of the U.S. Senate for 22 years. Prior to that, he served Hawaii's 2nd Congressional District in the United States House of Representatives for 14 years.

However, his story of leadership and service begins well before his tenure on Capitol Hill.

On December 7, 1941, a young Senator Akaka witnessed Japanese fighter planes attacking Pearl Harbor from his dorm room at the Kamehameha Schools. The events of that morning were life-altering for him and many young men his age, and he joined the war effort.

Following his service in World War II with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Senator Akaka earned a bachelor's degree from the University of Hawaii. He later attained a master's degree as well. As he has relayed in the past, had it not been for the benefits received under the G.I. Bill, Senator Akaka's future in public service would not have been more than a dream.

A believer in the power of education, Senator Akaka made it a career. Before entering politics, he served as a teacher, principal, and educational administrator, making a difference in the lives of many students for over 15 years.

As a veteran himself, Senator Akaka dedicated his service in Congress to helping servicemembers, veterans, and their families. His commitment to these issues led to his service as chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs from 2007 to 2011. As chairman, he worked to expand VA services. He also authored and passed the Post-9/11 G.I. Bill, which is making a difference to new generations of veterans as the original G.I. Bill did for his generation.

Not only was Senator Akaka a champion for education and veterans, he was also a champion for Native Hawaiians. He is the first person of Native Hawaiian ancestry to serve in the U.S. Senate, and he grew up in an era where the Hawaiian language and culture were heavily looked down upon. To help change this perception, he committed to protecting the language, culture, and traditions of indigenous peoples.

Senator Akaka advanced these priorities as chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs from 2011 to 2013. He also played a key role in ensuring the passage of legislation that enhanced Native Hawaiian education programs and authored a joint resolution that acknowledged the U.S. Government's role in the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii in 1893, while recognizing the special trust relationship held with the Native Hawaiian community.

He also fought tirelessly for self-determination for Native Hawaiians.

During his time in Washington, DC, he served the people of Hawaii well and with distinction. Although he retired in 2012, Senator Akaka has continued down a path of leadership and service, speaking to students and mentoring some of Hawaii's up-and-coming leaders. We all appreciate his continued service.

Mahalo nui loa, my dear friend, for being a true champion of aloha.

HONORING CORPORAL GEORGE A. PERREAULT, JR.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I want to recognize George Albert Perreault, Jr., a Korean war veteran whose remains are being brought home to

Vermont, 66 years after he was declared missing in action. CPL Perreault enlisted in the U.S. Army after graduating from Burlington High School, and he served bravely in the Korean war. CPL Perreault was assigned to Headquarters Battery, 15th Field Artillery Battalion, 2nd Infantry Division, which was supporting a regiment of the Republic of Korea Army in the area known as the Central Corridor in South Korea. Tragically, CPL Perreault went missing in 1951, after the Chinese People's Volunteer Forces launched a massive attack against the regiment at Changbong-ni. He was declared killed in action in 1954.

CPL Perreault's family, including his sisters and their husbands, Pauline and Jim O'Brien and Lorraine and Edward Winkowski, devotedly preserved his memory over the years. Pauline and Jim also joined families of other missing servicemembers at Department of Defense meetings to discuss efforts to recover the remains of their loved ones.

Last December, the POW/MIA Accounting Agency at the Defense Department identified CPL Perreault's remains using family DNA and anthropological analysis.

While sisters Pauline and Lorraine and their spouses are now deceased, Pauline and Jim's children will be present to welcome their uncle home, including Karen O'Brien, James O'Brien, Jr., Patricia O'Brien, Mary Kay Wyand and her husband Daniel, John O'Brien and his wife Kathy, Anne Booska and her husband Joseph, Daniel O'Brien and his wife Angela, and Sheila O'Brien, as well as CPL Perreault's 18 great-nieces and great-nephews, and 23 great-great-nieces and great-great-nephews.

I have long believed that we have a responsibility to families like CPL Perreault's to account for those missing in action from all conflicts. I commend the POW/MIA Accounting Agency for their tireless efforts to locate and identify the remains of CPL Perreault, more than six decades after he first went missing.

I also want to thank the U.S. Army, the Vermont Army National Guard, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars for their assistance in returning CPL Perreault's remains to his family. Lastly, I also want to thank the staff at Delta Airlines and Burlington International Airport who made it possible for CPL Perreault's remains to be flown home to Vermont, where they will be received with full military honors, surrounded by his family.

At long last, George Albert Perreault, Jr., will be laid to rest in Vermont on Saturday, May 13, next to his parents, George and Yvonne Perreault.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME-BUILDERS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, as a realtor and the former owner of a real estate company, it is my great pleasure today to congratulate the National Association of Home Builders on its 75th anniversary.

The National Association of Home Builders was established in 1942 to represent the interests of the Nation's homebuilding industry and to help create a business environment that facilitates homebuilding, enables more Americans to achieve homeownership, and provides for ample rental housing for all income levels. The National Association of Home Builders' membership includes not just builders, but professionals in a broad range of fields who are part of the homebuilding industry, including those who remodel, update, and help maintain existing homes.

For many years, the goal set forth in the Housing Act of 1949 of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family" has been a guiding principle for America's homebuilders, and they have made great strides in achieving that goal.

Since 1942, the total number of housing units in the United States has more than tripled, increasing from about 35 million to almost 136 million. Also the Nation's homeownership rate has increased from about 44 percent to almost 64 percent. Moreover, the Nation's standard of living has increased significantly thanks to the efforts of the National Association of Home Builders' members, who build about 80 percent of the new homes constructed in the United States each year.

The members of the National Association of Home Builders have served as a driving force behind the significant advances in the quality of the nation's housing and the resulting improvement in quality of life for Americans. America's homebuilders play important roles in the fabric of their communities, and they are essential to the Nation's economic health. Homebuilding accounts for about 16 percent of the total U.S. economy.

I congratulate the National Association of Home Builders and its members on the organization's 75th anniversary and encourage my colleagues in the Senate to reflect on the crucial role the homebuilding industry has played over the last 75 years in our Nation's economy and the lives of our people.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING DON DUNWELL

• Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to remember the life of Don Dunwell—journalist, husband, father, and community leader.

Don was known for his thoughtful interview style, creative storytelling, and ability to connect with the thousands of viewers who entrusted him to deliver the news.

It was common to find Don teaching and mentoring young reporters about the ins and outs of journalism.

He believed fiercely in the free press and the strong ethics that were required to be a trusted source of information.

He never took his platform for granted and used it to make Montana and this Nation a better place.

Outside the newsroom, he was a proud father to John, working hard each day to ensure that his son had every opportunity possible.

Don was immensely proud of his wife, Mary Ann, who charted her own path as a public servant.

Today we remember the life and legacy of Mr. Dunwell and aim to follow in his ever fervent footsteps.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-1535. A communication from the Director, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities (HSACU)" (RIN0524-AA39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1536. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Stephen R. Lanza, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1537. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1538. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, with respect to Sudan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1539. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Reserve Bank Capital Stock" (RIN7100-AE68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1540. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Reserve Bank Capital Stock" (RIN7100-AE47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1541. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical Amendments to Form ADV and Form ADV-W" (17 CFR Part 279) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1542. A communication from the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of the Comptroller's 2016 Annual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1543. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation as an emergency requirement all funding (including the rescission of funds) so designated by the Congress in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017, pursuant to section 251 (b) (2) (A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, for the enclosed list of accounts; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-1544. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism all funding (including the rescission of funds) and contributions from foreign governments so designated by the Congress in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017, pursuant to section 251 (b) (2) (A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, for the enclosed list of accounts; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-1545. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Clean Air Act Requirements for Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance, Nonattainment New Source Review and Emission Statements" (FRL No. 9960-15-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1546. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determinations of Attainment by the Attainment Date, Determinations of Failure to Attain by the Attainment Date and Reclassification for Certain Nonattainment Areas for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate

Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9962-25-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1547. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Delegation of New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the States of Arizona and Nevada" (FRL No. 9961-79-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1548. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to Emissions Banking and Trading Programs and Compliance Flexibility" (FRL No. 9960-22-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1549. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oklahoma; Revisions to Minor New Source Review Permitting Program" (FRL No. 9960-67-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1550. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alaska; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide and 2010 Sulfur Dioxide Standards" (FRL No. 9961-93-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1551. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2012 Fine Particulate Standard" (FRL No. 9961-87-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1552. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Removal of Stage II Gasoline Vapor Recovery Requirements for Gasoline Dispensing Facilities" (FRL No. 9961-86-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1553. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Revisions and Amendments to Regulations for Continuous Opacity Monitoring, Continuous Emissions Monitoring, and Quality Assurance Requirements for Continuous Opacity Monitors; Correction" (FRL No. 9961-38-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1554. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Quality Plans; Tennessee; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2012 PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9961-89-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1555. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; North Carolina Repeal of Transportation Facilities Rules" (FRL No. 9961-74-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1556. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; NH; Nonattainment New Source Review and Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permit Program Revisions; Public Hearing Revisions for State Permitting Programs; Withdrawal of Permit Fee Program; Infrastructure Provisions for National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9962-01-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1557. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Commissioner's Order for SABIC Innovative Plastics" (FRL No. 9962-11-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1558. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Commissioner's Order for Carmeuse Lime, Inc." (FRL No. 9962-09-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1559. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; ID, Updates to Incorporations by Reference" (FRL No. 9960-43-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1560. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Georgia: Heavy Duty Diesel Requirements" (FRL No. 9961-44-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1561. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indirect Food Additives: Polymers" (Docket No. FDA-2016-F-1805) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1562. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and a Management Report for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1563. A communication from the Executive Director, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Seventy-Fifth Financial Statement for the period of October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1564. A communication from the Executive Director, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Seventy-Sixth Financial Statement for the period of October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1565. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Control of Ergocristine, a Chemical Precursor Used in the Illicit Manufacture of Lysergic Acid Diethylamide, as a List I Chemical" ((RIN1117-AB24) (Docket No. DEA-320F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1566. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Restricted Areas R-4102A and R-4102B; Fort Devens, MA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0307)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1567. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment, Modification and Revocation of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Western United States" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9264)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1568. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establish-

ment of Restricted Area R-2507W; Chocolate Mountains, CA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-2193)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1569. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Materials: Revision of Maximum and Minimum Civil Penalties" (RIN2137-AF23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1570. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pipeline Safety: Inflation Adjustment of Maximum Civil Penalties" (RIN2137-AF16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 385. A bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-60).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HASSAN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1081. A bill to establish an Employee Ownership and Participation Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. LEAHY, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1082. A bill to provide for the establishment of the United States Employee Ownership Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

S. 1083. A bill to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1084. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require that the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ensure that each chief executive officer of a Federal penal or correctional institution provides a secure storage area located outside of the secure perimeter of the Federal penal or correctional institution for firearms carried by certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1085. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide enhanced penalties for convicted murderers who kill or target America's public safety officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1086. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on eligibility for TRICARE Reserve Select of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

S. 1087. A bill to ensure America's law enforcement officers have access to lifesaving equipment needed to defend themselves and civilians from attacks by terrorists and violent criminals; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1088. A bill to require the collection of voluntary feedback on services provided by agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1089. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to review and update a report on the energy and environmental benefits of the refining of used lubricating oil; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. RISCH, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1090. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to facilitate water leasing and water transfers to promote conservation and efficiency; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1091. A bill to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1092. A bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 1093. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve pediatric medical device application procedures; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. NELSON, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 161. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that defense laboratories are on the cutting-edge of scientific and technological advancement, and supporting the designation of May 18, 2017, as "Department of Defense Laboratory Day"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 139

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 139, a bill to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency may not regulate vehicles used solely for competition, and for other purposes.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 378

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 378, a bill to amend titles 5 and 28, United States Code, to require the maintenance of databases on awards of fees and other expenses to prevailing parties in certain administrative proceedings and court cases to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 407, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 423, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 428

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cospon-

sor of S. 428, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to authorize States to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through enhanced pediatric health homes, and for other purposes.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 431, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand the use of telehealth for individuals with stroke.

S. 459

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 459, a bill to designate the area between the intersections of Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest and Davis Street, Northwest and Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest and Edmunds Street, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as "Boris Nemtsov Plaza", and for other purposes.

S. 509

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 509, a bill to improve the control and management of invasive species that threaten and harm Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

S. 563

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 563, a bill to amend the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 to require that certain buildings and personal property be covered by flood insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 573

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 573, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 583

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 583, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 670

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 670, a bill to provide for the regulation of over-the-counter hearing aids.

S. 704

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 704, a bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces performing services in the Sinai Peninsula of Egypt shall be entitled to tax benefits in the same manner as if such services were performed in a combat zone.

S. 721

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 721, a bill to require the disclosure of certain visitor access records.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 772, a bill to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants.

S. 808

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 808, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

S. 939

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 939, a bill to reserve any amounts forfeited to the United States Government as a result of the criminal prosecution of Joaquin Archivaldo Guzman Loera (commonly known as "El Chapo"), or of other felony convictions involving the transportation of controlled substances into the United States, for security measures along the Southern border, including the completion of a border wall.

S. 954

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 954, a bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes.

S. 980

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to

provide for payments for certain rural health clinic and Federally qualified health center services furnished to hospice patients under the Medicare program.

S. 1018

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1018, a bill to provide humanitarian assistance for the Venezuelan people, to defend democratic governance and combat widespread public corruption in Venezuela, and for other purposes.

S. 1034

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1034, a bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 12

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 12, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that those who served in the bays, harbors, and territorial seas of the Republic of Vietnam during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and ending on May 7, 1975, should be presumed to have served in the Republic of Vietnam for all purposes under the Agent Orange Act of 1991.

S. RES. 109

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 109, a resolution encouraging the Government of Pakistan to release Aasiya Nooreen, internationally known as Asia Bibi, and reform its religiously intolerant laws regarding blasphemy.

S. RES. 155

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 155, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should work in cooperation with the international community and continue to exercise global leadership to address the causes and effects of climate change, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 161—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT DEFENSE LABORATORIES ARE ON THE CUTTING-EDGE OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENT, AND SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 18, 2017, AS “DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LABORATORY DAY”

Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. NELSON, Ms.

WARREN, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 161

Whereas the national network of laboratories and engineering centers that are owned by the United States Armed Forces and funded by the Federal Government and research and development centers that are owned by the United States Armed Forces and funded by the Department of Defense (referred to in this preamble as the “defense laboratories”) should be commended for the unique role that network has had in countless innovations and advances in the areas of defense and national security;

Whereas technological progress is responsible for up to 50 percent of the growth of the United States economy and is the principal driving force behind long-term economic growth and increases in the standard of living in the United States;

Whereas research and development supported by the Department of Defense has led to new products and processes for state-of-the-art Armed Forces weapons and technology;

Whereas defense laboratories frequently partner with State and local governments and regional organizations to transfer technology to the private sector;

Whereas defense laboratories have earned prestigious national and international awards for research and technology transfer efforts and lead the way in cutting-edge science and technology;

Whereas the innovations that are produced at defense laboratories fuel economic growth by creating new industries, companies, and jobs;

Whereas, since the global leadership and national security of the United States is dependent on innovation and new industries, the work of the national network of defense laboratories is essential to the continued prosperity of the United States; and

Whereas May 18, 2017, is an appropriate day to designate as “Department of Defense Laboratory Day”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of the “Department of Defense Laboratory Day” in celebration of all of the work and accomplishments of the national network of laboratories and engineering centers that are owned by the United States Armed Forces and funded by the Federal Government and research and development centers that are owned by the United States Armed Forces and funded by the Department of Defense (referred to in this resolution as the “defense laboratories”);

(2) recognizes that a key to maintaining United States Armed Forces superiority, innovation, and competitiveness in a global economy is to continue to support federally sponsored research and development;

(3) acknowledges that the knowledge base, technologies, and techniques generated in the national network of defense laboratories serve as a foundation for additional efforts relating to the Armed Forces in the defense industrial base;

(4) commits to find ways to increase investment in the national network of defense laboratories in order to increase support of federally sponsored research and development critical to the national security interests of the United States;

(5) encourages defense laboratories, Federal agencies, and Congress to hold an outreach event on May 18, 2017, “Department of

Defense Laboratory Day”, to make the public more aware of the work of the national network of defense laboratories; and

(6) recognizes the outstanding dedication, qualifications, service, and accomplishments of the scientists, technicians, and support staff of the defense laboratories.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 11, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, May 11; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Lighthizer nomination, with the time until the cloture vote equally divided in the usual form.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator WHITEHOUSE and Senator TILLIS.

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

The Senator from North Carolina.

ALZHEIMER’S DISEASE

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the new FDA Commissioner, or, more specifically, the role that the agency must play in tackling one of the biggest health crises of our day, one that I have personal experience with. Unless we act decisively, this crisis will only grow in terms of the staggering human and economic costs in the future.

That crisis is the Alzheimer’s epidemic in this Nation. The reason I am talking about Alzheimer’s is it is truly a terrible condition that affects patients, their families, and communities across the Nation. I learned firsthand about Alzheimer’s disease when my mother was robbed of many of her Golden Years at a relatively early age, in her seventies.

Currently, more than 5 million Americans are living with Alzheimer’s, including an estimated 160,000 in my own State of North Carolina. Estimates project the number of Alzheimer’s patients to grow to 16 million by 2050, with an annual cost of more than \$1 trillion to the healthcare system.

Alzheimer’s disease is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States.

It is a current and growing problem. It is the only top 10 disease for causes of death that cannot be prevented. It can't be cured. We can't even slow the pace of the disease. Simply put, we need a war on Alzheimer's disease like we have on cancer.

As a country, we must take the fight to this awful disease. This should be one of our highest priorities, to support the discovery and development of new medicines for the millions of patients who currently have Alzheimer's and the millions more who may develop it in the future. We need medicines to slow the progression of the disease. We need medicines to reverse its affects. We need medicines to cure Alzheimer's disease. One day, we need medicines to prevent it in the first place.

That is where the FDA comes in. The new Commissioner must make Alzheimer's an urgent priority. Obviously, the science of developing new medicines and technologies is complicated under any circumstances. Those challenges are only compounded by the fact that we still do not fully understand the disease, its causes, or how to stop it, but the FDA does hard things and they often do them very well.

The new Commissioner must ask tough questions of the agency: Are they doing everything they possibly can to encourage the development of safe and effective new drugs for Alzheimer's? Are they using all the tools at their disposal and using them flexibly to advance this goal? Do they have the right policies to be facilitators of and not barriers to important efforts to innovate in this space?

I recently visited with Dr. Gottlieb in my office and was pleased to hear the battle against Alzheimer's is a mission-critical item for him. I assume that pervades the FDA. I want to be clear. I do not know the answers to the questions related to FDA's specific regulatory policies related to Alzheimer's.

I think those determinations are best left to scientific and medical experts, but I know the status quo, the current standard of care, and the set of FDA-approved treatment options is not enough for patients or our Nation. Inaction is not acceptable. America is at its finest when we come together to do big things. Now is the time to commit to stopping the suffering and death from Alzheimer's.

The FDA cannot do this alone. This is an all-hands-on-deck kind of battle, but FDA will play a critical role in tackling this vital public health priority. I was pleased to vote for Dr. Gottlieb's confirmation yesterday. I look forward to working with him to ensure that we are doing everything we can to defeat Alzheimer's. For those of us who have been and will continue to be Alzheimer's caretakers, I hope we will see a cure in our lifetime. Those who are afflicted by the disease deserve it. It is a fiscal crisis we can avert.

With the right focus by the FDA and this Congress, I am absolutely convinced this is a disease we can take the war to and win the war in our lifetime in the near future.

I encourage the FDA and all of my Members to stand in battling this terrible disease so we can end it once and for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it is perhaps a providential happenstance that I should be giving this particular speech while the Senator from Louisiana is presiding because we are both from coastal States. I am sure he will find things that are familiar in my Rhode Island remarks, particularly given that his Governor has declared the Louisiana coast a state of emergency due to sea level rise.

As the Presiding Officer knows, one place where the effects of climate change are most evident is in our oceans and along our coasts. Rhode Island is the Ocean State, and we have almost 400 miles of beautiful coastline. Everyone in Rhode Island lives less than a half hour from the shore. We count on a healthy ocean and vibrant coast. Our ocean economy, including fishing, tourism, and shipbuilding, amounts to nearly \$2.5 billion every year—perhaps not what Louisiana's coastal economy is but pretty good for our small State.

It employs over 42,000 Rhode Islanders. Warming, acidifying, and rising oceans are a clear and present danger to many aspects of our Rhode Island way of life. Sea level rise now threatens to remake our Rhode Island coast, swallowing low-lying land, widening existing inlets, eroding beaches, and stranding higher shorefronts as new islands.

For my 166th "Time to Wake Up" speech, I want to show the Senate what this new island chain, the new Rhode Island Archipelago, would look like. The latest modeling software allows us to visualize these projected changes, and the latest science shows that they may be coming sooner than we thought. How soon and how much? Well, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration released a new report in January updating global sea level rise estimates based on the latest peer-reviewed scientific literature.

Ice sheets, it turns out, and glaciers, are melting faster than expected, raising the so-called extreme scenario for average global sea level rise in this century, the "we do nothing on climate change scenario," by around 20 inches.

When NOAA and its partners applied these findings to America's coasts, taking into account things like regional variations in ocean circulation, in

gravitational pull, and in landside conditions like erosion, settling, and depletion of groundwater, the news was particularly harsh for the northeast Atlantic coast—from Virginia through Maine, including Rhode Island.

Our Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council is now telling us that for planning purposes we need to face the possibility of 9 to 12 vertical feet of sea level rise along our shores by the end of the century. A little girl born today at Rhode Island's Women and Infants Hospital will likely actuarially live to see all of these changes. That invasion of our shores by the rising oceans will leave Rhode Island's map unrecognizable.

Early explorers to Rhode Island found our coastline looking much like it does today. Before the 1600s, it had looked much the same for many centuries before that to the Narragansetts and the Wampanoags who lived here. In the 19th century, the Industrial Revolution, which began in America in Rhode Island, brought our Nation great wealth, but it also created manmade pollution which began changing our climate.

Climate change causes sea levels to rise. As oceans warm, they expand. As the world warms, ice sheets melt and pour water into the oceans. We measure these things happening. This is not a guess or a projection.

Rhode Island's Coastal Resources Management Council has developed STORMTOOLS, which is an online simulation that models sea level rise and storm surge so we can see ahead what is coming at us. Once again, science gives us the headlights to look forward and see what is coming at us. This is what Rhode Island can expect.

Here is the high water scenario. This is the upper part of Narragansett Bay in Rhode Island, including Providence, up here, Warwick, and Warwick Neck and Greenwich Bay over here to the west. Bristol and Warren here, with Mount Hope Bay to the east.

This graphic shows the same image overlaying that previous scenario with the scenario that Rhode Island's CRMC now predicts for our State. This bright blue color depicted is land that gets covered up with 10 feet of sea level rise, and this teal color is what we get when the sea level rise hits 12 feet. Over here, Bristol gets two new islands, and Bristol and Warren become an island themselves.

If you cross over the bay to Warwick Neck, which is now part of our new coastline, that becomes a new island, Warwick Neck Island. Much of Barrington, which is a well-developed and prosperous bedroom community, just disappears under the water. As I said, Warren and Bristol become their own island.

Now we move down the bay to historic Newport, RI, and the historic waterfront area completely floods, the

historic Point section here floods, down here the western part of Newport becomes a new island. Again, all of this is now land that we lose to rising seas.

Not only does Western Newport become Western Newport Island, but it gains its own Castle Hill Island off to the side of it. Up here, the existing Goat Island virtually disappears.

This story is repeated all along Rhode Island's coast. The tip of Little Compton breaks off to become its own tiny little archipelago of new islands. This is Tiverton, which is just north of Little Compton. On the other side, here, is the shore of Portsmouth on Aquidneck Island. What you see is that the sea level rise turns Nonquit Pond into ocean and makes an island of this section of Tiverton here near Fogland Point, another new island.

Here we see the point on the other side of the opening into Narragansett Bay from Little Compton. You have Little Compton here, Aquidneck Island comes down in the middle, and on the other side you have Point Judith. Point Judith also begins to break up into little islands.

If you go up here, Galilee is our fishing port. It is where most of the fishing trawlers have their home port and the entrance runs right up here into the protected harbor area. As you can see, Galilee is now pretty much underwater.

So for folks who like to go to Champlin's Seafood, you will probably have to row there, and it might not even be there. For those who like Aunt Carrie's better, it is here, and it is not in great shape for surviving storms.

So we can go offshore to Block Island, which has been designated by The Nature Conservancy as one of the world's last 10 great places. Well, it is no longer one of the world's last 10 great places, it is now two of the world's last—I guess it would have to be 11 great places because it breaks into two separate islands. Block Island becomes Block Islands.

The beautiful town of Jamestown, which is its own island between Aquidneck Island and our mainland shore, breaks up into three separate islands. It is now one. Jamestown goes up a little bit further, that part stays intact, but the upper part breaks away from downtown Jamestown, here, and the Beaver Tail area breaks off into, I guess it would become Beaver Tail Island.

Now let's go up to our capital city. We started with the first map showing Providence. This series of images will show what happens to Providence as sea levels rise. Just to orient people who are seeing this, this is the Providence River coming in. This is the Woonasquatucket River. This is the circle at Waterplace Park and the Woonasquatucket River goes out over the Providence Place Mall, and it goes on from there.

This is Providence's downtown business district. That is 3 feet of sea level rise—not much change. Now you get to 7 feet of sea level rise, and you see the encroachment of the ocean into our business center. Seven feet used to be our worst-case scenario, but as the evidence comes in and we are seeing things happening faster and the sea level rise occurring greater than had been expected, we have been raising our expectations.

So here is the new worst-case scenario—10 feet of sea level rise. As you can see, the business section of downtown Providence is entirely overwhelmed. Twelve feet of sea level rise is a natural consequence once you get to 10 feet of sea level rise because if you have 10 feet of sea level rise, then what you get is a regular and recurring, what people call astronomic tides or king tides, when celestial bodies line up so you have a higher than usual tide. For sure people from Florida know about it because those are the days when the street in front of their house on a sunny day is filled with saltwater because the tide has washed in over it. If you go at king high tide time along the Boston wharf, you see parking areas and walking areas already flooded. So it is not unreasonable to look at 12 feet of sea level rise if you are expecting a baseline, what they call bathtub level of 10 feet.

As you can see, downtown Providence, our business district is more or less completely inundated. So this is Climate Central. Climate Central has allowed us to get these images of what downtown Providence looks like up close, with various levels of sea level rise, and this is something they run off of Google Earth. This, again, is downtown Providence.

This is Providence City Hall. This is Kennedy Plaza, you will be pleased to know, Senator. It is named after another John Kennedy because he gave his last speech in his campaign for President before he went home to take in the election results and find out that he had been elected—his last speech was right here to a huge crowd that had come out to see him in downtown Providence.

This is our famous Biltmore Hotel. This used to be the train station. Now the offices of the Rhode Island Foundation are there. As you can see, most of these historic buildings are up to their second floor. If you look at old pictures from the hurricane in 1954 and the hurricane in 1938, you see buildings where the water got that high, but that was at a peak of a hurricane surge. This becomes the baseline. This is what it looks like every day.

Here is a closeup of Providence City Hall. Instead of coming along the sidewalk and walking up the steps, you would have to come over in one of our gondolas in order to get in the front entrance, and the first floor of City Hall is lost.

If you look at all of this, it represents a loss of billions of dollars in property value to Rhode Islanders.

Let me grab the original. All of these areas are occupied right now—people's homes, people's businesses are there, and if they disappear below rising seas, all that value is lost. It is actually worse than that because if this is the new coastline, then behind that coastline is going to be a new set of flood zones and a new set of velocity zones. For those who are not familiar with what a velocity zone is, that is the part of the flood zone in which it is deep enough and exposed enough that you actually get wave action against structures. So you get the physical force of waves damaging structures rather than just tides rising. Between the V-zones and flood zones, there is a much larger area in which structures become uninsurable, they become unmortgageable, and as a result they become unsellable. So the economic harm from this potential sea level rise inundation of Rhode Island is virtually incalculable, and we are not the only ones who are looking at this.

Looking ahead at this coastal threat also is the massive government-backed home loan mortgage corporation Freddie Mac. Freddie Mac has predicted "the economic losses and social disruption may happen gradually, but they are likely to be greater in total than those experienced in the housing crisis and Great Recession."

Think about that. Think about the economic damage that this country sustained and the pain the families experienced after the 2008 Wall Street meltdown in that housing crisis, the great recession. Here is Freddie Mac saying this problem is going to be greater in total than the harm from the housing crisis and great recession. Some people would say you can't trust the government about this stuff. You have to trust the private sector. The government doesn't know what it is talking about.

Here is a quote from a recent article in the trade publication Risk & Insurance, an insurance trade publication. The editor of that publication wrote that this was what he called "a growing and alarming threat." He went on to say: "Continually rising seas will damage coastal residential and commercial property values to the point that property owners will flee those markets in droves, thus precipitating a mortgage value collapse that could equal or exceed the mortgage crisis that rocked the global economy in 2008."

For anybody who wonders why I come and give these speeches every week, for anybody who wonders why I am up to No. 166, it is about seeing the coastline of my home State of Rhode Island being whittled away into this chain of islands—this new Rhode Island archipelago. If this were your State, you would be up here too.

We have a responsibility here in Congress to all Americans to face up to what is happening. This is not just a Rhode Island circumstance. It is going to be Louisiana. It is going to be North and South Carolina. It is going to be Massachusetts and Maine and California. It is going to be the gulf coast. We are all going to have to face up to this and help communities prepare.

The carbon dioxide that we have already pumped into the atmosphere will make some of this sea level rise inevitable. It is baked in now, and we just have to wait for it to happen. We can still avoid these worst case scenarios if we act promptly and if we will, for one minute, say to the fossil fuel industry: You have had enough. You have fed enough at this trough. You have silenced Congress enough. Your power and your greed will no longer prevail here. We are going to solve this problem for the people of our States.

We can still do that, but we do have to act promptly.

With regard to the stuff that we cannot avoid, we also have an obligation to help our coastal communities prepare for this, to make this transition. All of these islands are going to need bridges to get to them where there are now roads. Where things are falling into the ocean and you can shore them up and protect them with hard protection, you need to do that. Where not, you need to go back and adjust zoning and planning so that nature can defend herself a little bit better through dunes and through marshes and so forth. There is a lot of work we need to do with this coming at us.

This is not funny. Nature will not wait for our politics to sort themselves out. The laws of physics, the laws of chemistry, the laws of biology do not give a hoot about the laws in the Senate. They are going to do their thing, and we need to get ahead of them. When this happens, that big, old fossil fuel industry, with all of its lies and its long, dishonorable campaign of calculated disinformation and phony front groups—so that you do not see its hands—and deliberate political mischief to prevent us from acting, is not going to be around to help us. It will be no help when this flooding comes, so it is up to us. That is why we have to wake up.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:13 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 11, 2017, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

J. CHRISTOPHER GIANCARLO, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION, VICE TIMOTHY G. MASSAD, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ADAM J. SULLIVAN, OF IOWA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, VICE DANA G. GRESHAM.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

ROBERT L. SUMWALT III, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2021. (RE-APPOINTMENT)

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEIL CHATTERJEE, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2021, VICE ANTHONY T. CLARK, RESIGNED.

ROBERT F. POWELSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2020, VICE PHILIP D. MOELLER, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

ANDREW K. MALONEY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE ANNE ELIZABETH WALL.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MARK ANDREW GREEN, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE GAYLE SMITH.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JAY PATRICK MURRAY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

JAY PATRICK MURRAY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE UNITED NATIONS.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

JOHANNA K. REAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

PAUL R. AGUIRRE
MICHAEL D. ARNOLD, JR.
NICHOLAS BRIAN BABIAK
JERRY B. BANCROFT, JR.
DAVID GEORGE BERUBE
JAMES KEVIN BLANTON
JOHN JOSEPH CAMPO
EDWARD D. CASEY
MARK K. CASEY
TIMOTHY MARK CATHEY
ROBIN LEEANN CELATKA
PATRICIA N. CHAVEZ
PETER S. CHIOU
CHAD S. CHRISTMAN
MICHAEL S. CLAY
JOHN A. CONLEY
SEAN FREDERICK CONROY
LISA M. CUNNINGHAM
JULIE PETRINA CURLIN
WILLIAM RAY CUSICK
JOSEPH M. DICKENS
JASON DEREK DICKINSON
ROBERT EDWIN DONALDSON
JUSTIN H. DUNCAN
CHARLES ALAN DURFEE
JUNE A. DYKSTRA
PAUL WILLIAM FEICHTINGER
CRISSIE DAWN FITZGERALD
PAMELA LEE FONTI
FREDERICK R. T. FOOTE
DANIEL R. FOWLER
PAUL EDWARD FRANZ
MATTHEW JOHNSON FRENCH
TREVOR JOHN FULMER
SUSAN ELAINE GARRETT
JOHN C. GIBBS
JAMES D. GLOSS
REBECCA A. GRAY
CHRISTOPHER L. GREEN
STEPHEN R. GWINN
RAED D. GYEKIS
MELISSA L. HAGEN
DARREN E. HAMILTON
FRANK A. HARROLD III
GILBERT THOMAS HARVEY

BARRY TODD HEILING
BRADLEY GENE HINKLE
TODD A. HOFFORD
LANCE A. HOPPER
JAMES PATRICK HOYE
CATHERINE ANNE HUTSON
DAVID MARK JAFFE
GEOFFREY MARK JENSEN
MATTHEW C. JENSEN
DAVID A. JOHNSON
MITCHELL R. JOHNSON
JEFFREY M. JONES
MATTHEW EDWARD JONES
SAMUEL DAVID KINCH
KENNETH KMETZ
STANLEY J. KOWALCZYK
JULIO R. LAIRET
JASON A. LAY
MICHAEL ALLEN LAYMAN
ANTHONY ANDREW LUJAN
ANTHONY DEL MACHABEE
CLAUDIA SUZANNE MALONE
ADAM JAMES MARSHALL
COREY PATRICK MASSEY
CHAD V. MCGARRY
JOSIAH L. MEYERS
JEREMY SCOTT MILLIMAN
WALTER L. MODDISON
MARK RICHARD MORRELL
MARTIN JAMES MOSER
BILLY F. MURPHY, JR.
LAWANA GAY NELSON
ERIC P. NEUMANN
KAREN E. NICHOLS
MICHAEL JOHN OLIVER
BRIAN L. PARKER
BARBARA M. PAZDERNIK
ROBIN CHRISTINE PETERSON
JEREMY CHAD PHILLIPS
LAWRENCE E. J. PHILLIPS
BRYAN W. PREECE
DAVID A. PREISMAN
PATRICK L. PRITCHARD
DAVID G. RABEL
LORALIE E. RASMUSSEN
LINDA A. ROHATSCHE
SHAWN GILBERT RYAN
MATTHEW PARRISH SANDS
YVETTE MARIE SCHUE
BRIAN K. SIMS
SUSANA CORONA SMITH
TIMOTHY J. SODERHOLM
CLIFFORD ADAM SOUZA
MARTIN STALLONE
ROBERT R. STATCHEN
KURT M. STEGNER
MICHAEL W. STINSON
MELINDA LEE SUTTON
JOSEPH B. SZUCS
BRYONY A. TERRELL
BRADD LEE THOMPSON
CHAD P. TUTTLE
TRENTON N. TWEDT
JOY D. UNDERWOOD II
SCOTT DALE VANBEEK
LEE A. VANDERHOOF
BRITT C. VANSBUR
JAMES MICHAEL WARD
THOMAS J. WATTS
PATRICK CLARK WEBB
MATHEW CARROLL WENTHE
JOHN D. WILLIAMS
PETER LAWRENCE ZALEWSKI

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

MOHAMAD EL SAMAD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

LANA J. BERNAT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

PATRICK K. SULLIVAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DEREK L. ADAMS
ADAM K. AKE
MARK G. ALESSIA
JOY L. ALEXANDER
GEOFFREY M. ALLEN
NADER S. ARAJ
DAVID E. BABB
THOMAS C. BARNETT, JR.
THOMAS E. BARRON
JAMES D. S. BARROS

JESSE L. BARTH
 DEBORAH L. BARTUNEK
 TODD L. BARTUNEK
 MICHAEL J. BEARDI
 KEVIN L. BECAR
 MATTHEW J. BEDWELL
 JOHN R. BENSON
 LARRY W. BENTON
 JAMES W. BIBB
 CHARLES M. BLOMQUIST
 JOHN L. BONNETTE II
 MARTIN L. BORTOLUTTI
 LEONARD D. BRANNOM III
 JOHN S. BREWER
 WILLIAM R. BREWER
 JONATHAN E. BROWN
 STEPHEN M. BURGGRAFF
 THOMAS P. CALDWELL
 DUDLEY R. CAPPS
 IRBY W. CARPENTER, JR.
 RICHARD A. CAUFIELD
 ADONIS H. CHAKIDES
 CLAYTON W. CHAPPELL
 TED N. CHAVEZ
 JOHN D. CLARK
 MARTIN M. CLAY, JR.
 TIMOTHY A. CLEVELAND
 TIMOTHY A. COAKLEY
 RICHARD D. COLLAGE
 ONEL COLON
 RYAN E. CONNELLY
 MATTHEW G. COOPER
 JOSEPH M. COYLE
 SCOTT G. E. CRAIG
 RONALD L. CRANE, JR.
 THOMAS W. CROSBY
 DAVID A. DAILEY
 CHRISTOPHER DANIELS
 JOHN L. DAVIS
 ZACHARIAHS DELWICHE
 JEFFERY L. DESMOND
 COROL B. DOBSON
 WAYNE W. DON
 SEAMUS K. DOYLE
 JEFFREY J. EGET
 LESTER W. ELMORE
 JOHN A. ENGELS
 ROBERT A. EPP
 STEVEN A. FAIRBOURN
 LEIF E. T. FAUTANU
 JOHN C. FELL
 JEFFERY J. FILES
 GREGORY D. FIX
 TROY G. FLOWERS, JR.
 TAMARA J. FRATTALONE
 ROBERT M. FUGERE
 KORY H. GACONO
 ERIC L. GAGNON
 GLYN C. GOLDWIRE
 JAMES C. GONYO II
 THOMAS P. GONZALES
 RODRIGO R. GONZALEZ III
 ALBERT T. GORMAN
 WILLIAM J. GRAY, JR.
 GRAHAM T. GREEN
 MICHAEL D. GREEN
 JOHN C. GREGORY
 MILTON L. GRIFFITH, JR.
 ALAN R. GRONEWOLD
 PATRICIA K. HAGEN
 DAVID L. HALL
 RICHARD E. HAMBY
 MATTHEW R. HANDY
 DANIEL E. HARRIS
 WILLIAM E. HAYGOOD
 ANTHONY C. HEIGAARD
 LARRY L. HENRY
 RONALD C. HENSON
 SCOTT M. HOUCK
 BRADLEY K. HOWE
 JOSEPH M. HUSS
 CHRISTOPHER A. HYMAN
 MARK L. INABA
 ERICA L. INGRAM
 CHRISTIAN J. JOHNSON
 ERIC N. JOHNSON
 MARK K. KAMPA
 JOHN C. KENNEDY
 JEFFERY C. KERNS
 PAUL A. KIRCHHOFF
 CHARLES W. KITSON, JR.
 RALPH E. KLINE III
 ROBERT M. KURTZ
 SUSAN B. KUSAN
 CAROLYN Y. LANCLOS
 JEFFREY C. LARRABEE
 ROBERT K. LASHBROOK
 RONALD G. LEE, JR.
 DEBRA K. LIEN
 DANIEL S. LOVETT
 ROBERT A. LUND
 CRAIG M. MACERI
 THOMAS W. MACKEY
 MICHAEL M. MAJORS
 LANE B. MARSHALL
 CORY L. MATTHEWS
 CLIFFORD A. MCDANIEL II
 DONNA G. MCDANIELCOX
 CHARLES P. MCDONALD
 SEAN T. MCGANN
 CHRIS A. MCKINNEY
 DONALD L. MCLELLAN

ERIN K. MCMAHON
 CODY A. MCROBERTS
 TROY D. MEUTH
 JACK B. MIDYETTE III
 RICHARD F. MIFSUD II
 VERL C. MILLER
 LOUIS B. MILLIKAN
 SHAUN R. MISTLEBAUER
 CHARLES C. MOORE
 SCOTTIE A. MOORE
 ANDREW C. MORESHEAD
 JOHN D. MORGEN
 WILLIAM F. MORRIS
 BRIAN C. MULCAHY
 TIMOTHY P. MULLEN
 MICHAEL H. MURPHY III
 WESLEY D. MURRAY
 PETER M. MUSHOVIC
 DERALD R. NEUGEBAUER
 JOSEPH T. NOONAN III
 JEFFREY A. NORRIS
 CRAIG P. NOWAK
 TRACEY M. Y. OMORI
 JAVIER ORTIZ
 LARS B. OSTERVOLD, JR.
 ROBERT F. PAOLETTI
 BRIAN L. PARCELL
 JAMES L. PAYNE, JR.
 BRIAN L. PETERSON
 THOMAS B. PICKLE, JR.
 THOMAS R. POWERS
 MARK D. PRESLEY
 JASON D. PRICE
 MARK A. RAAKER
 LORA J. RAINEY
 FELIX RAMOSTORO
 NATHAN C. RANGE
 DAVID S. RHODAS
 MICHAEL D. RIESKE
 ERIC J. RILEY
 BREN D. ROGERS
 GILBERT ROLDAN
 HERIBERTO ROMAN
 DARRIN M. ROSHA
 PAUL E. RUMBERGER
 JAMES J. SAHADY, JR.
 CRAIG L. SANDMAN
 SHAD B. SATTERTHWAITE
 MATTHEW C. SCHELL
 STEPHEN L. SCHMIDT
 PAUL W. SCHNEIDER
 JAMES P. SCHREFFLER
 ROBERT W. SHIPMAN
 WILLIAM A. SHOMENTO
 ANTHONY W. SMITH
 GREGORY SMITH
 ALAN C. SOUTH
 MARK J. SOUTH
 BOBBIE M. SPROUSE
 DANIEL M. STARK
 ROBIN B. STILWELL
 JEFFREY STRICKLE
 JONATHAN M. STUBBS
 SOL D. SUKUT
 MARC M. SULLIVAN
 DARRYL B. TAGUACTA
 JULIE A. THOMAS
 PAUL E. THOMPSON
 LOREN J. THOMSON
 JOHN M. TILL
 MICHAEL A. TOBEY
 TIMOTHY J. TOMCHO
 KELLARD N. TOWNSEND
 MICHAEL A. TREADWELL
 JOHN A. TURK II
 THOMAS M. TURNER
 IVAN E. UDELL
 PAUL E. WALDRON
 MICHAEL E. WEGNER
 JOHN W. WELLS II
 JAMES B. WHARTON
 THOMAS M. WHATLEY
 JAMES D. WHITAKER
 BRIAN P. WILKINS
 JAMES M. YATES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE
 ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

RODNEY ABRAMS
 RICK A. ACKERMAN
 KURT C. ADAMS
 DUSTIN L. AWTREY
 MARK R. BAADEN
 KEITH A. BARTA
 JAMES M. BECKER
 ANSON W. R. BELIN
 SHARLEEN N. BENDER
 GLEN D. BLACKBURN
 DARRELL J. BOAZMAN
 CHRISTINE C. BORGOGNONI
 LAURA R. BOSCO
 MORGAN C. BRANTLEY
 KATHERINE M. BRAUN
 CHRIS M. BRIAND
 MICHAEL F. BROCKWAY
 GREGORY L. BUNCK
 JOHN F. CADRAN
 JAMES W. CARMICHAEL, JR.
 STEPHEN P. CASE
 PETER M. CHACE, JR.

CHRIST W. Y. CHANG
 JERRY B. CHAPPEE
 JIMMY W. CLEMONS
 PETER T. CLINTON
 IAN D. CLUNIESROSS
 ROBERT J. COKER
 CLIFFTON C. CORNELL
 RICHARD J. COTE
 VICTORIA A. CUMINGS
 DAVID L. DEAN
 WILLIAM P. DEBACK
 GRETCHEN A. DECKER
 KIRK D. DECKER
 ROGER F. DEON, JR.
 JOHN M. DIDONATO
 ADAM T. DIETRICH
 DOUGLAS M. DILLON
 ALLAN L. DOLLISON
 MICHAEL J. DOUGHERTY
 JAMES R. DRAKE
 CHRISTOPHER S. DUBE
 THOMAS M. DUBININ
 VINCENT W. DUNCAN
 JAMES L. EIPPER
 DONALD R. ELLISON, JR.
 DERIK D. ERICKSON
 ANDREW L. FETHERSTON
 JOHN J. FINKLE, JR.
 CHARLES T. FLEETWOOD
 CHRISTOPHER L. FLOWERS
 JEANNE F. FORGEY
 ROELENE E. FREEMAN
 LEIGH F. FRIEDEL
 CHELEY A. GABRIEL
 CHARLES A. GAMBARO, JR.
 JUAN A. GARCES, JR.
 JASON E. GARCIA
 DAMIEN T. GARNER
 DEVIN P. GARRITY
 STEVEN D. GAVIN
 GINA M. GENTILE
 HELEN G. S. GEORGE
 LENORA T. GERMAN
 JAMES G. GILL, JR.
 GREGORY C. GLASOW
 DARRYL GODWIN
 CARLOS E. GORBEA
 PAUL C. GRESENS
 ANTHONY P. GRIFFIN
 MARC C. HALE
 KIMBERLY K. HAMILTON
 COLE A. HANSON
 STEPHEN G. HARLAN
 GROVER C. HARMS, JR.
 VICTOR H. HARRIS
 STEVEN D. HAYDEN
 SCOTT L. HEIL
 CORY F. HENRY
 DANIEL H. HERSHKOWITZ
 TODD M. HEUSER
 KIRK H. HOLMES
 KEITH K. HORIKAWA
 WILLIAM H. HOUSTON IV
 STEVEN B. HOWERY
 HEROLD J. HUDSON
 RACHEL E. HUMPHREY
 STANLEY A. HUTCHISON
 TAYLOR K. C. HWONG
 AMY M. IHDE
 VICTOR S. INGRAM
 AVRAM J. ISAACSON
 GERRY L. JACKSON
 MARK W. JACKSON
 DANIEL J. JAQUINT
 KELLY K. JONES
 MARTIN R. JUAREZ
 MARTIN C. JUNG
 RICHARD A. KAISER
 RUTH D. KANE
 MARK Y. KAZUNAGA
 SHARON K. KELSEY
 JOSHUA S. KENNEDY
 EERO R. KERAVUORI
 ROSE P. KERAVUORI
 KERIANN L. KLEIN
 MARCUS A. KOEPLINGER
 GEORGE E. KOKLANARIS
 GARRETT R. KOLO
 PAUL L. KUETTNER
 JAKE S. H. KWON
 FLOYD E. LACEY, JR.
 DANITA K. LADSON
 CHRISTOPHER D. LANGE
 GLEN A. LAYTON
 RAQUEL G. LEBLANC
 ARLENE M. LEIGH
 BRADLEY W. LEWIS
 RAYMOND LO
 JOSHUA M. LUBARSKY
 STEPHAN E. LYNSEY
 JEFFREY V. MAGLIO
 MURRAY A. MALLETTSTEIN
 MICHAEL J. MALONE
 DAVID P. MANN
 JAMES M. MANZI, JR.
 DRAGOMIR C. MARINKOVICH
 MARLENE K. MARKOTAN
 JORGE MARRERO
 JANENE A. MARSHALLGATLING
 SANDRA K. MARTIN
 THOMAS E. MCAVOY
 PETER A. MCBRIDE

THOMAS W. MCBROOM, SR.
PAUL J. MCCARTHY
DANIEL M. MCCLINTOCK
ALEX A. MCCULLOUGH
MARK R. MCCULLOUGH
JEREMY T. MCGARRY
SHAWN P. MCNABB
BRIAN J. MCNULTY
JON S. MIDDAGH
MEGAN E. MIRANDA
LOUIS L. MITCHELL
DELIRIS MONTANEZBERRIOS
COLIN J. MORROW
JACQUELINE E. MORTON
APRIL A. D. MYRICK
ANDREE G. NAVARRO
NICHOLAS NAZARKO II
JAMES D. NELSON
WILLIAM J. NELSON
RYAN J. NIELSEN
GINGER K. NORRIS
WILLIAM H. NORRIS
MARK L. OGBURN
GARY K. OGLE
ALEXA G. OLEARY
DANIEL J. OROURKE
JOHN D. OSBORNE
DOUGLAS M. OTTENBERG
OTTO M. PADRON
EDWARD R. PALACIOS
NOEL F. PALMER
DAVID R. PARAVECCHIA
MARK F. PARCELLS
GREGORY M. PAVICK
EUGENE POINDEXTER
ROBERT J. PORTWAY
KEVIN POWERS
DANIEL J. PRIETO
PETER PROZIK, JR.
KAREN D. RADOS
JEFFREY RECTOR
JEROME J. REDMOND
HEATHER A. REUTER
SCOTT W. RICHARDS
WILLIAM D. RITTER
BRIAN M. RIVERA
PETER D. ROCHA
JUAN R. RODRIGUEZ
RAUL L. RODRIGUEZ
JOSE E. RODRIGUEZRIVERA
CHRISTOPHER M. ROMERO
SCOTT S. ROMERO
STEVEN T. ROSE
YVETTE O. ROSE
MITCHELL A. RUEDEBUSCH
STEPHEN J. RYAN
JAMES P. SANDERS
RICHARD W. SETTINO
JAMES M. SINDLE
JODI J. SMITH
JOHN A. SMITH
STEPHEN J. SNYDER
GILBERTO SOTOMALDONADO
DAVID A. SPARACIO
NICOLE R. SPEARS
STEPHEN M. SPINELLI
JOHN STANLEY
BARRY M. STENTIFORD
JUSTIN STIEGLITZ
VINCENT J. STONEKING
KEVIN D. STRINGER
RICHARD T. STUBBLEFIELD
THOMAS P. SULLIVAN
MABRY A. SUMNER
TIMOTHY S. SUMOVICH
JULIA E. SWEET
PHILLIP A. TAYLOR
EARL D. TERRY III
WILLIE L. THORNTON
EVAN TING
WAI K. TONG
GREGORY W. TOTH
DEREK J. ULEHLA
CLARENCE M. WALTON
MATTHEW S. WARNER
GREGORY A. WEISLER
LATONIA R. WHITE
MICHAEL R. WHITESCARVER
GREG S. WICKLUND
WILLIAM F. WILKERSON
AARON D. WILKES
ANTOINE M. WILLIAMS
BRIAN D. WISNEWSKI
DAVID R. WOOD
TIMOTHY H. WRIGHT
D010081

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CHRISTINE N. ADAMS
THOMAS C. AKERLUND
JAMES M. AKERS
DARREN S. ANTAL
U. L. ARMSTRONG, JR.
BRIAN S. AXELSEN
CHRISTOPHER A. BAER
CHRISTOPHER A. BAINS
THOMAS W. BANNON
JONAH A. BRIERTON
CURTIS E. BURRELL, JR.

LEWIS D. CARPENTER
SEAN F. COUNIHAN
JEFFREY M. DUKAVAS
DAVID W. EATON
BRIAN P. ELLIOTT
DARL E. EVERETT, JR.
THOMAS D. FILLGROVE
CHRISTOPHER P. GERDES
JOHN J. GOBRICK
ANGEL E. GONZALEZ
KEITH G. HARLEY
CHRISTOPHER L. HENDERSON
GLEN R. HOWIE
STEPHEN P. HUCKS
TIMOTHY L. HUGHES
ANDREW W. JONES
CHARLES E. JONES
HUI C. KIM
MATTHEW W. LAWRENCE
ANGEL M. LIBERG
LINDA M. MARTIN
RICHARD R. MASSENGALE
MICHAEL D. MAYES
KEVIN M. MYERS
PATRICK M. PASCALL
CLAY D. PETTTT
DAVID A. POLAND
CHRISTOPHER R. QUALE
ROBERT R. REISZ
JOSE A. RIVERA
RAFAEL RODRIGUEZ, JR.
JOHN T. SCHULTE
CAMERON S. SELLERS
WARREN G. SEYMOUR, JR.
MARK W. SIEKMAN
TRACY L. SIMMONS
MARK D. THOMPSON
SCOTT K. THOMSON
ANDREAS M. THUM
EDWARD A. VAN RAVENSTEIN
THOMAS E. WALTON, SR.
RICARDO L. WARFIELD
LISA A. WEIDENBUSH
CHARLES W. WEKO
VALNECIA E. WILLIAMS
JERRY D. WILSON, JR.
CHARLETTE K. WOODARD

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

BRUCE E. OSBORNE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

COLETTE M. MURPHY
JOHN A. ROBINSON III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

NATHAN R. ANDERSON
RANDALL L. BICE
DANIEL P. GAVIGAN
WILLIAM J. HARTMAN
STANLEY P. HERNDON
ROBERT E. HUGHES
ERIC R. LIU
KURT B. MADSEN
KAI S. MARTIN
DOLORES J. PYNEMERCIER
DANIEL G. ROBSON
ERIK T. TYNAN
ROBERTO VALLETTA
JODIE M. C. YIM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

ADRIA R. SCHNECK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

MARY A. PONCE
BRIAN K. REED

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

RYAN K. MAHELONA
PHILIP L. NOTZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

JOSEPH T. BAILEY
MARCUS P. BAUER

RAYMOND K. BIZIOREK
HEATHER M. BOTHWELL
STANLEY A. BUNNER
EDWARD C. GARRANT
JOHN B. GARRY
RICHARD B. GILLIGAN
ROBERT E. JACKSON
KERRY D. MOORE
WILLIAM A. RIGAZZI
JILL A. ROUGH
GREGORY B. SETTELMAYER
JONPAUL STEFANI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

DAVID W. SHAEIB

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

LEE A. AXTELL
MAURICE A. BUFORD
CAREY H. CASH
ROBERT R. CHRISTIAN
JOSEPH L. COFFEY
JON W. CONROE
DENIS N. COX
STEPHEN S. DUESENBERY
ERIK P. LEE
JUDY T. MALANA
WILLIAM E. MIDDLETON
CURTIS PRICE
ROBERT J. VANCE
BRIAN K. WAITE
MARK S. WINWARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

THOMAS M. BESTAFKA
JAMES E. BROWN
JAY M. CAVNAR
JAMES J. H. CHO
MIGUEL DIEGUEZ
ALEXANDER K. HUTCHISON
GORDON E. MEEK III
RAFAEL A. MIRANDA
JEFFREY S. POWELL
RUSSELL C. RANG
MATTHEW C. RIETHMILLER
LAURIE SCOTT
FRANCIS J. STAVISH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

DANNY W. KING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

AARON L. WITHERSPOON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

BABAK A. BARAKAT
ROGER L. BILLINGS
TIMOTHY A. BROWN
GEORGE W. CLARK III
STUART M. DAY
ROY M. GARRISON
TONY V. GILES
TIMOTHY R. GRIFFIN
TROY M. GRONBERG
MICHAEL N. JEFFERSON
BLAKE W. KENT
JASON E. KLINGENBERG
BRUCE KONG
SCOTT D. LOGAN
MANUEL X. LUGO
CHRISTIAN M. MAHLER
ROBERT S. MAZZARELLA
MICHAEL C. MCCORMACK
JOSHUA H. MCKAY
JACQUELINE M. MEYER
EDWARD D. PIDGEON
WADE W. RINDY
NICHOLAS B. RUSSO
KENNETH W. RYKER III
KADIATOU F. SIDIBE
JAMES H. STRAUSS
SHANE P. STROHL
CHRISTOPHER A. WALDRON
RICHARD H. WILHELM
STEPHEN M. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MICHAEL J. ALLANSON

RANDY E. ASHMAN
JESSICA D. BEARD
SUSANNE E. BLANKENBAKER
JENNY S. BURKETT
ALISON H. CASTRO
CHARLES L. CATHER
DANIEL W. CLARK
CAROLYN M. CURRIE
JOSEPH L. DESAMERO
VICTOR M. DIAZ
ROBERT D. FETHERSTON
JOSEPH A. GOMEZ
ANNA M. GRUETZMACHER
HARRY W. HAMILTON
CHARLES S. HARTUNG
BOBBY J. HURT
JASON D. LAYTON
ANGELO P. LUCERO
FREDORA A. MCRAE
MARY K. PARKER
ELISABET PRIETO
DAVID V. D. THOMAS
PAUL S. VILLAIRES
ANTHONY G. VOEKS
GERARD J. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MATTHEW L. BERAN
MARC S. BREWEN
MARCUS N. FULTON
STACIA J. GAWRONSKI
CHRISTOPHER J. GREER
VANESSA C. HOPGOOD
FRANKIE D. HUTCHISON
AMY K. LARSON
KIMBERLEY B. MCCANN
HEATHER D. PARTRIDGE
STEPHEN C. REYES
MARC S. ROSEN
JONATHAN T. STEPHENS
JEFFREY A. SUTTON
DUSTIN E. WALLACE
IAN S. WEXLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

GARLAND H. ANDREWS
DARRYL P. ARFSTEN
GORDON R. BLIGHTON
BRIAN L. BOHRER
STEPHEN A. CHAPMAN
SERGIO CHAVEZ
MICHAEL O. ENRIQUEZ
WILLIAM E. GRADY
ROBERT P. HIGGINS
JEFFREY J. KLINGER
BRADLEY C. KLUEGEL
JASON T. LEWIS
THOMAS J. PINER
PAUL S. SCHIERMEIER
SPENCER T. SCHOEN
MICHAEL E. STEVENS, JR.
MICHAEL L. SUNMAN
TIMOTHY T. THOMPSON
ROMEO T. TIZON, JR.
ERIC R. WELSH
MEREDITH L. YEAGER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

OLADAPO A. AKINTONDE
NATHANIEL B. ALMOND
KATHERINE C. AUSTIN
CHAD M. BAASEN
JOHN S. BROOKS
HAN Q. BUI
HENRY F. CASEY III
GEORGE S. CONLEY
KONRAD L. DAVIS
BRENDON G. DREW
DENNIS J. FAIX
NATHANIAL FERNANDEZ
JONATHAN A. FORSBERG
DAVID M. FURLONG
CURTIS W. GABALL
MICHAEL S. GALITZ
RAMIRO L. GUTIERREZ
TIPTON D. Q. HUTCHESON
MICHAEL B. JACOBS
HENRY S. KANE
KARL C. KRONMANN
KELLY M. LATIMER
LANNY F. LITTLEJOHN
KAREN L. MATTHEWS
RYAN C. MAVES
MICHAEL L. MEADOWS
JOEL R. METZGER
ARASH MOHTASHAMIAN
MICHELE P. MORRISON
MARK M. MORTON
JAMES J. MUCCIARONE
FRANK E. MULLENS
TODD J. OCHSNER

KEVIN C. OMALLEY
ADAM K. SAPERSTEIN
ROLF K. SCHMIDT
JASON W. SCHROEDER
ANDREW J. SELLERS
SEAN C. SKELTON
JAMES P. SMITH
JASON D. SWEET
SEAN A. SWIATKOWSKI
CHRISTOPHER M. TEPERA
HASSAN A. TETTEH
KRISTOPHER P. THIBODEAU
JOHN W. VINCENT
MATTHEW J. WAUSON
CHRISTOPHER H. WAY
KEDRIC E. WEBSTER
SEAN R. WISE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JEFF A. BLEILE
TONI A. BOWDEN
DANIEL A. BROWN
HECTOR A. CABALLERO
CHRISTOPHER E. CRECELIUS
TUANH C. HALQUIST
THOMAS B. HINES, JR.
MOLLY A. JENKINS
DAVID W. JONES
REBECCA O. LEE
KEITH L. MAYBERRY
NANCY OSBORNE
ANTON PETRICH
RAOUL H. SANTOS
HIEN TRINH
JEFFREY G. ZELLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be captain

JOHN E. FRITZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

GRADY G. DUFFEY, JR.
BRETT D. INGLE
STEVEN W. LEEHE
JOSE F. MONTES
DAVID A. VONDRAK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

WILLIAM M. KAFKA
RYAN M. PERRY
KEVIN R. STEPHENS
WILLIAM R. URBAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

DANIEL E. FILLION
GREGORY A. FRANCIOS
JENNIFER B. JONES
TUAN NGUYEN
DAVID D. OBRIEN
JASON D. WEDDLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

DAMON B. DIXON
RICHARD A. KENNEDY, JR.
DAVID R. KUEHN
THOMAS A. MONEYSMAKER II
JONATHAN J. VORRATH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JAMES W. ADKISSON III
CHRISTOPHER G. BRYANT
ROBERT S. DAMSKY
ETHAN C. GIBSON
RACHEL J. V. LIND
DOMINIC R. LOVELLO
MARC W. RATKUS
JOSEPH D. SEARS
VICTOR L. SPEARS III
HOLLY A. YUDISKY
SHERRI R. ZIMMERMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

CORY S. BRUMMETT
ANDREW R. DITTMER

JAMES O. HAMMOND
JAMES A. LECOUNTE
ERIK G. PITTMAN
JAMES J. WATSON
DAVID J. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JULIE M. ALFIERI
JAMES L. BOND
TRENT W. FINGERSON
JAMIE A. FRASERLORIA
CHRISTOPHER W. HALL
STACY L. HANNA
RAYMOND E. KENDALL
ERIC E. LAHTI
KYLE L. LEESE
JOHN B. MARKLEY
FRANCISCO J. MARTINEZ
KEVIN J. MCHALE, JR.
SUZANNE R. MEYER
THOMAS P. SCARRY
MARCUS D. STARKS
TIMOTHY M. SULLIVAN
MATTHEW A. VERICH
BRETT A. WISE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MATTHEW E. ARNOLD
ROBERT B. BAILEY
WILLIAM R. BELL
EDWARD L. CALLAHAN
DAVID DWYER
MORRIS OXENDINE
JOHN W. POPHAM
JEFFRY A. SANDIN
ANTHONY C. TARANTO, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

PETER A. ARROBIO
RYAN G. BATCHELOR
JAMES C. CHITKO
ROBERT M. GALLAGHER, JR.
ERIC M. GARDNER
SAMUEL Y. HANAKI
ADAM T. SCOTT
PETER J. SHEEHY
LISA M. SULLIVAN
SHAUN A. SWARTZ
KEVIN J. WATKINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JOHN A. ANDERSON
KEITH A. BARAVIK
SAMUEL F. CORDERO
GREGORY A. CRAWFORD
JUSTIN A. DOWD
DAVID W. GAST
JASON S. HALL
GINALYN B. HARRELL
SIDNEY W. HODGSON III
MARK E. JOHNSON
FREDERICK L. LENTZ II
JEFFREY S. LOCK
CEDRIC J. MCNEAL
SETH A. MILLER
JAMES P. MOSMAN
RAMIRO E. ORELLANO
ETHAN R. PROPER
JAY A. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

LAWRENCE H. KENNEDY
KEVIN M. MULLANEY
TRACIE A. SEVERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JOSE G. HERNANDEZ
NATHAN J. KING
HALLOCK N. MOHLER
BRETT A. STGEORGE
DEREK A. VESTAL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

DAVID A. ABERNATHY
PAUL M. ALLGEIER
ROBERT W. ALPIGINI, JR.
KENNETH D. ANDERSON

JEREMY T. ANDREW
CHRISTOPHER M. BAHNER
LINDSEY J. BAKER III
MATTHEW R. BARR
BRIAN H. BENNETT
ROBERT T. BIBEAU
CHRISTOPHER G. BOHNER
GEOFFREY P. BOWMAN
JONATHAN J. BRADFORD
MICHAEL D. BRASSEUR
DAVID S. BRINSON
ROBERT T. BRYANS
RYAN J. BRYLA
RICHARD G. BURGESS
STEPHEN J. BURY
ADRIAN T. CALDER
JASON G. CANFIELD
HUNG CAO
BRYAN K. CARMICHAEL
RICHARD W. CARNICKY
RYAN C. CECI
JILL R. CESARI
ANDREW J. CLARK IV
DWIGHT L. CLEMONS II
DANIEL COBIAN
ELAINE A. COLLINS
JAMES N. COLSTON
MICHAEL CONCANNON
JOHN D. CRADDOCK
JOHN L. CROGHAN
KENNETH M. CURTIN
MICHAEL J. DAIGLE, JR.
THERON C. DAVIS
MICHELE M. DAY
SAMUEL F. DECASTRO
DAVID S. DEES
HANS D. DEFOR
JASON M. DENNEY
JEFFREY A. DERMODY
ALAN M. DJOCK
THOMAS A. DONOVAN
PETER J. EHLERS
JESSE G. ESPE
ERIK C. ESTENSON
JOHN J. FAY
DAVID P. FIELDS
ANDREW P. FITZPATRICK
KELLY T. FLETCHER
MICHAEL D. FRANCE
ROBERT C. FRANCIS, JR.
KENNETH R. FRANKLIN
BRIAN G. FRECK
TRACEY J. GENDREAU
NICHOLAS D. GOOD
TADD H. GORMAN
BRET M. GRABBE
DOUGLAS GRABER
THOMAS J. GRADY
DAVID L. GRAY
JEREMY GRAY
BRIAN C. GUGLIOTTA
BLAIR H. GUY II
JAMES W. HARNEY
SCOTT B. HATTAWAY
HARRY E. HAYES
MARK C. HAZENBERG
JEFFREY L. HEAMES
RYAN J. HEILMAN
JEFFREY W. HILL
MICHAEL P. HOLLENBACH
ROBERT L. HOLMES
FRASER P. HUDSON
CHRISTOPHER N. HURST
ERIC P. ILLSTON
STEPHEN J. ILTERIS
CHRISTOPHER C. JASON
ALLEN P. JOHNSON
STEPHEN O. JOHNSON
JAMES P. JOHNSTON

JEFFREY JUERGENS
AARON R. KELLEY
PETER S. KIM
DERRICK W. KINGSLEY
JOSHUA C. KINNAR
THOMAS G. KORSMO
GADALA E. KRATZER
JOHN A. KRISCIUNAS
JOHN W. KURTZ
JEFFREY E. LAMPHEAR
MICHAEL C. LANGBEHN
BRENDAN J. LEARY
RICHARD LEBRON
ANDREW G. LIGGETT
JONATHAN D. LIPPS
PRICE J. LOCKARD
TOMMY F. LOCKE, JR.
DAVID LOO
KEVIN W. MACY
JAMES R. MCIVER
KEVIN O. MOLLER
STEPHEN E. MONGOLD
GARY G. MONTALVO, JR.
TIMOTHY B. MOORE
JEFFREY V. MORGANTHALER
MICHAEL C. MOSBRUGER
WILLIAM G. MUSSER
THOMAS E. MYERS
MELVYN N. NAIDAS
TODD J. NETHERCOTT
MARK C. NEWKIRK
MARK S. NIESWIADOMY
EDWARD J. OGRADY III
FRANK E. OKATA
DANIEL P. PAPP
DOUGLAS A. PATTERSON
DAVID J. PEARSON
TODD S. PERRY
DOUGLAS M. PETERSON
GREGORY T. PETROVIC
JESSIE A. PORTER
ROBERT R. PORTER III
DAVID M. RAY
JOHN D. REARDON
JASON S. RELLER
TED C. RICCIARDELLA
PETER J. RIEBE
JEREMY Y. RIFAS
JAMES T. ROBINSON
SEAN P. ROCHELEAU
MIKAEL A. ROCKSTAD
CHRISTOPHER F. ROHRBACH
DAVID J. RUETER
MATTHEW F. RUTHERFORD
RUSSEL B. SANCHEZ
CHARLES R. SARGEANT
ZOA H. SCHENEMAN
TORSTEN SCHMIDT
WILLIAM D. SELK
JASON J. SHERMAN
JOSEPH T. SHULER
GREGORY A. SMITH
MICHAEL A. SMITH
MATTHEW M. SNIFFIN
MICHAEL D. SNOWDEN
ROLF B. SPELKER
JOEL G. STEWART
DANIEL C. STONE
DANIEL G. STRAUB
SCOTT T. TASIN
MATTHEW C. THOMAS
RODNEY A. THOMAS
JOSEPH P. THOMPSON III
MICHAEL B. THOMPSON
ANDREW J. THOMSON
JOSEPH F. TORIAN, JR.
BLAKE J. TORNGA
THOMAS A. ULMER
JONATHAN G. VOORHEIS

TIMOTHY L. WAITS
RICHARD W. WHITFIELD
TIMOTHY B. WILKE
ALAN R. WING
THOMAS R. WINKLER
ERNEST M. WINSTON
DORSEY G. WISOTZKI
MICHAEL L. WITHERSPOON
RONALD L. WITHEROW
TODD C. ZENNER
JESSE J. ZIMBAUER

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR MARINE
CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

MICHAEL S. STEVENS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR MARINE
CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be major

PATRICK J. MULLEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MA-
RINE CORPS RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION
12203:

To be colonel

RAYMOND L. ADAMS
DAVID B. ASHE
WILLIAM A. BARNES
DANIEL M. BELLIG
RICHARD D. BELLISS
JOSEPH S. BORNSCHNEIN
KYLE R. BURRESS
KEVIN F. COUGHLIN
MICHAELA C. COUGHLIN
JOHN D. COWART
MARK A. CUNNINGHAM
RAQUEL L. DECKERT
FRANCISCO P. DELGADO
SAMUEL J. DIBIANCA
SEAN R. DUNN
JAKE J. FALCONE
CHRISTOPHER T. GRAVES
JEFFREY D. GROHARING
JOHN K. JARRARD
ERIK W. JILSON
JOHN D. KAUFFMAN
JOHN F. KIDD
JOHN D. KNAPP
CHRISTOPHER M. LONG
HOWARD K. MAROTTO II
PETER W. MCCORMICK
RONALD S. MCGINTY
WILLIAM H. MCHENRY II
RICHARD J. MENDELOW
PERCY T. MOORE
ANDREW J. MUNRO
JOHN T. NGUYEN
CHRISTOPHER OBALLE
FELIPE PAEZ
WILLIAM J. PALMER
SIDNEY R. PARK
RODOLFO A. QUILES
THOMAS J. READY IV
ROBERT E. RHODE III
RICHARD J. RILEY
JEFFREY A. STERNBERG
DANIEL S. SULLIVAN
MICHAEL R. TEUBNER
TROY C. WARE
DOUGLAS S. WOODHAMS

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 11, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 16

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Sigal Mandelker, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, Marshall Billingslea, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, and Heath P. Tarbert, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary, all of the Department of the Treasury, and Mira Radielovic Ricardel, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Export Administration.

SD-538

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine bipartisan Medicare policies that improve care for patients with chronic conditions.

SD-215

3:15 p.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure

To hold hearings to examine leveraging Federal funding, focusing on innovative solutions for infrastructure.

SD-406

MAY 17

9:30 a.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine the growing Russian military threat in Europe, focusing on assessing and addressing the challenge.

SVC-208

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine current issues in American sports, focusing on protecting the health and safety of American athletes.

SR-253

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine improving America's transportation infrastructure.

SD-406

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 34, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for "midnight rules", S. 829, to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, S. 951, to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents, S. 21, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, S. 577, to require each agency, in providing notice of a rule making, to include a link to a 100 word plain language summary of the proposed rule, S. 584, to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, S. 579, to require agencies to publish an advance notice of proposed rule making for major rules, S. 459, to designate the area between the intersections of Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest and Davis Street, Northwest and Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest and Edmunds Street, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as "Boris Nemtsov Plaza", S. 595, to provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection with additional flexibility to expedite the

hiring process for applicants for law enforcement positions, S. 696, to amend title 5, United States Code, to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to Federal employees, S. 504, to permanently authorize the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program, S. 842, to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, S. 760, to expand the Government's use and administration of data to facilitate transparency, effective governance, and innovation, S. 831, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Pike Street in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, as the "Police Officer Scott Bashioom Post Office Building", an original bill entitled, "Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act of 2017", an original bill entitled, "Federal Agency Customer Experience Act of 2017", and an original bill entitled, "Saving Federal Dollars Through Better Use of Government Purchase and Travel Cards Act of 2017".

SD-342

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the state of social capital in America today.

SD-106

10:30 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine running the government for less.

SD-608

2 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine military space organization, policy, and programs.

SR-222

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Government Accountability Office's high risk list for Indian programs.

SD-628

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine pending calendar business.

SR-418

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Airland

To hold hearings to examine United States military small arms requirements.

SR-232A

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

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 11, 2017

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHABOT).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 11, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE CHABOT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Scott Wilson, Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Gracious and loving God, send Your spirit once again to these Halls of power, where so many have come to participate in the difficult but glorious process of governing by consent of the people. Be especially with those blessed with this awesome authority, that they may wield it with humility and grace.

Amid the many voices of our world and our culture, may we strain to hear clearly a word from You, the One who desires justice and mercy. And may we also be attuned to listen to one another, to hear each other with wisdom and understanding.

To that end, Lord, be with those who are in their home districts, and grant them peace as they dialogue with their neighbors, whether they be friend or foe. Help us to be strengthened by the good we see in others. Help us seek a way that is pleasing to You.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 299, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 9, 2017, at 9:09 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 140.

That the Senate passed S. 249.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

JOINT REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives and the majority and minority leaders of the United States Senate, their joint reappointment, pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381) as amended, and section 1(b) of Public Law 115-19, of the following individuals effective May 13, 2017, to the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance:

Ms. Barbara L. Camens, Washington, D.C., for a term of 5 years;

Ms. Roberta L. Holzwarth, Rockford, Illinois, for a term of 5 years.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 140. An act to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Right Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 249. An act to provide that the pueblo of Santa Clara may lease for 99 years certain restricted land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(b) of House Resolution 299, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. on Monday, May 15, 2017.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 15, 2017, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1317. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Stephen R. Lanza, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1318. A letter from the Secretary, Division of Investment Management, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Technical Amendments to Form ADV and Form ADV-W (Release No.: IA-4698) received May 8, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1319. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, DEA, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Control of Ergocristine, a Chemical Precursor Used in the Illicit Manufacture of Lysergic Acid Diethylamide, as a List I Chemical [Docket No.: DEA-320F] (RIN: 1117-AB24) received May 8, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1320. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Clean Air Act Requirements for Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance, Nonattainment New Source Review and Emission Statements [EPA-R06-OAR-2017-0054; FRL-9960-15-Region 6] received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1321. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determinations of Attainment by the Attainment Date, Determinations of Failure to Attain by the Attainment Date and Reclassification for Certain Nonattainment Areas for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2016-0515; FRL-9962-25-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT24) received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1322. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas;

Revisions to Emissions Banking and Trading Programs and Compliance Flexibility [EPA-R06-OAR-2015-0585; FRL-9960-22-Region 6] received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1323. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Delegation of New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the States of Arizona and Nevada [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0071; FRL-9961-79-Region 9] received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1324. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oklahoma; Revisions to Minor New Source Review Permitting Program [EPA-R06-OAR-2007-0989; FRL-9960-67-Region 6] received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1325. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alaska: Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide and 2010 Sulfur Dioxide Standards [EPA-R10-OAR-2016-0133; FRL-9961-93-Region 10] received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1326. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2012 Fine Particulate Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0373; FRL-9961-87-Region 3] received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1327. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Removal of Stage II Gasoline Vapor Recovery Requirements for Gasoline Dispensing Facilities [EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0308; FRL-9961-86-Region 3] received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1328. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Revisions and Amendments to Regulations for Continuous Opacity Monitoring, Continuous Emissions Monitoring, and Quality Assurance Requirements for Continuous Opacity Monitors; Correction [EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0042; FRL-9961-38-Region 3] received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1329. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's final rule — Air Quality Plans; Tennessee; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2012 PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R04-OAR-2014-0430; FRL-9961-89-Region 4] received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1330. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval: North Carolina Repeal of Transportation Facilities Rules [EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0614; FRL-9961-74-Region 4] received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1331. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; NH; Nonattainment New Source Review and Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permit Program Revisions; Public Hearing Revisions for State Permitting Programs; Withdrawal of Permit Fee Program; Infrastructure Provisions for National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R01-OAR-2017-0102; A-1-FRL-9962-01-Region 1] [EPA-R01-OAR-2016-0758; A-1-FRL-9962-01-Region 1] received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1332. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Commissioner's Order for SABIC Innovation Plastics [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0645; FRL-9962-11-Region 5] received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1333. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Commissioner's Order for Carmeuse Lime, Inc. [EPA-R05-OAR-0707; FRL-9962-09-Region 5] received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1334. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; ID; Updates to Incorporations by Reference [EPA-R10-OAR-2016-058 4; FRL-9960-43-Region 10] received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1335. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Heavy Duty Diesel Requirements [EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0116; FRL-9961-44-Region 4] received May 5, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1336. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria, declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, as modified, is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2017, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 202(d); (90 Stat. 1257) (H. Doc. No. 115—40); to the

Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1337. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to the Central African Republic declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014, is to continue in effect beyond May 12, 2017, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 202(d); (90 Stat. 1257) (H. Doc. No. 115—39); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1338. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to Yemen, declared in Executive Order 13611 of May 16, 2012, is to continue in effect beyond May 16, 2017, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 202(d); (90 Stat. 1257) (H. Doc. No. 115—41); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1339. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1340. A letter from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the semiannual report prepared by the Inspector General of the Farm Credit Administration for the period of October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017 pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1341. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — 2018 Sec. 233 Inflation-Adjusted Item (Rev. Proc. 2017-37) received May 9, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1342. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Victims of Crime Act Victim Assistance Program [Docket No.: OJP (OVC) 1523] (RIN: 1121-AA69) received May 8, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1343. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Extension of Eligibility Rule Waivers for Certain Automatic Changes Made To Comply with the Final Tangible Property Regulations (Rev. Proc. 2017-36) received May 9, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1344. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — List of Automatic Changes in Method of Accounting (Rev. Proc. 2017-30) received May 9, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1345. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Syndicated Conservation Easement Transactions Identified in Notice 2017-10 [Notice 2017-29] (NOT-113839-17) received May 9, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public

Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1346. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Distribution of Stock and Securities of a Controlled Corporation (Rev. Rul. 2017-09) received May 9, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1073. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a structure for visitor services on the Arlington Ridge tract, in the area of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1500. A bill to redesignate the small triangular property located in Washington, DC, and designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302 as "Robert Emmet Park", and for other purposes (Rept. 115-114). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROYCE of California: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 1677. A bill to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, encourage a negotiated political settlement, and hold Syrian human rights abusers accountable for their crimes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-115, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 115. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim; with an amendment (Rept. 115-116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 510. A bill to establish a system for integration of Rapid DNA instruments for use by law enforcement to reduce violent crime and reduce the current DNA analysis backlog (Rept. 115-117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1293. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that the Office of Personnel Management submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees; with an amendment (Rept. 115-118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEES

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, Committees on Financial Services and the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1677 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. MENG, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 2405. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that houses of worship are eligible for certain disaster relief and emergency assistance on terms equal to other eligible private nonprofit facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2406. A bill to amend section 442 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2407. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 2408. A bill to enhance the transparency, improve the coordination, and intensify the impact of assistance to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children and persons, including women and girls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 2409. A bill to allow servicemembers to terminate their cable, satellite television, and Internet access service contracts while deployed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 2410. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a sickle cell disease prevention and treatment demonstration program and to provide for sickle cell disease research, surveillance, prevention, and treatment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2411. A bill to provide that certain current and former Federal employees and members of the Armed Forces may enroll in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. DeLAURO, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SLAGHTER, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WALZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. McCOLLUM, Mr. COHEN,

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 2412. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to multiemployer pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 2413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an investment tax credit related to the production of electricity from offshore wind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 2414. A bill to limit the amount of expenditure on Presidential travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 2415. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to expedite completion of the reports for certain projects included in the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MENG (for herself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 2416. A bill to require menstrual product ingredient list labels; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2417. A bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DeLAURO, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2418. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit certain practices by employers relating to restrictions on discussion of employees' and prospective employees' salary and benefit history, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2419. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the process by which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs pays non-Department of Veterans Affairs health care providers for hospital care or medical services furnished to veterans pursuant to the

laws administered by the Secretary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2420. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for tax preferred savings accounts for individuals under age 26, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. RUSH, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 2421. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to amend the definition of the term "spouse" to recognize new State definitions of such term for the purpose of the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Ms. ESHOO):

H. Res. 319. A resolution reaffirming the commitment of the United States to promoting religious freedom globally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. KILMER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LOEBACK, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. DELBENE):

H. Res. 320. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2017 as "Mental Health Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MENG (for herself and Mr. ROYCE of California):

H. Res. 321. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of the Chinese railroad workers from 1865 to 1869, and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 322. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives supporting the Federal workforce; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

40. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3037, requesting the Congress and the President of the United States to enact legislation to expand and extend the current federal tax credit for carbon capture, utilization, and storage under Section 45Q of the Internal Revenue Code; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution—The Congress shall have Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution—The Congress shall have Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the ability to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to advance ongoing efforts for programs that are in the best interest of the United States.

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, sections 1, 3, and 18.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 2413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 2414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 2415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 and 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution and section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clauses 3 and 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into executive the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into executive the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 2421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, and Section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 38: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 113: Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 173: Mr. KILMER, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 179: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. LEE, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 289: Ms. CHENEY.

H.R. 305: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 356: Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 466: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 489: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 490: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 496: Mr. UPTON and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 535: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 613: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 619: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 632: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 662: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 669: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 695: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 731: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 758: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 809: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 820: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COMER, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 828: Mr. RUSSELL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 851: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE, and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 881: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 911: Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 918: Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 930: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BLUM, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Ms. LEE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BOST, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 972: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 991: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 994: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 1046: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 1057: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 1059: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1068: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1098: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1220: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1231: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. PARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1253: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1267: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1279: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1318: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1380: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1422: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 1444: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1478: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1494: Mr. PERRY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. YOHIO, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1536: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1552: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 1565: Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 1596: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1608: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1624: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1625: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 1635: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1659: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1661: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1676: Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1677: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MAST, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1698: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. KIND, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1734: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 1810: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 1812: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1815: Mr. VELA, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1838: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1861: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 1873: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1884: Ms. TENNEY and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1911: Mr. TROTT, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1944: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1945: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1988: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. LEE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1989: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1991: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1993: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2092: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2105: Mr. ROYCE of California.

H.R. 2108: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2118: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2119: Mr. KILMER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr.

GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. BEYER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2123: Mr. POCAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 2134: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 2155: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 2161: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 2175: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 2176: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2179: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 2190: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 2207: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2210: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2231: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 2234: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2248: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2260: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 2262: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2272: Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 2310: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 2340: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 2351: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 2353: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.

H.R. 2395: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GALLEGU, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2404: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. WALKER.

H. Res. 31: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 188: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H. Res. 318: Mr. LAHOOD.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

44. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Office of the Governor of Louisiana, relative to Executive Department Proclamation No. 43 JBE 2017, stating that a state of crisis and emergency is hereby declared to exist in the coastal area of Louisiana, as defined by La. R.S. 49:214.2(4), the effects of which continue to threaten the lives, property, health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of the State; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

SENATE—Thursday, May 11, 2017

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable LUTHER STRANGE, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's opening prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, the Reverend Bruce Scott, pastor of Pentecostals of South Lake, from Merrillville, IN.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Precious Lord, Creator of the heavens and the Earth, and all that dwells therein, we honor You from a grateful heart, knowing all of our blessings that we enjoy every day come from You.

Heavenly Father, as the Senators assemble in this Chamber today, let them come together in unity to build a stronger and better America. Thank You for their dedication and commitment, as they labor together with You for what is right and acceptable in Your sight. This Nation was founded on biblical principles. Lord, I pray that You would grant to them wisdom to make right decisions. The Old Testament prophet declares it is not by might, nor by power but by My Spirit, saith the Lord. Bless their families at home with peace and safety.

Lord, bless our military all over this world. Just as You paid the ultimate price for our freedom on Calvary, our brave military men and women are willing to give their all so we may live in freedom today. Strengthen and encourage each family as they wait for the safe return of their loved one. Bless and protect our first responders, police, fire, and EMS personnel.

It is true that God has shed His Grace on us. Lord, surround this Chamber with Your presence.

We pray in Jesus's Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The assistant bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2017.

To the Senate:

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

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

NOMINATION OF ROBERT LIGHTHIZER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate will take a cloture vote on the U.S. Trade Representative nominee, Robert Lighthizer. We know the task before Mr. Lighthizer is an important one. I appreciate his willingness to take on this challenge, and I look forward to working with the administration on pro-growth trade policies moving forward.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, over the past 8 years, the American people struggled in an economy that too often failed to meet its potential. Many struggled to pay bills. Many struggled to make the mortgage. Too many couldn't find a job at all.

Yet, time after time, when Americans looked to the Obama administration, they got tired leftwing ideology instead of serious solutions. When Americans asked for policies that would allow the economy to grow again, the Obama administration gave them just the opposite: a highly aggressive regulatory rampage that sometimes veered outside congressional authority, that often hurt the economy and job creation even more, that nearly always empowered unaccountable Washington bureaucrats at the expense of the American people.

Of course, not all regulations are bad regulations. Many are necessary and even beneficial, but what the Obama administration seemed to forget in its fit of ideological pique is this key point: Regulations are not issued in a vacuum. They can harm the middle class. They can kill jobs. They can

raise prices. They can depress wages. They can reduce opportunity.

No matter how well-intentioned, regulations can have undesirable, often unexpected, impacts—and in this regulatory avalanche of the last 8 years, we saw another example of the consequences of putting leftwing ideology over the lives of real people.

It is one reason why Americans decided to go in a pro-growth direction last November. They elected a new President who, as one of his first acts, ordered the elimination of at least two existing regulations for every new one issued. He called for a regulatory budget to cap regulatory costs. He and his administration took a number of actions that are already helping to turn the regulatory tide back in favor of growth and jobs.

The American people also reelected a Republican Congress that wasted no time in providing regulatory relief to Americans and restoring legislative power where it rightfully belongs, with the people through their elected representatives right here in Congress.

We have a tool that has proved incredibly helpful in this regard. It is called the Congressional Review Act. It is the brainchild of a bipartisan group of legislators, including former Democratic Leader Harry Reid, and what it allows Congress to do is overturn regulations issued over the last 60 days with a simple majority vote.

From its inception in 1996 until this February, it had only been used successfully one time. From February until today, it has been used successfully 13 times—with the 14th soon to be signed into law; namely, to overturn a number of Obama administration regulations rushed through at the last minute.

Getting this done hasn't always been easy, and we have met a lot of obstruction along the way. Although the Democrats once championed the CRA, a tool that is "fair" in the words of former Leader Reid, our current Democratic colleagues seem to take a very different view. They have fought against our efforts to deliver relief to the American people, just as they have blocked and punted and forced unnecessary procedural hurdles on the President's nominees for months, and that, remember, was mostly for the sake of unnecessarily taking up valuable floor time, knowing full well it would not change the end result. Regardless, despite those obstructionist tactics, we have continued our regulatory relief efforts because we knew it could make a positive difference for our country.

This congressional action we have taken already, in coordination with

key administration actions, is estimated to result in more than \$67 billion in regulatory cost savings. Let me say that again. The actions we have taken so far, coupled with key administrative actions they have taken on their own, result in more than \$67 billion in regulatory cost-savings and about 56 million hours' worth of paper-work reductions.

The New York Times says the efforts we have undertaken represent "a historic reversal of government rules in record time." A historic reversal of government rules in record time. The Washington Post proclaimed it "the most ambitious regulatory rollback since Reagan." Politico calls it "a once-in-a-generation opportunity," and that is exactly right.

In just a few short months, we have turned a significant corner from how things operated under the Obama administration. Instead of going around Congress to push through regulations, the President is working with us to ease the burden. Instead of adding even more redtape to the Federal Register, we are breaking through it. Instead of promoting policies that hinder growth, we are pursuing ones that actually encourage it.

The actions we have taken can benefit the American people in a number of meaningful ways: Like hard-working families saving for retirement—we made sure Obama-era regulations wouldn't stand in their way. Like students who want to receive the best education they can—we made sure Obama-era regulations wouldn't hold them back either.

After 8 years of an administration which punished coal miners and their families for simply working hard to make a living, we are finally working hand-in-glove with an administration that wants to help mining families instead. Here is an example of what I mean.

In the Republican administration, President Trump used Executive action to order a review of Obama-era regulations that attempted to close existing coal plants and prevent future ones from ever, ever being built. In the Republican Congress, we used the CRA to overturn an Obama administration rule which would have put as many as one-third of coal mining jobs at risk.

Together, Congress and the Trump administration are taking decisive action to support jobs in domestic energy and coal communities. As we do so, we have seen encouraging news as well. According to one report, Kentucky saw a slight, slight increase in coal production last quarter, and Federal projections predict that national production will continue to increase over the next few years. I was pleased to see that news. It is a trend we would like to see continue. I will keep working with the administration and my colleagues in Congress to continue to protect Kentucky jobs and Kentucky families.

These examples, and others, offer yet another illustration of how we can make meaningful and positive impacts in the lives of the people we represent.

Look, we know there is a lot more to be done. We know the scale of the challenge. The growth of the regulatory state has taken a substantial toll on our economy, one that can't be remedied overnight. A recent Washington Post column cited studies saying that "the costs of complying with federal rules and regulations totaled nearly \$1.9 trillion in 2015, equal to about half the federal budget"—\$1.9 trillion in 2015—and that regulations may have shrunk our annual growth rate by as much as 0.8 percent. These regulations may well have shrunk our growth rate by 0.8 percent. As the column pointed out, "A main rap against the administrative state is that, through its aggressive growth, the executive branch has usurped power from other parts of the government, mainly Congress."

With the action we have taken with the CRA, that is beginning to change. Indeed, one reason the Congressional Review Act is so important is because it helps Congress serve as a check and balance on the executive branch. As three former Senators, including former Leader Reid, put it, the Congressional Review Act can help "redress the balance [between the executive and legislative branches], reclaiming for Congress some of its policymaking authority."

While we can't simply turn back time or completely erase the negative impact that Obama regulations have had already, the CRA has allowed us to stop a number of them in their tracks while also preventing agencies from creating similarly harmful rules in the future.

A lot of time and a lot of effort has gone into seeing these resolutions across the finish line so I thank each of our colleagues who had a hand in that effort. Specifically, I recognize those who introduced these resolutions or the Senate companion of House CRA resolutions.

I thank: Senator INHOFE; Senator GRASSLEY, chairman of the Judiciary Committee; Senator JOHNSON, chair of Homeland Security; Senator MURKOWSKI, chair of Energy; Senator SASSE; Senator ALEXANDER, chairman of the HELP Committee; Senator CRUZ; Senator SULLIVAN; Senator CASSIDY; Senator FLAKE; Senator ERNST; Senator HATCH, the Finance chairman; and Senator BARRASSO.

I also thank Senator TILLIS, who was an outstanding advocate for using the CRA process, as well as Senator CORNYN who worked tirelessly to bring these resolutions over the finish line.

This historic regulatory rollback would not have been possible without their leadership. Because of their efforts and key actions by the Trump administration, we have begun chipping

away at policies that have hurt the middle class and prevented economic growth for far too long. Much work remains to be done, but we are going to keep working together to help our economy fully recover from 8 years of anti-growth regulatory overreach, 8 years of missed opportunities, 8 years of dreams deferred, and 8 years of government that left far too many behind.

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

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

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the dismissal of Director Comey has raised a bevy of troubling questions over the last few days. The President of the United States fired the man in charge of an active investigation about the President and his campaign ties to Russia. The truth is, the dismissal of Director Comey is part of a much longer pattern of this administration's interfering with or removing the people who are in a position to conduct an independent investigation of the President and his administration.

The administration requested that the chairmen of the House and Senate Intelligence Committees help them beat back reports in the press about the Russia probe. The administration picked this Attorney General—a very close political ally, then-Senator Jeff Sessions—to lead a Justice Department that was supposed to independently conduct this investigation.

Attorney General Sessions, of course, has since had to recuse himself from the Russia investigation after he misled Congress about his meetings with the Russian Ambassador.

The administration is not shy about removing independent prosecutors and law enforcement officers from their posts if they are simply doing something the President doesn't like, even if it is required by law. They fired Sally Yates. They fired Preet Bharara. They fired more than 40 U.S. attorneys across the country. Now they have fired Director Comey.

This is about more than just Mr. Comey. This is about a pattern of events that casts tremendous doubt on whether this administration has any

interest in allowing the Russia investigation or any other investigation that could be politically damaging to them to proceed unimpeded. This is about one of the most sacred things we believe in as Americans, the rule of law—the rule of law being threatened here.

We in Congress, in both parties, should have one overarching goal: to get the full unvarnished truth. That means getting to the bottom of the events that led to Mr. Comey's dismissal and making sure the Russia investigation is conducted impartially. Here in Congress, the Senate Intelligence Committee is doing its investigation in a bipartisan way, but the executive branch investigation has been compromised.

Attorney General Sessions, who had to recuse himself from the Russia investigation, played a significant role in firing the man who was leading it. Not only that, but the Attorney General is now reportedly leading a search to replace Mr. Comey. He is helping select the next FBI Director, who will be in charge of an investigation he cannot oversee—what an irony.

This Attorney General shouldn't be anywhere near the hiring process of the next FBI Director. His role will jaundice the entire process, if it hasn't already.

In order to ensure the American people can have faith in the impartiality of the investigation, it must be conducted far from the reach of the White House. It is the overwhelming view of my caucus that a special prosecutor should now be appointed to conduct the investigation into the Trump campaign's ties to Russia.

This special prosecutor should be appointed by the highest ranking civil servant at the Justice Department. Mr. Rosenstein and other political appointees should not be the ones who decide on a special prosecutor, lest that decision be seen as influenced, or worse, made at the direction of the administration. I thank my colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, for speaking so eloquently on this proposal.

In addition, there are several things that should happen here on Capitol Hill that will help get us to the bottom of the events this week.

First, Mr. Comey should testify before Congress. There are so many questions that only Mr. Comey can answer. So I applaud Senators BURR and WARNER for inviting him to appear before the Intelligence Committee next week. It was the right thing to do. We ought to hear from Mr. Comey, and I urge Mr. Comey to come and tell the whole story.

Second, Attorney General Sessions and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein should make themselves available to Congress. I am renewing my request of the majority leader to call an

all-Senators briefing where they can answer the questions swirling about from Tuesday night's firing. Attorney General Sessions and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein should appear separately and partially in a classified setting if necessary, but they must come.

Mr. Rosenstein has played a central role in all of these events. He could help clear up questions about where the decision to fire Mr. Comey originated. So later today, separate and apart from my request that he come before the Senate, I will be sending Mr. Rosenstein a letter with a list of questions for him to answer publicly. America needs to hear them. Many Democrats voted for Mr. Rosenstein a few weeks ago because he had a reputation for integrity. He assured us he would be an independent force inside the Department of Justice, and 94 Senators voted for him, but the events of last week have made many of us question that belief. He owes it to the Senate. He owes it to the people he supervises in the Justice Department and in the FBI, and he owes it to the American people to provide some answers.

In sum, we demand the appointment of a special prosecutor by a non-political appointee at the Department of Justice. We want to hear from Mr. Comey. We are asking the majority leader to hold separate all-Senators briefings with the Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General. This would help us get a hold on what happened, would explain why, and would help guide us in what to do next because this investigation will not die no matter who wants it to. I sincerely hope we will get an answer from the majority leader by the end of the day. This is a very serious matter.

Right now, there are two different stories coming out of the White House. Some are saying the decision to fire Mr. Comey came directly from the White House; others, including the Vice President, have said it came from the Department of Justice—specifically, Mr. Rosenstein and Mr. Sessions. We need to resolve these two story lines on something as important as this. We need the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. So I hope my Republican colleagues see the wisdom and value in our request and respond appropriately by the end of the day.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, just a word on the majority's use of the Congressional Review Act. The window for using the CRA is closing this week. I heard the majority leader touting the 13 CRAs the majority passed this year. I want to make two points.

First, despite what the majority leader and the President claim, these CRAs are not a huge accomplishment.

They simply overturned rules passed at the very end of the Obama administration. They hardly constitute a legislative agenda. In fact, the use of the CRA shows just how little this majority and this President have been able to accomplish in the first 100-plus days. The fact that they are bragging about these highlights how little else they have accomplished legislatively.

Second, the CRAs are designed to help special interests against the interests of working Americans, belying all the promises President Trump made when he campaigned. Let me give some examples. One of them is on foreign oil bribery. One of them is on a retirement rule. One of them is on stream protections. One is on mentally-ill access to guns. In each of these, it is a narrow special interest who pushed it, not a demand from the American people. Which Americans say "Make it OK for our companies to bribe foreign oil companies or pollute our streams" or "Give the mentally ill access to guns"? These are narrow interests in each case.

Let's be very clear about this. The CRAs Republicans passed are not rolling back burdensome regulations. Oh, no. They are giveaways to Big Oil, Big Gas, Big Coal, Big Mining, and wealthy special interests.

The most indefensible one of many is the one on a retirement rule. If localities or States want to set up systems whereby working people want to put money away for their retirement, why not? It doesn't hurt anybody. It doesn't require anybody to do anything. And these days where fewer and fewer Americans have pensions from their companies, it is what is needed. But some banks didn't want competition. They didn't want it shown that maybe the cities or the States could run these retirement systems more cheaply and take less money out of the average American's pocket. So we undid this rule. I don't think a single average constituent in any part of America wanted this rule undone, just the big banks—some of them, not all of them. That is the kind of thing my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and President Trump are bragging about. It is nothing to brag about.

Let's be very clear about this. These are not the priorities the American people voted for in November, where a substantial majority of Americans said in exit polls that the economy was rigged against them. These CRAs rig the game even further for the wealthy special interests and are nothing to brag about or write home about.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Lighthizer nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Lighthizer, of Florida, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Robert Lighthizer, of Florida, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Mike Rounds, Orrin G. Hatch, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Thad Cochran, Luther Strange, John Thune, Richard C. Shelby, John Hoeven, John Boozman, Rob Portman, Jerry Moran, David Perdue.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Robert Lighthizer, of Florida, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI),

and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULIVAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 81, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Ex.]

YEAS—81

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

NAYS—15

Blumenthal	McCain	Schatz
Gillibrand	Merkley	Schumer
Harris	Reed	Udall
Heinrich	Sanders	Warren
Markey	Sasse	Whitehouse

NOT VOTING—4

Capito	Murkowski
McCaskill	Sullivan

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 81, the nays are 15.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Wyoming.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, over the past few months, Congress has passed 14 different resolutions that are going to save the American people money and are going to make it a lot easier for our economy to grow. There have been 14 times since February that we have struck down unnecessary, burdensome, and costly regulations.

These were called "midnight regulations" because they came at the end of the Obama administration. Some came out, actually, after the Presidential election had been completed. The outcome was known, and, still, the outgoing administration tried to continue with what President Obama's Chief of Staff at one time called "audacious executive actions." Half of these 14 regulations—half of them—were actually put in place after the November Presidential election.

When one thinks about the election last year in November, President Obama said time and again during the campaign that his agenda was on the ballot. The American people rejected that agenda, and the President dumped these new rules on the American people as a parting shot. We wiped out 14 of these regulations—wiped them off the books.

In one resolution, we rolled back an important part of President Obama's war on coal. That was the so-called stream buffer rule. It was designed to shut down a lot of the surface coal mining in this country. It would have destroyed up to one-third of coal mining jobs in America. So we passed a resolution that will protect coal mining jobs and protect American energy independence.

There was another resolution we passed that restores the role of local land managers in deciding how best to use Federal land. Before the Obama administration, the local experts were the ones who would help decide how Federal land could be used in so many areas around the country. These are the people on the ground. They are the ones who know best what works there. They are the ones with the best sense of how to balance all of the different ways that land can be used. That could be things like recreation, energy production, and grazing.

Well, the Obama administration said it wasn't interested in hearing from the local experts anymore. It decided to put the decisions—all of those decisions—in the hands of unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats in Washington, DC. So Congress passed a resolution that says these are decisions that affect local communities and those communities should have the say—and a significant amount of say—in how decisions get made.

When we look at these 14 resolutions all together, they will save Americans over \$4 billion and more than 4 million hours of paperwork because not only are the regulations expensive, they are burdensome and time-consuming.

I can tell my colleagues this is just the beginning. These resolutions are just one tool that we have to strike down bad regulations. There is much more that Congress can do and will do, and there is much more that the Trump administration can do.

The administration has already made it clear that the bureaucrats in Washington are not in charge anymore. I plan to make sure the Trump administration keeps up the pace and tosses some of the worst regulations and rules into the garbage where they belong.

A good place to start would be for Ryan Zinke, the Secretary of the Interior, to throw out another rule that makes it more difficult to produce American energy. This regulation supposedly tries to reduce how much

methane gets lost in oil and gas production. There is always some unprocessed natural gas that gets released at gas and oil wells. Energy producers try to gather up this gas and then ship it to a processing plant where, of course, it can be sold. It can be used by customers, and taxes are paid on it that go to State and local governments, as well as money that is raised by the sales for the companies themselves.

To do that, the producers need small pipelines. They need these small pipelines to collect the unprocessed gas from the wells and to get it to the processing plant. Here is the problem: We don't have enough of these gathering lines. Without the gathering lines, the only option is for that gas to get burned, and that extra natural gas will escape into the air.

So what do the bureaucrats in Washington say? They could have addressed the real reason this gas is being lost; that is, the fact that they haven't allowed enough of these gathering lines on Federal land. Instead, they decided to write a regulation that makes it tougher for us to produce American energy here in America. The Obama administration blocked the permits to build the gathering lines.

So this methane rule is a terrible regulation. It is redundant. It is unnecessary. I believe it is illegal, and it needs to go. Secretary Zinke should wipe the slate clean and get rid of this outrageous rule immediately. He should also order the bureaucrats who work for him to start approving more of these gas-gathering lines. That is what we really need. We need to make energy as clean as we can, as fast as we can, and do it in ways that do not raise costs for American families. We need to balance thoughtful regulation with a growing economy. We can have both.

The Obama administration absolutely failed to strike the right balance. The Trump administration and Congress have a lot more we can do to make sure we get the balance right.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I will be brief. I think the Senator from Oklahoma is going to go into some additional details, and the Senator from Wyoming did a great job of summarizing some of the positive results that have come from our actions. I want to refer to his resolutions of disapproval for regulations that we feel were an overreach.

When we went through the 14 votes—we actually had 15, but we were not able to succeed in 1 last regulation of disapproval yesterday—there were arguments put forth against our disapproving these regulations. It was as if we were completely deregulating the subject matter area that we were focused on, but that was not the case. What we were trying to do is eliminate

the duplication and the costs associated with layering regulations on top of regulations.

We have a lot of discussion around here about tax reform, and we need to do that, but if we look at the regulatory burden on businesses and homeowners and State and local governments, there is a smart, right-size way to implement regulations, and there is a costly, complex, wrong way to implement regulations.

So I am proud we were able to get 14 resolutions of disapproval completed. I think they were regulations that were not necessary. They are obviously areas that if Congress ever needed to act, we could go back and implement regulations, if necessary.

What we ended up doing through this action over the past couple of months with the administration is reduce regulatory burdens by \$67 billion, and we have eliminated some 56 million paperwork hours. We are eliminating, we are cutting redtape, and that is a good thing.

I appreciate all the Members who worked hard on getting this together. I particularly appreciate my staff—Bill Bode and Torie Ness in particular—who worked hard with the other Senate offices to see what kind of support we could get for moving these regulatory disapprovals forward. I thank my fellow Members and the administration for working with us to fulfill our promise, which is to right-size government and get our economy going again.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, I appreciate the comments made by my colleague from North Carolina. It is even more meaningful to me because all during the time the regulations were coming on, I happened to be the one who was chairing the Environment and Public Works Committee, and we knew what was going to happen.

I am almost speechless when I think about the success. We went 20 years only taking up 1 CRA, and then we end up passing 14 of them—all but 1. That is a huge, successful record. My colleagues understand, this gives us the opportunity for people who are answerable to the public—people who are elected and have to stand for elections—to have a part in what is sometimes considered to be the action of an unelected bureaucrat.

We have had great opportunities here. I think the “midnight” regulations—a term that is used quite often—so that a party going out of office, such as President Obama, being very liberal—a very proud liberal, I might add—wanted to get as many of his rules in at the last minute. We were able to come in and pass these in the time required. We were able to pass 14 of these, in addition to the other regulations and other methods of doing reg-

ulations, which I want to address a little bit. It is just not something that we really anticipated would happen.

Now, I am particularly proud because mine was the first CRA to be passed in 20 years, and that was the very first one that came from what President Obama wanted having to do with the oil and gas industry, but the fact that nothing passed in that long period of time just shows now that people are recognizing that we who stand for election should be involved in this process of doing away with these regulations.

Now, the rule that I brought to the floor, which was the first one the President signed—we had a great signing ceremony and I enjoyed it very much—was the one that affected the oil and gas industry. It was an SEC ruling of the Obama administration that said that if you are a domestic producer of oil and gas—of course, that is the private sector—you have to release all of the information you are using in producing a bid against maybe another country. To use an example, in China, it is not in the private sector like it is in the United States. Their oil and gas business is in the public sector so they would have a distinct advantage. Quite frankly, it is consistent with what the previous President—President Obama—was doing in his war on fossil fuels. Fossil fuels are coal, oil, and gas, and he was very proud to be opposed to coal, oil, and gas, and frankly nuclear too.

I have often wondered—I go back to Oklahoma virtually every weekend that I don't have to be in one of the war zones or someplace like that. I go there really for my therapy because they ask questions that make sense. We don't get these questions in Washington. One of them I remember was in Shattuck, OK. When I was there, somebody said: Explain this to me. We have a President who wants to do away with fossil fuels and he wants to do away with nuclear energy. Now, we are dependent upon fossil fuels, coal, oil and gas, and nuclear energy for 89 percent of the power it takes to run this machine called America. If he is successful in doing away with it, how do we run this machine called America?

Well, I am proud to say that the war against fossil fuels is over. The particular CRA I sponsored came out of the Dodd-Frank Act.

By the way, overregulation is overregulation. When I talk to people back in my State of Oklahoma, if they are in the banking business or the financial services business, they are concerned about the overregulation that comes from Dodd-Frank. If they are farmers, they are concerned about the regulation that would take the jurisdiction of regulating our water resources out of the States and putting it in the Federal Government. So that is what this is all about.

So I will tell you how serious this was. The CRA that I had was so significant that the Federal courts came in, in July of 2013, and said that the SEC made several errors in rushing this regulation through. They actually vacated the rule. That was a major accomplishment. I was very proud that I had the courts on my side, for a change.

Anyway, the SEC finalized the second rule under the authority of Dodd-Frank, section 1504, by making some—without any really substantial changes. Nonetheless, this is the one that he first signed.

So thanks to the Congressional Review Act, oil and gas companies are not at a disadvantage when they are competing with State-owned oil and gas companies such as we have in China.

We passed other critical CRAs because regulations tied the hands of our businesses and took local control away from the States. A lot of people in America—and I think a higher percentage of my people in Oklahoma—are really concerned about Second Amendment rights. Of course, we had one of the regulations that went through—in fact, Second Amendment rights, when we talk about the farmers and the ranchers and not just from my State of Oklahoma—we are a farm State—but throughout America, they will tell you that there are problems. Their No. 1 concern was—and I asked the Farm Bureau representative. He said the greatest problem facing farmers is not anything that is found in the ag bill, it is the overregulation by the EPA and specifically what they call the WOTUS bill. The WOTUS bill, which is the one I just mentioned, would take the jurisdiction away from the State and give it to the Federal Government.

I have to say this. When you talk about “liberals,” that is not a negative term. It is a reality. It is how much power should be in the hands of the Federal bureaucrats as opposed to individuals and the States. So we have a lot of these regulations. One of the things the CRA has done is, it has taken away an excuse that people will use—I am talking about people in this Chamber who are legitimately liberals and believe we should have more control in Washington—it takes the power away from the Federal bureaucrats because what they can do is go ahead and pass the regulations. Then you go back home and when people are yelling and screaming about being overregulated back in their home States, they say: Don’t blame me, blame the unelected bureaucrats. A CRA takes away that excuse because it forces them to actually get on record.

So as chairman of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, we were involved with more of these regulations than any other committee because that is what we do for a living there. So I was very happy to see all of the successes we had.

Let me just mention because I don’t think it has been mentioned before—and I will submit this for the RECORD. There are two ways of doing away with these regulations, and one is through Executive orders. I think everybody knows that. But they don’t realize what has already been done. I think we have had a total of 30, 31 regulations that have been done away with either through Executive orders or through the Congressional Review Act. Some of the Executive orders, for example, are the WOTUS, the one we have been talking about; clean energy, something which repeals the Clean Power Plan and something which officially ended the war on fossil fuels, I might add; the Executive order on rebuilding the military; the Executive order on the Keystone and Dakota Access Pipelines—we are all familiar with that and the ongoing debate.

Some of the CRAs really aren’t talked about too much, and we are talking about regulations that came from the Obama administration that now have been done away with through use of CRAs—the educational rule mandating Federal standards for evaluating teacher performance; the educational rule establishing a national school board, with an effort to get away from local control of the schools; the Interior rule that blocked Alaska from controlling their own hunting and fishing in that beautiful State; the Social Security rule that put seniors on a gun ban list—Second Amendment rights.

All of these things are very significant, and I am very proud, quite frankly, of this body. With the exception of one, we passed all 14 of the CRAs, and I can’t think of any time that has been done in the past. So it is a great thing. It did put the power back in the hands of the people who are elected here, and I am very glad to have been a participant in that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete list of the Congressional Review Act resolutions passed and the Trump Executive actions be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTIONS PASSED

SEC Rule requiring oil and gas companies to disclose their “playbooks” on how to win deals. Inhofe-CRA—first signed since 2001; Stream Buffer Zone rule that blocks coal mining; Education rule mandating federal standards for evaluating teacher performance; Education rule establishing national school board; Interior rule that blocked Alaska-control of hunting & fishing; Social Security rule that put seniors with “representative payees” on gun-ban list; OSHA rule that changed paperwork violation statute of limitations from 6-months to 5-years.

Defense rule that blocked contractors from getting deals if suspected (not convicted) of employment-law violations; Labor rule blocking drug-testing of unemployment

beneficiaries; BLM rule blocking oil and gas development on federal lands. Federal Communications Commission rule that would have established 2nd regime of privacy rules in addition to Federal Trade Commission; HHS rule that would make it easier for states to fund Planned Parenthood; Department of Labor (DOL) rule forcing private sector employees onto government run retirement plans; DOL rule allowing states to bypass protections on retirement plans.

TRUMP EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

Regulatory reform: requires 2 regulations be repealed for each new regulation; WOTUS: directs EPA to rescind Waters of the United States Act; Energy: repeals clean power plan, other harmful regulations . . . ending War on Fossil Fuels; Mexico City: reinstates ban of fed funds going to NGOs that do abortions; Hiring Freeze: freezes federal hiring (exempted military); Military: rebuilds military; Approves Keystone XL pipeline; Approves Dakota Access pipeline.

Permit Streamlining: expedites infrastructure and manufacturing project permits; Immigration: 90 day suspension on visas for visitors from Syria, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Yemen. 20 day suspension of U.S. Refugee Admission Program; Sanctuary Cities: blocks federal Department of Justice grants to sanctuary cities; Dodd-Frank: demands review of Dodd-Frank banking regulations and demanding roll-back; Shrink government: directs federal agencies to reorganize to reduce waste and duplication; Trade: evaluates policies to reduce trade deficit; Opioids: fed task force to address opioid drug crisis; Fiduciary rule: delays implementation of bad DOJ rule; Religious Liberty: Eases enforcement of Johnson Amendment and grants other protections for religious freedom; Offshore drilling: revises Obama-era offshore drilling restrictions and orders a review of limits on drilling locations; National Monuments: Directs a review of national monument designations.

Improves accountability and whistleblower protections for VA employees; Affirms local control of school policies and examines Department of Ed regulations; Reviews agricultural regulations; Reviews use of H-1B visas; Top-to-bottom audit of Executive Branch; Moves Historically Black Colleges and Universities offices from Department of Ed to White House; Obamacare: directs federal agencies to ease burdens of ACA; Establishes American Technology Council; Establishes office of Trade and Manufacturing Policy; Identifies and reduces tax regulatory burdens; “Hire America, Buy America”; Establishes a collection and enforcement of anti-dumping and countervailing duties and violations of Trade and Customs laws; Creates an order of succession within DOJ; Revokes federal contracting executive orders.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MENTAL HEALTH

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I want to talk today about a topic that

I think is getting more attention now than it has gotten for some time—but still not the attention it deserves—and that is to talk a little bit in May, which is Mental Health Month, about mental health.

I was on the floor of the Senate the last day of October 2013, the 50th anniversary of the last bill that President Kennedy signed into law, which was the Community Mental Health Act. Through the Community Mental Health Act, you saw the facilities that were about to be closed, but the anticipated alternatives, in so many ways, never really developed. According to the National Alliance on Mental Illness, approximately one in five adults experiences mental illness in a given year, and one in five young people between the ages of 13 and 18 will experience severe mental illness sometime during their lifetime.

The National Institutes of Health says that one in four adult Americans has a diagnosable, and almost always treatable, mental health disorder, a mental behavioral health issue, and that one in nine adult Americans has behavioral health illness that impacts how they live every single day. So whether it is the statistic that relates to one in four or one in five or one in nine, this is an issue that affects the lives of lots of people.

Half of the children in that age group, 13 to 18, rarely get the help they need, and even fewer adults do. About 40 percent of adults who have behavioral health issues receive the treatment they need for that issue. I think we are beginning to make great strides on this. Certainly, the discussion has changed. The opportunity to treat mental health like all other health has changed.

In the 113th Congress, just a few years ago, Senator STABENOW from Michigan and I worked to get a bill passed; it was called the Excellence in Mental Health Act, and we now have eight States that have projects going on. In those eight States—in significant areas of all of those States—behavioral health is being treated like all other health.

The idea is really built on the federally qualified health centers idea, the reimbursement model, where anybody can go, and if you are covered by a government program, that is taken into consideration. If you are covered by private insurance, that is taken into consideration. If you are paying cash, there is a significant and rapidly declining amount of cash that you have to pay because your income gets smaller. But everybody in these States would have access to mental health care, just as they currently have access to other kinds of healthcare.

At the community mental health centers that meet 24/7 standards, that are available, that have the staffing needs, and in other places that have

the staff the law requires and the access the law requires, people can go to those facilities, and those providers will know they are going to be reimbursed for treating mental health like all other health.

I am certainly glad that my State of Missouri is one of the eight pilot States in that demonstration program. In our State, we have been—I think by any standard—forward-leaning on this issue for a long time, but not nearly as forward-leaning as we should be or as people who look at the pervasive character of behavioral health issues understand we should be.

When we passed the bill a couple of years ago, we really weren't sure how much interest we would get from States. There was some sense that, well, eight States would be all the States that would even want to do this, if every State that wanted to apply and could go through the application process did so. But, in fact, everybody in the mental health world was encouraged to see 24 States, which represented half of the population in the country, apply to be part of that pilot program—certainly, leading by example here, figuring out what happens.

Frankly, if you treat behavioral health like all other health, I think what many of these States will find—and they may all find—is that the other health costs are much more easily dealt with and, obviously, that not only is treating behavioral health like all other health the right thing to do, but it actually may save money to spend this money. People who have other health problems but who are seeing their doctor because their behavioral health issue is under control may be seeing two doctors. They are taking the medicine they need for behavioral health—if they need medicine for that—but because they are eating better, sleeping better, feeling better about themselves, they are also taking the medicine and getting to the appointments for any other health issue they have.

Early studies indicate that, actually, you save money by doing the right thing and understanding that mental health isn't a topic we don't talk about, but mental health is just another health issue we need to deal with.

We need to be sure that we have providers going forward. We don't have enough doctors in Missouri—or in other States—who are able to treat the increasing number of people who seek treatment. And as doctors retire in these fields, we are going to have an even greater shortage if we don't do something to encourage people to go into this field.

There is a particular shortage in care providers who deal with children. Children and youth who are in need of mental health services and who don't receive them run a greater risk of all

kinds of other problems, including dropping out of school, not doing well in school, ending up in the criminal justice system—things that needlessly happen because we haven't stepped forward and viewed their behavioral health problem as we would if they had some other problems.

I was glad Senator REED from Rhode Island and I were recently able to reintroduce a bill called the Ensuring Children's Access to Specialty Care Act. Pediatric medicine doesn't pay as well as other medicine for lots of reasons. One is that children don't have a lot of their own money to pay with, and often their parents don't have it either.

This bill that Senator REED and I introduced would allow physicians who want to specialize in, among other things, child and adolescent psychiatry to be eligible for the National Health Service Corps student loan repayment program. That program is generally not available now to doctors who go on and specialize on the theory that if you specialize, you are going to have more income than the general practice doctor might have. Those programs have always been focused on the general practice doctor, but if you specialize in children's health—whether it is, frankly, psychiatry or any other area of children's health—you are much less likely to financially benefit from deciding to do that. So this would allow those doctors to pursue that program as part of how they help get their loans paid back.

Whether it is physical or behavioral health, children have a unique set of health needs and often a lack of ability on their own to do what needs to be done. Medical residents who practice pediatric medicine require additional training. One of the barriers they cite for not getting that additional training is that they are going to have to have these additional student loans. Hopefully, we can allow ways for them to get into programs that other doctors get into, to see that they continue to be encouraged to be part of pediatric medicine and pediatric specialties.

Also, we are looking at another bill, the Advancing Care for Exceptional Kids Act, commonly referred to as ACE Kids. What ACE Kids does is treat kids who have serious medical problems as exactly that—to have a way to look at health needs and medically complex kids whom you wouldn't look at otherwise, seeing that these particular patients don't have to go through all kinds of barriers to find a doctor, fee for service. Medically complex kids really need help, and I think we could easily design a new and different way to deal with them.

Finally, talking about kids, I want to say one other thing, and that is just to mention that this particular week is Teacher Appreciation Week. I was a

teacher after I got out of college, before I had a chance later to be a university president. I think teachers are always inclined to be teachers and try to tell the stories we need to hear. But when we are talking about mental health and teachers, healthcare, mental health, first aid are things that don't allow teachers to become child psychiatrists or mental health professionals but do allow teachers, as they are watching the students whom they get to know so well, to identify what students need help and what students don't. Often teachers get the first chance outside the child's home to see that they are clearly challenged or may be challenged in ways that are easily dealt with, if they are dealt with, and are really troublesome if they are not dealt with at all.

So while we celebrate Teacher Appreciation Week at the very end of school and Mental Health Month, I hope we commit ourselves to look at these mental health issues for what they are. They are health issues. They need to be talked about. The right thing to do is to deal with them.

I think we are seeing new and better things happen there, but we are not nearly where we should be yet. As I said earlier, when Senator STABENOW and I could go to the floor on the 50th anniversary of the last bill President Kennedy signed and 50 years later talk about how few of the goals set in that bill have been met in five decades by society, we really have a lot of catching up to do.

I believe and hope we are catching up, and I hope this is a month where people really think about telemedicine, contacts, opportunities, and excellence in mental health in ways we haven't before.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, before the Senator from Missouri leaves the floor, I want to say a word about him and the topic he raised today about health and, in this particular case, children.

Senator BLUNT and I have adjoining States, Illinois and Missouri. We have joined up, as well, on the issue of medical research. I salute him. Even though he is my Republican colleague, I want to make clear that this is a bipartisan issue. He has made it a bipartisan issue. We had the good support of Senator ALEXANDER, Republican of Tennessee, and Senator MURRAY, Democrat of Washington.

The Senator from Missouri has done some amazing things. I want to say specifically for the Record that America owes him a debt of gratitude, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that is responsible for the National Institutes of Health, the foremost leading medical research agency in the world.

Let me tell you, with his leadership, what we accomplished. For two straight years, Senator BLUNT has been able to raise the appropriations for medical research at the National Institutes of Health by \$2 billion or more. The net result of that is that a \$30 billion budget has grown to almost \$34 billion. What does it mean? It means that researchers don't get discouraged. They stay on their projects. They keep working to find cures.

Secondly, we are making dramatic advances in medicine because of it. His leadership has been absolutely essential. If there is ever a bipartisan issue, this is it. The Senator has been quite a leader in this regard.

I want to salute you for that while you are on the floor on the topic of healthcare and children.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I appreciate my good friend's comments on this but also his commitment to seeing that we make this happen. As he mentioned, this is a bipartisan effort, but it is an effort that had about a 10-year lag, and we are doing our best to dramatically catch up with what is really an important time in healthcare research.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank my colleague from Missouri. I will tell you that he set a standard. I hope that both parties will agree that this is the starting point. For every year's budget, the starting point is at least a 5-percent real growth increase in medical research.

Thank you, Senator BLUNT, for your leadership.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Madam President, I also want to address an issue that came up in debate last week in the U.S. House of Representatives; that is, the question of the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. This is an issue where reasonable people can disagree about how exactly to run our healthcare system.

But at the end of the day, I hope that, as with medical research, we can all come together with some basic issues. Congress should not pass a law taking away health insurance coverage from Americans. Let's start there. Congress should work together on a bipartisan basis to find ways to reduce the cost of healthcare and health insurance premiums. I think we should agree on that too.

Third, we have to find a way to make sure that consumers and families across America are protected with health insurance that is there when they need it. Now, it was a little over a week ago when I became a statistic—not just a Senator but a statistic—in healthcare. I went through a heart catheter procedure in Chicago last week on Tuesday. After that procedure—which turned out just fine; thank you—I am a statistic. I am a person in America with a preexisting condition. I have to check that box that says I have had a heart procedure.

It used to be if you checked a box like that—diabetes, asthma, whatever you checked—it ended up having a direct impact on what you paid for health insurance or whether you could even buy it. There were people who survived cancer—children, adults—who could not buy health insurance because they were too big a risk for health insurance companies.

Well, we changed that. The Affordable Care Act changed that and said: Just because you have a preexisting condition—and one out of three Americans has one—you should not be denied coverage. Now, the House of Representatives passed a bill that allows Governors literally to take away that requirement in health insurance plans. What are they thinking?

Do they think they are so darn lucky that they will never have an accident, never have a diagnosis where they end up with a preexisting condition? It can happen to anybody, and it does. So what the House of Representatives did in this regard is a step backward.

They also changed the Medicaid system. People have this image, when you say Medicaid: Oh, that is the same as Medicare. No, Medicare is for seniors and disabled people. Medicaid is a policy of health insurance that is available for people who do not have a lot of money. Well, who qualifies for that? Well, it turns out that the largest number of people who qualify for Medicaid are children and their moms.

In my State of Illinois, half of the kids who are born in the State are covered by Medicaid. So the moms, when they need prenatal care to make sure the babies are healthy, and the babies, when they need care after the hospital, rely on Medicaid. But that is not the most expensive thing when it comes to Medicaid. The most expensive thing in Medicaid are your moms, your grandmothers, and granddads who are in nursing homes. You know what happens? They reach a point where they need to be in a place where folks can watch them and help them.

They have medical issues and age is taking its toll. But many of them get there, and all they have is Social Security and Medicare, and it is not enough. So Medicaid steps in and supplements it so that your mom, your dad, or your grandmother can stay in that place, which is good for them, secure, safe, and with the right kind of healthcare. The other group that relies on Medicaid the most in their daily lives are disabled people, folks who are born with a disability or have acquired one in life and they need ongoing medical care they cannot personally afford.

Children and their moms, elderly folks in nursing homes, and disabled people depend on Medicaid. So what does the Republican bill that passed the House of Representatives do to the Medicaid Program across America? It ends up cutting over \$800 billion in coverage. What it means in Illinois is that

1 million people—out of our 12.5 million population—are likely to lose their health insurance because of the action taken by the House of Representatives.

Even my Republican Governor in Illinois came out publicly and said what they did in the House of Representatives is disastrous for our State. It has a significant negative impact on the cost of healthcare and the coverage of health insurance. So why would we want to do that? Why would we want to take health coverage away from the groups I just mentioned?

Do we want to put less money in prenatal care? Well, if we do, we run the risk that children will be born with problems and challenges that could cost us a fortune and compromise their lives.

Do we want to put less money into supporting elderly people who are in nursing homes? Well, what are they going to do? What are they supposed to do? If they can't stay in a place that is good for them and with the right kind of care, does that mean the family now has to find a spare room for grandma or your mom? I hope not. These folks want to live in dignity, and they don't want to be in a situation where they have to look for charity or beg for help from their families.

The third group is disabled people. For goodness sakes, we are lucky. We have people with disabilities who are doing amazing things today. But many who are in lower income categories need the help of Medicaid.

I had a group of hospital administrators come in to see me this week from Illinois. They were from every part of the State. If you go down to our beautiful Southern Illinois area, there are some great towns. One of them is Anna, IL, right near Cobden, IL. It is down in the southern end of our State. It is a very rural area with smaller towns.

Then I had administrators in the same group from Quincy, IL, from Springfield, IL, my home town, and from the city of Chicago. They all came here to tell me the same thing: The bill that passed the House of Representatives last week is a disaster when it comes to Illinois hospitals. They estimate they are going to lose up to 60,000 people who are currently working in hospitals in Illinois, because of that bill, and they are also going to see closures and reductions in services at these same hospitals while we see the Medicaid cutbacks take place.

Now, why is that? Let's assume you have a small rural hospital in a town that you live in. If you do, you value it very much because that means there is healthcare there, right next door, when you need it. You don't have to drive 50 miles or more. You have it right there. You also know it is a great employer in your area. You also know, as well, that that is the way you keep a lot of busi-

nesses in your town and attract new ones.

So what these hospitals are telling us is that the bill that passed the House of Representatives to repeal the Affordable Care Act is a threat to the future of those hospitals. If the patients don't come in covered by Medicaid and pay for some of their services, the hospitals will still treat them, but they are charity patients, then, and the hospitals have to charge every other patient more because of it.

So that is a terrible way for us to approach healthcare reform in America. That is the reality of what we face today. I am troubled by the fact that this bill, which passed the House of Representatives by two votes—two votes—if two Congressmen had voted the other way, this bill would not have passed. This bill was never reviewed by the Congressional Budget Office. Well, who cares? I care.

For everything we do that is supposed to be that important to affect the American economy, we are supposed to go to the nonpartisan experts and ask them: Well, what does this really do? We have been held to that standard—Democrats have and Republicans, too—until now. Now, we have this decision by the House of Representatives to pass this bill affecting America's healthcare system—one-fifth of our economy, I might add—and they never went for an analysis to the Congressional Budget Office.

That has never happened before. They did it anyway. You know why they did it? Because the first version of this bill was a disaster. They sent that bill in for an analysis—24 million Americans losing their health insurance over the next 10 years. It was a disaster. They were afraid they would get the same analysis on the second bill. So they never sent it in for the analysis. In 2 weeks, we are going to have the numbers.

But it really gives you fair warning that this bill could be very hurtful to a lot of people across America, and yet it passed the House of Representatives. So today people say to me in Illinois, when I have town meetings: Well, we are listening to you, Senator. But what do you want to do about healthcare today? What would you change in the current system? Well, let me tell you first. I voted for the Affordable Care Act. I believe in it. The number of uninsured people in America—the percentage—has been cut in half because of the Affordable Care Act. Is it perfect? Of course not. Does it need to be changed? Yes.

I can give you two or three specifics, and I will. First, we have to do something about the price of drugs in America—pharmaceuticals. You see what is happening. Hedge funds are buying the rights to drugs and raising the prices two, three, four, and ten times because they have an exclusive drug. There is a

family I have come to know who has a young son who is in high school in Chicago. He has diabetes. He is an amazing kid. He is going to be a great success in life. He has fought diabetes for years and years. His mom and dad have stood behind him.

They came in to tell me: Do you know what has happened to the cost of insulin—insulin—which diabetics need dramatically? It has gone up two, three, four, and five times in the last few years for no reason other than that they can charge it. Of course, a person with diabetes may be dependent on that insulin even to survive.

So the first thing we ought to do when we look at the healthcare system is figure out how to make sure that we have reasonable pricing when it comes to pharmaceuticals. Of course, I want them to make a profit. Those pharmaceutical companies, with a profit motive, will keep doing research to find the next drug. But do I want these hedge funds and others—investment bankers—to buy out the rights to those drugs and drive their prices through the roof? That is not fair. It adds dramatically to the cost of healthcare.

Blue Cross Blue Shield is one of the biggest insurers in America. It is the biggest in my State of Illinois. My wife and I have a plan with them. So the head of Blue Cross Blue Shield came to me, and she said: Senator, did you know that last year Blue Cross Blue Shield paid more for pharmaceuticals than they paid for inpatient hospital care? What? Inpatient hospital care, people who have to come in for surgeries and things—you paid more for pharmaceuticals?

Yes.

Well, there are things we can do about it. I have legislation that I have introduced that reviews the pricing on pharmaceuticals, holds the pharmaceutical companies accountable. I take a position on an issue that all of my colleagues don't share, but I want to share it with you. There are only two nations in the world—only two—that allow pharmaceutical companies to advertise on television. The United States and New Zealand.

Well, what difference does it make? Have you turned on the TV lately and tried to find a show that did not have ads about pharmaceuticals? Have you tried to write down the names of some of those pharmaceuticals so that you might remember them if it is something of interest? Have you tried to listen to the warnings that they give you about all of these pharmaceuticals?

Well, some of the warnings are amazing: If you have had a liver transplant, be sure and tell your doctor. Well, yes, that explains that incision. A liver transplant? Why do they do that? Why do they buy all of those ads on television? Real simple. If you have some condition, and they talk about it in one of those ads, you are going to ask

your doctor about that drug, and it is likely, in many cases, that doctor, then, will end up prescribing that drug.

Is it necessary? It may not be. Is it the cheapest form of the drug? It may not be. So, then, why does the doctor write the prescription? Because it is easier to do that than a 10-minute stop in the office for him to sit down with you and patiently explain: You don't need this drug, or you can use a generic, or we ought to wait a while before we go into this.

The result of it is that more and more pharmaceutical companies have their drugs being prescribed and more and more profits coming their way. So I, for one, think that this direct consumer advertising is really hurtful in terms of the cost of healthcare in our country, and it is something we ought to deal with. I would make that part of the reform of the Affordable Care Act.

The second thing we need to do is to make sure, I believe, that in every place in America, if you so choose, you can choose a Medicare-type public plan to cover your family. Right now, it is private health insurance companies. You may choose to stick with the private health insurance company. That should be your choice. But you also ought to have a Medicare-type plan.

Over 50 million Americans are covered by Medicare, and most of them—the overwhelming majority of them—are happy with Medicare. What if we had a Medicare-type plan, a public option, available to every American to choose if they wish? I think that could reduce the cost of healthcare, and I think it is an option we ought to consider.

The third point I would make is that when we are dealing with reforming the healthcare system, we have one group in particular who is giving us a real challenge: individuals who are buying health insurance. The vast majority of Americans get their health insurance through their employment and many others through Medicaid—a program I described earlier—and then there is that group out there buying insurance on the open market. They are the ones who are seeing the runup in premiums and costs and overruns that they have to face, seeing copayments going up and the like. We need to find a way to deal with this group to give them affordable health insurance. There are a lot of ways to approach that, but that ought to be a target of what we do for the ones who are facing the toughest increases in health insurance.

I will just say this too: The good news about this conversation in the Senate is that it is finally reaching a new level. Now there are 12 Republican Senators who are meeting with Senator McCONNELL, and they are setting out to draw up a plan and try to pass it with just Republican votes. I hope that does not succeed, and I will tell

you why. If we can do this on a bipartisan basis and sit down in good faith and work out these improvements to the Affordable Care Act, that is the best option for this country. Senator COLLINS of Maine and Senator CASSIDY of Louisiana are trying to start that conversation. I have said to them that if this is a good-faith effort not to repeal the Affordable Care Act but to repair it, I want to pull a chair up to the table.

Let's have this conversation. We may not agree, we may not be able to come up with the best solutions, but the bipartisan approach of solving the current problems with the current healthcare system is a much more sensible thing to do than to have an all-Republican bill trying to force its way through here. I hope that doesn't happen. It is far better to do this on a bipartisan basis, and I hope that is what will be done.

I will be going home, as I do regularly, to talk about the impact of the bill passed by the House of Representatives. I have just touched on some of the major points of it.

There is one thing I do want to mention, though. It has an age tax in it that many people between the ages of 50 and 64 may not be aware of.

Currently the law says that there cannot be a disparity of difference in premiums charged of more than 3 to 1; that is, the most expensive premium charged to someone for health insurance, no matter what their health or condition, cannot be more than three times the lowest premium charged. That is current law. The bill passed in the House of Representatives changed that dramatically. It says: Instead of 3 to 1, let's make it 5 to 1. Who is going to pay the difference? Folks who are older and those facing chronic illness.

If you are between the ages of 50 and 64, watch out for your health insurance premiums under this measure that passed the House of Representatives. That is something which should not have been included. That is why the American Association of Retired Persons has come out against this bill. It is another reason we have to ensure that the bill that passed the House of Representatives does not become the law of the land. To have this discrimination against people because of their age is unfair, and I agree with the American Association of Retired Persons on that particular issue.

Let's hope we can find a bipartisan path to making healthcare even better in America. I don't care who takes the credit for it. If at the end of the day more families have peace of mind with health insurance that they can afford, that provides them quality care when they need it, that is something we need to achieve.

As I said earlier, I again learned this lesson last week. The lesson is simply this: If you go in for a diagnosis and

learn that you need quality healthcare, you want to have health insurance. You want to have access to the best doctors and hospitals. Everyone in America wants that. That shouldn't be a privilege which is reserved just for the rich and lucky; that ought to be there for every single American.

I believe healthcare is a right, not a privilege. If we start off with that premise, we can build a healthcare system in this country that is still the envy of the world.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, today I come to the floor in opposition to the nomination of Robert Lighthizer to be United States Trade Representative, USTR. After close examination of the confirmation process for Mr. Lighthizer, I have come to the conclusion that Mr. Lighthizer does not adequately understand the positive economic benefits the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA, has had and will continue to have on Arizona and our Nation. His advocacy for protectionist shifts in America's trade policies, including his support for the withdrawal from the Trans-Pacific Partnership, TPP, and the Trump administration's incoherent and inconsistent trade posture, have only solidified my opposition to his nomination to be USTR.

As I wrote in a February piece in the Arizona Republic, coauthored by my colleague Senator FLAKE and Arizona chamber president Glenn Hammer, NAFTA has delivered enormous economic benefits to the United States since its inception in 1994, especially for the citizens of Arizona. In just two decades, Arizona's exports to Canada and Mexico have increased by \$5.7 billion, or 236 percent. Mexico stands as Arizona's No. 1 trading partner, with bilateral trade accounting for 40 percent of our State's exports to foreign markets in 2015 and totaling \$9.2 billion. Arizona's trade relationship with Mexico also directly supports more than 100,000 Arizona jobs.

While I understand NAFTA could be strengthened and modernized, any efforts by this administration to withdraw from NAFTA or impose new restrictions or barriers on our ability to trade with Mexico and Canada will have serious consequences for Arizona, including massive job losses for workers and dramatically higher costs for consumers. Furthermore, I am troubled by the need for and the process by which Congress recently granted Mr. Lighthizer a waiver to serve as USTR given that he previously represented a Brazilian and Chinese client in trade litigation matters. As part of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, Congress adopted my amendment to prohibit an individual from serving as U.S. Trade Representative or Deputy U.S. Trade Representative if that person has "directly represented, aided, or advised a foreign entity" in "any trade negotiation, or trade dispute, with the United

States.” Ultimately, the waiver was tucked in the must-pass omnibus spending bill, with no chance to debate or vote on such an important trade related policy.

As Senator SASSE and I recently wrote in a letter opposing Mr. Lighthizer, the administration’s incoherent and protectionist message on trade “is especially troubling because confirming a USTR grants the Administration additional legal authority to negotiate trade deals that Congress must consider under ‘fast track’ procedures. Given these circumstances, granting the Trump Administration additional legal powers through your confirmation without understanding how you or the Administration intend to use those powers would be irresponsible.”

I plan to vote against the nomination of Mr. Lighthizer, and I urge colleagues to join me.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I support the nomination of Robert Lighthizer to be the United States Trade Representative.

Trade agreements should meet two tests: Does the agreement improve worker wages? And does the agreement add American jobs? For far too long, U.S. Trade Representatives have prioritized profits of large multinational organizations over the interests of the American people and our country as a whole.

The USTR should be someone who negotiates on behalf of the American worker and advances labor and environmental protections, and the USTR should be someone who works to enforce agreements. While I don’t agree with everything in Mr. Lighthizer’s resume, his record suggests that he will be a USTR who will approach trade policies in the ways I have outlined. I hope the approach he takes going forward will reflect the positions he has taken in the past. I expect him to ask: Does it improve worker wages? And does it add American jobs?

I believe that Mr. Lighthizer will bring fresh eyes to trade policy. I hope that he will focus on increasing transparency at the USTR. I hope that he will stand up for worker rights, both domestically and internationally. I hope that Mr. Lighthizer will work to enforce trade policies that protect the environment.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRADE

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I come from a State that in some ways is

very similar to yours, the State of Kansas. You get to see firsthand the impact of trade and exports on the people, on jobs, and on the economic opportunity of my communities. Our State economy relies on our ability to sell the products we grow and manufacture to people around the globe.

Strengthening our trade relationships and expanding market access for exports abroad creates a greater opportunity for Kansans today and those who follow us. One of my goals has always been to make certain that communities across Kansas remain a place in which the young men and women who grow up there find it to be a place to raise their families. Our ability to do that, especially in a small, rural community with agriculture and agricultural exports, is so important. It is a way that we can really put America first.

If our goal is to have an America that has strength and prosperity, we ought to continue to focus on improving our Nation’s economy. That is one of the things that I appreciate—we seem to be focused in such a significant way on our ability to grow an economy. I think we are poised for much greater things economically.

“Economics” may sound like just one of those words, but what that means is more jobs, better jobs, more secure jobs, jobs for our children so that maybe they can pay back their student loans. This country desperately needs the jobs in the communities across Kansas and around the country, and it is really what we call the American dream.

Trade, including our ability to sell the food and fiber we grow in our State, is a key part that drives our economy forward. Almost half of the wheat grown in Kansas is exported to foreign markets. What that means is, if you weren’t doing that, nearly half of the acres planted in our State would be idle. That means the communities those farmers and ranchers live in and around would have half of the amount of economic activity that currently is occurring. American ranchers ship over 1 million metric tons of beef to consumers abroad. Thousands of acres of corn, sorghum, and soybeans being planted this spring across Kansas and the Nation will ultimately be exported.

Approximately 95 percent of the world’s consumers live outside America’s borders. To reach those consumers, our Nation must produce a trade policy that grows the existing export markets while continuously building and developing new ones. Without export markets, both production and prices would fall for farmers and ranchers, and rural communities supported by agriculture would disappear. The revenue generated by exports not only keeps family farmers and ranchers afloat, it drives rural economies and supports small businesses.

The aerospace industry, which is so important in Kansas, also relies on an integrated supply chain and strong trade policy. Wichita, KS—appropriately labeled the “Air Capital of the World”—manufactures more than half of the world’s general aviation light aircraft and business jets. Without trade, aerospace and manufacturing facilities in Wichita and surrounding areas would not exist and workers in those factories would be left without job opportunities.

It is critical that we protect these jobs, many of which depend upon the United States having a strong economic relationship with Canada and Mexico. The North America Free-Trade Agreement, which went into effect in 1994, plays a significant role in supporting trade with those two neighboring nations.

Of course, the world and technology have changed since 1994 when that agreement was entered into. There are areas of the agreement that can be improved and modernized. Many of those changes have been discussed and are issues that the United States, Canada, and Mexico agreed to during TPP negotiations, such as strengthening our intellectual property rights and new provisions for e-commerce.

If we work collaboratively with Mexico and Canada to address the issues with NAFTA, including the issues on which we strongly disagree, I am confident we can improve the agreement for all parties. But efforts to pull out of NAFTA completely or to weaken our trading relationship with Canada and Mexico during renegotiations would cause significant damage to the American economy. We must have willing negotiators sitting across the table when discussing NAFTA, and that starts with treating our neighbors as trade partners and as friends. We need to treat these folks as friends, and we need to seize the opportunities we have.

Working together to improve NAFTA or building economic relations with other trading partners does not mean America should take a step back from enforcing the current rules. Oftentimes in the past, we have been too focused on striking trade deals and selling them to the public, but we haven’t done enough to make sure other countries are playing by the rules that are negotiated. Nontariff barriers and unfair trading practices by foreign countries harm our producers, workers, and consumers.

We must make certain American producers are competing on a level playing field in a global market and that our jobs and wages are not being undermined by other countries’ efforts to distort trade policies and trade agreements.

Many Americans have lost confidence in trade agreements, and I believe that

is partly because the benefits of trade agreements have been oversold, while the enforcement of unfair trade practices have been insufficient. In promoting agreements, leaders had set expectations for increased jobs, higher wages, growth in exports, and many other metrics that were impossible to meet. When these exaggerated promises did not come to fruition, many people lost confidence in those trade agreements.

America should strengthen our commitment to holding other countries accountable in order to inspire greater confidence from the American public in our Nation's ability to reach a trade agreement that benefits us all.

Weakening our trade relations will cause Kansans to lose jobs. Farmers and ranchers will no longer be able to pursue their careers and lifestyle. But with strong leadership and smart negotiating, I am convinced that America can improve our trade relationships in the world and continue to build on the economic successes we have today.

A robust U.S. economy that provides market opportunities for farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers, and job prospects for workers is an essential pillar of America's strength and well-being. Strong trade relationships, particularly with Canada and Mexico, are primary drivers of our Nation's economy. We must protect those relationships and carefully consider changes in our approach to trade to be certain that Americans continue to benefit from economic opportunities that are created by a strong trade policy.

Madam President, our relationships with Mexico and Canada are important and in many ways determine the economic future of the people of my State at home.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, these are not ordinary times. It is not ordinary for a winning Presidential campaign to be under investigation for collusion with a foreign adversary to influence our 2016 election and undermine our democracy. It isn't ordinary for a President to fire the man responsible for conducting this very investigation. It isn't ordinary for a President whose campaign is under investigation for having ties to Russia to hold an Oval Office meeting with that country's Foreign Minister and only invite the Russian press. This meeting came only a day after firing the person in charge of the Russia-Trump inves-

tigation. Yet, here we are. The question is, What should we do next?

The events of the past 48 hours have been shocking and concerning. Firing FBI Director James Comey in this manner, under this pretext, and at this time is a total disservice to the American people.

President Trump hopes the American people will believe he fired Director Comey because of how he treated Hillary Clinton during the Presidential campaign. President Trump hopes, as his Deputy Press Secretary said on Tuesday night, that the American people think it is "time to move on." President Trump hopes his attempts to distract us from the importance of getting to the bottom of the Russia-Trump matter will succeed. President Trump's hopes are misplaced. If anything, President Trump's firing of Director Comey has resulted in an increased concern about the Trump team's connections to Russian interference with our 2016 Presidential election.

The country is asking, Mr. President, what do you have to hide?

We are learning practically on an hourly basis about how the President made this decision to fire Director Comey and why. This information does not square with the official line coming from the White House, which also changes.

Most recently, the Washington Post reported that Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein threatened to resign after the White House misrepresented his role in the decision to fire Director Comey. CNN reported that President Trump fired Director Comey because he would not provide "assurance of personal loyalty." Both CNN and the Wall Street Journal reported that the decision to fire Director Comey came after the FBI's investigation was accelerating. All of this information has emerged in the last 48 hours or so.

This kind of Presidential interference, through the firing of the FBI Director during an ongoing investigation, is unprecedented, suspicious, and deeply concerning. These revelations and those that are sure to come further argue in favor of appointing a special prosecutor to fully investigate the Russia-Trump matter. A special prosecutor with full autonomy can follow the evidence wherever it leads and prosecute as appropriate.

I call upon Republicans of conscience to stand up and join the call for a special prosecutor.

Over the past few days, a number of my Republican colleagues have spoken out against the way the President had fired James Comey. In particular, I would like to acknowledge Senators MCCAIN, SASSE, FLAKE, BURR, KENNEDY, BOOZMAN, and CORKER for speaking out. I hope, as more information about President Trump's decision to fire Director Comey emerges, our Re-

publican colleagues will join in the call for a special prosecutor.

Leader MCCONNELL argued yesterday that appointing a special prosecutor would disrupt the ongoing work of the Senate committees that are conducting their own investigations. I disagree. The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the Senate Judiciary Committee have important oversight responsibilities regarding the Russia-Trump matter, but neither committee has the power to convene a grand jury or prosecute any crimes that may have been committed. Therefore, I reiterate the need for a special prosecutor with the mandate and authority to follow the facts wherever they lead—free of political considerations.

In the coming weeks, President Trump will nominate a new Director for the FBI. This person must be above reproach and be someone whose independent judgment can earn the country's confidence. I have been disturbed by some of the names being floated as potential replacements, names like Chris Christie and Rudy Giuliani. We cannot allow President Trump to appoint one of his buddies to oversee the Russia-Trump investigation or to lead the FBI.

The investigation into the Russia-Trump matter cannot and should not be a partisan issue. We should all care that a foreign government has sought to interfere with our elections and with our democracy. This is not just about the election. This is really about protecting our democracy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, there is a Chinese curse that reads: "May you live in interesting times."

To call the times that we find ourselves in right now "interesting" would be certainly an understatement. The fact is, we find ourselves and our country in a moment that is profoundly testing the rule of law here in America, profoundly testing the strength of our democratic institutions. We have a President who has now engaged in a pattern of removing individuals from office who are executing their responsibilities under the law.

First, on January 30, just 11 days into the Trump administration, it was Sally Yates, the Acting Attorney General, who warned the administration that Michael Flynn had been compromised by his connections to Russia—an incredibly responsible act for her to take, but she was fired.

On March 10, it was Preet Bharara, the U.S. attorney in New York, who

was reportedly investigating whether Secretary Price had profited from his position in Congress. He had been told he would be retained by this administration when suddenly he was fired.

Then this week, Tuesday, the President fired James Comey, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; James Comey, who was leading the FBI's investigation into the possible collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia in the Presidential election and who was scheduled to testify before the U.S. Senate this week; James Comey, who had just recently asked for more funding and resources in order to appropriately and substantially investigate Russian interference in our elections and possible connections to the Trump campaign; James Comey, whose investigation just handed down its first round of subpoenas.

The firing of James Comey has more than a passing resemblance to Nixon's Saturday Night Massacre, the infamous incident in October of 1973, when President Nixon ordered the Attorney General to fire the special prosecutor who was investigating Watergate. The Attorney General, Elliott Richardson, refused to do so and resigned. His deputy, William French Smith, refused to do so and resigned.

Day by day, we have seen more connections, bits and pieces, come to light—conversations involving Michael Flynn, former campaign manager Paul Manafort, Carter Page, and Attorney General Sessions.

The President insists there is no “there” there, but we have seen a pattern of conversations that we don't fully understand. Was there coordination between the Trump campaign and the Russians to interfere in the U.S. Presidential election? Was there collaboration? We don't know. We know there were a lot of conversations, but what was the substance of those conversations? And who instructed those meetings to take place? What is the full pattern of these events?

It is important that we get to the bottom of it because what every American understands is, if you conspire with a foreign government to undermine the integrity of the American elections, you are conspiring to undermine the integrity of the American Government itself; that this is a terrible assault, a terrible crime against our country.

The President's team says this firing of Director Comey had nothing to do with the Russia investigation. They did so through a series of documents, including a letter from Attorney General Jeff Sessions to the President, a memo to Jeff Sessions from Rod Rosenstein, and the President writing a letter to James Comey saying you are fired. So the memo from Rosenstein to the AG, the AG's letter to the President, the President's letter saying you are fired,

and all of this claiming the basis of the investigation was because they were dissatisfied with the way James Comey had treated Secretary Clinton.

Now, that doesn't really fit with the history we are familiar with. The President told audiences at a campaign rally in October: “I tell you what, what he did, he brought back his reputation.”

He is referring to James Comey.

“He brought it back.”

And then when the President talked to “60 Minutes,” he said: “I respect him a lot,” when he was asked about Director Comey in the context of the actions he had taken in regard to Secretary Hillary Clinton.

We remember the chants at his rallies: “Lock her up.”

I don't think there is a single American—not a single Member of this body of 100 Senators—who believes for a moment—not for a microsecond—that the reasoning in this memo from the Deputy AG to the AG and the letter from the AG to the President and the President's memo to James Comey, that the arguments made here were the basis of his firing.

If you believe the President woke up and said: I am so concerned about the way James Comey treated Hillary Clinton that he just has to be dismissed, then I have some oceanfront property in Arizona I would be happy to sell you.

We know from the reporting of the last few days that there is quite another story—an accurate story—about why the President fired James Comey. We now know the President had become increasingly frustrated with Director Comey because he wouldn't go along with the story line the President wanted. The President wanted him to support his claim that the Obama administration had wiretapped Trump Tower, but Director Comey, caring about the integrity of his team at the FBI and the office, refused to do so. In fact, he clarified that there is absolutely no information that corroborates the President's claim that Trump Tower had been wiretapped by President Obama.

We know the President was frustrated that the Director was doing his job to explore—that is, to investigate—Russia's actions in our campaign, in our Presidential campaign, and that he was frustrated that there was looking into potential ties between his campaign and the Russians. He didn't like a lot about the fact that Director Comey was asking for more resources to be able to do a thorough investigation.

Well, we know the result.

According to a report in the Washington Post this morning, President Trump made his final decision to fire the Director last weekend while he was golfing on his property in New Jersey. He then tasked the AG and the Deputy

Attorney General to come up with a cover story.

This is an astonishing chain of events. What we have here is the President making a decision based on the appropriate efforts of the FBI to investigate a potential crime against the United States of America. What we have here is a President determining he wanted to derail that investigation, and he went to the AG and the Deputy AG to say: Help me do this. Help me derail this investigation. Give me a cover story I can sell to the American public. And Attorney General Sessions complied and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein complied.

Now, that is quite different than what happened in the Saturday Night Massacre. In the Saturday Night Massacre, when the President said to the Attorney General: Get rid of that special prosecutor so I can derail the investigation, the Attorney General stood up and said: No way, and resigned—the Deputy Attorney General resigned, but that is not what we have here. We have now our AG agreeing to develop a cover story for the President.

Now, this memo from Attorney General Sessions reads as follows: “As Attorney General, I am committed to a high level of discipline, integrity, and the rule of law to the Department of Justice.”

Let me ask this question, Where is the integrity in collaborating in a false story in order to derail an investigation, an important investigation to the very heart of the integrity of our system of government? Where, I ask the Attorney General, is the integrity in developing a cover story—a false story to cover up the action of derailing an investigation. That is the opposite of integrity.

To the Deputy, who also agreed to conspire in this deception of the American public, where is your integrity? Where was your commitment to justice?

So here we have events that are deeply disturbing not only in terms of the President's decision to falsely mislead the American public but also to the Attorney General's decision to collaborate in that and the Deputy Attorney General's decision to support it. How is this not obstruction of justice?

If anyone here thinks for a moment that the President is going to nominate a new head of the FBI and ask that individual to conduct a robust investigation of Russia's entanglement in the U.S. elections, I have another thought for you: It is not going to happen. The President has deliberately, intentionally derailed this investigation, and the Justice Department has no intention of making it go forward again.

We need to hear from these top officials. We need to have these officials come to the U.S. Senate, to a committee of the whole, to tell us their story and answer these questions about

what they have just done to violate the integrity of the Department of Justice.

We need to have a special prosecutor. We know the head of the FBI, when we have one again, is not going to be able to conduct a robust investigation. Therefore, we need a special prosecutor to get to the bottom of this. The American people deserve no less. The restoration of integrity of the U.S. Government deserves no less.

Lady Justice carries scales in her hands, and where is the blindfold? The whole point is that no one in America is above the law, no one—not Presidents or Vice Presidents, not AGs or Deputy AGs. Lady Justice is all about getting the facts, following the facts where they go, holding individuals accountable, when we get those facts, when we get that information.

That is what we need to do now. We need to get to the bottom of this. We need to have that special prosecutor. We need to make sure that if anyone did conspire with the Russians, they are held to the full account of the law because conspiring with a foreign country to undermine the integrity of U.S. elections is treasonous conduct. This is not a traffic ticket. This is a question of treasonous—conspiring with a foreign government, undermining the U.S. Presidential election.

I am deeply disturbed about this turn of events. I am deeply disturbed about the information we have. We need to get the full, full story, the complete story, and make sure justice is served.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of Senator MURPHY, there be 20 minutes of postcloture time remaining on the Lighthizer nomination, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee; that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the Lighthizer nomination; and that, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RISCH. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank Senator MERKLEY for his remarks this week, as this body has been rightly focused on the firing of James Comey and the imagined rationale that the President gave.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, secret meetings have been happening amongst our Republican colleagues to draft a healthcare bill that could have devastating consequences on the people we all represent. I know we are about to have a

vote on the floor, but I wanted to come to the floor to simply remind all of my friends on both sides of the aisle of the promises that have been made about this process and this piece of legislation which emerged from the House last week with devastating consequences. Those consequences include 24 million people losing coverage and people with preexisting conditions being subjected to \$200,000 premium increases, potentially.

I just reference the words of the President of the United States, who told us repeatedly over and over again, during the campaign and after the campaign, that the result of this healthcare reform debate was going to be a healthcare system that was better. President Trump outlined that in a number of different ways.

Here is what he said on April 30, just a few weeks ago. He said:

The healthcare plan is on its way. Will have much lower premiums & deductibles, while at the same time taking care of pre-existing conditions!

That is not true. That is a lie. The healthcare bill that emerged from the House of Representatives did none of those things.

CBO has not come out with its final estimate. It is unbelievable that the House voted on a reordering of one-sixth of the American economy without a CBO estimate, but we can pretty much be sure that the first CBO estimate will hold, in that it will say that premiums are going to go up by 15 to 20 percent immediately for everybody, and then for the nonyoung healthy and wealthy, premiums are going to go up even higher.

It didn't take care of preexisting conditions. It did the opposite—allowed every State to be able to walk away from the protection of the Affordable Care Act, which makes sure people with preexisting conditions, which could be one-third of all Americans, can't be subject to higher rates, and it substituted that requirement with a high-risk pool which is dramatically underfunded to the point that it is laughable, in the opinion of many healthcare economists.

Here is what Donald Trump said earlier this year:

We're going to have insurance for everybody. People covered under the law can expect to have great healthcare. . . . Much less expensive and much better insurance for everybody.

CBO says 24 million people will lose their insurance, and that number might be higher when the new estimate comes out. This wasn't true. This was a lie.

Finally, the President said, during the campaign:

I was the first & only potential GOP candidate to state there will be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare & Medicaid.

No cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid—this is a giant cut to

Medicaid. This is an \$880 billion cut to Medicaid being used to finance a giant tax cut for people making over \$200,000 a year. This wasn't true. This was a lie as well.

A lot of Democrats will be willing to talk about making our healthcare system better, but we want our Republican colleagues, as they are having these behind-closed-door meetings, to remember the promises that were made. They said nobody would lose insurance, premiums would go down—not up—and your benefit package wouldn't become worse. If Republicans can deliver on those promises, then there is a discussion to be had. But if anything looking like the House product emerges, it is a violation of the promises this President and many Republicans made over and over again.

Finally, I also want all my colleagues to remember what is happening as we speak. Leader MCCONNELL was on the floor talking about premium increases announced by Blue Cross Blue Shield in Maryland. What he failed to mention was the head of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Maryland came out and specifically said that a big part of the reason they were asking for major premium increases was because of the actions President Trump is taking right now to sabotage the Affordable Care Act. They were not sure the individual mandate was going to be enforced. Why? Because in an Executive order this President signed, he directed his agencies to undermine the Affordable Care Act and to withdraw many of the fees levied on Americans, such as that which comes if you don't get insurance. He stopped advertising for the exchanges for the last week. We were on target to have more people sign up this year than ever before; but then, in the last week, the President withdrew all the money for the exchanges. Right now, as we speak, this administration is bleeding out the money for insurers to help pay for cost sharing within the exchanges 1 month at a time, not telegraphing if there is going to be any certainty for that funding in the future.

The President is undermining and sabotaging the ACA every single day. The reason insurers are passing along premium increases or considering withdrawing from these exchanges is because of this sabotage the administration is undertaking of our entire healthcare system. I hope these behind-closed-door meetings take into account all of the promises this President and our Republican friends made that they would repeal the Affordable Care Act and replace it with something better. Everything we hear is that the product that emerged out of the House of Representatives—the product that may emerge out of the Senate—violates every single one of these promises.

We await the ability to work together, Republicans and Democrats, to preserve what works in the healthcare

system, to fix what doesn't work, and to hold our Republican friends and the President of the United States to their promises.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are 20 minutes of postcloture time remaining, equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Finance, prior to a vote on the Lighthizer nomination.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague and good friend, Chairman HATCH, for his courtesies. We have worked very closely together on this nomination. This was a challenging task, and I thank Chairman HATCH for his cooperation.

Mr. Lighthizer needed a waiver because he had represented foreign interests. It was extremely important that we work with Senator MANCHIN and other colleagues to address the enormous needs of the miners, and we had a whole host of Members with a variety of extremely important trade issues—matters like steel, aluminum, and digital goods in our part of the world; we also care about softwood lumber tremendously.

Chairman HATCH and I worked with all the members of the Finance Committee. It was a unanimous vote, and I thank him for his cooperation.

We have talked a little bit about trade and what a modern trade policy is going to look like. The Lighthizer discussion is the beginning of the debate on trade in this Congress, and I have tried to be clear about my agenda. My agenda is to create more red, white, and blue jobs in America—high-skilled, high-waged jobs. Very often, the trade jobs pay better than do the nontrade jobs because there is more value added in them; there is a higher level of productivity. So my view is, as we set out on this journey to get more high-skilled, high-waged jobs, look to Asia where there are going to be 1 billion middle-class people there in a few years. What we ought to do is focus on growing them in the United States, making them in the United States, adding value to them in the United States, and then shipping them somewhere. That is my idea of a modern trade agenda.

So far, the administration's trade agenda amounts to a muddle of 140-character tweets, mixed messages, and overhyped announcements that seem to be backed by not much substance. I think we are going to have to put together a coherent strategy quickly to promote our exports and fight back against trade cheats. That is not exactly what we have seen from the administration to date.

We can almost suffer whiplash from the reports about what happens with various trade deals. Late at night, it was reported that the President is

about to pull the United States out of NAFTA; then suddenly there is another report saying he has changed his mind after a conversation with the Canadians. Next, at a moment of extreme tension on the Korean Peninsula, it is reported that the President is threatening to pull out of the U.S.-Korea trade agreement. Then suddenly that threat is walked back. So the President has made some major statements with respect to trade deals on the books, but he has yet to give us much in the way of specifics on how he would like to bring that about.

If one is trying to run a business in Oregon or around the United States that exports to foreign markets, it is pretty hard not to feel rattled and confused by some of the President's statements and tweets about trade. One might even make the decision not to invest and not to hire additional workers. I hope the President will soon see that some of the uncertainty and confusion that has been stoked as a negotiating tactic is not a recipe for creating red, white, and blue jobs.

I do think Robert Lighthizer knows what the challenge is really all about, and I want to tell him I have appreciated our conversations. He is a real pro at this. I have appreciated his views, particularly on digital goods, which I think are so important to our burgeoning technology sector, and his views on Canadian lumber.

I would also like to state at this time that I think very highly of Secretary Ross. He has been very constructive in our conversations, particularly on Canadian softwood lumber.

Obviously, the U.S. Trade Representative will lead our country in trade negotiations, and that will be Mr. Lighthizer's role. The bulk of the expertise of trade does reside within his office. When Mr. Lighthizer is confirmed, as I hope he will be and expect he will be, this expertise will no longer be silent.

I will wrap up simply by way of saying that the United States may be the world's largest economy, but it represents only 4 percent of the world's consumers. Red, white, and blue jobs in the United States depend on our ability to sell to the other 96 percent. The number of middle-class households around the world is going to double over the next decade. This represents a lot of potential buying power for the American brand, the Oregon brand. The fact is, people all over the world love buying the goods and the services we make. It is going to take a lot of hard work to smash through the barriers that block American-made goods and fight back against trade cheats.

Lastly, the trade rules in many particulars are out of date, so we have a lot of work to do to promote labor rights, combat human trafficking, crack down on trade in illegally taking wildlife and endangered species, and

get the trade system updated so it includes things like digital goods and small businesses that now have an international reach, which is especially important. The trading system has to respond more quickly to countries that break the rules or are unfairly producing basic commodities, such as steel and aluminum. This is especially true with respect to China.

As policymakers, we must continue to take an honest look at the trade rules and fix what doesn't work so that American workers aren't left behind. It is long past time to invest more resources in monitoring, litigating, and enforcing our trading partners' obligations, including China's. The United States must respond more aggressively and more rapidly to threats to U.S. workers and businesses.

There was a recent example of how this is done right when the Commerce Department said "enough" to Canada's unfairly traded softwood lumber. The steps the Commerce Department took were undeniably warranted after mill towns in Oregon and many other States have been clobbered over the last few decades. My first preference is a long-term agreement with Canada, but if they are not going to come to the table, I will keep fighting for our mills and mill jobs, and I will insist the administration do the same.

The U.S. needs to carry that same steadfast approach across the board—getting trade enforcement right is not just a lumber issue. That means more resources for boots on the ground: investigators and enforcers. Not just at the office of the USTR but also at Customs and Border Protection and the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, Labor, State, and Interior, where investigators are tasked with stopping trade in illegally taken wildlife. Bottom line, trade enforcement requires all hands on deck. If you boost trade enforcers at one agency only to wipe out the trade enforcers at another, you will fail to protect American workers from unfair or illegal imports.

So I will be looking closely at the budget that the President submits to determine whether he is serious about delivering real results on trade enforcement or whether the campaign rhetoric and dramatic tweets are just a bunch of hot air.

In recognition of the need for a new approach on trade enforcement, Congress recently passed new laws that give the President better tools to respond when trading partners don't follow the rules. It also passed legislation to strengthen domestic laws that enable the U.S. to unilaterally respond when American jobs are under threat, and it provided new direction should the President wish to negotiate new trade agreements or renegotiate past ones. In the coming months, I expect that those tools will not just sit and

gather dust while the administration talks tough with respect to trade.

It takes consistency, strategy and a lot of hard work to get trade done right. I have confidence that Robert Lighthizer will work to pursue a trade agenda that is coherent, constructive, and will deliver for American workers, and I will support his nomination.

However, I want to express reservation on one issue pertaining to this nominee. During his confirmation hearing, Senator STABENOW asked Mr. Lighthizer how he would deal with situations in which he was conducting trade negotiations with a country in which the President has business interests. Senator STABENOW wanted to make sure that the President's personal financial interests wouldn't take precedence over the public interest. Mr. Lighthizer seemed surprised by the question, saying, quote, "the idea that this President would do anything untoward is . . . far out of the realm of possibility."

I would like to put Mr. Lighthizer on notice. This is a legitimate issue, and I share Senator STABENOW's concern. Never before has this country faced a circumstance in which our trade representative will be negotiating trade agreements with countries in which the President or his family have active business interests, whether it is trademarks, golf courses, or construction deals. I have introduced a bill requiring the President, when initiating trade negotiations, to disclose whether he has business interests in the country that we will be negotiating with. I intend to press this issue as trade negotiations move forward. Trade should be about fighting on behalf of American workers and businesses. It is not about the President's bottom line.

Finally, on an issue that has been closely related to this nomination, I want to commend several of my colleagues for working together to provide relief to retired mineworkers regarding their healthcare costs. Senator MANCHIN has been a crusader on behalf of the mineworkers. Hardly a week went by over the last several months when I didn't hear from JOE MANCHIN about how important it was to get the mineworkers the healthcare benefits they have earned. And he has worked hand-in-hand with Senators BROWN, CASEY, and WARNER, all of whom serve on the Finance Committee. Chairman HATCH deserves thanks for working with us to get this across the finish line as well.

I see that my good friend, Chairman HATCH, is here to make his remarks. I thank him for the cooperation he has shown. I think the interests of both sides in processing this nomination have been advanced.

A lot could have gone awry here. We had challenges with getting the waiver Mr. Lighthizer needed. We needed the space to make sure the miners were protected. Members had strong views.

I thank Chairman HATCH for the diplomacy and cooperation he showed me and our side. I think that is why there was a very large vote for Mr. Lighthizer in the committee.

I will be voting aye this afternoon and look forward to the Chairman's wrap-up remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, who is an excellent person to work with. We enjoy each other and enjoy working together. We are getting a lot done, and I appreciate his kind remarks here today.

I rise today in support of the nomination of Robert Lighthizer to be the next United States Trade Representative. Mr. Lighthizer was reported out of the Finance Committee unanimously—Democrats and Republicans—and I hope he receives a similarly strong bipartisan vote here on the floor.

By statute, Congress has designated the USTR as the primary official for developing and coordinating U.S. trade policy, advising the President on trade, and leading international trade negotiations. The USTR must also report directly to and consult closely with Congress on a wide range of issues affecting international commerce. The USTR is Congress's first and most important point of contact when it comes to trade policy. Therefore, in order for Congress to have an effective voice in shaping our Nation's trade agenda, we need to have a fully staffed and functional USTR office.

For that reason, I have been very critical of the pointless and unprecedented delays we have faced in filling this vacancy, in filling this position, due to some unreasonable demands from some of my friends on the other side of the aisle. This delay has served only to weaken Congress's position in trade policy and has hampered our ability to provide the new administration with substantive input. Despite this ill-advised delay, I am pleased that Mr. Lighthizer's nomination has finally been brought to the floor, and I thank my colleagues for that.

Mr. Lighthizer's years of experience in public service, including as staff director for the Senate Finance Committee, as Deputy USTR during the Reagan administration, and in private practice, make him extremely well qualified to serve as our Nation's representative. Mr. Lighthizer's knowledge and experience will be vital to his service in this position and vital to our country.

Put simply, growing our economy and creating better paying jobs for American workers require increased U.S. trade. Toward that end, I have spoken to Mr. Lighthizer about the importance of removing trade barriers for American businesses, workers, consumers, and, where those barriers have

already been removed, maintaining the status quo.

I know there is quite a bit of discussion going around about potential changes to the North American Free Trade Agreement. As I told Mr. Lighthizer, there are definitely opportunities to update and improve NAFTA, but it is important that the administration follow the spirit of the Hippocratic Oath: First do no harm.

Mr. Lighthizer and I have also discussed the importance of protecting U.S. intellectual property rights around the globe through strong enforcement and better rules in trade agreements. I believe he recognizes the importance of this priority, and I will work to ensure that this issue plays a prominent role in our future trade negotiations.

I have also made clear to Mr. Lighthizer that I believe consultation on trade policy between Congress and the administration is essential, particularly if our agreements are going to adhere to the standards Congress put forward in the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, the statute that included the most recent reauthorization of trade promotion authority.

On this key point, I believe Mr. Lighthizer and I are in agreement. As U.S. Trade Representative, Mr. Lighthizer will have the task of holding our trading partners accountable, ensuring that Americans don't pay more for the products their families need and helping American businesses and workers sell more of their goods and services around the globe.

This is not an easy job, but I am confident that Mr. Lighthizer is up to the task. As chairman of the Senate committee with jurisdiction over our Nation's trade policy, I am committed to working with him to ensure that we advance a trade agenda that will grow our economy, create more jobs, and expand market access around the globe for America's farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers.

Mr. President, I suggest we vote on Mr. Lighthizer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Lighthizer nomination?

Mr. WICKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) would have voted "yea."

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

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 127 Ex.]

YEAS—82

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

NAYS—14

Blumenthal	McCain	Schatz
Gardner	Merkley	Schumer
Gillibrand	Reed	Warren
Harris	Sanders	Whitehouse
Markey	Sasse	

NOT VOTING—4

Capito	Murkowski
Isakson	Sullivan

The nomination was confirmed.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, there is a saying, an old adage, that history doesn't repeat, but it rhymes.

Over the past week, the dramatic firing of James Comey has recalled past events—history that involved one of the major scandals in our Nation's past—the Watergate scandal.

In Watergate, the saying originated—another very common saying—that the coverup is worse than the crime. The danger now in the United States—the greatest country in the history of the world, with the most effective and fair justice on our planet—is that, in fact, there may be a coverup, and that the truth will be stifled, and people who should be held accountable will not be. That is the danger.

In this instance, in comparison to Watergate, actually, the crime is ex-

traordinarily serious. In Watergate, there was a two-bit break-in or burglary, and the coverup, in fact, involved obstruction of justice. What we have here is a deliberate, purposeful assault on our American democracy by the Russians through a cyber attack that involved, really, in effect, an act of war—a combination of cyber, propaganda, and misinformation spread deliberately; it involved hacking into both major parties and the spread of the results of that hacking for one of those parties—possibly influencing the outcome of the election.

The issue of whether and how the outcome of that election may have been influenced will be discussed and contended through the annals of history. Regardless of your point of view on what the impact was, the fact is, the criminal action by the Russians interfering with our election must be investigated aggressively and impartially, and the Russians, and anyone who aided and abetted them, must be held accountable. That is what the American people want. They want the truth uncovered, and they want to hold accountable anyone who colluded with the Russians in this attack on our Nation, anyone who aided and abetted or assisted them, anyone who bears a responsibility and should be held criminally culpable.

The Watergate scandal was eventually successfully prosecuted. It took years to do so. The appointment of a special prosecutor was key to that effort. In fact, Elliott Richardson was not only requested, he was required to appoint a special prosecutor as a condition of his confirmation. He was specifically directed by the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate, and he agreed to do so. Archibald Cox was appointed, and then President Nixon fired Elliott Richardson as well as his deputy, William Ruckelshaus, because they refused to dismiss Archibald Cox.

The principle here—the rhyming of history if not its repeating—is that sometimes investigations come so close to power and the truth about the power that there is an effort to stifle them.

Watergate involved a two-bit burglary. This crime involves the theft of our democracy by the Russians and by others who may have colluded with him. So a successful investigation here goes to the fundamental principle that our elections will be free and credible, that they will be honest, without foreign interference or meddling by anyone.

The firing of James Comey as FBI Director is reminiscent of what happened with the dismissal of two Attorneys General and then a special prosecutor because it raises the possibility that an investigation will be catastrophically compromised and undermined by the President of the United States.

Just last week, I asked James Comey whether the President of the United

States might currently be a target of the criminal investigation. Director Comey would not and could not rule out that possibility because he cannot speak about targets freely and openly, but we know some of the individuals implicated are close associates of the Trump campaign, including Michael Flynn, Carter Page, Roger Stone, and Paul Manafort. Each had different roles; for example, Paul Manafort was a leader of the campaign.

We know that subpoenas have been issued from a grand jury in the Eastern District of New York for materials relating to Michael Flynn and to his associates. We know that then-Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates went to the White House and warned that he might be vulnerable to blackmail because he had lied to the Vice President.

We know also that very possibly he lied to the FBI. He deceptively omitted from materials or responses he gave in his security clearance information about payments to him from the Russians and the Turkish Government and that he may have committed other very serious violations of criminal law, punishable by years in prison. That investigation is ongoing now.

As I speak on the floor of the U.S. Senate, my hope is that agents of the FBI are doing their work, as they have done for decades, with integrity and determination and dedication. I know the work the FBI does, having worked with them as the U.S. Attorney in Connecticut. It is not only one of our premier law enforcement agencies, there is none finer in the world. I have confidence that they will continue this investigation successfully, meaning that they will achieve a just result, if there is the right leadership.

That is why I believe now there is no question that an independent special prosecutor must be appointed. There is no longer any doubt that an independent special prosecutor is necessary for the appearance and credibility, the appearance of integrity, and the credibility and objectivity of this investigation.

The different contradictory stories surrounding the firing of James Comey emphasizes this point. Initially, the decision was made by Rod Rosenstein as Deputy Attorney General, but of course it involved also the Attorney General, Jeff Sessions, who never should have been involved because he was recused from the investigation. The reason given by Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein involved the Hillary Clinton emails and statements made by Jim Comey 10 months ago—an explanation that defied belief, a pretense that was laughable and especially unfortunate—even tragic—from a career professional prosecutor like Rod Rosenstein.

Well, that explanation now has been supplanted; in fact, as recently as this morning, in an interview the President

gave to Lester Holt of NBC, acknowledging that he made the decision because he had lost faith in Jim Comey. Never mind that he reaffirmed that faith shortly after his inaugural. Never mind that he praised Jim Comey on the campaign trail. His reasons for dismissing Jim Comey also defy belief.

This set of incidents shakes to the core the trust all of us should have in our justice system, in the integrity of our public officials, in the capability of that system to uncover the truth and hold accountable anyone who has violated the law.

President Trump has now fired not one but two high-ranking Justice officials after they told him about suspicions that he or his associates have broken the law; first, Sally Yates and now Director Comey.

Attorney General Sessions has shown through his role in the Comey firing that even after he has recused himself from an investigation, he will help the President punish Justice Department officials who are pushing that investigation forward.

Maybe most disappointing, Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein—the man now responsible for the Trump-Russia investigation—has permitted himself to become a pawn in President Trump's game. His credibility and integrity may well have been irredeemably sacrificed. The only way for him to restore it now is to appoint a special prosecutor. That power is his alone. The rules and regulations of the Department of Justice not only permit it, in my view, the standards of ethics require it because he now is irrevocably conflicted.

President Trump, Attorney General Sessions, and Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein want Americans to believe Comey was fired because he publicly discussed his investigation into Hillary Clinton. That kind of statement betrays contempt for the intelligence of the American people because we remember President Trump applauding Director Comey's decision to discuss the Clinton investigation. He even used his letter firing Director Comey to publicly discuss the details of an FBI investigation, saying he has been told three times that he is not under investigation—albeit details I find very hard to believe.

He has called this investigation a charade. He has called the allegations of Russia meddling and Trump associates' collusion with it a hoax. He has belittled and demeaned not only the judges of our Federal bench, but, by implication, the hard-working men and women of the FBI who are doing an investigation which he says is "a taxpayer-funded charade." That statement is a disservice to the FBI—a non-political, nonpartisan law enforcement agency without superior in the world. They deserve and need a special prosecutor who can lead them in this moment of crisis.

Make no mistake, we face a looming constitutional crisis. The case of *United States v. Nixon*, which involved enforcement of subpoenas against the President, is no longer a matter of idle speculation; it is a real possibility.

What the FBI also needs now are resources to make sure this investigation is conducted fairly, impartially, objectively, and independently, with sufficient agents, staff, and other support. In fact, in my view, one of the precipitating factors in the firing of James Comey was his going to the Deputy Attorney General and asking for more resources. As a prosecutor, I know resources are the lifeblood of a successful investigation. An investigation deprived of resources cannot reach a just result; it will be strangled, stifled, and stopped. And that is clearly the purpose of some in this administration, perhaps because it is coming close to people whom they want to protect.

Congress can and must use every tool at our disposal to make sure the investigation of the Trump administration's and campaign's ties to Russia and the potential ongoing coverup of those ties is affirmed. The true and independent special prosecutor is the only one who can assure. Our Intelligence Committees can produce findings and recommendations. An independent commission, which I support, can hold hearings in public and also produce a report. But only a special prosecutor can bring criminal charges and hold accountable anyone and everyone who should bear a price.

On both sides of the aisle, we have said the Russians must pay a price or they will do again in 2018 what they did in 2016, but so should the people who aided and abetted and colluded with them. If they fail to pay a price, they will do it again, too, corrupting our system, undermining the rule of law, and imperiling our democracy.

If the President continues to object to an independent investigation or special prosecutor, people of good will on both sides of the aisle must stand up to him and demand one. I am encouraged by some of what my Republican colleagues have told me over the last 24 hours.

I believe we are at a rhyming moment when the integrity of our justice system and our democracy is at stake. People, regardless of their political affiliation, owe it to our democracy to come forward, to recognize the gravity of this moment, and to stand up and speak out. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will do so.

We may disagree about a lot of things, but on this point, we should agree fundamentally. Part of our obligation is to call before us Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein and, separately, Attorney General Jeff Sessions, as well as former FBI Director Jim Comey, to hear from them their views of this tragic and terrifying epi-

sode in our history. This firing must be a subject for our investigation. We owe it to the American people.

I thank my colleagues in advance for proving that this investigation is no charade. It is no hoax. It is deadly serious, and the failure to appoint an independent prosecutor could be deadly to our democracy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, before us as the Senate right now, aside from issues Mr. BLUMENTHAL referred to, is the repeal and replacement of the Affordable Care Act.

I am a physician, and I have been practicing in hospitals for the uninsured for the last 25 years. I would like to in one sense say that gives me special standing to speak about this issue, but in reality, it does not.

Senator MORAN from Kansas spoke up the other day at our lunch. He said that healthcare is like no other issue. He spoke of a friend of his approaching him at church with tears rolling down her face. Her mother had a preexisting condition, and she was so concerned that we get this right.

I don't need to say I have special standing, being a physician. We all have special standing from living, having families and friends who—sooner or later, healthcare will affect the family.

The Affordable Care Act for many is not working. Premiums are going sky high.

Two or 3 days ago, I had communication with someone from San Francisco. Her young family has a \$20,000-a-year premium, a \$6,000 deductible for each member of the family—in San Francisco, already paying so much for housing, food, and transportation, and \$20,000 on top of that for a family of relatively modest income.

Then I spoke to someone in Washington, DC. His family's premium is \$24,000; they have a \$13,000 deductible. He said: I am out \$37,000 before my insurance kicks in. I reassured him that his colonoscopy would be for free. I don't think he thought that funny.

Then a friend of mine who last year in Louisiana—his quote for a policy for himself and his wife, 60 and 61, was \$39,000 for 1 year—\$39,000 for 1 year—with a deductible.

Now we are being told there will be premium increases this coming year. In Connecticut, they just announced they are going to be 15 to 35 percent higher. In my own State, I have been told they may approach 30 to 40 percent higher, although that is not definite.

The reality is that premiums have become unaffordable. President Trump campaigned on this. There were four things he told the American people. He said he wanted to cover all, care for those with preexisting conditions, eliminate the Affordable Care Act

mandates that people hate so much, and lower premiums.

I would like to say I think it is part of President Trump's intuitive genius. Whatever you say about the fellow, he certainly has an intuition sometimes about how things work. Of course, the way you would lower premiums is that you would cover all, and by covering all, you expand the risk pool, which then lowers premiums for those with preexisting conditions but keeps them lower for the rest of us.

Folks ask how you can do that without mandates, and I say you can do it through the mechanism of the Cassidy-Collins plan, the Patient Freedom Act, which is to say you have an auto-enrollment feature.

By the way, here is President Trump. He said it many times, but here he is in the Washington Post on January 15, 2017, just before he takes the oath of office:

"We're going to have insurance for everybody," Trump said. "There was a philosophy in some circles that if you can't pay for it, you don't get it. That's not going to happen with us."

You cannot have a stronger statement from a fellow who is about to rise to be inaugurated and gives a speech in which he speaks passionately about the forgotten man and the forgotten woman. President Trump pledged to remember them.

The question is, How do you lower premiums? How do you fulfill President Trump's goals?

There are several ways to lower premiums. I just described one, where you fulfill the other parts of his contract with the voter, which is you cover all, and by doing so, you increase the size of the risk pool, and therefore you lower premiums. There is another mechanism. You can put in price transparency and do other things to lower the cost of medical care, which in turn lowers the cost of healthcare premiums. But there is one way which is not so good. One way that you can lower cost is to have a crummy policy that hardly covers anything. You think you are getting a deal in the front end because premiums are low, and then you or someone in your family gets sick, and it is not such a great deal after all.

I was asked about this on a Sunday morning show and spontaneously came up with something called the Kimmel test. Jimmy Kimmel, the late-night comedian, spoke of his son being born. We can all imagine—this happened 2 weeks ago—his child was born. I suspect somebody is videoing it. It is going to be a moment of celebration. As the child emerges and everybody wants to lean forward and hand the child to the mother and the father to hold and cuddle, instead, the doctor and the nurse notice that the child is blue—"blue" meaning he is not getting enough oxygen. It is quickly realized

that something is profoundly wrong. Instead of mother and father hugging and bonding with the child, they are pushed to the side. They hear a code blue call, which means this child will die if something is not done immediately.

I was not there, but I have been in similar situations.

They are being asked to sign forms which would allow this child—their child whom they have not yet held—to be transported by helicopter across Los Angeles to have emergency surgery that day and being told that if they do not sign this form, that child will die.

Now, Jimmy Kimmel pointed out that he is a millionaire, he could afford it, but he also pointed out: Others, not so much.

I think that brings us back to what President Trump said. President Trump said:

"We're going to have insurance for everybody. There was a philosophy in some circles that if you can't pay for it, you don't get it. That's not going to happen with us."

The Jimmy Kimmel test: We will protect those with preexisting conditions, but we will do it by lowering premiums and not by giving crummy coverage but, rather, by having adequate coverage. So if our approach passes the Kimmel test, then we feel it is a way to go.

Now, how do we go from here?

We can recognize that premiums are too high for middle-class families. They can no longer afford it, and that is before the premium increases, which are about to occur.

I will also say that as to the way the Affordable Care Act was passed—not blaming or praising anyone—that only one party was engaged is not the path forward. History says that any time there is significant social legislation that has an enduring effect in the United States, both parties engage.

I want this to change. I would challenge my Democratic colleagues to become engaged. Some have said: Oh, my gosh, Republicans are doing this through reconciliation; isn't that terrible?

I would say it presents opportunity. We don't need 12 Democrats; we don't need 8 Democrats. We could have three Democrats or four Democrats. Anyone who cares enough about the people in their State and their premiums, which are rising 20 to 40 percent a year, will put aside all the pressure from a political base and say: The people of my State are more important than the political pressure I may feel. They will step forward to influence the final product.

We know that if folks come in from the other side of the aisle, we will have a different product than if it is only among Republicans. If Republicans had participated in the passage of the Affordable Care Act, we would have had something perhaps a little different than the Affordable Care Act.

I am not pointing fingers. I am just observing that it would only take three or four Democrats to break ranks, to step across the aisle, and to ask for what they would need. This is not: You come to us, and you don't get it—no. We have a meeting of the minds so that we can come to the policy that fulfills President Trump's pledge—his pledge to cover all, caring for those with preexisting conditions, eliminating mandates, and lowering premiums.

We have an incredible opportunity before us to bring relief to those middle-class couples struggling with premiums that they can no longer afford and deductibles that they will never meet. If they don't meet and can't afford them and if they do not purchase the insurance, they are being fined and are accumulating resentment toward Washington because they are stuck with this. We can address that issue and at the same time fulfill President Trump's pledge that all will have coverage.

Some said you can't get it if you can't pay, but that is not going to be the case with us. It will provide them that coverage with something that passes the Kimmel test. I look forward to working with our Senate to come to this solution.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I am proud to take the floor, and I am especially proud to take the floor after my colleague from Louisiana, whom I believe has offered a very good-faith proposal, both in the specifics of the bill that he has introduced but also in his encouragement that Democrats should participate together with Republicans as the Senate takes up the House-passed American Health Care Act. I do applaud my colleague, and I find much in his presentation to support. I find some points of difference, which I will get into, but much to support.

I am strongly opposed to the House-passed American Health Care Act, TrumpCare. I found that one of the sets of reasons really crystalized yesterday. The Democrats had a hearing, and we invited patients to come from around the country to talk about their healthcare experiences.

There were six witnesses in the hearing. One was a Virginian, a man named Michael Dunkley, from Alexandria. His story was a common one but a tough one. He has been the caretaker for his wife, who has had multiple sclerosis for many years and then got diagnosed with cancer. He talked about trying to deal with being a full-time caregiver for a wife with multiple sclerosis and dealing with cancer before the Affordable Care Act and the unsustainable cost that it led to with his family. But after the Affordable Care Act, he was able to afford coverage for himself and his wife.

We heard from a mother from Indiana whose daughter was born with Down syndrome and how the medical bills connected to her child's treatment forced her, first, to stop working because she needed to be a full-time caregiver. She described the pain of cuddling her newborn in her arms and going to the mailbox and pulling out a \$64,000 bill and knowing that this is what the rest of my life is going to be like and the rest of my child's life. Then she talked about how her family got relief because of the Affordable Care Act.

We heard from a witness who has multiple sclerosis, a woman who is now a substitute teacher. Because the State she lived in, Texas, didn't expand Medicaid, she had to move to another State because she couldn't afford health insurance to deal with a medical problem. So she chose to move to a State that had done Medicaid expansion, Maryland.

We heard other stories as well. These were painful stories.

(Mr. CASSIDY assumed the Chair.)

I say to the Presiding Officer, I give you credit for modesty. You are too modest. You do have an expertise in this. You do understand this. You have heard these stories before, and I had heard some of them, too, even without a medical expertise. What I found so troubling—and during the testimony of this mother from Indiana about her child with Down syndrome, I could feel tears rolling down my face—was this. I had heard stories like this before, but what struck me was that the House voted on this bill without caring about any of these stories, without listening to any of these stories, without allowing a process to address any of these stories. I blurted out: The folks who voted for this bill in the House don't care about the challenges you are facing. They don't care about this or they would have listened to you.

I beg my Senate colleagues to treat this differently, to treat it seriously, to take these stories seriously, and to work together. I hope the Senate takes a different course on this.

Let me explain what I mean when I say the House Members who voted for this didn't care about these people and the challenges they were facing. When the House bill was taken up, there was a version of the bill taken up before March 24, and there were three hearings held. At those hearings—at two of the hearings—no patients were invited to speak. Nobody representing patients was invited to speak.

One of the hearings had one witness from the American Cancer Society and one witness who was a State insurance commissioner. Now, that bill came to nothing on March 24, and the bill was rewritten.

It was the rewritten bill that was passed by the House. There were no hearings on the rewritten bill. There

were no hearings. There were no opportunities for patients to talk about the bill and what it would mean to them. There were no Democratic amendments that were accepted. No patients or providers were given any opportunity to share their concerns in a hearing or in formal discussion about the bill. No expert witnesses were allowed to testify about the bill.

The House rushed to pass the bill without a CBO score—the Congressional Budget Office—which would have said what would have been the premium effect on people, how many people would have lost insurance, and were folks with preexisting conditions going to be covered or not. The House rushed to pass it before the score came about.

When they passed it by the narrow margin of 217 to 213, they boarded a bus and went to the White House and had a big celebration. It was the kind of celebration that happens at the White House when they invite the Super Bowl winning team or the NCAA football champions to come to the White House. It was a celebration.

Imagine if you are the mom with a kid with Down syndrome and you are getting a \$64,000 bill in the mail and you are saying: This is what the rest of my life is going to be like. And the House passes a bill without listening to you, that by some estimates could take health insurance away from 24 million people and could reimpose deep penalties on folks if they have preexisting conditions. And you watch people celebrating that—celebrating it like it is a sports victory?

This is what I found so very troubling during the hearing yesterday—these folks' stories, which are not the only stories to be told about the Affordable Care Act. There are good stories. There are challenging stories. But the stories weren't even important enough for the House to even listen to them.

I do think the Senate process should be different.

Where I am going to disagree slightly with the comments you made is that I am going to compare that process in the House to the process that was undertaken in Congress before the Affordable Care Act was passed in 2010, because sometimes it is said: Well, that was just a one-party thing.

Actually, that is not the case. In 2009, before the Affordable Care Act passed, the Senate Finance Committee held not one or two hearings. No, 53 hearings on health reform were held. The committee spent 8 days marking up the legislation, which is the longest markup in 22 years, and it considered 135 amendments.

In the Finance Committee, the then-Democratic chair, Senator Baucus, worked for months with a bipartisan group of three Democrats and three Republicans trying to find a compromise on healthcare reform. While they

couldn't find a compromise ultimately on the floor vote, Democrats and Republicans wrote the bill together and considered amendments in that committee offered by both Democrats and Republicans.

The HELP Committee, where you and I serve, was every bit as active. They had an additional 47 bipartisan hearings, roundtables, and walk-throughs on health insurance. HELP considered hundreds of amendments during a monthlong markup, which is one of the longest in congressional history, and many Republican amendments were accepted as part of the process.

When the bill came from the two committees to the Senate floor in 2010, the final Senate bill that was passed in this Chamber included not one or two, not a few dozen but 147 amendments that were proposed by Republicans. This bill, the Affordable Care Act, was shaped by the Republicans.

The Republicans decided, for their own reasons, to vote against the final product, but they offered amendments in good faith—147 of them were accepted. The Senate spent 25 days consecutively in session on healthcare reform, the second longest consecutive session in history.

The House did something similar in 2009: bipartisan hearings, 100 hours of hearings, and 181 witnesses from both sides testifying. Some 239 amendments were considered, and 121 by both Democrats and Republicans were adopted.

Again, in the House on the floor, there were no House Republican votes, but the bill was shaped by Republicans, amended by Republicans. There was a process that included two parties.

I would suggest to you that the difference in the processes—an ACA process that included hearings, hearing from patients, the opportunities to have committee hearings, the opportunities for both parties to amend—led to a situation in 2010 where many stakeholder groups supported the Affordable Care Act: the American Medical Association, the AARP, the American Hospital Association, and numerous other groups, providers, consumers, businesses, and other groups.

Compare that to what is the level of support for the bill as it passed out of the House. Patients oppose this bill: the American Association of People with Disabilities, AARP, the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, the American Diabetes Association, the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Society of Hematology, the Children's Defense Fund, Families USA, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, the National Breast Cancer Coalition, the Muscular Dystrophy Association, the National Disability Rights Center, the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, and the National Organization for

Rare Disorders. All of these groups represent patients. All of these groups oppose the House bill that contained no input from patients and no meaningful bipartisan process.

Doctors and nurses oppose the House bill: the American Medical Association, the American Nursing Association, the American Osteopathic Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American College of Physicians, the American College of Rheumatology.

Hospitals oppose the House bill: America's Essential Hospitals, the American Hospital Association, and the Federation of American Hospitals.

There are groups fighting for women's health access: the National Family Planning & Reproductive Health Association and Planned Parenthood.

All of these groups oppose the bill that came out of the House without patient input, without a meaningful committee process, without the ability of Democrats to offer amendments.

Mr. President, I think that points us to a lesson, and I do think it is the same lesson that you spoke about a few minutes ago. Democrats have called for a transparent and bipartisan process to engage in fixes to the Affordable Care Act. I had been on the committee with you no less than a week. I have been trying to get on the HELP Committee since I came into the Senate. I finally achieved my goal in January, and within a week or 10 days of being on committee, I led a group of 13 Democrats. We wrote to our chair, LAMAR ALEXANDER, the Finance chair, ORRIN HATCH, and the Senate majority leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, and said that we are ready to sit down and talk about improvements and fixes.

I say to the Presiding Officer, my heart soared when I read your comment last week: Any final bill must fulfill President Trump's promises to lower premiums, maintain coverage, and ensure protection for those with preexisting conditions—the same items that you put up on your board just a few minutes ago—because that is the same set of three goals I have. That is the same set of three goals, I think, all my colleagues have.

If we can hold that up as the standard, we will work on a bill together, and the bill should meet three promises: to maintain coverage so people don't lose, to maintain costs so people don't pay more, and to maintain compassion so those with preexisting conditions aren't kicked to the curb. If we can find that bill, we will do it as Democrats and Republicans. We will do it in a way that we can build something that will last. I agree with you on this point.

But I deeply believe this: No bill will achieve those aims if it is purely done

by one party. No bill will achieve those aims if it is cooked up and put on the floor without a meaningful committee process in HELP and Finance, without hearing from expert witnesses, without hearing from stakeholders, without hearing from patients, without hearing the kinds of stories we heard yesterday. If we wall ourselves off from the public presentation of this kind of information as we are grappling with the most important spending decision anyone ever makes in their life, as we are grappling with the largest sector of the American economy, if we just rush to get this to the floor and try to make it a one-party product, we will not achieve the three pillars that you and I share and that President Trump has promised to the American public.

So this is my hope. We want to work together, and the right way to work together is this: Send the House bill or a preferable bill, if you have it—your bill or a consensus bill that the group of 12 on the Republican side has. Put that bill in the two committees. Why not have this bill in the HELP Committee and the Finance Committee? Why not hear from patients and doctors and hospitals and nurses and insurance companies and small businesses that struggle to buy insurance for their employees? Let's hear from some expert witnesses about what they like about the status quo or like about the new proposals, what they don't like about them, and how we can fix them. Give us the opportunity to ask some questions. Give us the opportunity to offer some amendments, hopefully some bipartisan amendments, to make this better. Let's treat this at least with the seriousness it was treated in 2009.

You are right to critique that the final vote—save the vote of Arlen Specter, who at the time he voted was a Democrat—that the final vote was partisan. You are right to critique that. We would want to go beyond that, but we can't go backward. We can't eliminate the opportunity for public input, eliminate the opportunity for committee action and amendments. We should be doing that in a full and robust way.

So I just stand on the floor today to say amen to the boards that you put up there—amen to those three pillars that should be the test of the work that we do in this body—and to pledge that if you put this in the committees where we serve and we have the opportunity to work together, that is the most natural place for us to work in a transparent and bipartisan way.

To ask Democratic Members just to cross the aisle to work on something that will be rushed to the floor with no committee process—that is not really engagement; that is not really meaningful. But putting it in committees, where we can do our work in the light of day and hear from people like Michael Dunkley and the mother from In-

diana and do it with the American public watching—now that is engagement. I guarantee if we do that, we will get to a better result, a result that will be better for people, a result that will be more likely to meet your criteria and mine, and a result that will be more likely to last.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ALL-SENATORS BRIEFINGS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns for the weekend, I wish to address a few things related to the dismissal of FBI Director James Comey.

The story coming out of the White House about why Mr. Comey was fired continues to change and there are no good explanations for the change.

For 2 days, the White House implied that the decision to fire Mr. Comey either originated or was largely influenced by the recommendations from the Deputy Attorney General and the Attorney General. The Vice President of the United States spoke to reporters here on Capitol Hill and said that it was the President's "decision to accept the recommendation of the Deputy Attorney General and the Attorney General to remove Director Comey."

Those accounts, by the spokespeople of the President and the Vice President himself, were just blatantly and completely contradicted by the President himself on national television.

President Trump told NBC News that it was his decision to fire Mr. Comey, and he had made up his mind to do so before hearing from either the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General, in direct contradiction to what his own Vice President and his own press people were saying.

Well, which one was it? Did the Vice President mislead the public or did the President? When was the decision made to fire Mr. Comey, and what was the reason? And why did it take so long for the White House to get its story straight?

These are all critical questions, and the American people deserve answers. We need to understand the true nature of the events that led to Director Comey's dismissal, why it happened, and what it means for the investigation into the potential collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia as we move forward.

This morning, I made a request of the majority leader to call an all-Senators briefing with Attorney General Sessions and Deputy Attorney General

Rosenstein. Given the events of this week, and particularly after what the President said this afternoon, a briefing from these two officials before the whole Senate, where Senators from both parties can ask and get answers to the serious questions hanging over us, is imperative for this body and for the American people. The all-Senators briefing with the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General should be separate and partially classified, if necessary.

The need for these briefings is even greater now than it was this morning, given what the President said this afternoon. The rule of law, the separation of powers, and their strength—hallmarks of American democracy—are at stake.

Now, I have just heard from the majority leader that he will invite Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein to an all-Senators briefing next week. I asked the majority leader to do the briefing early in the week. It is a good first step, and I thank the majority leader for consenting to this request.

Mr. Rosenstein was here on the Hill today meeting with Members. He requested to meet with me, and I said I wanted to meet with him along with my 99 colleagues so Members of both parties were given the opportunity to question him. I am glad he has a willingness to come talk to Congress, and I hope he will accept our bipartisan invitation from Leader MCCONNELL and from me to brief the entire Senate next week.

My caucus still believes that Attorney General Sessions must be made available to the Senate in a similar capacity, given his reported role in firing Director Comey and helping select his replacement. Considering his recusal from the Russia investigation, his close involvement in these events warrants the Senate's questioning as well, but I thank the majority leader for trying to set up the briefing with Mr. Rosenstein. It is very likely, I believe, that it will happen, just pending Mr. Rosenstein's consent, and I hope the majority leader soon comes to the right decision and grants our request to question Mr. Sessions as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING LEO THORSNESS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am speaking tomorrow at an Air Force ROTC commissioning ceremony at the University of Arkansas. As I have been preparing my remarks, I have been

thinking a lot about the airmen who have left more than contrails behind them—the men and women who served with such distinction that we still remember them to this day, those great Americans, the heroes of the sky.

The first name that came to mind, the name that resounded louder than almost any other is the great Leo Thorsness, so you can imagine how saddened I was to hear about his passing last week. Whenever you hear such a legend has left the Earth, it is like a sudden crack of thunder in the dead of night. It wakes you up. It sobers you. It reminds you of what we have lost because Leo Thorsness was an American classic.

Born in Walnut Grove, MN, his childhood sounds as idyllic as his hometown. He joined the Boy Scouts and later rose to become an Eagle Scout. He met his wife Gaylee in the freshman registration line at South Dakota State College. They married 3 years later and had one daughter, Dawn. He joined the Air Force, went to flying school, and became a pilot.

Soon, he was a fighter pilot in both the Strategic and Tactical Air Commands. Looking back on his life, we can see Leo Thorsness was part of an era—those burly, self-confident, middle-class families who, after the Great Depression and the greatest of wars, put down roots and built the booming America of the mid to late 20th century.

Of course, Leo was not simply a part of his generation; he inspired it with his courage and self-sacrifice. For many Americans, the only number they remember from the Vietnam years is their draft number. But for Leo Thorsness, there are two numbers that stick out: 88 and 93.

It was on his 88th mission for the Air Force that he performed the noble deeds for which he would later receive the Medal of Honor. He was flying an F-105 Thunderchief with his weapons specialist, Harold Johnson. They were escorting fighter bombers targeting a North Vietnamese army barracks. They shot down a MIG, roughed up another, and hit two missile batteries. They were low on ammo and fuel, but they fought on. He continued to scare off MIGs and instructed a tanker plane to refuel another fighter. When he finally landed 70 miles south in Thailand, the fuel tank was on empty. It was a stunning act of bravery.

It was on his 93rd mission, just seven shy of completing his tour of duty, that Leo Thorsness was shot down. He was captured and spent 6 years in the “Hanoi Hilton”—6 years in the darkness. It was there that he met his cellmate, our colleague and future Senator, JOHN MCCAIN.

Imagining 6 days in such a terrible place is more than most people can handle, never mind 6 years. But Leo Thorsness endured; he saw the mission

through. When he returned in 1973, it was to an astonished and grateful nation, but the man himself was unfazed. He called his wife after being released and said: “I would have called sooner, but I’ve been all tied up.”

He later went on to serve in the Washington State Senate and run for other offices. But his legacy is not one of the titles he won; it is the example he set.

He was quite a man, Leo Thorsness. And though we have lost him, we will keep his memory for a good long time to come.

Leo Thorsness, rest in peace.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

NOMINATION OF MARK GREEN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of State and Foreign Operations, I welcome the nomination of Ambassador and former Member of Congress Mark Green to be the next Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Ambassador Green brings a wealth of experience to this important position. He has been president of the International Republican Institute since 2014. In 2013, he was president and chief executive officer of the Initiative for Global Development, and before that, he served as senior director at the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition, a network of 400 businesses, nongovernmental organizations, policy experts, and others supporting the role of development in U.S. foreign policy. He served as the U.S. Ambassador to Tanzania from 2007 to 2009. While there, he led a mission of more than 350 Americans and Tanzanians and was ultimately responsible for some of the largest U.S. overseas development programs. Prior to his serving as U.S. Ambassador, Mark Green served four terms in the U.S. House of Representatives, representing Wisconsin's 8th District.

Ambassador Green also served on the board of directors of the Millennium

Challenge Corporation, after being appointed to that position by President Obama. He is currently on the Human Freedom Advisory Council for the George W. Bush Institute and cochairs the Consensus for Development Reform, a coalition of policy and business leaders devising new principles for making development policy more effective and growth-oriented. He is a board member of WorldTeach and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Since 1989, as either chairman or ranking member of the subcommittee that provides the funding for USAID's operations and programs, I know the critical role that it plays in promoting and protecting U.S. interests around the world. Its field missions are its greatest strength, and countless lives have been saved, conflicts avoided, and government institutions strengthened, thanks to the global health, social and economic development, and democracy programs administered by USAID. These programs are not charity. They are essential and complementary to the roles played by our diplomats and soldiers.

President Trump has talked about "America First." We all want this country to be the best it can be, but slogans are not a substitute for effective policies. Creating jobs at home is not, by itself, a foreign policy. The United States cannot remain a leader in the global economy, where the gravest security problems we face can only be solved by working with other countries, if we reduce our engagement with the world. The vacuum we leave will quickly be filled by our competitors, and it will be difficult if not impossible to recover lost ground.

At a time when OMB is proposing to slash USAID's budget and downgrade its overseas presence, the nomination of Ambassador Green is a positive signal. If confirmed, I look forward to working with him and subcommittee Chairman GRAHAM, as well as with our House appropriations subcommittee counterparts Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY, to ensure that USAID has the resources it needs to continue and expand its presence and impact around the world.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for today's vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Robert Lighthizer to be U.S. Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador. I would have voted yea.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I intend to object to any unanimous consent request at the present time relating to the nomination of Courtney Elwood of Virginia to be the general counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I will object because the CIA has still not responded to my letters from April

14, 2014; and April 5, 2017, requesting declassification of two congressional notifications, CNs, about whistleblower communications. In 2014, the inspector general of the Intelligence Community issued two CNs about whistleblower communications. The first, sent on March 28, 2014, had the unclassified subject line "Whistleblower Communications." The second, sent on March 31, 2014, had the unclassified subject line "Whistleblower Communications—Clarification." Both documents were classified Secret/NOFORN. I requested that the CNs be declassified as soon as possible. More than 3 years have passed since my initial request, and I still have not received declassified versions of the documents or an explanation of why the documents have not been declassified.

The information contained in the two CNs raises serious policy implications, as well as potential Constitutional separation-of-powers issues. The CNs do not appear to contain any information about sources or methods, and there is a strong public interest in their content. As a matter of respect, for a co-equal branch of government, my declassification request should have been processed in a timely manner. Moreover, under the executive branch's own regulations, there are time limits that apply to processing declassification requests and classification challenges that the CIA has failed to meet.

In addition, I have requested copies of the CIA's PPD-19 procedures and policies which allow CIA whistleblowers to seek relief from reprisal, but the CIA has refused, stating that the documents are classified and for CIA's internal use only. PPD-19 was largely codified by the Intelligence Authorization Act, and so the CIA is also required by law to implement such a policy. It is now at issue in a Federal lawsuit challenging the CIA's failure to adhere to its own procedures under the Administrative Procedures Act.

My objection is not intended to question the credentials of Ms. Elwood in any way. However, the CIA must recognize that it has an ongoing obligation to respond to Congressional inquiries in a timely and reasonable manner.

NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the invaluable work of nurses. With 3 million nurses nationwide, these men and women make up the largest providers of healthcare in the country. I am proud to acknowledge the talents and successes of these caregivers as we recognize National Nurses Week.

These dedicated health professionals provide quality care to patients every single day. Their dedication and passion to caregiving is constantly on display, often during critical and stressful situations. The work they do helps

save lives and gives reassurance to patients facing questions about their health. While on the front lines of healthcare delivery they are also frequently the first line of communication when health problems arise. These healthcare heroes wear many hats.

Providing nurses with the resources they need to deliver quality care needs to be a priority. Last week, members of the Emergency Nurses Association from Arkansas shared with me one legislative fix to improve patient care. Amending the Controlled Substance Act to allow paramedics and other emergency medical services professionals to continue to administer controlled substances like pain narcotics when allowed by State law would improve emergency outcomes, particularly in rural areas where a medical facility may be miles away. That is why I cosponsored legislation to amend the Controlled Substance Act.

Nurses are taking on more responsibilities in our evolving healthcare system in order to meet the needs of our aging population. They are being asked to do more with less and still provide the quality patient care they are known for.

If you are like me and have been cared for by a nurse, you understand the important work they do. I am grateful for the care they provide and proudly support nurses as a cosponsor of the Senate resolution recognizing National Nurses Week.

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LISTER-KNOWLTON VFW POST 9389

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States traces its roots to 1899, when veterans returning home after the Spanish-American War joined together to support each other and to advance the ideals of our Nation. Nearly a half century later, on May 11, 1947, veterans returning to my hometown after World War II joined together for the same noble causes. Today I wish to commemorate the 70th anniversary of Lister-Knowlton VFW Post 9389 in Caribou, ME.

The name of Post 9389 signifies a fundamental purpose of the VFW: to honor those who gave their lives for freedom. Private Evan Lister and CPL Edward Knowlton were both born in Caribou, both served in the U.S. Army during World War II, and both made the ultimate sacrifice when they were each just 23 years old. Neither will ever be forgotten. Nor will we ever forget those who returned home but who have since passed into history. It is sobering to note that today there is just one living charter member of the Caribou post, WWII veteran David O. Michaud, and we honor him for his service.

In 2003, the Northern Maine Veterans Cemetery was dedicated in Caribou. This final resting place for our heroes

was the result of many years of hard work and determined advocacy by committed citizens, with our VFW post leading the way. My father, Donald Collins, a decorated World War II veteran, was among those who made that enduring tribute possible.

A defining quality of America's veterans is that they continue to serve long after their service in uniform ends. Members of the Caribou VFW and the auxiliary are part of a vast network that assists the patriots serving today, fellow veterans, and their families. They generously support a wide range of community projects, charitable endeavors, and youth programs. One of the most important contributions made by the VFW is its focus on educating our young people on American values. Each year, more than 175,000 high school and middle school students nationwide join in the VFW's Voice of Democracy and Patriot's Pen essay competitions. That wonderful level of participation is always matched by the quality of the submissions. Last year, at the State VFW convention, I was delighted to congratulate the two Maine winners, including Corrine Corbin of Caribou, sponsored by our hometown VFW.

I am proud to be a life member of the Caribou VFW Post auxiliary, which was also chartered in 1947. Working side by side, the VFW and auxiliary honor America and the men and women who defend us. It is a pleasure to congratulate the Lister-Knowlton VFW Post 9389 on this landmark anniversary.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the Caribou VFW on their 70th anniversary. The Caribou VFW, known as the Lister-Knowlton VFW Post 9389, was founded on May 11, 1947, by veterans returning home from World War II. The post was named after two brave Caribou natives, Private Evan Lister and CPL Edward Knowlton, who served their country during World War II and made the ultimate sacrifice when they were only 23 years old. Their dedication and service to our country will never be forgotten.

I also want to recognize the ladies auxiliary, who will celebrate their 70th anniversary on June 19. The ladies auxiliary was formed by women who were mothers, wives, sisters, and daughters of veterans who served in our Armed Forces and whose service made them eligible for the Veterans of Foreign Wars. In addition, the auxiliary includes female veterans who served abroad in times of war.

While I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge all of the veterans for their service, I want to make special note of David O. Michaud. David is a World War II veteran and the sole surviving charter member of the Lister-Knowlton VFW Post 9389. I would also like to honor Josephine Bell, an original charter member of the

VFW Ladies Auxiliary in Caribou who is still with us today.

These 70th anniversaries, of both the Lister-Knowlton VFW post and the ladies auxiliary, provide occasion to celebrate the storied tradition of service, both past and present, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars represent. Each of us is forever indebted to those members of the VFW who served in the protection of the United States and to their families for the care and support they have provided. We are also grateful to the VFW for their continued service, supporting those veterans who have returned, advocating on their behalf at all levels of government, and organizing a variety of community building projects.

In closing, I am glad to join with the members of the VFW and the ladies auxiliary in Caribou in honoring this 70th year of working on behalf of veterans, the State of Maine, and our great Nation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE RUTGERS UNIVERSITY-NEWARK DEBATE TEAM

• Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Rutgers University-Newark senior debate team of Nicole Nave and Devane Murphy as they celebrate back-to-back national championships with their victories at the National Debate Tournament, NDT, and the Cross Examination Debate Association National Tournament this year.

Last year, I stood on this floor to recognize Rutgers University-Newark's victory at the National Debate Tournament at the University of Missouri-Kansas City. This year, I am extremely proud to be here once again congratulating Rutgers-Newark on another collegiate National Debate Tournament championship. This is truly an impressive and historic accomplishment. It is only the second time in collegiate debate history that the same team has won both national championships in a single year.

In addition to the national championship, Nicole Nave and Devane Murphy were also honored individually at the National Debate Tournament this year. Devane was named the NDT's top speaker, and Nicole received the NDT second place speaker award. At this year's Cross Examination Debate Association National tournament, Nicole earned a record-shattering five perfect scores out of eight. Nicole and Devane, the two best collegiate debaters in America, use their life experiences to shape their uniquely Rutgers-Newark debate style, one which has led the Rutgers University-Newark team to remain ranked as the No. 1 team in the Nation.

The Rutgers University-Newark debate team, founded in 2008, is sponsored by the school of public affairs and administration and the office of the chancellor, Newark. Under the leadership of Rutgers University-Newark chancellor Nancy Canton, debate director Christopher Kozak, and debate team head coach Willie Johnson, the team has been ranked first in the Northeast for 4 consecutive years. In the 2014-2015 year, the team was ranked 14th nationally. Nicole, Devane, and the rest of the Rutgers University-Newark debate team have brought pride to my beloved city of Newark and to the entire State of New Jersey. I am honored to join with these outstanding students, their families, and the Rutgers University-Newark community in celebrating another landmark achievement in the Rutgers University-Newark debate team's history.

Thank you.●

TRIBUTE TO JACK YOUNG

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week, I have the distinct honor of recognizing Jack Young, a U.S. Army veteran and teacher at Harlem Public Schools. Whether serving our Nation inside an Abrams tank or serving his local community at the front of a classroom, Jack has represented the character of the Treasure State in both settings.

After graduating from high school, Jack enlisted in the Army. He served our Nation on Active Duty for 4 years and completed two overseas assignments. Not long after finishing his military service, Jack attended Montana State University—Northern and trained to become a teacher. In 2006, he began teaching at Harlem Public Schools. Since arriving in Blaine County, he has grown into a fixture in the local community. Jack has taught history and government to both high school and junior high school students. During the warm months, you will find Jack in the classroom teaching summer school, helping students rise to the next level academically. For the past 4 years, he has taught government courses at the Aaniiih Nakoda College. Earlier in his teaching career, Jack was an assistant coach for the Harlem Wildcats football team. Through all seasons and across multiple academic levels, Jack has served his fellow Montanans by teaching the historic context and hard-earned value of our constitutional system of government.

Jack has excelled in his transition from a tanker to a teacher. The best part of Jack's story is he loves what he does and plans to continue doing it for a long time. Montanans are grateful for folks like Jack who make our communities stronger. Thank you, Jack, for your service, and I wish you the best in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL "MIKE"
MUNOZ

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the hard work of my Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee law clerk Mike Munoz. Mike hails from Avon, CT, and will soon graduate from Georgetown University Law Center. As a law clerk on the Commerce Committee, Mike assisted the Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security Subcommittee. He is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his clerkship. I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Mike for all of the fine work he did for the committee and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HELLS
CANYON PRESERVATION COUNCIL

• Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Hells Canyon Preservation Council. Without the council and its courageous work, there might be multiple dams despoiling one of the deepest gorges in North America rather than the wondrous Snake Wild and Scenic River flowing through the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area and Hells Canyon Wilderness.

The story of the creation of the council begins in 1967 as a conflict simmered for a long time over damming Hells Canyon, an 85-mile gorge on the Oregon-Idaho border. That fight appeared to solely turn on the question of who would get to build the dam in Hells Canyon, not whether to build the dam on what is often called the Grand Canyon of the Snake River. Washington Public Power Supply System, WPPSS, delivered public power and Idaho Power Company was a private power supplier. In 1964, the Federal Power Commission ruled in favor of the private power, WPPSS appealed, and their dispute went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court.

On June 5, 1967, Justice William O. Douglas read the Court's majority opinion from the bench. The Supreme Court ruled neither for public power nor for private power. Instead, it remanded the entire case back to the Federal Power Commission with instructions to consider whether the best dam in Hells Canyon might be no dam at all. The Supreme Court ruled that the case wasn't about public versus private power. Instead, Justice Douglas said: "Nor is the test solely whether the region will be able to use the additional power. The test is whether the project will be in the public interest. And that determination can be made only after an exploration of all issues relevant to the 'public interest,' including future power demand and supply, alternate sources of power, the public interest in preserving reaches of

wild rivers and wilderness areas, the preservation of anadromous fish for commercial and recreational purposes, and the protection of wildlife."

Within 2 months, the debate over the best use of Hells Canyon shifted from what entity would dam it, to the core question of whether to dam it. Six members of the Idaho Alpine Club met in a Boise living room and formed the Hells Canyon Preservation Council. Joining that group was a young Seattle lawyer and Sierra Club attorney named Brock Evans.

Brock soon fell in love with Hells Canyon and northeastern Oregon and vowed that the Snake River would not be dammed. The Hells Canyon Preservation Council soon grew to have more than 2,000 members in all 50 States. Its chapters included one in the little town of Enterprise in Wallowa County, home to half of Hells Canyon. The national attention attracted media personality Arthur Godfrey and folk singer Pete Seeger, along with national environmental groups who wanted to save the great gorge.

Their efforts also attracted the attention of Oregon Senator Bob Packwood. From his first day in office, Senator Packwood championed the preservation of Hells Canyon.

It took 8 years of hard work by Brock, assisted by Doug Scott, a native Oregonian who replaced Brock as the Sierra Club's Northwest Representative—and so many others inside and outside of Congress; yet that sweat equity paid off in 1975 when Congress passed the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area Act.

I am proud to say that Brock and his wife, Linda, have recently returned to Oregon, having moved to La Grande, near his beloved Hells Canyon.

Oregonians and all Americans are indebted to the Hells Canyon Preservation Council and its allies, including Senator Packwood and many other fine Oregonians, for their tireless advocacy for preserving wild nature for the benefit of all of us today as well as future generations.

Thanks to their work, we Oregonians today consider the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area, the Hells Canyon Wilderness, and the Snake Wild and Scenic River to be an irreplaceable part of our priceless natural legacy, and we would no more think of damming Hells Canyon than of draining Crater Lake.●

RECOGNIZING FISHERS JUNIOR
HIGH SCHOOL

• Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish with great pride today to honor Fishers Junior High School of Fishers, IN, for their impressive victory in the We the People National Invitational held in Washington, DC, on April 28 through May 2, 2017. In light of Indiana's proud tradition of civic engagement, it gives

me great pleasure in honoring these students and future leaders of our communities. These individuals embody the fundamental purpose of the Constitution and live by its principles both inside and outside the classroom.

The We the People National Invitational comprised of eight teams from across the United States. The qualified contestants included middle and high school groups from Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Maine, Ohio, Oregon, Virginia, and of course Fishers Junior High School, representing the Hoosier State. To be in the running for the national invitational, student contestants must display their knowledge, as well as current political awareness and constitutional acumen by holding mock or simulated congressional hearings at the local and State level during the current school year. Once qualified, during the final competition in DC, similar to the simulated congressional hearings held at the local level to be one of the eight finalists, each class went before a group of judges. Teams were allocated a 4-minute introductory statement and then faced pressing questions pertaining to existing constitutional subjects as well as past from the judges. The winning team must show an exceptional understanding of constitutional principles applicable to historical and current issues.

For the record, I want to acknowledge each student of the Fishers Junior High School team who participated in achieving first place in the We the People National Invitational: Makenna Adams, Izzy Alexander, Addi Arena, Blake Backes, Jackson Bakle, Mackenzie Boyer, Milan Colzani, Joe Conde, Kamryn Dean, Grace DeLong, Sydney Doyle, Madison Ewart, Faith Farrell, Maya Fotedar, Abby Funk, Ray Gao, Abigail Garrison, Meg Gibson, Liberty Hayes, Morgan Joiner, Braden Kirkendall, Shea Koley, Ben Lilley, Tatiyana Lockridge, Olivia Lux, Ali Mohamed, Cassidy Robertson, Gracey Scholl, Kara Van Dyke, Jonah VanDer Kamp, and Bailey Wilson. Furthermore, I would like to recognize Mr. Mike Fassold for his efforts to teach and implement a passion for constitutional and civic engagement in his students.

Again, congratulations to the Fishers Junior High School team for their extraordinary victory, and thank you for representing your fellow Hoosiers. It is truly an honor to have brilliant students in the State of Indiana who inspire others with their knowledge, hard work, and dedication.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 174. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to consolidate the reporting obligations of the Federal Communications Commission in order to improve congressional oversight and reduce reporting burdens (Rept. No. 115-61).

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 139. A bill to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes.

S. 583. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 934. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. 1028. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National Family Caregiving Strategy, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 1094. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1095. A bill to ensure that the Secretary of the Interior collaborates fully with State and local authorities and certain nonprofit entities in managing the Corolla Wild Horse population on Federal land; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1096. A bill to amend and enhance certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1097. A bill to postpone the deadline for the completion of the conversion of certain military technician (dual status) positions to positions of civilian employment by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1098. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from employing individuals who have been convicted of a felony and medical personnel who have had their medical licenses or credentials revoked or suspended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

S. 1099. A bill to provide for the identification and prevention of improper payments and the identification of strategic sourcing opportunities by reviewing and analyzing the use of Federal agency charge cards; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1100. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the program to provide assistance for small shipyards and maritime communities through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. HELLER, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1101. A bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1102. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an investment tax credit related to the production of electricity from offshore wind; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 1103. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department-wide guidance and to develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1104. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish a methodology for the collection by the Commission of information about commercial mobile service and commercial mobile data service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr.

WARNER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. NELSON, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BURR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1105. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1106. A bill to designate the same individual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service as the National Nurse for Public Health; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1107. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1108. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. BURR, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1109. A bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to extend advanced education nursing grants to support clinical nurse specialist programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1110. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for private lactation areas in the terminals of large and medium hub airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 1111. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to improve the provision of services and benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans who experience domestic violence or sexual assault, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1112. A bill to support States in their work to save and sustain the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period, to eliminate disparities in maternal health outcomes for pregnancy-related and pregnancy-associated deaths, to identify solutions to improve health care quality and health outcomes for mothers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1113. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr.

WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. COONS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1114. A bill to nullify the effect of the recent Executive order laying a foundation for discrimination against LGBTQ individuals, women, religious minorities, and others under the pretext of religious freedom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1115. A bill to improve access to prescription drugs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 1116. A bill to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1117. A bill to protect the investment choices of investors in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 1118. A bill to reauthorize the North Korea Human Rights Act of 2004, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 162. A resolution reaffirming the commitment of the United States to promoting religious freedom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 59

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 59, a bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as long guns.

S. 109

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 109, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 139

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 139, a bill to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform deci-

sions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes.

S. 340

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 340, a bill to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes.

S. 394

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 394, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that a member of the Armed Forces and the spouse of that member shall have the same rights regarding the receipt of firearms at the location of any duty station of the member.

S. 422

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 422, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 534

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 534, a bill to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 583

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 583, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 682

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide for the purchase of paper United States savings bonds with tax refunds.

S. 782

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 782, a bill to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes.

S. 829

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 829, a bill to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 867

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 867, a bill to provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 870

At the request of Mr. WICKER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 870, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to implement Medicare payment policies designed to improve management of chronic disease, streamline care coordination, and improve quality outcomes without adding to the deficit.

S. 872

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 872, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 926, a bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial

Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 993, a bill to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from reclassifying broadband Internet access service as a telecommunications service and from imposing certain regulations on providers of such service.

S. 1034

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1034, a bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1055

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1055, a bill to restrict the exportation of certain defense articles to the Philippine National Police, to work with the Philippines to support civil society and a public health approach to substance abuse, to report on Chinese and other sources of narcotics to the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 12

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 12, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that those who served in the bays, harbors, and territorial seas of the Republic of Vietnam during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and ending on May 7, 1975, should be presumed to have served in the Republic of Vietnam for all purposes under the Agent Orange Act of 1991.

S. RES. 156

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 156, a resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster-care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster-care system.

S. RES. 161

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 161, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that defense laboratories are on the cutting-edge of scientific and technological advancement, and supporting the designation of May 18, 2017, as "Department of Defense Laboratory Day".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1097. A bill to postpone the deadline for the completion of the conversion of certain military technician (dual status) positions to positions of civilian employment by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

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

S. 1097

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Armed Forces Reserve and National Guard Dual-Status Review and Modernization Act".

SEC. 2. POSTPONEMENT OF DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION OF CONVERSION OF CERTAIN MILITARY TECHNICIAN (DUAL STATUS) POSITIONS TO POSITIONS OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A September 2013 study conducted by a federally funded research and development center found that 21 percent of the military technician (dual status) positions are administrative in nature—the largest category as a percentage of military technician (dual status) positions. The study recommends investigation on whether "some Dual Status MilTech positions supporting general administration functions could be converted to Title 5 Federal civilian full-time support positions without compromising unit readiness". The study further recommends investigation on whether "it is more appropriate to use military full-time support for other reasons (such as currency in military operations and training and augmentation)".

(2) Section 1053 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 directs the conversion of not fewer than 20 percent of all military technician positions to positions of Federal civilian employment under title 5, United States Code, by January 1, 2017. Section 1084 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 extends the deadline for that conversion from January 1, 2017, to October 1, 2017.

(3) The Department of Defense submitted a report on the management of military technicians in December 2016 that finds that 12.6 percent of the military technician (dual status) positions were administrative in nature, and recommended a conversion of 4.8 percent of such positions to positions of Federal civilian employment.

(4) The Chief of the National Guard Bureau testified before Congress in April 2017 that a conversion of 20 percent of military technician (dual status) positions to positions of Federal civilian employment would degrade readiness, but that a lower number could be converted with minimal impact. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau also testified that the Department of Defense had not conducted an analysis of the associated costs and benefits of a conversion of 20 percent of military technician (dual status) positions to positions of Federal civilian employment.

(b) POSTPONEMENT OF DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION OF CONVERSION.—Notwithstanding

the deadline otherwise specified in paragraph (1) of section 1053(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (10 U.S.C. 113 note) for the completion of the conversion of military technician positions as described in that subsection, the deadline for the completion of such conversion shall be 180 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense transmits to Congress under paragraph (6) of subsection (c) the report of the working group required by paragraph (5) of that subsection.

(c) WORKING GROUP ON FULL TIME SUPPORT OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be established in the Department of Defense a working group to be known as the "Working Group on Full Time Support of the Reserve Components" (in this subsection referred to as the "working group").

(2) CO-CHAIRS.—The co-chairs of the working group shall be the following:

(A) The Director of the Army National Guard.

(B) The Director of the Air National Guard.

(C) The Chief of the Army Reserve.

(D) The Chief of the Air Force Reserve.

(3) MEMBERS.—The members of the working group shall include the co-chairs of the working group and such other personnel of the Department of Defense as the Secretary shall appoint from among organizations and elements of the Department with an interest in full time support of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, including the National Guard Bureau and the Adjutants General of the States.

(4) DUTIES.—The working group shall undertake a comprehensive review of full time support of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, including the following:

(A) An identification of the missions, purposes, and objectives of military technicians (dual status) in support of an operational reserve force.

(B) A review of the posture of current military technician (dual status) positions, and of their current role in meeting the objectives identified pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(C) An analysis of potential restructurings of the workforce of military technicians (dual status) in order to identify a restructuring that fully aligns military technician (dual status) positions with objectives for full time support of the reserve components.

(D) An identification of the military technician (dual status) positions whose conversion to positions of Federal civilian employment under title 5, United States Code, would best ensure the achievement of objectives for full time support of the reserve components.

(E) An assessment of the impact on the readiness of the National Guard for domestic operations of the conversion of positions identified pursuant to subparagraph (D) as described in that subparagraph.

(F) An assessment of costs and potential savings associated with the conversion of positions identified pursuant to subparagraph (D) as described in that subparagraph.

(5) REPORT TO SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the working group shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a report on the comprehensive review undertaken pursuant to paragraph (4). The report shall include the following:

(A) A comprehensive description of the review and the results of the review.

(B) The percentage of military technician (dual status) positions whose conversion to

positions of Federal civilian employment under title 5, United States Code, would best ensure the achievement of objectives for full time support of the reserve components of the Armed Forces as an operational reserve.

(C) A transition plan for implementing a new force structure for full time support of the reserve components, including for the conversion of positions as described in subparagraph (B) which mitigates any risks to readiness identified pursuant to paragraph (4)(E).

(D) Recommendations for the reform of personnel management policy for military technician (dual status) positions that address—

(i) the eligibility of military technicians (dual status) for civilian retirement upon retirement from the Armed Forces; and

(ii) the process for appealing employment decisions.

(E) Recommendations for reforms of compensation and benefits policies for military technician (dual status) positions in order to provide military technicians (dual status) with parity in compensation and benefits with other Federal civilian employees of the Department of Defense under title 5, United States Code.

(6) TRANSMITTAL OF REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall transmit to the congressional defense committees the report of the working group under paragraph (5), together with such discussion and recommendations in connection with the report as the Secretary considers appropriate. The Secretary shall publish the report, and any such discussions and recommendations, in the Federal Register at the time of transmittal.

(7) CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “congressional defense committees” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code.

MR. DAINES. Mr. President, under current law, twenty-percent of our military dual-status technicians in the National Guard, Army Reserve, and Air Force Reserve will become federal civilians on October 1st. This will leave the state Governors to respond to wildfires, floods, and other natural disasters with twenty-percent fewer people. The benefits of this conversion are unclear. In fact, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau testified that no formal analysis has been conducted as to whether there is any benefit at all. It seems prudent to me to take a pause, bring all of the affected stakeholders together, and figure this problem out before we take any irreversible action. Today, I'm introducing the “Armed Forces Reserve and National Guard Dual-Status Review and Modernization Act,” to do exactly that.

As I've studied this situation, I understand there are a number of valid concerns involved. The current statutory construct for dual-status military technicians is nearly 50 years old and the role of the Reserve components has changed dramatically just in the past 15 years, let alone the last half-century. I agree we should update the statute to better meet the needs of the total force and my bill addresses this concern. Similarly, many Guardsmen and Reservists feel that personnel management practices under this aging

construct doesn't fit the needs of a 21st century workforce. My bill addresses those concerns as well.

Most importantly, the bill ensures that there is no adverse impact to the Guard's ability to respond to domestic emergencies on October 1st, by postponing that date until Department of Defense leadership conducts a thorough, comprehensive review on the requirements of a 21st Century total force, and how our current structure should be aligned to meet those requirements. This will allow Congress to make an informed and measured judgment on how to update current law. I urge my colleagues to give this matter their full consideration and support.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1113. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to improve the safety oversight of products that affect every single family on a daily basis. Whether it's shampoo or shaving cream, lotion or make-up, hair dye or deodorant, personal care products are a part of our everyday lives. I thank Senator COLLINS for her support and hard work on this important legislation.

However, even though our bodies absorb many chemicals in these products through our skin and even our nails, their ingredients are largely unregulated. It's time to modernize our safety oversight and correct this problem. Most people assume these products have up-to-date federal oversight, but in reality the Food and Drug Administration's authority to do so is sorely outdated—in fact, it's based on a law from the 1930s that has changed little over the past eight decades. There are questions about the safety of some ingredients in these products, which not only leads to health concerns but also causes uncertainty for companies working to innovate and expand domestically.

Over the last several years, Senator COLLINS and I have worked with a wide group of stakeholders that represent both industry and consumer groups. Those stakeholders include small and large companies, doctors, consumer advocates, patient advocates, scientists, and the Food and Drug Administration. Together, we have drafted bipartisan legislation that puts commonsense measures in place and has the support of both industry and consumer and health organizations.

The Personal Care Products Safety Act sets up a process for reviewing the safety of ingredients in personal care products. The bill requires manufacturers to register so consumers know who produces personal care products sold in the United States.

The legislation also modernizes authority for the Food and Drug Administration so the agency is better equipped to deal with public health concerns, such as being able to recall contaminated products if companies choose not to do so voluntarily. The updated system is completely paid for by industry fees. Companies will provide information about the ingredients in their products to the Food and Drug Administration, and attest to their safety. Many companies manufacturing in the United States currently follow strict voluntary standards for manufacturing under proper conditions, but the lack of federal standards leaves this to chance. Under this legislation, the agency sets Good Manufacturing Practice guidelines to ensure companies meet minimum requirements. Companies will also need to report adverse health events related to their products to the Food and Drug Administration.

Last year, we heard about WEN shampoo, a product that was causing significant hair loss. Among those affected were children, including a little girl named Eliana who lost all of her hair after using WEN. She shared her story with my office and several of my colleagues. What's shocking is that the company received more than 20,000 reports of this happening, but under current law WEN had no legal obligation to tell the Food and Drug Administration. Under this legislation, companies would be required to do so.

Another example of concern is the ongoing use of formaldehyde, also called methylene glycol when mixed with water, in the popular hair treatment called a Brazilian blowout. Formaldehyde is released into the air during this beauty treatment. It can cause shortness of breath, headaches, and dizziness in the short-term. Over the long-term, formaldehyde has been linked to cancer.

I am also greatly concerned about the effect on the health of salon professionals who are constantly exposed to a variety of chemicals daily. In addition to reviewing the safety of chemicals they may be exposed to, this legislation also ensures that the salon products they use are properly labeled with ingredients and warnings.

The Food and Drug Administration will be required to evaluate at least five ingredients per year for safety and use in personal care products. In addition to reviewing the latest scientific and medical studies, the agency will consider how prevalent the ingredient is, the likely exposure, adverse event reports, and information from public comments. Public input will be critical to the review process. There will be opportunities for companies, scientists, consumer groups, medical professionals, and members of the public to

weigh in on, not only the safety of particular ingredients but also, which ingredients should be a priority for review. After review, the Food and Drug Administration may deem an ingredient safe, unsafe, or safe under certain uses or under certain conditions. The agency will also have the authority to require warning labels as needed for certain ingredients and limit the amount of an ingredient that may be used in personal care products. For example, some ingredients may only be safe for use by adults or when used by professionals in a salon or spa setting.

The Personal Care Products Safety Act is the result of many diverse groups working together with the common goal of modernizing the federal oversight system to ensure the safest products possible are on the market. We have worked closely with small businesses to ensure that the legislation recognizes their needs and supports their growth. This legislation incorporates changes to increase flexibility for small businesses, particularly those making low-risk products. The bill recognizes the unique nature of the handmade cosmetic industry and meets their needs to encourage growth and innovation.

I am pleased that the major organizations representing these small businesses (Handmade Cosmetic Alliance, Coalition of Handcrafted Entrepreneurs, Handcrafted Soap and Cosmetic Guild), have said that the provisions within this legislation “afford producers in the handmade cosmetic industry the opportunity to continue to innovate, grow, create jobs and produce safe, quality handmade products in communities across the nation.”

I am pleased to have the support of a broad coalition, including Environmental Working Group, Society for Women's Health Research, Endocrine Society, National Alliance for Hispanic Health, Au Naturale, Coalition of Handcrafted Entrepreneurs, Handcrafted Soap and Cosmetic Guild, Handmade Cosmetic Alliance, Herbal Lifestyle, The Honest Company, American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, Babo Botanicals, Goddess Garden Organics, Caregiver Action Network, March of Dimes, EO Products, Eclair Naturals, Juice Beauty, National Psoriasis Foundation, and the following major companies that together represent over 99 brands of products: The Estee Lauder Companies, Johnson and Johnson, Procter and Gamble, Revlon, Unilever, and L'Oreal.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this much needed legislation to modernize our outdated regulatory system for personal care products, and I hope the Senate will pass this long overdue legislation this year.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself,
Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr.

FRANKEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. COONS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1114. A bill to nullify the effect of the recent Executive order laying a foundation for discrimination against LGBTQ individuals, women, religious minorities, and others under the pretext of religious freedom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President. I rise today to join with my colleagues in introducing a rescission bill to nullify President Trump's Executive Order 13798, titled “Promoting Free Speech and Religious Liberty.” Unfortunately, this Executive Order does not live up to its title. Instead, it furthers the aim of this administration to diminish critical protections for women, minorities, and LGBT Americans.

I am deeply troubled by Section 3 of the Order, which paves the way for the Trump administration to roll back protections to preventive health services under the Affordable Care Act (ACA), especially for women and LGBT individuals. Through new regulations issued pursuant to this Order, companies could use “conscience-based” objections to deny their employees coverage for preventive services that they have a right to under the ACA. This means that because of their employers' moral objection, women could lose access to contraception, and those in the LGBT community could lose access to essential services, including cancer screenings or counseling for domestic violence.

I respect that we all have religious and moral convictions, but it is wrong to put employers' religious views above individuals' rights to access basic health care. I also note that this section of the Order invites members of the President's Cabinet to eliminate an accommodation President Obama administration made allowing religiously affiliated nonprofit employers, including large universities and hospital systems, to opt out of providing their employees with contraception coverage based on religious objections.

Importantly, women working for objecting employers can receive contraception coverage directly through their insurance companies. Seven federal courts of appeals have upheld this accommodation in the face of religiously based challenges. But with this Order, the President signals that his administration is likely to do away with the accommodation, which would deny contraception access to women whose bosses want to make this important and intimate decision for them.

The Order also directs the Attorney General to issue guidance to all agencies on “religious liberty protections in

Federal law.” This language is concerning as it opens the door for the Attorney General to eliminate protections in federal rules and regulations for LGBT individuals and minorities. The Attorney General's duty is to enforce and protect the civil rights and constitutional freedoms of all Americans. This Order's direction for guidance that could change the implementation of critical rules affording equal treatment for all in America is a disturbing step backward. For example, there are rules protecting same-sex spouses' ability to visit their partners in the hospital and ensuring that LGBT individuals have equal access to federally funded emergency housing. Under this provision, however, new religious exemptions may be implemented to weaken these protections. Shelters could turn LGBT families away because of who they love. As the Human Rights Campaign has described, this provision opens the door to a “license to discriminate” even where basic services funded with government dollars are at stake.

This Executive Order opens the door to weakening the enforcement of longstanding tax laws against individuals, houses of worship, and other religious organizations engaging in political campaign speech. Notably, the Johnson Amendment was proposed by Lyndon B. Johnson in 1954 and is part of our tax code. It prohibits 501(c)(3) tax-exempt entities, including churches, from engaging in political campaign activity on behalf of candidates. The Johnson Amendment does not bar nonpartisan voter education and registration activities, which are important to a strong democracy, nor does it prohibit speech on moral issues.

The President has promised to repeal the Johnson Amendment. Doing so could have a significant impact on political campaign fundraising and would change the current tax consideration for certain political contributions. While repeal of the Johnson Amendment is something only Congress has the power to do, this Executive Order clearly indicates the administration's intention to undermine the separation between tax-exempt charities and religious organizations and political campaign activity in the tax code.

It remains to be seen whether the President and the administration will implement this Order in ways that will realize our worst fears about the kind of discrimination it could enable. But we know for certain that this Order represents a disturbing statement of principles and values. Instead of seeking even greater protections from discrimination, this administration has set the stage to undermine protections, especially for women and LGBT individuals. That is not what our country stands for.

Mr. President, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the

bill I am introducing today to nullify this troubling Executive Order.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 162—RE-AFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROMOTING RELIGIOUS FREEDOM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 162

Whereas the United States Congress has a proud history of promoting internationally recognized human rights;

Whereas religious freedom is a fundamental human right of all people;

Whereas the free exercise of religion must stand for the right to practice any faith or to choose no faith at all;

Whereas every individual's rights to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion is guaranteed under the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted at Paris December 10, 1948, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted at New York December 16, 1966, which recognize, "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.";

Whereas, during his 1941 State of the Union address, President Franklin D. Roosevelt noted the "Four Freedoms" that the world should be founded upon, including the "freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world";

Whereas, according to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF), abuses committed by governments and non-state actors has increased and the incarceration of prisoners of conscience remains widespread;

Whereas, according to the latest Pew Research Center's Study of Global Restrictions on Religion, which surveyed 2015, an estimated 79 percent of the world's population lives in countries where freedom of religion and conscience is highly restricted, either by the government or social groups;

Whereas the 2017 report produced by USCIRF recommended that the Department of State designate the following countries as Countries of Particular Concern: Burma, Central African Republic, China, Eritrea, Iran, Nigeria, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam;

Whereas, in the same report, USCIRF categorized as Tier 2 violators, meaning violations engaged in or tolerated by the government are serious and characterized by at least one of the elements of the 'systematic, ongoing, and egregious' Country of Particular Concern standard, Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Laos, Malaysia, and Turkey;

Whereas USCIRF also recommended that the Department of State designate the following non-state actors as entities of par-

ticular concern: the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), the Taliban in Afghanistan, and al-Shabaab in Somalia;

Whereas, according to the Pew Research Center Study, the two geographic regions with the highest government restrictions continue to be the Middle East-North Africa and the Asia-Pacific;

Whereas Congress has recognized that Christians, Yazidis, Shi'a, Turkmen, Shabak, Sabeen-Mandeans, Kaka'i, and other religious and ethnic minorities in Iraq and Syria have faced genocide and other crimes against humanity perpetrated by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), and that ISIL seeks to eradicate the communities of these minorities;

Whereas Egyptian Coptic Christians have been repeatedly targeted and their aggressors have gone unprosecuted, including two suicide bombings conducted by ISIL that killed 44 people at Coptic churches on Palm Sunday 2017 and an attack in December 2016 that killed 29 and injured numerous other Coptic worshippers, many of whom were women and children;

Whereas, according to USCIRF, Rohingya Muslims and other religious and ethnic minorities, including Christians, in Burma have faced ongoing persecution from state and non-state actors for decades, including incidents of intimidation and violence; the forced relocation and destruction of religious sites; violent attacks by mobs and the military; sexual violence and trafficking in persons, and an ongoing campaign of coerced conversion to Buddhism;

Whereas, according to USCIRF's most recent annual report, conditions for freedom of religion or belief in China continue to decline, with authorities targeting anyone considered a threat to the state, including religious believers, and Chinese authorities arrested Christians for displaying the cross in their homes and printing religious materials, threatened parents for bringing their children to church, and blocked them from holding certain religious activities;

Whereas, according to USCIRF, the Government of Eritrea continues to target Evangelical and Pentecostal Christians and Jehovah's Witnesses, suppresses the religious activities of Muslims, dominates the internal affairs of the Coptic Orthodox Church of Eritrea, and has engaged in the torture of religious prisoners;

Whereas apostasy and blasphemy laws are routinely used across the Middle East and North Africa to intimidate and punish minority faiths and those who would leave Islam;

Whereas, according to Human Rights Watch, in Pakistan, Christians, Hindus, and Ahmadis are often the victims of violent extremists; forced conversion and marriage of Christian and Hindu girls and young women remains a systemic problem; and blasphemy laws are often used as an excuse to settle personal scores or stir up religious animosity against marginalized religious minorities, resulting in a climate of fear and a chilling effect on religious expression;

Whereas, according to the Department of State's 2015 International Religious Freedom Report, the Government of Iran continues to repress religious minorities, including Bahais, Christians, Sunnis, Sufis, Yarsanis, and Zoroastrians, by raiding religious gatherings services, arresting and imprisoning worshippers and religious leaders, imprisoning educators, confiscating properties, and executing dissidents;

Whereas, according to the Department of State's 2015 International Religious Freedom

Report, the Government of Sudan has systematically targeted the Christian community, prosecuting Christian pastors on trumped-up charges, confiscating Christian-owned properties, banning the construction of new Christian houses of worship, destroying numerous religious facilities throughout the country, and targeting human rights defenders for legally representing the Christian community;

Whereas, according to the February 2014 report of the United Nations Commission of Inquiry on the Human Rights Situation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), there is "an almost complete denial of the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion," and the Government of the DPRK "considers the spread of Christianity a particularly serious threat" and enforces severe punishments for the practice of Christianity;

Whereas the global religious freedom crisis we are experiencing today has created millions of victims and undermines liberty, prosperity, and peace in places vital to United States national interests—posing direct challenges to United States interests in the Middle East, Russia, China, and sub-Saharan Africa;

Whereas the absence of fundamental human rights, including religious freedom, contributes to persecution of minorities, religious extremism, terrorism, and instability;

Whereas there is greater peace, political and social stability, economic development, democratization, and women's empowerment when human rights, including religious freedom, are protected and advanced; and

Whereas Congress recently recognized, with broad bipartisan support, in the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act (Public Law 114-281), enacted on December 16, 2016, that because the promotion of international religious freedom protects human rights, advances democracy abroad, and advances United States interests in stability, security, and development globally, the promotion of international religious freedom requires new and evolving policies, and diplomatic responses that are drawn from the expertise of the national security agencies, the diplomatic services, and other governmental agencies and nongovernmental organizations, and are coordinated across and carried out by the entire range of Federal agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to promoting religious freedom as a fundamental human right and calls on the President and the Secretary of State, in accordance with the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-292), as amended by the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act (Public Law 114-281), to strengthen United States foreign policy on behalf of individuals persecuted in foreign countries on account of religion;

(2) calls on the President, the Secretary of State, and the Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom to develop an action plan on international religious freedom and to integrate that plan into United States diplomatic, development, and national security strategies;

(3) in accordance with section 106 of the International Religious Freedom Act (22 U.S.C. 6415), calls on the President, in collaboration with the Secretary of State, the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, and the Administrator of the

United States Agency for International Development, to develop a strategic plan to direct grants funded by the United States Government towards civil society that are implementing innovated programs in key countries to train and work with local religious leaders of all religious communities, including minorities, on the importance of pluralistic societies, rights guaranteed under international law, and reporting mechanisms available to them within international institutions;

(4) urges the Secretary of State to implement the requirements of section 103 of the Frank Wolf International Religious Freedom Act (Public Law 114-281) and develop a training curriculum for all American diplomats in international religious freedom policy;

(5) urges the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and other relevant agencies to develop a comprehensive response to protect the victims of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes and to provide humanitarian, stabilization and recovery assistance to all individuals from religious and ethnic groups so effected in Iraq and Syria;

(6) calls on the President and the Secretary of State to reestablish the Religion and Foreign Policy Working Group within the Department of State's Federal Advisory Committee established by the previous administration, bringing together experts from government, universities, religious and other nongovernmental organizations to develop an effective multiyear plan to address religious persecution globally and protect and promote international religious freedom; and

(7) calls on the President, the Secretary of State and the United States Trade Representative to ensure that trade negotiations include religious freedom conditions as mandated by the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (title I of Public Law 114-26).

NOTICES OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDINGS

I, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Courtney Elwood, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency, dated May 11, 2017.

I, Senator RON WYDEN, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Sigal Mandelker, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, dated May 11, 2017.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 11, 2017 at 9:30 a.m.,

in 328A Russell Senate Office Building, in order to conduct a hearing entitled "Pesticide Registration under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act: Providing Stakeholders with Certainty through the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act."

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 11, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on Cyber Policy, Strategy, and Organization.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 11, 2017 at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "The Status of the Housing Finance System After Nine Years of Conservatorship."

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 11, at 9:30 a.m. in SD-106.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on May 11, 2017, at 10 a.m., in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate Thursday, May 11, 2017 at 10:30 a.m. in 428A Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Nomination of Althea H. Coetzee to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration."

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Thursday, May 11, 2017 from 10 a.m., in room SH-216 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold an open hearing entitled "Worldwide Threats."

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Thursday, May 11, 2017 from 1:30 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed hearing.

PROVIDING FOR STAYS DURING A PERIOD THAT THE MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD LACKS A QUORUM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Gov-

ernmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 1083 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1083) to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 1083) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1083

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

SECTION 1. STAYS BY MSPB DURING PERIODS WITH NO QUORUM.

Section 1214(b)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(i)" before "The Board may"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: "(ii) If the Board lacks the number of members appointed under section 1201 required to constitute a quorum, any remaining member of the Board who was appointed, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall, upon request by the Special Counsel, extend the period of any stay granted under subparagraph (A)."

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 15, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, May 15; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Rosen nomination; further, that the time until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the pending cloture motions ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 15, 2017, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate,
at 5:50 p.m., adjourned until Monday,
May 15, 2017, at 3 p.m.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DAVID J. KAUTTER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE MARK J. MAZUR.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

BROCK LONG, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE ADMINIS-
TRATOR OF THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE
WILLIAM CRAIG FUGATE, RESIGNED.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by
the Senate May 11, 2017:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

ROBERT LIGHTHIZER, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED
STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF
AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by
the Senate:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE PERMIAN BASIN
HONOR FLIGHT—MAY 2017

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 88 veterans from West Texas who will be visiting Washington, D.C. this week, sponsored by the Permian Basin Honor Flight. On behalf of a grateful state and nation, we welcome these heroes to the nation's capital.

The veterans on this Honor Flight are Clint Adams, Larry Allen, Robert Barbee, William Bourbon, Johnny Bragg, Patrido Brijalba, James Brooks, Randall Brooks, Jack Brookshire, Norval Brown, Leo Carr, Garry Clark, Edmundo Cobos, Edward Comacho, Jose Contreras, Guadalupe Cruz, Marvin Crain, Michael Crain, Ernest Davis, MJ Dinkins, Richard Dolan, Jose Duarte, Michael Dyess, Rayburn Favre, Carlton Fite, Richard Foncannon, John Foreman, Richard Galloway, Bobby Gann, Jerry Giles, Gonzalo Guzman, Barry Handlin, Donald Hawke, John Hayes, Harry Hemmenway, Cary Holt, John Hood, Earl Jackson, Joe Jackson, Marvin Jennings, Albert Johnson, Thomas Johnston, Velton Jones, William Jones, James Langston, Robert Lathrop, Robert Love, Lee Maston, Mark Martin, Robert Martin, Walter Mason, Donald McSparan, Miguel Medina, Donald Merritt, Dory Miles, Kenneth Moore, Donnie Murray, Michael Norman, John Palmer, Jerry Partridge, Charles Pounds, Robert Patterson, Robert Price, Daniel Ramirez, Donald Ritchey, Joe Robledo, Jesus Rodriguez, Gary Roe, Monica Schwab, Dennis Sever, Larry Sisk, William Smartt, Larry Stowe, Oscar Taylor, Gustavo Tijerina, Bernaro Tucker, Joe Turner, Lewis VanZant, Sandra VanZant, Joe Villalva, Mark Webb, Donnie White, Eddy Willmon, Leo Wilson, Willie Woods.

Mr. Speaker, I am humbled to have the opportunity to meet these brave men and women who exemplify the best of our country. Their sacrifice and commitment to the duty to our nation can never be fully repaid, and I hope that when they visit our nation's monuments in Washington, D.C., the gratitude and respect we have for them will truly be reflected.

Colleagues, please join me in thanking these veterans and their families for their exemplary dedication and service to this great nation. I would also like to extend a special thank you to the local communities, all of the volunteers, and Ms. Teresa Galloway and Mr. John West for their extensive work in organizing this Honor Flight. This trip would not have been possible without all the financial and emotional support of the people who have put in so much hard work and personal time to make sure this trip could be possible.

A TRIBUTE TO LT. COL. DAVID
WORLEY

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lieutenant Colonel David Worley, who is retiring after forty-two years of distinguished service with the United States Air Force.

Born in Los Angeles in 1953, Dave grew up in Woodland Hills, California. An excellent student and astronomy enthusiast, he attended Serrania Avenue Elementary School, Parkman Jr. High and Taft High School. Dave met his future wife, Gayle, in Sunday School, and after their high school graduation, they attended Pierce College together. In 1975, Dave enlisted in the United States Air Force (USAF) and he and Gayle married shortly after his enlistment. Upon completion of his basic training, he was assigned to the Keesler Air Force Base in Biloxi, Mississippi for technical training. After finishing his technical training, he was assigned to Dover AFB for a one year assignment. He was reassigned back to Keesler AFB in Biloxi, where their children, Valerie and Bryan were born.

Dave served as an Air Traffic Controller Manager for seven years, after which he received his commission. Upon completing training as an Air Battalion Manager, then-Second Lieutenant Worley was stationed in Germany for eight years, where he served as a mobile Theater Air Control specialist and evaluator and was promoted to the subsequent ranks of First Lieutenant and Captain. In 1992, Captain Worley served as a Flight Commander at the Squadron Officer School at the Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama and in 1994, he was stationed in Korea where he was promoted to Major and worked as Battle Director for air-space control. In 1995, Major Worley returned to the Squadron Officer School as Chief of Plans and Programs, then attended college in Virginia, and after college, began a three year tour at the U.S. Central Command Headquarters in Tampa, Florida. While in Florida, he served as the Chief of the Theater Air and Missile Defense Branch as Executive Officer to the Director of Operations, where he received the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. In 2000, Lt. Col. Worley returned once again to Alabama as Commander of the 30th Student Squadron Officers School, where he commanded hundreds of USAF officers, international officers and U.S. Department of Defense civilian personnel as an airpower and leadership education scholar, before his retirement in 2002.

In 2003, Dave became a Senior Aerospace Science instructor at Crescenta Valley High School in La Crescenta, California. Lt. Col. Worley was responsible for administering the Air Force Junior Officer Training Corps

(AFJROTC) program, a citizenship-based program for nearly 100 high school student "cadets," who are expanding their aerospace science and leadership education to become better leaders and citizens.

During his illustrious career in the United States Air Force, Lt. Col. Worley has received several decorations including the Joint Service Commendation Medal, five Meritorious Service Medals, a Defense Meritorious Service Medal, and two USAF Commendation Medals, and was honored in 2007 and in 2008 with the AFJROTC outstanding instructor award, which is presented annually to the top twenty percent of all AFJROTC instructors worldwide.

I ask all Members of Congress to join me in thanking Lt. Col. Worley for his many years of dedicated service to our country, the AFJROTC students at Crescenta Valley High School, and the greater foothills community.

HONORING THE JOHNSTOWN ROTARY
CLUB'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. KEITH J. ROTHFUS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Johnstown Rotary Club's 100th Anniversary.

Since its founding in May 1917, the Johnstown Rotary Club has aided many community organizations such as scouting, child relief agencies, arts and theater organizations, police and fire departments and health and service organizations. It has also sponsored Interact Clubs at local high schools and awarded scholarships to outstanding high school students. In addition to providing dictionaries to every third grader in the Johnstown area, Johnstown Rotarians are also involved in various literacy initiatives such as the One Book, One Community Program.

The Johnstown Rotary Club has also been actively involved in international service initiatives such as supporting clean water projects in developing nations. They have been very involved in hosting high school exchange students from numerous countries including Spain, France, Slovakia, Turkey, Venezuela, Mexico, Ecuador, Argentina, Bolivia, the Dominican Republic and Japan. Since 1968, when Rotary International first took on the challenge of eradicating polio, the Johnstown Rotary Club has participated in various projects, which helped to bring the number of countries experiencing the polio endemic from 122 down to two.

I thank the Johnstown Rotarians for their dedication to improving both the Johnstown community and the international community through their commitment to supporting education, providing clean water, promoting

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

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

peace, saving mothers and children, growing local economies and fighting disease. Congratulations to the Rotary Club of Johnstown on its 100th Anniversary.

IN HONOR OF THE COMMEMORATION OF THE GREAT FALLS LIBRARY COMMUNITY ROOM

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the commemoration of the Great Falls Library Community Room in honor of Marge Gersic and also to recognize her tremendous contributions to not only the Great Falls Community Library, but the entire 10th District of Virginia over the course of her 20 years of public service.

Growing up as the child of two German immigrants in Queens, New York, Ms. Gersic often found herself in her local library, reading books written in English. There she not only gained an appreciation for books, but she also learned about the impact libraries can have on a community. Ms. Gersic began her work in the Great Falls community after moving to the area in 1971 with her husband and then newborn son. As both a member of the Library Board and as President of the Great Falls Citizens Association, she was instrumental in placing a library in Great Falls and also in preserving it throughout the years.

In both 1989 and 1996, as a skilled and dedicated public organizer, Ms. Gersic led community movements to keep the Great Falls mini-library open amidst budget cuts that would have eliminated numerous mini-libraries across Fairfax County. By organizing drives, collecting signatures, and leading these movements, she was able to keep the local mini-library open. In fact, during the 1996 budget cuts, four mini-libraries across Fairfax closed, but due to her initiatives the Great Falls library remained open. In addition to her efforts to preserve the library throughout the years, as a member of the Fairfax County Library Board, Gersic was also integral in the funding and the eventual expansion of the library to its current location, which opened in October of 2000.

Honoring the life of Ms. Gersic with a room in the library, which she worked so hard to maintain and expand is only fitting, and I am thankful for the Great Falls Citizens Association's dedication to preserving her legacy. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Marge Gersic and the commemoration of the Great Falls Library Community Room, which will serve as a permanent reminder of all her contributions to both the library and the community at large.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE & LEGACY OF FATHER JOHN K. RING

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life and legacy of a dear friend and

beloved pillar of the San Francisco community, Father John Ring, who served for 25 years as Pastor of St. Vincent de Paul Church.

Born and raised in San Francisco, Father Ring's leadership and compassion were invaluable to our parish and our community, in times of joy and sorrow alike. In the suffering of the Loma Prieta earthquake, Father Ring bound up the wounds of our community, consoling and encouraging us, tending his flock.

During his entire Pastorate, we saw the creation of a mass for young adults, a group of Home Visitors to care for the sick and homebound in the parish and beyond, and for the first time girls were allowed to be altar servers. He also poured himself into the service of the parish's children, and the strength of the St. Vincent de Paul school will be an enduring part of Father Ring's rich legacy.

My husband Paul, my family and I were deeply saddened to hear of Father Ring's passing. Our family has been parishioners at St. Vincent de Paul for generations, since Paul's parents John and Corinne Pelosi became parishioners in the 1930s. We count ourselves deeply blessed to have known Father Ring, and it was a special privilege to join in celebrating the Golden Jubilee of his priestly service in 2011. He will remain an inspiration to our family.

Father Ring once said that Christ's farewell to his disciples was one of his favorite parts of Scripture. In the Gospel according to John, Jesus says, "Peace I leave with you; My peace I give to you; not as the world gives do I give to you. Do not let your heart be troubled, nor let it be fearful." Truly, Father Ring was an instrument of God's peace.

The families of Father Ring's parish were blessed with a Pastor who strengthened their church and school, built community, and inspired their love for service and their love for God. May it bring comfort to all those who loved and admired Father Ring that so many join in remembering this extraordinary man and the blessing he was to our community.

CELEBRATING ANGEL DEL VILLAR
FOUNDER AND CEO OF DEL
RECORDS

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute Angel Del Villar on his service as founder and CEO of DEL Records, a flourishing music company located in Bell Gardens, California, in my 40th Congressional District. Since his launch of DEL Records in 2008, Angel has built the label into a place where young and independent Regional Mexican artists can develop their talents and find success. Angel's passion for music, his business acumen, and his civic and philanthropic efforts have built DEL Records into a vibrant, thriving part of the local community.

DEL Records exists because of Angel's vision: he knew that the entertainment industry was full of talented artists who were not signed to a label and were not receiving the

support they needed in order to build a career. When he began DEL Records, Angel spent time searching YouTube for young musicians. In the years since, his hard work has paid off: today, the label boasts a broad slate of major artists. Musicians like Gerardo Ortiz, Luis Coronel, Chiquis, Jose Manuel Lopez, and the late Ariel Camacho are just a few of those who have been a part of the DEL Records family.

Angel has used his success at DEL Records as a driving force to create positive change in the community. He has been tireless in giving back time, effort, and resources to help his neighbors. Angel and DEL Records work to lift up the less fortunate, and to give individuals of all ages the opportunity to thrive and excel. As we work to build communities that protect the vulnerable and support those in need, the good works of civic-minded community leaders like Angel are invaluable to that endeavor.

With the help of his sister Maria, and guided always by the inspirational example of his parents Jose Angel and Frances, Angel Del Villar has made DEL Records a key Southeast LA County business and a vital voice in the Regional Mexican music scene. I commend Angel and his team at DEL Records for their achievements in music and contributions to the community, and wish them all the best for the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF ORCHARDS
CHILDRENS' SERVICES ON ITS
55TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Orchards Children's Services as it celebrates its 55th anniversary. Orchards provides critical adoption, foster parenting and family preservation services throughout southeast Michigan.

Founded in 1962 by the Greater Detroit Section of the National Council of Jewish Women, Orchards Children's Services provides comprehensive services and supports to vulnerable children in the southeast Michigan community. The organization recruits, trains and licenses foster parents to provide care for children in need of these services. Additionally, Orchards facilitates adoptions and runs several Post Adoption Resource Centers to ensure that these children and their adoptive families receive the support and resources to help make the transition a success. The organization also maintains a scholarship fund to help Orchards foster children afford a college education. Orchards' Promise Scholarships provide critical financial support to help these children achieve success in college, and every child who receives an Orchard Promise scholarship has achieved at least a 3.0 GPA at a Michigan University.

Orchards Children's Services has played a key role in providing resources and support to vulnerable children in the southeast Michigan community. Since the organization began its adoption program in 1986, it has helped place

over 3,000 children with adoptive families. It also serves over 5,000 children through its family preservation programs, which provide assistance like household organization and other skills training to help stabilize families and keep them together. Collectively, these initiatives have helped empower children in need to reach their potential and provide them resources for success later in life, and I am confident that Orchards will continue its excellent work in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Orchards Children's Services on their 55th anniversary for their work on behalf of Michigan's children. Orchards' programs have helped support vulnerable children in southeast Michigan.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CLAUDIA TENNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, although present for the vote, due to an error, my vote was not properly recorded. Had it been recorded, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 257.

HONORING THE KILGORE HIGH SCHOOL BULLDOGS, 2017 CLASS 4A STATE SOCCER CHAMPIONS

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with enormous pride that I recognize and congratulate the Kilgore High School Bulldogs on achieving the title of 2017 Texas State Soccer Champions. This is the third straight appearance for the Bulldogs in the state soccer showdown, but this is Kilgore High School's first state team title since 2004.

Despite losing their team captain to injury during the state semifinals, the Bulldogs pulled together and made their way to the state final against the Bridgeport Bulls. After the end of grueling regulation play, the match was tied 2-2, and went to penalty kicks. Two brilliant saves by keeper and championship MVP Kaleb Jett, on back-to-back shots, brought the Bulldogs a hard-earned 4-2 victory on penalties.

Congratulations should be extended to team members Kaleb Jett, Yonatan Contreras, Jesus Gonzalez, Jovany Gonzalez, Noe Zavaleta, Raul Cedillo, Jamie Veloz, Elian Torres, Mateo Meraz, Brandon Espinoza, Daniel Sifford, Tucker Konczak, Jordi Contreras, Diego Huerta, Wayne McIntyre, Jose Gonzalez, David Garcia, Jose Arrendondo, Jackson Hatcher.

This recognition of their accomplishment is extended to all of the athletic staff including Coaches: Austin Walker, Mark Roskos; Trainers/Managers: Head Trainer, Darrell "Red" Ganus; Student Trainer, Brandon Mayers; Manager, Carlos Godoy; Videographer, Josue

Reyes. The staff and faculty who led and inspired the Bulldogs in pursuit of the state crown include Superintendent Cara Cooke; Principal Greg Brown; Athletic Director Michael Wood; Assistant Athletic Director Doug Duke.

The faculty, staff and friends of Kilgore Independent School District and the entire community of Kilgore have devoted countless hours to support and encourage these outstanding young athletes in the pursuit of their dreams.

It is my most esteemed honor to congratulate everyone involved with this endeavor. May God continue to bless these students, their families and friends, and all those individuals who call Kilgore, Texas their home. Congratulations to the 2017 Class 4A State Soccer Champions, the Kilgore Bulldogs, as their championship legacy is now recorded and will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

CELEBRATING ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. EVAN H. JENKINS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Israel Independence Celebration in my hometown of Huntington, West Virginia, that took place on Sunday, May 7. This event honoring the establishment of one of our nation's greatest allies was made possible by the hard work of Jewish Charities of Huntington and Christ Temple Church of Huntington. I thank Linda Klein and Pastor Chuck Lawrence for their steadfast leadership as well.

Just like West Virginia, Israel's greatest strength is the resolve and resilience of its people. I witnessed firsthand the importance of the relationship between our two countries during my recent visit to Israel, where it was evident that the nation is under threat like never before. That is why I will continue to hold the Iranian regime accountable for its nuclear and ballistic missile programs so that it will never be able to obtain a nuclear weapon. I have also been a vocal supporter of placing stronger sanctions on Iran until it no longer financially supports terrorist groups that pose a threat to both Israel and the United States, and to providing aid and support to Israel to help it defend itself.

Israel will always have a friend in the United States, and in me. I congratulate the citizens of Israel on 69 years of independence and look forward to many more years of friendship between our people.

IN RECOGNITION OF TOYOTA MOTOR NORTH AMERICA ON THE DATE OF ITS SUPPLIER CENTER GRAND OPENING

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Toyota Motor North America on the

date of the Toyota Supplier Center and Prototype Development Facility grand opening. Toyota Motor North America has been a strong partner to southeast Michigan by utilizing our state's automotive expertise to help produce its next generation of automobiles.

Originally established in July 1977, Toyota Motor North America's Research and Development has contributed significantly to the leadership of southeast Michigan as a leader in automotive engineering, driving important breakthroughs in automotive design and safety. Toyota employs approximately 1,440 individuals in its Ann Arbor and York Township facilities whose work has critical input to many of Toyota's most popular vehicles. These facilities collectively have contributed to the vehicle development of many of Toyota's most popular vehicles, including the 2014 Tundra and 2015 Camry designs, and its advanced research and prototype development efforts continue to serve as a critical source of innovation for the company at large.

Toyota Motor North America's significant investment in expanding and upgrading its Ann Arbor and York Township engineering facilities underscores the importance of the groundbreaking research and development being done here. The expansion of the powertrain development facility in Ann Arbor Township, as well as further improvements to the York Township site, will allow a continuation of the successful partnership between Toyota and the State of Michigan. The talented and educated southeast Michigan workforce, combined with Toyota's new facilities and additional resources, will help ensure that Michigan's automotive industry remains a worldwide leader in the coming decades.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Toyota Motor North America and Mr. Toyota during the grand opening of the Toyota Supplier Center and Prototype Development Facility expansion. This critical investment will leverage Michigan's talented workforce to conduct cutting edge automotive research and development.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE GRAND OPENING OF CENTERFUSE

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the grand opening of CenterFuse in Manassas, Virginia, an innovative business accelerator that will allow individuals, entrepreneurs, start-up companies, and established firms to lease office space and conference rooms. This state of the art facility is equipped with brand new office and conference equipment, including smart televisions, fast wifi, and a fully functional kitchen. While offering some of the most modern technology, and yet at the same time being situated in Old Town Manassas, CenterFuse will provide the residents of Virginia's 10th Congressional District with 24/7 access to a unique combination of advanced technology and a relaxed and familiar setting.

The idea for CenterFuse was originally conceived by Gail and Bennet Whitlock, of

Whitlock Financial, and Jacqueline and Ken Krick, of ECU Communications, who formed an LLC to purchase the Hyson Building in Manassas on the corner of Center Street and Main Street. The two firms have their own offices upstairs, but below, where the Fauquier Bank once stood, they built CenterFuse. To fund the construction of CenterFuse, they formed a public-private partnership with the City of Manassas, receiving a \$200,000 grant from Manassas City leaders. The day-to-day operations will be overseen by Historic Manassas, Inc. (HMI) and their Executive Director/CEO, Debbie Haight, and under her leadership, HMI will manage the office's front desk, organize classes and activities, and lead the recruiting efforts for new clients.

In today's competitive economy, many small companies and individuals require modern workspaces, yet often find it difficult to secure or maintain an office. CenterFuse will ameliorate this problem by offering a variety of options for businesses, ranging from year-long leases for private offices to co-working day passes. This will enable these growing businesses or individuals to work in an environment that caters to their specific needs.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that my colleagues join me in applauding the Grand Opening of CenterFuse. It is my hope that CenterFuse will help Virginia's 10th Congressional District to continue to be a catalyst for new businesses to thrive. I am very thankful for the broad range of opportunities it will afford my constituents and I look forward to the positive impact it will have on individuals, entrepreneurs, businesses and our commonwealth as a whole.

IN HONOR OF MR. FREDERICK VAN
HOOSE'S FORTY YEARS OF
SERVICE

HON. PRAMILA JAYAPAL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Frederick Van Hoose, Executive Director of the Northwest Field Office of SourceAmerica, who is retiring after 40 years of service.

Mr. Van Hoose grew up in the agricultural heartland of eastern Washington, where he learned at a young age the value of honest work. He also came to understand work as a social connection—an activity that, in bringing people together for a common purpose, validates our collective worth and impact on each other. After receiving his bachelor's degree from Central Washington University and his MBA from City University of Seattle, Mr. Van Hoose built a career centered on the needs of persons living with disabilities. As an executive manager at Provident Industries in Yakima, Washington, and Northwest Center Industries in Seattle, he developed employment opportunities that increased the quality of life for hundreds of workers with disabilities.

In March 1997, Mr. Van Hoose secured a position as an Operations Manager with National Industries for the Severely Handicapped—now SourceAmerica—a non-profit agency that works through the provisions of

the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act to facilitate meaningful employment for persons living with disabilities. Mr. Van Hoose has helped scores of non-profit agencies build business systems to expand their capacity to compete for contracts, and he has worked with Federal procurement professionals to find contracting solutions that enhanced the double bottom line: quality services and products for a fair price, while supporting access to employment for persons living with disabilities.

During his tenure with SourceAmerica, Mr. Van Hoose has served as a model of the selfless spirit and inspired leadership that has helped the program grow to employ many individuals living with the full range of disabling conditions, including many wounded warriors. Mr. Van Hoose's dedication to enhancing the lives of Americans living with disabilities extends to his personal life, as he serves as guardian to a man living with a severe disability.

For his years of dedicated service, it is appropriate to express our deep appreciation for Frederick Van Hoose's long and exceptional career and his outstanding volunteer service, and to wish him well on his retirement.

CONGRATULATING NIEMANN FOODS' 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DARIN LaHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to honor Niemann Foods as they celebrate one hundred years of business.

In 1917, brothers Ferd Sr. and Steve Niemann achieved the American dream by opening their first grocery store, Niemann Brothers, in Quincy, Illinois. By providing quality produce, goods, and customer service, the Niemanns afforded the opportunity to expand their operations to thirty grocery stores by 1930. One decade later, the Neimann brothers opened Quincy's first full service supermarket, Food Center, which was open seven days a week. Food Center became the heart of the town and was the beginning of the area's modern shopping tradition. Today, Niemann Foods, an ESOP company, provides employment for over 5000 hard-working people spread throughout their retail banners, which include County Market, Save-A-Lot, Ace Hardware, Pet Supplies Plus and Haymakers convenience stores. As the Niemann tradition continues to thrive, consumers can find their quality products and customer service at more than one hundred stores all across the Midwest.

For one hundred years, Niemann Foods has given back to their community through hard work, generosity, and their commitment to helping others. Without a doubt, Niemann Foods is a staple of Illinois' 18th District and I am proud to consider them our neighbors. Congratulations to Niemann Foods on a prosperous century and I wish them one hundred more years of success.

IN RECOGNITION OF BYRON BUNKER FOR BEING NAMED A FINALIST FOR THE SAMUEL J. HEYMAN SERVICE TO AMERICA MEDAL

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Byron Bunker for being named a finalist for the Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medal. Mr. Bunker's work as Director of Compliance Programs for the Environmental Protection Agency was key to uncovering Volkswagen Group's automotive emissions evasion scheme and safeguarding public health.

Since 1999, Mr. Bunker has worked for the EPA's National Vehicle and Fuel Emissions Laboratory in Ann Arbor, Michigan, which conducts tests to certify that vehicles and engines meet the United States' emissions and fuel economy standards. As Director of the NVFEL's Compliance Division, Mr. Bunker tests automobiles and their components to ensure that they comply with clean air regulations. Working in conjunction with academic researchers and other federal officials, Mr. Bunker helped uncover and halt a scheme by Volkswagen to evade emissions standards through the use of software designed to intentionally fool regulators about the true emissions levels of its diesel vehicles. This discovery eventually resulted in the largest penalty ever levied against a car manufacturer and helped lay the foundation for additional criminal investigations. These have resulted in \$4.3 billion in civil and criminal penalties, as well as indictments against Volkswagen executives.

Mr. Bunker's expertise and tireless efforts played a critical role in uncovering this wrongdoing and underscore the importance of the EPA's enforcement efforts. As a result of Mr. Bunker's work, the EPA was not only able to detect a sophisticated and widespread emissions evasion scheme, but also strengthen its testing procedures to prevent similar deceptions in the future. Through his rigorous work and collaboration with other officials in the EPA, Mr. Bunker has been an important driver of efforts to protect Americans' health and the environment, and it is my hope that he continues to effectively safeguard public health and safety in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Byron Bunker for being named a finalist for the Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medal. Mr. Bunker's rigorous enforcement work has been important in protecting public health and safety.

HONORING NEAL A. DEANGELO

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I honor my good friend, Neal

DeAngelo, and congratulate him on being named the 2017 Distinguished Citizen of the Year by the Greater Hazleton Area Boy Scouts. With years of success with his family business, and his commitment to giving back to Hazleton and the broader community of Pennsylvania's 11th district, it comes as no surprise to me that he has been chosen to receive this honor.

Neal has been an instrumental figure in the Hazleton community. I can say with certainty that there are few people who have done as much for Hazleton as Neal. He has served on the boards of several non-profit organizations, including the YMCA and United Way. He has also served as the President of the Professional Lawn Care Association of America, and is a founding member of the State Association, for which he also served as President. Neal has been a longtime supporter of Scouting in the Greater Hazleton Area. Through his generosity and commitment, Neal has helped make a positive difference in the lives of more than 500 young men throughout our community, providing them with an opportunity to participate in Scouting's character-building and leadership programs.

Not only is Neal one of the most charitable people I know, he is also a well-respected businessman. Neal co-founded DBI Services with his brother in 1978 and grew the company into an international diversified services enterprise, exceeding \$250 million annually with a global network of over 50 locations and 1,800 employees. His hard work made it possible for his company to spur growth in and bring quality service to Hazleton, as well as the rest of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing Neal for all he has contributed to the Hazleton community and once again congratulating him on being recognized as the Greater Hazleton Area Boy Scouts' 2017 Distinguished Citizen of the Year.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF
FRANCIS R. LUDOVICI

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Francis R. Ludovici, a beloved member of the Upper Southampton, Pennsylvania community who passed away on Saturday April 29, 2017.

Mr. Ludovici—Frankie to his friends—was a Combat Engineer in the U.S. Army Reserve, a builder, a business owner, and a family man. When he wasn't renovating and flipping houses, his passion, he was selling pinball machines and poker tables, a business he took over from his father before him. Frankie loved his community in Upper Southampton and they loved him back. His presence will be greatly missed but his contributions will be felt for generations to come.

HONORING DR. MANUEL BACA

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the long career of public service provided by an outstanding educator in my region, Dr. Manuel Baca, who has served the students, staff, and faculty of Rio Hondo College with distinction for the past 32 years.

Dr. Baca has been an invaluable resource to me and my staff, and will be truly missed at Rio Hondo College. Dr. Baca has served in many capacities as Professor of Political Science, Director, Dean, Vice President, and Interim Superintendent/President of Rio Hondo College. He also serves on the Board of Trustees of one of the largest community colleges in the Country, Mt. San Antonio College, and is the immediate past President of the California Community Colleges Board of Governors.

I have been privileged to work with Dr. Baca in numerous areas that have improved educational opportunities for students and the needs of our region. We have worked together on expanding transit services to the student body and staff by offering free and reduced price transit passes and buying shuttle buses for enhanced connectivity. Dr. Baca has supported the growth of Rio Hondo College's police, fire and first responder training programs that have benefited the greater Los Angeles Community by providing a well-educated workforce for our public safety agencies.

I am particularly thankful for the work Dr. Baca has done to increase educational opportunities at Rio Hondo College for veterans. As a veteran of the United States Marine Corps, Dr. Baca understood the important role Rio Hondo College could play in helping post-9/11 veterans and all veterans receive workforce training and other services to start new careers and assimilate into civilian life. In addition, Dr. Baca has assisted in organizing veteran student summits throughout the State of California. Our nation is grateful for Dr. Baca's service as a Marine and his continued service to the men and women of our military.

Dr. Baca has been a role model and leader in opening up opportunities for Latino/a students by advocating for legislation at the state and federal level to support Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Rio Hondo College Community and the many people he has impacted in the greater Los Angeles Region, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Manuel Baca on his retirement, and thanking him for his long career of public service to Rio Hondo College, the State of California and our nation.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE WOMEN'S
CENTER OF SOUTHEASTERN
MICHIGAN FOR ITS WORK ON BE-
HALF OF WOMEN IN NEED

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Women's Center of Southeastern Michigan as the community gathers to celebrate all the good work it performs. The Women's Center provides affordable counseling and health services to women in a caring environment.

Originally established in 1977 as Soundings: A Center for Women, the organization changed its name to reflect the growing region it. The organization combined with several other service-oriented groups over the years to better serve its constituency of women in need while continuing to offer low-cost, women-friendly counseling and support services. Today, the Women's Center, based out of Ann Arbor, Michigan, builds on this legacy, offering divorce support, job coaching, personal counseling, and other services through its staff of social workers, graduate interns and community volunteers. Collectively, these individuals help the Women's Center provide direct services to approximately 500 individuals each year, as well as referral services to over 1,000 other individuals to access additional community resources.

The assistance provided by the staff and volunteers of the Women's Center provides professional services that build confidence, strengthen connections and create positive energy. Women find a network and gain access at a low affordable cost to therapists, job coaches, legal aid, divorce specialists, financial advisors and other important tools they need for support and success. The Women's Center's unique approach and comprehensive resources have empowered countless women to address issues in a confidential and specialized setting, and it is my hope that the Center continues to build on its legacy of success.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Women's Center of Southeastern Michigan on its 17th annual Swing into Spring fundraiser. The Women's Center offers important services and supports to women in need.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL
ROOFING CONTRACTORS ASSO-
CIATION AND NATIONAL ROOF-
ING WEEK

HON. RANDY HULTGREN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Roofing Contractors Association (NRCA) headquartered in Rosemont, Illinois, and its efforts to designate the week of June 4–10, 2017 as National Roofing Week.

The roof is one of the most important components of any home or business. It is the first line of defense against natural elements, such as rain, snow or wind, and yet it is often taken for granted until it falls into disrepair. National Roofing Week honors the thousands of roofing contractors and roofing-related businesses across the country and the industry's commitment to public service. National Roofing Week is a valuable reminder of the significance quality roofing has on every home and business in the United States.

Established in 1886, NRCA is one of the nation's oldest trade associations and the voice of professional roofing contractors worldwide. Today, the NRCA has more than 3,800 members located across all 50 states and represents a variety of industry stakeholders, including roofing, roof deck, and water proofing contractors. Using its vast network of roofing contractors and industry-related members, NRCA is responsible for the installation of a majority of new construction and replacement roof systems on commercial and residential structures in America. Most of its members are small, privately-held businesses that provide high-paying jobs for thousands of hard-working families and individuals that are the backbone of our economy.

Professional roofing contractors provide vital services to their communities, both on and off the clock, in all 50 states. NRCA members will recognize National Roofing Week on June 4–10 by supporting numerous charitable community service roofing projects throughout the nation. I commend the NRCA and the vital role the organization and its members play in every community and I ask all my colleagues to join me in acknowledging their contributions during National Roofing Week.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "KEEP
OUR PENSION PROMISES ACT"

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduce the Keep Our Pension Promises Act to reinstate the long standing federal law and principal that prohibited cuts to private pension benefits in plans for retirees.

Pensions are one of the surest means to afford millions of middle class families' security in retirement. They have allowed millions of Americans to enjoy their golden years without fear that they have not saved enough. For decades, pensions guaranteed our senior citizens the peace of mind that a check would arrive every month for as long as they live: this is true retirement security.

But in December 2014, Congress uprooted this security for millions of retirees. At the last minute, in a must pass funding bill, Congress included the Multiemployer Pension Reform Act (MPRA) eviscerating this protection. With little understanding of what the provisions meant, Congress changed a forty year old pension law that ensured retirees were given the highest level of pension-defense. The Employee Retirement Income Security Act, or ERISA, allowed for pension benefits in multi-

employer plans to be cut only when a plan runs out of money—and even then, the retiree benefits should face cuts last. This held true because it was the right thing to do.

Pensions are not handouts, they are deferred wages earned over a lifetime of hard work. An estimated 1.5 million participants, including retirees, are in multiemployer pension plans that are in danger of running out of money in the near future. The passage of MPRA allowed for the first time, benefits of current retirees to be cut in an attempt to address the fiscal distress confronting some of these multiemployer plans.

This was wrong then, and remains a blemish on the Congressional record that little action has been taken to correct the undue burden it placed on retirees. That's why today I introduce the "Keep Our Pension Promises Act" with Senator BERNIE SANDERS of Vermont.

This Act corrects the injustices bestowed upon our most vulnerable retirees by restoring anti-cutback rules so retirees in financially troubled multiemployer pension plans are protected from having their earned benefits cut.

It will allow plans to partition off "orphaned" participants into a separate plan, giving participating employers relief from shouldering the full financial burden and risk of underfunded "orphaned" participants—ensuring the ability for plans to become financially secure once more.

This bill recognizes funding is the ultimate concern. It shores up the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp and creates a legacy fund to ensure participants in partitioned plans will continue to receive the benefits they depend upon. The costs to create this fund are covered by closing tax loopholes the very wealthy use to avoid taxes on like-kind exchanges and supersized IRA accounts that hold millions, despite laws that limit accounts to much smaller tax deductible amounts.

Further the bill ensures pension obligations are prioritized during bankruptcies, which will help the remaining employers in the plan by making it less likely they become responsible for underfunded orphan plans.

Over the past few years the retirees facing these cuts mobilized. They organized dozens of committees to spread the message of how damaging the Multiemployer Pension Reform Act has and will be to their lives and financial security. The Keep Our Pension Promises Act recognizes shared sacrifice is the appropriate course of action to save the golden years of retirement for these retirees. I encourage my colleagues to support this measure and correct the misguided action of passage of the Multiemployer Pension Reform Act.

IN RECOGNITION OF JAYNE HOMCO
FOR HER DISTINGUISHED CA-
REER AND WORK IN THE COM-
MUNITY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jayne Homco for her outstanding

achievements and career with Kroger Co. As president of Kroger's Michigan division, Ms. Homco's leadership and business expertise have helped make Kroger one of America's premier companies.

After graduating from Indiana University, Ms. Homco joined Kroger in 1978 and has served with the company in a variety of roles. She was named co-manager of an Indianapolis store before she turned thirty, and has held management positions with five different divisions within the company across six states. Prior to being named president of Kroger Michigan, Ms. Homco served as vice president of merchandising for Kroger's Southwest division, where she oversaw merchandising for over 200 Kroger supermarkets. In her current role, Ms. Homco leads a division of 16,000 Michigan employees across over 100 stores, which collectively account for billions of dollars in revenue each year.

Ms. Homco's pioneering career has helped her break down barriers for women in the workplace while providing outstanding leadership for Kroger Co. During her career, Ms. Homco became the first woman vice president at Kroger's Dillion's and QFC divisions. Additionally, she is active in the Michigan business community, serving as a board member of the Michigan Chamber of Commerce and Forgotten Harvest, a hunger relief organization in Metro Detroit. Ms. Homco's ability to leverage her business experience and management skills on behalf of Michigan has helped make it a great place to live and work, and I have confidence that she will continue to lead in business and in the community in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Jayne Homco for her work with Kroger Co. and in the community. Ms. Homco has been an effective leader as President of Kroger's Michigan Division while working on behalf of the southeast Michigan community.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PAY
EQUITY FOR ALL ACT OF 2017

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Pay Equity for All Act of 2017, a bill that will help eliminate the gender and racial pay gap by prohibiting employers from asking job applicants for their salary history before making a job or salary offer. Representatives ROSA DELAUNO, JERROLD NADLER, and JACKIE SPEIER are original cosponsors of the bill. Even though many employers may not intentionally discriminate against applicants or employees based on gender, race or ethnicity, setting wages based on salary history can reinforce the wage gap. Members of historically disadvantaged groups often start out their careers with unfair and artificially low wages compared to their white male counterparts, and the disparities are compounded from job to job throughout their careers.

Our bill will ensure that applicants' salaries are based on their skills and merit, not on a potentially problematic salary history, by assessing penalties against employers who ask

applicants for their salary history during the interview process or as a condition of employment. It would also provide job applicants and employees with a private right of action against employers who violate these provisions.

Although the wage gap has decreased for some women, it still persists for women and men of color with similar skill sets. There is much work to be done to address the wage gap for everyone, and our bill is just one step toward that goal.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

HONORING THE DEDICATED SERVICE AND SELFLESS SACRIFICE OF STAFF SERGEANT MARK R. DE ALENCAR

HON. MATT GAETZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with both profound sadness and deep gratitude that I rise to pay tribute to a fallen decorated American hero. On April 8, 2017, Staff Sergeant Mark R. De Alencar, who was assigned to Bravo Company, 1st Battalion, 7th Special Forces Group, Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, tragically succumbed to injuries received from small arms fire in support of Operation Freedom's Sentinel in Nangarhar Province, Afghanistan. Staff Sgt. De Alencar was 37 years old, but lived a lifetime marked by and full of service.

Born in a U.S. Army hospital in Nuremburg, Germany, Staff Sgt. De Alencar's childhood followed his father's military career. Graduating from Joppatowne High School, Joppa, Maryland, in 1998, he then worked odd jobs before becoming a carpenter. But it was in 2009, that he choose to follow in his father's footsteps and joined the U.S. Army.

After attending Basic Combat Training and Cannon Crewmember (13B) Advanced Individual Training (AIT) at Fort Sill, Oklahoma, Staff Sgt. De Alencar was assigned to Bravo Battery, 2nd Battalion, 11th Field Artillery Regiment, 2nd Stryker Brigade Combat Team, 25th Infantry Division at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.

After arrival, he was deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation New Dawn. Staff Sgt. De Alencar later attended Ranger School, graduated, and re-classed as an Infantryman (11B). During his time at Schofield Barracks, he served as Fire Team Leader, Rifle Squad Leader, and attended

multiple training events with partnered forces throughout the Pacific; including Australian Jungle Operations, Operation Cobra Gold in Thailand, and multiple rotations to the National Training Center in Fort Irwin, California.

In September 2016, Staff Sgt. De Alencar graduated from the Special Operations Qualification Course earning the qualification as a Weapons Sergeant (18B) and was assigned to Bravo Company, 1st Battalion, 7th Special Forces Group (Airborne) located at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida.

Staff Sgt. De Alencar's military education includes Basic Leaders Course, Advanced Leaders Course, Jungle Operations Course, Ranger School, Airborne School, Air Assault School, Special Forces Qualification Course, and Survival Evasion Resistance and Escape School.

Staff Sgt. De Alencar's awards and decorations include the Army Commendation Medal with five Oak Leaf Clusters, Army Achievement Medal with 6 Oak Leaf Clusters, Meritorious Unit Citation, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Iraqi Campaign Medal with two Campaign Stars, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Non Commissioned Officer Professional Development Ribbon, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, Expert Infantryman's Badge, Special Forces Tab, Ranger Tab, B Badge, and the Drivers Badge.

As exemplified by his extraordinary heroism, Staff Sgt. De Alencar's life stands as a testament that freedom is not free, and his legacy will echo in time as an example of the ultimate sacrifice made in the name of freedom. On behalf of a humble and grateful Nation, I hope the De Alencar family will find solace in knowing their support, love, and counsel helped make him the hero he became both in uniform and as a father. I pray that God will be with Mark's wife, Natasha; sons, Rodrigo and Marcos; stepson, Deshaun; daughter, Tatiyana; stepdaughter, Octavia and all their family and friends during this time of great mourning and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

IN RECOGNITION OF KEN FISCHER FOR 30 YEARS OF SERVICE ON BEHALF OF THE UNIVERSITY MUSICAL SOCIETY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ken Fischer for his 30 years as

President of the University of Michigan's University Musical Society. Under Mr. Fischer's leadership, UMS has become one of the leading performing arts organizations in the country, brought some of the world's top performers and artists to the University of Michigan, and provided unparalleled cultural and artistic opportunities at the University and to the southeast Michigan community.

Mr. Fischer has been the President of UMS since 1987. During these years, Mr. Fischer has helped the UMS grow and expand its artistic offerings to the wider southeast Michigan community by attracting world-class performers to UMS, including the Royal Shakespeare Company and the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra. In addition, UMS has partnered with local communities to expand access to the arts. He has done extensive work with metro Detroit's Arab American community, which launched a multiyear program to showcase art from different regions and cultures. Under Mr. Fischer's direction, UMS has also commissioned many new works, sponsored artist residences, and organized collaborative performances with local, national and international artists.

Mr. Fischer's outstanding tenure has positioned UMS for success in the coming years. In addition to introducing new programs and expanding the organization's outreach to students and new members of the southeast Michigan community, Mr. Fischer has also grown the organization's development efforts to support these new initiatives. Since appointing Mr. Fischer as President, UMS's budget has increased fourfold, allowing it to reach new audiences. Mr. Fischer has also worked to further intercultural understanding by serving as a speaker and cultural ambassador to Brazil, China, Lithuania and Mexico under the direction of the U.S. State Department. Because of Mr. Fischer's outstanding leadership for three decades, UMS was chosen as a 2014 recipient of the National Medal of the Arts, which is awarded by the President of the United States to organizations that have demonstrated artistic excellence.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ken Fischer for his 30 years of success as President of the University of Michigan's University Musical Society. Mr. Fischer's talent and passion for the arts has built a world-class organization that offers access to artistic performances to a variety of audiences.

SENATE—Monday, May 15, 2017

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TODD YOUNG, a Senator from the State of Indiana.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Immortal, invisible God only wise, we praise Your Name. Lord, You are our strength and our hope for years to come.

Today, may our lawmakers make Your joy their strength. Awaken in them a desire to be guided by You so that their lives and labors will honorably represent Your purposes. Lord, give them wisdom to trust You to finish the work You have started in our lives, our Nation, and world. May they exercise self-discipline in all things, resolving to stay on the path of integrity. Remove from their lives anything that would hinder them from fulfilling Your purposes.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2017.

To the Senate:

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

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, this week marks National Police Week, an annual celebration in honor of the men and women who serve in local, State, and Federal law enforcement all across our country. We are all safer because of their efforts, and this week is an important reminder of their continuing service and sacrifice on our behalf—each and every day.

Traveling across the country, thousands of law enforcement officers gather in our Nation's Capital each year to mark this occasion. They come here to recommit themselves to the peace and safety of our communities and to show respect for their fallen brothers and sisters in uniform who have made the ultimate sacrifice. We are honored to have them in Washington and to join them in recognizing these officers.

I wish to pay a special tribute to the brave men and women who protect and serve my home State of Kentucky. These officers put themselves in harm's way to defend our communities every day, and we owe them a tremendous debt of gratitude.

Today, we also remember those officers from the Bluegrass State who tragically fell in the line of duty.

First, I want to pay tribute to Officer Nick Rodman of the Louisville Metro Police Department. Officer Rodman unfortunately passed away after a car crash in Louisville while responding to calls of shots fired. He was 30 years old and had served in the department for 3 years.

The Rodman family maintains a strong tradition in law enforcement, and he proudly continued that legacy. The many individuals Officer Rodman touched over the course of his life will remember his compassion, patience, and dedication to family.

I wish to also pay tribute to Officer Charles Howley of the Oldham County Police Department. The day before his death, Officer Howley responded to a call reporting smoke in a daycare center. While ensuring all of the children and employees had evacuated, Officer Howley was exposed to a refrigerant. The next day, he suffered a fatal heart attack. Officer Howley was 51 years old and dedicated 20 years of service to his department and his community.

Officers Nick Rodman and Charles Howley displayed courage and heroism, and their service will not soon be forgotten.

I wish to also take a moment to thank the men and women of the U.S. Capitol Police, who stand guard at the heart of our democracy. They protect the Nation's legislature, the people

who work here, and the millions of visitors who travel here to see our government in action. We are grateful for their diligence and for their service.

I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing the Senate family's gratitude to law enforcement officers all across our country as we welcome so many of them to the Capital this week. I wish to reiterate our admiration for their honorable and dangerous work. We live in a safer society because of their brave efforts, and I am glad that we are able to take this opportunity today to thank them for their service.

NOMINATION OF JEFFREY ROSEN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, later today, the Senate will vote to advance another well-qualified nominee, Jeffrey Rosen, to be Deputy Secretary of the Department of Transportation. Mr. Rosen has extensive experience serving at both the Office of Management and Budget and at the Department of Transportation. When he last came before the Senate to be the Chief Legal Officer of the Department of Transportation, he was confirmed by voice vote. It is disappointing that we had to file cloture on this bipartisan choice this time around.

Mr. Rosen's work in both the private and public sectors has given him a unique insight into the budgetary and regulatory challenges that infrastructure projects face. I look forward to the Senate advancing his nomination later this afternoon.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Rosen nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 55, Terry Branstad to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of China.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Terry Branstad, of Iowa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of China.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Terry Branstad, of Iowa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of China.

Mitch McConnell, Jeff Flake, Bob Corker, Roger F. Wicker, Cory Gardner, Marco Rubio, John Boozman, Pat Roberts, Joni Ernst, Mike Rounds, Todd Young, Rob Portman, John Thune, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, James M. Inhofe, John Cornyn.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of the Rosen nomination.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized. Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first let me thank my friend and colleague from Iowa for letting me go forward. The two Charles in the Senate work together whenever we can.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

First, Mr. President, I want to thank our Capitol Police, the New York police, and police around the country for the outstanding work they do. Much like our troops overseas, our law enforcement officers risk their lives for our safety.

As we welcome many police officers to the Capitol this week, I would like to express, on behalf of the Senate, our gratitude for their service, their sacrifice, and their countless daily acts of courage. Particularly, I want to say that in New York City, where we are so proud that crime is the lowest of the 25 largest cities in the country, we thank our New York City Police Department for a job well done. I would also like to thank the many police departments, sheriffs' offices, and so many others of our law enforcement in the State of New York. I have gotten to know them, respect them, and admire them as human beings and for the job they do.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Getting back to a less happy subject, Mr. President, the events of last week tested some of the fundamental precepts of our democratic system, including the rule of law and the independence of our law enforcement agencies that were designed to be a check on any abuse of power.

The President of the United States fired the FBI Director, who was conducting an active investigation of the President's campaign and its ties to Russia. The Attorney General, who had recused himself from that investigation, played a role in that dismissal and continues to be involved in the selection of the new FBI Director. The White House gave pretextual reasons for the firing, which were contradicted by the President himself a few days later when he admitted that he had planned to fire Director Comey for weeks and that he was thinking about Russia when he did it. The President then suggested there were tapes of conversations between himself and Director Comey, threatening to release them if Mr. Comey spoke to the press.

These are not the actions of an administration that respects the rule of law or treasures fidelity to the truth. These are not the actions of an administration that is eager for and even open to an independent investigation into a very serious matter—the interference of our elections by a foreign adversary.

The Founding Fathers, in their infinite wisdom—the more I am around,

the more I am impressed with them, and I was impressed to begin with—designed three coequal branches of government with appropriate powers to check and balance the others. The Founding Fathers explicitly worried about foreign powers trying to influence our elections and government. They actually wrote into the Constitution protections against that very threat. Their concerns, expressed over 240 years ago, gain new prominence and meaning today, perhaps more than at any time in the past.

We in Congress—both parties—need to exercise the powers afforded to us by the Constitution to check and balance. We need to see that we get all the facts. We need to see that the Russia investigation is allowed to proceed as independently and as impartially as possible. We need to hold this administration accountable for any abuse of their powers.

So first of all, if there are “tapes” as the President has suggested, he should turn them over immediately to Congress and the investigators. To destroy them would be a violation of law. If there are no tapes, he should apologize to James Comey and to the American people for misleading them.

Second, the fact that the President has said that he may have taped Mr. Comey makes the need for a special prosecutor all the more important. If it is true, if there are tapes, a special prosecutor would have the ability to obtain these tapes undeterred, and then he would examine them to see what wrongdoing, if any, has occurred.

The reasons for a special prosecutor are compelling. A special prosecutor is not subject to day-to-day supervision by the Attorney General or anyone else at the Justice Department. He or she would have greater latitude in whom they can subpoena, which questions to ask, and how to conduct the investigation. He or she would have purview to investigate, not only the subject but also anyone who attempts to interfere with the investigation. There is built-in congressional oversight, and Congress is notified whenever a special prosecutor is appointed, removed, or finished with the investigation. He or she can only be removed for cause, not to quash an investigation.

With the events of the past week—and given that we have different stories coming out of this administration from different people—the need to have someone who is independent and far away from any of the actors, to get to the bottom of this, is so important. Firing the FBI Director is extremely rare and deeply troubling. We need the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Third, we in the Congress need to hear testimony from Director Comey, as well as be briefed by Attorney General Sessions and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein. I understand that

Director Comey declined an invitation to testify tomorrow, but I have no reason to believe he won't be willing to come before the Senate in the future. I hope that he will sooner rather than later and that those appearances are in a public setting. This week, on Thursday, Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein will brief the full Senate on the events of the last week. Again, I thank the majority leader for joining me in that request. Again, I hope we can make as much of that information public as possible. The American people deserve to know the truth just as much, if not more, than the Senate does.

My caucus still believes that Attorney General Sessions must be made available to the Senate in a similar capacity, given his reported role in firing Director Comey and in helping select his replacement. Considering his recusal from the Russia investigation, his close involvement in these events warrants the Senate's questioning as well. To repeat, we need the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The Russian meddling is so serious, and it is no place for partisan fighting.

Frankly, we need our Republican colleagues to help to get to the bottom of what happened in the 2016 elections and to hold this or any administration accountable when they don't tell the truth. If only one party is doing the talking, the issue will seem too partisan to the American people. A subject as important as this one—the tampering of our elections by a foreign power, a matter the Founders fretted about at the dawning of the Republic—shouldn't be colored by partisan politics.

It is time to put country before party. We need our Republican friends to help us call upon the White House to get an independent investigation on Russia. We need them to speak out when the White House misleads the public. No less than the integrity of our system of government and the rule of law is at stake.

TRUMP CARE

Mr. President, a word on healthcare. As the Senate Republican caucus debates what to do on healthcare, they should take a hard look at the consequences of the House Republican bill on individual Americans. Last week, Senate Democrats met with four Americans who shared their stories and explained how they would be hurt by TrumpCare. Because of the furor over Director Comey's firing, their voices may have been drowned out. So I wanted to repeat a few of their stories.

We heard from Cindi Johnson from Bloomington, IN, whose daughter was born with Down syndrome, a preexisting condition. Ms. Johnson was approaching the lifetime coverage limit on her plan when healthcare reform was passed, which eliminated the limit. That policy change, as well as

Medicaid, helped Ms. Johnson and her family climb out from under a mountain of medical debt and get the care they needed for their daughter. Every parent so much wants to help a child who is sick. That might be taken away from the Cindi Johnsons of the world if the House bill is passed. Under TrumpCare, States are no longer required to prohibit lifetime limits, and Medicaid is cut by \$880 billion. Let's think of the Ms. Johnsons and their daughters and sons.

We also heard from Michael Dunkley from Alexandria, VA. Mr. Dunkley is a 64-year-old fulltime caregiver for his wife, who has advanced MS. In 2013, shortly after being laid off, Mr. Dunkley was diagnosed with an aggressive stage IV non-Hodgkin lymphoma, but his insurance coverage through COBRA was set to expire at the end of the year. Mr. Dunkley was able to sign up for insurance on Virginia's marketplace that provided coverage despite his preexisting condition. Under TrumpCare, Mr. Dunkley could be charged five times or more by the insurance companies because he is older. He could also be priced out of insurance because of his preexisting condition.

President Trump and the Republicans promised better and cheaper healthcare for everyone, but these Americans and many more like them—perhaps millions, pretty certainly millions—would be devastated by TrumpCare. It is another colossal promise to folks like Mr. Dunkley, Ms. Johnson, and her daughter.

So my Republican friends in the Senate, I hope you will listen to these stories and the stories of your constituents saying so many of the same things. To take away healthcare from the Johnsons and the Dunkleys to give a tax break to the very wealthiest of Americans—hundreds of thousands of dollars for people who make tens of millions of dollars—no American would be for that, but that is what is in the bill in the House, and that is where the Republican Senate bill, despite all the talk back and forth, is aiming to go.

My Republican friends here in the Senate, please, listen to these stories. Drop repeal. Drop TrumpCare. Work with Democrats on ways to improve our healthcare system and bring costs down. We can move forward together, or Republicans can move backward on their own.

WORLDWIDE CYBER ATTACK

Lastly, Mr. President, I want to make a note about the worldwide cyber attack. So far, according to the New York Times, the attack has afflicted at least 200,000 computers in more than 150 countries. It is a sobering reminder that cyber attacks are one of the century's greatest challenges. They continue to get larger in scale, broader in scope, and more malicious in intent. It is time we stopped talking about the

threat of cyber attacks and actually started doing something about it.

A few years ago, the Senate tried to pass a bill to protect our critical infrastructure from cyber attacks, but some of our friends on the other side of the aisle blocked it to defend a business community that didn't want to share information necessary to fight these challenges. I hope this global cyber attack serves as a wakeup call and renews bipartisan interest in protecting the United States, the country we love, and in protecting our hospitals, our universities, our businesses, our intellectual property, our credit files, election systems, and critical infrastructures from cyber attacks.

I yield the floor for my friend from Iowa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

REPEALING AND REPLACING OBAMACARE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, let me assure the Senator from New York that I am willing to listen to his stories about how people might be affected by the health care debate that is going on in the Congress right now if he will listen to some of the stories I have to tell. By the middle of June, people in 94 of the 99 counties in Iowa may not be able to buy insurance through the Obamacare exchanges.

Senator SCHUMER talked about the tough consequences of the House bill on healthcare. I am coming to the Senate floor today to talk about the tough consequences of ObamaCare.

I rise today to speak some more about the Affordable Care Act. The law is collapsing before our eyes. After 7 years of ObamaCare, it continues to overreach, overpromise, and overstay its welcome for the American people. I want to tell you the history about a bridge that relates very much to what is happening to ObamaCare today.

Before I dive into the details of how ObamaCare is denying people in the State of Iowa the ability to get health insurance, I want to share a story about a bridge in the State of Washington.

This bridge is depicted right here. This is the collapse of that bridge. The bridge is called Tacoma Narrows Bridge. It was built in 1940. It was the world's third largest suspension bridge. It was considered a state-of-the-art masterpiece of 20th-century engineering, but the bridge was set to fail from the very beginning.

On July 1, 1940, the \$6 million bridge opened to traffic. Just 5 months later, on November 7, 1940, the bridge collapsed. What caused the massive steel and concrete structure to twist, turn, and drop nearly 200 feet into Puget Sound? Importantly, there was a key foreshadowing clue. The bridge was nicknamed "Galloping Gertie" for its dancing, swaying bridge deck. On most days, it resembled a roller coaster rolling in the wind. But on the morning of

November 7, Gertie's dance became twisted in a howling 40-mile-an-hour wind. Dramatic footage shown here shows tons of concrete and steel cables snapping like fishing lines before its collapse. Gertie essentially self-destructed due to design flaws that created sheer havoc in those high winds.

Like ObamaCare, the Tacoma Narrows Bridge wasn't built to last, and like Galloping Gertie, ObamaCare is on a self-destruction course with destiny. Galloping Gertie collapsed by a flawed design that was unable to withstand high winds, and every day that goes by without a bipartisan solution to fix the flaws, ObamaCare is moving the American people closer to a calamity.

Sooner rather than later, ObamaCare will become its own bridge to nowhere, with no insurance plans on the exchanges. Millions of Americans will be left twisting high and dry. The warning signs can no longer be ignored. First, many health insurers are bailing. The individual market is near collapse.

Just last week, another insurance company, Aetna, announced it will quit the remaining two States it planned to sell plans in under ObamaCare. That means in 2018, Aetna will sell zero plans on the individual market exchanges. Just a year ago, in 2016, Aetna participated in the individual markets in 778 counties across the country. In 2017, that number fell to 242. In 2018, that number will be zero.

We ought to repeat this story because everybody is talking about what the House health care bill might do to people's health insurance and their healthcare. The fact is that people can't buy health insurance, or if they buy it, the deductibles are so high they can't afford it. That is the story we ought to be telling at least with equal weight with the stories given by people who are talking about not wanting to do anything with healthcare.

My home State has been hit particularly hard by insurers pulling out of the individual market. In 2016, UnitedHealth Group announced it would leave Iowa the following year. Last month, Aetna and Wellmark announced they would be pulling out of the individual market in Iowa. This leaves 94 of our 99 counties in Iowa with one choice for health insurance on the individual market.

A constituent wrote to me following the news of their departure.

My son recently turned 26 years old and is ineligible to remain on my insurance; therefore, he signed up for his own policy through Wellmark. My son farms with my husband, so while my husband has coverage through me, my son may soon be facing the fact that he will not be able to buy health insurance. My son, a true "beginning farmer," will be forced to leave our farming operation and seek employment solely for the purpose of health care coverage.

If Congress doesn't act, the individual market may come crashing down, just like the Tacoma Narrows

bridge. We simply can't ignore another warning sign. Healthier, younger people are choosing the off-ramp. The toll to join ObamaCare is turning out to be unaffordable for them. ObamaCare is unsustainable.

Remarkably, instead of joining us to fix this broken bridge, the other side wants to leave Americans twisting in the wind. In my home State, 70,000 Iowans are enrolled in the individual exchanges, and the last carrier left, Medica, is on the fence about its plans for 2018. That is why I told Senator SCHUMER to listen to our stories. The people in 94 of Iowa's 99 counties may not even be able to buy insurance on the exchange.

The day has come. It is time to cross the bridge. It is time to repeal and replace ObamaCare before it finishes its collapse.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to law enforcement officers from Arkansas and all across the country who are called to serve and to protect. I am grateful for their dedication and commitment because it takes a very special person to put his life on the line every day to protect our communities.

Arkansans are proud of the law enforcement history in our State. In my hometown of Fort Smith, AR, the U.S. Marshals Service has a deep-rooted history that has helped shape our Nation's westward expansion. Today, many people in the area find their family roots traced back to a U.S. Marshal. As home to the future U.S. Marshals Museum, the community and the State have rallied around this proud heritage. The tradition of courageous public service is carried on today by the men and women who keep communities across the country safe 24 hours a day.

This week, members from law enforcement agencies from around the Nation will join together in Washington to honor their fallen brothers and sisters who have died in the line of duty. May 15 marks Peace Officers Memorial Day, and this week is recognized as National Police Week. We take this opportunity to honor the men and women who have died in the line of duty by adding their names to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

This year, nearly 400 names will be added to the memorial, including these Arkansans: Robert Barker, a patrolman for the McCrory Police Department, who died while serving the people of Woodruff County on September 15, 2016; Corporal Bill Cooper, of the Sebastian County Sheriff's Office, who gave his life in the line of duty on August 10, 2016; and Corrections Officer Lisa Mauldin, who died in service to the community on December 18, 2016.

These Arkansans represent the selfless sacrifice that our law enforcement personnel embody. It is the truest testament to the life that they chose—to serve their communities.

I am sad to say that the name of another Arkansas law enforcement officer will be carved into the memorial. Yell County Sheriff's Deputy Kevin Mainhart was killed in the line of duty last week. He was a veteran officer with more than 20 years of serving and protecting Arkansas communities. I offer my condolences and my gratitude to his family and friends and the law enforcement community as they cope with this unspeakable tragedy.

Our law enforcement officers are true heroes. We recognize, not only during this week but all year long, the devotion of the 900,000 law enforcement officers whose service each and every day makes our communities safer.

I was proud to recognize the service and sacrifice of these first responders and show my support for their commitment to our safety during a tour of Arkansas last year that we called Every Second Counts. First responders invest so much of their lives in public service that one must take the opportunity to commend them for their tireless efforts and willingness to serve in a crisis at a moment's notice.

The role of law enforcement is changing. These men and women perform a variety of roles from responding to emergencies to maintaining public safety and promoting safety services and programs. In Arkansas, we are blessed to have the Criminal Justice Institute, which is a part of the University of Arkansas System. It is a resource to police departments and sheriffs' offices that provides them with updated training and information as they adapt to provide more services to their communities.

As a member of the Senate Law Enforcement Caucus, I am deeply committed to supporting the Criminal Justice Institute and advocating for the policies and resources that law enforcement agencies need to successfully carry out their missions, as well as honoring those lives that are tragically cut short while in the line of duty.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor the Honoring Hometown Heroes Act, which allows Governors to order the American flag to fly at half-staff in recognition of the sacrifice of the first responders who make the ultimate sacrifice. The House of Representatives passed similar legislation earlier this month, and I am hopeful that it will also have the support of this Chamber.

I thank the law enforcement officers in Arkansas and across the country who dedicate their lives to protecting our children and communities and seek to bring criminals to justice. These heroes come to our rescue when we need help, and I am committed to continuing to advocate for these officers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, this is National Police Week—a time each year when we remember and honor those who have fallen in the line of duty.

There are more than 900,000 law enforcement officers serving in our country, and tragically every year dozens lose their lives defending our communities and our freedoms.

This year, as part of National Police Week, I am so thankful that Javier Vega, Jr., one of Texas's own, was honored at the National Law Enforcement Officer Memorial over the weekend, right here in Washington, DC. Just a few hours ago, I had the honor of meeting his family—his wife, his children, and his parents—along with several of his friends whom he served alongside in the U.S. Border Patrol.

They know, all too well, the high cost paid by our law enforcement officers who put themselves at risk every day. Javier—who was known by his close family and friends as Harvey—grew up in La Feria, TX, a small town in South Texas. He was a man known for putting others before himself—someone who would always serve rather than be served.

That desire turned first into a military career. He enlisted in the Marine Corps right out of high school, and later he put himself through college. Then he decided he hadn't done all he wanted to do in public service so he joined the Border Patrol, and just like everything else he pursued in life, he dedicated himself to tirelessly serving others and serving his country.

Sadly, that service was cut short when he and his family, while out on a fishing trip on a Sunday afternoon, were ambushed by two men who tried to rob them. The clash turned violent. Javier immediately thought of protecting others before himself so he jumped into action to fend off the attackers and defend his family.

Tragically, he was killed by the two men—illegal immigrant criminals who had been reportedly deported but managed repeatedly to find their way back into the country, even after committing serious crimes. What a testament to the great need we have to strengthen our border security and justice system to keep us all safe.

Now, there is no denying that Javier Vega, Jr., was taken from his family, his community, and from all of us far too soon. So while we consider the fallen this week, like Javier, and their lives of service, I hope we can also take time to consider how we can better support and serve those who have promised to defend us to the point of risking their very lives.

As we learn from the story of Javier, one obvious way we can do that is by making sure our Federal laws are fully

enforced to protect our communities from those who would take advantage of our generosity and commit violent crimes, even though they are not in the country legally.

We have a chance to do more for our law enforcement officers, and we should always look for ways to do right by them. Now isn't the time to look the other way or to pretend that real problems facing our Nation and our law enforcement community will simply go away. So during this year's National Police Week, I look forward to playing my part to put forward policies that better support their mission to defend and protect communities all across the country.

Let me thank the family of Javier Vega, Jr.—particularly his wife, his children, and his parents who are here with us today—for letting me share his story and honor his service.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I rise today to recognize National Police Week and the service and sacrifice of our country's law enforcement officers. As past Governor of the State of West Virginia, I worked with West Virginia State Police very often and saw firsthand their dedication to the rule of law and commitment to keeping West Virginians safe.

Last year, the State of West Virginia lost one of our own, West Virginia State Police first sergeant Joseph Portaro. Joseph was from Clarksburg and joined the State police in 1998 and served in Kingwood. In 2008, he was assigned staff officer at the academy and was then promoted to deputy director of training. Joseph was a veteran of the West Virginia Army National Guard and served in the West Virginia State Police for 17 years.

Although the loss of Joseph will never heal, I know I join all West Virginians and the entire law enforcement community in praying for Joseph's family and friends.

National Police Week acknowledges the service and sacrifice of our country's law enforcement officers and the safety and protection they provide our communities. Madam President, I know you do too. I go to a lot of schools and talk to the children. I want them to understand that anytime they see a person in uniform, whether it be a policeman, fireman, or EMT, these are people willing to get in front of harm's way for their safety and sacrifice themselves for them. When you have a police officer willing to take a

bullet for you, that is a pretty special person. They don't do it for the pay. I think we all know that. They are dedicated and committed to the well-being and safety of every American. We are very lucky to have them in our respective States of Iowa and West Virginia.

This week, we must remember Joseph and the other 139 law enforcement officers who lost their lives in the line of duty in 2016 and continue to support their families as they continue to mourn their loss. We can never bring back the person who basically sacrificed for all of us, but we can make sure we never forget their families, and I hope we all do that.

This is a special week and a special day for these people we recognize. One hundred and thirty-nine people gave their lives for us. The least we can do is make sure that not only do we remember them but that we go beyond that in order to support the members of the family, their children who need a father or mother they might not have now, who need the nurturing and the financial support for their education so they can continue to grow to be good, healthy, productive adults. I hope we never forget.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I rise today in strong support of Jeffrey Rosen to be the Deputy Secretary of Transportation. It is my understanding that later this evening we will have a vote on that nomination. It will be the first of a couple of votes.

I would just ask my colleagues on the Democratic side and on the Republican side to look carefully at his qualifications and to be in a position to support this good public servant to be the new deputy at Transportation.

I recall that this body overwhelmingly supported Elaine Chao to be the Secretary of Transportation. She is doing a terrific job, in my view. She needs help, and she needs a deputy in place. Jeff has gone through the proper process. We have had hearings, and he has been voted on in committee. It is time to get him there to help Secretary Chao to be able to have her team in place and accomplish the goals that so many of us share.

Jeffrey is a graduate of Northwestern University and Harvard Law School. Here in DC, where there are lots of lawyers, he is one of the most respected ones. He has 30 years of experience handling very complicated, high-stakes cases. He has litigated in more than 20 States. He has been in just about every

setting imaginable: jury trials, bench trials, arbitrations, appellate arguments—on every topic—contracts, antitrust, securities, business torts, enforcement actions, product liability, and class actions. You name it, and he has been involved.

He has a lot of experience. Maybe particularly relevant to this job at Transportation, in 2003 he was unanimously confirmed by this body to serve as the Chief Legal Officer at the Department of Transportation. There he supervised more than 400 lawyers at the Department of Transportation. As the top lawyer there, he wasn't afraid to roll up his sleeves and get involved in lots of issues, including policy issues. I think the kind of experience he gained there will make him very well qualified to serve now as Deputy Secretary of that same agency.

He did such a good job that in 2006 I reached out to him and asked him to join my team at the Office of Management and Budget. I wanted somebody who was a good lawyer but also someone who could manage well and give me good advice, and Jeffrey Rosen was that person. I recruited Jeff to serve as general counsel and senior policy advisor at OMB. In that role, he was always vigilant about the use of taxpayer dollars, a guy who understands those hard-earned dollars need to be stewarded properly. He was someone who focused on management in the Department. He understood the need for us to ensure that taxpayers are getting the best bang for the buck, and, finally, maybe most important, he gave me good advice. He was insightful but also honest. I think that kind of candid advice is exactly what every Department Secretary or leader would want, and that is what he will provide should he become Deputy Secretary.

Since that time, I have stayed up with Jeff. He has continued to give me good advice and counsel. He is a guy who is well regarded in the legal community here in town and someone who understands how the Department of Transportation works and what is needed to ensure that it will be successful.

One thing that Jeff and I have in common is we married way over our heads. Kathleen is an Ohioan. She has the Ohio commonsense that makes Jeff, in my view, an even better public servant. They have three amazing kids—Anne, Sally, and James—and for all of Jeff's personal and professional accomplishments, he would be the first to say that his greatest pride is in his family—and rightly so, by the way.

In my view, Jeff has the judgment, he certainly has the experience, he has the skills, and he has the right aptitude to be the Deputy Secretary of Transportation. He is needed now, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the cloture motion today on his nomination and in favor of his nomination

to ensure we can get him in place to help move the Department of Transportation forward.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise to honor and recognize the folks who are first to respond when crisis strikes—the folks who patrol our streets, keep our families safe, and are willing to enter harm's way on a daily basis.

I rise today to honor our police officers in Montana and every corner of the country. Police officers answer a call to duty to protect and defend our communities. While this Nation's police forces are on patrol, it is critical that the folks in this body are doing everything we can to keep them safe on the job and to honor their service.

To recognize National Police Week, I have partnered with Senators BOOZMAN, GARDNER, MORAN, UDALL, BLUMENTHAL, and CARPER to introduce the bipartisan Honoring Hometown Heroes Act. Our bill will provide the Governor of each State the ability to fly the American flag at half-staff to honor a police officer or any first responder who dies in the line of duty. This bill will treat our fallen responders with the respect they deserve.

In the past, Republicans and Democrats have worked together to strengthen resources for local police officers, and we have ensured that our first responders have access to critical healthcare services, but this bill is a bit different. This bill makes sure that our police officers and their families receive the recognition they deserve for their selfless service to their communities. When tragedy strikes, I think it is important the entire State takes a moment to honor that police officer who was lost while serving others.

This bipartisan bill has the support of police officers and first responders from across the country—from the Fraternal Order of Police, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, and the International Association of Firefighters, just to name a few.

The Honoring Hometown Heroes Act will give our fallen first responders the honor they so much deserve, but for the police officers we have already lost, it is too late. Today is Peace Officers Memorial Day. Across the country, the names of fallen officers will be carved into granite, and their photos will be hung in stations for all to see. Yet

these folks and their families did not have the honor of seeing their entire States mourn alongside them because flags were never flown at half-staff.

To ensure that these folks get the recognition they deserve, today I enshrine in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of 128 law enforcement officials who have died in the line of duty. They have made the ultimate sacrifice while protecting their neighbors and keeping our communities safe. I ask unanimous consent that their names be printed in the RECORD.

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

Anaconda Police Dept.: Lieutenant Timothy Sullivan, 2/10/1985; Assistant Chief of Police Edwin E. Stuart, 6/6/1939; and Policeman Patrick Dougherty, 6/3/1904.

Beaverhead County Sheriff's Dept.: Sheriff Raymond Lamar Davis, 8/9/1980 and Sheriff Cyrus King Wyman, 4/21/1920.

Big Horn County Sheriff's Dept.: Deputy Sheriff Janet Louise Rogers, 6/14/1990 and Sheriff Robert Peter Gilmore, 10/19/1926.

Billings Police Dept.: Detective Alexander Finalyson Mavity, 2/14/1989; Patrolman Arthur D. Pettit, 12/21/1935; Policeman Enos Nelson, 12/16/1917; and Sergeant Robert T. Hannah, 7/2/1904.

Blaine County Sheriff's Office: Undersheriff Patrick Alan Pyette, 12/14/2011 and Deputy Sheriff Joshua Thomas Rutherford, 5/29/2003.

Butte Police Dept.: Policeman Nicholas Aleksich, 2/28/1937; Policeman Thomas J. O'Neill, 12/25/1935; Chief of Police Jeremiah Joseph Murphy, 9/20/1935; Police Officer Joseph E. Sage, 4/8/1925; Policeman Bart J. McCarthy, 7/22/1916; Policeman James H. Pace, 7/27/1915; Policeman Ivan W. Lincoln, 3/30/1915; Policeman Joseph A. Freshman, 9/23/1906; Policeman Fred A. Parlin, 3/18/1896; Policeman Frederick Kranbeck, 1/15/1895; Policeman Dennis W. Daly, 7/4/1894; and Policeman William F. Jordan, 6/24/1892.

Cascade County Sheriff's Office: Deputy Sheriff Joseph James Dunn, 8/14/2014 and Chief Deputy Sheriff Herbert Locke, 12/11/1928.

Columbia Falls Police Dept.: Town Marshal Leslie A. Green, 10/2/1937 and Town Marshal Jacob Neitzling, 4/19/1931.

Columbus Police Dept.: Town Marshal Charles Davidson, 7/28/1912.

Custer County Sheriff's Dept.: Deputy Sheriff H. M. "Muggins" Taylor, 10/1/1882.

Dawson County Sheriff's Office: Sheriff Dominick Cavanaugh, 12/23/1898.

Denton Constable's Office: Constable A. B. Cheney, 10/28/1913.

Dillon Police Dept.: Patrolman Stephen Carl Shaffer, 2/14/1981.

East Helena Police Dept.: Patrolman Clifford Wayne Haskin, 9/14/1985.

Fairview Police Dept.: Chief of Police Orville Edwin Sharbono, 3/17/1990.

Fallon County Sheriff's Dept.: Sheriff William Homes, 8/7/1949.

Gallatin County Sheriff's Dept.: Deputy Sheriff Frank C. Curtice, 10/10/1919; Deputy Sheriff Pomeroy Vrelland, 10/10/1919; Special Deputy Sheriff Jack Allen, 1/24/1897; and Sheriff Silas Ralston, 9/5/1878.

Glendive Police Dept.: Policeman Frank Cavanagh, 7/3/1946.

Golden Valley County Sheriff's Dept.: Undersheriff Arthur "Buzz" Burford, 4/14/1938 and Sheriff Jesse Garfield, 12/18/1920.

Great Falls Police Dept.: Senior Officer Shane Russell Chadwick, 9/7/1994; Lieutenant

Segval "Sig" Semingsen, 11/28/1935; Police Officer Frank H. Connolly, 8/2/1920; Police Officer Luke Curry, 11/19/1898; and City Marshal Commodore Perry Downing, 11/7/1895.

Hardin Police Dept.: Policeman Leo Clinton Shonrock, 8/30/1947.

Havre Police Dept.: Policeman Fred Stevens, 5/25/1904.

Helena Police Dept.: Police Office John W. Flynn, 4/11/1894.

Lake County Sheriff's Office: Reserve Deputy Deborah Jean Hobbs, 1/16/2003.

Lewis and Clark County Sheriff's Office: Sheriff George W. Huffaker, 7/8/1921; Constable Valmore De Rosier, 9/13/1917; and Deputy Sheriff Anthony Korizek, 8/12/1904.

Lewistown Police Dept.: Patrol Officer Frank J. Draper, 12/1/1925.

Libby Police Dept.: Chief of Police John Ferdinand Bockman, 4/28/1924.

Liberty County Sheriff's Dept.: Undersheriff Otto S. Fossen, 10/5/1957.

Livingston Police Dept.: Chief of Police Peter Holt, 8/21/1929; Police Officer Martin Zollman, 8/21/1929; and Police Officer Charles Wilson, 8/20/1924.

Madison County Sheriff's Office: Sheriff Frank S. Metzel, 10/27/1930 and Sheriff James E. Summers, 1/25/1901.

Meagher County Sheriff's Dept.: Sheriff Michael James Bergan, 2/19/1955; Deputy Sheriff James Mackay, 5/13/1893; and Special Deputy Sheriff William Rader, 5/9/1893.

Miles City Police Dept.: Policeman James Fraser, 8/7/1935.

Mineral County Sheriff's Office: Sheriff Alfred F. Klugman, 5/21/1915.

Missoula County Sheriff's Office: Sergeant Allen Leslie Kimery, 12/6/1984; Deputy Sheriff Lloyd J. Stringer, 3/11/1941; Sheriff Lyle Ward, 3/26/1934; Special Deputy Edmund Trudeau, 2/14/1904; and Undersheriff James Thompson, 7/1/1878;

Missoula Police Dept.: Police Officer Robert Heinle, 2/12/2010; Officer Stephen A. LePiane, 11/5/1982; Sergeant Donald E. Gregory, 1/27/1976; and Merchant Policeman Alexander David Ross, 3/17/1931.

Mont. Dept. of Corrections—State Prison: Correctional Officer Richard C. Wallace, 12/20/1985; Deputy Warden Theodore Rothe, 4/16/1959; Guard Frank L. Russell, 1/22/1938; and Deputy Warden John Robinson, 3/8/1908.

Montana Dept. of Justice—Division of Criminal Investigation: Agent Randolph Scott Gergesheimer, 2/20/1980.

Montana Highway Patrol: Trooper David James DeLaitre, 12/1/2010; Trooper Michael Warren Haynes, 3/27/2009; Trooper Evan Frederick Schneider, 8/26/2008; Trooper David A. Graham, 10/9/2007; Patrolman Michael M. Ren, 4/8/1978; Patrolman Richard E. Hedstrom, 7/19/1973; Patrolman James H. Anderson, 7/24/1954; and Patrolman Robert G. Steele, 11/2/1946.

Park County Sheriff's Office: Undersheriff Roy Hodges, 4/18/1954 and Sheriff George T. Young, 11/9/1900.

Poplar Police Dept.: Police Officer Oscar Theodore Peterson, 11/18/1950.

Powell County Sheriff's Dept.: Undersheriff George Warburton, 4/20/1920.

Ravalli County Sheriff's Dept.: Deputy Sheriff William Wolfe, 8/24/1997.

Richland County Sheriff's Dept.: Deputy Sheriff George Eikhoff, 2/6/1962.

Rosebud County Sheriff's Office: Sheriff William Moses, 1/19/1914 and Undersheriff Orville Bitle, 12/16/1911.

Shelby Police Dept.: Chief of Police Ed TenBroeck, 12/22/1935.

Sheridan County Sheriff's Dept.: Sheriff Tom A. Courtney, 4/4/1913 and Undersheriff Richard Burmeister, 4/4/1913.

Silver Bow County Sheriff's Dept.: Deputy Sheriff Batt Arrigoni, 12/29/1911; Special Deputy Sheriff Charles B. Streb, 7/24/1911; and Deputy Sheriff John J. Streb, 12/20/1900.

Sweet Grass County Sheriff's Dept.: Undersheriff H. Frank Whitsel, 8/24/1931 and Deputy Sheriff Joseph S. "Joe" Brannin, 11/16/1911.

Teton County Sheriff's Dept.: Deputy Sheriff Julius B. Olson, 9/30/1935.

Thompson Falls Police Dept.: Chief of Police Don Richard Williams, 1/7/1974.

Toole County Sheriff's Dept.: Undersheriff James Shelton Alsup, 12/22/1935.

Treasure County Sheriff's Office: Undersheriff Irving Keeler, 12/9/1921.

Valley County Sheriff's Office: Posseman Charles Hill, 6/15/1903 and Deputy Jack Faul Williams, 6/6/1903.

West Yellowstone Police Dept.: Police Officer Patrick Roy Kramer, 11/22/2006.

Whitefish Police Dept.: Police Officer Lloyd Eugene Murphy, 4/26/1956.

Yellowstone County Sheriff's Office: Deputy Sheriff David Leroy Briese, Jr., 11/3/2006; Undersheriff Ed O'Donnell, 6/26/1941; Sheriff Russell J. Sage, 7/6/1926; and Sheriff James T. Webb, 3/24/1908.

Montana Dept. of Fish, Wildlife and Parks: Game Warden Robert M. May, 12/6/1988; Game Warden Delbert E. Bloom, 6/2/1979; Game Warden Eugene Sara, 1/7/1974; Game Warden I. L. Todd, 12/27/1967; Game Warden John C. Thompson, 11/10/1960; Game Warden Marion R. Ammerman, 2/13/1958; Game Warden Roy Thompson, 8/19/1957; Game Warden Harold Gartside, 4/24/1955; and Deputy Game Warden Charles B. Peyton, 10/18/1908.

Mr. TESTER. In going forward, it is critical that our police officers receive the honor they so much deserve.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I rise to voice my strong support for the nomination of Jeff Rosen to be the next Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

Mr. Rosen has had a long and distinguished career in transportation policy and public service. He is currently a partner at the law firm of Kirkland & Ellis, where he has worked on a range of regulatory and litigation matters for more than 30 years. Prior to starting his career at the firm, he obtained his bachelor's degree in economics at Northwestern University and his law degree from Harvard Law School.

Mr. Rosen's private sector experience has been punctuated by significant leadership positions in the public sector. Mr. Rosen served as the General Counsel of the Department of Transportation from 2003 to 2006 after winning Senate confirmation by a voice vote. He also served as the General Counsel and Senior Policy Adviser at the White House Office of Management and Budget from 2006 to 2009. Mr. Rosen's prior experience in government is a testament to his ability to lead,

manage, and effectively operate within the Federal Government.

If confirmed as Deputy Secretary of Transportation, Mr. Rosen will be responsible for overseeing the daily operations of the Department. He will also oversee the DOT's 10 modal administrations and approximately 55,000 employees and will exercise stewardship for the Department's budget and its efforts to provide funding for State and local transportation projects.

Mr. Rosen's fundamental responsibility will be to ensure that the DOT's crucial mission—the safe and efficient movement of goods and people across our Nation and the world—is achieved while fostering innovation and maintaining the reliability of our infrastructure.

As I mentioned, Mr. Rosen brings valuable experience to this position. As the DOT's General Counsel during the George W. Bush administration, Mr. Rosen had responsibility for the DOT's regulatory programs, enforcement, litigation activities, legal issues relating to international transportation activities, and legislative proposals. He acted as counsel to Secretary Norman Mineta. Later, as General Counsel and Senior Policy Adviser at the OMB, Mr. Rosen served as the Bush administration's top lawyer for regulations, fiscal issues, and executive orders.

Of note, during the past 2 years, Mr. Rosen has served as chair of the American Bar Association's Section of Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice, where he has been praised for revitalizing the section with more debate and programs while seeking consensus on recommended changes to the Administrative Procedure Act. His thoughtful leadership will be valuable as the Department of Transportation looks toward a pro-growth agenda in the transportation sector.

On March 29, 2017, I held a hearing in the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee to consider his nomination. I was impressed, as were my colleagues on the committee, with Mr. Rosen's credentials, experience, and depth of knowledge on transportation policy.

On April 5, 2017, the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee acted by a rollcall vote to favorably report his nomination to the floor. While it is my hope that the Senate will confirm this exceptionally well-qualified nominee today, it is my understanding that some of my Democrat colleagues will oppose him. It is my understanding that their decision is, in large part, because Mr. Rosen refused to publicly oppose President Trump's proposed budget at his confirmation hearing last month. I think this is an unfair basis for opposing such a well-qualified nominee.

I believe Mr. Rosen's extensive and distinguished career in transportation policy and prior public service will be

an asset in addressing the infrastructure challenges our Nation faces.

I look forward to confirming Mr. Rosen's nomination, and I urge my colleagues to support his nomination.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, Dan Sullivan, Shelley Moore Capito, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, Orrin G. Hatch, Bill Cassidy, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, John Thune, Jerry Moran, James E. Risch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: The Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea."

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 128 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Peters
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Cochran	Hoeben	Scott
Collins	Inhofe	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Strange
Cornyn	Kaine	Sullivan
Cotton	Kennedy	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Warner
Daines	Manchin	Wicker
Donnelly	McCain	Young
Enzi	McConnell	
Ernst	Paul	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Franken	Murray
Bennet	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Harris	Reed
Booker	Hassan	Sanders
Brown	Heinrich	Schatz
Cantwell	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—6

Flake	Moran	Sasse
Isakson	Murkowski	Toomey

Thre PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 42.

The motion is agreed to.

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

ANTI-LGBTQ VIOLENCE IN CHECHNYA

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, today, with deep concerns, I wish to speak about the treatment of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer—LGBTQ—individuals in Chechnya, in southern Russia.

Starting in early April of this year, news reports from the region told the horrific story of gay men being detained, tortured, and in some cases killed on the basis of their sexual orientation. At least 100 gay men—and according to some press reports, as many as several hundred—were held and tortured in secret detention facilities in Chechnya. At least three men were killed: one after being tortured by authorities and two following calls by local officials encouraging so-called honor killings. As one Russian gay rights activist noted, "there is little doubt that we are dealing with crimes against humanity." Stories of men being tortured and interrogated to reveal fellow LGBTQ individuals are also deeply disturbing.

Ramzan Kadyrov, the Head of the Chechen Republic, has made a number of troubling comments that LGBTQ individuals "don't exist" in Chechnya, an abhorrent denial of the human rights of LGBTQ individuals in Chechnya. According to accounts by the British Foreign Ministry, Kadyrov is planning to "eliminate" gay men in Chechnya before the beginning of the religious month of Ramadan at the end of May.

State-sanctioned violence that targets individuals based on their sexual orientation demands international condemnation, and the United States must be a strong voice for the human rights of all individuals.

Though Russian President Vladimir V. Putin has stated he will support an inquiry into these reports, Russia's track record shows a lack of serious commitment to human rights, particularly on LGBTQ issues.

I commend the work of nongovernmental organizations in Russia and abroad who have worked to evacuate LGBTQ individuals from Chechnya, and I am heartened by the advocacy of many Ohioans on this important issue. The U.S. must stand as a fierce advocate for the inalienable rights of all individuals. I urge the administration to take a strong stance in defense of human rights and publicly condemn these acts of barbarous inhumanity. We must never forget lessons of the past concerning what happens when we allow unchecked hatred and bigotry to manifest, and we must always preserve the U.S. as a beacon of hope for individuals around the world.

TRIBUTE TO HMONG AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I am honored to recognize a remarkable coalition of veterans today. Every year on May 15, Alaskan Hmong American Vietnam veterans come together to celebrate Hmong American Veterans Memorial Day in remembrance of General Vang Pao's final flight out of Laos.

From February 1961 to May 1975, Hmong fighters from the hill country in Laos risked their homes, their families, and their lives to join the United States and South Vietnam in the fight against communist oppression. They undoubtedly knew that, whether they won or lost the war, life would never be the same for them; yet they willingly chose to serve. For nearly three decades, their involvement was kept a secret, in what is now commonly referred to as "the Secret War."

Mr. Pasert Lee, a resident of the Mountain View neighborhood in Anchorage, AK, is one of those honorable Hmong American veterans. He served as a lieutenant in General Vang Pao's army and played a role in rescuing downed American pilots and returning them to American Forces in South Vietnam. He tells me that, under the leadership of the general, Hmong forces rescued nearly 50 pilots and were responsible for saving countless American lives. Many people do not realize that more than 40,000 Hmong were killed or wounded in support of freedom in Vietnam.

May 15, 1975, marked the beginning of the exodus of the Hmong people from their homes in Laos. Mr. Lee, like most

of our honorable Hmong American veterans, have never returned home—even to visit—in fear for their lives.

Having lost tens of thousands of our Hmong allies in support of the United States in Vietnam, it is appropriate that we acknowledge and honor the sacrifices of those like Mr. Pasert Lee and all the Hmong veterans who worked tirelessly to protect, rescue, and defend American servicemembers and downed American pilots on the Ho Chi Minh Trail. The efforts of the Hmong people have never properly been acknowledged and, like many of our Vietnam veterans, were never properly appreciated.

Today, more than 40 years after the end of “the Secret War,” I would like to commend our Hmong Americans and wish them peace and bountiful blessings as they remember their fallen on May 15, 2017.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DONALD BELLAMY

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Donald Bellamy for his hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Donald is a native of Casper, WY, and a graduate of Natrona County High School. He is a junior at the University of Wyoming at Casper, where he studies human communication and political science. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Donald for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO BAILEY BOWEN

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Bailey Bowen for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Bailey is a native of Kemmerer, WY. She currently attends Utah Valley University, where she is studying behavioral science. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Bailey for the dedication she has shown while working for

me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

TRIBUTE TO TIMOTHY CORLEY

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Timothy Corley for his hard work as an intern at the Republican Policy Committee. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Timothy is a native of Maryland and a graduate of American University, School of International Service. He studied U.S. foreign policy. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Timothy for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO JACOB HENRY

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Jacob Henry for his hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Jacob is a native of Casper, WY, and is a second-year student at Casper College. He served in the Marine Corps and has received two Purple Hearts. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Jacob for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO SARAH MILLER

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Sarah Miller for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Sarah is a native of Pennsylvania. She recently graduated from American University, where she received a degree in international studies. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which

has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Sarah for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

TRIBUTE TO SEAN O'BRIEN

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Sean O'Brien for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Sean is a native of Illinois and a graduate of American University, School of International Service. He received a degree in international studies. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Sean for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL OWEN

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Samuel Owen for his hard work as an intern in my Cheyenne office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Samuel is a native of Columbus, OH, and is a junior at the University of Wyoming. He is studying finance and energy development and management. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Samuel for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO JACKSON VENTRELLA

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Jackson Ventrella for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Jackson is a native of Mesa, AZ, and is a junior at Hillsdale College. He is studying politics. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Jackson for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO COLYER WOOLSTON

● Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Colyer Woolston for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Colyer is a native of Sheridan, WY, and a graduate of Hamilton College. He studied environmental studies and geosciences, as well as comparative literature. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Colyer for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL PATRICK KERR

● Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, today I wish to recognize the military career of COL Patrick Kerr, who is retiring from Active Duty on June 1, 2017 after serving more than 26 years in the U.S. Army.

Colonel Kerr was commissioned into the Army as a second lieutenant through the ROTC program at James Madison University in 1990. Over the course of his long career, Colonel Kerr served at every leadership level in the Army from platoon leader in the 63rd Signal Battalion to brigade commander of the Army Information Systems Engineering Command at Fort Huachuca. During his brigade command, Colonel Kerr's unit defended Army networks against daily attacks and conducted cyber space and network operations in support of the warfighter.

Throughout his time in the Army, Colonel Kerr has been a leader in the incredibly important battlefield of cyber security and network communications. It is difficult to imagine aspects of the military that have changed more in the last quarter century than military communications, information

technology, and cyber security. Colonel Kerr provided extraordinary leadership for the Army to navigate through the many challenges of building, operating, and protecting Army and Defense Department communications networks.

Prior to his current assignment in Arizona, Colonel Kerr was the deputy operations officer for recently created Army Cyber Command. He also commanded the 53rd Signal Battalion, which operates the Department of Defense's constellation of military command and control satellites, providing secure and protected communications around the globe. Colonel Kerr also served as executive officer of the 44th Signal Battalion for its deployment to Afghanistan during the first parliamentary elections for the new government in 2005. As a young officer, Colonel Kerr also deployed to Somalia for Operation Continue Hope; to Kosovo as part of the NATO stabilization force operations; and to Central Command for Operation Provide Comfort.

Colonel Kerr has received numerous awards, including the Legion of Merit, with oakleaf cluster, Bronze Star, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, with two oakleaf clusters, and the Meritorious Service Medal, with two oakleaf clusters. He has earned the U.S. Air Force Space Badge and is a recipient of the Signal Corps Regiment Silver Order of Mercury.

Finally, Colonel Kerr provided mentorship to countless soldiers throughout his career. He is known for going the extra mile in professionally developing his subordinates and truly preparing them for their next leadership role. In fact, Colonel Kerr's advice and counsel is regularly sought by all who work with him to include his peers and superiors.

Colonel Kerr is retiring in Vail, AZ, with his family. He has been married to his wife, Wendy, for over 25 years, and they have two children, Noelle and Peter. For a career soldier, the support of family is vital, and I sincerely thank Wendy, Noelle, and Peter for their sacrifice and support during their numerous deployments and moves.

For a career of exceptional service to the Army and to the Nation, I congratulate COL Patrick Kerr on his retirement and I wish him and his family well in their future endeavors.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381), as amended, and section 1(b) of Public Law 115-19, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate jointly reappoint

the following individuals effective May 13, 2017, each to a 5-year term on the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance: Ms. Barbara L. Camens of Washington, DC and Ms. Roberta L. Holzwarth of Rockford, Illinois.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 218. A bill to restrict the inclusion of social security account numbers on documents sent by mail by the Federal Government, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-62).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 1119. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 for the Federal Maritime Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 1120. A bill for the relief of Valent Kolami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1121. A bill to establish a postsecondary student data system; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr.

BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1122. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to clarify when the time period for the issuance of citations under such Act begins and to require a rule to clarify that an employer's duty to make and maintain accurate records of work-related injuries and illnesses is an ongoing obligation; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms.

HASSAN):

S. 1123. A bill to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1124. A bill to grant the Director of the United States Marshals Service authority to appoint criminal investigators in the excepted service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1125. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide Federal Pell Grants to Iraq and Afghanistan veteran's dependents; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. STRANGE (for himself and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1126. A bill to prohibit certain Federal funds from being available to sanctuary jurisdictions that refuse to cooperate with the Federal Government on immigration matters or retaliate against border security contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 41

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 41, a bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate covered part D drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries.

S. 98

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 98, a bill to reduce a portion of the annual pay of Members of Congress for the failure to adopt a concurrent resolution on the budget which does not provide for a balanced budget, and for other purposes.

S. 207

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 207, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues.

S. 292

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 292, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 315

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 315, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to place in Arlington National Cemetery a monument honoring the helicopter pilots and crewmembers who were killed while serving on active duty in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 339, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, to grant probation officers authority to arrest hostile third parties who obstruct or impede a probation officer in the performance of official duties.

S. 374

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from West Vir-

ginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 374, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 379

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 379, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 445

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 445, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 515

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 515, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

S. 534

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 534, a bill to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 546

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 546, a bill to reduce temporarily the royalty required to be paid for sodium produced on Federal lands, and for other purposes.

S. 548

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 548, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

S. 568

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 568, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 583

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 583, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

S. 760

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 760, a bill to expand the Government's use and administration of data to facilitate transparency, effective governance, and innovation, and for other purposes.

S. 842

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 842, a bill to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, and for other purposes.

S. 870

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 870, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to implement Medicare payment policies designed to improve management of chronic disease, streamline care coordination, and

improve quality outcomes without adding to the deficit.

S. 992

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 992, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct an independent review of the deaths of certain veterans by suicide, and for other purposes.

S. 1016

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1016, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 1018

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1018, a bill to provide humanitarian assistance for the Venezuelan people, to defend democratic governance and combat widespread public corruption in Venezuela, and for other purposes.

S. 1027

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1027, a bill to extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000.

S. 1089

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1089, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to review and update a report on the energy and environmental benefits of the re-refining of used lubricating oil.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1094, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1105

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1105, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 40

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 40, a joint resolution to provide limitations on the transfer of air-to-ground munitions from the United States to Saudi Arabia.

S. RES. 136

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 136, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the 102nd anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

S. RES. 139

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 139, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 155

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 155, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should work in cooperation with the international community and continue to exercise global leadership to address the causes and effects of climate change, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 161

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 161, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that defense laboratories are on the cutting edge of scientific and technological advancement, and supporting the designation of May 18, 2017, as "Department of Defense Laboratory Day".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1125. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide Federal Pell Grants to Iraq and Afghanistan veteran's dependents; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, when a United States servicemember gives their life in service to their country, they often leave behind family who we are equally indebted. Ensuring that these survivors are provided every opportunity to succeed and get a quality education supports our values and upholds our promise to servicemembers and military families. Unfortunately, our ability to uphold our promise to dependents of servicemembers who were killed in action (KIA) in Iraq and

Afghanistan following the attacks on September 11, 2001 was affected recently.

In May 2016 the U.S. Department of Education sent a letter to institutions of higher education requiring them to reduce the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grant awards by 7% or roughly \$400 per student. These grants are critical for students to use for tuition, books, and room and board and any future cut would be significant for a young college student. Many children and dependents of servicemembers who were KIA in Iraq and Afghanistan are now reaching college age so more and more students will not be receiving as much in grants as they should be getting and rightfully deserve.

Today, I am pleased to introduce with my colleague Senator TESTER the Protect our Gold Star Families' Education Act of 2017. This legislation will move the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grant program to the Pell Grant program to stabilize the funding source for these awards and ensure Gold Star families have access to the maximum Pell Grant funding available if they previously did not qualify for Pell Grants. The program would maintain the same eligibility requirements under the existing Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grants—parent or guardian having died as a result of military service in Iraq or Afghanistan after 9/11 and are 24 years old or younger—and the award would continue to equal the maximum Pell Grant for that award year.

While Virginia public universities already offer tuition assistance to dependents whose parents were killed in action or were permanently disabled under the state's Virginia Military Survivors and Dependents Education Program (VMSDEP), these funds could be used to offset tuition at private institutions and could also cover additional expenses, including room and board, books, and supplies. Over 500 Virginians have attended or are currently attending college at public universities with assistance through VMSDEP and would qualify for these Pell Grants as well.

Our Gold Star families have made the ultimate sacrifice for this country and ensuring they have access to a quality college education is the right thing to do. Moving the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grant under the Pell Grant program will provide more security to Gold Star families and help ease the burden of college costs. As more of our post 9/11 Gold Star children are starting to reach college age, now is the right time to improve the grant system. I hope that my colleagues will incorporate this bill in a reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to Les Bernys through the end of the year.

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

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 114-255, appoints the following individuals to the Health Information Technology Advisory Committee: Steve Ready of Kentucky and Dr. Anil Jain of Ohio.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 16, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, May 16; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Rosen nomination, with the time until 12:30 p.m. equally divided in the usual form; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. to

allow for the weekly conference meetings; finally, that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture on the Rosen nomination.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:12 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 16, 2017, at 10 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, May 15, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. UPTON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 15, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable FRED UPTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

You have blessed us with all good gifts, and with thankful hearts, we express our gratitude. On this National Peace Officers Memorial Day, we thank

You for the faithful service of the men and women in blue who serve our Nation in towns and cities across this country. Keep them safe as they keep watch for our safety.

We ask Your blessing as well upon the families and precincts who have lost fellow officers in the line of duty, especially mindful of those who have paid the ultimate price this past year. May they be blessed with Your comfort and consolation.

In this moment of prayer, please grant to the members of this people's House, as they meet with their respective constituents, the gifts of wisdom and discernment that in their words and actions they will do justice, love with mercy, and walk humbly with You.

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

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution

299, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(b) of House Resolution 299, the House stands adjourned until noon tomorrow for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 16, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATION, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Henry Cueller	2/18	2/19	England		137.00				318.00		455.00
	2/20	2/23	India		328.00				806.00		1,134.00
	2/23	2/25	Sri Lanka		158.00				440.00		598.00
	2/25	2/26	Austria		115.00				190.00		305.00
Hon. Andy Harris	2/9	2/10	Republic of Congo		409.75						409.75
	2/10	2/12	Egypt		444.00						444.00
	2/12	2/13	Paris		515.00						515.00
Hon. David Joyce	3/30	3/31	Ottawa		312.00						312.00
Hon. Tim Ryan	3/30	3/31	Ottawa		312.00						312.00
Committee total					2,730.75				1,754.00		4,484.75

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, Chairman, Apr. 27, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Travel to England, Germany, January 16–19, 2017:											
Mr. Mark Morehouse	1/17	1/18	England		404.11						404.11
	1/18	1/19	Germany		249.60						249.60
Commercial airfare							1,960.06				1,960.06
Ms. Katy Quinn	1/17	1/18	England		404.11						404.11
	1/18	1/19	Germany		249.60						249.60
Commercial airfare							1,960.06				1,960.06
Travel to Panama, Colombia, January 16–21, 2017:											
Mr. Jason Schmid	1/16	1/18	Panama		544.00						544.00
	1/18	1/21	Colombia		1,313.06						1,313.06

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

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

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial airfare							2,853.86				2,853.86
Ms. Lindsay Kavanaugh	1/16	1/18	Panama		544.00						544.00
	1/18	1/21	Colombia		1,313.06						1,313.06
Commercial airfare							2,853.86				2,853.86
Travel to Germany, Belgium, February 17–21, 2017:											
Hon. Michael R. Turner	2/18	2/19	Germany		91.00						91.00
	2/19	2/21	Belgium		578.00						578.00
Hon. Seth Moulton	2/18	2/19	Germany		91.00						91.00
Commercial airfare							447.60				447.60
Travel to Italy, Israel, Jordan, Austria with CODEL Wicker, February 17–25, 2017:											
Hon. Trent Kelly	2/18	2/19	Italy		522.38						522.38
	2/19	2/20	Jordan		514.41						514.41
	2/20	2/22	Israel		1,036.00						1,036.00
	2/22	2/25	Austria		1,552.17						1,552.17
Travel to Germany, Iraq, Afghanistan, February 17–23, 2017:											
Hon. Joe Wilson	2/18	2/19	Germany		91.00						91.00
	2/20	2/20	Afghanistan								
	2/20	2/21	Qatar		162.00						162.00
	2/21	2/23	Iraq		11.00						
Commercial airfare							2,075.00				2,086.00
Hon. Stephen Knight	2/18	2/19	Germany		91.00						91.00
	2/20	2/20	Afghanistan								
	2/20	2/21	Qatar		162.00						162.00
	2/21	2/23	Iraq		11.00						
Commercial airfare							2,075.00				2,086.00
Hon. Donald Norcross	2/18	2/19	Germany		91.00						91.00
	2/20	2/20	Afghanistan								
	2/20	2/21	Qatar		162.00						162.00
	2/21	2/23	Iraq		11.00						
Commercial airfare							2,075.00				2,086.00
Craig Collier	2/18	2/19	Germany		91.00						91.00
	2/20	2/20	Afghanistan								
	2/20	2/21	Qatar		162.00						162.00
	2/21	2/23	Iraq		11.00						
Commercial airfare							2,075.00				2,086.00
Brian Greer	2/18	2/19	Germany		91.00						91.00
	2/20	2/20	Afghanistan								
	2/20	2/21	Qatar		162.00						162.00
	2/21	2/23	Iraq		11.00						
Commercial airfare							2,075.00				2,086.00
Travel to Spain, Italy, Germany, February 18–24, 2017:											
Jeanette James	2/19	2/21	Spain		322.98						322.98
	2/21	2/23	Italy		274.00						274.00
	2/23	2/24	Germany		245.40						245.40
Commercial airfare							1,202.60				1,202.60
Daniel Sennott	2/19	2/21	Spain		322.98						322.98
	2/21	2/23	Italy		274.00						274.00
	2/23	2/24	Germany		245.40						245.40
Commercial airfare							1,202.60				1,202.60
Alison Lynn	2/19	2/21	Spain		322.98						322.98
	2/21	2/23	Italy		274.00						274.00
	2/23	2/24	Germany		245.40						245.40
Commercial airfare							1,202.60				1,202.60
Craig Greene	2/19	2/21	Spain		322.98						322.98
	2/21	2/23	Italy		274.00						274.00
	2/23	2/24	Germany		245.40						245.40
Commercial airfare							1,202.60				1,202.60
Travel to Estonia, Latvia, February 19–25, 2017:											
Peter Villano	2/20	2/22	Estonia		923.58						923.58
	2/22	2/24	Latvia		479.75						479.75
Commercial airfare							7,500.56				7,500.56
Kevin Gates	2/20	2/22	Estonia		923.58						923.58
	2/22	2/24	Latvia		479.75						479.75
Commercial airfare							7,500.56				7,500.56
Lindsay Kavanaugh	2/20	2/22	Estonia		923.58						923.58
	2/22	2/24	Latvia		479.75						479.75
Commercial airfare							7,500.56				7,500.56
Delegation expenses			Estonia				591.97				591.97
Travel to Belgium, Germany, Poland, Lithuania, February 19–26, 2017:											
Catherine Sendak	2/20	2/23	Belgium		341.88						341.88
	2/23	2/24	Poland		179.59						179.59
	2/24	2/25	Germany		252.75						252.75
	2/21	2/23	Lithuania		758.86						758.86
Commercial airfare							6,056.06				6,056.06
Paul Arcangeli	2/20	2/23	Belgium		341.88						341.88
	2/23	2/24	Poland		179.59						179.59
	2/24	2/25	Germany		252.75						252.75
	2/21	2/23	Lithuania		758.86						758.86
Commercial airfare							6,056.06				6,056.06
Katy Quinn	2/20	2/23	Belgium		341.88						341.88
	2/23	2/24	Poland		179.59						179.59
	2/24	2/25	Germany		252.75						252.75
	2/21	2/23	Lithuania		758.86						758.86
Commercial airfare							6,056.06				6,056.06
Brian Garrett	2/20	2/23	Belgium		341.88						341.88
	2/23	2/24	Poland		179.59						179.59
	2/24	2/25	Germany		252.75						252.75
	2/21	2/23	Lithuania		758.86						758.86
Commercial airfare							6,056.06				6,056.06
Delegation expenses			Poland							22.11	22.11
Delegation expenses			Lithuania							62.77	62.77
Committee total					24,438.33		129,086.78		84.88		153,609.99

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

May 15, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE, Vol. 163, Pt. 6

7771

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DIANE BLACK, Chairman, Apr. 24, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Tim Walberg	2/17	2/18	Czech Republic		357.73		(³)				357.73
	2/19	2/20	Israel		568.00						568.00
	2/21	2/21	UAE		415.81						415.81
	2/22	2/22	Ethiopia		707.49						707.49
	2/23	2/23	Uganda		340.00						340.00
	2/24	2/24	Benin		189.87						189.87
	2/25	2/25	Ghana		361.00						361.00
	2/26	2/27	Spain		287.85						287.85
Kelsey Guyselman	2/27	3/02	Spain		943.00		1,235.86				2,178.86
David Goldman	2/27	3/02	Spain		943.00		1,235.86				2,178.86
Committee total					5,113.75		2,471.72				7,585.47

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. GREG WALDEN, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS, Chairman, Apr. 10, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. French Hill	2/9	2/10	Republic of Congo		409.75		(³)				409.75
	2/10	2/12	Egypt		444.00		(³)				444.00
	2/12	2/13	France		377.00		(³)				377.00
Hon. Robert Pittenger	2/9	2/10	Republic of Congo		409.75		(³)				409.75
	2/10	2/12	Egypt		444.00		(³)				444.00
	2/12	2/13	France		377.00		(³)				377.00
Hon. Juan Vargas	2/9	2/10	Republic of Congo		409.75		(³)				409.75
	2/10	2/12	Egypt		444.00		(³)				444.00
	2/12	2/13	France		377.00		(³)				377.00
Hon. Claudia Tenney	2/18	2/20	Germany		403.75						403.75
	2/20	2/21	Afghanistan		109.00						109.00
	2/21	2/22	Iraq		11.00		11,371.61				11,382.61
Hon. Stevan Pearce	2/18	2/19	Czech Republic		357.73		(³)				357.73
	2/19	2/20	Israel		568.00		(³)				568.00
	2/20	2/21	UAE		355.53		(³)				355.53
	2/21	2/23	Ethiopia		707.49		(³)				707.49
	2/23	2/24	Uganda		340.00		(³)				340.00
	2/24	2/25	Benin		189.87		(³)				189.87
	2/25	2/26	Ghana		376.85		(³)				376.85
	2/26	2/27	Spain		287.85		(³)				287.85
Hon. Dave Trott	2/19	2/20	United Kingdom		455.00		(³)				455.00
	2/20	2/23	India		1,134.00		(³)				1,134.00
	2/23	2/25	Sri Lanka		598.00		(³)				598.00
	2/25	2/26	Austria		305.00		(³)				305.00
Albert Joseph Pinder	2/21	2/22	Belgium		424.00		(³)				424.00
	2/22	2/24	France		820.00		(³)				820.00
	2/24	2/25	United Kingdom		620.00		1,532.76				2,152.76
Committee total					11,755.32		12,904.37				24,659.69

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. JEB HENSARLING, Chairman, Apr. 27, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	3/3	3/4	Honduras		264.00		1,068.46		* 1,959.00		3,291.46
	3/4	3/5	Guatemala		230.00				* 2,191.30		2,421.30
Hon. Albio Sires	3/3	3/4	Honduras		266.00		1,121.56				1,387.56
	3/4	3/5	Guatemala		228.00						228.00
Edward Acevedo	3/3	3/4	Honduras		276.00						1,099.06
	3/4	3/5	Guatemala		223.00		823.06				223.00
Sadaf Khan	3/3	3/4	Honduras		274.00						1,097.06
	3/4	3/5	Guatemala		230.00		823.06				230.00
Leah Campos	2/20	2/22	Colombia		689.73		1,786.56				2,476.29
	2/22	2/24	Panama		594.00						594.00
Eric Jacobstein	2/20	2/22	Colombia		669.73		1,766.56				2,436.29
	2/22	2/24	Panama		594.00						594.00
Sadaf Khan	2/20	2/22	Colombia		669.73		1,766.56				2,436.29
	2/22	2/24	Panama		594.00						594.00
Scott Cullinane	2/19	2/21	Bulgaria		523.00		2,668.96		* 163.19		3,355.12
	2/21	2/25	Romania		993.00				* 290.00		1,283.00
Philip Bednarczyk	2/19	2/21	Bulgaria		542.00		2,671.66				3,213.66
	2/21	2/25	Romania		1,015.00						1,015.00
Hon. Eliot L. Engel	2/18	2/19	Italy		328.79		(³)				328.79
	2/19	2/20	Jordan		335.64		(³)				335.64
	2/20	2/22	Israel		1,036.00		(³)				1,036.00
	2/22	2/25	Austria		1,552.17		(³)				1,552.17
Kyle Parker	2/18	2/19	Italy		328.79		(³)				328.79
	2/19	2/20	Jordan		335.64		(³)				335.64
	2/20	2/22	Israel		1,036.00		(³)				1,036.00
	2/22	2/25	Austria		1,552.17		(³)				1,552.17
Matthew Zweig	2/9	2/12	Czech Republic		943.00		4,336.62				5,279.62
Mira Resnick	2/9	2/12	Czech Republic		878.00		1,679.46				2,557.46
Thomas Alexander	2/22	2/25	Netherlands		882.56		1,173.86				2,056.42
Peter Freeman	2/22	2/25	Netherlands		882.56		1,173.86				2,056.42
Mark Iozzi	2/22	2/25	Netherlands		882.56		1,173.86				2,056.42
Hon. Ted Deutch	2/18	2/19	Germany		731.20		(³)				731.20
Paul Behrends	3/24	3/27	Belgium		1,513.21		1,976.16				3,489.37
Philip Bednarczyk	3/24	3/27	Belgium		1,513.21		2,011.16				3,524.37
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	2/9	2/10	Congo		409.75		(³)		* 4,025.70		4,435.45
	2/10	2/12	Egypt		444.00		(³)		* 3,646.67		4,090.67
	2/12	2/13	France		377.00		(³)		* 2,544.00		2,921.00
Paul Behrends	2/9	2/10	Congo		409.75		(³)				409.75
	2/10	2/12	Egypt		444.00		(³)				444.00
	2/12	2/13	France		377.00		(³)				377.00
Philip Bednarczyk	2/9	2/10	Congo		409.75		(³)				409.75
	2/10	2/12	Egypt		444.00		(³)				444.00
	2/12	2/13	France		377.00		(³)				377.00
Matthew Zweig	2/21	2/22	Belgium		451.00		1,532.76		* 756.00		2,739.76
	2/22	2/24	France		906.00						906.00
	2/24	2/25	United Kingdom		667.00						667.00
Sarah Blocher	2/21	2/22	Belgium		451.00		1,497.76				1,948.76
	2/22	2/24	France		906.00						906.00
	2/24	2/24	United Kingdom		274.93		34.00				308.93
Edmund Rice	2/21	2/22	Belgium		451.00		970.00				1,421.00
Committee total					31,405.87		32,055.94		15,575.83		79,037.64

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

* Indicates Delegation Costs.

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
CODEL Rohrabacher											
Hon. Correa	2/9	2/10	Republic of Congo		195.75		(³)				195.75
	2/10	2/12	Egypt		94.00		(³)				94.00
	2/12	2/13	France		138.00		(³)				138.00
Committee total											427.75

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Chairman, Apr. 24, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Darrell Issa	1/15	1/18	Switzerland		350.00		12,169.16		1,188.00		13,707.16
Hon. Steve King	2/08	2/13	France, Egypt & Congo		428.00		(³)		803.00		1,229.00
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	2/18	2/26			738.00		(³)		1,754.00		2,492.00
Hon. Sheila Jackson Lee	2/18	2/26			738.00		(³)		1,754.00		2,492.00
Hon. Hank Johnson	2/18	2/26	England, India, Sri Lanka, & Austria ..		738.00		(³)		1,754.00		2,492.00
Hon. David Cicilline	2/18	2/26			738.00		(³)		1,754.00		2,492.00
Shelley Husband	2/16	2/26			738.00		(³)		1,754.00		2,492.00
George Fishman	2/18	2/26			738.00		(³)		1,754.00		2,492.00
Matthew Keeley	2/18	2/26			738.00		(³)		1,754.00		2,492.00
David Shahoulian	2/18	2/26			738.00		(³)		1,754.00		2,492.00

May 15, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE, Vol. 163, Pt. 6

7773

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
John Manning	2/18	2/26			738.00		(³)		1,754.00		2,492.00
Hon. Trey Gowdy	2/19	2/23	Germany, Italy & France		469.00		(³)		1,050.48		1,519.48
Hon. Steve King	2/23	2/25	Austria		230.00		(³)		1,207.17		1,437.17
Committee total					8,119.00		12,169.16		20,034.65		40,322.81

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, May 3, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. STEVE CHABOT, Chairman, May 2, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DAVID P. ROE, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Adam Schiff	1/14	1/17	(⁴)				13,961.06				13,961.06
Commercial airfare											
Michael Bahar	1/14	1/17	(⁴)				13,961.06				13,961.06
Commercial airfare											
Amanda Rogers-Thorpe	1/14	1/17	(⁴)				13,961.06				13,961.06
Commercial airfare											
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	2/8	2/11	(⁴)		1,103.00		2,724.12				1,103.00
Commercial airfare											2,724.12
Chelsey Campbell	2/8	2/11	(⁴)		1,103.00		2,013.56				1,103.00
Commercial airfare											2,013.56
Shannon Stuart	2/8	2/11	(⁴)		1,103.00		3,897.62				1,103.00
Commercial airfare											3,897.62
Nicholas A. Ciarlante	2/8	2/11	(⁴)		1,103.00		1,158.16				1,103.00
Commercial airfare											1,518.16
Hon. Frank LoBiondo	2/8	2/13	(⁴)		510.00		12,904.37				510.00
Commercial airfare											12,904.37
George Pappas	2/8	2/13	(⁴)		510.00		12,266.39				510.00
Commercial airfare											12,266.39
Hon. Adam Schiff	2/17	2/19	(⁴)		729.30		1,252.79		2,269.58		4,251.67
Rheanne Wirkkala	2/17	2/11	(⁴)		729.30		1,252.79		2,269.58		4,251.67
Commercial airfare							2,037.10				2,037.10
Andrew House	2/18	2/25	(⁴)								
Commercial airfare							16,064.76				16,064.76
Shannon Stuart	2/18	2/25	(⁴)				16,064.76				16,064.76
Commercial airfare											
William Flanagan	2/18	2/25	(⁴)				16,064.76				16,064.76
Commercial airfare											
Wells Bennett	2/18	2/25	(⁴)				16,064.76				16,064.76
Commercial airfare											
Hon. Brad Wenstrup	2/19	2/20	(⁴)		222.00				10.16		232.16
.....	2/20	2/22	(⁴)		710.82						710.82
.....	2/22	2/23	(⁴)		423.00				50.43		473.43
.....	2/23	2/25	(⁴)								
.....	2/25	2/25	(⁴)						109.63		109.63
Commercial airfare							17,632.26				17,632.26
Hon. Chris Stewart	2/19	2/20	(⁴)		222.00				10.16		232.16
.....	2/20	2/22	(⁴)		710.82						710.82
.....	2/22	2/23	(⁴)		423.00				50.43		473.43
.....	2/23	2/25	(⁴)								
.....	2/25	2/25	(⁴)						109.63		109.63
Commercial airfare							21,121.96				21,121.96
Chelsey Campbell	2/19	2/20	(⁴)		222.00				10.16		232.16
.....	2/20	2/22	(⁴)		710.82						710.82
.....	2/22	2/23	(⁴)		423.00				50.43		473.43

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial airfare	2/23	2/25	(*)						109.63		109.63
Scott Glabe	2/19	2/20	(*)		222.00		17,632.26		10.16		17,632.26
	2/20	2/22	(*)		710.82						232.16
	2/22	2/23	(*)		423.00				50.43		710.82
	2/23	2/25	(*)								473.43
Commercial airfare	2/25	2/25	(*)						109.63		109.63
Steve Keith	2/19	2/20	(*)		222.00		19,598.16		10.16		19,598.16
	2/20	2/22	(*)		710.82						232.16
	2/22	2/23	(*)		423.00				50.43		710.82
	2/23	2/25	(*)								473.43
	2/25	2/25	(*)						109.63		109.63
Commercial airfare	2/19	2/20	(*)		895.00		18,025.66		89.60		18,025.66
Hon. Elise Stefanik	2/21	2/21	(*)		1,384.00				501.05		984.60
Commercial airfare	2/19	2/21	(*)		895.00		10,803.36		89.60		984.60
Hon. Will Hurd	2/21	2/25	(*)		1,384.00				501.05		1,885.05
Commercial airfare	2/19	2/21	(*)		895.00		10,803.36		89.60		984.60
Damon Nelson	2/21	2/25	(*)		1,384.00				501.05		1,885.05
Commercial airfare	2/19	2/21	(*)		895.00		10,803.36		89.60		984.60
George Pappas	2/21	2/25	(*)		1,384.00				501.05		1,885.05
Commercial airfare	2/19	2/21	(*)		895.00		10,803.36		89.60		984.60
Timothy Bergreen	2/21	2/25	(*)		1,384.00				501.05		1,885.05
Commercial airfare	2/19	2/20	(*)		450.62		955.58		533.47		1,939.67
Hon. Michael Turner	2/21	2/22	(*)		322.00		428.72				750.72
	2/22	2/25	(*)		1,522.79		1,629.76		221.39		3,373.94
Commercial airfare	2/19	2/20	(*)		577.62		2,434.16		533.48		2,434.16
Douglas Presley	2/21	2/22	(*)		322.00		428.72				2,066.68
	2/22	2/25	(*)		1,522.78		1,629.76		221.38		750.72
Commercial airfare	2/19	2/20	(*)		577.62		3,349.76		533.48		3,349.76
Rheanne Wirkkala	2/21	2/21	(*)		744.38		955.58		296.65		2,066.69
Commercial airfare	2/21	2/23	(*)				2,002.10				2,002.10
Hon. Michael Quigley	2/21	2/21	(*)				10,054.16		156.75		156.75
Commercial airfare	2/21	2/21	(*)						296.65		1,041.03
Amanda Rogers-Thorpe	2/21	2/21	(*)						156.75		10,054.16
	2/21	2/23	(*)		744.39				296.65		156.75
Commercial airfare	2/22	2/23	(*)		148.78		9,287.00				1,041.04
Lisa Major	2/23	2/25	(*)		479.75						9,287.00
Commercial airfare	2/22	2/23	(*)		148.78		7,831.16				148.78
Carly Blake	2/23	2/25	(*)		479.76						479.75
Commercial airfare	2/22	2/23	(*)		148.78		7,831.16				7,831.16
Hon. Michael Turner	3/3	3/5	(*)		508.00				1,700.00		148.78
Commercial airfare	3/3	3/5	(*)		508.00		2,264.12				479.76
Lisa Major	3/3	3/5	(*)		508.00				1,700.00		7,831.16
Commercial airfare							1,987.62				2,264.12
Committee total					34,121.98		348,061.16		14,693.53		2,208.00
											2,208.00
											1,987.62

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.⁴ In accordance with title 22, United States Code, Section 1754(b)(2), information as would identify the foreign countries in which Committee Members and staff have traveled is omitted.

HON. DEVIN NUNES, Chairman, May 1, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Alcee Hastings	2/18	2/19	Italy	Euro	3,852.55						3,852.55
	2/19	2/20	Jordan	Dinar							
	2/20	2/22	Israel	Shekel							
	2/22	2/25	Austria	Euro							
Hon. Robert Aderholt	2/18	2/19	Italy	Euro	3,922.82						3,922.82
	2/19	2/20	Jordan	Dinar							
	2/20	2/22	Israel	Shekel							
	2/22	2/25	Austria	Euro							
Hon. Richard Hudson	2/18	2/19	Italy	Euro	3,852.55						3,852.55
	2/19	2/20	Jordan	Dinar							
	2/20	2/22	Israel	Shekel							
	2/22	2/25	Austria	Euro							
Hon. Chris Smith	2/20	2/21	Italy	Euro	471.00		2,996.26				3,467.26
Mark Milosch	2/20	2/21	Italy	Euro	471.00		2,060.76				2,531.76
	3/21	3/25	Austria		1,288.00		2,837.06				4,125.06
Hon. Steve Cohen	2/18	2/19	Italy	Euro	3,328.94						3,328.94
	2/19	2/20	Jordan	Dinar							
	2/20	2/22	Israel	Shekel							
	2/22	2/25	Austria	Euro							
Janice Helwig	1/1	2/27	Austria	Euro	18,676.00		3,502.24				22,178.24
Committee total					35,862.86		11,396.32				47,259.18

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Co-Chairman, May 1, 2017.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1347. A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Uniform Compliance Date for Food Labeling Regulations [Docket No.: FSIS-2016-0048] (RIN: 0583-AD05) received May 10, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1348. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the activities of the National Guard Counterdrug Schools during fiscal year 2016, pursuant to 32 U.S.C. 112 note; Public Law 109-469, Sec. 901(f)(1) (as amended by Public Law 114-328, div. A, title X, Sec. 1012) (130 Stat. 2385); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1349. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General James K. McLaughlin, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1350. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a renewal of the August 12, 2016 declaration of the public health emergency of national significance existing within the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico relating to pregnant women and children born to pregnant women with the Zika virus, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d(a); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 319(a) (as amended by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 144(a)); (116 Stat. 630); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1351. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to Emissions Banking and Trading Programs and Compliance Flexibility [EPA-R06-OAR-2015-0585; FRL-9960-22-Region 6] received May 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1352. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chemical Substances When Manufactured or Processed as Nanoscale Materials; TSCA Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2010-0572; FRL-9962-58] (RIN: 2070-AK39) received May 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1353. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flonicamid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0013; FRL-9959-91] received May 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110

Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1354. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluazinam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0160; FRL-9960-50] received May 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1355. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's report entitled "Report to Congress on Abnormal Occurrences: Fiscal Year 2016", pursuant to Sec. 208 of Public Law 93-438 as amended and Public Law 104-66; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1356. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil Rights, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's FY 2016 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1357. A letter from the Director, External Affairs, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Designation of Beneficiary received May 10, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1892. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty (Rept. 115-119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII,

Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself and Mr. SIMPSON) introduced a bill (H.R. 2422) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve essential oral health care for low-income and other underserved individuals by breaking down barriers to care, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY
STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitu-

tion to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 ("The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the common Defen[s]e and general Welfare of the United States[.]") (By establishing a grant program for mobile dental health units, the bill will expand access to oral care, and improve the health and wellbeing of Americans that lack access to dental services.).

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 795: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 916: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1136: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1205: Mr. HARPER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1245: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1414: Ms. MOORE and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1478: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1551: Mr. BACON, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1608: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1676: Mr. BOST and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1892: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 2024: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 2029: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 2052: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 2056: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 2158: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2166: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 2197: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 2210: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2213: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 2276: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H. Res. 15: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. BOST, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 129: Mr. ELLISON.

H. Res. 202: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

45. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Elmira, NY, relative to Resolution No. 2017-87, opposing the proposed elimination and further reductions in funding to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME program; which was referred to the Committee on Financial Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF THE GRAND
OPENING OF DELIRIUM CAFÉ

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the grand opening of Delirium Café in Leesburg, Virginia, a world renowned international franchise known for its great food and extensive beer selection. Delirium Café's flagship franchise is located in Brussels, Belgium, and this grand opening marks its first location in the United States. While offering some classic dishes and beers, and yet at the same time being situated at the corner of South King Street and Loudoun Street, Delirium Café will provide its patrons with a traditional Belgian experience right here in Virginia's 10th District.

Curtis Allred, former manager of the Shoes Cup & Cork and a Leesburg native, traveled to Brussels six years ago and has since dreamed of opening a Delirium Café here in the United States. This dream started to come to fruition earlier this year, as he, his business partner, Rick Leith, and Aislin Kavaljdian, who will serve as the Assistant General Manager of Delirium Café, began working tirelessly to open the doors of this restaurant after signing their first lease on January 1, 2017. Since then, Mr. Allred has leased two additional connected spaces, and the restaurant now has the capacity to sit over 150 guests with both indoor and outdoor seating.

Delirium Café is known internationally for its beer selections, but it was important to Mr. Allred and his management team to strike a balance between offering world renowned beers and beers from local breweries. In addition to providing customers with a wide array of beverage selections, Delirium Café will also offer catering services, lease space for private events, and sell a variety of merchandise.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that my colleagues rise and join me in applauding the Grand Opening of Delirium Café. Not only am I excited for the experiences and memories it will afford my constituents, but as the only location in the United States, I look forward to the visitors that will be drawn to downtown Leesburg, a truly vibrant area. I wish Mr. Allred, Ms. Kavaljdian, Mr. Leith, and the entire 50 person staff of Delirium Café all the best moving forward and in their future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF PASTOR VICTORIA JAMES FOR HER SERVICE ON BEHALF OF THE WASHTENAW COUNTY COMMUNITY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pastor Victoria James of Ekklesia Fellowship Ministries in Ypsilanti, Michigan. Pastor James has provided spiritual guidance and support to the Ypsilanti community at large.

Pastor James works with the Ekklesia Fellowship Ministries church in Ypsilanti, which holds religious services every Sunday and also participates in a variety of different community initiatives to support groups and individuals in need. These include the annual Back to School Prayer, which provides backpacks and school supplies to needy children, as well as an annual community Thanksgiving celebration for members of the congregation and surrounding areas. Additionally, Pastor James serves as a member of the Washtenaw Faith Leaders Forum, a county-wide interfaith initiative that mobilizes and speaks out on behalf of justice and equality. She has also been an outspoken advocate of improved community relations with law enforcement and has worked with other faith leaders and law enforcement officials to address this and other issues. Collectively, Pastor James' actions have provided critical support to individuals in need throughout Washtenaw County.

Pastor James' work has had a transformative effect on the city of Ypsilanti. As a lifelong resident of Ypsilanti and longtime community leader, she has leveraged her deep knowledge of the issues affecting the city and its residents to drive positive change. Ms. James' role as a counselor of Ekklesia Fellowship Youth, a church youth group, underscores her position is a respected mentor and voice for individuals in need. Her work with Ekklesia Fellowship Ministries has helped transform countless lives, and it is my hope that she continues to play a leading role in the Ypsilanti community in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Pastor Victoria James of Ekklesia Fellowship Ministries for her work on behalf of Washtenaw County. Pastor James has been key to the growth and development of Ypsilanti and the surrounding areas.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE
HONORABLE JOE MAY

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the Honorable Joe May, my friend and former colleague from the House of Delegates of the Virginia General Assembly. Delegate May has had both an illustrious business career, in which he has served as the Founder, Chief Technology Officer, and Chairman of the Board of Directors of Electronic Instrumentation and Technology (EIT), and a distinguished career as a public servant as he honorably and capably represented the people of Virginia's 33rd House District for two decades.

Delegate May has dedicated most of his life serving the people of Virginia, starting with his service in the United States military. Afterwards, Delegate May became a professional engineer and has since excelled in the field of electrical engineering, as he obtained 24 patents for a variety of inventions, including, among others, a signature reproduction machine, an instrument to measure the curvature of railroad tracks, and the instrument used for measuring octane on gasoline. Then in 1977, soon after he relocated to Loudoun County, Delegate May and his wife, Bobby, founded Electronic Instrumentation and Technology (EIT), which provides electronic manufacturing and engineering services for the medical, communications, industrial process control and analytical instrument markets. EIT would later evolve into a multi-million-dollar company and has been instrumental to the development and success of Loudoun County's economy during a period when the county's economy has flourished.

In 1993, the year that would mark the advent of his political career, Delegate May was first elected to the House of Delegates from Virginia's 33rd District, which at the time included parts of Clarke, Fairfax, Fauquier, and Loudoun counties. In the House of Delegates, Delegate May's sharp business acumen and unique experience as only one of a few professional engineers in the entire General Assembly, enabled him to play an integral role in passing numerous legislative initiatives, including a bill to establish the House's Science and Technology Committee, of which he would later serve as chair. Through his time as Chair of both the Joint Commission on Technology and Science and the Science and Technology Committee, Delegate May helped promote legislation that allowed Loudoun County to become a leading innovator in the technology sector while also ensuring that western Loudoun retained its bucolic character.

For Delegate May's innumerable contributions in both his career as an entrepreneur

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

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

and public servant, a remarkable number of well-deserved accolades and honors have been bestowed upon him, including being inducted into Virginia Tech's College of Engineering Academy of Engineering Excellence, being named the Loudoun Times-Mirror's Person of the Year for 2012, and being recognized as the Legislator of the Year by multiple associations, such as the Virginia Soil, Water and Conversation Districts, the Virginia Cable and Telecommunications Association, and the Virginia Biotechnology Association and Virginia Transit. Delegate May is the true embodiment of a public servant, and the residents of Virginia will benefit for years to come from his lifetime of service to the Commonwealth. It is honor to call him a friend and I wish him all the best as he continues his focus on the development and expansion of EIT and on whatever future endeavors he may pursue.

RECOGNIZING MR. ROBERT "BOB" MAXWELL

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 2017

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mr. Robert "Bob" Maxwell of Bend, Oregon for his outstanding military and civilian service to Oregon and our nation.

Mr. Maxwell is well known in veterans circles mostly as a WWII Medal of Honor recipient. He served with the famed 3rd Infantry Division in North Africa, Sicily, Italy and France. During the invasion of Anzio, Italy, he was wounded and acted bravely to earn his first Silver Star and Purple Heart. Shortly after being released from the Army hospital in Naples, he participated in "Operation Dragoon"—the invasion of Southern France during late August, 1944. While protecting his Battalion Headquarters with 3 other soldiers in Besancon, France on September 7, 1944, a German Infantry unit outnumbering his unit 10 to 1 attacked the outpost. Mr. Maxwell hurled his unprotected body on a German hand grenade thrown into their midst. The grenade exploded under Mr. Maxwell, saving the lives of 3 comrades and severely wounding Mr. Maxwell. For his unhesitating valor above and beyond the call of duty, he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, a second Silver Star, a second Purple Heart, a Bronze Star and French Croix de Guerre.

Mr. Maxwell was discharged from the U.S. Army and used the "GI Bill" to earn his credentials in Automotive Technology. He worked in that profession for 32 years, teaching at Bend High School, Central Oregon College and Lane Community College. In 1970, he was named one of 5,000 outstanding educators in our nation.

Since his retirement from teaching, "Bob" has served as a Director of the Bend Heroes Foundation, and has co-chaired several veterans projects including the Bend Parade of Flags, Bend Heroes Memorial, the first-of-its-kind WWII Veterans Historic Highway, and the Oregon Medal of Honor Exhibit.

Mr. Maxwell is a passionate promoter of the Congressional Medal of Honor Foundation's

"Character Development Program" now being adopted in Central Oregon schools. As devoted Christians and proponents of higher education, Mr. Maxwell and his late wife Bea initiated the Bob and Bea Maxwell Medal of Honor Scholarship program at Boise Bible College many years ago.

Mr. Maxwell celebrated his 96th birthday on October 26, 2016. He is the oldest surviving recipient of the Medal of Honor, our nation's highest military award. It has been my privilege and honor to know and have worked with Bob Maxwell for many years.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful state and country, I wish to honor Mr. Robert D. "Bob" Maxwell for his grand accomplishments over many years.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARGARET CRAWFORD FOR HER PIONEERING CAREER WITH LINCOLN CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Margaret Crawford for her outstanding career with Lincoln Consolidated Schools. As school board member and president for Lincoln Schools, Ms. Crawford worked tirelessly on behalf of the school district's students and staff.

After graduating from Wayne State University with a degree in Social Work, Ms. Crawford began her career doing case management work for the State of Michigan, eventually transitioning to work in fiscal management for Head Start. She then utilized her management and community service experience to successfully run for a seat on the school board of Lincoln Consolidated Schools. During her time on the school board, Ms. Crawford established a reputation as an effective advocate for the district's students. As a result of her successes, Ms. Crawford was elected school board president of Lincoln Consolidated Schools, making her the first female and black president in the schools' history. Additionally, Ms. Crawford later started the non-profit Council for Black Student Achievement, which provided academic assistance and financial support to individuals in need. These initiatives played a critical role in providing impactful aid to the district's students.

Ms. Crawford's work with Lincoln Consolidated Schools and in the community has helped empower countless students and improve educational outcomes. In addition to her work with the local school system, Ms. Crawford also partnered with local social and community agencies to support efforts to better serve children in the school district. Her exemplary public service and activism have left a lasting legacy in the community, and it is my hope that Lincoln Consolidated Schools can continue to build on these successes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Margaret Crawford for her work on behalf of Lincoln Consolidated Schools. Ms. Crawford's trailblazing career has improved the lives of countless students.

IN RECOGNITION OF KAREN CLEVELAND

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an extraordinary leader, Karen Cleveland, for the incredible impact she has had on individuals, families, and communities in Northern Virginia and to congratulate her on being named Northern Virginia Family Service's 2017 Community Champion.

Ms. Cleveland's father, Jim Kelly, was a coach and Athletic Director at the University of Cincinnati, and she and her family not only had a strong grasp for health and wellness, but also for working with others. Accordingly, after graduating from the University of Cincinnati in 1978, Ms. Cleveland began her career in Fairfax County teaching aerobics. She knew she wanted to engage with her community, which is why she took an executive position in the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce in 1986. She then had the opportunity, in 1988, to serve as the first Executive Director for Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce, which at the time was a start-up chamber that needed tremendous leadership to grow. At the chamber, she worked to establish business and community relationships, and her efforts included starting initiatives to host awards ceremonies, fundraisers, and more. Additionally, she then went on to serve as the executive vice president of the Association of Sales and Marketing Companies and as the president and CEO of Habitat for Humanity of Northern Virginia.

In 2008, Ms. Cleveland received a certificate in leadership coaching from Georgetown University and then started the Cleveland Coaching Group. As a Leadership Coach, she works with executives and emerging leaders to assist them with their personal growth and development. Now as the president and CEO of Leadership Fairfax, Inc., a community leadership development organization, Ms. Cleveland's expertise has allowed her to empower other individuals and organizations to expand their businesses and explore new opportunities. She has received numerous impressive awards, including being named the YMCA of Metropolitan DC Volunteer of the Year, receiving the EXCEL Award for Nonprofit Leadership Excellence by the Center for Nonprofit Advancement, and more.

Ms. Cleveland's dedication to improving and preserving businesses and leaders is evident through her illustrious career of dedication and impressive accomplishments. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Ms. Karen Cleveland on being named Northern Virginia Family Service's 2017 Community Champion, and I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all

meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, May 16, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 17

9:30 a.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine aging with community, focusing on building connections that last a lifetime.

SD-562

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine the growing Russian military threat in Europe, focusing on assessing and addressing the challenge.

SVC-208

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine current issues in American sports, focusing on protecting the health and safety of American athletes.

SR-253

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine improving America's transportation infrastructure.

SD-406

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 34, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for "midnight rules", S. 829, to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, S. 951, to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents, S. 21, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, S. 577, to require each agency, in providing notice of a rule making, to include a link to a 100 word plain language summary of the proposed rule, S. 584, to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, S. 579, to require agencies to pub-

lish an advance notice of proposed rule making for major rules, S. 459, to designate the area between the intersections of Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest and Davis Street, Northwest and Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest and Edmunds Street, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as "Boris Nemtsov Plaza", S. 595, to provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection with additional flexibility to expedite the hiring process for applicants for law enforcement positions, S. 696, to amend title 5, United States Code, to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to Federal employees, S. 504, to permanently authorize the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program, S. 842, to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, S. 760, to expand the Government's use and administration of data to facilitate transparency, effective governance, and innovation, S. 831, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Pike Street in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, as the "Police Officer Scott Bashium Post Office Building", an original bill entitled, "Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act of 2017", an original bill entitled, "Federal Agency Customer Experience Act of 2017", and an original bill entitled, "Saving Federal Dollars Through Better Use of Government Purchase and Travel Cards Act of 2017".

SD-342

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the state of social capital in America today.

SD-106

10:30 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine running the government for less.

SD-608

2 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine military space organization, policy, and programs.

SR-222

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Scott P. Brown, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador to New Zealand, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Independent State of Samoa, Department of State.

SD-419

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 458, to support the education of Indian children, S. 691, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe, and S. 1116, to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide indus-

try and economic development opportunities to Indian communities; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine the Government Accountability Office's high risk list for Indian programs.

SD-628

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 23, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to adopt and implement a standard identification protocol for use in the tracking and procurement of biological implants by the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 112, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize per diem payments under comprehensive service programs for homeless veterans to furnish care to dependents of homeless veterans, S. 324, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans, S. 543, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to include in each contract into which the Secretary enters for necessary services authorities and mechanism for appropriate oversight, S. 591, to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, S. 609, to amend the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Programs Enhancement Act of 2001 and title 38, United States Code, to require the provision of chiropractic care and services to veterans at all Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers and to expand access to such care and services, S. 681, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, S. 764, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the enrollment of veterans in certain courses of education, S. 784, to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2017, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, S. 804, to improve the provision of health care for women veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 899, to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the requirements that new Federal employees who are veterans with service-connected disabilities are provided leave for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disabilities apply to certain employees of the Veterans Health Administration, S. 1024, to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, S. 1094, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, an original bill entitled, "Serving our Rural Veterans Act", and an original bill entitled, "Veteran Partners' Efforts to Enhance Reintegration Act".

SR-418

May 15, 2017

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS, Vol. 163, Pt. 6

7779

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
To hold hearings to examine United States military small arms requirements.

SR-232A

MAY 18

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Kari A. Bingen, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary, Robert Story Kareem, of the District of Columbia, and Kenneth P. Rapuano, of Virginia, both to be an Assistant Secretary, and Ryan Dean Newman, of New Mexico, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Army, all of the Department of Defense.

SD-G50

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of William Francis Hagerty IV, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador to Japan, Department of State.

SD-419

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine domestic and international policy.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SH-216

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of David Bernhardt, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

SD-366

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 867, to provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforcement officers, and the nomination of Amul R. Thapar, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

SD-226

2 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

MAY 23

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine worldwide threats.

SD-G50

MAY 24

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
To hold hearings to examine Department of Energy atomic energy defense activities and programs.

SD-G50

CANCELLATIONS

MAY 17

1 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

POSTPONEMENTS

MAY 18

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation
To hold hearings to examine the Balkan Peninsula, focusing on strengthening democracy and countering malign foreign influence.

SD-419

SENATE—Tuesday, May 16, 2017

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JAMES LANKFORD, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Savior, lead us as a shepherd guides the sheep. We find consolation in the knowledge that You have gone before us to bring us to Your desired destination.

Lord, direct the steps of our lawmakers so that even when they fail to fulfill Your purposes, You will continue to uphold them with the right hand of Your righteousness. May they remember that nothing can separate them from Your love. As they face the heat of tough decisions, provide them with the watered gardens and living springs of Your presence. Lord, You have begun a good work in them; carry it on to completion.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The assistant bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2017.

To the Senate:

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

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as ObamaCare continues to collapse, a new Gallup poll out last week showed “Healthcare Surges as Top Problem in US.”

It is not hard to see why so many Americans feel this way. They turn on the TV and hear there will be even fewer options on the ObamaCare marketplaces in State after State. They pick up the newspaper and see that even more double-digit premium increases are being proposed for too many of the ObamaCare plan options that still remain. They know what these stories mean for their families: They will be left to pick up the pieces as ObamaCare continues to crumble all across the country. Unless we act, ObamaCare premiums will keep skyrocketing across the Nation, pushing the financial burden of this broken law onto the backs of more hard-working Americans.

We have seen the result of this already with last year’s rate filings, which left many States with double-digit premium increases as even more insurance options left the market. Premium price hikes for some ObamaCare plans reached startling levels, averaging 53 percent in Pennsylvania, 63 percent in Tennessee, and a shocking 116 percent in Arizona, just to name a few.

Families are again awaiting projections for this year’s filings and once again bracing for the very worst. In the coming weeks and months, proposed rate increases under ObamaCare will roll in across the Nation, and already ObamaCare customers in a handful of States have learned just how high their premiums could rise in 2018.

For example, consumers in Vermont just learned that premiums on the exchanges could increase by double digits next year. In Connecticut, requested premium rate increases are as high as 52 percent on the exchanges. In Maryland, one major insurer is asking for an average rate increase of nearly 60 percent. ObamaCare’s marketplaces, that insurer warned, are in the “early stages of a death spiral.”

Are our Democratic friends who promised to lower costs under ObamaCare OK with what looks to be yet another year of massive ObamaCare premium increases? This news is alarming not only for the families on the exchanges in the States I just named but for the thousands more across the Nation who may be hit with similar reports in coming weeks.

As one recent AP story, titled “More price hikes likely for government in-

surance markets,” observed: “Early moves by insurers suggest that another round of price hikes and limited choices will greet insurance shoppers around the country when they start searching for next year’s coverage on the public markets established by the Affordable Care Act.”

Moreover, as the story went on to say, over 40 percent of counties could have just a single insurer to choose from on the exchanges next year. It is troubling news, especially given that so many States, like mine, have already experienced insurers fleeing the ObamaCare marketplace leaving families with limited options.

Let’s just look at the chart behind me. In Kentucky, under ObamaCare, 49 percent of counties have only one insurer this year in 2017. Forty-nine percent of our counties, nearly half the counties in Kentucky, have only one insurer to choose from, and of course having one option is really no choice at all. It is a harsh reality facing more and more Americans, and these ObamaCare failures have real consequences for the men and women whom we all represent.

As one of our Democratic friends commented just last week on news that his State will be left with only a single insurer next year under ObamaCare, “This will mean that more than 12,000 Delawareans will have to find a new insurance plan and [that] our hard-working families will have fewer options and harder choices to make about their health insurance coverage.”

Can our Democratic colleagues who promised more choice under ObamaCare really be OK with the continuing failures of ObamaCare?

The status quo under ObamaCare is simply unsustainable and unacceptable. That is why the entire Senate Republican conference is working together on the best way forward to bring much needed relief to the families who have been left behind by ObamaCare’s continuing failures.

I hope our Democratic colleagues will join us in working on this. They just sent me a letter last week where they acknowledged that ObamaCare hasn’t lived up to its promises and where they effectively conceded that the status quo is unsustainable. I hope it means they are finally ready to join us in moving away from ObamaCare and supporting smarter healthcare policies. After years of defending a system that isn’t working for far too many Americans, it is time that Senate Democrats finally face the reality of this flawed ObamaCare law.

The failures of ObamaCare aren’t just isolated to one region of the country

either. They are affecting people from the east coast to the west coast, from the North to the South, and things are likely to get even worse, unless we work to finally move beyond the failures of this law.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Rosen nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The assistant Democratic leader.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I had a meeting last week in Illinois, and I asked hospital administrators, doctors, nurses, pediatricians, those who are in the substance abuse treatment area, what they thought of the Republican bill. It was all Republicans who passed the healthcare finance act, whatever the name of it is—their version of the healthcare system that they are calling for reform in the House of Representatives. It was interesting. They were unanimously opposed to it, all of them—hospital administrators, doctors, nurses, pediatricians, across the board.

Why would all the medical providers in my State be opposed to the Republican plan that just passed the House of Representatives? Well, because they have read it. Here is what they found. It threatens the survival of downstate and inner city hospitals. The Illinois Hospital Association came out against the Republican plan and said we could lose 60,000 jobs in Illinois, and we could see cutbacks in services in our hospitals.

I know the Acting President pro tempore from the State of Oklahoma knows what rural hospitals mean to these small towns. It is not only life and death to have access to quality healthcare, they are some of the best

paying jobs in town. The thought that those hospitals are going to see services cut back, people laid off is worth sitting up and taking notice.

They also are worried because the Congressional Budget Office never gave an analysis of the Republican plan that passed the House of Representatives. That is unheard of. When we passed the Affordable Care Act in the U.S. Senate, we waited week after weary week for the Congressional Budget Office to analyze each of the major changes. We didn't want to make a mistake, and we felt obligated to tell the American people what we were doing to the healthcare system, which is one-sixth of the national economy.

Somehow the Republican leaders in the House of Representatives paid no attention to that and passed a bill without a Congressional Budget Office analysis. Possibly it is because the first version of that bill, which was analyzed by the CBO, found that it was devastating. Twenty-four million Americans would lose their health insurance under the Republican plan in its first phase. Twenty-four million Americans lose their health insurance.

In Illinois, 1 million people—in a State of 12½ million people, 1 million people living in my State would have lost their health insurance coverage by the plan proposed initially by the Republicans in the House, and we also know it would shorten the lifespan of Medicare, for one thing. We know it allowed for waivers by Governors to eliminate what they call nonessential services in health insurance.

One of them hits close to home. I can remember as a new Senator coming to the floor and watching Paul Wellstone, who used to be at that desk, and Pete Domenici, who used to be at that desk, get up on a bipartisan basis and argue again and again that every health insurance plan in America should cover mental illness and substance abuse treatment. It seems so obvious, and yet they had to fight the insurance industry for years before we finally achieved it. Now when you buy health insurance in America, it covers mental illness and substance abuse treatment. Thank goodness. We need it. We desperately need it. Yet that becomes one of the nonessential elements in the Republican analysis of health insurance.

What are they thinking? Have they listened or read recently about the opioid and heroin crisis in America? I have sat at tables with victims, addicts who, thank goodness, had an intervention, had an opportunity, and now can speak of their addiction in the past tense.

These are amazing young people whose lives were compromised and threatened because of addiction. How did they turn the corner? They turned the corner because of loving families, their personal determination, and the availability of medical treatment under their health insurance plans.

Now the Republicans are arguing in the House of Representatives that we don't need that coverage, we don't need that protection. We do now more than ever.

When I hear the Republican leader come to the floor and criticize the Affordable Care Act, I basically have to ask him, Is this a problem that is of your own creation?

The Republicans, including the leader, have refused to sit down with Democrats and work on a bipartisan solution. In fact, when the Republican leader sat down to determine how the Senate would respond to the House action, he put together a group of, I believe, 12 Republican Senators—no Democrats allowed—to sit down and write the alternative. That is not a good way to start this.

What we ought to do is to say, first, we are not going to repeal the Affordable Care Act; we are going to improve it, and we will do it on a bipartisan basis. If the majority leader wants to suggest that, I would like to be part of it. Many Democrats would like to be part of it. Take repeal off the table before the conversation on repair begins. I think that is essential. Let's make sure that within health insurance in America we have some basics.

First, if you have a preexisting condition, you shouldn't be disqualified from health insurance or you shouldn't have to pay twice the premiums. That is something that is now built into the law that the Republicans want to repeal. Well, I want to make sure that preexisting conditions are protected.

As I have said on the floor before, a couple of weeks ago I had a heart procedure, a catheter procedure, an outpatient procedure. Apparently it worked pretty well. I am standing here talking to you today. I feel good. But a lot of people go through this, and I became a statistic the day that happened. I guess I now have a preexisting condition; so be it. One out of three Americans fit that category. Why would we not protect them in any health insurance reform bill? That seems like the starting point in our conversation. Yet the bill that passed the House, the Republican bill that passed the House allows Governors to basically ask for waivers so that health insurance plans in their States will not cover people with preexisting conditions or allow people with those conditions to have the same premiums. That is not a good starting place. It is a terrible starting place.

Let's try to make sure that if we are going to move forward on real healthcare reform, we do it in a sensible fashion. Let's put forward a bill not like the one that passed the House, but let's put together a bill that has the support of hospital administrators across the Nation. Let's put together a bill that protects the Medicaid expansion that is part of the Affordable Care Act.

Medicaid is an essential part of healthcare in America for tens of millions of people. Medicaid—most people think, oh, that is health insurance for poor people. Really? That is not an accurate description. For example, in the State of Illinois, Medicaid provides health coverage for half of the children who are born in my State—prenatal care, postnatal care, and the actual delivery of half of the children in my State, under Medicaid.

That is not the most expensive part of Medicaid. The most expensive part in my State and across the Nation is the fact that Medicaid is there to help your mother or grandmother or your dad or your grandfather when they are in a situation in life where they need a helping hand. They may be in an assisted care facility, and the Social Security check is not enough; Medicare is not enough. Medicaid steps in to make sure they have the quality of care they need. Are we going to eliminate that kind of protection?

Ask disabled people and ask the organizations that represent them what it means to have a good strong Medicaid system. These people rely on Medicaid for maintaining their health through disability, day in and day out.

So when the Republicans propose an \$840 billion cut in Medicaid protection across America over 10 years, sadly, they are setting out on a path that could compromise the basic care we need for babies and new moms, for the elderly in assisted care facilities and nursing facilities, and for the disabled who live in our States. We don't want to see that happen.

It is interesting that my Republican Governor in the State of Illinois seldom comments on Federal legislation. He came out in opposition to the bill that passed the House of Representatives. He said that this is a significantly bad bill for the State of Illinois, and I agree with him. I am glad he spoke up. I don't know how the seven Republican Congressmen who voted for it in my State can ignore that reality. Our Governor—our Republican Governor—believes it is bad for our State in cutting back Medicaid. The hospitals believe it is bad for our State in the impact that it will have on down-State hospitals. Doctors, nurses, and pediatricians also oppose it.

What can we do? What should we do? First, we ought to try to see what we can do to make the Affordable Care Act work better. We can do that on a bipartisan basis. We want to make sure, as the Senator from Kentucky said earlier, that there are available health insurance programs in every county of every State. Certainly, one thing we can do is make sure that a public option is there for everyone if they choose it—something that looks like Medicare.

People respect Medicare. Medicare is a great program for millions of Ameri-

cans who are seniors and disabled. Why wouldn't we create a program like Medicare—a not-for-profit, government-operated program like Medicare for people who wish to have it? Those who don't can stick with private insurance if that is their choice, but I believe more and more people will move toward the Medicare option. That is something I would like to put on the table in reforming the Affordable Care Act.

Secondly, we need to address the cost of pharmaceutical drugs in America. The costs are out of control.

This week I received a publication from the AARP, the American Association of Retired Persons, and they are talking about what is happening to pharmaceutical prices across America. You don't have to tell seniors or those who buy prescription drugs what the reality happens to be.

Let me give you a few numbers to demonstrate why we need to have a new program to make sure drug prices don't go out of control. According to AARP, Americans spent \$457 billion on prescription drugs in 2015, up about 8 percent over the previous year—\$457 billion. The rise in prices for the most popular brand name drugs from 2008 to 2016 is over 200 percent. They have more than doubled in that 8-year period of time for the most popular drugs.

The median salary of a pharmaceutical firm's CEO in 2015 was \$14.5 million, more than any other industry; \$6.4 billion is the amount drug companies spend advertising directly to consumers in the U.S. annually; \$24 billion is the amount drug companies spend per year marketing to doctors. We are one of only two nations in the world that allows direct consumer advertising. Think about what that means.

When you see all these ads on television for drugs with names you can't pronounce, why are they doing it? It is because the drug companies know that consumers across America will write down the name of the drug and go ask the doctor to prescribe it. Many times, the doctor, rather than debate the issue with the patient or suggest they don't need it or should use a generic, will just write out the prescription. What happens? More expensive drugs get into the system, raising the cost of healthcare, raising the cost of premiums for health insurance. It doesn't make us healthier; it just means healthcare is more expensive.

I love to listen to the warnings on these drugs that go on and on and on. One of my favorites was this: Be sure and tell your doctor if you have had a liver transplant. I am thinking to myself, yeah, I think I would probably mention that somewhere along the way to a doctor.

These warnings should give us fair warning that this is inflating the cost of healthcare across America. It is not

making us healthier, and it is running up profits dramatically for pharmaceutical companies. Why is it that exactly the same drugs made in the United States sell for a fraction of their cost in America in places like Canada and Europe? It is a legitimate question. We ought to address it. Do we have the political nerve to do it? I hope so, as part of the Affordable Care Act reform. I hope we sit down and do something on a bipartisan basis to deal with the challenges we face, but first, take repeal off the table.

Let's make the Affordable Care Act stronger. Let's do it on a bipartisan basis. Let's set out to come up with a solution that doesn't do what the House version did, which could eliminate health insurance for millions of people across America and a million people in my State of Illinois.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

PRESIDENT'S MEETING WITH RUSSIAN OFFICIALS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, by now we have all had the chance to read the report in the Washington Post that alleges stunning behavior on the part of the President in a meeting with the Russian Ambassador and Russian Foreign Minister.

According to the report, the President revealed classified information about a terrorist threat to officials of a foreign government. The President didn't share it with just any government; the report states he shared it with the Russian Government, a global adversary that has violated the sovereignty of peaceful nations, propped up dictators and human rights abusers, including Iran and Syria, and has been widely proven to have interfered in our elections and the elections of our allies in Europe.

If this report is indeed true, it would mean that the President may have badly damaged our national security, nothing less, and in several ways. First, the act of a disclosure of this type could threaten the United States' relationships with allies that provide us with vital intelligence and could result in the loss of this specific intelligence source.

We rely on intelligence from our allies to keep America safe. America can't have eyes and ears everywhere. If our allies abroad can't trust us to keep sensitive information close to the vest, they may no longer share it with us. That undermines key relationships and, even more importantly, makes us less safe.

Second, if accurate, such a disclosure could damage our interests in the Middle East. We do not collaborate with Russia in Syria or elsewhere in the Middle East for the simple fact that we have diverging interests. Russia, for example, has worked with Iran to prop

up the brutal Assad regime. Sharing vital intelligence with Russian officials could allow the Russians to pursue or even possibly eliminate the source or figure out how the ally conducts operations, including any against Russia or Russia's allies in the region.

Third, if the report is true, the President's alleged carelessness with classified information will further damage the relationship between the White House and the intelligence community—an essential relationship for the security of America. The intelligence community needs to be able to trust the President and trust that he will treat classified information with caution and with care. Our intelligence professionals put their lives on the line every day to acquire information that is critical to our national security and critical to keeping Americans safe. They have done a very good job.

If the reporting is accurate, in one fell swoop, the President could have unsettled our allies, emboldened our adversaries, endangered our military and intelligence officers the world over, and exposed our Nation to greater risk.

Given the gravity of the matter, we need to be able to quickly assess whether this report is true and what exactly was said. So I am calling on the White House to make the transcript of the meeting with the Russian Foreign Minister and Ambassador available to the congressional Intelligence Committees as soon as possible. The White House should make the transcript of the meeting available immediately to the congressional Intelligence Committees. If the President has nothing to hide, he should direct that the transcript of the meeting be made available.

The Members who sit on those committees have the necessary clearances to review the transcript and any related summary of the President's meeting with the Russians. I agree with the senior Senator from Maine that this briefing should happen immediately. Those committees would be able to help establish the facts before we grapple with the potential consequences.

Last night, the administration issued several overlapping denials. Some questioned the overall veracity of the account. Some took pains to specifically deny certain accusations but not others. This morning, the President tweeted a version of events that undercut his advisers' carefully worded denials and seems to confirm the reports that he had shared the information in question.

Following so closely after Mr. Comey's firing, which was rationalized to the press and the American public in several different ways over the course of a week, this administration now faces a crisis of credibility. The President has told us that we cannot take at face value the explanations of some of

his key advisers, but the events of the past week have taken this to an untenable extreme. The timelines and rationales in the administration contradict one another. The truth, as it were, sits atop shifting sands in this administration.

We need the transcripts to see exactly what the President said, given the conflicting reports from the people in the room. Producing the transcripts is the only way for this administration to categorically prove the reports untrue.

Mr. President, there is a crisis of credibility in this administration which will hurt us in ways almost too numerous to elaborate. At the top of the list is an erosion of trust in the Presidency and trust in America by our friends and allies. The President owes the intelligence community, the American people, and the Congress a full explanation. The transcripts, in my view, are a necessary first step. Until the administration provides the unedited transcript, until the administration fully explains the facts of this case, the American people will rightly doubt if their President can handle our Nation's most closely kept secrets.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I noted yesterday that this week we celebrate National Police Week. In particular, we recognize and remember those law enforcement officers who have paid the ultimate price and sacrificed their lives to protect the communities in which they serve. Yesterday, I had the chance to speak about Javier Vega, Jr., a Border Patrol agent who served in South Texas and was tragically killed by two illegal immigrant criminals.

Today, I want to talk about the attack on law enforcement officers in Dallas almost a year ago. Last July, about 800 people gathered in downtown Dallas for a peaceful march. Given the size of the event, dozens of law enforcement officers were on hand to protect the protesters so they could exercise their fundamental constitutional right. Before 9 p.m., the event had been going very well, by any standard. There wasn't any violence reported in the crowd, even though some similar events across the country hadn't been as calm. But in Dallas, it was clear that there existed a mutual respect between the citizens protesting and law enforcement. There were even social media posts of protesters embracing police officers in a show of solidarity and friendship.

Unfortunately, the night would soon be robbed of any enduring image of that sort of positive scene. A man—someone who came that night explicitly to target law enforcement officers—opened fire, killing five officers and wounding seven more—the dead-

liest day for American law enforcement since 9/11. The officers who lost their lives that day—Brent Thompson, Patrick Zamarippa, Lorne Aherns, Michael Krol, and Michael Smith—will not be forgotten. They, like the other officers on duty that night—many of whom were injured by the gunmen—didn't look the other way or run the other way when the violence erupted. Like the heroes they are, they ran to the danger, not away from the gunshots and the uproar. They, like law enforcement officers across the country, weren't about to shy away from doing their job, even if that meant putting their own lives on the line.

So today, I want to commend the men and women of the Dallas police force, a group of men and women with incredible courage and unflinching valor in the face of danger. This Police Week I am particularly grateful to them and to the officers and first responders all over the State of Texas and all around our Nation who count the costs and choose to serve their communities day after day, often with little thanks or recognition.

As I said last summer, it shouldn't take an event of this scale to jolt our consciences into action. As legislators, we have tremendous opportunities to better support our men and women in blue who risk their lives to protect ours. We have a duty to do all we can to keep them safe and to keep our society safe and peaceful. So as we celebrate Police Week, I hope we can each do our part to better support the men and women serving in law enforcement.

Later today, Mr. President, I plan to introduce a piece of legislation called the Back the Blue Act, along with Senator CRUZ and Senator TILLIS. This is legislation that makes clear our support for these public servants who spend their lives protecting us and serving us. The Back the Blue Act would create a new Federal crime for killing or attempting to kill a Federal judge, a law enforcement officer, or a federally funded public safety officer. It would create a new crime for assaulting a law enforcement officer, as well.

There is no justification—none at all—for attacking a police officer. It is an act of anarchy to attack the very people who help keep our society safe and protected.

We need to know and need to show that we value their lives, and we need to make it absolutely clear that we will hold those who carry out crimes against our police officers accountable. The Back the Blue Act sends that message loud and clear.

I think it is important to point out that this legislation would also help make our communities stronger by allowing grant funds to be used for efforts to help foster more trust between police and the communities they protect. This bill would better serve the

men and women who work tirelessly in our communities every day. So I would hope our colleagues would join me in supporting it.

We can do more to protect and support our law enforcement officers, and we can start with the Back the Blue Act to do just exactly that.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I would like to commemorate National Police Week and the lives and sacrifices of two extraordinary Massachusetts law enforcement officers who fell in 2016: Thomas Clardy, a trooper with the Massachusetts State Police, and Ronald Tarantino, a police officer with the Auburn Police Department. Their names will be inscribed on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial here in Washington, DC, in honor of their service.

By the end of this year, more than 21,000 names will be on that wall. We will never forget their service and sacrifice to our communities and to our country. With the help of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, we pledge to their families and loved ones that they will have the support and resources they need.

FIRING OF JAMES COMEY

Mr. President, I rise to speak about President Trump's firing of FBI Director James Comey. In and of itself, this action by President Trump is seismic and has shaken the very foundation of our government and, I dare say, of our democracy. But just yesterday, the American people were also once again confronted by Presidential actions that raised both alarm and the need for investigation. In a new story, the Washington Post reported that President Trump revealed highly sensitive classified material to senior Russian officials during a meeting last week. According to the Post story, President Trump reportedly revealed information about ISIS that could compromise a partner country's key intelligence sources and enable Russia to, according to the story, "identify our sources and techniques" for gathering intelligence.

There could be no greater compromise of American security. The information that President Trump revealed was so sensitive that the United States had previously refrained from sharing it even with our allies.

President Trump's decision to relay some of our most sensitive intelligence with representatives of the Russian Government betrays an astounding lack of judgment. By revealing what is called "code-word" information to Russia, President Trump may have compromised key intelligence sources, endangered the fight against ISIS, and undermined the trust of our international partners.

While the President may have the authority to declassify U.S. intelligence,

it is imperative to the safety of our military and intelligence personnel and those of our partners that he do so through a careful and deliberative process. There is no evidence that Donald Trump did that.

Congress must immediately investigate this irresponsible action and take steps to ensure that President Trump does no additional damage to national security in his dealings with Russia. This dangerous behavior comes on the heels of the President's reckless decision to fire former FBI Director James Comey, pushing our country ever closer to a constitutional crisis. President Trump's firing of Mr. Comey is disturbingly reminiscent of Watergate's Saturday Night Massacre, when our Constitution was last subject to an executive-branch-induced stress test.

Then, President Nixon fired the independent prosecutor, Archibald Cox, who was leading the investigation into the Watergate scandal and the Nixon campaign's involvement in it. Now President Trump has fired his FBI Director, who was leading the investigation into the Russian interference scandal and the Trump campaign's involvement in it. Mark Twain is purported to have said that history doesn't repeat itself, but it does tend to rhyme. Unfortunately, there is no humor in President Trump's actions.

At first, we were supposed to believe that the President fired Director Comey because of the way he handled the investigation of Hillary Clinton's email server, which was unfair to her. That was what President Trump sent his staff out to tell the press and the American people. The official White House statement from Press Secretary Sean Spicer on May 9 said that President Trump acted based on the clear recommendation of both Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein and Attorney General Jeff Sessions. That was a reference to the now-infamous memorandum by Attorney General Sessions, prepared by Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein, which cited Comey's "handling of the conclusion of the investigation of Secretary Clinton's emails" as the reason why the public purportedly had lost confidence in the FBI and on which Attorney General Sessions based his recommendation to the President that he fire Mr. Comey.

On May 9, Counselor to the President Kellyanne Conway said that President Trump "took the recommendation of his Deputy Attorney General, who oversees the FBI Director." Then on May 10, Deputy White House Press Secretary Sarah Huckabee Sanders said that the President "took the recommendation seriously. And he made a decision based on that." Even Vice President PENCE said that President Trump's decision to fire Comey was based on the Rosenstein memo.

So the American people were being told to believe that President Trump

took the unprecedented step of firing the FBI Director in the midst of an investigation of the Trump campaign because James Comey was too hard on Hillary Clinton. That simply didn't pass the laugh test. Who can forget that Candidate Trump repeatedly called her "crooked Hillary Clinton" throughout the campaign? Who can forget that Candidate Trump applauded Director Comey for the way he handled the Clinton investigation? At the end of October 2016, just days before the election and after Comey had reopened the Clinton email investigation, Trump said that Comey had "guts" and had "brought back his reputation."

But it took only 1 day after Mr. Comey's firing for President Trump himself to admit that reason was utterly false. In an interview President Trump said that Rosenstein "made a recommendation, but regardless of recommendation I was going to fire Comey, knowing there was no good time to do it."

So much for the Rosenstein memo. So much for the White House press statement. So much for what Kellyanne Conway said. So much for the words of the Vice President of the United States. If that admission wasn't enough, President Trump went on to tell everyone what was on his mind when he made that decision. Here is his quote:

And, in fact, when I decided to just do it, I said to myself, I said, "You know, this Russia thing with Trump and Russia is a made-up story. It's an excuse by the Democrats for having lost an election that they should have won."

President Trump's statements about the Russia investigation are, of course, untrue. There is nothing made up about the conclusion of the intelligence community that Russia interfered with our election. The allegations of the Trump campaign's collusion with the Russians are serious. That is why the FBI and the House and Senate Intelligence Committees have been investigating them.

So contrary to what White House senior administration officials and—the President, in fact, admitted that he fired the Director of the FBI precisely because he was overseeing an investigation of the Trump campaign and its ties to Russia. According to all of these various reports, the President did so just after Director Comey had gone to Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein and asked for more resources for the Russia investigation.

The firing of James Comey now brings the number of law enforcement officials who were investigating the Trump campaign or his administration when they themselves were fired to three—first, Manhattan U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara, then Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates, and now Director Comey.

President Trump himself, in his termination letter to Comey, made no

mention of the Clinton email investigation but instead expressly linked the firing to the Russia investigation. Trump claimed that he fired Comey despite Comey having informed the President on three separate occasions that he was not under investigation—a claim that has not been substantiated.

Here is the plain and simple truth: President Trump feared that the FBI investigation into his campaign's possible collusion with Russia was getting too close for comfort, so he fired Director Comey. Comey's firing could be nothing less than obstruction of justice masquerading as a personnel action. It is what impeding a Federal investigation looks like. It is what an assault on the rule of law looks like.

If there is one lesson President Trump should have learned from Watergate, it is this: If you are under investigation, don't fire the investigator.

But as disturbing as Mr. Comey's firing is, it gets worse. Days after, President Trump tweeted a veiled threat—one that smacked of witness intimidation. Here is the quote: "James Comey better hope that there are no tapes of our conversation before he starts leaking to the press." Are there recordings? We don't know yet. But if there are, the White House and Justice Department must ensure that they are preserved.

It is clear that President Trump did not learn any of the lessons of Watergate, which only underscores the need for a special prosecutor independent of the White House and Justice Department to get to the bottom of this. The role of a special independent prosecutor is to follow all of the facts wherever they lead. That individual needs to be as far away from the White House as possible.

Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein should not be the one to appoint a special prosecutor. Just 3 weeks on the job, Mr. Rosenstein is now compromised by the questions swirling around his role in the Comey firing: Did Comey meet with Rosenstein and ask for more resources for the Russia investigation? Why did Rosenstein discuss the removal of Director Comey with Attorney General Sessions after Sessions had recused himself from the Russia investigation? Why didn't Rosenstein question Sessions's involvement?

The magnitude of—the decision to appoint a special counsel in these circumstances cannot be made by a political appointee. Instead, I join Minority Leader SCHUMER's call that the appointment must be made by the highest ranking career civil servant in the Justice Department, someone insulated from politics and the White House. Until we have an independent special prosecutor appointed, we should not move forward with the confirmation of any replacement for James Comey as Director of the FBI.

Additionally, Director Comey should come and testify before Congress, which both Senate Intelligence Committee Chairman BURE and Vice Chairman WARNER have already requested, clearly showing the bipartisan support for this. There are too many unanswered questions that only Director Comey can answer.

Finally, while it has been announced that Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein will brief all Senators and answer their questions, we must still hear from Attorney General Sessions.

We must not lose sight of the fact that a foreign power interfered in our last Presidential election and that the Trump campaign may have colluded with it to win the White House. This strikes at the heart of our government and our very democracy. Our elections must be fair and free of foreign interference. It is time for both Democrats and Republicans to put love of country ahead of party and to come together and demand the appointment of a special prosecutor who will investigate and follow the facts no matter where they lead.

Mr. President, I would like to conclude my remarks today by expressing my opposition to the nomination of Jeffrey Rosen to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation. Mr. Rosen has a long history, both in government and in the private sector, of defending private industry against regulations designed to protect the American public. When he first worked for the Department of Transportation, he touted the fact that he was involved in ending or withdrawing 180 potential Transportation Department rulemakings.

He has also been hostile to environmental regulations designed to protect our air and water. He opposed greenhouse gas emissions regulations in his role at the Office of Management and Budget and personally represented the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in attempting to undermine climate change science in order to fend off potential regulations. Mr. Rosen's firm represented the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers and other auto groups against California over rules meant to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase nonpolluting vehicles.

I will vote no on Mr. Rosen's nomination because our automobile safety, environment, and clean energy future are just too important. I urge my colleagues to join me.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week, the American people were stunned by what we learned happened

in the White House. We saw an alarming set of developments about how this President is handling the investigation into Russia's interference with our democracy.

Last Monday, the Senate Judiciary Committee heard testimony from Sally Yates, whom President Trump had asked to serve as Acting Attorney General when he was first sworn into office. Ms. Yates testified that soon after the inauguration, she twice visited White House Counsel Don McGahn to warn him about National Security Advisor Michael Flynn. She warned that General Flynn had been compromised by his secret communications with Russian Ambassador Kislyak and that General Flynn could be blackmailed.

Ms. Yates first visited White House Counsel McGahn on January 26. McGahn invited her back to ask followup questions the following day, on January 27. Those followups included questions about General Flynn's potential criminal exposure.

What else happened on January 27? The President of the United States brought in FBI Director James Comey for a one-on-one dinner, where he reportedly asked Director Comey for a pledge of loyalty. Is the timing of this Comey dinner curious? You bet it is. According to Press Secretary Sean Spicer, President Trump was briefed immediately by White House Counsel McGahn after Ms. Yates' warning. That means the President knew about the Justice Department's concerns with Flynn when he met Director Comey for dinner.

Was the President's request for loyalty from Director Comey an attempt to impede the Justice Department's investigation into General Flynn? Was it an effort by the President to inoculate himself from Russia-related investigations? These are unanswered questions. But when Director Comey reportedly refused to swear his loyalty to President Trump, he apparently sealed his fate as Director of the FBI.

Last Tuesday evening, President Trump fired Director Comey while Comey was giving a speech to FBI agents in Los Angeles. The reason? Well, on Thursday, the President made clear that the Russia investigation was on his mind when he fired Director Comey. He said to Lester Holt of NBC: "When I decided to do it, I said to myself, you know, this Russia thing with Trump and Russia is a made up story." President Trump later said that the Russia investigation "should be over with, in my opinion, should have been over a long time ago." Then, on Friday, the President found time to threaten Mr. Comey on Twitter, implying that he had taped their conversations and that he would release the tapes if Comey disclosed what he knew.

Let's be clear. The President is in dangerous territory here. What the President is doing when it comes to potential obstruction of justice is similar

to a chapter in history many of us remember. On October 20, 1973, President Nixon fired special prosecutor Archibald Cox when his Watergate investigation got too close to the White House. That sparked a constitutional crisis in America.

Now we have learned that President Trump has disclosed highly classified information to the Russian Foreign Minister and that same Ambassador, Kislyak. The Washington Post reported that the President specifically revealed extremely sensitive intelligence considered so sensitive that details were being withheld from America's allies and tightly restricted even within our own government. Last night, the White House denied this happened. This morning, however, President Trump confirmed in two separate tweets that the story was true.

This kind of disclosure is what former Director Comey and just about every other congressional Republican described last year as "extremely reckless" in the handling of classified information. It jeopardizes critical intelligence sources in the fight against ISIL and the broader fight by America against terrorism.

This morning, European officials reacted, told the Associated Press that at least one European country might stop sharing intelligence with the United States if this is how it is going to be treated. That is not, as the majority leader described it this morning, "drama." This is a real consequence of a dangerous President putting American lives at risk. This is truly incredible and historic. It is a national security breach by the President of incredible proportions. How in the world can we trust the President to put the national security needs of the American people ahead of his own?

There are a lot of parallels between the Watergate era and what we see today, but one major difference from the Nixon era to the Trump era is the willingness of Republicans in Congress to speak out against the abuse of power and to actually serve as a check on the Presidency. Back in Nixon's day, there were Republicans in Congress who were willing to speak truth to power, to say: Enough of the lies and damage to our democratic institutions, and to put the country ahead of party.

Listen, in November of 1973, just a few weeks after the Saturday Night Massacre, Senator Edward Brooke of Massachusetts was one of the first Republicans to stand up and say he did not feel the country could "stand the trauma that it has been through for the past few months."

In July of 1974, Republican Congressman Lawrence Hogan of Maryland said:

The evidence convinces me that my President has lied repeatedly, deceiving public officials and the American people. . . . Do we want to be the party loyalists who in ringing rhetoric condemn the wrongdoings and scan-

dals of the Democratic Party and excuse them when they are done by Republicans?

On the same day, Republican Congressman William Cohen of Maine said:

I have been faced with the terrible responsibility of assessing the conduct of a President that I voted for, believed to be the best man to lead this country, who has made significant lasting contributions toward securing peace in this country and throughout the world, but a President who in the process, by act or acquiescence, allowed the rule of law and the Constitution to slip under the boots of indifference and arrogance and abuse.

Republican Congressman from Virginia M. Caldwell Butler said:

For years we Republicans have campaigned against corruption and misconduct. . . . But Watergate is our shame.

Republican Congressman Paul Findley of Illinois, whom I ran against when I first had the privilege to serve in the House and whom today I call a friend, said a month later:

Hearings of the Judiciary Committee and developments in the courts have, I believe, clearly established gross negligence, maladministration and moral insensitivity on the part of the President.

That same month, Republican Senator Barry Goldwater from Arizona said:

There are only so many lies you can take, and now there has been one too many.

In fact, at the same time, Senate Republicans nominated Goldwater to deliver a direct message to President Nixon. Goldwater, along with the House Republican leader, John Jacob Rhodes, and the Senate Republican leader, Hugh Scott, went to the White House, sat directly in front of President Nixon's desk, and explained that enough was enough.

These courageous Republicans were, of course, talking about lies, corruption, the obstruction of justice, and a danger to our democratic system of government emanating from the Nixon White House. They took our oath of office to protect the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and certainly above a party or short-term policy gain—they took it seriously, and to their courage, we and history owe them a debt of gratitude.

So I ask today, amid a swirling and deeply troubling mix of lies—nearly 500 in just the first 100 days of this new Presidency—obfuscation, the withholding of information, attempts to interfere with Federal investigations regarding possible collusion with a foreign adversary, and thinly veiled threats against those involved in such investigations by our current President, where are the many Republican patriots who are ready to stand up against these troubling abuses and threats?

It has now been more than 7 months since 17 of our intelligence agencies provided overwhelming evidence of a Russian attack on our democracy and an attempt to help elect someone seen as more favorable to their interests,

not our interests. The evidence was damning and continues to emerge. Yet what has this Congress done during this same 7-month period to uphold our oath to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic"?

Have congressional Republicans launched an independent investigation into this historic cyber act of war as we did after 9/11? Unfortunately, no.

Have congressional Republicans retaliated against Russia for its actions by imposing sanctions or taking other actions, making sure its leadership knows it will pay a price for such attacks and think twice before doing so against the United States or at the expense of our allies? No.

Have Republicans in Congress passed meaningful cybersecurity legislation to help protect America against future attacks and help any States that request help? No.

Have Republicans demanded the appointment of a special prosecutor and insisted that the White House turn over all documents regarding the Trump campaign and ties with Russia, including potentially Russian intelligence? No.

Have Republicans demanded that the President explain why he keeps denying Russia's attack on our election in the face of overwhelming evidence? No.

In fact, has the majority party done anything to respond to, protect against, or even address these troubling attacks and refusals to cooperate from the White House? Sadly, no.

Let me tell you what the majority party has found time to pursue during the 7 months after an attack on our Nation—a cyber act of war that will live in cyber infamy. Some of this you simply cannot make up.

The Republican majorities in the House and in the Senate passed legislation making it easier to kill baby bears and their mothers in their dens, making it easier to work with corrupt regimes overseas, making it harder for Americans to save for retirement, and they are trying to strip healthcare away from millions of Americans in order to pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest people in America.

This is, quite simply, an abdication of the majority party's responsibility in Congress to address an attack by a foreign power on our Nation and investigate possible collusion by an erratic and sometimes deceptive White House.

Let me close by asking my Republican colleagues, whom I know care very deeply about the Senate and our Nation, When will you speak up about the travesty unfolding? When will you take even a fraction of the action that would have most certainly occurred if these outrages had occurred under a Democratic President?

We need Republicans in Congress to stand up and protect our democratic institutions and to support a special

prosecutor and an independent investigation into the Russian election interference now.

I am hopeful some Republican Senators will have the courage to join us in calling for a special prosecutor. We need someone above politics and above the controversy whom we can trust to really pursue the facts and the evidence, wherever it may lead, to determine what we can do to protect America from another Russian attack in our next election and to hold Russia accountable for what we have been through. It is time to do this on a bipartisan basis. America is waiting.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). If no one seeks recognition, time will be charged equally to both sides.

The Senator from Louisiana.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, it is fair to say that Americans are sick of partisanship when it comes to issues of greatest concern. They are asking, if you will, that we in the Senate put party behind us—behind the needs of the people. This is especially true when we are speaking of those issues of greatest importance, and I would argue that the replacement of the Affordable Care Act is one of those issues of greatest importance.

Whatever the excuse, no Senator of either party should sit on the sidelines. This is such an important issue that every Senator, whatever her or his personal views, should be engaged.

We know President Trump's principles, if you will. He laid them out time and again on the campaign trail. He wants to maintain coverage, lower premiums, care for those with pre-existing conditions, and eliminate the ObamaCare mandates upon individuals and businesses.

At his inauguration speech, he spoke of the forgotten man and of the forgotten woman. In fact, we can see that just before his inauguration, he emphasized that with what he said during the campaign:

We're going to have insurance for everyone. There's a philosophy in some circles that if you can't pay for it, you don't get it. That is not going to happen to us.

He also emphasized the quality of the care, saying that people covered under the law that he would propose to replace can expect to have great healthcare. "It will be in a much simplified form. Much less expensive, much better," he said to the Washington Post just before he was sworn in. These are his principles.

When he was sworn in and gave his inaugural address, speaking of the forgotten man and the forgotten woman, I cannot help but think that he was influenced as he went through counties seeing folks with terrible tales of their child dying from opioid addiction or their spouse unable to afford insurance under ObamaCare.

I will point out that there is a huge dimension to this that we sometimes forget, but we should not. Senator JERRY MORAN from Kansas made the point that healthcare is like no other issue. It is an issue which touches us most personally. I think President Trump saw that on the campaign trail. He saw the parent of an adult child with mental illness, and she could not get a psychiatric bed for her child. We know the fate of that child if he does not have the care he needs. He will end up either in a homeless shelter, a jail cell, or the morgue. That is the human dimension to this, and that is why we need to help President Trump fulfill his pledge.

Voters understand what we are speaking of; they understand the importance of it. But let me speak just a little bit more to the politics of this because we cannot separate what we do here in Washington, DC, from politics.

There are researchers from Princeton who recently published a report. If you look at White males and females between 18 and 54 who lack a college education, their life span is decreasing. Now, for Hispanics, African Americans, and other minorities, it is improving, but for this group, it is decreasing.

I have seen data which shows that in the population centers of the United States in which this phenomenon is being most seen—these Whites from age 18 to 54, noncollege educated, their life span is decreasing—the counties in which this effect is most seen were most likely to vote for Donald Trump. Think about the politics of this. The politics are that a group of folks who understand that their life is materially and physically declining, with higher rates of suicide, addiction, liver disease, and other chronic illness, ending in premature death, voted significantly more for the President who swore that he would remember them, who spoke of the forgotten man and the forgotten woman. His pledge to them was a lifeline. Their vote for him was a cry for help.

This is not just a human dimension; there is a political dimension leading to a policy necessity.

Let's stop for a second. There is a key issue of cost. We understand that the Affordable Care Act was too expensive. We can save money. But let's not fool ourselves; it is still going to cost. We can save the \$150 billion or so that the House suggested we have to save. We know the rules the Senate has to address to save at least that much money. On the other hand, we know that Congress has mandated people can get care; therefore, if Congress mandates that folks get care, then Congress should help provide the means by which to pay for it.

There are some who think, oh, my gosh, Congress does not need to provide for the money for care, and everything will be good. I am a physician. I have

been in the emergency room at 2 in the morning, and at 2 in the morning, when those emergency room doors are open, whoever comes in is treated. She may have heart failure, he may have a drug overdose, they might be a schizophrenic, or they might be somebody vomiting blood. Each one of them receives all the care that he or she needs to stabilize their emergency condition. And if they have to be hospitalized—think of a car wreck with multiple traumas—and they are in the hospital for 4 months, they still get that care because Congress mandates that. But, if Congress does not provide the means to pay for it, the cost of that care is shifted not to government; the cost of that care is shifted to the privately insured. All of those getting their insurance through their employer begin to pay higher premiums—much higher premiums. Somebody pays. And if we do not fulfill our obligation, after mandating that those patients get cared for—we, being Congress—then society pays, and society is the person struggling to make ends meet and now finds out from her employer that her premium has increased 20, 30, sometimes 50 percent—all because of the cost-shifting that occurs.

It is not just the group market. Under ObamaCare, we can see that in the individual market, premiums have skyrocketed. It is not that the Affordable Care Act is working so well. Last week I communicated with someone who lives in San Francisco, and she and her young family are paying \$20,000 a year for a premium, \$6,000 deductibles; none of them is sick, none of them will meet their deductibles, but living in a very expensive city, having to struggle to pay their mortgage, groceries, and transportation, now they have to come up with \$20,000 to pay for their healthcare. That is all because of the Affordable Care Act.

Then I spoke with a person in Washington, DC, and someone in Washington, DC—that person who is a consultant on insurance issues, knows insurance backward and forward, says that for his family, the premium is \$24,000 a year, with a \$13,000 family deductible. The insurance expert says: I will be out \$37,000 in a single year before my insurance kicks in. Families cannot afford that.

I will finish up lastly with a story from Louisiana. Folks never believe this because it seems too crazy, but I put it on my Facebook page. There is a couple back home, 60 and 61. They were quoted a premium of \$39,000 for a premium of one year, with a deductible on top of that—\$39,000. We can see that in the individual market, the Affordable Care Act is not working, it is becoming the un-Affordable Care Act. We have to address this.

But let me say, we have to address it whether we are a Democrat or a Republican. We must respond to the cries for

help coming from those folks suffering from addiction, mental illness, heart failure, or any other chronic disease for which they do not have coverage, but also to the cries for help from middle-class families who cannot afford these premiums, and if they don't sacrifice something in the budget to pay for it, under the Affordable Care Act, they will be fined.

Let's return to the political side. The political side is that I have voters back home asking why Republican Senators are not helping a Republican President fulfill his pledge—a pledge to all voters—but one that certain Republican voters specifically took to heart; that is, to fulfill his pledge of caring for those with preexisting conditions, continuing coverage, lowering premiums, and eliminating mandates.

If you are a Democratic Senator, the forgotten woman and the forgotten man is in your State too. I can promise you, even if you are not a Republican but you are a Democrat, you have an opioid crisis in your State. So if we are now looking at addressing Medicaid expansion or the affordability of the individual market, and you are a Democratic Senator and you decide to sit on the sideline—if you are a voter in that State, you should be asking why.

Let's face it. Speaking of my Democratic colleagues, many of you do not like President Trump. Some of you hate President Trump. Some of you like him, but you have to pretend that you hate him. Even though this is President Trump's pledge, this is not about President Trump. This about the voters—the patients, the people in our States who either cannot afford their insurance or who have an addiction or some mental illness or some other critical mental healthcare need that, if this ObamaCare replacement is not done well, will leave them far worse off.

I have heard some of the excuses from my Democratic colleagues as to why they cannot participate. They say: Oh, we are using the word “repeal” or, oh, we are not going through a normal committee process—oh, this, or oh, that. I concede it all. Who cares? If you are a voter right now, and your child is addicted to opioids, do you really care that there is a semantic issue regarding whether or not we are saying “repeal” or “repair”? Do you really care that after 8 years of hearings, we don't have a few more hearings? Do you even understand the difference between reconciliation versus normal process? I would say no, because the principal thing that concerns you is that your child is desperate for help and you are not sure that the help will continue.

So I say to my Democratic colleagues: Whatever the excuse, ignore the excuse, and please engage.

Let me finish where I started. I think the average American right now wants every Senator, whether Republican or

Democrat, to help President Trump fulfill his pledge to maintain coverage, lower premiums, and care for those with preexisting conditions, without mandates. Every Senator should listen to the American people as they ask us to put patients over party, to put the American people over partisanship.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during quorum calls until 12:30 p.m. today be equally divided.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with my colleagues on the floor to talk about Police Week.

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

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, during this week, all across the country, people are honoring the men and women who serve as law enforcement officials. Clearly, they deserve and receive recognition every day for what they do, but this is an incredibly difficult job.

Last night, I was with some of our officers from Missouri and with family members, and I said: A lot of times, it is easier for you to walk out the door than it is for your family to see you walk out the door, not knowing what you are going to face every day.

When Senator COONS and I came to the Senate 7 years ago, we created and cochaired the Senate Law Enforcement Caucus. It is a privilege to be part of that and also to speak today on behalf of those who serve us.

This is a week in which we take a moment to recognize the law enforcement officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty. Today, I want to pay tribute to three Missouri law enforcement officers who were killed in the line of duty this past year. Master Sergeant Carl T. Cospers of the Barry County Sheriff's Office was one of those, as were Officer Blake Curtis Snyder of the St. Louis County Police Department and Deputy Sheriff Paul Allen Clark of the St. Francois County Sheriff's Office.

Just last month, Master Sergeant Cospers was killed in a vehicle collision while responding to a domestic disturbance call. He had served the Barry County Sheriff's Office for 10 years before that fatal accident.

In October of 2016, Officer Blake Snyder was shot and killed while responding to a disturbance. He had served the

St. Louis County Police Department for 4 years. He is survived by his wife and their 2-year-old son. I had a chance last night to visit with his wife again. Elizabeth and her brother Justin, also a police officer in St. Louis County, were here earlier this year to talk about police and families and what we need to do to really express our understanding of what those families go through, their strength and their reliance, both humbling and inspiring, and I am sure they are passing along those very values to Blake's 2-year-old son.

In July of 2016, Deputy Sheriff Paul Clark died from complications related to injuries he sustained in October of 2015 when he was intentionally struck by a stolen vehicle near Desloge, MO. Deputy Clark had served the St. Francois County Sheriff's Department for 13 years and had previously served with the Park Hills Police Department for 5 years. He is survived by his wife, two children, and by their grandchildren.

All of these individuals are heroes, and our prayers remain with their families.

Let me now turn to Senator COONS. As I said earlier, he and I founded the Law Enforcement Caucus when we came to the Senate. We try on a regular basis to have opportunities to talk about policing practices, family challenges, and mental health issues that police deal with every day. I turn to Senator COONS for some comments.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from the State of Missouri. Working with Senator BLUNT, my cochair of the Law Enforcement Caucus, has been a terrific experience. We have had the opportunity over several years and several Congresses now for more than a dozen conversations, where we invite law enforcement leaders from around the country to talk about partnership between Federal, State, and local law enforcement, intelligence sharing, equipment issues, policy and operational issues to allow us to provide needed support for the men and women of law enforcement.

It is my honor to join with several of my colleagues today to recognize the men and women of law enforcement as part of National Police Week. Together, we offer our gratitude and our support to the men and women of law enforcement and their families, who together support our communities.

It is only May, and yet my home State of Delaware has already been reminded of the tremendous risks and great sacrifices made by law enforcement officers and their families.

In February of this year, Lieutenant Steven Floyd of the Delaware Department of Correction was killed on the job in a prison riot in Smyrna, the Delaware correctional center. He was a 16-year veteran of the department and left behind his wife of 28 years, Sandra; his children, Candyss, Steven, Jr., and Chyvante; and two grandsons.

Just last month, Corporal Stephen Ballard of the Delaware State Police was senselessly gunned down while investigating a suspicious vehicle. Corporal Ballard had served with the Delaware State Police for 8½ years and left behind his wife Louise and his daughter Abigail.

Delawareans are still grieving for the loss of both of these brave men in the line of duty.

As we recognize the entire law enforcement community from across our country during National Police Week, we should honor their sacrifice by serving them as well as they serve us. This week and every week, we must do everything we can to honor our obligations to fallen heroes and their families.

In the wake of these losses in Delaware, I am committed to continuing to work with my colleagues across the aisle and across the country, like Senators KLOBUCHAR, CORNYN, and Senator BLUNT, to make sure our officers have the resources they deserve to do their jobs and to come home safely at the end of every shift. That means continuing to champion programs like the Bulletproof Vest Partnership, which literally saves officers' lives. Delaware knows the importance of this long-running program all too well. Two of our Delaware Capitol Police officers who were shot in the line of duty survived due to bulletproof vests provided through this vital and ongoing Federal-State partnership.

I will also continue to work here in the Senate with colleagues to reform the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program to make sure the families of officers who lose their lives or are permanently disabled in the line of duty receive the benefits they deserve.

Chairman GRASSLEY, who has joined us here on the floor, is one of the lead cosponsors of this bill, along with Senators HATCH, GILLIBRAND, and KLOBUCHAR—is one of many cosponsors. This is a bill that will take important steps in these reforms, and it is just one step away from passing the Senate, and my understanding is it could head to the House of Representatives as early as later today.

Of course, our commitment to serving the men and women of law enforcement has to extend beyond the patrol car and the police station. Building and maintaining trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve is essential to preventing and reducing crime and keeping officers safe. That is why Senator BLUNT and I have both taken steps to encourage the strategy of community policing, which helps officers do their job more effectively in partnership with local communities. We have also continued to support local officials who are working to bring Federal resources, expertise, and convening power to help strengthen the bonds between the police and the communities they serve.

In light of all these important efforts, we can't let ideology or partisan politics in this Chamber prevent us from doing our job in support of law enforcement. We will fail those who serve us if we do so. We have to move forward in a bipartisan way to improve and invest in officer safety. That is why I am proud to stand with my colleague and partner from Missouri as coauthors of the Law Enforcement Caucus. The mission of this bipartisan group of Senators is simple: to bring law enforcement, community leaders, issue experts, and Republicans and Democrats together to share ideas and generate solutions to challenges facing State and local law enforcement. We have hosted more than a dozen briefings and events.

Now more than ever, Senator BLUNT and I are committed to this mission. We are on the floor today to honor women and men, like Corporal Ballard and Lieutenant Floyd from Delaware, who put on the uniform and the badge every day, not knowing whether they will come home at the end of their shift. We are here today for their families, whose sacrifice and burden are heavy.

When I attended Corporal Ballard's moving memorial service earlier this month, the most powerful speaker among many was his widow, Louise. She stood up, stood tall, and with a smile on her face thanked the 3,000 officers from 36 States across the country who had come to stand in solemn procession and honor Corporal Ballard's sacrifice and pay their respects.

Louise Ballard said:

This is my Stephen's victory, when I get to see men and women from all over the country who every single day get up and do a job. A job that's hard, a job that requires heart.

Few jobs are as hard or require as much heart as patrolling the streets and protecting our communities.

This week, together we honor the service and sacrifice of those law enforcement officers whose names have been added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial this year and the hundreds of thousands, even millions, who even today, even tonight, will be on patrol keeping our communities and our families safe.

Mr. President, I yield to the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, my colleague from Iowa and partner in legislating in the interest of law enforcement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues from Missouri and Delaware for leading this effort to honor our law enforcement officers and particularly those who have been killed in the line of duty.

In 1962, Congress passed a joint resolution proclaiming the week of May 15 as "National Police Week."

The National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, located here in Wash-

ington, DC, is our country's monument to these fallen officers. Carved into the marble walls of the memorial are the names of the more than 20,000 officers killed in the line of duty throughout our Nation's history. Every year, tens of thousands of fellow officers from around the world come to Washington, DC, as part of Police Week to pay tribute to the men and women whose names are inscribed on this wall.

The planned events surrounding Police Week began with the 36th Annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service, held on the west front of the U.S. Capitol. The President of the United States was the keynote speaker, and his presence was a testament to the fraternity of this noble profession. Immediately following the service, there was a wreath-laying at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. The annual memorial service is an opportunity for all Americans to reflect on the dedication of these public servants and the ultimate sacrifice they have paid for this great Nation.

We should also acknowledge the families of the fallen, whose lives have been forever changed by the loss of their loved ones.

During the memorial service, there was a Roll Call of Heroes for the 143 law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty last year. Their names will adorn the memorial walls in perpetuity. The list of the fallen include five of my fellow Iowans: Sergeant Anthony Davis Bemino of the Des Moines Police Department; Officer Susan Louise Farrell of the Des Moines Police Department; Patrolman Justin Scott Martin of the Urbandale Police Department; Sergeant Shawn Glenn Miller of the West Des Moines Police Department; and Officer Carlos Bernabe Puente-Morales of the Des Moines Police Department.

We honor these great heroes for laying down their lives to protect their communities in Iowa. There is no year in recent memory in which so many Iowans have lost their lives in the line of duty.

I would like to specifically address the ambush-style killing of Sergeant Bemino and Officer Martin. These officers were heinously murdered by the same perpetrator on the same night while they sat in their patrol cars. While the exact motive of the killer is unknown, he nevertheless sought out these brave men and gunned them down in cold blood.

These ambush-style attacks have become more prevalent since the incidents in Dallas, TX, and Baton Rouge, LA, spanning 10 days last July. According to a report by the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, there were a total of 21 officers killed in ambush-style attacks just last year—the highest total in two decades.

There has been much vitriol written and directed toward law enforcement

over the last few years. The notion that the actions of a few bad individuals implicate the entire profession may still, unfortunately, endanger public servants in the area of law enforcement.

This sort of rush to judgment against all law enforcement officers ought to end and end right now. The men and women of law enforcement make great sacrifices every day to protect our families and, of course, all of our fellow citizens. They do so freely, not out of a sense of obligation but because they are dedicated to the cause of justice.

Their devotion merits our attention, admiration, and we are deeply indebted to them. This is why today I am submitting a bipartisan resolution to commemorate Police Week and honor those who have given their lives in this pursuit. I thank my colleagues in the Senate who have cosponsored this resolution with me.

I call on all Americans to remember the fallen and pay tribute to the sacrifices they have made. To quote the motto of the Fraternal Order of Police Auxiliary: "Never Let Them Walk Alone."

I hope that during Police Week, the Senate will pass my legislation to reform the operations of the Public Safety Officers' Benefit Program. Delays in the award of benefits to the families of fallen officers have become intolerable, and those families deserve to know the status of their applications during the process.

In addition, the Judiciary Committee has reported two other bills that I hope the Senate will take up during Police Week. One bill sets standards for the use of a new form of DNA evidence. The second makes an allowable use of COPS grants for recruiting and promoting of military veterans as police officers.

Finally, during Police Week, my Judiciary Committee will report a bill that is designed to provide mental health services to police officers who live through and with enormous stress as they work to protect us.

I am pleased to join with my colleagues in saluting the service of our law enforcement officers during Police Week.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, before we turn to Senator CORNYN, I want to mention his leadership in the National Criminal Justice Commission Act and also thank Senator GRASSLEY for moving the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act out of his committee this week. Those are two of the things we clearly can do that will make a difference to people in law enforcement and their families, and there has been no more strident advocate of families or those who serve in law enforcement than the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am delighted to be here during Police Week, along with our colleagues from Missouri, Delaware, Minnesota, and Iowa to celebrate the men and women in blue who put their lives at risk so that our communities can be safer, more stable, more prosperous places.

I am reflecting this week on the terrible experience in Dallas, TX, about a year ago when Chief David Brown inspired the Nation with his response to the terrible tragedy there that took the lives of five Dallas police officers and injured seven more.

Following the attack, Chief Brown made clear that if you want to see change or if you want to protest law enforcement, why not instead join their ranks and be a part of the solution. I am grateful to him for his encouragement of the young men and women who have many opportunities to serve their communities—many in uniform.

The truth is, we can do a lot of good by inspiring confidence in law enforcement and showing our support for them. We saw what was referred to by the former Director of the FBI as the "Ferguson effect," where, in fact, he said it was his view that many police officers were afraid of being criticized unjustly, so they withheld or were reticent in acting in the face of a criminal activity.

We need to make sure that our law enforcement personnel know we are firmly behind them and we will always support them. As Chief Brown liked to point out, if somebody has crossed a line they should not cross, that is an appropriate subject for disciplinary action on a police force.

There is never any excuse for assaulting a police officer. That is the thin blue line between us and anarchy in our society.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for working with me on the American Law Enforcement Heroes Act that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee just mentioned. This bill will help State and local law enforcement hire more veterans into their ranks. Obviously, that is relevant experience and training that can help our law enforcement departments across the country be better and take advantage of these great patriots who have now taken off one uniform to put on another.

We know there are places in the country where, despite the best efforts of law enforcement, danger is spiking violent crime rates in some parts of the country due to dangerous criminals like the MS-13 gang, a vicious gang from Central America that is wreaking havoc in parts of the country. We can't let our officers face these dangers without knowing we have their backs.

I am delighted to be here with our colleagues celebrating National Police Week and making it clear to the men and women in blue that we unequivocally

support them and stand by them and need to let all of our country men and women know that these are true American heroes who deserve our respect and support every day, not just during Police Week.

I yield to our friend and our colleague from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise with my colleagues today in recognition of Police Week. I thank Senator BLUNT and Senator COONS for bringing us together, as well as Senator GRASSLEY and Senator CORNYN.

Law enforcement officers play a critical role in keeping our communities safe, and Police Week is all about honoring their dedication and sacrifice and, sadly for so many families, those officers who made the ultimate sacrifice. Our officers are on the frontlines of public safety, and while most people run away from crime scenes or run away from disaster, they run bravely toward it.

In my State, we were reminded all too well of the courageous dedication of law enforcement just this last year when Jason Falconer, an off-duty police officer at a shopping mall spending his free time on his own, encountered a horrific scene of a man unhinged who was stabbing people in the St. Cloud shopping mall. Falconer didn't even pause. He made sure that he saved the people who were wounded; 10 were wounded that day. So many would have been killed if he had not intervened—an off-duty officer.

I think about Officer Shawn Schneider, who is no longer with us, in Lake City, MN. I met with his family several times. This was a brave officer, a popular officer in a small community. One night he was called to the scene of a domestic abuse case. A young woman, scared, had called. He showed up at the door, and a man unhinged opened the door and shot and killed that officer.

The story behind that officer and the people behind that officer are the ones who carry on his memory—his fellow officers, as we see this week during Police Week, his family, his widow, and their three children. I will never forget sitting in the pews of that church and hearing the story as those three little kids walked down the aisle. There were two young boys and a girl in a blue dress covered in stars. The story was that the last time the family had been in that church and the last time those children had been in that church was for the church nativity play, and their dad, Officer Schneider, was sitting there watching them with such pride. A few weeks later, there they were at his funeral.

Those are the people we remember during this important week. Our job as U.S. Senators is to treat them in the way that they treat their jobs. They go to work every day without fear or

favor. That is what we have to do when we think about police officers.

There are issues, as Senator COONS mentioned, we need to work on—policies and the relationship between officers and our communities. We have to promote more community policing, more training, more recruiting. That is why I am very positive about these bills—the COPS bill I have with Senator MURKOWSKI, where we finally have bipartisan sponsorship for grants that have now helped to place approximately 129,000 police officers on the beat in more than 13,000 State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies.

In that community I mentioned, St. Cloud, are the recipients of some of the grants we are talking about. That is why Senator MURKOWSKI and I are taking on this issue, to make sure that this program continues to be funded and that, in fact, we reinforce the program.

The bill Senator CORNYN just mentioned that we are leading together to promote the hiring of veterans as law enforcement officers would encourage local police departments to hire and train veterans as cops while providing our veterans with the opportunity to continue to serve their communities.

Yes, we can do all we can to have the backs of our officers and to work with them and our communities, but what we are doing this week is something a little different. We honor them. We recognize their sacrifices, whether it is taking dangerous criminals off the street, whether it is preventing extremist groups from recruiting people in our neighborhoods, whether it is fighting the opioid abuse epidemic, whether it is simply giving a kid a second chance—and they do those kinds of things all the time.

Law enforcement officers are doing some of the hardest and most important work out there. We owe our safety to them, and we thank them for their remarkable service.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, in conclusion, I thank my colleagues, Senators KLOBUCHAR, GRASSLEY, CORNYN, and BLUNT, for joining us today in a colloquy on the floor. It is a small but important gesture of bipartisan support, sustained and long-lasting bipartisan support for the community of law enforcement that serves each of us and our communities every day.

I wish to yield to my friend Senator BLUNT for his closing remarks.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I thank Senator COONS.

The pieces of legislation to support officers and their families are wide ranging, even legislation to be voted out of the Judiciary Committee today. It was exactly 1 year ago today that President Obama signed the Fallen Heroes Flag Act into law. This is a bill that I introduced along with my colleague that provides that American flags be flown over the U.S. Capitol and

given to the families of firefighters, law enforcement officers, and other first responders who lose their lives in the line of duty.

As Senator KLOBUCHAR so well pointed out, these are the people who run to danger when the rest of us are able to head the other way. We are grateful to them and grateful for them.

Mr. President, I think we will yield the floor with great appreciation for the law enforcement officers who are being recognized this week. There are still too many names that Senator GRASSLEY mentioned who will be added to the over 20,000 officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty since the country was founded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time from 2:15 p.m. until 5:15 p.m. today be equally divided in the usual form; and that at 5:15 p.m., all postcloture time be expired and the Senate vote on the Rosen nomination; that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate resume consideration of the Brand nomination; further, that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the Brand nomination occur at 12 noon on Wednesday, May 17; and that if cloture is invoked, the time count as if it were invoked at 1 a.m. on Wednesday; finally, that if cloture is invoked on the Brand nomination, the cloture vote on the Branstad nomination occur following disposition of the Brand nomination; and that if cloture is not invoked on the Brand nomination, the cloture vote on the Branstad nomination occur immediately following the failed cloture vote.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from New Mexico.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, it is an honor to join my colleagues. I know Senator COONS and others have come together as a bipartisan group to talk about fallen police officers.

It is with my greatest respect and deepest sympathy that today I honor five fallen New Mexico heroes on the floor of the Senate. These five brave men were police officers who died in the line of duty. Police officers who sacrificed their lives in service to the people of their communities and our State.

Police Officer Jose Ismael Chavez was a member of the Hatch Police Department. While conducting a traffic stop in Hatch on August 12, 2016, one passenger exited and opened fire on Officer Chavez. Officer Chavez is survived by his wife and two children.

Secondly, Police Officer Clint E. Corvinus of Alamogordo was part of

the Alamogordo Police Department and was shot while pursuing a suspected felon on foot in Alamogordo on September 2, 2016. Officer Corvinus is survived by his daughter.

Deputy Sheriff Ryan Sean Thomas of the Valencia County Sheriff's Department was responding to a call for service on December 6, 2016, when his patrol car left the roadway between Los Lunas and Belen, and overturned. He was ejected from his car. He is survived by his wife, daughter, and a baby boy after he died.

Sheriff Steven Lawrence Ackerman, of the Lea County Sheriff's Department, was killed in a single vehicle crash near Encino on January 17, 2017. Sheriff Ackerman had served with the Lea County Sheriff's Department for 14 years and previously with the Lea County Detention Center for 12 years. He is survived by his wife, daughter, son, and grandson.

Police Officer Houston James Largo, of the Navajo Tribal Police, was shot while responding to a domestic violence call near Prewitt, NM. He passed away the next day on March 12, 2017. He was only 27 years old.

There are no words to express the sadness or the gratitude we all feel toward these New Mexico officers and their families and toward all police officers who are killed in the line of duty. We honor them all this Police Week and by legislation we introduced last week in the Senate to extend flying the flag half-staff for the first responders. We will push to give first responders the respect they are owed by passing the Honoring Hometown Heroes Act.

Every day, tens of thousands of policemen and policewomen serve our communities in myriad ways, from tracking down violent criminals to finding shelter for homeless persons. The police and their families deserve our respect, gratitude, and support every day.

I thank you, Officer Chavez, Officer Corvinus, Deputy Sheriff Thomas, Sheriff Ackerman, and Officer Largo, from the bottom of my heart and with sincere appreciation.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, the White House and President Trump face yet another crisis—perhaps the biggest in his chaotic term so far. According to the Washington Post and other outlets, President Trump disclosed highly classified information to the Russian Foreign Minister and Russian Ambassador to the United States in the Oval Office last week. This is utterly stunning.

Congress needs to find out exactly what happened, on a bipartisan basis, but we can tell already that President Trump's behavior in this incident is very dangerous. It is dangerous to our national security institutions, dangerous to the men and women overseas who are serving their country and risking their lives. Many other outlets

have confirmed the Washington Post article, and they have cited several sources.

Assuming it is true, the President has endangered our relationship with a partner who gave our security agencies this information. That has ripple effects that will risk similar relationships with other countries. It also could put our sources at risk.

While his national security team denied the news reports this morning, the President was on Twitter contradicting them. He claims he has the right to tell the Russian Foreign Minister anything he wants. I can't think of any parallel in history for the President's dangerous lack of discretion or his dangerous misunderstanding of how to handle classified national security information.

As the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CORKER put it this way: The White House is in a "downward spiral," and he said it needs to get it "under control." Senator CORKER is a senior Republican. I know the Presiding Officer and I serve with him on the Foreign Relations Committee. He is a man I respect very much, and I hope the White House will listen to Chairman CORKER.

It is very strange that the President chose to meet with the Russian Ambassador at the center of the Trump campaign's contacts to Russia or to allow the Russian press with their electronic equipment into the meeting at the Oval Office, but let's put these strange and dangerous events in the context of the last several weeks and months.

America's intelligence agencies have concluded that Russia interfered in the U.S. election and that they favored the Trump campaign. Now the President is hosting senior Russian officials in the Oval Office and disclosing highly classified information—information that puts future intelligence and maybe lives at risk.

The day after he fired the FBI Director, President Trump admitted on camera to NBC News that he did so in part because he is frustrated at the FBI's investigation into Russian interference and potential Trump campaign contacts. Congress must get to the bottom of this. Republicans and Democrats must come together for real oversight. Based on what I see now, President Trump's actions call into question his fitness for office and further underscore the imperative for independent investigations.

It is not an exaggeration to say our Nation faces a constitutional crisis. Our Constitution is based on rule of law. In the United States, no man or woman is above the law, not even the President of the United States. Our constitutional democracy is remarkable for many reasons. One is that Presidential action has threatened the fabric of our democracy only a few times in our history. President Nixon's

Watergate scandal was one of them, and I believe we face another one today.

President Trump's firing of the FBI Director in the middle of an investigation into the campaign that put him in office and the President's bizarre behavior since should concern all Americans regardless of party. The only rational explanation is that he has something to hide, that he wants to disrupt the investigation into Russia's interference in our election. What possible reason could the President have for wanting to hinder this investigation? It should be his highest priority to ensure it never happens again. Instead he calls it "fake news."

Now, here is what we know. Early in the new administration, the White House Chief of Staff asked the FBI to publicly disavow reports that the FBI was investigating Trump campaign ties to Russia. This attempted political interference was wrong.

The White House next set its sight on House Intelligence Committee chair DEVIN NUNES, who was investigating Russian interference in the election. Representative NUNES made midnight runs to the White House to view documents that he said validated the President's claims that he was wiretapped.

While the information did not ultimately prove that, Representative NUNES still chose to go public with classified information before discussing it with his committee. This was circus-like behavior, which ultimately forced Representative NUNES to recuse himself from the committee's investigation. But it was also serious. It showed that the White House was willing to go to great lengths to interfere with the House investigation into the President.

Next, the President fired Acting Attorney General Sally Yates. At the time, he claimed it was for refusing to defend his Executive order barring Muslims from the country. In the end, her analysis was correct. The Federal courts found the order to be unconstitutional. We now know that Ms. Yates was fired just days after notifying the White House that then-National Security Advisor Flynn had lied about his conversations with the Russian Ambassador.

She had told the White House that Flynn's own conduct "in and of itself was concerning." She warned that the President's chief advisor on matters of national security was susceptible to blackmail by Russia. It still took the President 18 days to fire Flynn. As Ms. Yates put it, "to state the obvious, you don't want your national security advisor compromised with the Russians."

Now, the President has fired FBI Director James Comey. It defies reason to believe that President Trump fired Mr. Comey because he was too hard on Secretary Clinton. We give the FBI Director a 10-year term so that he or she can do the job free from political inter-

ference and follow any investigation wherever it may lead, even into the Oval Office. A deluge of evidence has pointed to the conclusion that the President fired Director Comey for similar reasons as Sally Yates—because he was unhappy with the FBI probe of Russian election interference and possible ties to the Trump campaign.

It has been reported that Director Comey had sought additional resources for the investigation and was receiving daily briefings on the investigation days before he was fired. The U.S. attorney's office in Virginia had also issued grand jury subpoenas to persons with knowledge of Flynn's ties with Russia and Turkey. Well-sourced media reports say the President had become increasingly angry with Director Comey's public statements about the FBI's investigation of him and because Mr. Comey would not confirm the President's baseless claims that the President Obama administration wiretapped Trump Tower.

The President understood that Director Comey would not do his bidding and so he fired him. Still, the White House has flatly lied about the circumstances of Mr. Comey's dismissal. Numerous White House officials, including the Vice President himself, said the decision was at the recommendation of Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein. They have said this publicly on the record and on camera.

But President Trump himself contradicted them. He said again on camera that he had already decided to fire Director Comey before receiving the Deputy Attorney General's recommendation. He made clear that he was frustrated with the continuing counterintelligence probe into Russia's election influence. He was upset with Mr. Comey's testimony before Congress.

The White House also claimed that Director Comey had lost confidence at the FBI. But in a public hearing last week, my colleague and Senator from New Mexico, Mr. HEINRICH, asked the FBI's Acting Director if that was true, and the Acting Director strongly denied it. It has been well reported that the Deputy Attorney General threatened to resign based on the White House claims that Mr. Rosenstein advocated for firing Director Comey.

It seems clear that he was told to draft the cover story for the real reason. His memo was short and is dated the same day as the firing.

Now, on what may be the worst development so far, the President of the United States is threatening on Twitter to release "tapes" of Mr. Comey. He is implying, not confirming, that he has tapes of their conversations and that he will release them if Mr. Comey talks to the press and the public.

Mr. Comey knows he is well within his rights to speak publicly as long as

he does not reveal classified information. The President's comment is another example of interference. A sitting President is seeking to pressure a fired FBI Director against speaking out publicly, a man who is likely to be a witness before Congress.

Mr. Comey reportedly would like to testify in an open hearing. Apparently, he doesn't have anything to hide. We need to hear his testimony as soon as possible. Let's find out if President Trump demanded the FBI Director's loyalty. If the President does have tapes of their conversations, he should release them, or we need to subpoena them. But let's get to the bottom of this.

At this point, there is more than probable cause to believe that the President is attempting to obstruct the FBI and congressional investigations. President Trump seems to put himself above the law. Firing the FBI Director and the Acting Attorney General and interfering with a congressional investigation are actions of an autocrat. As a former assistant U.S. attorney and attorney general for New Mexico, I have some experience with investigations. When someone interferes with ongoing investigations, it seems clear that they have something to hide. That is not the behavior of an innocent person.

Make no mistake, Russia's interference in our democratic process is an attack upon our Nation. If the President or his associates colluded in any way with Russia in this attack, it would represent the most serious betrayal of our Nation by a President. While there are rarely exact parallels in history, the parallel between Nixon's Saturday Night Massacre and President Trump's Tuesday Night Massacre is hard to ignore.

Nixon's firing of the man heading the investigation into his actions led to his impeachment and resignation. Recall that the first article of impeachment was obstruction of justice. At that point in our history, both Congress and the Supreme Court stood resolute that the President was not above the law. Congress must again stand resolute that the President is not above the law. It is well past time for Congress to appoint an independent commission like the 9/11 commission.

It must investigate every aspect of Russia's interference with our election and recommend steps to ensure it never happens again. It must investigate whether Candidate Trump or his associates colluded with Russia to interfere with our Presidential election. Congress must do so swiftly and must give the commission sufficient resources to do the job.

The Attorney General is compromised. He has recused himself from any investigation into the Trump campaign. But I believe he violated the terms of his recusal when he weighed

in on Director Comey's termination. Several of us will be sending a letter this week to the Justice Department inspector general asking him to investigate this specific issue.

Now the President is about to nominate a new FBI Director, presumably one he believes will be less independent than Director Comey, one who will not pursue the Russia investigation if it points to his campaign.

Given these circumstances, Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein must appoint a special counsel to conduct a counterintelligence investigation into Russia's role in our election and, if necessary, a criminal investigation into the conduct of the Trump campaign and the administration. A special counsel must be appointed before we consider a new nominee for FBI Director.

That nominee needs to be closely scrutinized by the Senate. We need a Director who is nonpartisan and has a law enforcement background. This person will be responsible for restoring Americans' confidence in the FBI and ensuring that he or she does not pledge loyalty to the President but pledges loyalty to the Constitution.

The majority in Congress must listen to the American public, must follow the lessons of history, and must protect the rule of law and our Constitution.

In the United States, no person is above the law, not even—and especially—the President of the United States. In my career in Congress, I have always believed you put the country first. Party comes last. In their hearts, I know my Republican friends and colleagues feel the same. Congress and the Senate need to fulfill the roles the Founding Fathers envisioned: When the executive branch is moving outside the bounds of the rule of law, we must rein it in.

It is well past time for action.

RECESS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:27 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 5:15 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Utah.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, peace and order are the indispensable pillars of a stable society. They grant us security in our daily lives, trust in our commu-

nities, and faith in our democratic institutions. Where peace and order reign, so too does society thrive and prosper, but none of that is possible without our Nation's 700,000 men and women in blue.

Each and every day, these brave sons and daughters—brave souls—stand up for all of us. Each and every day, they stand guard, ready to do justice or risk harm—all on our behalf. So today I rise on behalf of a grateful Nation to recognize them. Their performance is exceptional, and their sacrifice is immense.

Far too often, we take our police officers for granted. Far too often, we forget how hard it is to win and how easy it is to lose the peace and order that we all enjoy, but our police officers never forget. They are always at the ready. As we honor them this week, we remember that the question is not "What causes violence or what causes crime?" but rather, "What causes peace, and what causes security?"

The answer is our men and women in blue.

In celebration of our National Police Week, I wish to express my profound appreciation for our Nation's law enforcement community—the courageous men and women who each day put the safety of others before their own. Their success is impossible to fully measure. It cannot be counted in crime statistics or etched into medals. It can only be seen in the peace and order that their sacrifice makes possible.

Therefore, allow me for a moment to speak directly to our police officers.

Trust that your selflessness does not go unseen, that your service does not go unfelt, and that your sacrifice does not go unknown. We appreciate you, we support you, and we honor you. Law enforcement is among the noblest of professions. You are the brave guardians among us who fight for peace and protect the vulnerable from harm. On behalf of a grateful nation, I wish to thank you and your families for bearing the burden, shouldering the sacrifice, and making us all proud.

Let it be known that I proudly back the blue.

This is a critical moment to show the police our support. We live in a time when law enforcement officials are not only underappreciated but often maligned and, quite often, openly disparaged. Day in and day out, they suffer criticism and pressure. This week we let them know of our respect and admiration.

Today, I wish to express my gratitude for our men and women in uniform by sharing stories of their heroism. You see, we hear all about police mistakes, and we hear wall-to-wall coverage of the controversies, but we seldom hear about the acts of bravery and professionalism that distinguish our police officers as the finest in the world. In particular, I would like to relate the account of Utahns Bre and

Kayli Lasley, two sisters whose lives were saved by an on-duty police officer.

In September 2015, a man armed with a knife climbed through a bedroom window in Bre and Kayli's Salt Lake City apartment. Once inside, he brutally beat both sisters before pulling out a knife and repeatedly stabbing Bre. Just as the attacker raised his knife to Bre's throat, Salt Lake City police officer Ben Hone charged into the room. He told the intruder to drop his knife.

In that critical moment, with lives literally hanging in the balance, Bre remembers:

That's when I saw the officer, and he was our angel . . . I looked at the officer in his eyes, and he was so professional and calm.

When the attacker refused to surrender his weapon, Officer Hone raised his service pistol and fired, killing the armed intruder and saving Bre's life. In that moment, Officer Hone was truly Bre's guardian angel.

She remembers:

When [we] made eye contact, I knew I was safe. It's a miracle that he had so much composure and was able to take that shot.

In recognition of his heroism, Officer Ben Hone was honored by the National Associations of Chiefs of Police and the American Police Hall of Fame as the 2015 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year. I think it was an honor richly deserved.

Officer Hone survived that day. For that, we give thanks, but the sad reality is that many lose their lives in the line of duty. So today I wish to honor those men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice and paid the highest price that society can ask. Our debt to them will not—indeed, cannot—be repaid.

Among the fallen is Utah Highway Patrol Trooper Eric Ellsworth, who died only a few days after being struck by a car while on duty in Box Elder County. We also mourn the passing of West Valley City police officer Cody Brotherson and Greater Salt Lake Unified Police Department officer Douglas Barney, who were both killed in the line of duty this past year in Utah.

I express my deepest condolences to the families and friends of these brave heroes and the countless others who have experienced similar tragedies.

Although we cannot bring these officers back, we can honor their legacies by committing ourselves to supporting their brothers and sisters in uniform. To that end, I have introduced and cosponsored a number of bills this Congress that are meant to assist law enforcement as they serve our communities. These bills include the Rapid DNA Act, the Probation Officer Protection Act, and the Child Protection Improvements Act. Just yesterday, I joined Senator COONS in introducing the U.S. Marshals Service Hiring Improvement Act, which was named in honor of U.S. Marshals Service deputy

Patrick T. Carothers, who was a 26-year veteran of the U.S. Marshals Service who died in the line of duty in Georgia in November 2016.

Last week, I was grateful to see the Senate Judiciary Committee favorably report my bipartisan bill—the Rapid DNA Act of 2017. This critical legislation, which has garnered support from the National Association of Police Organizations, the Fraternal Order of Police, and the National District Attorneys Association, updates the law and leverages advancements in rapid DNA technology to expedite analysis in the FBI's Combined DNA Index System. If enacted, this commonsense proposal will enable law enforcement to analyze DNA in record time, reducing backlogs in rape kits and keeping violent criminals off of our streets. By facilitating the use of rapid DNA technology, this bill will also help to exonerate those wrongly accused of crime.

The Rapid DNA Act has received strong support from U.S. Attorney General Sessions. During his confirmation hearing, Attorney General Sessions said:

Rapid DNA analysis is a hugely important issue for the whole American criminal justice system. It presents tremendous opportunities to solve crimes in an effective way and produce justice because it's the kind of thing that you can't fake or mislead, so I am very strongly in favor of it."

In remarks before the Senate Judiciary Committee, former FBI Director James Comey said that the Rapid DNA Act "will help us change the world in a very exciting way," and it "will materially advance the safety of the people of the United States."

Each time I talk to a police officer, I always hear nearly the same thing. They have no need for fanfare or fame. All they need is the public's support and the tools necessary to do the job. In commemoration of National Police Week, let's make sure to give them both. I encourage my colleagues to join me in passing these bills and in showing our heroes in blue the gratitude and admiration they deserve.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL
CHRISTOPHER C. BOGDAN

Mr. President, in addition to honoring our men and women who wear the police uniform, I wish to pay tribute to a seasoned leader who wears the military uniform—Lt. Gen. Christopher C. Bogdan. General Bogdan is the program executive officer of the F-35 Lightning II Joint Program Office. He is really a respected airman, a true patriot, and a dear friend.

Nearly singlehandedly, he salvaged the F-35 program from ruin, providing much needed leadership at a critical time in the development of this important weapons system. He will be retiring this June after more than three decades of dedicated and decorated service in the U.S. Air Force. On behalf of a grateful nation, I wish to thank

General Bogdan for his leadership, service, and his sacrifice.

General Bogdan is an exceptional leader and a man of unwavering character and integrity. Several years ago, the general was given the daunting task of saving the F-35 program from the clutches of "scandal and tragedy," as Senator McCain once so accurately described. During his tenure, General Bogdan overcame seemingly insurmountable obstacles to right the ship at the F-35 program office. Along the way, he demanded the highest performance from his own staff and industry partners to establish a corrective path forward.

I first met General Bogdan in October 2013, when I made a special visit to the F-35 program office in Arlington, VA. General Bogdan warmly greeted me before introducing me to all eight of the national deputies from the program's partner nations. I was so impressed to see all of them in uniform—these great heroes from all of these other nations that are dependent upon the United States and our F-35 program. The general spoke briefly about how important this weapons system was not only to our own national security but also to the collective defense of the program's partner nations—the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Italy, Turkey, Canada, Australia, Norway, and Denmark, and, in the case of military sales, Israel and Japan. At that moment, I realized just how vital this cutting-edge platform was to the cause of freedom around the globe.

We then adjourned to General Bogdan's office, where he asked for my help in three areas that would be critical to bringing the F-35 to full operational capability: activating depot workloads, expanding the Utah Test and Training Range, and building infrastructure for the sustainment of F-35 software—one of the most complicated and the most highly scientifically run airplane in the world.

That day, I made a commitment to help General Bogdan. Years later, I am pleased to say that, in working together, we were successful in achieving all three objectives. In last year's National Defense Authorization Act, I offered an amendment to expand the Utah Test and Training Range by 40 percent, which is an increase of more than 1,000 square miles. With a little help from Congress, the depot activations at Hill Air Force Base progressed quickly, enabling the Air Force to station its first operational F-35 squadron at the base last August. In working alongside State leaders, I was also able to generate support for the construction of a software facility that will help sustain the F-35 for years to come.

Without General Bogdan's vision and strategic direction, none of these accomplishments would have been possible. It really is important. Utah is the only place over land where you had

a big enough area where you could fly this immensely important F-35 and do the training that needed to be done—with live ordnance by the way.

A year after we met, General Bogdan cleared his schedule so he could accompany me on a visit to the F-35 production line in Fort Worth, TX. There, I witnessed the current production run of over 100 F-35s progressing through the assembly line—truly a sight to behold. As planes moved out of the assembly line, General Bogdan explained critical challenges at each stopping point. I wondered how one man could be so intimately involved in every minute detail of the plane's production, yet still have the capacity to lead at the highest levels. In that moment, I knew General Bogdan was the right man to be in the largest acquisition program the world has ever seen.

When General Bogdan first took the helm of the F-35 Joint Program Office, he walked into a hostile environment, knowing full well he would face constant scrutiny and tremendous political pressure from all sides. He knew he would have to answer for every decision he would make, but General Bogdan was more than up to the task. In his leadership of the F-35 Joint Program Office, General Bogdan embodied three core values of the U.S. Air Force: integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all they do.

Both in the Air Force and in his private life, General Bogdan is a model of commitment and sacrifice. As great as his service to our Nation, the Air Force, and the F-35 program has been, it pales in comparison to the dedication he has shown his lovely wife April and their two children, Amanda and Adam.

Our Nation is safer today thanks to General Bogdan's 34 years of distinguished military service. I would like to congratulate my friend on the Senate floor on a stellar Air Force career. I consider myself lucky to know General Bogdan and even luckier to call him a friend. I wish him and April the very best as they begin the next chapter of their lives.

This is a man for whom I have the utmost respect. I lost my brother in the Second World War. He was a flier on a B-24 in one of the Palestine oil raids. I have to say that General Bogdan reminds me of my brother and a lot of heroes I have met who have served this country so well. He is at the top of the list. I just think the world of him, I think the world of his family, and I wish him the absolute best.

I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to honor the incredible men and women of our Nation's law enforcement agencies.

Each year, peace officers from all over the country and from countries all over the world come to Washington, DC, to celebrate and remember the lives of their colleagues whom they have lost in the line of duty.

The men and women who serve as peace officers in our Tribal, Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies selflessly put their lives before the lives of those whom they have taken an oath to protect and serve. I am here to not only remember those peace officers we have lost but to thank each and every officer who puts on a uniform and a badge every day to protect our citizens and our communities.

As a former attorney general of North Dakota, I have always had a special relationship and appreciation for law enforcement. Serving as the top law enforcement officer in my State will always be one of the most meaningful moments in my professional career. When I began serving as attorney general, law enforcement wasn't one of the goals I had. So I told my head of the Bureau of Criminal Investigation, a brilliant leader by the name of Bill Broer, that he could just deal with the law enforcement portion of the job, and I would take responsibility for the rest of the job.

Bill was going to have none of that, and consistently invited me along as he visited peace officers from all over the State, as we went to intel meetings, and as we talked about the challenges of equipping and staffing our law enforcement agencies. I can tell my colleagues that after 8 years of being North Dakota's attorney general, that portion of the job was the job I miss and love the most because I worked with the finest collection of peace officers in the country, and I could not be more proud to continue that work and work alongside of them as their U.S. Senator.

I am here to thank each and every one of the peace officers who selflessly serve in communities throughout North Dakota and to let you know I don't just appreciate the work you do and the sacrifices you and your family make each and every day, but I also have your back, 24/7, 365 days a year.

I also come to the floor with a heavy heart, as I have had to come to the floor twice already in less than a year, to honor North Dakota peace officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty.

We lost Officer Jason Moszer of the Fargo Police Department on February 11, 2016. Less than a year later, we lost Rolette County Deputy Colt Allery on January 18, 2017. I say "we" because the loss of these fine, young peace officers was felt across the entire State of North Dakota, and it still impacts their families, their departments, and our communities to this day.

Both of these young men made the ultimate sacrifice in service to their

State and their communities, each succumbing to gunshot wounds inflicted by individuals who were prepared to inflict even more damage and take more lives. The brave actions of these two peace officers prevented that from happening.

Officer Jason Moszer's name was etched into the Peace Officer Memorial here in Washington, DC, this week, and his name was read out loud during a ceremony this past weekend honoring all the officers who died in the line of duty last year and whose names have been added to the wall.

Officer Moszer's name will now serve as an example not just to North Dakotans but to people from all over this country and all around the world who visit the memorial each year. He will serve as an example of the best our State and country has to offer, an example of what it truly means to have lived and died so others may be safe; quite simply, an example for everyone of what it means to be a hero.

We must also remember the families of our peace officers that sacrifice so much, not knowing if their loved ones will return each time they walk out the door. I want to recognize Officer Moszer's family, his wife Rachel, his children Dillan and Jolee, his brother Brian, his sister Michelle, and especially his parents Dave and Karen, who care so much and have sacrificed so much and today suffer that loss with their community, but, more importantly, in private. So I know what Jason meant to you. I know what he means to you. He now belongs to the entire State of North Dakota. We will never forget his name or his sacrifice.

To the men and women of the Fargo Police Department, led by a great guy, Chief David Todd, I commend all of you for your courage and strength, for standing alongside the Moszers every step of the way. Jason's loss was your loss too. I stand in awe and appreciation of the job you do each and every day, and I thank you.

Next year, unfortunately, I will be coming to the floor again to honor Deputy Allery, as his name will be engraved on the memorial wall. My heart breaks about having to do this again, but I also consider it an incredible privilege to honor the very best of what we as a State and country have to offer.

To all of our peace officers, especially those back home in North Dakota, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for your sacrifice to the people of Fargo and the State of North Dakota.

I also want to mention that we walk by peace officers every day—peace officers who have the responsibility of protecting the most iconic image of American democracy; that is, the U.S. Capitol and the buildings we serve in. They stand ready to take anything that walks through that door. Let me tell

you, anyone who thinks that is an easy job—trying to anticipate, trying to pay attention, and trying to know how to treat our citizens with the utmost respect but also recognizing that every one of those people coming through the door at any of these gates, any of these doors, could be intent on doing damage to this institution and causing death among the people we work with every day—it is an awesome responsibility and I think a responsibility that too often goes unattended and unrecognized and unappreciated.

I want to stand today and give a shout-out not only to the great peace officers of my State but the great peace officers who serve with us every day. Whether they are in border patrol and protection, whether they are in Customs and Border Protection, whether they are police officers at the parks, whether they are police officers serving all across these Federal agencies, whether it be ICE or the FBI, we should be proud of the work that they do. We should be standing with them in the work they do because their job is as important as our job, and that is to protect our country and protect our people.

So I want to say it is not enough to just stand here and recognize the heroes. If we really want to appreciate peace officers and peace officer week, and if we want to really honor peace officers, every day is a day that we say thank you. Every day we pass a uniform of a peace officer who is protecting us, we say thank you. We recognize their service, we recognize their sacrifice, and we recognize that all too often they are the only people who stand between us and chaos, who stand on that line and protect our country and protect our children and protect our citizens.

May God bless all of our peace officers and may God bless the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I, too, stand in honor of National Police Week. I want to thank my two previous colleagues from Utah and North Dakota for their heartfelt tributes to the men and women in blue and the hard work they do in protecting us every day.

National Police Week was established in Congress in 1962. National Police Week is an opportunity to pay tribute to law enforcement officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty. It is also an opportunity to recognize and thank the members of our law enforcement community in Nevada and throughout the country.

Each day our law enforcement officers put themselves at risk to protect our families and to protect our communities. Their courage, selflessness, and commitment to serve is a reflection of

what makes this country so great; that is, their willingness to answer the call—without being asked—to put the welfare of others over themselves.

This commitment doesn't come without tremendous sacrifice. I was reminded of that earlier this month at the 30th annual James D. Hoff Peace Officer Memorial in Reno.

The James Hoff Peace Officer Memorial is a tribute to Nevada law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty. The memorial also recognizes officers who were placed in danger and survived. Named after Reno Police Officer James Hoff, who was killed in 1979 by the suspects he was investigating, the memorial hosts an annual ceremony attended by State and local officials and members of the law enforcement community. It is always a privilege to attend this annual event honoring the heroism of fellow Nevadans whose names and legacies are enshrined in this memorial.

At this year's ceremony, we honored and celebrated the life of Detective Chad Parque, who served with the North Las Vegas Police Department for 10 years. At just 32 years old, Detective Parque tragically lost his life after his department vehicle was struck head-on by another vehicle earlier this year. Detective Parque is survived by his wife, children, and siblings, and mourned by all of those who had the privilege to know him.

In describing Detective Parque, a fellow law enforcement officer said:

He was a ten-year officer and you could see the fire in his eyes as if he had just signed on. He loved his community.

He served with passion and dignity. He will never be forgotten for the many contributions to North Las Vegas and to our great State.

His plaque is now alongside other members of Nevada's law enforcement community who were enshrined on this memorial from past years and whose stories continue to inspire all of us.

In 2016, at least 144 law enforcement officers across this country lost their lives in the line of duty, a sharp increase from the previous year.

Let's not forget that behind the names—the many names—of those who have fallen are the people, spouses, children, and parents who may not have had a chance to say good-bye. Most of us will never know their pain, but we are deeply appreciative of their unwavering support for their community. While there is nothing we can do to bring back those who died in the line of duty, I am committed to doing everything I can at the Federal level to try to prevent it from happening to one more officer and one more family.

I am proud to support the Back the Blue Act, legislation that increases penalties for killing law enforcement officials. The bill ensures that anyone who purposely targets law enforcement should, and would, face justice for that crime.

The Nevada law enforcement community has my full support this Police Week—and every week and every day, each year they are on the job.

To all our law enforcement officials, we are all indebted to you and your families for all your sacrifices, and I am personally and sincerely grateful for your dedication to the people of Nevada.

To our protectors, our peacekeepers, and those who are first to answer the call for help and who run toward, not away, from danger, we thank you, and we honor you.

I yield the floor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I oppose Jeffrey Rosen's nomination to be Deputy Secretary of the Department of Transportation. Mr. Rosen has a troubling history of standing with industry over consumers and opposing common sense public health and environmental protections.

In both his time as general counsel at the Department of Transportation in the George W. Bush administration and his private sector work on behalf of industry, Mr. Rosen advocated for limits on the agency's authority to protect health and safety through the regulatory process. In one case when he was at the Department of Transportation, the National Highway Transportation Safety Agency proposed a weak standard for the required strength of vehicle roofs, which could collapse in rollovers. In addition to the weak standard, the rule would make it difficult for consumers who had been in accidents to seek damages from the companies responsible.

Mr. Rosen has also repeatedly questioned the necessity of limiting carbon emissions from vehicles. He opposed efforts to improve fuel economy standards that have spurred innovation, cut pollution, and saved consumers at the pump.

Mr. Rosen's ideological approach to regulation appears bent on minimizing rulemaking at any costs, regardless of the need. He has advocated for one-in, one-out regulatory schemes and "regulatory budgeting" that place arbitrary limits that would interfere with the ability of agencies to implement the law.

Agency leadership must focus on their mission and use the best available science and data to guide implementation of the law. Based on Mr. Rosen's history, I am concerned that he may politicize rulemaking, so I must oppose his nomination today.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

USER FEES

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, last year seems like a long time ago, but just 5 months ago, 94 Members of this body voted for a bill called the 21st Century Cures Act. Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL called it the most important legislation of the year. The Presiding Officer, the Senator from Ohio, had a major role in that legislation, especially the part having to do with opioids. This was legislation to spur research and development of cures, devices, and treatments for some of the most deadly and some of the most stubborn illnesses and diseases.

Dr. Frances Collins, head of the National Institutes of Health—which he calls the “National Institutes of Hope”—last year offered what he called bold predictions about major advances that we could expect over the next decade with a sustained commitment to medical research. One prediction of Dr. Collins is that science will find ways to identify Alzheimer’s before symptoms appear, as well as how to slow down or even prevent the disease. Another is that doctors could use the patient’s own stem cells to rebuild his or her heart. An artificial pancreas will help diabetes patients by tracking blood glucose levels and by creating precise doses of insulin. He also predicts a Zika vaccine, a universal flu vaccine, and an HIV/AIDS vaccine in the next 10 years. To relieve suffering and deal with the epidemic of opioid addiction, Dr. Collins predicts new, nonaddictive pain treatments to manage pain.

The 21st Century Cures Act became a law last year and authorized 4.8 billion new dollars for medical research, on top of the support Congress already provides through the annual appropriations process. Because of bipartisan support, that was an extra \$2 billion last year and an extra \$2 billion this year. The way we add up money around here, over 10 years, that is \$20 billion over 10 years last year and another \$20 billion this year, which includes the \$4.8 billion authorized in the 21st Century Cures legislation, all for medical research.

The next step in our efforts to turn Dr. Collins’ predictions into a reality and to help America’s patients benefit from all the research we are helping support is to fund the Food and Drug Administration. The FDA, as we call it, is the agency responsible for making good on the promise of the 21st Century Cures Act to actually reach America’s patients.

Before September 30 of this year, four different FDA user fee agreements need to be reauthorized. They need to be acted on by the Senate, by the House, and sent to the President of the United States. These user fees are paid by manufacturers of drugs and medical devices and account for \$8 billion to \$9 billion over 5 years and over a quarter of all FDA funding.

Last week, 21 of the 23 members of the Senate HELP Committee voted to send to the Senate floor a bill reauthorizing those four user fee agreements based on recommendations from industry and from the FDA after a thorough and lengthy public process.

The FDA Reauthorization Act, sponsored by me and by Senator MURRAY, the distinguished Senator from Washington who is the ranking Democrat on our Senate HELP Committee, reauthorizes the four user fee agreements that expire at the end of September. The four agreements are, No. 1, the prescription drug user fee, which accounted for 70 percent of the brand drug review budget last year; No. 2, medical device user fee amendments, which accounted for 36 percent of the medical device review budget in fiscal year 2016; the generic drug user fee amendments, which accounted for over 75 percent of the generic drug review budget in fiscal year 2016; and the biosimilar user fee amendments, which accounted for 29 percent of the biosimilar review budget in fiscal year 2016.

So here is my message to colleagues: The U.S. Senate has the opportunity to provide Americans with a prompt, bipartisan reauthorization of the Food and Drug Administration user fee agreements and, in doing so, take the next crucial step in helping Americans see the benefits of the results of our 21st Century Cures Act passed last year. If we do not move quickly to pass these agreements in late July, the FDA will be forced to send layoff notices to more than 5,000 FDA employees to notify them that they may lose their job in 60 days.

As I said, these reauthorizations are based on recommendations both from industry and from the Food and Drug Administration after a thorough public process. The FDA posted meeting minutes after every negotiation and held public meetings before discussions began and to hear feedback on the draft recommendations last fall.

Patients were also involved in developing commitment letters. We have received support from patient groups asking us to authorize the agreements expeditiously.

In Congress, over the last 15 months, the Senate HELP Committee, of which I am chairman and Senator MURRAY is the ranking Democrat, had 15 bipartisan briefings, some of which were with the Energy and Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, and heard, as well, from the FDA and industry about the reauthorization.

Our HELP Committee held two bipartisan hearings earlier this year on the Food and Drug Administration medical device and drug user fees and released a discussion draft of our legislation on April 14, which provided 2 weeks for public comment.

I go into all this because I want everyone to see how thoroughly this has been discussed and how important it is.

The committee then worked in a bipartisan way to incorporate comments from the public and from members of the committee.

The manager’s amendment—which we approved in the committee last week, as I said, by a vote of 21 to 2—includes many priorities that are broadly bipartisan. Here are a few examples: legislation from Senators ISAKSON and BENNET to improve the medical device inspection process; a provision from Senator HASSAN, Democrat, and Senator YOUNG, Republican, to improve communication about abuse-deterrent opioid products; from Senators FRANKEN, Democrat, and Senator ENZI, Republican, a provision to encourage medical device development for children and make sure FDA has the appropriate expertise to review devices for children; from Senator BALDWIN, a provision to make sure the full experience of clinical trial participants is studied; from Senator BURR and Senator YOUNG, additional reporting to make sure that the FDA is meeting their goals and that we can do proper oversight of the new agreements. It includes legislation by Senators CASEY, FRANKEN, and WARREN on a pilot project on studying medical devices after approval to make sure they work as intended. A provision from Senator CASSIDY requiring additional guidance for complex generics, like EpiPens, so manufacturers know what they have to do to make a generic version, was also included. A provision to make new hearing aid technology available came from Senators WARREN and ISAKSON, as well as a provision from Senators ROBERTS, DONNELLY, and BURR to allow more appropriate classification of accessories used with medical devices.

In the committee markup last week, we unanimously adopted these bipartisan amendments, which follow: an amendment from Senator COLLINS, which reflected legislation from Senators COLLINS, FRANKEN, MCCASKILL, and COTTON on improving generic drug development and helping to lower prescription drug costs; an amendment from Senators HATCH, BURR, and CASEY to improve patient access to clinical trials.

A delay in reauthorizing these agreements would delay the review of drugs and devices submitted after last April 1—more than a month ago. If we don’t pass these reauthorizations into law on time, which means by the end of July, an FDA reviewer who gets started reviewing a cancer drug submitted to the agency in April would be laid off on October 1, before the reviewer is able to finish his or her work. In addition to harming patients and harming families who rely on medical innovation, a delay in the reauthorization would threaten America’s global leadership in biomedical innovation.

After reviewing the recommendations from industry and from the FDA,

I am convinced these are good agreements for patients. The sooner we pass this legislation, the better, to give certainty to patients, doctors, FDA reviewers, and companies.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS' BENEFITS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 10, S. 419.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 419) to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Grassley substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 216) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The bill (S. 419), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RAPID DNA ACT OF 2017

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 74, S. 139.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 139) to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be

considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 139) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:
S. 139

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Rapid DNA Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. RAPID DNA INSTRUMENTS.

(a) STANDARDS.—Section 210303(a) of the DNA Identification Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14131(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5)(A) In addition to issuing standards as provided in paragraphs (1) through (4), the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall issue standards and procedures for the use of Rapid DNA instruments and resulting DNA analyses.

"(B) In this Act, the term 'Rapid DNA instruments' means instrumentation that carries out a fully automated process to derive a DNA analysis from a DNA sample."

(b) INDEX.—Paragraph (2) of section 210304(b) of the DNA Identification Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14132(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) prepared by—

"(A) laboratories that—

"(i) have been accredited by a nonprofit professional association of persons actively involved in forensic science that is nationally recognized within the forensic science community; and

"(ii) undergo external audits, not less than once every 2 years, that demonstrate compliance with standards established by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; or

"(B) criminal justice agencies using Rapid DNA instruments approved by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in compliance with the standards and procedures issued by the Director under section 210303(a)(5); and"

SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COLLECTION OF DNA IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.

(a) FROM CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFENDERS.—Section 3 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following: "The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may waive the requirements under this subsection if DNA samples are analyzed by means of Rapid DNA instruments and the results are included in CODIS."; and

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following:

"(3) The term 'Rapid DNA instruments' means instrumentation that carries out a fully automated process to derive a DNA analysis from a DNA sample."

(b) FROM CERTAIN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFENDERS.—Section 4 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following: "The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may waive the requirements under this subsection if DNA samples are analyzed by means of Rapid DNA instruments and the results are included in CODIS."; and

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following:

"(3) The term 'Rapid DNA instruments' means instrumentation that carries out a fully automated process to derive a DNA analysis from a DNA sample."

AMERICAN LAW ENFORCEMENT HEROES ACT OF 2017

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 75, S. 583.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 583) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 583) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 583

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Law Enforcement Heroes Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. PRIORITIZING HIRING AND TRAINING OF VETERANS.

Section 1701(b)(2) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(b)(2)) is amended by inserting "including by prioritizing the hiring and training of veterans (as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code)" after "Nation".

LAW ENFORCEMENT MENTAL HEALTH AND WELLNESS ACT OF 2017

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 867 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 867) to provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be

considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 867) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 867

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. SUPPORT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.

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

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

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

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

(c) PEER MENTORING PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 1701(b) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(b)) is amended—

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

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

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

SEC. 3. SUPPORT FOR MENTAL HEALTH PROVIDERS.

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

SEC. 4. SUPPORT FOR OFFICERS.

The Attorney General shall—

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

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

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

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

(2) in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the head of other Federal agencies that employ law enforcement officers, examine the mental health

and wellness needs of Federal law enforcement officers, including the efficacy of expanding peer mentoring programs for law enforcement officers at each Federal agency; and

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

GRANTING THE CONSENT AND APPROVAL OF CONGRESS TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, THE STATE OF MARYLAND, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO ENTER INTO A COMPACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 22 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 22) granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Commonwealth of Virginia, the State of Maryland, and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact relating to the establishment of the Washington Metrorail Safety Commission.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I further ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered read a third time and passed, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 22) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S.J. RES. 22

Whereas the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, an interstate compact agency of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the State of Maryland, provides transportation services to millions of people each year, the safety of whom is paramount;

Whereas an effective and safe Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority system is essential to the commerce and prosperity of the National Capital region;

Whereas the Tri-State Oversight Committee, created by a memorandum of understanding amongst these 3 jurisdictions, has provided safety oversight of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority;

Whereas section 5329 of title 49, United States Code, requires the creation of a legally and financially independent State authority for safety oversight of all fixed rail transit facilities;

Whereas the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the State of Maryland intend to create a Washington Metrorail Safety Commission to act as the State safety oversight authority for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority system under section 5329 of title 49, United States Code; and

Whereas this compact is created for the benefit of the people of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the State of Maryland and for the increase of their safety, commerce, and prosperity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent and approval of Congress is hereby given to the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the State of Maryland to enter into a compact, substantially as follows, for the safety oversight of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority system, which compact, known as the Metrorail Safety Commission Interstate Compact, has been negotiated by representatives of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the State of Maryland:

“ARTICLE I

“DEFINITIONS

“1. As used in this MSC Compact, the following words and terms shall have the meanings set forth below, unless the context clearly requires a different meaning. Capitalized terms used herein, but not otherwise defined in this MSC Compact, shall have the definitions set forth in regulations issued under section 5329 of title 49, United States Code, as they may be revised from time to time.

“(a) ‘Alternate Member’ means an alternate member of the Board;

“(b) ‘Board’ means the board of directors of the Commission;

“(c) ‘Commission’ means the Washington Metrorail Safety Commission;

“(d) ‘Member’ means a member of the Board;

“(e) ‘MSC Compact’ means this Washington Metrorail Safety Commission Interstate Compact;

“(f) ‘Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan’ means the comprehensive agency safety plan for a rail transit agency required by section 5329 of title 49, United States Code, and the regulations issued thereunder, as may be amended or revised from time to time;

“(g) ‘Public Transportation Safety Certification Training Program’ means the Federal certification training program, as established and amended from time to time by applicable Federal laws and regulations, for Federal and State employees, or other designated personnel, who conduct safety audits and examinations of public transportation systems, and employees of public transportation agencies directly responsible for safety oversight;

“(h) ‘Safety Sensitive Position’ means any position held by a WMATA employee or contractor designated in the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan for the WMATA Rail System and approved by the Commission as directly or indirectly affecting the safety of the passengers or employees of the WMATA Rail System;

“(i) ‘Signatory’ means the State of Maryland, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the District of Columbia;

“(j) ‘State’ or ‘jurisdiction’ means the District of Columbia, the State of Maryland, or the Commonwealth of Virginia;

“(k) ‘Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority’ or ‘WMATA’ is the entity created by the WMATA Compact, which entity is responsible for providing certain rail fixed guideway public transportation system services;

“(l) ‘WMATA Compact’ means the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Compact (Public Law 89-774; 80 Stat. 1324); and

“(m) ‘WMATA Rail System’ or ‘Metrorail’ means the rail fixed guideway public transportation system and all other real and personal property owned, leased, operated, or otherwise used by WMATA rail services and shall include WMATA rail projects under design or construction by owners other than WMATA.

“ARTICLE II

“PURPOSE AND FUNCTIONS

“2. The Signatories to the WMATA Compact hereby adopt this MSC Compact pursuant to section 5329 of title 49, United States Code. The Commission created hereunder shall have safety regulatory and enforcement authority over the WMATA Rail System and shall act as the State safety oversight authority for WMATA under section 5329 of title 49, United States Code, as may be amended from time to time. WMATA shall be subject to the Commission’s rules, regulations, actions, and orders.

“3. The purpose of this MSC Compact is to create a State safety oversight authority for the WMATA Rail System, pursuant to the mandate of Federal law, as a common agency of each Signatory, empowered in the manner hereinafter set forth to review, approve, oversee, and enforce the safety of the WMATA Rail System, including, without limitation, to—

“(a) have exclusive safety oversight authority and responsibility over the WMATA Rail System pursuant to Federal law, including, without limitation, the power to restrict, suspend, or prohibit rail service on all or part of the WMATA Rail System as set forth in this MSC Compact;

“(b) develop and adopt a written State safety oversight program standard;

“(c) review and approve the WMATA Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan;

“(d) investigate hazards, incidents, and accidents on the WMATA Rail System;

“(e) require, review, approve, oversee, and enforce Corrective Action Plans developed by WMATA; and

“(f) meet other requirements of Federal and State law relating to safety oversight of the WMATA Rail System.

“ARTICLE III

“ESTABLISHMENT AND ORGANIZATION

“A. Washington Metrorail Safety Commission

“4. The Commission is hereby created as an instrumentality of each Signatory, which shall be a public body corporate and politic, and which shall have the powers and duties set forth in this MSC Compact.

“5. The Commission shall be financially and legally independent from WMATA.

“B. Board Membership

“6. The Commission shall be governed by a Board of 6 Members with 2 Members appointed or reappointed (including to fill an unexpired term) by each Signatory pursuant to the Signatory’s applicable laws.

“7. Each Signatory shall also appoint or reappoint (including to fill an unexpired term) one Alternate Member pursuant to the Signatory’s applicable laws.

“8. An Alternate Member shall participate and take action as a Member only in the ab-

sence of one or both Members appointed from the same jurisdiction as the Alternate Member’s appointing jurisdiction and, in such instances, may cast a single vote.

“9. Members and Alternate Members shall have backgrounds in transit safety, transportation, relevant engineering disciplines, or public finance.

“10. No Member or Alternate Member shall simultaneously hold an elected public office, serve on the WMATA board of directors, be employed by WMATA, or be a contractor to WMATA.

“11. Each Member and Alternate Member shall serve a 4-year term and may be reappointed for additional terms, except that each Signatory shall make its initial appointments as follows:

“(a) One Member shall be appointed for a 4-year term.

“(b) One Member shall be appointed for a 2-year term.

“(c) The Alternate Member shall be appointed for a 3-year term.

“12. Any person appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the unexpired term.

“13. Members and Alternate Members shall be entitled to reimbursement for reasonable and necessary expenses and shall be compensated for each day spent meeting on the business of the Commission at a rate of \$200 per day or at such other rate as may be adjusted in appropriations approved by all of the Signatories.

“14. A Member or an Alternate Member may be removed or suspended from office only for cause in accordance with the laws of such Member’s or Alternate Member’s appointing jurisdiction.

“C. Quorum and Actions of the Board.

“15. Four Members shall constitute a quorum, and the affirmative vote of 4 Members is required for action of the Board. Quorum and voting requirements under this section may be met with one or more Alternate Members pursuant to section 8.

“16. The Commission action shall become effective upon enactment unless otherwise provided for by the Commission.

“D. Oath of Office

“17. Before entering office, each Member and Alternate Member shall take and subscribe to the following oath (or affirmation) of office or any such other oath or affirmation as the constitution or laws of the Signatory he or she represents shall provide:

“I, _____, hereby solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States as a Member (or Alternate Member) of the Board of the Washington Metrorail Safety Commission and will faithfully discharge the duties of the office upon which I am about to enter.

“E. Organization and Procedure

“18. The Board shall provide for its own organization and procedure. Meetings of the Board shall be held as frequently as the Board determines, but in no event less than quarterly. The Board shall keep minutes of its meetings and establish rules and regulations governing its transactions and internal affairs, including, without limitation, policies regarding records retention that are not in conflict with applicable Federal record retention laws.

“19. The Commission shall keep commercially reasonable records of its financial transactions in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

“20. The Commission shall establish an office for the conduct of its affairs at a location to be determined by the Commission.

“21. The Commission shall adopt subsections (a) through (d) and subsection (g) of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Freedom of Information Act’) and section 552b of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Government in Sunshine Act’), as both may be amended from time to time, as its freedom of information policy and open meeting policy, respectively, and shall not be subject to the comparable laws or policies of any Signatory.

“22. Reports of investigations or inquiries adopted by the Board shall be made publicly available.

“23. The Commission shall adopt a policy on conflict of interest that shall be consistent with the regulations issued under section 5329 of title 49, United States Code, as they may be revised from time to time, which, among other things, places appropriate separation between Members, officers, employees, contractors, and agents of the Commission and WMATA.

“24. The Commission shall adopt and utilize its own administrative procedure and procurement policies in conformance with applicable Federal regulations and shall not be subject to the administrative procedure or procurement laws of any Signatory.

“F. Officers and Employees

“25. The Board shall elect a Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary, and Treasurer from among its Members, each for a 2-year term and shall prescribe their powers and duties.

“26. The Board shall appoint and fix the compensation and benefits of a chief executive officer who shall be the chief administrative officer of the Commission and who shall have expertise in transportation safety and one or more industry-recognized transportation safety certifications.

“27. Consistent with section 5329 of title 49, United States Code, as may be amended from time to time, the Commission may employ, under the direction of the chief executive officer, such other technical, legal, clerical, and other employees on a regular, part-time, or as-needed basis as it determines necessary or desirable for the discharge of its duties.

“28. The Commission shall not be bound by any statute or regulation of any Signatory in the employment or discharge of any officer or employee of the Commission, but shall develop its own policies in compliance with Federal law. The MSC shall, however, consider the laws of the Signatories in devising its employment and discharge policies, and when it deems it practical, devise policies consistent with the laws of the Signatories.

“29. The Board may fix and provide policies for the qualification, appointment, removal, term, tenure, compensation benefits, worker’s compensation, pension, and retirement rights of its employees subject to Federal law. The Board may also establish a personnel system based on merit and fitness and, subject to eligibility, participate in the pension, retirement, and worker’s compensation plans of any Signatory or agency or political subdivision thereof.

“ARTICLE IV

“POWERS

“A. Safety Oversight Power.

“30. In carrying out its purposes, the Commission, through its Board or designated employees or agents, shall, consistent with Federal law—

“(a) adopt, revise, and distribute a written State Safety Oversight Program;

“(b) review, approve, oversee, and enforce the adoption and implementation of WMATA’s Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan;

“(c) require, review, approve, oversee, and enforce the adoption and implementation of any Corrective Action Plans that the Commission deems appropriate;

“(d) implement and enforce relevant Federal and State laws and regulations relating to safety of the WMATA Rail System; and

“(e) audit every 3 years the compliance of WMATA with WMATA’s Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan or conduct such an audit on an ongoing basis over a 3-year time frame.

“31. In performing its duties, the Commission, through its Board or designated employees or agents, may do the following:

“(a) Conduct, or cause to be conducted, inspections, investigations, examinations, and testing of WMATA personnel and contractors, property, equipment, facilities, rolling stock, and operations of the WMATA Rail System, including, without limitation, electronic information and databases through reasonable means, which may include issuance of subpoenas.

“(b) Enter upon the WMATA Rail System and, upon reasonable notice and a finding by the chief executive officer that a need exists, upon any lands, waters, and premises adjacent to the WMATA Rail System, including, without limitation, property owned or occupied by the Federal Government, for the purpose of making inspections, investigations, examinations, and testing as the Commission may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this MSC Compact, and such entry shall not be deemed a trespass. The Commission shall make reasonable reimbursement for any actual damage resulting to any such adjacent lands, waters, and premises as a result of such activities.

“(c) Compel WMATA’s compliance with any Corrective Action Plan or order of the Commission by such means as the Commission deems appropriate, including, without limitation, by—

“(1) taking legal action in a court of competent jurisdiction;

“(2) issuing citations or fines with funds going into an escrow account for spending by WMATA on Commission-directed safety measures;

“(3) directing WMATA to prioritize spending on safety-critical items;

“(4) removing a specific vehicle, infrastructure element, or hazard from the WMATA Rail System; and

“(5) compelling WMATA to restrict, suspend, or prohibit rail service on all or part of the WMATA Rail System with an appropriate notice period dictated by the circumstances.

“(d) Direct WMATA to suspend or disqualify from performing in any Safety Sensitive Position an individual who is alleged to or has violated safety rules, regulations, policies, or laws.

“(e) Compel WMATA’s Office of the Inspector General, created under WMATA Board Resolution 2006–18, or any successor WMATA office or organization having similar duties, to conduct safety-related audits or investigations and to provide its findings to the Commission.

“(f) Take such other actions as the Commission may deem appropriate consistent with its purpose and powers.

“32. Action by the Board under section 31(c)(5) shall require the unanimous vote of all Members present and voting. The Commission shall coordinate its enforcement activities with appropriate Federal and State governmental authorities.

“B. General Powers

“33. In addition to the powers and duties set forth above, the Commission may—

“(a) sue and be sued;

“(b) adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations respecting the exercise of the powers conferred by this MSC Compact;

“(c) create and abolish offices, employees, and positions (other than those specifically provided for in this MSC Compact) necessary or desirable for the purposes of the Commission;

“(d) determine a staffing level for the Commission that is commensurate with the size and complexity of the WMATA Rail System, and require that employees and other designated personnel of the Commission, who are responsible for safety oversight, be qualified to perform such functions through appropriate training, including, without limitation, successful completion of the Public Transportation Safety Certification Training Program;

“(e) contract for or employ consulting attorneys, inspectors, engineers, and such other experts necessary or desirable and, within the limitations prescribed in this MSC Compact, prescribe their powers and duties and fix their compensation;

“(f) enter into and perform contracts, leases, and agreements necessary or desirable in the performance of its duties and in the execution of the powers granted under this MSC Compact;

“(g) apply for, receive, and accept such payments, appropriations, grants, gifts, loans, advances, and other funds, properties, and services as may be transferred or made available to it by the United States government or any other public or private entity or individual, subject to the limitations specified in section 42;

“(h) adopt an official seal and alter the same at its pleasure;

“(i) adopt and amend by-laws, policies, and procedures governing the regulation of its affairs;

“(j) appoint one or more advisory committees; and

“(k) do such other acts necessary or desirable for the performance of its duties and the execution of its powers under this MSC Compact.

“34. Consistent with this MSC Compact, the Commission shall promulgate rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this MSC Compact.

“ARTICLE V

“GENERAL PROVISIONS

“A. Annual Safety Report

“35. The Commission shall make and publish annually a status report on the safety of the WMATA Rail System, which shall include, among other requirements established by the Commission and Federal law, status updates of outstanding Corrective Action Plans, Commission directives, and on-going investigations. A copy of each such report shall be provided to—

“(a) the Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration;

“(b) the Governor of Virginia, the Governor of Maryland, and the Mayor of the District of Columbia;

“(c) the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia;

“(d) the President of the Maryland Senate and the Speaker of the Maryland House of Delegates;

“(e) the President of the Virginia Senate and the Speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates; and

“(f) the General Manager and each member of the board of directors of WMATA.

“36. The Commission may prepare, publish, and distribute such other safety reports that it deems necessary or desirable.

“B. Annual Report of Operations

“37. The Commission shall make and publish an annual report on its programs, operations, and finances, which shall be distributed in the same manner provided by section 35.

“38. The Commission may also prepare, publish, and distribute such other public reports and informational materials as it deems necessary or desirable.

“C. Annual Independent Audit

“39. An independent annual audit shall be made of the financial accounts of the Commission. The audit shall be made by qualified certified public accountants selected by the Board, who shall have no personal interest, direct or indirect, in the financial affairs of the Commission or any of its officers or employees. The report of audit shall be prepared in accordance with generally accepted auditing principles and shall be distributed in the same manner provided by section 35. Members, employees, agents, and contractors of the Commission shall provide access to information necessary or desirable for the conduct of the annual audit.

“D. Financing

“40. The Commission’s operations shall be funded, independently of WMATA, by the Signatory jurisdictions and, when available, by Federal funds. The Commission shall have no authority to levy taxes.

“41. The Signatories shall unanimously agree on adequate funding levels for the Commission and make equal contributions of such funding, subject to annual appropriation, to cover the portion of Commission operations not funded by Federal funds.

“42. The Commission may borrow up to 5 percent of its last annual appropriations budget in anticipation of receipts, or as otherwise set forth in the appropriations budget approved by all of the Signatories, from any lawful lending institution for any purpose of this MSC Compact, including, without limitation, for administrative expenses. Such loans shall be for a term not to exceed 2 years, or at such longer term approved by each Signatory pursuant to its laws as evidenced by the written authorization by the Mayor of the District of Columbia and the Governors of Maryland and Virginia, and at such rates of interest as shall be acceptable to the Commission.

“43. With respect to the District of Columbia, the commitment or obligation to render financial assistance to the Commission shall be created, by appropriation or in such other manner, or by such other legislation, as the District of Columbia shall determine; provided, that any such commitment or obligation shall be approved by Congress pursuant to the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (Public Law 93–198; 87 Stat. 774).

“44. Pursuant to the requirements of sections 1341, 1342, 1349, 1350, 1351, 1511, and 1519 of title 31, United States Code, and sections 47–105 and 47–355.01 to 355.08 of the D.C. Official Code (collectively referred to in this section as the ‘Anti-Deficiency Acts’), the District of Columbia cannot obligate itself to any financial commitment in any present or future year unless the necessary funds to pay that commitment have been appropriated and are lawfully available for the purpose committed. Thus, pursuant to the Anti-Deficiency Acts, nothing in the MSC Compact creates an obligation of the District of Columbia in anticipation of an appropriation for such purpose, and the District of Columbia’s legal liability for the payment of any amount under this MSC Compact does not and may not arise or obtain in advance of the lawful availability of appropriated funds for the applicable fiscal year.

"E. Tax Exemption

"45. The exercise of the powers granted by this MSC Compact shall in all respects be for the benefit of the people of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the State of Maryland and for the increase of their safety, commerce, and prosperity, and as the activities associated with this MSC Compact shall constitute the performance of essential governmental functions, the Commission shall not be required to pay any taxes or assessments upon the services or any property acquired or used by the Commission under the provisions of this MSC Compact or upon the income therefrom, and shall at all times be free from taxation within the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the State of Maryland.

"F. Reconsideration of Commission Orders

"46. WMATA shall have the right to petition the Commission for reconsideration of an order based on rules and procedures developed by the Commission.

"47. Consistent with section 16, the filing of a petition for reconsideration shall not act as a stay upon the execution of a Commission order, or any part of it, unless the Commission orders otherwise. WMATA may appeal any adverse action on a petition for reconsideration as set forth in section 48.

"G. Judicial Matters

"48. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Alexandria Division, the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, Southern Division, and the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive and original jurisdiction of all actions brought by or against the Commission and to enforce subpoenas under this MSC Compact.

"49. The commencement of a judicial proceeding shall not operate as a stay of a Commission order unless specifically ordered by the court.

"H. Liability and Indemnification

"50. The Commission and its Members, Alternate Members, officers, agents, employees, or representatives shall not be liable for suit or action or for any judgment or decree for damages, loss, or injury resulting from action taken within the scope of their employment or duties under this MSC Compact, nor required in any case arising or any appeal taken under this MSC Compact to give a supersedeas bond or security for damages. Nothing in this section shall be construed to protect such person from suit or liability for damage, loss, injury, or liability caused by the intentional or willful and wanton misconduct of such person.

"51. The Commission shall be liable for its contracts and for its torts and those of its Members, Alternate Members, officers, agents, employees, and representatives committed in the conduct of any proprietary function, in accordance with the law of the applicable Signatory (including, without limitation, rules on conflict of laws) but shall not be liable for any torts occurring in the performance of a governmental function. The exclusive remedy for such breach of contract or tort for which the Commission shall be liable, as herein provided, shall be by suit against the Commission. Nothing contained in this MSC Compact shall be construed as a waiver by the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Virginia, or the State of Maryland of any immunity from suit.

"I. Commitment of Parties

"52. Each of the Signatories pledges to each other faithful cooperation in providing safety oversight for the WMATA Rail Sys-

tem, and, to affect such purposes, agrees to consider in good faith and request any necessary legislation to achieve the objectives of this MSC Compact.

"J. Amendments and Supplements

"53. Amendments and supplements to this MSC Compact shall be adopted by legislative action of each of the Signatories and the consent of Congress. When one Signatory adopts an amendment or supplement to an existing section of this MSC Compact, that amendment or supplement shall not be immediately effective, and the previously enacted provision or provisions shall remain in effect in each jurisdiction until the amendment or supplement is approved by the other Signatories and is consented to by Congress.

"K. Withdrawal and Termination

"54. Any Signatory may withdraw from this MSC Compact, which action shall constitute a termination of this MSC Compact.

"55. Withdrawal from this MSC Compact shall be by a Signatory's repeal of this MSC Compact from its laws, but such repeal shall not take effect until 2 years after the effective date of the repealed statute and written notice of the withdrawal being given by the withdrawing Signatory to the governors or mayor, as appropriate, of the other Signatories.

"56. Prior to termination of this MSC Compact, the Commission shall provide each Signatory—

"(a) a mechanism for concluding the operations of the Commission;

"(b) a proposal to maintain State safety oversight of the WMATA Rail System in compliance with applicable Federal law;

"(c) a plan to hold surplus funds in a trust for a successor regulatory entity for 4 years after the termination of this MSC Compact; and

"(d) a plan to return any surplus funds that remain 4 years after the creation of the trust.

"L. Construction and Severability

"57. This MSC Compact shall be liberally construed to effectuate the purposes for which it is created.

"58. If any part or provision of this MSC Compact or the application thereof to any person or circumstances be adjudged invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such judgment shall be confined in its operation to the part, provision, or application directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered and shall not affect or impair the validity of the remainder of this MSC Compact or the application thereof to other persons or circumstances, and the Signatories hereby declare that they would have entered into this MSC Compact or the remainder thereof had the invalidity of such provision or application thereof been apparent.

"M. Adoption; Effective Date

"59. This MSC Compact shall be adopted by the Signatories in the manner provided by law therefor and shall be signed and sealed in 4 duplicate original copies. One such copy shall be filed with the Secretary of State of the State of Maryland, the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the Secretary of the District of Columbia in accordance with the laws of each jurisdiction. One copy shall be filed and retained in the archives of the Commission upon its organization. This MSC Compact shall become effective upon the enactment of concurring legislation by the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the State of Maryland, and consent thereto by Congress and when all other acts or actions have been taken, including, without limitation, the

signing and execution of this MSC Compact by the Governors of Maryland and Virginia and the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

"L. Conflict of Laws

"60. Any conflict between any authority granted herein, or the exercise of such authority, and the provisions of the WMATA Compact shall be resolved in favor of the exercise of such authority by the Commission.

"61. All other general or special laws inconsistent with this MSC Compact are hereby declared to be inapplicable to the Commission or its activities."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, this week, our Nation observes National Police Week. This year, during National Police Week, we pay tribute to 143 officers who died in the line of duty during 2016—among them, Sergeant Allen David Brandt of the Fairbanks Police Department. I come to the floor to acknowledge not only Sergeant Brandt but all those officers who served us so honorably.

Sergeant Brandt's wife Natasha and children, Fritz, Kate, Claire, and Belle have traveled all the way from Fairbanks to participate in the events this week. They are accompanied by Allen's best friend, Officer Phil McBroom of the North Pole Police Department, as well as a large group of colleagues from the Fairbanks Police Department, led by Chief Eric Jewkes.

Chief Jewkes, joined by Sergeant Lockwood and Officer Werner, came into Washington for Police Week in a somewhat unique way. They joined 2,200 officers from around the Nation in a 4-day charity bike ride from Northern New Jersey to Washington, DC. They call it the Police Unity Tour, and their motto is: "We ride for those who died."

Police Week begins with the dedication of names added this year to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial on Judiciary Square. That dedication occurs during a very, very moving candlelight vigil at the beginning of Police Week. The candlelight vigil was conducted on Saturday evening on the National Mall this year.

Chief Jewkes, in full uniform, read Allen's name before a crowd numbering 10,000 people or more. A bell was rung, acknowledging the loss of Allen David Brandt. Allen's name was the only Alaska name added to the wall this year.

I wish to thank Craig Floyd, who is the president of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, for the courtesy in affording Chief Jewkes this special honor.

Allen's name is now inscribed in perpetuity on the memorial wall among the 21,000 officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice. His name appears on the bottom of Panel 21—East. This week, the shoulder patch of the Fairbanks Police Department is affixed at the top of that panel. Quite coincidentally, a few lines up on that same panel are the names of Officers Matt Tokuoaka and Anthony Wallace of the Hoonah Police Department, who were brought down by an assailant's bullet in 2010.

During Police Week, we do not dwell on the circumstances under which law enforcement officers gave their lives. We rather focus on how they lived their exemplary lives, and, yes, we pay our respects to the fallen, but Police Week also looks forward. The annual survivor's seminar, sponsored by Concerns of Police Survivors, which helps those who have suffered a law enforcement tragedy grieve and ultimately recover, is an important part of this week as well.

While so much of Police Week is for the law enforcement family, those of us in Washington cannot help but notice what is going on around us—officers in uniform, honor guards, motorcycles, police cars from around the country, the entire law enforcement family—Federal, State, local, Tribal, and visiting officers from places like Canada, England, and Israel.

Many visiting officers bring their spouses. Some bring their children. We are able to truly see the faces behind those uniforms and those badges, and we can look into the eyes of the families.

Let me say a few words about the children who have come in for the observance. You see them on the Metro, sitting atop their father's shoulders. Daddy is wearing his dress uniform. At the candlelight vigil, one of my staff members witnessed a U.S. Park Police officer, in uniform, explaining to her young daughter the meaning of the ceremony. You experience the words of the children at the memorial wall itself, where Emma Moody, the 10-year-old daughter of a fallen California officer, left a hand-drawn memorial to her dad, and it reads:

When I get to heaven the first thing I am going to do is find you. The second thing I will do is never ever let you go again.

When you experience things like this, you cannot help but appreciate the humanity behind the uniforms—a father, a mother, an aunt, an uncle, a friend, a colleague, a neighbor. Law enforcement is no stranger to controversy. Yet it is so important that we see beyond controversy; that when we look at an officer we see the humanity that

runs toward danger and not from it; the humanity that responds to every call for service, not knowing whether it will be the last; the humanity that kisses a child goodbye before beginning a shift, not knowing whether he will ever see those children again; the humanity that was Allen Brandt.

The story I just recited is Allen's story. Allen was released from the hospital after being shot five times by an assailant. He died from complications associated with a second series of surgeries.

Allen lived long enough to appear before the Fairbanks City Council and thank the community for their support. He also offered some very cautionary words. He said:

Our officers do a very hard job, most of the time thankless. Working weekends when their friends are with their families. Working nights and sleeping during the day. We need your support and not just when bad things happen.

A few weeks later, Anchorage Police Officer Arn Salao thought he was responding to a call involving a dispute between a cabdriver and his passenger. When he arrived at the scene, he was ambushed and shot four times. Miraculously, Officer Salao survived his injuries.

In spite of these tragedies, it is dispiriting that people continue to challenge law enforcement. Last week, Colonel James Cockrell, retired after 30 years with the Alaska State Troopers, and just prior to his retirement, reflected on the dangers troopers face. Assaults on Alaska State Troopers are up, from 52 in 2013 to 131 last year.

I wish to share with the Senate a few lines from an interview with KTUU in Anchorage. Colonel Cockrell said:

I think there's generally a little bit less respect for law enforcement. I think a lot of that spurred from the Lower 48. We're having troopers contact people in a one-on-one situation. Individuals are more apt to fight with us if they think they have an advantage, when we don't have backup. We don't have two or three troopers responding to a high risk crime in progress. The consequences are that people are more apt to fight with our Troopers.

All of this is deeply tragic. As I look across the Nation, we are not really seeing any signs of abatement. Some might be attributable to the opioid crisis, some to a loss of respect for law enforcement, and some simply because suspects challenge law enforcement in hopes of evading them.

This year, law enforcement has already suffered 48 line-of-duty deaths, 17 of those from gunfire. This fact is not lost on the officers from Interior Alaska who are in our Nation's Capital this week. It is not lost on those who are considering law enforcement careers but decide to perhaps take a pass, leaving critical vacancies in agencies throughout the country. Law enforcement remains very dangerous work, and for all the satisfaction that comes

from serving people in their darkest moments, there are no guarantees the officer will return home.

I hope that, during this National Police Week and throughout the year, we will reflect on Allen Brandt's final words: "Law enforcement needs our support and not just when bad things happen."

In these times, law enforcement needs that support now more than ever. On behalf of my Senate colleagues, I offer my continued condolences to Natasha Brandt and her family, to Allen Brandt's colleagues, and to survivors of law enforcement tragedies everywhere.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CHINA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today as part of my office's Expression NOT Oppression initiative, which highlights human rights abuses around the world and the plight of individuals imprisoned or oppressed for simply exercising their God-given rights.

Earlier this month, we observed World Press Freedom Day, which serves as a reminder that freedom of expression is a fundamental, universal human right and that a free press is vital to a free society.

We should never take for granted the freedom of the press we enjoy here in the United States. These rights are an integral part of the bedrock of any healthy democracy, and in too many parts of the world, they are nonexistent or under assault.

According to Reporters Without Borders' 2017 World Press Freedom Index, press freedom is threatened now more than ever. Governments around the world continue to crack down on their citizens' access to information. Out of 180 countries, Burundi dropped from 156 to 160. Most problematic for press freedom, Egypt dropped from 159 to 161, and Bahrain dropped from 162 to 164.

Additionally, Reporters Without Borders has reported that at least nine journalists have been killed already in 2017. Several were killed in Mexico, here in our own hemisphere. It is hard to believe that people are being thrown in jail or worse simply because government officials don't like what they write or publish, but that is what is happening, especially in countries like China, Russia, Iran, and Saudi Arabia, just to name a few.

The case I come to the floor today to highlight is that of Huang Qi, who has long been targeted by the Chinese Government because of his advocacy for

the rights of ordinary citizens and his coverage of the Chinese Government's violation of those rights. In November of last year, the police reportedly burst into his residence and ransacked his home and took him to detention. In December of last year, Chinese prosecutors authorized Huang's arrest for allegedly "illegally providing state secrets overseas," a charge that can result in a sentence of life imprisonment. The Committee to Protect Journalists described his detention as part of "an intensified crackdown on online journalists and bloggers who report on protests and human rights abuses."

Huang founded the 64 Tianwang human rights website in 1998. The Chinese Government has blocked access to 64 Tianwang since 2003, according to Radio Free Asia, because the site covers issues deemed politically sensitive by authorities, such as protests and government corruption.

Authorities previously sentenced Huang to 3 years in prison in November 2009 for "illegal possession of state secrets"—this in connection with his work assisting parents who lost children during the 2008 Sichuan earthquake. In addition, Chinese authorities sentenced Huang to 5 years in prison in 2000 for "subversion" for his advocacy on behalf of the families of the 1989 Tiananmen protest victims—a solemn anniversary we will mark next month.

In short, Huang, a veteran activist, is no stranger to the Chinese Government's silencing of dissent. His life's work is a testament to fearless reporting regardless of what consequences may follow. While his own government views him as a threat, outside of China, his work is widely praised and recognized. Reporters Without Borders awarded the 2016 Press Freedom Award to his website. His case has been championed by Human Rights Watch, Freedom House, and others, including the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, which I am proud to chair. His case is featured in the Commission's Political Prisoner Database, which presently contains more than 1,400 active prisoner records—a staggering but far from exhaustive number.

Huang is committed to reporting the facts—facts that describe the daily struggles of Chinese citizens. For this, he has suffered greatly, including reported torture and mistreatment in detention, unjust imprisonment, and deprivation of his most basic rights.

The Chinese Government should immediately and unconditionally release him. The United States should make this case and the cases of many others like him languishing unjustly behind bars in China or tortured into "confessing" to "crimes" they did not commit, priorities—we should make these priorities in our bilateral engagement with Beijing.

It is the second point—the torture and mistreatment of rights defenders—

that brings to mind another troubling case, that of prominent rights lawyer Xie Yang. His wife, who recently arrived in the United States with her two young children, will testify before the House Foreign Affairs Committee later this week. Xie has bravely taken on sensitive cases, including land grab victims and advocates for democratic reform. Chinese security agents detained him as part of the 709 Crackdown—a sweeping, nationwide campaign against Chinese rights lawyers and advocates that started on July 9, 2015.

The plight of 45-year-old Mr. Xie burst onto the international scene in January 2017 when his attorneys released transcripts of their meetings with him. The transcripts recount the threats of his inquisitors. They said: "We'll torture you to death just like an ant." Another warned: "I'm going to torment you until you go insane." He told his lawyers: "I wanted to end their interrogation of me as quickly as I could, even if it meant death. . . . Later, I wrote down whatever they wanted." As if foreshadowing the fate that awaited him, he had earlier written a letter in detention in which he cautioned, "If one day in the future I admit guilt . . . that will not be a true expression of my thoughts."

Fast-forward to last week. He was charged with "inciting subversion of state power and disrupting court order" and pled guilty in a recorded video released by the court and widely reported in major media outlets. He said: "I want to take this opportunity to express to other rights lawyers my view now that we should give up using contact with foreign media and independent media to hype sensitive news events, attack judicial institutions and smear the image of the nation's party organs while handling cases. . . ."

He continued in that same coerced statement: "Everyone should take me as a warning to certainly stay within the framework of the law and avoid being exploited by Western anti-China forces."

Yet, despite these warnings and the Chinese Government's unyielding assault on human rights, there are still men and women committed to reporting on the government's abuses and steadfast in defending the powerless and the marginalized. Their courage is an inspiration, and it must summon our solidarity.

I look forward to the day when the Chinese Government upholds rather than tramples the rights of its own citizens, abides by the rule of law at home, and respects the international rules-based system globally. However, that day has not yet arrived. Until it does, we must signal to the Chinese people that whatever our broader diplomatic and strategic aims may be as it relates to North Korea or any other issue, America is under no illusions

about the iron-fisted leadership of President Xi and his utter disregard for the rights and dignity of his own people.

As President Trump continues fulfilling his duty and appointing individuals to key positions, I will keep raising these issues with each and every relevant nominee whom I meet with both privately, as I did with Governor Branstad, and publicly, as I did during his confirmation hearing. It is critical that the United States keep human rights for all people as a core pillar of our foreign policy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Rosen nomination?

Mr. GARDNER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Peters
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Cochran	Hoeven	Sasse
Collins	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kaine	Strange
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	McCain	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Cooms	Heinrich
Bennet	Cortez Masto	Hirono
Blumenthal	Duckworth	King
Booker	Durbin	Klobuchar
Brown	Feinstein	Leahy
Cantwell	Franken	Markey
Cardin	Gillibrand	McCaskill
Carper	Harris	Menendez
Casey	Hassan	Merkley

Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Reed
Sanders

Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester

Udall
Van Hollen
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Isakson

Moran

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rachel L. Brand, of Iowa, to be Associate Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

CONFLICT MINERALS LAW

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Congress often considers issues that have far reaching consequences for millions of people, but in 2010, a law was enacted that literally meant life-or-death for millions of people in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The law stems the flow of financial support to warloads in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Many may not realize that more than 5 million people have been killed during long-running conflicts in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which have been the most deadly since World War II. Tragically, women and children have suffered the most, as is too often the case when it comes to conflict.

Millions have been displaced from their homes, and the prevalence of rape and sexual violence as a weapon of war is almost beyond belief, earning eastern Congo the grim distinction of being the "Rape Capital of the World." Sam Brownback first took me there in 2005, and I returned again in 2010. At the time, the U.N. reported that about 1,000 women were sexually assaulted every day in Congo, roughly equivalent to 12 percent of all Congolese women. I can still vividly remember walking across the lava-strewn refugee camps and vis-

iting the victims of sexual assault in the heroic Heal Africa Hospital. I also recall the hearing I held in the Judiciary Subcommittee on Human Rights and the Law about rape as a weapon of war. Congolese doctor Denis Mukwege testified about the horrors of the region's sexual violence he helped treat at Panzi Hospital. One of the drivers and funders of this conflict was paradoxically that which fills the DRC with such potential: its natural resources. Instead of paying for the nation's peace, education, roads, and public health programs, the DRC's mineral wealth was being siphoned off to fund the armed groups that vie for local and regional control of vast areas far from Congo's capital, Kinshasa.

Tin, tantalum, tungsten, and gold are found in everyday electronics, jewelry, airplanes, and manufacturing equipment, but these minerals also have provided weapons and salaries to fighters, including conscripted child soldiers, who then commit unspeakable horrors on innocent civilians. That is why, in 2009, I joined Senators Brownback and Feingold and Congressman McDermott in drafting a simple reporting requirement for US-registered corporations that source these four minerals from the DRC or its neighbors. It passed and became law in 2010 to help stem the flow of financial support from illicit mining to the region's horrific violence.

It wasn't a ban. It was simply a transparency measure that said if you use any of these key minerals from the region, you had to note in your filings with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission what, if anything, you were doing to not source from those fueling the region's violence. If a company isn't taking any action to avoid fueling the region's violence, there isn't a penalty, but at least consumers would know that. This gives consumers the final decision on what electronics they want in their pockets. On a broader scale, the measure aimed to use collective industry action to clean up the supply chain of these minerals, which I am proud to say has worked.

For example, before the law, not a single smelter of tin, tungsten, tantalum—also known as the 3Ts—or gold had submitted to and passed an audit about dealing in conflict minerals. Today, 76 percent of the world's smelters of the 3Ts or gold have passed such an audit. Today more than 200 mines have also now been certified as conflict free. The effects of supply chain due diligence in this region are remarkable and are due to the leadership of many in the industry, including Intel, Apple, Kemet, and a number of companies from Illinois, including Motorola and AAR Corp. This process is far from complete or perfect, but the conflict minerals law has helped clean up the minerals trade and ease the grip Congolese warlords have had on the mining sector.

So imagine my dismay when I recently learned the Acting Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Michael Piowar, unilaterally instructed his staff to halt enforcement of the law. In his April 7 statement, he mistakenly conflated aspects of an earlier court decision to justify his actions. It sets a dangerous precedent when an Acting Chairman decides which laws the SEC should and should not enforce.

Let me be clear, this unilateral action was without legal basis and is beyond the scope of the Acting Chairman's authority. As such, I urge the Acting Chairman to rescind his directive and allow full enforcement of the Conflict Minerals law and rule. This isn't just about enforcing the law as written by Congress, this is life-or-death for millions of people in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Acting Chairman would be well advised to remember that.

TRIBUTE TO ANN KALAYIL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to acknowledge Ann Kalayil. Earlier this year, after 6 years, Ann stepped down as Regional Administrator of the U.S. General Services Administration's—GSA—Great Lakes Region. Ann Kalayil is a trailblazer. She is the first woman—and first Asian American—to serve as GSA Administrator of the six-State Great Lakes Region. I am honored to congratulate her on a job well done.

Headquartered in Chicago, IL, the GSA is the Federal Government's real estate and procurement manager. As Regional Administrator, Ann Kalayil was responsible for 128 Federal buildings, 986 leased locations, 11 U.S. land ports, nearly 1,000 employees, and about \$150 million in contracts to small and economically disadvantaged businesses. To say Ann Kalayil had a big job is an understatement, but it will come as no surprise to the people who know her that she met the challenge head-on and thrived in the role.

Her story is the story of the American dream. Born in Chicago, Ann was the daughter of Indian immigrants. When she was 5 years old, her parents moved back to Kerala, India. It was the first time Ann met her siblings, Tom, Sales, and Lisa. They were ecstatic to meet their baby sister but spoke very little English and struggled to communicate with each other. So what did Ann do? She took it upon herself to learn Malayalam, a South Indian language native to Kerala, India. Malayalam is an extremely complicated language, but Ann picked it up immediately, and people never guessed it wasn't her first language. This is how Ann would handle situations throughout her career. She never feared going out of her way to learn the needs of the community or group,

even if it meant she would do most of the work. All that matters to Ann Kalayil is getting results.

People who know Ann best describe her as fierce, outspoken, and compassionate—just like her late father, Philip Kalayil. Her dad taught her the importance of these shared values and public service. Philip Kalayil was a Chicagoland legend. He was leader in the Indian American community, starting organizations to help people stay in touch with their culture and religion. Later, he would start the Indo-American Democratic Organization, empowering people to register to vote and make their voices heard. Ann would later serve as its president. In 2008, Philip was recognized by the Association for Asian American Studies with its Heart of Asian America Community Award, a well-deserved honor.

You could say public service was in Ann's blood, and although Philip is no longer with us, I know he would feel the same way. What a proud moment it must have been for him, watching his youngest daughter being sworn in to a top Federal job—appointed by the President of the United States—while holding the family Bible.

Growing up as Philip Kalayil's daughter, Ann had a front row seat in how to be a leader in the community and has waged countless successful campaigns, issues ranging from education policy, campaign finance reform, immigration reform, and documenting Asian American history. During the 2008 Presidential campaign, Ann cochaired Obama's Asian American and Pacific Islander Leadership Council and was among a select few who was in a reserved area near the stage in Grant Park when Obama greeted a crowd of nearly 200,000 to celebrate the historic election. For all she takes on, her brother Tom only recalls seeing Ann nervous once, and it was when she was asked to throw the first pitch at a Chicago White Sox game following her appointment at the GSA.

Prior to her appointment at the GSA, Ann worked for more than 12 years at the University of Chicago in Information Technology Services in Emerging Technologies and Communications and as director of Client Services and Support. Like her father, she was also a teacher. Ann taught interdisciplinary courses on Asian Americans at DePaul University, Loyola University Chicago, and the University of Illinois at Chicago. Ann also holds a bachelor's degree in political science from the University of Illinois at Chicago, a bachelor's degree in computer science from Northeastern Illinois University, a master's degree in Asian studies from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and a doctorate from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

I want to congratulate Ann Kalayil on her wonderful career and her outstanding service to our community and the country. I wish her all the best.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO UTAH'S SERVICE ACADEMY NOMINEES

• Mr. LEE. Mr. President, one of the great privileges of representing my fellow Utahns in the U.S. Senate is the annual opportunity to meet the exceptional young men and women from the great State of Utah who have answered the call of service by applying to the U.S. Air Force Academy, the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

Under title 10 of the U.S. Code, each year, Members of Congress are authorized to nominate a number of young men and women from their district or State to attend the country's service academies. It is my distinct honor to recognize 10 of these exemplary Utahns this year.

Each of these 10 students is of sound mind and body. This will serve them well in Colorado Springs, West Point, Annapolis, and Kings Point—but to succeed they will need more than this.

The journey on which these young men and women will soon embark requires more than mental and physical aptitude. It also demands strong moral character—leadership, courage, honesty, prudence, and self-discipline. It calls for a commitment to service and love of country.

Today I would like to recognize and congratulate each of these impressive students, all of whom embody, in their own unique way, the standards of excellence on which America's service academies are built.

Jacob Lee Angeletti will be attending the U.S. Air Force Academy. Jacob will be graduating from Bingham High School, where he was the captain of the soccer team. He also captained his championship club soccer team, was named to the Utah Olympic Development Soccer Team, and encouraged young athletes as a coach in the local soccer league. A leader among his peers, Jacob participated in the Boy Scouts and also served as a president in his church's youth organization.

Emilyanne Rose Baker, from Wasatch High School, accepted an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point after visiting multiple service academies. Active in both her school and community, Emilyanne served as president of the Japanese Club, a group leader for Youthline, and a mentor for Big Brothers Big Sisters. She is a member of the National Honor Society and was the scholar-athlete on the swim team.

Cody William Brophy will be attending the U.S. Air Force Academy after graduating from Corner Canyon High School. Throughout high school, Cody prepared himself to attend an academy by preparing academically, physically, and by seeking leadership opportunities.

He ran cross country and track, played competitive soccer, was a member of the National Honor Society, and participated in the Civil Air Patrol. Cody also attended Boys State and served as president of the peer leadership team council.

Andrew Jesse Dansie has accepted an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. An Eagle Scout and active member of JROTC, Andrew will soon graduate from Snow Canyon High School. Using his skills as captain of the swim team, he served others as coach of a special needs swim team. Andrew was selected as one of five students to represent his school with the district leadership academy, where he sharpened his leadership skills through service opportunities.

Hunter Mansfield Holt, from Desert Hills High School, will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. In addition to being an Eagle Scout and member of the National Honor Society, Hunter also attended Boys State. He served as captain of the football team and also lettered in wrestling. He has been an active member of the student council and is currently serving as the senior class vice president, all while earning high honor roll recognition.

Russell Isaac Landes will be returning to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point after spending the past 2 years serving in the Taiwan Taipei Mission for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. As an Eagle Scout and a recognized leader among his peers, Russell honed his skills as the student body president of the American Leadership Academy, where he was also captain of the wrestling team.

Kylee Paige Madsen will be attending the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy in Kings Point, NY. Kylee will soon graduate from the Northern Utah Academy for Math, Engineering and Science, NUAMES, where she was president of the student outreach and service club. As a member of the National Honor Society and with an eye for community service, Kylee served local veterans and worked to turn an abandoned home into a youth homeless shelter. Kylee was also honored to be elected governor of Girls State.

John Hawkins Romney will be returning to the U.S. Air Force Academy after 2 years of speaking Korean as a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the Korea Busan Mission. As a graduate of Lone Peak High School, John was a member of the National Honor Society. He is an Eagle Scout and worked on the Veteran's Memorial in Alpine City cemetery. John's brother will graduate from the Air Force Academy in 2017.

William Patrick Ryan III, from Judge Memorial Catholic High School,

will be attending the U.S. Naval Academy. At Judge Memorial, William distinguished himself in student government as student body president and previously as the freshman, sophomore, and junior class president. He lettered in football, track, and men's dance. William was elected a member of the peer ministry, a member of National Honor Society, and served as a volunteer for disabled youth and adults at Camp Kostopulos.

Grace Elizabeth Santella, a graduate of Davis High School and current Weber State University student, has accepted an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy. Grace worked hard to earn this appointment and prepare for the academy. She was a member of the National Honor Society and took many AP and college classes. Grace also served as captain of both the swim team, where she was named "Swimmer of the Year," and a championship competitive soccer team.

It has been an honor and inspiration to speak to and nominate each of these exemplary young men and women. Doing so has given me an unshakeable confidence in the future of this great Nation and future of our Armed Services.

To these 10 students and to all their future classmates from around the country, do not forget: this is but the beginning of your journey.

You would not have arrived at this point were it not for your hard work and sacrifice, but now what matters most is not your accomplishments of the past, it is what you have yet to achieve in the future.

Thank you.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13303 OF MAY 22, 2003, WITH RESPECT TO THE STABILIZATION OF IRAQ—PM 7

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message

from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, is to continue in effect beyond May 22, 2017.

Obstacles to the orderly reconstruction of Iraq, the restoration and maintenance of peace and security in the country, and the development of political, administrative, and economic institutions in Iraq continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Accordingly, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 16, 2017.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 392. A bill to establish the 400 Years of African-American History Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-63).

S. 502. A bill to modify the boundary of Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-64).

S. 508. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-65).

S. 513. A bill to designate the Frank and Jeanne Moore Wild Steelhead Special Management Area in the State of Oregon (Rept. No. 115-66).

S. 590. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain or replace certain facilities and structures for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch in Idaho, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-67).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 558. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park to include the Wallis House and Harriston Hill, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-68).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

H.R. 698. A bill to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the

White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-69).

H.R. 863. A bill to facilitate the addition of park administration at the Coltsville National Historical Park, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-70).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 131. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain National Forest System land and non-Federal land in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Jeanne F. Bailey and ending with Robert Henry Hanson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 25, 2017.

*Foreign Service nomination of Scott S. Sindelar.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1127. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent unjust and irrational criminal punishments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1128. A bill to expand the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program to include grants for the support of changing the status of part-time or paid-on-call firefighters to full-time firefighters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1129. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1130. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to create a sustainable future for rural healthcare; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 1131. A bill to require reporting regarding certain drug price increases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. KING):

S. 1132. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the removal of the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare program with respect to speech generating devices; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1133. A bill to repeal changes made by health care reform laws to the Medicare exception to the prohibition on certain physician referrals for hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. STRANGE, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1134. A bill to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1135. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the Federal Pell Grant duration limits of borrowers who attend an institution of higher education that closes or commits fraud or other misconduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1136. A bill to improve the structure of the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 1137. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to include provisions relating to drinking water and wastewater infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 1138. A bill to rescind \$500,000 a week from the Office of the Secretary of Education until the Secretary of Education reconsiders Upward Bound applications that were rejected due to arbitrary formatting issues; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1139. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to modify the requirements of stress tests; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1140. A bill to repeal the Congressional Review Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1141. A bill to ensure that the United States promotes the meaningful participation of women in mediation and negotiation processes seeking to prevent, mitigate, or resolve violent conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 1142. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HATCH, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. Res. 163. A resolution recognizing the roles and contributions of the teachers of the United States in building and enhancing the civic, cultural, and economic well-being of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. KING, Mr. COONS, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 164. A resolution recognizing the contributions of senior volunteers and designating the week of May 15 through 19, 2017, as "National Senior Corps Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COONS, Mr. ENZI, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. ERNST, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. Res. 165. A resolution celebrating April 30 through May 6, 2017, as "National Small Business Week" and commending the entrepreneurial spirit of small businesses owners in the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 166. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Nurses Week, to be observed from May 6 through May 12, 2017; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 109

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 109, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 184

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 184, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency may not regulate vehicles used solely for competition, and for other purposes.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 339, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 366

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to require the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to take risk profiles and business models of institutions into account when taking regulatory actions, and for other purposes.

S. 379

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 379, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 428

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 428, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to authorize States to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through enhanced pediatric health homes, and for other purposes.

S. 448

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 448, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare

for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 568

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 568, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 583

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 583, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 665

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 665, a bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to authorize additional lease sales to be added to an approved 5-year leasing program.

S. 712

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 712, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 766

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 766, a bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to improve and enhance authorities relating to the employment, use, status, and benefits of military technicians (dual status), and for other purposes.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants.

S. 833

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 833, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand health care and benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for military sexual trauma, and for other purposes.

S. 836

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 836, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude a loan secured by a non-owner occupied 1- to 4-family dwelling from the definition of a member business loan, and for other purposes.

S. 860

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 860, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

S. 867

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 867, a bill to provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 926, a bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 938

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 938, a bill to require notice of cost-free Federal procurement technical assistance in connection with registration of small business concerns in procurement systems.

S. 956

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 956, a bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to limit the authority of the President to withdraw areas from oil and gas leasing, and for other purposes.

S. 989

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 989, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide

for the participation of pediatric subspecialists in the National Health Service Corps program, and for other purposes.

S. 1057

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1057, a bill to amend the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998 to address harmful algal blooms, and for other purposes.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1094, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1114

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1114, a bill to nullify the effect of the recent Executive order laying a foundation for discrimination against LGBTQ individuals, women, religious minorities, and others under the pretext of religious freedom.

S. RES. 61

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 61, a resolution calling on the Department of Defense, other elements of the Federal Government, and foreign governments to intensify efforts to investigate, recover, and identify all missing and unaccounted-for personnel of the United States.

S. RES. 102

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 102, a resolution reaffirming the strategic partnership between the United States and Mexico, and recognizing bilateral cooperation that advances the national security and national interests of both countries.

S. RES. 136

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 136, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the 102nd anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

S. RES. 154

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 154, a resolution promoting awareness of motorcycle profiling and encouraging collaboration and communication with the motorcycle community and law enforcement officials to prevent instances of profiling.

S. RES. 156

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 156, a resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster-care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster-care system.

S. RES. 161

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 161, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that defense laboratories are on the cutting-edge of scientific and technological advancement, and supporting the designation of May 18, 2017, as "Department of Defense Laboratory Day".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. STRANGE, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1134. A bill to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S. 1134

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Back the Blue Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. PROTECTION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) KILLING OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

(1) OFFENSE.—Chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1123. Killing of law enforcement officers

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

"(1) the terms 'Federal law enforcement officer' and 'United States judge' have the meanings given those terms in section 115;

"(2) the term 'federally funded public safety officer' means a public safety officer or judicial officer for a public agency that—

"(A) receives Federal financial assistance; and

"(B) is an agency of an entity that is a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or any territory or possession of the United States, an Indian tribe, or a unit of local government of that entity;

"(3) the term 'firefighter' includes an individual serving as an official recognized or

designated member of a legally organized volunteer fire department and an officially recognized or designated public employee member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew;

"(4) the term 'judicial officer' means a judge or other officer or employee of a court, including prosecutors, court security, pretrial services officers, court reporters, and corrections, probation, and parole officers;

"(5) the term 'law enforcement officer' means an individual, with arrest powers, involved in crime or juvenile delinquency control or reduction or enforcement of the laws;

"(6) the term 'public agency' includes a court system, the National Guard of a State to the extent the personnel of that National Guard are not in Federal service, and the defense forces of a State authorized by section 109 of title 32; and

"(7) the term 'public safety officer' means an individual serving a public agency in an official capacity, as a law enforcement officer, as a firefighter, as a chaplain, or as a member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew.

"(b) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for any person to—

"(1) kill, or attempt or conspire to kill—

"(A) a United States judge;

"(B) a Federal law enforcement officer; or

"(C) a federally funded public safety officer while that officer is engaged in official duties, or on account of the performance of official duties; or

"(2) kill a former United States judge, Federal law enforcement officer, or federally funded public safety officer on account of the past performance of official duties.

"(c) PENALTY.—Any person that violates subsection (b) shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for not less than 10 years or for life, or, if death results, shall be sentenced to not less than 30 years and not more than life, or may be punished by death."

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"1123. Killing of law enforcement officers."

(b) ASSAULT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

(1) OFFENSE.—Chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 120. Assaults of law enforcement officers

"(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'federally funded State or local law enforcement officer' means an individual involved in crime and juvenile delinquency control or reduction, or enforcement of the laws (including a police, corrections, probation, or parole officer) who works for a public agency (that receives Federal financial assistance) of a State of the United States or the District of Columbia.

"(b) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful to assault a federally funded State or local law enforcement officer while engaged in or on account of the performance of official duties, or assaults any person who formerly served as a federally funded State or local law enforcement officer on account of the performance of such person's official duties during such service, or because of the actual or perceived status of the person as a Federally funded state or local law enforcement officer.

"(c) PENALTY.—Any person that violates subsection (b) shall be subject to a fine under this title and—

"(1) if the assault resulted in bodily injury (as defined in section 1365), shall be impris-

oned not less than 2 years and not more than 10 years;

"(2) if the assault resulted in substantial bodily injury (as defined in section 113), shall be imprisoned not less than 5 years and not more than 20 years;

"(3) if the assault resulted in serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365), shall be imprisoned for not less than 10 years;

"(4) if a deadly or dangerous weapon was used during and in relation to the assault, shall be imprisoned for not less than 20 years; and

"(5) shall be imprisoned for not more than 1 year in any other case.

"(d) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—No prosecution of any offense described in this section may be undertaken by the United States, except under the certification in writing of the Attorney General, or a designee, that—

"(A) the State does not have jurisdiction;

"(B) the State has requested that the Federal Government assume jurisdiction;

"(C) the verdict or sentence obtained pursuant to State charges left demonstratively unvindicated the Federal interest in eradicating bias-motivated violence; or

"(D) a prosecution by the United States is in the public interest and necessary to secure substantial justice.

"(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the authority of Federal officers, or a Federal grand jury, to investigate possible violations of this section.

"(e) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) OFFENSES NOT RESULTING IN DEATH.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no person shall be prosecuted, tried, or punished for any offense under this section unless the indictment for such offense is found, or the information for such offense is instituted, not later than 7 years after the date on which the offense was committed.

"(2) OFFENSES RESULTING IN DEATH.—An indictment or information alleging that an offense under this section resulted in death may be found or instituted at any time without limitation."

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"120. Killing of law enforcement officers."

(c) FLIGHT TO AVOID PROSECUTION FOR KILLING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS.—

(1) OFFENSE.—Chapter 49 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1075. Flight to avoid prosecution for killing law enforcement officials

"(a) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for any person to move or travel in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, under the laws of the place from which the person flees or under section 1114 or 1123, for a crime consisting of the killing, an attempted killing, or a conspiracy to kill a Federal judge or Federal law enforcement officer (as those terms are defined in section 115), or a federally funded public safety officer (as that term is defined in section 1123).

"(b) PENALTY.—Any person that violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for not less than 10 years, in addition to any other term of imprisonment for any other offense relating to the conduct described in subsection (a)."

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 49 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"1075. Flight to avoid prosecution for killing law enforcement officials."

SEC. 3. SPECIFIC AGGRAVATING FACTOR FOR FEDERAL DEATH PENALTY KILLING OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.

(a) AGGRAVATING FACTORS FOR HOMICIDE.—Section 3592(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (16) the following:

"(17) KILLING OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER, PROSECUTOR, JUDGE, OR FIRST RESPONDER.—The defendant killed or attempted to kill a person who is authorized by law—

"(A) to engage in or supervise the prevention, detention, or investigation of any criminal violation of law;

"(B) to arrest, prosecute, or adjudicate an individual for any criminal violation of law; or

"(C) to be a firefighter or other first responder."

SEC. 4. LIMITATION ON FEDERAL HABEAS RELIEF FOR MURDERS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) JUSTICE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND THEIR FAMILIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2254 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(j)(1) For an application for a writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court for a crime that involved the killing of a public safety officer (as that term is defined in section 1204 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b)) or judge, while the public safety officer or judge was engaged in the performance of official duties, or on account of the performance of official duties by or status as a public safety officer or judge of the public safety officer or judge—

"(A) the application shall be subject to the time limitations and other requirements under sections 2263, 2264, and 2266; and

"(B) the court shall not consider claims relating to sentencing that were adjudicated in a State court.

"(2) Sections 2251, 2262, and 2101 are the exclusive sources of authority for Federal courts to stay a sentence of death entered by a State court in a case described in paragraph (1)."

(2) RULES.—Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts is amended by adding at the end the following: "Rule 60(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall not apply to a proceeding under these rules in a case that is described in section 2254(j) of title 28, United States Code."

(3) FINALITY OF DETERMINATION.—Section 2244(b)(3)(E) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking "the subject of a petition" and all that follows and inserting: "reheard in the court of appeals or reviewed by writ of certiorari."

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—This paragraph and the amendments made by this paragraph shall apply to any case pending on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) TIME LIMITS.—In a case pending on the date of enactment of this Act, if the amendments made by this paragraph impose a time limit for taking certain action, the period of which began before the date of enactment of this Act, the period of such time limit shall begin on the date of enactment of this Act.

(C) EXCEPTION.—The amendments made by this paragraph shall not bar consideration under section 2266(b)(3)(B) of title 28, United States Code, of an amendment to an application for a writ of habeas corpus that is pend-

ing on the date of enactment of this Act, if the amendment to the petition was adjudicated by the court prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON RECOVERY OF CERTAIN DAMAGES FOR INDIVIDUALS ENGAGED IN FELONIES OR CRIMES OF VIOLENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1979 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1983) is amended by—

(1) striking "except that in any action" and all that follows through "relief was unavailable." and inserting the following: "except that—

"(1) in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in the judicial capacity of that officer, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable; and

"(2) in any action seeking redress for any deprivation that was incurred in the course of, or as a result of, or is related to, conduct by the injured party that, more likely than not, constituted a felony or a crime of violence (as that term is defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code) (including any deprivation in the course of arrest or apprehension for, or the investigation, prosecution, or adjudication of, such an offense), a court may not award damages other than for necessary out-of-pocket expenditures and other monetary loss."; and

(2) indenting the last sentence as an undesignated paragraph.

(b) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—Section 722(b) of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988(b)) is amended by striking "except that in any action" and all that follows and inserting the following: "except that—

"(1) in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in the judicial capacity of that officer, such officer shall not be held liable for any costs, including attorneys fees, unless such action was clearly in excess of the jurisdiction of that officer; and

"(2) in any action seeking redress for any deprivation that was incurred in the course of, or as a result of, or is related to, conduct by the injured party that, more likely than not, constituted a felony or a crime of violence (as that term is defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code) (including any deprivation in the course of arrest or apprehension for, or the investigation, prosecution, or adjudication of, such an offense), the court may not allow such party to recover attorney's fees."

SEC. 6. SELF-DEFENSE RIGHTS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 203 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3053 the following:

"§ 3054. Authority of law enforcement officers to carry firearms

"Any sworn officer, agent, or employee of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision thereof, who is authorized by law to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of law, or to supervise or secure the safety of incarcerated inmates, may carry firearms if authorized by law to do so. Such authority to carry firearms, with respect to the lawful performance of the official duties of a sworn officer, agent, or employee of a State or a political subdivision thereof, shall include possession incident to depositing a firearm within a secure firearms storage area for use by all persons who are authorized to carry a firearm within any building or structure classified as a Federal facility

or Federal court facility, as those terms are defined under section 930, and any grounds appurtenant to such a facility."

(b) CARRYING OF CONCEALED FIREARMS BY QUALIFIED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—Section 926B(e)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting "any magazine and" after "includes".

(c) CARRYING OF CONCEALED FIREARMS BY QUALIFIED RETIRED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—Section 926C(e)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting "any magazine and" after "includes".

(d) SCHOOL ZONES.—Section 922(q)(2)(B)(vi) title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting "or a qualified law enforcement officer (as defined in section 926B(c))" before the semicolon.

(e) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall promulgate regulations allowing persons described in section 3054 of title 18, United States Code, to possess firearms in a manner described by that section. With respect to Federal justices, judges, bankruptcy judges, and magistrate judges, such regulations shall be prescribed after consultation with the Judicial Conference of the United States.

(f) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 203 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3053 the following:

"3054. Authority of law enforcement officers to carry firearms."

SEC. 7. IMPROVING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES AND THE COMMUNITIES THEY SERVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, the Attorney General using covered amounts shall, using such amounts as are necessary not to exceed \$20,000,000, award grants to State, local, or tribal law enforcement agencies and appropriate non-governmental organizations to—

(1) promote trust and ensure legitimacy among law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve through procedural reforms, transparency, and accountability;

(2) develop comprehensive and responsive policies on key topics relevant to the relationship between law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve;

(3) balance the embrace of technology and digital communications with local needs, privacy, assessments, and monitoring;

(4) encourage the implementation of policies that support community-based partnerships in the reduction of crime;

(5) emphasize the importance of high quality and effective training and education through partnerships with local and national training facilities; and

(6) endorse practices that support officer wellness and safety through the re-evaluation of officer shift hours, including data collection and analysis.

(b) COVERED AMOUNTS DEFINED.—In this section, the term "covered amounts" means—

(1) any unobligated balances made available under the heading "GENERAL ADMINISTRATION" under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE" in an appropriations Act in a fiscal year;

(2) any amounts made available for an "Edward Byrne Memorial criminal justice innovation program" under the heading "STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE" under the heading "OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS" under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE" in an appropriations Act in a fiscal year; or

(3) any combination of amounts described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 163—RECOGNIZING THE ROLES AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE TEACHERS OF THE UNITED STATES IN BUILDING AND ENHANCING THE CIVIC, CULTURAL, AND ECONOMIC WELL-BEING OF THE UNITED STATES

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HATCH, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 163

Whereas education and knowledge are the foundation of the current and future strength of the United States;

Whereas teachers and other education staff have earned and deserve the respect of their students and communities for the selfless dedication of the teachers and staff to community service and the futures of the children of the United States;

Whereas the purposes of National Teacher Appreciation Week, celebrated from May 7, 2017, through May 13, 2017, are—

- (1) to raise public awareness of the unquantifiable contributions of teachers; and
- (2) to promote greater respect and understanding for the teaching profession; and

Whereas students, schools, communities, and a number of organizations representing educators are hosting teacher appreciation events in recognition of National Teacher Appreciation Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

- (1) thanks the teachers of the United States; and

- (2) promotes the profession of teaching by encouraging students, parents, school administrators, and public officials to participate in teacher appreciation events during National Teacher Appreciation Week.

SENATE RESOLUTION 164—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF SENIOR VOLUNTEERS AND DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 15 THROUGH 19, 2017, AS “NATIONAL SENIOR CORPS WEEK”

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. KING, Mr. COONS, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 164

Whereas volunteers in the United States who are 55 years of age and older (referred to in this preamble as “senior volunteers”) provide

much-needed services to their communities, neighbors, and friends;

Whereas Senior Corps, through the RSVP, Foster Grandparent, and Senior Companions programs administered by the Corporation for National and Community Service, provides meaningful opportunities to 250,000 senior volunteers and recruits thousands of additional community volunteers;

Whereas, for more than 5 decades, RSVP volunteers, Foster Grandparents, and Senior Companions have played an important role in strengthening communities by contributing their experience, knowledge, and accomplishments in order to—

- (1) help their neighbors recover from natural and manmade disasters;
- (2) provide nutrition services;
- (3) mentor and tutor schoolchildren;
- (4) support veterans and military families; and
- (5) provide respite care to caregivers;

Whereas, in 2016, Senior Corps volunteers provided 75,000,000 hours of direct service through more than 28,000 nonprofit, educational, and faith-based community groups nationwide;

Whereas structured volunteering by senior volunteers—

- (1) keeps those senior volunteers active, healthy, and engaged;
- (2) helps the United States by saving taxpayer dollars and reducing health care costs; and
- (3) supports the ability of seniors to live independent and productive lives;

Whereas the RSVP, Foster Grandparent, and Senior Companion programs have proven to be cost-effective ways to engage senior volunteers in service that meets pressing community needs;

Whereas the United States should expand senior volunteer service opportunities to take advantage of the talents and experiences of the 10,000 baby boomers who will retire each day for the next 20 years; and

Whereas, at a time of mounting social need and growing interest in service by older individuals in the United States, the United States has an unprecedented opportunity to harness the talents of senior volunteers to address community challenges: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

- (1) designates the week of May 15 through 19, 2017, as “National Senior Corps Week”; and

- (2) encourages the people of the United States to recognize the contributions of senior volunteers and join in the celebration of National Senior Corps Week.

SENATE RESOLUTION 165—CELEBRATING APRIL 30 THROUGH MAY 6, 2017, AS “NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK” AND COMMENDING THE ENTREPRENEURIAL SPIRIT OF SMALL BUSINESSES OWNERS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COONS, Mr. ENZI, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. ERNST, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 165

Whereas 2017 marks the 54th anniversary of National Small Business Week;

Whereas every President for more than ½ a century has proclaimed a week celebrating the significance of small businesses across the United States;

Whereas, as of May 2017, there are over 28,000,000 small businesses in the United States;

Whereas small businesses in the United States—

- (1) employ nearly ½ of the workforce of the United States;
- (2) comprise 99.7 percent of all employers in the United States;
- (3) employ veterans, and since 2007, 9.3 percent of all business owners have been veterans;
- (4) produce ⅓ of all exports of the United States; and
- (5) account for nearly ½ of private sector output;

Whereas, on July 30, 1953, Congress established the Small Business Administration to aid, counsel, assist, and protect the small business community;

Whereas 2 of every 3 new jobs are created by small businesses; and

Whereas the President designated the week of April 30 through May 6, 2017, as “National Small Business Week”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

- (1) supports the designation of the week of April 30 through May 6, 2017, as “National Small Business Week”;

- (2) celebrates the entrepreneurial spirit of small business owners in the United States;

- (3) recognizes the importance of creating a small business climate that allows for sustained, entrepreneurial success;

- (4) celebrates the invaluable contribution that small businesses make to the United States as the backbone of the economy; and

- (5) supports increasing consumer awareness of the value and opportunity that small businesses bring to local communities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 166—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL NURSES WEEK, TO BE OBSERVED FROM MAY 6 THROUGH MAY 12, 2017

Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 166

Whereas, beginning in 1991, National Nurses Week is celebrated annually from May 6, also known as “National Recognition Day for Nurses”, through May 12, the birthday of Florence Nightingale, the founder of modern nursing;

Whereas National Nurses Week is a time of year to reflect on the important contributions that nurses make to provide safe, high-quality health care;

Whereas nurses are known to be patient advocates, acting fearlessly to protect the lives of individuals under the care of the nurses;

Whereas nurses represent the largest single component of the health care profession, with an estimated population of 3,600,000 professionally active nurses in the United States;

Whereas nurses are leading in the delivery of quality care in a transformed health care system that improves patient outcomes and safety;

Whereas the Future of Nursing report of the Institute of Medicine has called for the nursing profession to meet the call for leadership in a team-based delivery model;

Whereas, when nurse staffing levels increase, the risk of patient complications and lengthy hospital stays decreases, resulting in cost savings;

Whereas nurses are experienced researchers, and the work of nurses encompasses a wide scope of scientific inquiry, including clinical research, health systems and outcomes research, and nursing education research;

Whereas nurses provide culturally and ethnically competent care and are educated to be sensitive to the regional and community customs of individuals needing care;

Whereas nurses are well-positioned to provide leadership to eliminate health care disparities that exist in the United States;

Whereas nurses are the cornerstone of the public health infrastructure, promoting healthy lifestyles and educating communities on disease prevention and health promotion;

Whereas nurses are strong allies to Congress as the nurses help inform, educate, and work closely with legislators to improve the education, retention, recruitment, and practice of all nurses and, more importantly, the health and safety of the patients for whom the nurses care;

Whereas strengthening nursing workforce development programs at all levels, including the number of doctorally prepared faculty members, and providing education to the nurse research scientists who can discover new nursing care models to improve the health status of the diverse population of the United States, are needed;

Whereas nurses touch the lives of the people of the United States from birth to the end of life; and

Whereas nursing has been voted as the most honest and ethical profession in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Nurses Week, as founded by the American Nurses Association;

(2) recognizes the significant contributions of nurses to the health care system in the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Nurses Week with appropriate recognition, ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate the importance of nurses to the everyday lives of patients.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 216. Mr. ALEXANDER (for Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 419, to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 216. Mr. ALEXANDER (for Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 419, to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program, and for other purposes.; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvement Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REPORTS.

Section 1205 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting "Rules, regulations, and procedures issued under this part may include regulations based on standards developed by another Federal agency for programs related to public safety officer death or disability claims." before the last sentence;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting "(1)" before "In making"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) In making a determination under section 1201, the Bureau shall give substantial weight to the evidence and all findings of fact presented by a State, local, or Federal administrative or investigative agency regarding eligibility for death or disability benefits.

"(3) If the head of a State, local, or Federal administrative or investigative agency, in consultation with the principal legal officer of the agency, provides a certification of facts regarding eligibility for death or disability benefits, the Bureau shall adopt the factual findings, if the factual findings are supported by substantial evidence."; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(e)(1)(A) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Bureau shall make available on the public website of the Bureau information on all death, disability, and educational assistance claims submitted under this part that are pending as of the date on which the information is made available.

"(B) Not less frequently than once per week, the Bureau shall make available on the public website of the Bureau updated information with respect to all death, disability, and educational assistance claims submitted under this part that are pending as of the date on which the information is made available.

"(C) The information made available under this paragraph shall include—

"(i) for each pending claim—

"(I) the date on which the claim was submitted to the Bureau;

"(II) the State of residence of the claimant;

"(III) an anonymized, identifying claim number; and

"(IV) the nature of the claim; and

"(ii) the total number of pending claims that were submitted to the Bureau more than 1 year before the date on which the information is made available.

"(2) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Bureau shall publish on the public website of the Bureau a report, and shall update such report on such website not less than once every 180 days thereafter, containing—

"(A) the total number of claims for which a final determination has been made during the 180-day period preceding the report;

"(B) the amount of time required to process each claim for which a final determination has been made during the 180-day period preceding the report;

"(C) as of the last day of the 180-day period preceding the report, the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau on or before that date for which a final determination has not been made;

"(D) as of the last day of the 180-day period preceding the report, the total number of

claims submitted to the Bureau on or before the date that is 1 year before that date for which a final determination has not been made;

"(E) for each claim described in subparagraph (D), a detailed description of the basis for delay;

"(F) as of the last day of the 180-day period preceding the report, the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau on or before that date relating to exposure due to the September 11th, 2001, terrorism attacks for which a final determination has not been made;

"(G) as of the last day of the 180-day period preceding the report, the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau on or before the date that is 1 year before that date relating to exposure due to the September 11th, 2001, terrorism attacks for which a final determination has not been made;

"(H) for each claim described in subparagraph (G), a detailed description of the basis for delay;

"(I) the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau relating to exposure due to the September 11th, 2001, terrorism attacks for which a final determination was made during the 180-day period preceding the report, and the average award amount for any such claims that were approved;

"(J) the result of each claim for which a final determination was made during the 180-day period preceding the report, including the number of claims rejected and the basis for any denial of benefits;

"(K) the number of final determinations which were appealed during the 180-day period preceding the report, regardless of when the final determination was first made;

"(L) the average number of claims processed per reviewer of the Bureau during the 180-day period preceding the report;

"(M) for any claim submitted to the Bureau that required the submission of additional information from a public agency, and for which the public agency completed providing all of the required information during the 180-day period preceding the report, the average length of the period beginning on the date the public agency was contacted by the Bureau and ending on the date on which the public agency submitted all required information to the Bureau;

"(N) for any claim submitted to the Bureau for which the Bureau issued a subpoena to a public agency during the 180-day period preceding the report in order to obtain information or documentation necessary to determine the claim, the name of the public agency, the date on which the subpoena was issued, and the dates on which the public agency was contacted by the Bureau before the issuance of the subpoena; and

"(O) information on the compliance of the Bureau with the obligation to offset award amounts under section 1201(f)(3), including—

"(i) the number of claims that are eligible for compensation under both this part and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 (49 U.S.C. 40101 note; Public Law 107-42) (commonly referred to as the "VCF");

"(ii) for each claim described in clause (i) for which compensation has been paid under the VCF, the amount of compensation paid under the VCF;

"(iii) the number of claims described in clause (i) for which the Bureau has made a final determination; and

"(iv) the number of claims described in clause (i) for which the Bureau has not made a final determination.

"(3) Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, and 2 years

thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

“(A) conduct a study on the compliance of the Bureau with the obligation to offset award amounts under section 1201(f)(3); and

“(B) submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subparagraph (A) that includes an assessment of whether the Bureau has provided the information required under subparagraph (B)(ix) of paragraph (2) of this subsection in each report required under that paragraph.

“(4) In this subsection, the term ‘nature of the claim’ means whether the claim is a claim for—

“(A) benefits under this subpart with respect to the death of a public safety officer;

“(B) benefits under this subpart with respect to the disability of a public safety officer; or

“(C) education assistance under subpart 2.”.

SEC. 3. AGE LIMITATION FOR CHILDREN.

Section 1212(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796d-1(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “No child” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), no child”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) DELAYED APPROVALS.—

“(A) EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE APPLICATION.—If a claim for assistance under this subpart is approved more than 1 year after the date on which the application for such assistance is filed with the Attorney General, the age limitation under this subsection shall be extended by the length of the period—

“(i) beginning on the day after the date that is 1 year after the date on which the application is filed; and

“(ii) ending on the date on which the application is approved.

“(B) CLAIM FOR BENEFITS FOR DEATH OR PERMANENT AND TOTAL DISABILITY.—In addition to an extension under subparagraph (A), if any, for an application for assistance under this subpart that relates to a claim for benefits under subpart 1 that was approved more than 1 year after the date on which the claim was filed with the Attorney General, the age limitation under this subsection shall be extended by the length of the period—

“(i) beginning on the day after the date that is 1 year after the date on which the claim for benefits is submitted; and

“(ii) ending on the date on which the claim for benefits is approved.”.

SEC. 4. DUE DILIGENCE IN PAYING BENEFIT CLAIMS.

Subpart 1 of part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1206. DUE DILIGENCE IN PAYING BENEFIT CLAIMS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Bureau, with all due diligence, shall expeditiously attempt to obtain the information and documentation necessary to adjudicate a benefit claim filed under this part, including a claim for financial assistance under subpart 2.

“(b) SUFFICIENT INFORMATION UNAVAILABLE.—If a benefit claim filed under this part, including a claim for financial assistance under subpart 2, is unable to be adjudicated by the Bureau because of a lack of information or documentation from a third party, such as a public agency, and such information is not readily available to the claimant, the Bureau may not abandon the

benefit claim unless the Bureau has utilized the investigative tools available to the Bureau to obtain the necessary information or documentation, including subpoenas.”.

SEC. 5. PRESUMPTION THAT OFFICER ACTED PROPERLY.

Section 1202 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796a) is amended—

(1) by striking “No benefit” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—No benefit”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) PRESUMPTION.—In determining whether a benefit is payable under this part, the Bureau—

“(1) shall presume that none of the limitations described in subsection (a) apply; and

“(2) shall not determine that a limitation described in subsection (a) applies, absent clear and convincing evidence.”.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.

The amendments made by this Act shall—

(1) take effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to any benefit claim or application under part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796 et seq.) that is—

(A) pending before the Bureau of Justice Assistance on the date of enactment; or

(B) received by the Bureau on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 5 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 16, 2017 at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing to consider the following nominations: Ms. Sigal Mandelker, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, U.S. Department of Treasury; Ms. Mira Radielovic Ricardel, to be Under Secretary for Export Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce; Mr. Marshall Billingslea, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, U.S. Department of Treasury; and Mr. Heath P. Tarbert to be Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Treasury.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 16, 2017, at 10 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Tuesday, May 16, 2017 from 2:15 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 16, 2017, at 3:15 p.m., in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, “Leveraging Federal Funding; Innovative Solutions for Infrastructure.”

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, in consultation with the chairperson of the Committee on Indian Affairs, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 114-244, appoints the following individuals to serve as members of the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children: Carlyle Begay of Arizona and Melody Staebner of North Dakota.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 163, S. Res. 164, S. Res. 165, and S. Res. 166.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 17, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 17; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Brand nomination; finally, that the time until 12 noon be equally divided in the usual form.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator WHITEHOUSE.

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

The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, as we know here in Washington, politics is a battlefield as much as it is a debating society. On this battlefield, a new form of political weapon has emerged, one for which the American political system was not well prepared. As Democrats, I can say from our side, we were virtually blind to this weapon in the last election. For my 167th "Time to Wake Up" speech, I am here to discuss this new political weapon: systematic fake news.

Fake news does not just fall like rain from heaven. In its most dangerous form, fake news is weaponized for effect—usually, political effect.

Vladimir Putin's regime in Russia made weaponized fake news a core element of its political manipulation throughout the former Soviet Union and the modern European Union, revving up public ire over rapes that never happened, for instance; planting fake material in politicians' laptops and social media that can then be "exposed," and broadcasting false political propaganda. This phenomenon has been documented in Chairman GRAHAM's recent hearing in our Crime and Terrorism Judiciary Subcommittee, featuring, among other sources, the Center for Strategic and International Studies' "Kremlin Playbook," and it has been documented throughout the proceedings of this year's McCain Institute Sedona Forum. Because of this history of political manipulation, the Putin regime's interference in the 2016 U.S. Presidential election ought to be a wakeup call for America.

Weaponized fake news requires a delivery system, and here is where this connects to climate change. In America, we are particularly vulnerable to such election interference because a robust delivery system for weaponized fake news already exists. Putin doesn't need to build a fake news delivery system in America. The fossil fuel industry already did. Climate denial was the original fake news. They have been at it awhile.

A decade ago, a peer-reviewed academic study of the climate denial apparatus described how this works. The fossil fuel industry sets up an array of "environmental skeptics." But of course they are not just skeptics; they in reality "are predominantly agents of conservative think tanks." These think tanks, in turn, have the "essen-

tial role" of providing what the report calls "political insulation for industry," including "for companies such as ExxonMobil". Again quoting this report, the "defining feature" of this apparatus is the "denial of the authenticity of environmental problems." Collectively, this climate denial apparatus creates for the fossil fuel industry "a full scale counter movement" against environmental science. Concluding in the report, "Its major tactic is to manufacture uncertainty."

The Center for Strategic and International Studies' "Kremlin Playbook" report, by comparison, describes Russia's fake news tactic as "to disseminate erroneous information that fosters public confusion." To manufacture uncertainty, "to disseminate erroneous information that fosters public confusion"—do you see the similarity?

If we collapse into fewer words these decade-old findings about the fossil fuel industry climate denial apparatus, here is what you have: front groups who disguise the identity of the real actors and pump out fake news—in their case, the fake news of climate denial.

The tactics and methods of climate science denial are the tactics and methods of weaponized fake news: false front organizations, hidden funding sources, controllable means of communication, mimicry of legitimate groups, personal disparagement of opponents, relentless repetition of lies, and shameless persistence when debunked. You could say that the fake news propagation we face today in America metastasized from climate denial. Climate denial was the original "School for Scoundrels" in these fake news techniques.

To put financial scale to this, Putin's Russia has a \$200 billion annual budget. With that, they funded a significant weaponized fake news effort to influence our Presidential election. But the fossil fuel industry has a \$2 trillion annual budget. The fossil fuel industry fights to protect an annual subsidy in the United States estimated by the International Monetary Fund to be \$700 billion. With stakes like that, the climate denial delivery system the fossil fuel industry could profitably set up in the United States can be very robust and complex, and it is.

Fake news, dark money, and hidden political spending have been the fossil fuel industry's primary political weapons. This creates the problem. Once a fake news delivery system is in place, that system will not necessarily differentiate between different types or sources of fake news. Once that road is open, anyone can travel it with any fake news cargo. The same fake news delivery system that will distribute fake news designed to manipulate American politics for the fossil fuel industry can just as effectively distribute fake news designed to manipulate

American elections for Russia or China or Iran. The fake news delivery system is not restricted to any one payload.

The fossil fuel industry also fought hard to create the dark money political spending apparatus that now despoils American politics. They lobbied the Supreme Court for the wretched Citizens United decision. They saw it coming and they were swift at the mark, and they have stopped any effort in Congress at political spending disclosure. They need and depend on dark money to buy influence in Congress.

Here, the problem is the same. Once you tolerate a dark money political spending apparatus in American politics, that dark money apparatus will be just as good at hiding the hand of Vladimir Putin or China or Iran as it is at hiding the hand of the fossil fuel industry. Darkness is darkness, whether it is Charles and David Koch or Vladimir Putin operating in that darkness.

The dangers of fake news, dark money, climate science denial, and foreign interference in our elections are thus all tied together, and they call for an American response. Politics is a battlefield, and dark money and fake news are now assets for our Nation's enemies.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for adjournment occur following the remarks of the Democratic leader.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FBI INVESTIGATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in a week full of revelation after revelation, on a day when we thought things couldn't get any worse, they have. I was shaken by the report in the New York Times that alleged that the President tried to shut down an active FBI investigation into a close political associate, and we are only 1 day removed from stunning allegations that the President may have divulged classified information to a known adversary.

Concerns about our national security, the rule of law, the independence of our Nation's highest law enforcement agencies are mounting. The country is being tested in unprecedented ways.

I say to all of my colleagues in the Senate: History is watching.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:15 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 17, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

BRIAN D. QUINTENZ, OF OHIO, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 13, 2020, VICE SCOTT O'MALIA, RESIGNED.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

KEVIN ALLEN HASSETT, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS, VICE JASON FURMAN.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DEREK KAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR POLICY, VICE BLAIR ANDERSON.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DAN R. BROUILLETTE, OF TEXAS, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF ENERGY, VICE ELIZABETH SHERWOOD-RANDALL.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SUSAN PARKER BODINE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE CYNTHIA GILES.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

JAMES DONOVAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE SARAH BLOOM RASKIN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DOUG MANCHESTER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE BAHAMAS.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

JAMES J. SULLIVAN, JR., OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 27, 2021, VICE THOMASINA ROGERS, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

BROOKS D. TUCKER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (CONGRESSIONAL AND LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS), VICE JOAN M. EVANS, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT AS THE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 154:

To be general

GEN. PAUL J. SELVA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JAY B. SILVERIA

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LAURA J. RICHARDSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE SERVING AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601, 3037, AND 3064:

To be lieutenant general

BRIG. GEN. CHARLES N. PEDE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. PHILLIP G. SAWYER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. SAMUEL J. PAPARO, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. GREGORY N. HARRIS

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT AS THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 152 AND 601:

To be general

GEN. JOSEPH F. DUNFORD, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. BRIAN D. BEAUDREAULT

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(D):

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) STEVEN J. ANDERSEN
REAR ADM. (LH) PAT DEQUATTRO
REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM G. KELLY
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN P. NADEAU
REAR ADM. (LH) JOANNA M. NUNAN
REAR ADM. (LH) KEITH M. SMITH
REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID G. THROOP

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

DAVID P. HAWORTH

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 16, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

JEFFREY A. ROSEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 16, 2017

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 16, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EARL L. CARTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, all across America over the last 2 or 3 weeks has been an exciting time for a lot of young Americans and families as graduating seniors in 4-year programs and 2-year programs are receiving their degrees and beginning, obviously, a new, exciting stage in their life.

Unfortunately, there is still, though, a cloud over a lot of those folks in terms of what they face in the near future and the long-term future and many others who graduated in recent years, which is the high cost of student loan debt. The Federal Reserve has calculated that over \$1 trillion of overhang exists in the U.S. economy because of student loan debt: an amount greater than credit card debt, an amount greater than auto debt, and at rates that far exceed any of those forms of consumer debt, including mortgages for homes.

The Federal Government, in the meantime, is out selling bonds as a borrower to people who buy Treasury

bonds, 10-year notes. This morning's rate, which I checked before coming down here, the rate that the Federal Government is going to pay as borrower, is 2.3 percent. Well, as many, I think, listening here, Mr. Speaker, know, the fact is that student loans carry much higher rates of interest, particularly legacy debt that goes back 5, 6 years ago when, again, the rates for Stafford student loans, which are the publicly financed loans through the Federal Government, and certainly private loans that banks give to students that are on an unsecured rate can sometimes exceed 8, 9, 10 percent.

So tomorrow, I and many others are going to be introducing legislation called the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, which will allow folks who carry the student loan debt not to get their debt forgiven, but to allow them to actually refinance down to 3.76 percent, which was the interest rate last year that the Federal Government offered for Stafford student loans.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that that will put about \$50 billion into the pockets of young people all across the country who, because of student loan debt, are being inhibited in terms of getting married, starting a family, starting a business, and getting out of their parents' house. There is just all kinds of, I think, inhibitors that student loan debt creates for young people, millennials, all across the country.

Again, I want to emphasize the bill that I will be introducing tomorrow with 61 cosponsors is not debt forgiveness. It just simply does what any middle class family does in a low-interest rate environment, whether it is with a home mortgage or credit cards, to just simply get their rates down to a proportionate level with, again, the rest of consumer debt that is out there in the economy.

Simultaneously tomorrow, Senator ELIZABETH WARREN from Massachusetts will be introducing exactly the same bill, so we will have bills in the House and in the Senate. Last year we had 182 cosponsors on a similar piece of legislation. Unfortunately, the Speaker never allowed the bill to be brought to the floor for debate. But it is a new Congress; it is the 115th Congress that was sworn in last January.

This problem, I will just submit, Mr. Speaker, exists in Republican districts and Democratic districts, rural districts, suburban districts, urban districts. This is an opportunity to lift a

debt burden from, again, the very folks that we really want to assist and help as they begin a new phase, a new chapter, in their life, and they should not have the albatross of high student loan rates hung around their neck. Hopefully, this will be the year that we will move forward on this measure, which is fully paid for—it does not add to the Federal debt—and just, again, allows young people and families the opportunity to do what they do with all other forms of consumer debt.

So it is the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act. Hopefully, anyone listening to this will call their Members to tell them to get on this bill. And I would urge, Mr. Speaker, all of us on both sides of the aisle to deal with an issue that really is a bread-and-butter, kitchen-table issue all across America, that, again, at this special time when students are graduating, we can do a really positive thing to help students and families all across America.

FUTURE OF U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, after 16 years, \$800 billion, over 2,000 Americans killed, and 20,000 Americans severely wounded in Afghanistan, it is time that the House of Representatives has a debate on our future involvement in Afghanistan. Mr. Speaker, let me remind you again: We have been there 16 years, and nothing has changed at all.

H.R. 1666 is a bill introduced by JOHN GARAMENDI from California and me. All this bill does is to say that the House of Representatives, after 16 years, will have a debate on the future involvement of our country in Afghanistan.

Obviously, Members of Congress can vote for this bill or against this bill. We are just saying that, after 16 years, it is time for the Congress to meet its constitutional responsibility and to have a debate on the future of America. We owe this to our military. We owe it to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. Speaker, we have 300 Members of Congress today that were not here in 2001. 2001 was the last time we had a debate on this floor of the House, a meaningful debate, on the future of Afghanistan. In fact, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Kulack, now retired, has been one of the biggest supporters of mine in saying that it is

time for the American people to put pressure on their Member of Congress to say debate the future of Afghanistan and maybe to put pressure on our Congress to say it is time to come home from Afghanistan.

I have Camp Lejeune Marine Base in the Third District of North Carolina, which I have the privilege to represent. I have talked to many, many marines who have been to Afghanistan, and, Mr. Speaker, almost every one of them will tell you: Nothing is going to change. Many of those marines I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, have been there three, four, and five times.

Mr. Speaker, Afghanistan is known as the graveyard of empires. Why in the world are we continuing to spend our money, but, more importantly, our young men and women, over in a country that will never change no matter what you do? It is a tribal nation. It is a nation that will never change.

That is why I hope my colleagues in Congress will join JOHN GARAMENDI and me in H.R. 1666 that only asks the Speaker of the House, PAUL RYAN, to let us have this debate on the floor of the House. After 16 years, we owe it to the military, and we owe it to the taxpayers to say that we are listening to the taxpayers and our military. Let's debate the future of America in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, to ask God in His arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I ask God to please bless the House and wake the House up that we will debate the future of Afghanistan. And I will ask three times, God, please, God, please, God, please, bless America.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Dr. Bruce Hargrave, Bruce Hargrave Ministries and Charities, Rowlett, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank You this day for the bountiful blessings You have poured out upon the peoples of the United States of America and to the men and women elected and assem-

bled here today to serve the "We the People."

Grant us, O God, Your grace, knowledge, and wisdom in the affairs that we will deliberate, debate, and vote upon. May the outcome of our endeavors be for the great benefit of the American people.

Help these Members as Representatives of their various congressional districts be more than an elected Representative. Help each of them to be servant leaders guiding all of us to greater heights and achievements for all the American people.

I ask all of this in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KILDEE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING DR. BRUCE HARGRAVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the gentleman who has just given our invocation, Dr. Bruce Hargrave. As a faith leader, a city council member in Rowlett, Texas, and a trusted member of his community, he has dedicated his life to helping others. He has served in the Baptist and United Methodist churches for more than 40 years and continues to help those not only in need in his community, but those who seek him out and who he seeks through spiritual and emotional guidance.

As a civil servant, Bruce has played an integral role in his community. He is a member of the Rowlett Chamber of Commerce and the Rowlett Rotary Club, where he is a Paul Harris Fellow.

In the wake of the devastating tornadoes that hit north Texas over a year ago on December 26, Bruce decided that he wanted to do more than just help but rather to rebuild the city that he called home. So he ran for the city

council and was elected to serve in May.

It truly is a distinct honor not only to have a well-respected person from Rowlett, Texas, in the 32nd Congressional District with us today, but it highlights how important it is that each of the Members of Congress who are so proud of those that we represent come to our great Nation, our Nation's Capital, and not only give us best wishes but pray for our success.

I would like to thank the Honorable Dr. Bruce Hargrave for his service to not only Rowlett, Texas, to his country, but also to our Lord. And I thank him very much.

God bless Texas, and God bless America.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Police Week, a time each year when we honor the service and sacrifice of our Nation's heroes in blue.

At this particular time, I especially cherish the memory of Officer Greg Alia, a veteran of the Forest Acres Police Department. He was a hardworking, humble man, an Eagle Scout, a graduate of Richland Northeast High School and the University of South Carolina.

Greg's end of watch was September 30, 2015, when he was shot while pursuing a suspect. He is survived by his wife, Kassy; parents, Richard and Alexis; and his young son, Sal. Kassy continues to promote Greg's legacy of service through the Heroes in Blue, an organization dedicated to sharing the caring and courageous stories of police officers across the Nation. As we mark National Police Week, I am grateful to have officers who risk their lives every day to protect our families.

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

Congratulations to the newly crowned Miss USA, Kara McCullough, a South Carolina State University graduate who represented the District of Columbia. Also, congratulations to Miss South Carolina USA, Megan Gordon, of North Augusta, who placed in the top five.

SERIOUS QUESTIONS ABOUT PRESIDENT'S CARELESSNESS AND LACK OF JUDGMENT

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, in revealing classified information to the Russians, President Trump has compromised our ability to defend ourselves against ISIS to gather intelligence against them, and he has jeopardized our relationships with allies across the globe.

Make no mistake about it, the President's actions were reckless. They are indefensible, and they make America less safe.

Republicans cannot stay silent. There are serious questions about the President's carelessness, about his lack of judgment. In fact, last July, the Speaker said that individuals who are extremely careless with classified information should be denied further access to it.

Even the President's own Chief of Staff said those who mishandle classified information have had their security clearances revoked. They have lost their jobs. They have faced fines. Some have gone to prison.

I have to ask my colleagues, shouldn't the President of the United States be held to that same standard? They say he can do what he wants, but does that make it smart? No. Does that make it right? No. Does it make it less safe? Absolutely.

JUDGES THREATEN OUR DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in their coverage of the President, the liberal media have given up being objective, and their credibility is now at an all-time low.

Are the courts next?

When considering the President's written immigration orders, some judges are basing their decisions not on the actual text but on what was said during the heat of the campaign.

This is a dangerous development, dangerous to our judicial system and dangerous to our democracy. The judiciary's role is to interpret the law and decide whether it is constitutional.

When judges decide to become politicians, injecting their own political bias into a decision, our Constitution and our government are at risk.

If the media and the judiciary cease being objective, we should fear for the future of our country.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, this week recognizes National Police Week. I would like to especially highlight the

small but significant things officers do for our communities.

Police officers in Clearwater, Florida, surprised a 10-year-old robbery victim with lunch after his lunch money was stolen as he walked to school.

Hillsborough County sheriffs will drive homeless men and women to the Social Security office and help them with paperwork.

These are extraordinary individuals, Mr. Speaker. There are countless examples of local law enforcement doing good every day.

This week we commemorate the fallen officers. Florida lost 11 officers in the past year, including Deputy Sheriff John Robert Kotfila from Hillsborough County who was killed after a collision with a wrong-way driver.

We also remember the Tarpon Springs officer, Officer Charles Kondek, who was fatally shot by a fugitive while on duty in 2014.

Thank you to our law enforcement officers in Florida and nationwide who keep us safe.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 15, 2017, at 2:44 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1083.
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 16, 2017, at 9:40 a.m.:

Appointment:
Health Information Technology Advisory Committee.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

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

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

□ 1601

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNN) at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 16, 2017, at 3:44 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 139.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

RAPID DNA ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 510) to establish a system for integration of Rapid DNA instruments for use by law enforcement to reduce violent crime and reduce the current DNA analysis backlog.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 510

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Rapid DNA Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. RAPID DNA INSTRUMENTS.

(a) **STANDARDS.**—Section 210303(a) of the DNA Identification Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14131(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5)(A) In addition to issuing standards as provided in paragraphs (1) through (4), the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall issue standards and procedures for the use of Rapid DNA instruments and resulting DNA analyses.

“(B) In this Act, the term ‘Rapid DNA instruments’ means instrumentation that carries out a fully automated process to derive a DNA analysis from a DNA sample.”.

(b) **INDEX.**—Paragraph (2) of section 210304(b) of the DNA Identification Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14132(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) prepared by—

“(A) laboratories that—

“(i) have been accredited by a nonprofit professional association of persons actively involved in forensic science that is nationally recognized within the forensic science community; and

“(ii) undergo external audits, not less than once every 2 years, that demonstrate compliance with standards established by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; or

“(B) criminal justice agencies using Rapid DNA instruments approved by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in compliance with the standards and procedures issued by the Director under section 210303(a)(5); and”.

SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COLLECTION OF DNA IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.

(a) **FROM CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFENDERS.**—Section 3 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following: “The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may waive the requirements under this subsection if DNA samples are analyzed by means of Rapid DNA instruments and the results are included in CODIS.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) The term ‘Rapid DNA instruments’ means instrumentation that carries out a fully automated process to derive a DNA analysis from a DNA sample.”.

(b) **FROM CERTAIN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFENDERS.**—Section 4 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following: “The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may waive the requirements under this subsection if DNA samples are analyzed by means of Rapid DNA instruments and the results are included in CODIS.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) The term ‘Rapid DNA instruments’ means instrumentation that carries out a fully automated process to derive a DNA analysis from a DNA sample.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 510, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The House of Representatives works on many important issues, but few are more important than making sure that innocent arrestees are promptly released and that culpable suspects are not released to strike again.

Rapid DNA technology has the potential to do both of those things and, as such, can be an important tool for law enforcement and a key component of this body’s ongoing efforts on criminal justice reform.

I applaud the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) for reintroducing H.R. 510, the Rapid DNA Act of 2017, in this session of Congress.

With Rapid DNA technology, it is possible to test the DNA of arrestees as soon as they are in custody and determine within hours whether they match the DNA profile from a crime scene or from other earlier crimes.

This technology would also enable police to check the Federal DNA database to see if an arrestee matches the DNA profile from previous crimes for which a DNA sample exists but no known suspect has been identified.

Rather than waiting weeks for a DNA sample to be processed and risk releasing a suspect back into the public to potentially reoffend, creating new victims, police will be able to determine at initial booking if the suspect is a person of interest in other crimes.

This bill will provide important tools for law enforcement. For instance, it will inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions. It will solve and prevent all crimes, including violent crimes. By freeing up forensic analysts, it will prevent DNA analysis backlogs.

I believe this is necessary, responsible legislation that will aid law enforcement and protect American citizens by keeping offenders off the streets. I again thank Congressman SENSENBRENNER for sponsoring this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

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

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 510, the Rapid DNA Act of 2017. I also want to salute Mr. SENSENBRENNER for his hard work on it.

This bipartisan legislation would integrate Rapid DNA technology into the

FBI’s Combined DNA Index System, popularly known as CODIS, to enable law enforcement to perform valuable investigative functions faster and more efficiently.

DNA technology is a valuable, dynamic, and rapidly unfolding element of our criminal justice system. DNA technology helps us to identify suspects, eliminate false suspects, exonerate the innocent, and ultimately to convict responsible perpetrators of crime. My State of Maryland is home to the first capital prisoner in the United States who was exonerated while in prison for a homicide with DNA technology.

CODIS and the National DNA Index System play a critical role across the country in criminal investigations by Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies. Rapid DNA involves a fully automated, hands-free process designed to produce a DNA profile within minutes at the booking stage outside of a crime lab.

Existing law does not provide for the inclusion of Rapid DNA analyses into CODIS. H.R. 510 would bridge the gap between Rapid DNA technology and CODIS by authorizing law enforcement to conduct Rapid DNA analyses and upload the results to the national index, as long as the Rapid DNA machines that are used are accredited. This adds a real-time layer to CODIS and saves us all significant time and resources, improving efficiency in the criminal justice process.

H.R. 510 has significant practical and positive consequences for law enforcement and for public safety. For example, Detroit, as of this April, has tested approximately 10,000 backlogged sexual assault kits. As a result, there have been more than 2,600 DNA matches, including CODIS hits; the identification of nearly 800 potential serial rapists; 92 convictions obtained by the Wayne County Prosecutor’s Office; and DNA crimes linked to 40 other States and the District of Columbia.

The addition of Rapid DNA information to the CODIS database will help identify serial rapists if matches are made to the lab analyses of the sexual assault kit samples.

I hope that the use of Rapid DNA will allow other DNA labs to focus more of their resources on reducing the backlog of untested sexual assault kits across the country. My home State of Maryland has 3,700 untested rape kits right now, according to a report done last year.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join the chairman and those of us in the minority in supporting this important legislation.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the former chairman

of the House Judiciary Committee and the chief author of this legislation.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for yielding me this time.

Rapid DNA is a promising new technology that allows for the almost immediate DNA analysis of an arrestee. Unlike standard DNA practices, which require sending DNA samples from arrestees out to labs with a result taking weeks to ascertain, Rapid DNA results take only a few hours and can be done right at the booking station. Like fingerprinting, photographing, and other booking procedures which at the time were novel but now have become routine, Rapid DNA will soon be standard procedure in police stations throughout the country.

There is only one problem with Rapid DNA technology: Federal law. Our law, written in 1994 when DNA technology was still in its infancy, prohibits the use of Rapid DNA technology in booking stations. This is not because of any limitation in Rapid DNA technology, but simply because at that time Rapid DNA technology was not even contemplated. Similar to the transformation of musical devices—records leading to cassette tapes, cassette tapes leading to CDs, CDs leading to MP3, and now iPods and online music hosting services—technology moves quicker than we can legislate. Now is the time to change the law to permit Rapid DNA technology.

Rapid DNA machines are compact, approximately the size of copy machines, and can provide a DNA analysis from a cheek swab sample of an arrestee within 2 hours. This has two profound implications. First, arrestees may be exonerated of crimes in 2 hours rather than waiting for up to 72 hours for release, or months for more standard DNA testing. Second, those arrested for a crime can quickly be matched to other unsolved crimes where there was forensic evidence left at the crime scene but for which there was no identified suspect.

The Rapid DNA Act updates the current law to allow DNA samples to be processed using Rapid DNA instruments located in booking stations and other approved locations. The bill will require the FBI to issue standards and procedures for the use of such instruments and their resulting DNA analyses to ensure the integrity of such instruments and the accuracy of the results. It will permit those results to be included in the DNA index if criminal justice agencies taking the samples comply with the standards and procedures that the FBI approves. In this way, the bill would permit this new category of DNA samples to be uploaded into the index with the same protections and quality standards as current DNA samples.

Not only does Rapid DNA have the potential to reduce crime, help expedi-

tiously exonerate the innocent, but also to positively impact the current backlogs for rape kits and other DNA sample analysis.

This committee has spent a great deal of time and significant work to try to reduce the forensic DNA backlog, especially in rape kits. Rapid DNA could not at this time be used for rape kits, but the implementation of Rapid DNA will allow forensic labs to focus on forensic samples, not on identification samples which can easily be handled by Rapid DNA machines. I hope this will reduce the rape kit backlog, which will also prevent future rapes from happening.

I am pleased that the House is taking a significant step in furthering the use of this technology. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. RASKIN for his kind words and his work on this. I particularly thank Mr. SENSENBRENNER for his work. He has been the sponsor of this since it was introduced. I was an original sponsor since it was introduced as well. It makes a lot of sense for us to do this and get DNA evidence and use science to the advantage of the American people, and particularly in law enforcement where we have problems in identifying suspects and proving guilt on occasion, and also exonerating the innocent. DNA is a perfect tool as it exonerates the wrongfully accused and gets the person who has committed the crime.

I am honored to be a part of this. This bill, while a small part in the big picture, shows that Democrats and Republicans can work together to get some things done. I appreciate the honor to be able to sponsor, and I appreciate Mr. SENSENBRENNER's work.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I don't have any additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

The Rapid DNA Act is strongly supported by several organizations which know that the expanded use and availability of Rapid DNA will enhance public safety by reducing the DNA backlog, reducing violent crime, and allowing law enforcement to investigate crimes and identify suspects with greater efficiency and accuracy. The organizations include the National Center for Victims of Crime; the Police Foundation, which works to improve policing through innovation and science; and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association.

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, in the case that I referred to before, the Bloodsworth case

from Maryland, this was a gentleman who was convicted of a grisly rape and murder of a 9-year-old girl. He swore he hadn't done it. He was convicted. In court he swore every day that he was the wrong guy.

When DNA technology was first unveiled, he read about it. He begged his lawyer who is now the chief judge on the D.C. Superior Court, Judge Morin, to get the DNA test done. That lawyer took \$5,000 out of his own pocket to do the DNA test, and it came back with greater than 99 percent certainty it could not have been Bloodsworth.

Then the DNA evidence provided an exact match to a prisoner who was a floor below Bloodsworth at the time. So they found the right guy, and he was about to get out of prison a few months later.

The DNA evidence establishes an extraordinary new era that we are in terms of criminal justice, and I am proud to be supporting this legislation that Mr. SENSENBRENNER has brought forward, which I think will improve accuracy and efficiency all around. I applaud his efforts and the efforts of our chairman to ensure the integrity and the quality of the analysis that will be used in the criminal justice system.

I urge all of our colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 510 today.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It is a bipartisan bill. I thank Members on both sides of the aisle for their contributions to this effort. I again commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) for reintroducing this bill. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 510, the Rapid DNA Act of 2017.

The Rapid DNA Act, or H.R. 510, will aid law enforcement in its effort to solve cases and bring justice to the victims of crimes. In particular, victims of rape and sexual assault will be able to regain peace of mind because this legislation increases the likelihood that these perpetrators will be captured. The language of the Rapid DNA Act gives law enforcement investigators the ability to facilitate the quick testing of DNA tests, such as rape kits. DNA material is sensitive and has only a limited time before it is rendered useless. This act addresses the issue by removing some of the preexisting regulations and red tape that have hindered this process in the past.

It is a disservice to the American people to deny them the results from a Rape Kit. They deserve the truth. The Constitution of the United States ensures that every citizen of the United States of America has the right to privacy, as stated in the Fourth Amendment to the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution. The Rapid DNA Act of 2017 will increase the chance that those who committed such wrongs and those who have inhumanely violated the basic rights and dignity of another

person are brought to justice by streamlining the process and by reducing regulations around the testing of these kits.

H.R. 510 would provide amendments to the DNA Identification Act of 1994 and the DNA Backlog Analysis Backlog Act of 2000 that require more external regulation for all Rapid DNA tests. Organizations performing such tests would still be audited by the Federal government to ensure the quality of test. It will also be accredited by credible, nonprofit institutions that will lend the imprimatur of reliability.

I fully support this measure and I am firmly committed to bringing justice to offenders of these crimes. This bill will provide relief to the countless victims of sexual assault. Rape kits often go untested because of existing regulations that make it more difficult to test such time sensitive data. I support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 510.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING STATE AND LOCAL CYBER CRIME FIGHTING ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1616) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the National Computer Forensics Institute, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1616

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Strengthening State and Local Cyber Crime Fighting Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL COMPUTER FORENSICS INSTITUTE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 381 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 822. NATIONAL COMPUTER FORENSICS INSTITUTE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized for fiscal years 2017 through 2022 within the United States Secret Service a National Computer Forensics Institute (in this section referred to as the ‘Institute’). The Institute shall disseminate information related to the investigation and prevention of cyber and electronic crime and related threats, and educate, train, and equip State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges.

“(b) FUNCTIONS.—The functions of the Institute shall include the following:

“(1) Educating State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges on current—

“(A) cyber and electronic crimes and related threats;

“(B) methods for investigating cyber and electronic crime and related threats and conducting computer and mobile device forensic examinations; and

“(C) prosecutorial and judicial challenges related to cyber and electronic crime and related threats, and computer and mobile device forensic examinations.

“(2) Training State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers to—

“(A) conduct cyber and electronic crime and related threat investigations;

“(B) conduct computer and mobile device forensic examinations; and

“(C) respond to network intrusion incidents.

“(3) Training State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges on methods to obtain, process, store, and admit digital evidence in court.

“(c) PRINCIPLES.—In carrying out the functions specified in subsection (b), the Institute shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that timely, actionable, and relevant expertise and information related to cyber and electronic crime and related threats is shared with State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers and prosecutors.

“(d) EQUIPMENT.—The Institute may provide State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers with computer equipment, hardware, software, manuals, and tools necessary to conduct cyber and electronic crime and related threat investigations and computer and mobile device forensic examinations.

“(e) ELECTRONIC CRIME TASK FORCES.—The Institute shall facilitate the expansion of the network of Electronic Crime Task Forces of the United States Secret Service through the addition of State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement officers educated and trained at the Institute.

“(f) SAVINGS PROVISION.—All authorized activities and functions carried out by the Institute at any location as of the day before the date of the enactment of this section are authorized to continue to be carried out at any such location on and after such date.”.

(b) FUNDING.—For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, amounts appropriated for United States Secret Service, Operations and Support, may be used to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 821 the following new item:

“Sec. 822. National Computer Forensics Institute.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1616, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the National Computer Forensics Institute serves a vital purpose in preparing State and local law enforcement to combat computer and cybercrime.

Last Congress, the House passed this legislation by voice vote under suspension of the rules. I am pleased to support this legislation once again, and I am confident that this bill will once again receive bipartisan support.

The United States Department of Justice has declared that cybercrime is one of the greatest threats facing our country and that it has enormous implications for our national security, economic prosperity, and public safety. We have seen this just in the past few days after cyber vulnerabilities led to widespread computer disruptions around the world.

With this in mind, the National Computer Forensics Institute serves the vital purpose of providing legal and judicial professionals a free, comprehensive education on current cybercrime trends, investigative methods, and prosecutorial and judicial challenges.

The National Computer Forensics Institute is a 32,000-square-foot facility located in Hoover, Alabama. The institute boasts three multipurpose classrooms, two network investigations classrooms, a mock courtroom, and a forensics lab.

The special agents of the United States Secret Service staff the institute and work diligently training attendees in modern counter-cybercrime procedures and evidence collection.

When the attendees leave, they take with them the critical knowledge and equipment required to conduct autonomous and thorough cybercrime investigations at their home agencies.

Since its creation in 2008, the institute has earned praise for its work in preparing America's local law enforcement in how to deal with these important technology issues.

Over the last 7 years, the institute has instructed law enforcement professionals from every State in the country and from over 500 different law enforcement agencies.

In fact, law enforcement in my own district has benefited from NCFI training, including Lynchburg Commonwealth Attorney Mike Doucette and his staff.

Each professional educated at the institute is a force multiplier for the Secret Service. The institute itself is a force multiplier for other law enforcement cyber forensic efforts, complementing vital training offered by entities like the National White Collar Crime Center, otherwise known as NW3C. After successful completion of the NCFI and the NW3C programs, the

students can bring their new knowledge back to their local agency to inform their colleagues how to properly conduct computer forensic investigations.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that for our Nation to successfully combat the cybercrime threat, we must support legislation such as H.R. 1616.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE), a member of the Judiciary Committee, for sponsoring this important legislation.

Authorizing the existing National Computer Forensics Institute in Federal law will cement its position as a high-tech cybercrime training facility and will help law enforcement professionals nationwide in their efforts to combat cyber-related crimes.

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

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

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: I write concerning H.R. 1616, the "Strengthening State and Local Cyber Crime Fighting Act of 2017". This legislation includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 1616, the Committee on Homeland Security agrees to forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill would not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee on Homeland Security's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2017.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on the Judiciary and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1616, the "Strengthening State and Local Cyber Crime Fighting Act," so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your foregoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1616 into the Congressional Record during floor

consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of H.R. 1616, the Strengthening State and Local Cyber Crime Fighting Act. This bill establishes the National Computer Forensics Institute as an official Federal program to be managed by the Department of Homeland Security and operated by the U.S. Secret Service. I strongly support it because it addresses a serious problem and advances a solution that is critically important to the safety of our people.

Cybercrime poses an enormous threat to national security, economic prosperity, and public safety. The range of threats and the challenges that they present for law enforcement multiply just as rapidly as technology evolves, causing serious insecurity in the personal lives, the work lives, and the finances of our people.

Over the past decade, our law enforcement community has recorded a significant increase in the quantity, quality, complexity, and danger of sophisticated cybercrimes targeting private industry, including our financial services sector and private individuals. These crimes include intrusions; hacking attacks; the surreptitious installation of malicious software; identity theft; and massive data breaches that have compromised and exposed the personal, financial, business, medical, and professional information of millions of U.S. citizens.

How many of our people have suffered the disruption, indignity, and anxiety of identity theft, for example?

For Americans who have been victimized by cybercrime, especially our seniors, it is a terrifying and demoralizing experience. For small businesses affected, it is costly and enormously draining.

Just as cyber warfare has transformed the nature of war in this century, cybercrime has transformed the nature of crime, adversely affecting the members of our law enforcement and intelligence services.

To date, the National Computer Forensics Institute has risen to the occasion, training more than 4,000 State and local law enforcement officers and 1,600 prosecutors. With this legislation, the institute will continue to educate State and local law enforcement officials, prosecutors, and judges on current trends in cyber and electronic crime investigations and best practices taken across the country. The institute will train officers on proper procedures to conduct these important investigations that are affecting more and more Americans every year.

In addition, the National Computer Forensics Institute will continue to work to protect our citizens' personal information from unwarranted governmental intrusion by establishing national standards for conducting these investigations. The institute will protect these important privacy interests along with the security of our businesses, our homes, our finances, and our personal effects.

For these reasons, I proudly support H.R. 1616.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE), the chief sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1616, the Strengthening State and Local Cyber Crime Fighting Act of 2017.

Let me start out by thanking Chairman GOODLATTE for his support and allowing this bill to come to the floor and Senator GRASSLEY, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and Ranking Member FEINSTEIN for their support in introducing a companion measure over in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the bicameral, bipartisan support on this issue underscores its critical importance and the need for this issue to transcend political parties and partisan politics.

Mr. Speaker, this is Police Week in the United States. It is our chance to show appreciation for some of the most important unsung heroes in our Nation. I couldn't be more grateful for the opportunity to use my time before this legislative body today to thank each and every member of this country's brave dedicated men and women of law enforcement. From patrolling our streets to pursuing criminals of every kind, it is these men and women in blue who keep our communities safe and uphold the pillars of law and order in society each and every day. Every American should be grateful for those who run towards danger and who march into harm's way to keep us safe.

Nearly a decade ago I had the privilege of being appointed the United States Attorney under former President George W. Bush. Serving as the President's top Federal law enforcement official gave me the chance to work shoulder to shoulder with hundreds of great police officers and police departments across the 33,000 square miles of the Eastern District of Texas. It also instilled in me an incredible sense of gratitude for those in law enforcement who wake up each and every day simply wanting to make the world around them a safer place to live for all of us.

I could say it 1,000 times and it wouldn't do justice to the service that they provide: Thank you. Thank you for all you do. We are all grateful.

And while the simple truth is that we can never really repay those in law enforcement for the incredible sacrifices they make each and every day, as a lawmaker, I want to do everything within my power to give them the tools to help them keep us safe.

Today this body has a unique opportunity to stand up for those who selflessly and dependably stand up for all of us. H.R. 1616, the Strengthening State and Local Cyber Crime Fighting Act of 2017, does exactly that by authorizing into law the National Computer Forensics Institute, or NCFI.

As the chairman said, the NCFI is a critical national training center located in Hoover, Alabama, that is operated by the United States Secret Service for the purpose of training our State and local law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges on how to investigate cyber and electronic crimes, on how to conduct computer and mobile device forensics examinations, to respond to network intrusions, and to preserve the chain of custody for digital evidence.

Mr. Speaker, in today's digital world, it is rarely that drop of blood or strand of hair that solves a crime or a case. Instead, far more frequently, it is proof of a text message that was sent or an online purchase that was made or geolocation data on a mobile device.

Since its creation, the NCFI has trained and equipped more than 6,000 law enforcement officials from all 50 States on how to handle digital evidence and solve and prosecute cybercrimes. By authorizing the NCFI into Federal law, Congress can ensure that the NCFI remains our Nation's premier cybercrime training center for State and local law enforcement officials for many years to come.

This isn't some theoretical program at the NCFI. The proverbial rubber is already hitting the road. In fact, three different law enforcement agencies in my own district have had their folks trained at the NCFI, folks like Don Waddle, a 25-year veteran of the Greenville Police Department in my home district. In a hearing I chaired last year about the impact of the training that Don received at NCFI, he talked about the value that not just he got as a law enforcement officer, but the community that he serves.

He told me: I am not the main benefactor of this training. The citizens of Greenville and Hunt County and the entire northeast Texas area reap the benefits of this training with better recovery rates for stolen property, as well as more perpetrators being taken off of our streets.

□ 1630

Don is like thousands of detectives and prosecutors and judges across the country who because of their NCFI training are better able to serve their communities and do their law enforce-

ment jobs in an ever-increasing digital world.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this bill could not be more clear. Cybercrime has surpassed drug trafficking as the most profitable criminal enterprise in the world. Today, let's vote to help fight cybercrime by passing this commonsense legislation to support our law enforcement and give our officers a leg up on the criminals who are increasingly using digital means in cyberspace to evade justice.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1616. I once again thank Chairman GOODLATTE and my Senate colleagues for their support.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time. Just to close, I want to echo Congressman RATCLIFFE in observing it is National Police Week, so we have the opportunity to highlight the successful efforts that have already taken place to combat cybercrime.

As the operator of the National Computer Forensics Institute, the Secret Service has demonstrated its excellence and diligence in pursuing cybercrime both domestically and internationally. Its investigations have produced more than 4,000 arrests, involving more than a billion dollars in fraud, and saving the public billions of dollars more in potential fraud that would have taken place absent their intervention.

H.R. 1616 will strengthen these efforts in continuing to combat cyber and electronic crime.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman RATCLIFFE and the committee for their work on this bill.

The internet is an ever-increasing medium for criminals to carry out crimes, such as sex trafficking, credit card theft, and identity theft. We are currently witnessing an unprecedented global cyber attack. Attacks such as this threaten our economy and our national security. This highlights the need for law enforcement to be trained at local, State, and national levels to recognize and combat this activity.

Prior to 2008, training for State and local law enforcement and cybercrimes was difficult to find. Recognizing this problem in 2007, the State of Alabama offered the Secret Service and the Department of Homeland Security property and funds to construct a state-of-the-art facility if the Federal Government would fund the training and allow the Secret Service to operate it. I am proud to say this facility is located in my district in the city of Hoover.

The National Computer Forensics Institute, NCFI, opened its doors in May of 2008. State and local law enforcement officers come from all across the Nation to be trained at this one-of-a-kind facility, where they are trained by Secret Service agents on the same equipment and same software that our Secret Service agents use.

NCFI has trained law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges from all 50 States, and its graduates represent over 500 agencies. They are not only trained in solving crimes but also in prosecution.

I am pleased that the work that NCFI does is being recognized, and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 1616. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this good legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1616, or the Strengthening State and Local Cyber Crime Fighting Act of 2017. This piece of legislation will help our local and state agencies protect against the rising threat of cybercrime.

The Strengthening State and Local Cyber Crime Fighting Act of 2017 will provide more protection for our citizens by sharing the expertise and knowledge of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) with local and state agencies so that they have the ability to stop these threats at a local level. Law enforcement officials in states, tribes, and territories will be provided with additional training to identify potential issues.

Cybercrime is a growing threat to American security. Hackers have become notorious lately, stealing a plethora of information including credit cards numbers, security codes, bank numbers, and other personal information that can compromise the security of an individual. Further protections and training in cyber security also protect local municipalities and state government intranets and cyber services which are also at risk of compromise.

In DHS, there is an organization known as the National Computer Forensics Institute that is under the oversight of the United States Secret Service. The Institute oversees the fight against cyber threats on a national level. Under H.R. 1616, the members of the Institute will be able to provide high quality training to lower echelon departments at state and local levels, to assist them in the battle against cybercrime. On top of the training, the Institute will provide new, advanced technology to these agencies to even further their ability to combat cybercrime.

As technology has progressed, hackers have found new ways to dishonestly make a living. We are at the precipice of a new age of technological advances that come with more sinister implications. With new technology, new threats have materialized that can have major impacts on all of our lives. Hackers can steal personal files, ruin our reputations, and destroy our financial stability. They can slow or destabilize our local governments, making our lives harder.

This bill helps to put the United States at an advantage against hackers. We will now be

able to more effectively combat these criminals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1616, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

HONORING HOMETOWN HEROES ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1892) to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1892

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Honoring Hometown Heroes Act".

SEC. 2. PERMITTING THE FLAG TO BE FLOWN AT HALF-STAFF IN THE EVENT OF THE DEATH OF A FIRST RESPONDER SERVING IN THE LINE OF DUTY.

(a) AMENDMENT.—The sixth sentence of section 7(m) of title 4, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "or" after "possession of the United States" and inserting a comma;

(2) by inserting "or the death of a first responder working in any State, territory, or possession who dies while serving in the line of duty," after "while serving on active duty,";

(3) by striking "and" after "former officials of the District of Columbia" and inserting a comma; and

(4) by inserting before the period the following: " , and first responders working in the District of Columbia".

(b) FIRST RESPONDER DEFINED.—Such subsection is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking " , United States Code; and" and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting " ; and"; and

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

"(4) the term 'first responder' means a 'public safety officer' as defined in section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b)."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to deaths of first responders occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1892, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

On June 14, 1777, the Second Continental Congress passed a resolution establishing an official flag for the new American Nation. The resolution, now known as the Flag Act of 1777, stated that the flag would be "thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new Constellation."

For the last 240 years, the American people have celebrated Flag Day every June 14, and, over that time, the flag has evolved. As we all know, changes have been made to its design, shape, and arrangement. The Flag Act of 1794 changed the design from 13 to 15 stars to accommodate the admission of Vermont and Kentucky into the Union. The Flag Act of 1818 mandated that the 13 stripes represented the Thirteen Original Colonies, the number of stars matched the number of States, and provided that subsequent changes in the number of stars would be made on the 4th of July.

What has remained rock solid over that quarter millennium, however, is what our flag represents. It represents one nation, freedom, and justice for all, and the sacrifices made in pursuit of those core American values.

Current law provides guidance for displaying and handling the flag so it is afforded the respect it deserves and has earned. In abiding by these guidelines, we all commemorate the value and love we hold for what our flag represents. That is why the legislation before us today, H.R. 1892, the Honoring Hometown Heroes Act, is not only appropriate but necessary.

This bill amends Federal law to permit State and Territorial Governors and the Mayor of Washington, D.C., to order that the flag be flown at halfstaff in the event that a public safety officer dies in the line of duty. For purposes of this legislation, "public safety officers" include local police officers, firefighters, and EMS professionals. These are individuals who make great sacrifices so we all can live in a free country. These men and women work long hours, separated from their loved ones, and consistently place themselves in harm's way so we as Americans can enjoy our freedom and our way of life.

These sacrifices often go unappreciated.

When an officer dies in the line of duty, he or she is making the ultimate sacrifice for their community, their family, and for their country. H.R. 1892 allows the American people to show their appreciation to these men and women, who are truly the bulwark between order and chaos. They represent the values the Founders held so dear nearly 250 years ago, and their sacrifices must be publicly acknowledged so they are not taken for granted.

I thank the lead sponsor of this bill, Congressman JOHN LARSON. On May 3, the House Committee on the Judiciary approved the Honoring Hometown Heroes Act with unanimous, bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and the other bills before the House today to honor the men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice to ensure the safety of our Nation.

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

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

I rise also in support of H.R. 1892, the Honoring Hometown Heroes Act. I want to begin by saluting the distinguished author of this legislation, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), who has navigated the twists and turns of the legislative process to bring this legislation to the floor with the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1892 would bestow one of the highest honors that can be given in America to our first responders who have died in the line of duty by allowing the U.S. flag to be lowered in their respective jurisdictions. The bill amends the U.S. Flag Code to allow the Governor of a State, Territory or possession, and the Mayor of the District of Columbia to order the flag be lowered to halfstaff if a first responder in the jurisdiction dies while serving in the line of duty.

Our first responders put their lives on the line every day for the greater good of the people that they have taken an oath to serve and protect. Every year, some first responders make the ultimate sacrifice and lose their lives while serving and protecting their communities in the line of duty.

Currently, under the U.S. Flag Code, a Governor or the Mayor of the District of Columbia can order that the flag be lowered to halfstaff after the death of a President or former government official or after the death of a member of the Armed Forces from the jurisdiction. It is only fitting that, given the hard work and sacrifices and crucial role of first responders, we honor these brave men and women in the same way that we honor government officials and members of the Armed Forces when they make the ultimate sacrifice. Accordingly, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1892.

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

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Member from Maryland and our distinguished chairman from Virginia for taking up this legislation.

Let me start by thanking so many cosponsors, starting with PETER KING and BILL PASCRELL, the co-chairs of our Congressional Fire Services Caucus, for their extraordinary work; the sheriff, as I like to refer to DAVID REICHERT, who I serve with on the Committee on Ways and Means; and TIM WALZ, the chairman of the Congressional Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Caucus and ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Amongst the Members who are cosponsors of the bill, many are former first responders as well: DUTCH RUPERSBERGER, former police officer; JOHN RUTHERFORD, former sheriff of Duval County, Florida; BRIAN FITZPATRICK, former FBI special agent; JIM RENACCI, former volunteer firefighter from Ohio.

Special thanks to the Committee on the Judiciary for recognizing, however simple a solution, how powerful the meaning for those who have lost a member of their community and their family who, as Lincoln would say, have given the full measure of their devotion. I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS, STEVE KING, and STEVE COHEN also for their work on this. I deeply appreciate it.

I especially thank and single out Jim McLoughlin, a veteran firefighter from Connecticut. He is the founder of the National Honor Guard Commanders Association, and it was he who first came to me with endorsing this concept.

I also thank the strong support of Harold Schaitberger of the International Association of Firefighters, the Fraternal Order of Police, Sergeants Benevolent Association, International Association of Fire Chiefs, and the National Volunteer Fire Council, among others.

As has been said on the floor already today, a number of people have mentioned that this week we come together during National Police Week to recognize first responders. In fact, the White House was lit in blue last night. It is those who put their lives on the line every day to protect us and our communities, as the chairman noted, who often get forgotten in terms of their line of duty.

I am the son of a proud firefighter. I think in every firefighter's memory and every memory of the Nation will be permanently seared that vision of firefighters rushing up the steps of the

World Trade Center as people were coming down.

□ 1645

Whether it is a national emergency or a medical emergency, these brave men and women are the first to answer the call, and they deserve our respect.

Scripture tells us to love our neighbors as we love ourselves, but only a few are willing to step into harm's way for others. When everyone else flees from danger, our law enforcement officers, firefighters, and EMTs heroically place their lives in jeopardy to help people that they have never met.

These jobs are inherently dangerous. The reminders are too common. And as any family of a first responder can tell you, they oftentimes do not return home to their families. JOE CROWLEY has spoken eloquently of that on this very floor.

This bill has been reviewed by the chairman, and I thank Mr. RASKIN for his comments as well. But I think we can all agree that these courageous men and women deserve what is a simple tribute but a very powerful message when the American flag and all that it stands for is lowered to halfstaff when they have given the full measure of their devotion to their community, their State, and this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its passage and am thankful for the bipartisan support that we have received on this very important week for these incredibly remarkable and important people who serve their country.

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

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this wonderful legislation, and I take the occasion of National Police Week to restate everyone in this body's appreciation for the hard work that our responders and our officers do.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1892, The Honoring Hometown Heroes Act. This bill will be crucial in giving the courageous first responders the recognition they deserve.

The Honoring Hometown Heroes Act, or H.R. 1892, will help give honor to those who have passed away while serving their communities. First responders are some of the most important people in the country. They put out the fires that threaten our homes. They keep our streets safe to live on. They bring people who are suffering from a medical issue to the hospital to provide them with the care that they need. They investigate the crimes that have been committed and bring the perpetrators to justice. These brave men and women are often volunteers, who merely want to help their communities.

These jobs are often dangerous. They involve fires, carbon monoxide, violence, and other hostile acts. Unfortunately, due to the dangerous nature of this work, not all of these

men and women survive. They are killed serving their communities, making them better places to live. These men and women have given the ultimate sacrifice to their towns and cities. They deserve as much honor and respect that can be bestowed upon them and their families.

I have the utmost respect and admiration for these men and women and believe that this bill gives proper public respect to fallen first responders. Governors will now be able to declare the flag to be lowered to half-mast. This gives governors the ability to immediately honor the fallen first responders. These men and women deserve as much.

I believe that Congressman LARSON's bill is a necessity for the United States. It is regrettable that such legislation has not been passed before this time. I put my full support behind this effort to honor those who have fallen in the service of others. This bill is an example of true patriotism that all members of this chamber, Republicans, Democrats, and Independents, can get behind for the benefit of the fallen first responders, their families, and the American people. I therefore urge passage of H.R. 1892.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1892.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

AMERICAN LAW ENFORCEMENT HEROES ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1428) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1428

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Law Enforcement Heroes Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. PRIORITIZING HIRING AND TRAINING OF VETERANS.

Section 1701(b)(2) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(b)(2)) is amended by inserting "including by prioritizing the hiring and training of veterans (as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code)" after "Nation".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1428, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Police officers and military veterans have much in common: Both wear uniforms, both protect and serve, and both face great physical risk in executing their duties. It is understandable, then, that many military servicemen and -women seek employment as police officers upon returning to civilian life.

Similarly, police departments are seeking men and women who are physically and mentally fit to assume these roles, who are used to working in teams, and who have experience making quick decisions under stress. To a police department, a military veteran may be a perfect fit.

In recent years, we have strived for community-oriented approaches to policing. A community-oriented approach requires officers not just to enforce laws, but to wear many other hats, like first aid provider, social worker, counselor, crisis manager, and peacemaker. If there is a problem, we expect the police to solve it. The knowledge, skill, and abilities military veterans bring to police departments enhance the departments' problem-solving mission.

H.R. 1428, the American Law Enforcement Heroes Act of 2017, is good legislation introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD). The bill authorizes grantees who receive grants under the Community Oriented Policing Services program at the Department of Justice, commonly known as COPS, to use them for prioritizing the hiring and training of military veterans.

When military veterans return from deployment and enter civilian life, it is important we recognize their sacrifices by assuring they can obtain employment and support their families. This bill helps to ensure veterans can do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HURD for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 1428, the American Law Enforcement Heroes Act of 2017. I want to thank the author of the bill, Mr. HURD, for bringing it forward.

This measure has the laudable goal of recognizing our brave men and women

who have served in the armed services, but it also helps to protect our communities through community-oriented policing.

I support H.R. 1428 for several reasons. To begin with, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, also known as the COPS Office, is responsible for advancing community policing by law enforcement agencies through information and grant resources.

The COPS Office promotes community policing with a commitment to building trust and mutual respect between police and the people in the communities they serve by awarding grants to law enforcement agencies for the hiring of law enforcement officers for community policing.

Through the COPS Hiring Program, funds are provided directly to law enforcement agencies to hire or rehire career law enforcement officers to increase their community policing capacity and crime prevention activities. To date, more than 129,000 officers for over 13,000 agencies have been funded via the COPS Hiring Program, which was first established 23 years ago under President Bill Clinton in 1994.

The COPS Office began supporting military veterans through the COPS Hiring Program and currently gives additional consideration to law enforcement agencies that commit to hiring our veterans. Although we have not had hearings to discuss the import of providing incentives through this program for the hiring of veterans as new law enforcement officers by State and local law enforcement, we believe the bill is well designed and well intentioned.

The bill prioritizes grant applications of law enforcement agencies that will use grant funds from the COPS Office to hire veterans, thereby giving preference to those agencies when applying for grant funds. The intent is to assist law enforcement agencies in attracting well-qualified, service-oriented people who have already served America through their military service.

Another positive purpose of this legislation is to provide our brave veterans the opportunity to continue to serve their country and respective communities upon completion of their military service. Military service provides vital leadership traits that can be valuable in assisting military veterans in their effort to succeed in law enforcement careers, and we need to take advantage of that.

Veterans with combat experience have obtained skill sets that relate to law enforcement work, such as discipline, loyalty, ethical standards, and integrity; physical fitness; firearms and tactical skills; the ability to respond appropriately under stress; and experience working with diverse populations.

Those who have served in the military often have a desire to continue to

serve others, and a career as a law enforcement officer allows veterans to continue serving others through community policing, where we need them so much. A career in law enforcement also provides veterans with long-term stability, gives a sense of accomplishment and pride, and offers a career where their dedication to protecting and serving the public can be applied.

Finally, measures such as H.R. 1428 will help ensure our communities are protected through community-oriented policing.

Accordingly, we support passage of H.R. 1428, the American Law Enforcement Heroes Act.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), the chief author of this legislation.

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, the veteran unemployment rate is currently 5 percent in Texas, higher than the national average of 3.7. While the national average has steadily declined in recent years, the unemployment rate for young veterans ages 18 to 24 has skyrocketed to 13 percent, more than double the rate it was at this time last year.

We need to do more for the men and women who have sacrificed so much for our freedom and our safety. That is why I introduced the American Law Enforcement Heroes Act: to provide an outlet for these heroes to continue their service right here at home.

My district is home to more than 4,600 Active Duty and 45,000 military veterans who have served or supported Joint Base San Antonio, Laughlin Air Force Base, and Fort Bliss, among others. They often tell me about their struggles to find good jobs once they leave the military.

This bill incentivizes State and local governments to hire veterans as new law enforcement officers by giving preference when applying for grants through DOJ's COPS Office which fund academy and field training along with promoting community collaboration. It is modeled after an expired program called Troops to COPS, which helped about 1,000 veterans in the late 1990s.

We owe our freedom to these men and women and must do a better job facilitating their transition into meaningful civilian careers. Ultimately, we should be doing everything we can to help those who have served our Nation in one uniform continue to do so in another one right here at home.

In commemoration of both National Police Week and Military Appreciation Month, this bill will better serve our veterans and be a win for communities nationwide.

I want to thank Senator JOHN CORNYN, my colleague from Texas, for his leadership on this issue, and I ask my

colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 1428.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I close by restating my support for this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I again commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) for his thoughtful legislation and his outstanding leadership on this issue. This is good legislation that will help young military men and women find employment in law enforcement where they can provide great continued service to our country.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1428, the American Law Enforcement Heroes Act of 2017. This bill will positively affect the way we fight crime in our nation.

The American Law Enforcement Heroes Act of 2017 provides for the prioritization of the hiring of veterans to police forces across the nation and will allow public funds granted by the Community Oriented Policing Services program to be allocated towards the hiring and training of veterans entering local police forces.

Our veterans are some of the bravest and most honorable men and women in this nation. They have voluntarily risen to the occasion to protect our nation from foreign threats. These men and women have served in far flung, dangerous places around the globe, from Iraq and Afghanistan to Vietnam to Lebanon. They have risked their lives to fulfill the goal of President Woodrow Wilson: to "make the world safe for democracy." These veterans helped bring freedom and security to oppressed peoples, while protecting and serving all Americans, to protect our unique and comfortable existence.

Our veterans are currently plagued with issues such as mental health issues often stemming from combat experience, drug abuse, unemployment, and homelessness. Veterans are currently more likely to become homeless after serving, more likely to be unemployed, and more likely to fall under the oppression of hard drugs. By implementing the American Law Enforcement Heroes Act of 2017, we, as a Congress, will be continuing our commitment to our veterans by helping to provide them with jobs. These jobs will provide a stable income and resources for our veterans to access, in case of debilitating mental health issues such as Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

Our veterans will be able to continue serving the American people with the particular training and expertise provided by the greatest military in the world. They have had access to education and are highly skilled at a plethora of jobs that municipal police departments can utilize to their advantage. By hiring these men and women, police forces around the nation can make the nation a safer, more secure place.

I give my full support to the American Law Enforcement Heroes Act of 2017. This bill not only provides employment for our veterans, who have provided so much for our nation, but also makes our cities safer places to live.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1428.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE STABILIZATION OF IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-42)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, is to continue in effect beyond May 22, 2017.

Obstacles to the orderly reconstruction of Iraq, the restoration and maintenance of peace and security in the country, and the development of political, administrative, and economic institutions in Iraq continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Accordingly, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 16, 2017.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 115, THIN BLUE LINE ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-126) on the resolution (H. Res. 323) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 115) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1039, PROBATION OFFICER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-127) on the resolution (H. Res. 324) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1039) to amend section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, to grant probation officers authority to arrest hostile third parties who obstruct or impede a probation officer in the performance of official duties, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

STRENGTHENING STATE AND LOCAL CYBER CRIME FIGHTING ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1616) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the National Computer Forensics Institute, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 3, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 258]

YEAS—408

Abraham	Bera	Boyle, Brendan
Adams	Bergman	F.
Aderholt	Beyer	Brady (TX)
Aguilar	Biggs	Brat
Allen	Bilirakis	Bridenstine
Amodei	Bishop (GA)	Brooks (IN)
Arrington	Bishop (MI)	Brown (MD)
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Brownley (CA)
Bacon	Buchanan	Buck
Banks (IN)	Black	Bucshon
Barletta	Blackburn	Budd
Barr	Blum	Burgess
Barragán	Blumenauer	Bustos
Barton	Blunt Rochester	Butterfield
Bass	Bonamici	Byrne
Beatty	Bost	

Calvert	Gibbs	Lujan, Ben Ray	Schneider	Stivers	Walker
Capuano	Gohmert	Lynch	Schrader	Suozi	Walorski
Carbajal	Gonzalez (TX)	MacArthur	Schweikert	Swalwell (CA)	Walters, Mimi
Cardenas	Goodlatte	Maloney,	Scott (VA)	Takano	Walz
Carson (IN)	Gosar	Carolyn B.	Scott, Austin	Taylor	Wasserman
Carter (GA)	Gottheimer	Maloney, Sean	Scott, David	Tenney	Schultz
Carter (TX)	Gowdy	Marchant	Sensenbrenner	Thompson (CA)	Waters, Maxine
Cartwright	Granger	Marshall	Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Watson Coleman
Castor (FL)	Graves (GA)	Mast	Sessions	Thompson (PA)	Weber (TX)
Castro (TX)	Graves (LA)	Matsui	Sewell (AL)	Thornberry	Webster (FL)
Chabot	Graves (MO)	McCarthy	Shea-Porter	Tipton	Welch
Cheney	Green, Al	McCaul	Sherman	Titus	Wenstrup
Chu, Judy	Green, Gene	McClintock	Shimkus	Tonko	Westerman
Cicilline	Griffith	McCollum	Shuster	Torres	Williams
Clark (MA)	Grothman	McEachin	Simpson	Trott	Wilson (FL)
Clarke (NY)	Guthrie	McGovern	Sires	Tsongas	Wilson (SC)
Clay	Hanabusa	McHenry	Slaughter	Turner	Wittman
Cleaver	Harper	McKinley	Smith (MO)	Upton	Womack
Clyburn	Harris	McMorris	Smith (NE)	Valadao	Woodall
Coffman	Hartzler	Rodgers	Smith (NJ)	Vargas	Yarmuth
Cohen	Hastings	McNerney	Smith (TX)	Veasey	Yoder
Cole	Heck	McSally	Smith (WA)	Vela	Yoho
Collins (GA)	Hensarling	Meadows	Smucker	Velázquez	Young (AK)
Collins (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Meehan	Soto	Visclosky	Young (IA)
Comer	Hice, Jody B.	Meeks	Speier	Wagner	Zeldin
Comstock	Higgins (LA)	Meng	Stefanik	Walberg	
Conaway	Higgins (NY)	Messer	Stewart	Walden	
Connolly	Hill	Mitchell			
Conyers	Himes	Moolenaar			
Cook	Holding	Mooney (WV)	Amash	Jones	Massie
Cooper	Hollingsworth	Moore			
Correa	Hoyer	Moulton			
Costa	Hudson	Mullin	Brady (PA)	Lieu, Ted	Rohrabacher
Costello (PA)	Huffman	Murphy (FL)	Brooks (AL)	Marino	Rooney, Thomas
Courtney	Huizenga	Murphy (PA)	Chaffetz	Napolitano	J.
Cramer	Hultgren	Nadler	Grijalva	Newhouse	Roybal-Allard
Crawford	Hurd	Neal	Gutiérrez	Pelosi	Sinema
Crist	Issa	Noem	Hunter	Perlmutter	Tiberi
Crowley	Jackson Lee	Nolan	Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)	
Cuellar	Jayapal	Norcross			
Culberson	Jeffries	Nunes			
Cummings	Jenkins (KS)	O'Halleran			
Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (WV)	O'Rourke			
Davidson	Johnson (GA)	Olson			
Davis (CA)	Johnson (LA)	Palazzo			
Davis, Danny	Johnson (OH)	Pallone			
Davis, Rodney	Johnson, E. B.	Palmer			
DeFazio	Jordan	Panetta			
DeGette	Joyce (OH)	Pascrell			
Delaney	Kaptur	Paulsen			
DeLauro	Katko	Payne			
DelBene	Keating	Pearce			
Demings	Kelly (IL)	Perry			
Denham	Kelly (MS)	Peters			
Dent	Kelly (PA)	Peterson			
DeSantis	Kennedy	Pingree			
DeSaulnier	Khanna	Pittenger			
DesJarlais	Kihuen	Pocan			
Deutch	Kildee	Poliquin			
Diaz-Balart	Kilmer	Polis			
Dingell	Kind	Posey			
Doggett	King (IA)	Price (NC)			
Donovan	King (NY)	Quigley			
Doyle, Michael	Kinzinger	Raskin			
F.	Knight	Ratcliffe			
Duffy	Krishnamoorthi	Reed			
Duncan (SC)	Kuster (NH)	Reichert			
Duncan (TN)	Kustoff (TN)	Renacci			
Dunn	Labrador	Rice (NY)			
Ellison	LaHood	Rice (SC)			
Emmer	LaMalfa	Richmond			
Engel	Lamborn	Roby			
Eshoo	Lance	Roe (TN)			
Espallat	Langevin	Rogers (AL)			
Estes (KS)	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)			
Esty (CT)	Larson (CT)	Rokita			
Evans	Latta	Rooney, Francis			
Farenthold	Lawrence	Ros-Lehtinen			
Faso	Lawson (FL)	Rosen			
Ferguson	Lee	Roskam			
Fitzpatrick	Levin	Ross			
Fleischmann	Lewis (GA)	Rothfus			
Flores	Lewis (MN)	Rouzer			
Fortenberry	Lipinski	Royce (CA)			
Foster	LoBiondo	Ruiz			
Fox	Loeb	Ruppersberger			
Frankel (FL)	Lofgren	Rush			
Franks (AZ)	Long	Russell			
Frelinghuysen	Loudermilk	Rutherford			
Fudge	Love	Ryan (OH)			
Gabbard	Lowenthal	Sánchez			
Gaetz	Lowey	Sanford			
Gallagher	Lucas	Sarbanes			
Galleo	Luetkemeyer	Scalise			
Garamendi	Lujan Grisham,	Schakowsky			
Garrett	M.	Schiff			

NAYS—3

NOT VOTING—19

□ 1853

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. GARAMENDI changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

No (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 258.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUES- TION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause (2)(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately disclose his tax return information to Congress and the American people;

Whereas, in the United States' system of checks and balances, Congress has a responsibility to hold the executive branch of government to the highest standard of transparency to ensure the public interest is placed first;

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed their tax return information to the public;

Whereas, tax returns provide an important baseline disclosure because

they contain highly instructive information, including whether the candidate paid taxes, number one; what they own, number two; what they have borrowed and from whom, number three; whether they have made any charitable donations, number four; and whether they have taken advantage of tax loopholes, number five.

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns could help those investigating Russian influence in the 2016 election understand the President's financial ties to the Russian Federation and Russian citizens, including debts owed and whether he shares any partnership interests, equity interests, joint ventures, or licensing agreements with Russia or Russians;

Whereas, the President fired FBI Director James Comey last week, whose FBI was investigating whether the Trump campaign colluded with Russia to influence the 2016 election;

Whereas, Attorney General Jeff Sessions, who made the recommendation to fire Director Comey, during sworn testimony—the Interior Ryan Zinke to review national monuments that Presidents have designated or expanded since 1996;

Whereas, this review was praised by industry groups who could benefit financially from oil, gas, mining, and condemned by environmental organizations concerned this review will scrap or scale back critical Federal designation to protect tribal and historic lands;

Whereas, the American people are in the dark to knowing if this review was started to justify selling or leasing public lands to private corporations that could enrich the President or his business partners without reviewing the President's tax returns;

Whereas, it has been reported that Federal prosecutors have issued grand jury subpoenas to associates of former National Security Adviser Michael Flynn seeking business records as part of the ongoing probe into Russian involvement in the 2016 election;

Whereas, according to his 2016 candidate filing with the Federal Election Commission, the President has 564 financial positions in companies located not only in the United States but around the world;

Whereas, against the advice of ethics attorneys and the Office of Government Ethics, the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his businesses and can still withdraw funds at any time from the trust of which he is sole beneficiary;

Whereas, the Emoluments Clause was included in the United States Constitution for the express purpose of preventing Federal officials from accepting any—from the Constitution, article I, section 9—“present Emolument, Office, or Title . . . from any King, Prince, or foreign state”;

Whereas, the most signed petition on the White House website calls for the release of the President's tax return information to verify compliance.

The legislative branch has the responsibility and the authority to check the executive branch in section 6103 of the Tax Code—in 1924 allows for an examination of his tax returns, the authority put in place specifically so Congress could examine the conflicts of interest in the executive branch of government following the biggest scandal of the 20th century, the Teapot Dome scandal.

□ 1900

Nothing could be more of a threat to the integrity of the House than ignoring our duty to fully examine the personal financial entanglements this President may have with Russian entities and individuals and whether he has abused the tax laws of the United States of America.

We have nothing but evidence to justify such an examination. If and when such conflicts are revealed, I do not want to say to our constituents that we had the power to review these conflicts, but we did nothing. I, for one, do not want my integrity, or the integrity of my colleagues on either side of the aisle in this body, to be demeaned by such a shameful failure.

To restore the dignity of the House, we must use our authority to request President Trump's tax returns and give the American people the transparency they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the oral announcement of the resolution in order that the entire text appears in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately disclose his tax return information to Congress and the American people.

Whereas, in the United States' system of checks and balances, Congress has a responsibility to hold the Executive Branch of government to the highest standard of transparency to ensure the public interest is placed first;

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed their tax return information to the public;

Whereas, tax returns provide an important baseline disclosure because they contain highly instructive information including whether the candidate paid taxes, what they own, what they have borrowed and from whom, whether they have made any charitable donations, and whether they have taken advantage of tax loopholes;

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns could help those investigating Russian influence in the 2016 election understand the President's financial ties to the Russian

Federation and Russian citizens, including debts owed and whether he shares any partnership interests, equity interests, joint ventures or licensing agreements with Russia or Russians;

Whereas, the President fired FBI Director James Comey last week, whose FBI was investigating whether the Trump campaign colluded with Russia to influence the 2016 election

Whereas, Attorney General Jeff Sessions, who made the recommendation to fire Director Comey, during sworn testimony neglected to mention his contacts with the Russian ambassador and recused himself from anything involving the Russian investigation;

Whereas, Senate Russia investigators have requested information from the Treasury Department's criminal investigation division, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, or FinCEN, which handles cases of money laundering, for information related to President Trump, his top officials and campaign aides. FinCEN has been investigating allegations of foreign money-laundering through purchases of U.S. real estate;

Whereas, the President's tax returns would show us whether he has foreign bank accounts and how much profit he receives from his ownership in myriad partnerships;

Whereas, the President hired a law firm to send a letter to Senator Lindsey Graham to fight suggestions he has Russian business ties; this letter left open the question whether Mr. Trump or his firms received Russian income or loans or derived income from Russian-linked partnerships.

Whereas, Donald Trump Jr. said the Trump Organization saw money "pouring in from Russia" and that "Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets."

Whereas, the White House will not confirm whether the President has filed a 2016 tax return;

Whereas, Congress gave itself the authority to review an individual's tax returns to investigate and reveal possible conflicts of interest of executive branch officials involved in the Teapot Dome scandal.

Whereas, President Donald Trump's executive order on the Review of designations under the Antiquities Act has directed the U.S. Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke to review national monuments that presidents have designated or expanded since 1996.

Whereas, this review was praised by industry groups who could benefit financially from oil, gas and mining and condemned by environmental organizations concerned this review will scrap or scale back critical federal designation to protect tribal and historic lands.

Whereas, the American people are in the dark to knowing if this review was started to justify selling or leasing public lands to private corporations that could enrich the President or his business partners without reviewing the President's tax returns.

Whereas, it has been reported that federal prosecutors have issued grand jury subpoenas to associates of former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn seeking business records as part of the ongoing probe into Russian involvement in the 2016 election;

Whereas, according to his 2016 candidate filing with the Federal Election Commission, the President has 564 financial positions in companies located in the United States and around the world;

Whereas, against the advice of ethics attorneys and the Office of Government Ethics,

the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his businesses; and can still withdraw funds at any time from the trust of which he is the sole beneficiary;

Whereas, the Emoluments Clause was included in the U.S. Constitution for the express purpose of preventing federal officials from accepting any "present, Emolument, Office, or Title . . . from any King, Prince, or foreign state";

Whereas, the most signed petition on the White House website calls for the release of the President's tax return information to verify compliance with the Emoluments Clause, with 1 million, 94 thousand signatures as of date of this resolution;

Whereas, the Chairmen of the Ways and Means Committee, Joint Committee on Taxation, and Senate Finance Committee have the authority to request the President's tax returns under Section 6103 of the tax code;

Whereas, the Joint Committee on Taxation reviewed the tax returns of President Richard Nixon in 1974 and made the information public;

Whereas, the Ways and Means Committee used IRC 6103 authority in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas, the American people have the right to know whether or not their President is operating under conflicts of interest related to international affairs, tax reform, government contracts, or otherwise: Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives shall—

1. Immediately request the tax return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015 for review in closed executive session by the Committee on Ways and Means, as provided under Section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code, and vote to report the information therein to the full House of Representatives

2. Support transparency in government and the longstanding tradition of Presidents and Presidential candidates disclosing their tax returns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from New Jersey will appear in full in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not, at this point, determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

HONORING AN AMERICAN HERO, JEREMY "SCOTT" MCGUIRE

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor an American hero. Jeremy "Scott" McGuire was a special agent assigned to the National Security Investigations Division at the Department of Homeland Security in New Orleans.

Scott began his career in law enforcement while pursuing a bachelor's degree in criminal justice at the University of Southern Mississippi, where he received the Most Outstanding Undergraduate Pursuing a Career in Law Enforcement Award. After graduating with honors from USM, Scott was hired by the former U.S. Customs Service, where he was an import specialist.

After the September 11 terrorist attacks, Scott was selected to be a special agent with the Immigration and Customs Enforcement team at the Department of Homeland Security. There, he received numerous awards and citations while he investigated successes that included preventing the export of radioactive material in Iraq and halting an attempt to smuggle military aircraft parts to Pakistan, just to name a few examples.

On January 25 of 2016, Scott was killed in the line of duty while conducting investigations to dismantle transnational criminal and terrorist organizations that threaten the United States.

Scott will forever be in our hearts and minds. I want to thank his family for being here with us in the balcony.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 60

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 60.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING THE BISHOP HENDRICKEN HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC DECATHLON TEAM

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Bishop Hendricken High School's Academic Decathlon team, the Division II winners of the United States Academic Decathlon National Competition.

The team consists of Mitchell Boyer, Ryan Brady, Darragh Harkin, Steven Huang, Jaidan Idarraga, Connor Milson, Cory Morris, Alden Pratt, and Dylan Temel. They spent countless hours studying and, on April 22, their hard work paid off. Led by Coach Sister Carol Ann Murray, they won an impressive 12 gold, 8 silver, and 11 bronze medals and became the first Rhode Island team to win their division at the national competition.

The students' dedication and scholastic abilities have made Bishop Hendricken, my alma mater, and the whole State of Rhode Island extremely proud.

Mr. Speaker, they have shown the vast academic potential of Rhode Is-

land students, and I congratulate them on this great accomplishment.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize police officers and our law enforcement community during National Police Week.

It is these brave men and women who put their lives on the line every day for us and for our communities; and it is a special time to remember those who have fallen in the line of duty who have actually made the ultimate sacrifice. Police officers from around the country are gathering this week at the national memorial as a part of that remembrance.

We must also never forget that serving in law enforcement is a family affair and requires strength and dedication from loved ones as well.

As a member of the Law Enforcement Caucus, I know that our communities are better served, and served well, thanks to the unwavering commitment from our police officers who take on countless risks for other people and not just themselves. The badge is not just a symbol of authority but one of selflessness and commitment to the greater good.

Mr. Speaker, we owe so much to these police officers for the many difficult decisions and situations that they face every day, and we thank them for keeping us safe.

NOW IS THE TIME TO ACT

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, today we learned that former FBI Director James Comey documented his conversations with President Trump in a series of memos. In one memo, Mr. Comey claims that, after clearing the room, President Trump asked him to end the investigation of General Michael Flynn. If true, this assault on the rule of law would be a violation of our democracy unseen since Watergate.

What comes next is uncertain, but investigations into this matter must begin, as those into the President's Russia ties must continue. All the Comey memos should be turned over to Congress. Any unclassified memos should be released to the public, and President Trump should submit to investigators any tapes with which he threatened Mr. Comey. Lastly, Congress and the American public must hear Mr. Comey testify publicly and under oath.

The time has come when silence is no longer denial, it becomes complicity.

Now is the time to act, and to do otherwise is only to delay the truth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

HONORING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS DURING POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, tens of thousands of law enforcement officers from across the country arrived in Washington for National Police Week.

Established by a joint resolution of Congress in 1962, National Police Week pays special recognition to those law enforcement officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty for the safety and protection of others. National Police Week is a collaborative effort of many organizations dedicated to honoring America's law enforcement community.

The National Peace Officers' Memorial Service took place on Monday as the Nation paused to remember officers who made the ultimate sacrifice. A candlelight vigil hosted Saturday evening recognized nearly 400 fallen officers. This week honors the men and women in blue who gave everything to protect their country and their communities.

Earlier this year, Pennsylvania mourned the loss of 23-year-old State Trooper Landon Weaver, who was killed in the line of duty on December 30, 2016.

Our officers put on their uniforms each day knowing that they can be in harm's way at any moment. On behalf of a grateful nation, thank you to all of our officers who serve.

INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, this year, the American Society of Civil Engineers once again gave America's infrastructure a D-plus rating.

During Infrastructure Week, I must highlight the need for action and investment in our Nation's infrastructure. Our roads, bridges, and waterways are neither Republican nor Democrat; they belong to all of us.

From the New Deal to the Federal interstate highways, infrastructure projects have traditionally enjoyed broad bipartisan support and leadership. Improving and maintaining our 21st century transportation system creates access and opportunities for all, allowing for job creation, economic growth, and fostering innovation.

As we continue to wait for the President to put forth a plan and true efforts toward investment in our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, we bear witness to hundreds of millions of dollars in lost economic productivity and a threat to the safety and security of our Nation.

It is time to build. It is time to invest in America.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, as we know, this week is National Police Week. With many officers coming from all over the country to Washington, D.C., it is an opportunity for all of us to show our support for our local law enforcement at home by thanking them for all they do to keep us safe in our communities.

I recognize all the men and women in uniform in my own district in northern California and across the country who sacrifice to protect and serve our communities each day. We can't allow these sacrifices to go quietly unnoticed either.

Last year, 135 officers never made it home to their families or their loved ones. In California, 11 officers lost their lives in 2016, one of which was from my district in northern California.

Sheriff Deputy Jack Hopkins of Modoc County Sheriff's Department was murdered while responding to a disturbance call at a rural property a few miles south of Alturas, California. His watch ended on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.

Jack's killer is rightfully facing the death penalty in California; and this week, the House of Representatives is voting on the Thin Blue Line Act, which adds the murder of a law enforcement officer, firefighter, or first responder, as an aggravated factor for a jury to consider in deciding whether to impose the death penalty in Federal capital cases.

The murder of a Federal law enforcement officer is already an aggravated factor under current law. Now we are taking action to ensure that those who harm local and State law enforcement officers are brought to justice as well. We have to send this clear message: We cannot tolerate this under any circumstances.

□ 1915

54TH ANNIVERSARY OF PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 54th anniversary of

Peace Officers Memorial Day, so I rise tonight to pay tribute to the law enforcement officers from Florida who were killed in the line of duty last year.

Today we remember them and honor them for their service and dedication: Deputy Sheriff Eric James Oliver from the Nassau County Sheriff's Office; Major Jorge Sanchez from the Miami Police Department; Deputy Sheriff Michael Scott Williams from the Taylor County Sheriff's Office; Sergeant Jorge Ramos from the Florida Department of Corrections; Deputy Sheriff John Robert Kotfila, Jr., of the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office; Police Officer Henry Malcolm McAleenan, Jr., of the Miami-Dade Police Department; and, as you have already heard tonight, Special Agent J. Scott McGuire of U.S. Homeland Security Investigations.

Mr. Speaker, we remember these brave men and pray for their families and the countless others who have mourned their loss.

CONGRATULATIONS TO LADY EAGLES SOFTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, it all started 11 years ago: The Lady Eagles from Fort Bend Baptist Academy won their first Texas State softball title. Years later, the name was changed to Fort Bend Christian Academy, but the dynasty had been born. The Lady Eagles won their sixth Texas title last week by defeating Dallas Christian School with a score of 6-2.

One word can describe the Lady Eagles' playoff run: domination. In the last four games, they scored 37 runs, their opponents only 2. Our four seniors—Claire, Lauren, Danielle, and Kendall—have set us up to make history: our third straight Texas title in 2018.

We will honor them as we honor the Lord.

Congratulations, Eagles.

PRESIDENT SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO FIRE FBI DIRECTOR

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, why did President Trump fire FBI Director Comey? He called Comey a "showboat" and "grandstander" and said he was going to fire him regardless of the rationale outlined by the Deputy Attorney General. He justified firing Comey, who was leading the investigation into Michael Flynn and Russian interference in our elections, by saying it "is a made-up story."

But the President's political removal of Comey without any legal or ethical

reason shatters the idea that the FBI is independent and insulated from partisan politics. The President should not be able to fire the FBI Director for political or personal reasons.

That is why, today, I introduced legislation to raise the standard for the President to dismiss the FBI Director. Congress placed similar restrictions on the President's power to remove members of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Director of the CFBP, and special counsels. The FBI should be no different.

Congress cannot continue to be a rubberstamp for this administration. Let's uphold our constitutional responsibility to hold the President accountable.

COMMENDING COMFORT CREW FOR MILITARY KIDS FOR THEIR EFFORTS

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor a nonprofit organization in Austin for their outstanding achievements. The Comfort Crew for Military Kids develops and delivers programs to help support the children in our Gold Star families who serve around the world.

This month, the organization is celebrating their 10th anniversary. As a Congressman from Fort Hood, the largest military base, Comfort Crew for Military Kids holds a very special place in my heart. For too long, military families have faced constant struggles and have had few places to turn. The Comfort Crew helps provide relief for these American families who sacrifice so much for our country.

I have personally met with Comfort Crew both in Washington and, just last month, in Austin, Texas. While I was in Austin, I was fortunate enough to lend a hand, assembling care packages for the military children whose parents are deployed. These care packages may not seem like much in comparison to what these kids are giving up in return; however, they provide some comfort and solace.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Comfort Crew for their selfless efforts. They have had an impact on over 1 million military family members. In this unstable world, it is vital that we support these military families that give so much to us.

I am proud to represent this organization and will continue to do everything I can to ensure our military children receive the support they need and the support they deserve.

In God we trust.

HONORING LAW ENFORCEMENT AND FIRST RESPONDERS

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the men and women who protect our families, our streets, and our communities.

Fifty-five years ago, President Kennedy proclaimed May 15 National Police Week. Each year, Americans come together to honor our law enforcement professionals and remember those who have made the ultimate sacrifice while protecting our families and our communities.

I remember that infamous day, 9/11, when thousands were running away from burning and crumbling buildings; yet, at the same time, our police and first responders ran into the same burning and crumbling buildings to save lives. These brave men and women knew that they were running to certain death.

Every day, police leave their homes knowing full well that they may not return that evening. Every day, they have our backs. It is our job to make sure that they know that we have theirs.

CONVINCE CHINA TO REIN IN NORTH KOREA

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, like a character out of Looney Tunes, the incorrigible little Kim of North Korea and his minions can't stop rattling their sabers.

New satellite images show a prolonged and heightened level of activity at North Korea's underground nuclear site. Since coming into power, little Kim has continually defied U.N. sanctions and increased testing of missiles and nuclear weapons.

Just this last weekend, North Korea illegally launched yet another menacing ballistic missile. North Korea plans to develop submarines from which to launch these missiles towards the United States.

Despite little Kim's Wile E. Coyote antics, the United States cannot underestimate the war-prone lunacy of Kim Jong-un. Even our old Deputy Secretary of State recently warned that little Kim's weapon capabilities have shown improvement within the past year, resulting in "unprecedented level of activity."

The last administration's appeasement policy of North Korea and its strategic patience has failed. The United States must cripple North Korea's regime with multiple sanctions. We must convince China that it is in their interest to rein in their puppet state of North Korea, and quickly deploy the new THAAD missile systems throughout the region and in Asia.

And that is just the way it is, Mr. Speaker.

BRING BACK ALL CHIBOK GIRLS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, Nigerian Government officials announced the release of 82 Chibok schoolgirls who have been held captive by Boko Haram since April 20, 2014. I couldn't believe it.

It is truly, truly a reason for celebration, and I thank each and every Member of this House who has shown support for this extremely endless cause.

Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled for the families whose daughters were among the 82 released, but we cannot forget that there are still 113 waiting to be freed. Nigerian President Buhari has vowed to bring them all home.

When we began this fight, the lives of more than 200 girls were at stake. Slowly but surely, we are making progress. The release of the 82 underscores why we cannot give up. We have to keep pushing and pressing, doing everything we can to ensure that this fight doesn't end until the last girl has returned home.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Wear Something Red Wednesday, and I hope that this news will compel every Member of Congress to wear something red and show his or her support for the #bringbackourgirls movement.

Women of Congress, wear your red scarf, a gift for Valentine's Day from Congresswoman DINGELL. Men of Congress, wear a red tie, Republicans and Democrats, and tweet, tweet, tweet.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK AND RECAP OF FIFTH ANNUAL FIRST RESPONDERS TOUR

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Police Week and to thank these brave men and women for their service and sacrifice to their communities.

Our law enforcement and first responders run toward the danger when, oftentimes, we are running away from it. There is no way we can ever truly say "thank you" for their willingness to serve.

Last week, I held my fifth annual first responders tour to thank them for their dedication to the communities of South Carolina and beyond. The tour consisted of five of the counties I represented: Newberry, Saluda, Edgefield, McCormick, and Greenwood. I can tell you that their expertise, focus, and commitment are unmatched.

I visited the facilities and met with the men and women that are on the first line of defense, the ones who are so critical to the safety of our citizens. These folks encounter dangerous and life-threatening situations that require

critical, on-the-spot decisionmaking, but they never second-guess answering that call and going towards the unknown to help those in need.

I hope that events like National Police Week and first responders tours encourage more people to learn about the unique challenges that face these heroes every day. It is important for our law enforcement and first responders to know that their hard work and sacrifice is greatly appreciated.

Thank you to all those that serve and have served. They are truly heroes, and we are grateful for their service to make us safe.

May God bless these heroes, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

BACK THE BLUE AND FIRST RESPONDERS

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, this week we honor the brave men and women who make it their life's duty to protect and defend our citizens, our Nation, and our way of life. Police officers across the country wake up every morning unaware of the challenges they may face, the threats they must overcome, and the lives they will affect and protect in the process.

The badge officers don is a symbol of their altruism and their devotion to the common good. I believe in "Backing the Blue" and visit first responders throughout my district in Texas to express my unyielding support.

America's police officers represent the best in all of us and are the finest our country has to offer. For their service, their sacrifice, and their selflessness, we are eternally thankful.

PRESIDENT'S BREACH OF INTELLIGENCE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I too rise to honor this week of celebrating our police officers and hope to be able to speak about their bravery throughout the week.

But I am overwhelmed and shocked at the actions of the President of the United States to have yielded classified information into code-word intelligence inside a room with the Foreign Minister of Russia and the Ambassador.

It is well known that Ambassador Kislyak is reportedly considered by the U.S. intelligence community to be one of Russia's top spies and a central figure in the FBI investigation into Russia's collusion with Trump campaign officials during the 2016 Presidential election, along with the downfall of

General Flynn. This is an absolutely unacceptable way for a President to act.

Mr. President, you have jeopardized the lives of the American people; you have jeopardized the lives of intelligence assets around the world; and you have breached the liaison relationship that we have had with many of our allies.

This needs to have a full investigation, besides a number of tools of the commission, a special prosecutor. This Judiciary Committee on the House side needs to stand up and have full hearings regarding the investigation of these horrific actions, violations that may breach on high crimes and misdemeanors.

It is shocking that the day after the President fired FBI Director Comey to impede the Bureau's investigation of the Trump campaign's ties to the Russian agents and entities that interfered in the 2016 presidential election, we learn that the President recklessly disclosed classified and highly sensitive information to Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov and Russian ambassador to the U.S. Sergey Kislyak at a meeting held at the request of Russian President Vladimir Putin.

Ambassador Kislyak is reportedly considered by the U.S. intelligence community to be one of Russia's top spies and a central figure in the FBI investigation into Russia's collusion with Trump campaign officials during the 2016 U.S. presidential election.

And yet, the President thought it appropriate to disclose to him classified information that had not even been shared with some of our allies.

The President's disclosure of classified and highly sensitive information may have severely compromised a U.S. intelligence partner.

But rather than provide a more thorough explanation for the President's actions, his surrogates are engaged in a bait and switch, feigning outrage over leaks when the President's loose lips are responsible for the crisis he has created for our nation and for himself.

Every day the President gives the nation another reason to question his judgment, doubt his word, mistrust his motives, or question his capacity and competence to manage the national security and foreign policy of the United States.

The American people deserve better.

Beginning with the creation of an independent bipartisan commission to investigate President Trump's ties to Russia and the appointment of an independent special counsel to investigate the Trump campaign's ties to the Russian agents and entities that interfered in the 2016 presidential election.

And Congress must take seriously its oversight responsibilities, and its oath to uphold the Constitution, and be a check on the excesses of the Executive Branch.

□ 1930

HONORING THE SERVICE OF OUR NATION'S POLICE OFFICERS

(Mr. KATKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the courage and commitment of our policemen and -women across this great country. Every day, individuals donning the police shield risk their lives to protect and serve our local communities.

Having served as a Federal organized crime prosecutor for 20 years, I have had the distinct pleasure and honor of working with countless police organizations across this country, including in my hometown, such as the Syracuse Police Department, the Syracuse Gang Violence Task Force, and the Onondaga County Sheriff's Department, among many others. Together, we worked to make Syracuse safer by going after drug and gang organizations that plague our community. While I now proudly represent New York's 24th Congressional District, their mission continues.

I am elated that this body will consider two bills, the Thin Blue Line Act and the Probation Officer Protection Act, that will help protect these individuals who protect us every day. Further, I have a bill that will be debated tomorrow. This bill will help fusion centers disseminate information to our policemen and -women as they continue to tackle new and adapting threats across this country.

Again, I would like to thank all our Nation's police officers and honor them this day for their dutiful service.

POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the law enforcement community, I rise today to recognize the service and the profound commitment of our police officers around our great Nation.

The dedication and sacrifice of our blue line deserves to be respected every day. National Police Week gives us all the opportunity to stand together in support for those in blue and to recommit ourselves to the ideals and laws of our Nation that they are tasked to uphold.

National Police Week is a special time to unite nationwide to honor those who sacrifice so much to protect our neighborhoods and our loved ones. To those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty, we as a nation stand eternally grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize National Police Week 2017 and to join with the millions of proud Americans throughout our country to thank our law enforcement members for their continued service and sacrifice.

POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise unscripted and sober in respectful support for my brothers and sisters of the thin blue line from sea to shining sea. These men and women behind the badge rise each day and serve each night as we work and as we slumber, sure to face dangers unknown, certain to face enemies unseen, and sometimes to be completely unappreciated. This week, we recognize them and we celebrate them.

To my brothers and sisters of the thin blue line, please hear that your support within this body is unwavering and shall not falter.

God bless you, one and all.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, this is Infrastructure Week.

Infrastructure. Can you imagine Congress actually talking about building things that America needs, like roads, high-speed internet, and maybe a few ports and ships and high-speed trains from here to there?

It is Infrastructure Week. Mr. President, you promised us a trillion-dollar infrastructure bill; however, you seem to be occupied on a few other things. So we will be understanding and just kind of take up the issue here and talk about it and see if we can move this issue forward since we really haven't heard from the administration on your trillion-dollar program.

Let's talk about some of the elements of it today. I am going to start with a really old placard that we have used now for 7 years. We call this the Make It In America agenda, and it has been something that Mr. HOYER of Maryland and I and many others on the Democratic side of the aisle have been talking about for some time. We talk about trade; tax policy; energy policy; and labor issues, such as the Davis-Bacon Act that guarantees that we are not going to have a rush to the bottom, but that we are going to hold up the working men and women that are making things in America, like roads and bridges; education; research; and not at the bottom, but always important, infrastructure.

So today we talk about infrastructure. As we do so, I want us to always keep in mind that infrastructure offers an incredible opportunity for America to do more than just lay down concrete, more than just putting asphalt on a road or a pipe in the ground. Infrastructure offers an opportunity for us

to rebuild the American manufacturing sector. There are many different ways we can do that.

For example, if we are going to build locomotives for the eastern corridor of the Amtrak system here in the United States, new electric locomotives. Way back when, some of us do remember the Great Recession and the effort of this Congress—then controlled by the Democrats—to jump-start, to rebuild the American economy. In what was the stimulus legislation there was a piece of it that called for, I think, \$700 million or \$800 million for about 80 new electric locomotives for Amtrak. Some brilliant staffer wrote into it: 100 percent American made.

Guess what. Siemens, a German company, said, Oh, a \$700 million, \$800 million contract to make a bunch of locomotives; we can do that. So, in Sacramento, California, they expanded their little trolley plant and made it into a locomotive plant. They have now built all of those 100 percent American made.

So when we talk about infrastructure—in this case, the Amtrak system—it can be made in America. Manufacturing matters.

To get down to the details here of what infrastructure is all about, international trade is critical to the American economy. Unfortunately, we are running a trade deficit. All of that trade—about 90 percent of it, actually—comes through the ports of America. So when you talk about infrastructure, you have got to talk about the ports.

Harbor maintenance is a particular program that has been in existence for a long time. It is a tax on every cargo container that arrives in the United States in ports and is basically used for dredging.

My colleague and I, who will be joining me in a few moments from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, made a little change here. We said that money can't just go for the support of the Treasury and the deficit, but, rather, it must be used on harbor maintenance. We expanded the definition of harbor maintenance to include on the wharf and related issues.

But when we talk about infrastructure, much of that infrastructure will start at the great ports on the West Coast up in Seattle and the Puget Sound and San Francisco Bay. Don't let me forget about Oregon. They have got some great ports in Oregon. Then, of course, the busiest port in America—well, probably among the busiest ports—L.A.-Long Beach Port in California.

Infrastructure. Are the American ports ready for tomorrow's international commerce?

The answer is: Not really.

The Panama Canal has been expanded and now we have ships called Panamax ships and super Panamax

ships, all of which require that our ports be upgraded. The channel has deepened. The wharf has expanded. The number of containers that can be handled at any one time increased.

So you have got the channel deepening, wharves that need to be made, docks, the rest, and all of the cranes and all of the movement necessary to handle these ships that have thousands upon thousands of containers, all of which have to be unloaded quickly.

I want to begin with the infrastructure issue at the ports, but there is more to it than that. It is the ships that arrive at the ports.

The United States used to have a great maritime industry. At the end of World War II, there were more than 1,500 American-flagged and American-built ships. Over the years, we have seen a continuing decline in that. We had 500 about 20 years ago, and today, less than 80 ships are American-flagged.

We do have the Jones Act, which is extremely important. That is for the domestic shipping. Those are American-flagged and American-built ships, but those are all domestic. The intercontinental ships—what they call the Blue Ocean Ships—are not made in America anymore, but they could be.

This is where I want to take this discussion. I want to take this discussion back to another part of the infrastructure. Remember, I was talking to you about the trains, the locomotives made in America and really rebuilding the American locomotive industry in California with a German company, Siemens, building those locomotives.

Now, guess what. America is not energy independent yet, but we are on our way to that. We would expect to be the third largest exporter of natural gas in the form of liquefied natural gas by 2020 and one of the world's largest exporters of crude oil by 2025. As of today, none, nada, not any of that liquefied natural gas or oil will be on American-built ships.

Don't you think it ought to be the American policy that some of it should be on American-built ships with American flags and American mariners?

If you care about the national security, you should care about blue water shipbuilding in the United States. There are two bills that I am introducing that go directly to this.

The fundamental question is this: Will the LNG ships be made in China, Korea, Japan, or will they be made in America?

American national security depends upon the U.S. Navy and the ability to build ships in the United States.

Right now, the great oceangoing ships on the commercial side are not built in the United States and our shipyards are losing the trained men and women, from naval architects to welders and steamfitters, and on and on, that can build these ships.

What we need to do is to reenergize the American shipbuilding industry and the infrastructure that goes with it by passing legislation that we call the Energizing American Maritime Act and energizing the American shipbuilding industry, all part of an infrastructure package that includes the ports, the docks, the trains and trucks that arrive there, multimedia, and on the water itself—American-built ships with American sailors providing at least some of the export potential that is in the process of being achieved.

Liquefied natural gas. We would expect to have more than 100 ships moving that LNG from American ports to somewhere around the world—mostly China, Japan, India, and Europe.

□ 1945

But right now it will be zero unless we pass a bill—16 lines of law—that say: Build it in America; make it in America, American mariners, American ships.

We can do this as part of a large, trillion-dollar infrastructure package—ships on the ocean and ports in America that are capable of handling the largest ships in the world, docks that are capable of quickly unloading these ships in an efficient, effective manner, rail yards that move the goods out of the ports and into the ports for export, and the trucks that move across the highways, all of this, part of an infrastructure package, just one piece of a much larger issue.

Now, joining me tonight in our little discussion is an extraordinary Representative from the great State of Connecticut who has now taken a leadership position on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee as vice ranking member, ELIZABETH ESTY.

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

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, Mr. GARAMENDI, for our shared commitment to American manufacturing and to ensure that, once again, America will be the envy of the world for a fantastic infrastructure and transportation system.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), who is my friend and colleague, to continue our discussion on this the second day of National Infrastructure Week to talk about the tremendous need that we have in this country to do a better job to ensure our citizens get to work on time and safely and get home in the same way.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) for allowing me this time to engage the American people in a subject that is crucial to the economy of this Nation and for the citizens that use transportation throughout this country. I think Mr. GARAMENDI really gave us the bang in terms of looking at the rail situation. That is an area that I also am going to speak on.

Let me say that, with every day that passes, the need for Federal infrastructure investment grows more and more urgent. Robust and reliable infrastructure is the foundation for economic success and security. But for too long, the United States has underinvested in our infrastructure, and this once vibrant foundation has crumbled.

Yesterday, in my district, I took a visit with Amtrak to the 107-year-old Portal Bridge that carries about 450 trains and thousands of passengers over the Hackensack River in New Jersey every weekday. It is a major bottleneck along the Northeast corridor, the Nation's busiest rail line. This rail line goes through New Jersey—well, actually, it starts here in Washington and will travel to Boston. So it travels through Connecticut as well. But we have a major bottleneck in New Jersey.

This old infrastructure, this 107-year-old bridge, is really outdated machinery because this bridge over the river has to spin on a turret when there are barges coming through. Normally it gets stuck. The replacement of the bridge is a key component of the \$23.9 billion Gateway program, a comprehensive rail investment program to double rail capacity between New Jersey and New York City.

According to a recent study released by Amtrak, the program could generate \$3.87 worth of economic benefit for every \$1 invested. New Jersey and New York have agreed to contribute \$750 million towards the estimated \$1.5 billion costs for the Portal Bridge project. But the program will not be able to move forward without Federal investment. President Trump's proposal to zero out the New Starts programs threatens to derail the overall Gateway program and the Portal Bridge project along with it.

America's infrastructure is failing. Now is the time to build the infrastructure that we need to grow our economy, keep America safe, and become more competitive. Every dollar of infrastructure investment means another \$3 of economic growth. America's infrastructure needs could be met, and then some, for a fraction of the cost of the President's tax plan—which is estimated to increase the deficit by \$3 trillion to \$7 trillion over the next decade—while contributing immensely to economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, we see what is happening across this Nation. We have

seen what has happened when bridges crumble, poor infrastructure and tunnels, and it is time for this Nation to invest, once again, in its infrastructure if it wants to remain the beacon in the world for economic growth.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman, once again, for allowing me this opportunity to talk about a critical topic. If no one hears this call, we are doomed in terms of our infrastructure.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Infrastructure Week. I do this proudly as the daughter and granddaughter of civil engineers—men who built bridges, roads, airports, and dams all across this country and all across the world. However, Mr. Speaker, sadly, today I need to recognize that America is not getting a good grade in infrastructure. In fact, just this last month, the American Society of Civil Engineers gave America's infrastructure a grade of D-plus.

Now, before we despair, we can be happy it is not as bad as 4 years ago when it was a D. But there is no parent in America who will cheer when their child comes home and says: I made it all the way from a D to a D-plus.

America can and must do better, and this Congress needs to fulfill its duty under the Constitution and under the basic tenets of what a government is supposed to do by meeting the needs of the American people. There is no better time than now, and there is no better place than here, in the people's House, for us to take up this call because, at the end of the day, infrastructure is about jobs. It is about putting people to work right now replacing those bridges, roads, dams, airports, and rails. But, more importantly, it is about getting people to work safely and on time tomorrow and getting home in time to see the soccer game.

So we are going to go through, a little bit, some of what these grades were. So the composite grade of D-plus is made up of roads, D; and bridges, C-plus. Many Americans will remember an August night 10 years ago in 2007, in the Twin Cities. People were driving across a heavily traveled bridge on I-35. The bridge collapsed, sending people crashing down into the river. Twenty Americans lost their lives when that bridge collapsed.

In my own State of Connecticut, people remember when the Mianus River Bridge collapsed on I-95, the major backbone of the entire Northeast corridor. Fortunately, the bridge collapsed in the middle of the night, and only three people died. Had it been during the middle of the day, that number would have been far higher.

Mr. Speaker, America should not wait, nor should this Congress wait, until bridges collapse or trains derail until we fix our aging infrastructure. It

is the backbone of what government is supposed to do.

Our roads are congested. In 2014, engineers estimated that congestion cost American commuters \$160 billion in a single year. For the average commuter in an urban area, that was 42 hours of their lives—a full workweek. So it is not just dollars and aggravation, it is polluted air, and it is broken axles. But it is also time, which for many Americans is the most valuable thing we have. We want to see our families. We work hard in this country, and we in Congress should be working harder to make sure that our hardworking people we represent can get home on time to see their families.

So that is where we are. That is where we are with bridges and roads. I had a constituent come up to me in the nearby city of Waterbury last week. We were looking at an aging infrastructure intersection. She said:

I came over here just to tell you that I hit such a big pothole last week. I have got a couple-hundred-dollar repair bill for my car, and I don't have the money to pay for it. You have got to tell those people in Washington we need to fix things so I don't have to worry about a pothole ruining my car and making me unable to pay my bills.

Mr. Speaker, too many of our bridges are structurally deficient—almost 4 in 10 of our bridges. Thirty-nine percent are 50 years old or older. That is the structural lifespan of a bridge—50 years. I drive across some of those every single day, and nearly 10 percent of the Nation's bridges are graded structurally deficient. Just to say, they are really not safe.

It is not just bridges and roads that are in dire need of repairs. We also have our rail system. We saw from my colleague, Mr. PAYNE, that rail systems are a problem. Our transit systems are in desperate need of upgrade. Passenger rail, we don't even have a full estimate of what that would take to bring it up to speed. We have passenger rail that runs through Connecticut; 100,000 people commute every single day. The commute right now from New Haven, Connecticut, to New York City is as long as it was 100 years ago. Surely America can do better. It is not just passenger rail and freight rail.

We should say a good word about freight rail here. Freight rail is the reason we are up from a D-plus to a D. Freight has moved up to a B, so we can be glad about freight's grade this past year.

We also have airports. Now, I don't know how many of you have been through airports recently. If you have, you might even be surprised they are up to a D and not lower than that. American airports are congested. Many of them are aging and are in need of significant work. Congestion at airports is growing. Twenty-four of the top 30 airports in the U.S. are experiencing the "Thanksgiving-peak traffic volume" once a week. That used to be

a term that was used once a year. American airports across the country are serving 2 million passengers a year.

I can tell you about a recent time I landed in LaGuardia Airport in New York. It used to be considered one of the Nation's shining examples. People came and arrived in LaGuardia and were amazed and impressed with this great country.

□ 2000

One of the last times I was in LaGuardia Airport, I was greeted by a blue plastic tarp duct-taped to the ceiling inside the terminal, funneled down into a 30-gallon trash can to collect the water that was leaking through the terminal. That is not the way a great country greets its own citizens, or any others, to one of the world's great cities.

In addition to the work we need to do on our airports, we have our water infrastructure. This is our clean water system, and it is also our wastewater system. According to the most recent Clean Watersheds Needs Survey, the EPA reports that the total wastewater and storm water treatment capital needs in the next 25 years is \$271 billion; yet the Federal Government has been contributing less and less to that growing need to make sure that our rivers and streams and waterways are clean.

All of America saw, last year, what happened when one single community, Flint, Michigan, failed to add a single corrosion-prevention agent to its clean water and ended up literally poisoning its children with lead.

It is time for America to do better. There are costs when we don't invest in this country. I like to think of it more or less like the roof on America's house.

Now, many of you may know it is pretty exciting when you put an addition on your house, but it is not exciting to replace your roof; but if you don't replace your roof and it keeps leaking, ultimately, you lose the entire house. The ceiling collapses. That is where we are as a country right now. We have stopped fixing America's roof. We have stopped it in bridges and roads. We have stopped it in airports and rail. It is time for us to get going.

I will tell you that I am encouraged by reports coming from the new administration about making a serious commitment to invest in America's infrastructure, but there are some things that we need to keep in mind when we are talking about American infrastructure. One is to remember that it used to be called by another name. It used to be called public works.

There is a reason it was public works. There is a reason it wasn't private works. So I think it is certainly appropriate that we look to do public-private partnerships, to leverage the power of private investors to fix some of our

aging infrastructure, and to build some new infrastructure.

But we should make no mistake: This country became great, it was transformed by the Interstate Highway System, literally linking America from end to end. But we cannot expect, nor should we think, that the basic public infrastructure of America is going to be able to be outsourced to financiers in New York City. If that were the case, they would have already done it. These are basic public works where we need real dollar investments, and I can assure the administration there are many of us in Congress who are ready to move forward with that.

When we are talking about infrastructure, there is another piece I like to remind people we need, because part of infrastructure is moving goods and services, getting people to work and back, getting things to markets and things they want to buy and put on the table. But the 21st century is going to be built on information, and information is what is moving most in this society and creating much of the value.

So if we need information, that means we need energy and we need internet everywhere. So in addition to infrastructure and transportation, we need to have infostructure. We need to have reliable, cybersecure, sustainable energy systems across America, and we need to have internet available for every single American to participate in this exciting new economy. So we have infrastructure, we have infostructure, and we have public works.

Mr. Speaker, the roof of America's house is leaking. The time is now for this body, the people's House, to come together to work on real transportation and infrastructure bills. We have dozens of them that are available in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and other committees.

But the time has passed; the time has passed for us to wait, to pass the buck, to delay fixing the roof because the leaks are getting worse. The American people are suffering. When it is your family that is on the bridge that is structurally deficient, you would want, if your family crosses that bridge every day, you would want to make sure that it gets fixed and not wait until it falls down.

This is the sort of basic function government used to do without a question. It is what used to happen in this Chamber because people didn't care whether there was a D or an R after their name. Bridges and roads don't have D's or R's after their names. They are not affiliated with political parties, nor should they be. It is time for us to do our jobs and set aside whatever partisan bickering there may be in other venues.

On this, on bridges and roads, rail systems and dams, water infrastructure and infostructure, I ask my colleagues to please join me—join all of us—and make this, National Infra-

structure Week, the start of the 115th Congress' commitment to do right by the American people, to make these investments, to do the sort of compromise and negotiation that this body is supposed to be doing to meet the needs of the American people.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MARINO (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. NEWHOUSE (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and for the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1083. An act to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 17, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1358. Under clause 2 of rule XIV, a letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Strategy, Plans, and Capabilities, Department of Defense, transmitting an amendment to a report, was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2169. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance information sharing in the Department of Homeland Security State, Local, and Regional Fusion Center Initiative, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-120).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2213. A bill to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2281. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reauthorize the Border Enforcement Security Task Force program within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1715. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Medgar Evers House, located in Jackson, Mississippi, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 1177. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States the condition that certain lands conveyed to the City of Old Town, Maine, be used for a municipal airport, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2154. A bill to rename the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, as the Edward T. Schaffer Agricultural Research Center; with an amendment (Rept. 115-125). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUCK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 323. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 115) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim (Rept. 115-126). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 324. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1039) to amend section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, to grant probation officers authority to arrest hostile third parties who obstruct or impede a probation officer in the performance of official duties (Rept. 115-127). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 2423. A bill to implement certain measures relating to management of Washington County, Utah, required by Public Law 111-11; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 2424. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to issue new resource management plans applicable to the Beaver Dam Wash National Conservation Area and the Red Cliffs National Conservation Area and a new amendment to the St. George Field Office Resource Management Plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 2425. A bill to support the establishment and improvement of communications

sites on or adjacent to Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture through the retention and use of rental fees associated with such sites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2426. A bill to require the disclosure of beneficial ownership by a foreign person of high-security space leased to accommodate a Federal agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. DEMINGS:

H.R. 2427. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002, to direct the Assistant Secretary for State and Local Law Enforcement to produce and disseminate an annual catalog on Department of Homeland Security training, publications, programs, and services for State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SABLON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 2428. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to clarify when the time period for the issuance of citations under such Act begins and to require a rule to clarify that an employer's duty to make and maintain accurate records of work-related injuries and illnesses is an ongoing obligation; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. DUFFY, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 2429. A bill to support businesses in Puerto Rico, improve health funding for Puerto Rico, and promote security in Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, Education and the Workforce, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself, Mr. PALONE, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2430. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 2431. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve immigration

law enforcement within the interior of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LATTI, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FASO, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. EMMER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 2432. A bill to amend the Volunteer Organization Protection Act of 1997, to provide for liability protection for organizations or entities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 2433. A bill to direct the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis to develop and disseminate a threat assessment regarding terrorist use of virtual currency; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. DUNN):

H.R. 2434. A bill to establish a postsecondary student data system; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 2435. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent unjust and irrational criminal punishments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 2436. A bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to reauthorize the organic agriculture research and extension initiative; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 2437. A bill to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTHFUS (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 2438. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit any regulation under such Act concerning the emissions of carbon dioxide from a fossil fuel-fired electric generating unit from taking effect until the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency makes certain certifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2439. A bill to require reporting regarding certain drug price increases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 2440. A bill to require the President to report to the Treasury and make publicly

available past business transactions with foreign countries exceeding \$10,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2441. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include an additional permissible use of amounts provided as grants under the Byrne JAG program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 2442. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require an annual report on the Office for State and Local Law Enforcement; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself and Mr. McCAUL):

H.R. 2443. A bill to require an inventory of all facilities certified by the Department of Homeland Security to host infrastructure or systems classified above the Secret level, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 2444. A bill to create an alternative prosecutor for certain Federal offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2445. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a prior authorization process under the Medicare program for certain high cost durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 2446. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may only be removed for cause, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Ms. LEE, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 2447. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to provide loans and grants for solar installations in low-income and underserved areas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself and Mr. MACARTHUR):

H.R. 2448. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on the Advancement of Social Enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2449. A bill to repeal the Congressional Review Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. LONG, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 2450. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the special expensing rules for certain film, television, and live theatrical productions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2451. A bill to improve the structure of the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut (for herself, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. WALZ, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANCE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 2452. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself and Mr. McCAUL):

H.R. 2453. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Intelligence Rotational Assignment Program in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. HURD (for himself and Mr. McCAUL):

H.R. 2454. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a data framework to provide access for appropriate personnel to law enforcement and other information of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 2455. A bill to prohibit Federal employees from taking certain acts affecting a financial interest of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 2456. A bill to expressly provide for the extraterritorial application of the Federal bribery and illegal gratuity statute to the President and other covered officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 2457. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2458. A bill to make payments by the Department of Homeland Security to a State contingent on a State providing the Federal Bureau of Investigation with certain statistics, to require Federal agencies, departments, and courts to provide such statistics to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to require the Federal Bureau of Investigation to publish such statistics; to the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Mr. McCAUL):

H.R. 2459. A bill to require a threat assessment regarding the exploitation by transnational criminal organizations of the unaccompanied alien children services program within the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 2460. A bill to amend chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, to improve access to motor vehicle information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 2461. A bill to expand the use of E-Verify, to hold employers accountable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 2462. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to assist States to rehabilitate or replace certain bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 2463. A bill to prohibit the sale of shark parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 2464. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 2465. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the removal of the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare program with respect to speech generating devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MENG (for herself and Mr. EMMER):

H.R. 2466. A bill to facilitate the expedited review of applications of aliens applying for admission to the United States under section 101(a)(15)(J) of the Immigration and Nationality Act who are coming to the United States to participate in a program under which they will receive graduate medical education or training, require the Secretary of State to provide relevant Foreign Service

officers with training regarding such aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2467. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to permit the flag of the United States to be flown at half-staff in the event of the death of the Mayor of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 2468. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a homeland intelligence doctrine for the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Mr. MAST, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 2469. A bill to establish a moratorium on oil and gas-related seismic activities off the coastline of the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. McCAUL):

H.R. 2470. A bill to require an annual homeland threat assessment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD (for himself and Mr. McCAUL):

H.R. 2471. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to share with State, local, and regional fusion centers release information from a Federal correctional facility, including name, charging date, and expected place and date of release, of certain individuals who may pose a terrorist threat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHSTER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 2472. A bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 2473. A bill to ensure compliance with the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, to make strides toward eradicating human trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California (for herself and Mr. BERA):

H.R. 2474. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative standard for substantial equivalence determinations for devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H. Res. 325. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should retain a protective pool of reporters for purposes of covering the official business of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H. Res. 326. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of May 15 through 19, 2017, as Infrastructure Week; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. COOPER, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. DENT):

H. Res. 327. A resolution recognizing the importance of vaccinations and immunizations in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SUOZZI (for himself and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida):

H. Res. 328. A resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 2423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 2424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 2425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or office thereof.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DEMINGS:

H.R. 2427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 2429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 2430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 2431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 . . . "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 . . . "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 2433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 2434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 2436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution which states that Congress has the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 2438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1: All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives. Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall

have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;

By Mr. RASKIN:

H.R. 2440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause—Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 3 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 2442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 2444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article II, Section 2, of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 2446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 2447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1, Clause 1

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 2450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut:

H.R. 2452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HURD:

H.R. 2454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 2455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 2456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 2457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 4, Section 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 2460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 2461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which states that the Congress has the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 2462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 2463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 as applied to the Social Security Act.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 2468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:

H.R. 2470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 2471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 10—"To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations" and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the

United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 2473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XIII

Amendment XIV

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California:

H.R. 2474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which permits Congress to regulate commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. WALKER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. DAVIDSON, and Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 19: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 35: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 36: Ms. CHENEY.

H.R. 99: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 108: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 113: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 140: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 154: Mr. COHEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. DELAUNO, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 169: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 203: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 281: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 305: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 354: Ms. FOXX and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 357: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 389: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 390: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 426: Mr. MESSER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 448: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 490: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 544: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 545: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 548: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 564: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 592: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 606: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 619: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 632: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 664: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 672: Mr. MESSER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 676: Mr. SIREs and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 721: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. COOK, Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 747: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. YOHIO, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 750: Mr. KIHUEN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 767: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 771: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 772: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 785: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 799: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 807: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MAST, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 816: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 820: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 828: Mr. BARR and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 846: Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BOST, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 849: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. REED, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. JONES, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 852: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 853: Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 873: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BERA, Mr. POSTER, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 878: Mr. FASO.

H.R. 880: Mr. POCAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HECK, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 884: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 930: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 931: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 948: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 959: Mr. TAKANO, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 964: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 975: Mr. CORREA and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 980: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 989: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 990: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1002: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1005: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1006: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1017: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1038: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1046: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1057: Ms. BASS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LONG, Mr. BARR, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1058: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1065: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1083: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. BARRAGAN.

H.R. 1090: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 1092: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1095: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1133: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1143: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1144: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1148: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1156: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1158: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1164: Mr. HARPER and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1175: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 1185: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1200: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1229: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. WELCH, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1231: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1232: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1236: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1241: Mr. LUCAS and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1243: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1253: Mr. VELA and Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER.

H.R. 1264: Mr. POSEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 1265: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1267: Mr. BARTON and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1268: Mr. FASO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1272: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1281: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1291: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1296: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 1310: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1311: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BLUM, Mr. KIND, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1316: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 1329: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1334: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 1341: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1361: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1368: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1384: Mr. NEAL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 1421: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1422: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1454: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 1456: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. TROTT, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1472: Mr. COURTNEY and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1475: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

- H.R. 1483: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1498: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 1502: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1541: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 1552: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BARR, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 1560: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1562: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1566: Ms. TITUS, Mr. EVANS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1567: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1606: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1608: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 1614: Mr. McEACHIN and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1616: Mr. YOHO, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. MESSER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 1626: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 1629: Mr. POCAN and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1635: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 1639: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 1645: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 1651: Ms. DeGETTE and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 1652: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1656: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 1661: Mr. CRIST and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 1666: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1673: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1697: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MAST, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 1699: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 1711: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 1722: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 1724: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 1730: Ms. TITUS and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1733: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1753: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1770: Mr. HURD, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MOULTON, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 1772: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1776: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1777: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. UPTON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 1784: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1793: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 1796: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1818: Ms. DeLAURO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MOORE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. DENT, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1825: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. DUFFY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1836: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1844: Mr. POLIS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1854: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 1861: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. RATCLIFFE.
H.R. 1868: Ms. PINGREE and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1889: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 1902: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1939: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 1949: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1953: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1955: Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 1959: Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 1960: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. COOPER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1969: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1997: Mr. BURGESS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1998: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1999: Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 2012: Mr. NADLER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2013: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 2046: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2052: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. MENG, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2056: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 2062: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 2083: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 2092: Mr. POLIS and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2106: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 2113: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2121: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2127: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2136: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2148: Mr. WALKER.
H.R. 2150: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. JONES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2158: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2170: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2173: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2180: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2200: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 2203: Mr. RASKIN and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 2211: Mr. JONES and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 2213: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 2215: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2224: Mr. JONES, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2228: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 2230: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 2242: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2249: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 2268: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 2273: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 2285: Ms. NORTON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. DeGETTE, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2288: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 2298: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 2310: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2317: Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2327: Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ROSS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 2330: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2340: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2344: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 2345: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. KATKO, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2352: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 2353: Ms. FOX, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2358: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 2367: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2369: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2379: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2386: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 2389: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 2392: Mr. RUSH and Mr. KHANNA.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. REED, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. JONES.
H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. BERA.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H. Con. Res. 13: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. BEYER and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. MARSHALL.
H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. LOVE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Con. Res. 47: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H. Res. 28: Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H. Res. 166: Mr. LYNCH.
H. Res. 195: Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 199: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H. Res. 218: Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 220: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 236: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. LUCAS.

H. Res. 255: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H. Res. 256: Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 276: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H. Res. 307: Mr. BACON.
H. Res. 312: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H. Res. 313: Mr. SOTO.
H. Res. 320: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 321: Mr. TONKO and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative JACKSON LEE (TX) or a designee, to H.R. 1039 the Probation Officer Protection Act of 2017, does not contain any congress-

sional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits to defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Mr. WILLIAMS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RIVIERA THEATRE

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Riviera Theatre, a historical landmark in North Tonawanda, New York. This past December, the Riviera celebrated 90 years of bringing a multitude of performing arts, including live concerts, theatre, dance shows, and movies to Western New York.

Originally known as the Twin Cities Rivera, the theatre was built during the year 1926, by the Yellen Family. The architects Leon H. Lempart and Son drew the plans, which were patterned after the Italian Renaissance. The theatre changed multiple times over the years but is currently owned and run by Riviera Theatre and Organ Preservation Society.

Opening night was December 30, 1926, a gala event, which featured the movies "Upstage" starring Norma Shearer, "The Mona Lisa", in Technicolor, a short comedy, and the newsreel. Organist Fred Meyer accompanied the films and soloed at the Mighty Wurlitzer organ.

Perhaps the Riviera is best known for housing a Wurlitzer Theatre organ, made nearby at the Rudolph Wurlitzer Company of North Tonawanda. In 2008, the organ was re-voiced and restored to nearly original condition, providing a new symphonic sound for concerts and events. The Riviera's Mighty Wurlitzer has provided more entertainment consistently in its original setting than most other theatre organs, nationwide. Many of the top name artists in the country have performed here in hundreds of concerts over the past 35 years.

Listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the Riviera Theatre is currently in the planning stages of an Expansion and Development Project (Set The Stage) that will add 23,000 square feet of new space including a black box theatre, a new lobby and new modern amenities for their patrons and performers. It is estimated when completed an additional 50,000 visitors will attend annually.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments today to recognize the heritage of the Riviera Theatre and to celebrate its 90th Anniversary. I wish them well in their continuing expansion as the Buffalo community is fortunate to have a building with such a historical background and which promotes performing arts.

TRANS TOWN HALL

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, recently, I sat down with a number of activists in Minnesota to talk about how LGBTQ folks, and especially trans people, are fighting for basic economic rights in a world that belittles, excludes, and dehumanizes them.

The transgender community is more visible than ever. Leaders like Laverne Cox, Caitlyn Jenner, and Janet Mock have become icons for the future of the LGBTQ movement. And in my hometown of Minneapolis, my dear friend Andrea Jenkins just received the democratic endorsement for City Council. She will be the first out trans person to hold office in Minnesota.

But this increased visibility hasn't improved the lives of all transgender people.

Compared to other states, Minnesota's transgender community is a lot safer and healthier. But that's not saying much. Nationwide, violence against trans people—and trans women in particular—is at an all-time high. Even in deeply progressive Minneapolis, my constituent CeCe McDonald was attacked outside a bar and imprisoned in a men's prison for 19 months for defending herself.

This sort of violence has far-reaching repercussions—high unemployment, difficulty accessing lifesaving healthcare, housing instability, and educational barriers. And we need to stop thinking of these injustices as separate from our economic lives.

To get a better understanding about how trans folks are living in the 21st century, I attended Minnesota's LGBTQ Lobby Day in April and hosted a town hall forum. I'll tell you—it's not easy. It takes a lot of courage to hold space for your truth. My friend Kye kicked off the testimony with a story about how important simply accepting people's identities are:

For many young trans people, growing up and going through elementary school, junior high, high school, and even college can be extremely difficult. And these folks don't always have the support system they need. Many talked about the deep opposition they faced from their families.

But it doesn't end there. There's difficulty finding work too. And even when trans people do find work, they can be subjected to cruel behavior from customers and even their own colleagues.

Now most American get their health insurance through their employers. But there are no protections to ensure that trans people can have the medically necessary care covered. This extends to our service members too. But there are also issues of racism and people being excluded because of their disabilities.

Listening to these very real struggles, I get upset thinking about how much time we have to spend convincing others to treat trans people as equals. It's clear we still have a lot of work to do, including in places that are seen as more tolerant to the LGBTQ community. I don't always know the right words, and I don't always get everything right when talking about this issue. And that's okay—I'm not trans. I do not have that experience. What's important is that I listen, that I hear and accept what my trans friends and colleagues are telling me. And that I do the work they ask me to do. That is how you build a movement of generosity and inclusion.

Thanks to OutFront Minnesota and the Minnesota Transgender Health Coalition for their help coordinating this town hall. But more importantly, thank you to those who shared their stories.

The following are excerpts from various LGBTQ activists I recently invited to a town hall forum:

Kye Allums: I was a sophomore in High School. I was unaware of all things transgender and had no words to describe who I was. Constantly fighting with my mom to prove I liked who I liked, and that I would rather wear basketball shorts instead of a dress. I was invisible; never validated or affirmed. My mom let it be known that she was the one who defined me. I was her daughter; I was her girl. Until one day I went with her to meet a friend. We walked up to his office and he asked my mom, "Is this your son? He's a lot taller than I remember." In my mind I was like, "Yes!" Before my mom could say anything, I quickly replied, "Yup that's me. I'm her son." That moment, I was seen; I was seen by somebody, and that somebody was Congressman Keith Ellison.

Aaron Dotta: I am a co-president of the GSA at St. Paul Academy, which is a private school in St Paul. Something I want to point out is, because our parents have resources to send us to a private school, we are able to be educated in a community that supports us, and we are able to be GSA presidents and we are able to push for things such as gender neutral bathrooms, which we now have in our school. What we wanted to say is, this privilege of being able to push for equality and have our identities be recognized, should not be limited to private schools. Students at all schools, including public schools, should be able have their own GSAs and their identities recognized by their administration, teachers and peers. Also as gender queer youth, we do face a lot of hardship when it comes to choosing colleges, when it comes to trying to finding summer jobs. We have to think about what names we put on our applications, and resumes. Looking at schools where we will hopefully be able to spend four years and get a college degree, we have to carefully think about what places in the country and what schools will be friendly to our identities, so that we can focus on getting an education without having to worry about our indent threatening our safety and our mental health.

Leo Bukovsan: Most of my college decision making was based on where I wouldn't get

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

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

kicked out of school. As a female to male transgender person, figuring out where I could be housed, where I could be safe, basically, and that really was tough, making those decisions. Because I'm in a privileged situation where I can choose where I go to college pretty well, based on all those kinds of things, I still have to make sure that I'm going to be safe.

Zaylore Stout: I live in St Louis Park. I'm a board member for RECLAIM!, which provides mental health services to transgender and gender non-conforming youth. Locally, I'm a member of the Allies of St Louis Park, which is an advocacy group that started right after the election, in regards to working towards progressive issues. Today I'm here representing as well the St Louis Park GSA group. The focus here is a student-led initiative to try to get the St Louis Park school board to pass a gender inclusion policy. Now the school board has been working on this. They came up with a draft policy that's been enhanced since October of last year, but they stalled. They stalled because of the Gavin Grimm case in front of the Supreme Court. They also stalled because of the Virginia-Minnesota case, as well. Part of the issue was that they're currently in the midst of looking for a new superintendent, but students need protection. There's current no policy on the books in regards to whether the transgender and gender non-conforming students can use whatever restroom facilities it is they need. There is no protection for them in regards to faculty members or staff outing them to other students, to staff members or to the parents. There are great model policies that are out there, but the schools locally need to be able to pass these policies on their own. It's my understanding that the Minnesota Department of Education, as well the district attorney has advised the school boards to hold off, in regards to passing these policies because of the Virginia-Minnesota case. But the plaintiffs have pulled back in regards to that action, so there's not holding the local school boards in regards to passing these types of initiatives.

Jannifer Halpaus: My child is transgender. He's a sophomore. He came out 2 years ago, so it's been a learning experience. And in this experience, I have encountered multiple phone calls from the school district because my child is trans. Because he wants to use a certain bathroom, because he wants to use a certain locker room and he won't use the one they tell him to. On a state level, leadership should pass gender inclusion policies or gender affirming policies for all the schools in Minnesota, so we can end the problems we are having. My child is being pulled out of classes. He's is being sat down with principals, and district employees, such as Title IX coordinators, upper level employees, the superintendent. As a child, I did not know my principals; I did not know my superintendents, personally. I think my child should have that experience if he chooses. He should be able to attend schools as a boy, and be one of the guys. My child has recently been hospitalized three separate times in a psych ward. Since things were brought to the school board's attention, he successfully joined the boy's swim team. The staff supported him. With three swim meets left in the season, the school board contacted the principal, who contacted me to say, "Your son cannot change in that locker room anymore." Three hours later they rescinded that, but then instead of being allowed to take phy-ed like his peers, he was told, "We will give you a phy-ed credit for having par-

ticipated in the swim team, in lieu of you not being in these locker rooms." My child is female to male transgender, and many times when groups speak, they are not speaking about my child. They are speaking about male to female transgender. My child has problems with self-harm, suicide ideation, high level of anxiety, and addiction. And I can't believe that none of these has been part of why.

Dave Edwards: I am a board member at Transforming Families Minnesota it's a peer group and community organization that supports families with gender diverse youth. I appreciate you being here today and focusing on future outcomes for trans people, because that's where my daughter will be not that long from now. I love the focus on the future; I think that always has to include our youth's experiences in public schools. We can't expect our landlords to rent to a trans person when they watch their high school principal tell a trans student where they can and can't use the restroom. We can't expect managers make hiring decisions equitable if they have watched their teachers minimize or diminish the discrimination that their trans classmates faced. I'm glad we brought up the gender inclusion policy; I worked with Minnesota Department of Education create the Model Policy. It has been completed and sitting since October and needs to come out and be available to schools before the 2017-2018 school year.

Danny Roman: A lot of the times people don't realize it but home life isn't very good either, along with school. It's kind of hard for me, I suppose, because I don't get all the support, but I get the support from friends and stuff and the school does supports me.

Dasia Timmerman: Growing up is really hard in this state. I came from the Montevideo, Fairmount, and Morris area, finally the Twin Cities, Bloomington, and Eden Prairie. I didn't get to come out. I tried in 1996; I couldn't find services and I was with a really belittling family, and I eventually disowned my dad because of all his hate. He would get red in the face, and looked like he was going to get violent.

Kaylee Jakubowski: It took me three years to come out to myself because it was terrifying. Once I finally did, soon after coming out to my parents, they told me (their exact words): not in this house. So, I was not allowed to come home. I got abandoned from all the financial stability that they offered. And I was kind of set out to figure it out myself there on out. I was going to university at Winona State at that time, and being very financially responsible, as I thought I was, I took out just enough money so that I can survive from beginning of fall semester to end of spring semester. What I didn't foresee was losing the financial stability for the summer. I had no other option but to take out a credit card in order to feed myself. I maxed out the credit card, fifteen hundred dollars throughout the summer, to survive. I took out even more loans to go back to school. Funny thing about signing up for student loans with your parents as co-signers is that once you have to pay them back, they assume that you're still under your parents' budget. So when they're making \$80,000 a year, I have to pay my loans as if I'm making \$80,000 a year. When in reality, after taxes, I'm making 18 to 19 thousand dollars a year. That is very difficult. Turns out to be six to eight hundred dollars a month, depending on whether or not I want to skip one. Getting through the day, day to day, is an incredible challenge.

Hayes McRoy: One of my groups I go to, a LGBTQ group, is losing some of its funding.

It is a free group, but they supply snacks and activities. One time, there's a trans girl there who doesn't have any clothes because her family doesn't support her. And we went out, we got her some clothes so she can feel more comfortable. And a great resource like that is currently losing funding, and along with that there also homeless shelter for LGBTQ youth, which will take up 20-40 percent of homeless population, is also losing some funding. And that just seems very wrong to me.

Dasia: At first I got some part time jobs. I wasn't paid for three weeks because they had a problem with my preferred name versus my legal name. I've since changed my legal name, all my documents, but I'm starting my own business to escape transphobia. I am house cleaner and I am good at it. It's awesome.

Kaylee: I tried to get a job [after my parents cut me off], but that posed to be another difficult challenge. There's nothing I can do legally about the hiring discrimination that I faced. Because the evidence is seeing the hiring professional come out with all this little books, looking over the papers as he was going to ask me questions about [my application]. Looking up and seeing who I am, and then losing all that energy and giving me half of an interview because he didn't want to. There's nothing I can prove there, but it's everything that I feel to know that I was not allowed to get a job in that establishment. I went back to school at this time. Tried to get a job on top of school and ended up working at McDonalds because they're very easy to get a job with. I worked there for seven months until it culminated on me that all the bullying I was getting from co-workers and customers was too taxing on my mental health. The entire last week that I worked at McDonalds, I remember just crying in the washroom because there nothing else to do. This is not a way that anyone deserves to make money. To make \$7.25 an hour to try to feed themselves.

Zaylore: As a labor and employment law attorney, I still see discrimination cases and handle discrimination cases from individuals within the LGBTQ community. Whether it's employers not providing reasonable accommodations to individuals who are HIV positive, or terminating employees once they find they are HIV positive, or outing transgender employees at their facilities. And when they report to HR, they end up getting retaliated against in regards to that. So this is still an issue, even though we have laws on book protecting individuals. We still need the support from our local officials regards to making this type of things get addressed and taken care of.

Emily Ott: My specific concern is the First Amendment Defense Act and the similar bills that are popping up around the United States, one of which is here in Minnesota. I feel that these bills set a dangerous precedent. These bills will allow blatant and open discrimination against members of our community based solely on individuals saying, "I have a religious objection to who you are," or to how you live your life, or who you love. I cannot think of anything more potentially damaging to the concept of American liberty and freedom and justice for all people than these bills. It sets a dangerous precedent for future minority groups that might also run afoul. For example, what about Wiccan people? Do I throw them out of my business because I don't agree with their philosophies and their religious beliefs, and they're objectionable to me? Do I refuse service as a medical provider to somebody because, "I'm

sorry but I can't treat your child you're a lesbian couple and I don't agree with your lifestyle?" These things are happening already, and I fear what this does and what it can do to the United States of America and to its people if these bills are allowed to become law.

Dasia: We're facing insurance things in this state that would prevent me from my HRT, which I have been on for seven months. It's good insurance, Minnesota state insurance. She works for MNSCU, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities. It's awesome insurance. Apparently it's not going to be soon.

Dave: I am an employee of the University of Minnesota. I work in the Educational Psychology department. I have great health insurance. Last year my daughter was lucky enough, after being on the waiting list for over a year at the Center for Sexual Health, to finally get in. The second they ran my insurance, they wanted to let me know that there was a categorical exclusion for any kind of medical intervention. While that is many years down the road, that's something we need to fix. If the University of Minnesota can't provide coverage for the services they offer as an institution to their employees, something's wrong. The Center for Sexual Health is leading in the Midwest as the expert location for affirming Trans care; all the service that they either provide or refer to should be covered by our insurance.

Kaylee: I fought very hard to get HRT programs in Winona because, before I petitioned Semcac, which is essentially our Planned Parenthood, about getting hormone procedures in their office, we would either have to go up to Rochester, an hour away, or down to Lacrosse, out of state and forty minutes away. So I tried to get those local and I succeeded. And now, I get to pay about \$80 a month for hormones, which is not doable for me. Right now, I take about half the recommended dosage. I skip days; I skip weeks at a time because I don't have the money to take care of myself because all the things I've had to sacrifice financially have culminated on top of another and stacked. Now, it's difficult. Even getting here was challenging. I've counted every penny that every bus has required of me. \$50 for round trip train ticket to here. \$2.25 for the bus here, but I had to pay \$3 because I didn't have any quarters. Bottled of water cost \$1.25. I'm counting all this in my head; keeping it on track so I don't go negative before my next paycheck. HRT is described as very big challenge I can't do.

Nicole Vanderheiden: I am a queer trans woman. As a direct result of my trans status, I have experienced family rejection, homelessness, hunger, and sexual assault, discrimination in education, employment, and health care. I am going to talk about my experience as a veteran in the U.S. Forces. Like many other trans folk who serve in the military at a proportion twice that of the general population, I served honorably in the U.S. Air Force. I get my treatment solely from the Department of Veteran Affairs, which currently operates under blanket exclusion for transgender surgical care. It is unconscionable that in 2017 we have a federal agency that is not only failing to prohibit discrimination, but also operating under policies that prescribe discrimination. I really want to ask you to take action to end those policies, and to prevent our federal agencies from discriminating against trans folks.

Luci Peterson: I am transgender, male-to-female, I am autistic, Jewish, and just re-

cently was hired as a para-educator with a great company. The real reason I want to share and testify, whenever it comes to the LGBT community in conversation, wherever I go, I experience what I consider a gap in the conversation. That gap is around disabilities. The one I can specifically speak about is autism. I volunteer a lot with Autism Society of Minnesota, Awesome.org, and AISM. I just think that it is very dangerous for those people out there, because there is a lot of nonverbal autistic people and then people of all types of disabilities that, depending on where they are living or what their current situation is, they may not have the freedom that able-bodied people do to speak for themselves. We're trying to get a mentorship program going for autistic adults like me to mentor younger autistic people, and I'd like to see more programs like that in the LGBT community, where no matter what your other identities are that LGBT adults could come along LGBT youth. Showing them how they have coped and managed to live a healthy and successful life.

Roxanne Anderson: I want to talk a little bit about where I work and spend time at 3405 Chicago, The Minnesota Transgender Health Organization and Coalition. We're formed by and for transgender folks. We're the only transgender led by-and-for 501(c)3 nonprofit in Minnesota. We do a lot of work, and we've been doing that work since 2007. We offer services that are inclusive, and serve about 165 Trans and gender non-conforming folk throughout the week. We do six support groups. Our shot clinic serves over 40 people in the six hours that we are open during the week. We spend a lot of time working with Dave [Edwards], and others with the Minnesota Department of Education to be gender-inclusive in schools, and to insure that trans and gender non-conforming can mark their identities on the student survey, something we need to make sure we keep in place in Minnesota. We do harm reduction through syringe exchange; we have food shelves, clothes shelves, gender gear. We do shot assistance, and we do that all through the support of volunteers. We do that all under a budget under \$30,000 a year. That sounds awesome, and it is not sustainable. It means that everybody that gives their time, and energy, and effort to MTHC does so without pay. We are located at 3405 Chicago which also houses Café Southside, which employs at about 80-85 percent trans and non-gender conforming folk. I don't know if there is any other place in the whole state that can say that the majority of the people that they employ are trans. It also houses Rare Productions, which is an art and entertainment for LGBT folk of color. The reason I am mentioning this is because like lots of folks have said, we're in jeopardy. We don't have a lot of funding, and we don't get a lot of support from foundations or big business. I think to the point of economics it's really important to know that those organizations that are specially supporting trans folk, and figuring out how to support them.

COMMENDING THE NORTHWEST INDIANA BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY HALL OF FAME CLASS OF 2017

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I rise to commend numerous exceptional leaders from Indiana who were honored as the Northwest Indiana Business and Industry Hall of Fame Class of 2017. While there were many nominees, this year's inductees include Joseph Mansueto, Raymundo Garcia, Karen Maravilla, Craig Dwight, Robert Johnson, Fair Oaks Farms, and Don Babcock. For their many contributions to the community of Northwest Indiana and beyond, these honorees were recognized at the 10th Annual Induction Ceremony on Tuesday, May 16, 2017, at the Avalon Manor in Merrillville, Indiana. Mitch Daniels, President of Purdue University and former Governor of Indiana, was the keynote speaker for the event.

Joe Mansueto is the founder and Executive Chairman of Morningstar Incorporated. Morningstar was initially created to educate individual investors, but it quickly became an asset to financial advisors and institutions. Under Joe's leadership, the company has become a global organization, managing 1.2 million retirement assets and advising up to 10.9 million individual investors, 300,000 plan sponsors, 250,000 investment advisors and more than 1,300 institutions. Morningstar secures \$800 million in annual revenue, does business with 27 companies globally, and employs more than 4,500 people worldwide.

Raymundo Garcia and Karen Maravilla are the owners and operators of El Taco Real restaurant in Hammond, Indiana. In addition, Karen owns and operates Its Just Serendipity, a vintage shop in downtown Hammond. Throughout their twenty-one years together, Karen and Raymundo have shared a passion for entrepreneurship as well as a philanthropic spirit. The community of Hammond is very important to them, and they have worked hard to help revitalize parts of the city over the years. Their next project includes the purchase of three large properties in downtown Hammond that they will renovate and repurpose.

Craig Dwight is the Horizon Bancorp Chairman and Chief Executive Officer. Under Craig's leadership, Horizon's total assets increased from \$360 million to \$3.1 billion in 2016. In addition, Horizon currently includes 59 branches and is one of the top largest banks in the state of Indiana, while ranking as the 342nd largest bank in the United States. Mr. Dwight's charitable efforts are to be admired and commended. Craig continues to give back to the community and has chaired numerous fundraising campaigns for many organizations, including the United Way of LaPorte County, the Martin Luther King Center, the Michigan City Education Fund, and the YMCA, to name a few.

Robert Johnson is the founder and Chief Executive Officer of Cimcor, which is based in Merrillville, Indiana. Cimcor is a global cybersecurity company that acts to keep information

and servers protected and secure. Due to his hard work, strong leadership, and innovative mind, Robert Johnson has made Cimcor immensely successful. Customers include NASA, the United States Air Force, and the Chicago Stock Exchange, to name a few. In addition, Mr. Johnson enjoys giving back to the community of Northwest Indiana and serves on the advisory boards for Valparaiso University's Cyber Operations/IT Programs, Purdue University Northwest's Computer Technology Department, and Indiana University Northwest's Computer Information Sciences Program. Robert also serves as chairman of the board of directors of the Legacy Foundation, and he is a member of the board of directors for Methodist Hospitals.

The recipient of the Enterprise of the Year Award is Fair Oaks Farms. Fair Oaks Farms, located at the border of Jasper and Newton counties, is an incredibly successful working farm that is also an agricultural tourist destination. The farm brings in more than 600,000 visitors each year and is a popular field trip site for area schools. Fair Oaks continues to grow and expand its many attractions, including the pig adventure, pork education center, the farm-to-table Farmhouse Restaurant, the dairy adventure, and more. Fair Oaks is planning to add many new and innovative attractions that will appeal to a wide audience and give guests a reason to keep coming back, such as a beef cattle adventure and a poultry attraction that will demonstrate how 500,000 to 700,000 chickens are raised.

The recipient of the Partners in Progress Award is Don Babcock. Don is the Economic Development Director for NIPSCO and has been very successful in creating partnerships that bring in new industries, such as Alcoa Howmet, Hoist Litruck, and Pratt Industries. Don also works tirelessly to build support for many public works projects such as the South Shore commuter rail expansion and the Gary Airport runway improvement. Mr. Babcock is also President of the Michigan City Redevelopment Commission, which is currently working on a \$20 million rejuvenation of the city. He has been called, "an unsinkable cheerleader for the region." I am truly grateful for his enthusiasm and unwavering dedication to the community of Northwest Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my distinguished colleagues to join me in commending these dedicated leaders upon their induction into the Northwest Indiana Business and Industry Hall of Fame. They are truly deserving of this honor, and for their exceptional leadership and commitment to the region and beyond, each of them is worthy of the highest praise.

HONORING WILLIAM MOREHOUSE

HON. JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of William "Bill" Morehouse. So many of us in the greater Vancouver community knew, or knew of, Bill. He was a member of the United States Army and

the National Guard early in his life, and his lifelong service to not only his country but his local community are what helped defined him. Bill's military service spanned World War II, and then as a POW guard at the Fort Vancouver barracks in Washington state. Bill was a true patriot who cared about the safety of all Americans.

Later in his life, Bill became involved in countless volunteer organizations to continue serving those around him. He was a member of the global community service organization, the Lion's Club, as well as the American Legion. But it was his many years spent as a member and even president of the Moses Williams Pacific Northwest Chapter of the Buffalo Soldiers by which most of us knew him. In that position, he led toy and food drives for underprivileged kids, and provided Honor Guard at various military ceremonies and parades.

In his free time, Bill enjoyed being with his child, grandchild, and great grandchildren and on behalf of Southwest Washington, I express to them my sincere condolences. He will be missed and always remembered.

IN RECOGNITION OF E.T.
RICHARDSON MIDDLE SCHOOL

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate E.T. Richardson Middle School, in the Springfield School District of Pennsylvania, on their re-designation as a School to Watch by the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grade Reform and the Pennsylvania Don Eichhorn Schools: "Schools to Watch Program."

Schools that earn the Schools to Watch designation demonstrate academic excellence, developmental responsiveness, social equity, and organizational processes. E.T. Richardson Middle School has demonstrated its commitment to educating young students in the community and preparing them for success in and beyond middle school. The middle school provides a rigorous curriculum and offers many academic, athletic and social activities open to all students.

I congratulate Principal Daniel Tracy and all the school's hardworking teachers, staff, students and parents for earning this impressive distinction.

80TH BIRTHDAY OF JOSEPH
GEOGHAN

HON. DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 80th Birthday of Brooklyn's Joseph Geoghan.

Born on May 26, 1937, Joe Geoghan is a man devoted to his family, faith and career. In 1961, he married the love of his life, Kay, with whom he has five children and nine grand-

children. After graduating from St. John's University in 1959 and Fordham Law School in 1964, he volunteered his time to the Brooklyn Diocese starting in 1975. Having attended a Catholic school for his undergraduate studies, Joe knew the great work that the Catholic faith has done in providing students with a quality education. Nevertheless, his volunteer work did not stop there. He served on the Diocesan Education Commission, and he was a founding member of the Diocesan Finance Council, on which he still serves. Additionally, he also served as the first director of the Alive in Hope Foundation. To top it off, Joe is a Eucharistic Minister at St. Rosalie Parish. For all he has done for the Brooklyn Diocese, the Vatican made Joe a Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great in 2003.

Aside from championing numerous charitable causes, Joseph Geoghan also had a successful business career. While still in college, Joe got his first job at Union Carbide, for which he would end up working decades. After graduating law school, the company immediately made him one of their attorneys. From there, he served as Chief International Counsel, Deputy General Counsel, and Vice President and General Counsel. Moreover, Joe sat on Union Carbide's Board of Directors from 1990 through 1998.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Joseph Geoghan a very happy 80th birthday. His lifelong devotion to his faith, as well as his tremendous work ethic are simply astounding. I thank him for his service to the Brooklyn community and wish him all the best.

IN TRIBUTE TO TOM HLAVACEK

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tom Hlavacek who has served as the Executive Director of the Alzheimer's Association of Southeastern Wisconsin since 2005. He is retiring on June 30, 2017.

As Executive Director of the Alzheimer's Association of Southeastern Wisconsin he has supervised a staff of 29 who provided over 37,000 points of service per year in the chapter's eleven county region service area. Mr. Hlavacek convened and chaired the Alzheimer's Challenging Behaviors Task Force which produced two reports, "Handcuffed" and "We All Hold the Keys". The reports led to his testimony before U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging. Mr. Hlavacek has also been very involved in Wisconsin and proposed legislation to assist those receiving long term care services.

Mr. Hlavacek holds a Master of Science degree in Rehabilitation Counseling from the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee. He is a past recipient of the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation Public Policy Fellowship and served in Washington, D.C. as a Disability Fellow in the United States Senate in the Office of former Senator Harkin—Iowa.

Prior to his service with the Alzheimer's Association of Southeastern Wisconsin, Mr. Hlavacek directed the Milwaukee Office of Disability Rights Wisconsin which is the statewide

protection and advocacy system for people with disabilities. He also served as the Advocacy Director at United Cerebral Palsy of Southeastern Wisconsin.

He has advocated tirelessly on behalf of the disability and aging communities for nearly 40 years. I am grateful to have had the opportunity to know and work with Tom over the years, whether it was on housing for those with disabilities or funding for Alzheimer's and other long term care services, he provided invaluable information and counsel. I am so sorry I am unable to join him, his family, friends and colleagues at his retirement celebration on June 14, 2017. However, I wish him much success as he transitions into a different phase of his life.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Tom Hlavacek and I am proud to call him a friend of the long term care community. The citizens of the Fourth Congressional District and the State of Wisconsin are privileged to have someone of his ability and dedicated service working on their behalf for so many years. I am honored for these reasons to pay tribute to Tom Hlavacek.

CELEBRATING THE SALEM
VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the Salem Volunteer Fire Department.

On November 27, 2016, our country's flag was raised over the Fire Department's brand new station, beginning a fresh chapter in the organization's two hundred and fourteen-year history. Since its foundation, the Salem Volunteer Fire Department has played a crucial role in the community. In 2011, firefighters were called on to rescue Salem's families from the flooding caused by Hurricane Irene, as well as to respond to a deadly propane explosion on State Route 29. This department has also served the entire state of New York, readily volunteering their assistance on September 11, 2001.

In my district, we are proud of these firefighters and respect the sacrifices that they make to ensure our community is safe. On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to congratulate the Salem Volunteer Fire Department as they open their new firehouse. We are grateful for their service, and hope that this new station will serve as a suitable home for many years to come.

RECOGNIZING MR. SID LAPIDUS

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mr. Sid Lapidus, who is receiving a Lifetime Achievement Award from United Jewish Appeal (UJA) Federation of New York.

Mr. Lapidus retired in 2007 after a long, distinguished career as a partner of Warburg Pincus LLC, a private equity firm in New York City. He previously worked at the Securities and Exchange Commission and today sits on the board of two publicly traded companies, Lennar Corporation and Knoll, Inc.

Outside of work, Sid has dedicated his time to charitable organizations. He has held numerous roles within UJA Federation, including serving as a board member, chair of the Network, Commission, and member of the Finance and Executive Committees. In addition, Mr. Lapidus is passionate about cultural artifacts and heritage, serving as a trustee and chair of both the Finance Committee of the Center for Jewish History and the Library Committee of the New York Historical Society.

Mr. Speaker, Sid Lapidus has had an exceptional career and has dedicated himself to improving the lives of others. I urge my colleagues to join me in commending him for receiving the Lifetime Achievement Award from UJA Federation of New York.

HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY HONORS PREP PROGRAM AT HARRISBURG HIGH SCHOOL

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I offer my sincere congratulations to Harrisburg High School on the 25th Anniversary of its School of Business and Industry (SBI) Honors Prep Program.

In 1991, the Harrisburg School District entered into a partnership with Florida A&M University to incorporate a School of Business & Industry Prep School Program into the Harrisburg High Campus curriculum. The goal of the SBI Program is to orient potentially high achieving scholars to the world of business and industry and enhance their critical thinking, listening and communication skills.

SBI is a three-year accelerated honors program and has proven to build leadership skills and self-esteem, strengthen scholars' preparation for college and the career world, and empower them to become entrepreneurs.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, I thank and congratulate all involved—past and present—with the SBI Honors Prep Program at Harrisburg High School on their 25th Anniversary and wish them continued great success in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING MR. MICKEY GORAL FOR HIS DECADES OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mickey Goral, who is retiring as the

Rockford Township Supervisor. Mr. Goral has honorably worked through various levels of government and public service for more than 40 years, and he will be greatly missed.

Mr. Goral served our region as a member of the Winnebago County Board for 18 years. Since then, he has held the position of Rockford Township Supervisor for the past two decades in which he has provided temporary assistance to some of our community's most vulnerable populations. Through his tenure as Township Supervisor, he has strived to mentor and provide individuals with the tools and resources they need to succeed. Under the direction of Mr. Goral, Rockford Township's general assistance office has not only enriched the lives of those in our community, but has allowed Rockford Township to serve as a role model for those across our state and the country that are looking to better their assistance services.

Mr. Goral's great accomplishments have been recognized far beyond our community, leading him to being elected to the position of First Vice President for the Township Officials of Illinois by representatives from over 14,000 Townships.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. Goral for his commitment to public service and for all of the work he has done to better our community. I congratulate him again on his well-earned retirement and wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

TWO HARRISBURG HEROES

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge City of Harrisburg, Illinois, Water and Sewer Superintendent Kelly Hefner and Harrisburg Fire Chief John Gunning for their fast thinking and their quick response during our most recent flooding in the 15th District of Illinois. At the beginning of May, both the superintendent and the fire chief rescued drivers whose vehicles had ended up submerged in water.

Kelly Hefner dove into the floodwaters near the intersection of East Sloan Street and Commercial Street in Harrisburg on May 1st. Hefner moved quickly to rescue a man who had driven his SUV into a flooded ditch. It was the second rescue in that particular area of town. Just the day before, Fire Chief Gunning had to rescue the driver of a vehicle who had driven into a flooded ditch.

Both heroes selflessly acted fast to assist the drivers, who could not undo their seat belts as cold water flooded into their sinking vehicles. I offer my deepest admiration and gratitude to these two heroic gentlemen for working hard to keep Harrisburg's citizens safe, and for inspiring us all to think about others.

I thank Superintendent Hefner and Chief Gunning for their service.

HONORING BASCOM SORRELL

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a very special individual, Mr. Bascom Sorrell, of Nicholas County, Kentucky. Bascom has been a prominent member of his community for many years.

Bascom Sorrell is a lifelong resident of Nicholas County and a graduate of Nicholas County High School. Jockey International employed him from 1966 to 2005, where he served as Plant Manager from 1984 until 2005. Bascom served in the Kentucky National Guard from 1960 to 1966 and reached the rank of Sergeant. He coached Babe Ruth baseball for many years and was chairman and coach of JC's Little League basketball from 1966 to 1975. Bascom was a member of Daugherty Lodge 65 of F & AM for 45 years and Master in 1975. Bascom has served on the Advisory Board for Hospice of the Blue Grass and continues to serve on the Advisory Board for the Community Action Council. A loyal member of the Carlisle Rotary Club, Bascom is a past president and recipient of the Paul Harris Fellowship award.

Bascom recently retired as Chair of the Nicholas County Economic Development Authority, having served on the board from 2006 to 2008 and again from 2011 to 2017. His leadership with this group was critical in improving economic opportunities in Nicholas County.

There is no question that Carlisle and Nicholas Counties are much better places due to Bascom's dedication to the community and its citizens. His devotion and long-term service to Carlisle and Nicholas Counties are widely recognized and greatly appreciated. Bascom is a true leader in his community and a role model for future leaders. His fellow citizens are honoring him for his leadership and devotion.

Bascom Sorrell is a fine man who has earned the respect of his community. He is a true servant leader. It is my honor to call him my friend and to recognize him before the United States House of Representatives.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF U.S. MARINE
CORPS IN WORLD WAR I**HON. WALTER B. JONES**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today to recognize the U.S. Marine Corps' achievements in World War I. At the entry of the United States into World War I, the Marine Corps was relatively small and relegated to ship-borne duty and small expeditionary outposts in far flung locations, such as China and the Caribbean, numbering less than 14,000 officers and men. By the end of the war, the Corps had swelled to more than 75,000; of which 30,000 were ground combat forces in France, and another 1,600 served with the U.S. Navy in Europe on board ships, on

shore, and with the Navy's aviation force, the Northern Bombing Group.

The 5th and 6th Regiments as well as the 6th Machine Gun Battalion formed the 4th Brigade under the U.S. Army's 2d Division in late 1917. Their baptism by fire came at Belleau Wood in June 1918 when the 2d Division halted the German advance toward Paris through three weeks of bloody fighting. The Marines continued to prove their mettle throughout the summer and fall of 1918 at Soissons, St. Mihiel, Blanc Mont, and Meuse-Argonne. At the end of the war, the 4th Brigade remained as part of the 3d Army, occupying Germany along the Rhine River.

While the 4th Brigade battled the Germans, the 5th Brigade arrived in France and served as part of the Army's Service of Supply to the entire American Expeditionary Forces, as well as provided a pool of replacements to the 4th Brigade. The First Marine Aviation Force (FMAF), as part of the Northern Bombing Group, arrived in late summer 1918 and operated over the English Channel and Belgian coast from Calais, France, conducting antisubmarine patrols, bombing German submarine pens, and even providing close air support and food drops to Entente troops in Belgium. On a smaller scale, the First Marine Aeronautic Company conducted antisubmarine patrols out of Ponta Delgada, Azores.

In the six months of fighting on the Western Front, the Marine Corps suffered approximately 12,000 casualties; 8 Marines earned the Medal of Honor, and another 152 Marines earned the Navy Cross. The Marine reputation as a fierce fighting force was well earned, and whether on "land, air, or sea," the American people can be undeniably proud of the performance of their Marine Corps in World War I.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO DIS-
PLAY THE FLAG IN HONOR OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MAYORS ACT**HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce a bill that would make a small but significant change to federal law by adding the Mayor of the District of Columbia to the list of named principals for whom the President can order the U.S. flag be flown at half-staff. Current law states that the President shall make this order "upon the death of principal figures of the United States Government and the Governor of a State, territory, or possession, as a mark of respect to their memory." Surely the death of a current or former D.C. Mayor should qualify as a principal. My bill would add D.C. Mayors, who have many of the same responsibilities as state and territory governors, to the current list of officials. This bill is a continuation of our "Free and Equal D.C." series to ensure fair recognition of the nearly 700,000 citizens of the District of Columbia.

Congress already acknowledges that D.C. deserves a place among the states for certain honors, and this addition is not as great as

others Congress has already recognized. We have already won congressional recognition of D.C. in situations where the city was overlooked while honoring the states. For example, our legislation ensured that the District of Columbia War Memorial honored only District residents who served in World War I and that D.C.'s Frederick Douglass statue sits in the Capitol alongside statues from the 50 states. We also successfully worked with the U.S. Postal Service to create a D.C. stamp, like the stamps for the 50 states, and worked with the National Park Service to add the D.C. flag alongside the state flags across from Union Station.

Legislation was also enacted to give D.C. a coin after it was omitted from legislation creating coins for the 50 states. Legislation was needed to require the armed services to display the District flag whenever the flags of the states are displayed. With this acknowledgement, it is not too much to ask Congress to add the Mayor to the list of principals who are recognized upon their deaths.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

TERRY WETHERILL

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Terry Wetherill, who recently received the Emergency Manager of the Year Award. Terry is the Mineral County emergency manager and search and rescue coordinator. As part of the Mineral County Search and Rescue team, he serves as an EMT in the County Ambulance Service and as a fireman in the Volunteer Fire Department. Terry's roots in the community run deep. Terry's family was one of Mineral County's founding families, settling there over one hundred years ago. Terry made his home in Creede after 29 years of service in the U.S. Navy.

As Mineral County Emergency Manager, Terry has spearheaded the use of technology to aid in difficult search and rescue missions in the San Luis Valley in situations where all-terrain vehicles and snowmobiles can't access those in need of emergency services. Avalanches and steep cliffs create treacherous conditions in parts of the San Luis Valley, and the drone helps prevent rescuers from having to put themselves in life-threatening situations. Thanks to the work of Terry's office, Archuleta, Hinsdale, Mineral, and Rio Grande counties will now have access to this life saving drone.

Mr. Speaker, Terry Wetherill's service to Colorado and his commitment to safety and security in the San Luis Valley is commendable and we are fortunate to have him. He is well-deserving of this honor, and I wish him the very best in the future.

IN HONOR OF NATIONAL POLICE
WEEK**HON. BETTY McCOLLUM**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the dedicated law enforcement officers who serve and protect communities in Minnesota and across the United States and to remember those who have lost their lives in the line of duty.

In Minnesota's Fourth District and throughout America, police and peace officers bear an enormous responsibility. In local departments, state agencies, and for the federal government, the women and men of law enforcement put their lives on the line each and every day to keep our families and communities safe.

As Ranking Member of Interior-Environment Appropriations Subcommittee, I am particularly mindful of the work and sacrifice of federal law enforcement officers whose tasks range from serving Americans visiting our National Parks to protecting our natural resources.

This National Peace Officers Memorial Day and Police Week, we remember our fallen law enforcement officers. Last year, more than 140 officers lost their lives in the line of duty. As we honor their courage and sacrifice, I send my deepest condolences to the family, friends, and loved ones of our fallen heroes who so proudly wore the police uniform.

Congress must continue to ensure that our local and state police, as well as their federal colleagues, have the resources they need to do their jobs and serve our communities.

Today and throughout the year, I join my colleagues and all Americans as we honor our law enforcement officers and remember those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the service of our families and communities.

RECOGNIZING THE GETZVILLE
VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANY LA-
DIES AUXILIARY UPON THE OC-
CASION OF THEIR 95TH ANNIVER-
SARY**HON. BRIAN HIGGINS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I join the Amherst Women's Interclub Council in recognizing the accomplishments and tireless work of the Getzville Volunteer Fire Company Ladies Auxiliary. The Ladies Auxiliary has been serving their community for nearly 95 years through fundraising for many causes, and assisting those who were displaced due to factors beyond their control.

The Ladies Auxiliary was formed in September 5, 1922 at the request of then-President of the Getzville Fire Company Sam Heim and Mr. George Dettmer. During the early years of the Auxiliary, the ladies would hold fundraisers such as card parties, dances and dinners. The money raised would help the Fire Company buy new equipment. During the 1940's, the Ladies Auxiliary Group donated to

the American Red Cross to assist them during World War II.

The Getzville Ladies Auxiliary continues to provide vital assistance to those in need and enhance the quality of life in their community to this day. Especially impressive is their willingness to help victims of disasters by giving them a safe place to stay and ensuring they are fed.

Trademarks of the Ladies Auxiliary that will long be remembered include their famous chili during their summer picnics, their fashion shows, mystery rides and dinners that celebrate their anniversary. In the grand scheme of things, they will mostly be remembered for their work in the community, their selfless volunteerism and their caring and compassion.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the work that the Getzville Volunteer Fire Company Ladies Auxiliary has done as they approach their 95th Anniversary celebration on September 11, 2017. I wish them the best in all their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING SUMTER COUNTY
LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS**HON. DANIEL WEBSTER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Sumter County Sheriff Bill Farmer, Wildwood Police Department Chief E.W. Reeser and the law enforcement officers who keep Sumter County safe every single day.

This week marks the annual observance of Police Week. Though we set aside one week a year to honor law enforcement, I encourage all Americans to join me not only this week, but every day, in recognizing the honor, courage, and commitment of America's law enforcement.

Our law enforcement officers are heroes in the community. They keep us safe, and are willing to put their lives on the line every day in the course of their duties. It is impossible to fully express our gratitude or adequately recognize the professionalism of the men and women who voluntarily put their lives on the line for our safety and security. It is with deep respect that we pause today to honor the memory of the heroes who gave the last full measure of devotion and made the ultimate sacrifice.

I want to extend my sincere appreciation to Sumter County Sheriff Bill Farmer, City of Wildwood Police Chief E.W. Reeser, and the law enforcement officers who bravely and selflessly serve Sumter County. It is an honor to recognize them and all men and women in law enforcement.

IN HONOR OF THE WYOMING
STATE SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF
THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION**HON. LIZ CHENEY**

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Wyoming State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, which will hold its one hundred and second annual conference on May 18–21st in Casper, Wyoming. Members will attend from across Wyoming and host Daughters of the Republic President General Ann Turner Dillon as the keynote speaker. As part of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, the Wyoming State Society is a non-profit, non-political, women's volunteer organization that is dedicated to preserving American history and promoting patriotism.

The Wyoming State Society, Daughters of the Revolution, is comprised of women who can prove lineal descent from a patriot of the American Revolution. These women invest many hours serving their local communities by supporting active duty military personnel, promoting historic preservation, working with school children, and welcoming new American citizens at naturalization ceremonies. I am grateful for Daughters of the Revolution members' commitment to preserving our national heritage.

Each chapter in the State Society has a unique connection to the local community and its history. The Fort Caspar Chapter, NSDAR, where this year's conference will be held, is named in honor of Lieutenant Caspar Collins, who sacrificed his life trying to rescue a wagon train that was headed for the local fort. The Fort Caspar Chapter has been dedicated to veteran services, genealogy, community services, and historic preservation since its founding in 1914. It is my honor to acknowledge this and the many contributions the women of the Daughters of the Revolution have made throughout history, and continue to make today.

RECOGNIZING DEER PARK POLICE
DEPARTMENT ON PEACE OFFI-
CERS MEMORIAL DAY**HON. BRIAN BABIN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Deer Park Police Department. On May 15, 2017, the Deer Park Police Department will hold its 17th Annual Police Officer Memorial Service to recognize the 135 police officers killed in the line of duty across the nation, and specifically the 17 police officers killed in the State of Texas in 2016. We honor and memorialize 135 police officers who will never go home, see their spouses, see their children, or walk on God's earth again.

The service is in recognition of National Police Week, May 14 to May 20, 2017. Established by a Joint Resolution of Congress in

1962, President John F. Kennedy proclaimed May 15th as National Peace Officers Memorial Day and the week in which that day falls, as National Police Week.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time to honor those who form the thin blue line that protects our community and pay tribute to those who have given their life keeping us safe. I couldn't be more thankful and proud of the men and women who protect our communities.

May God continue to protect our entire law enforcement community and comfort the family and comrades of those who paid the ultimate sacrifice.

HONORING REVEREND PEG
CHEMBERLIN

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Reverend Peg Chamberlin, for her many years of public service to the citizens of the Fifth Congressional District, the Minnesota Council of Churches (MCC), and to the great state of Minnesota.

As the leader of the MCC since 1995, Reverend Chamberlin has led the organization into one of the premier state councils of churches in the nation. The Rt. Rev. James L. Jelinek, Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Minnesota, described Reverend Chamberlin as, "both a professional and a volunteer, with the gift of leadership and inspiration." During her time leading the MCC, the membership has grown by over 30 percent, half from historic Black Churches.

She has been a key voice against religious bigotry, working hard to unite interfaith communities, foster interfaith solidarity, and to uphold the constitutional right to religious freedom without the fear of violence. Following the attacks of 9/11, she organized a diverse group of faith leaders for a massive gathering at the Minnesota State Capitol. She also aided in organizing a broad group of religious leaders, including Buddhists, Jews, Muslims, Hindus, and more to pray after the 35W bridge collapse in Minneapolis.

Reverend Chamberlin also had the honor of being the 25th President of the National Council of Churches from 2009 to 2011. She was the first Minnesotan and the fourth woman to hold that position. The NCC has been a leading force in increasing collaboration among various Christian groups throughout the United States.

Reverend Chamberlin has also been the recipient of numerous awards, including former Minnesota Governor Arne Carlson's Woman of Excellence award in 1994, the NOVA (Non-Violent Alternatives) Peace and Justice Award presented by St. Cloud State University, and Angel of Reconciliation award from Unity Baptist Church.

After 21 years, Rev. Peg Chamberlin has chosen to retire. Twenty-one years of mobilizing faith communities to engage in civic matters, strengthening ties within different religious denominations, and emphasizing the importance of welcoming refugees to our nation.

Through her accomplishments, she has excelled in bringing to life MCC's mission to manifest unity in the church and to build the common good in the world.

I commend Rev. Peg Chamberlin, and all she has done for the state of Minnesota. I want to thank her for her dedication and service in creating interfaith connections and a safe atmosphere for people of all faith communities.

IN HONOR OF NEW CITIZENS

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and sincerity that I take this time to congratulate thirty individuals who took their oaths of citizenship on Friday, May 12, 2017. This memorable occasion, presided over by Magistrate Judge Andrew P. Rodovich, was held at the United States Courthouse and Federal Building in Hammond, Indiana.

America is a country founded by immigrants. From its beginning, settlers have come from countries around the world to the United States in search of better lives for their families. Oath ceremonies are a shining example of what is so great about the United States of America—that people from all over the world can come together and unite as members of a free, democratic nation. These individuals realize that nowhere else in the world offers a better opportunity for success than here in America.

On May 12, 2017, the following people, representing many nations throughout the world, took their oaths of citizenship in Hammond, Indiana: Xuezhe Wang, Jyoti Awasthi, Jovan Bujaroski, Karen Jazmin Flores Martinez, Amane Seid Djoubar, Rosa Brisco, Hilda Alvarez, Mario Algraini, Emmanuel Chigozie Chijioke, Ayodeji Ekundayo, Thiola Makhiwa Moyo, Andy Dai Nguyen, Gerson David Plaza, Julio Rolando Plaza Jr., John Michael Prejmak, Bianca Yasmin Rafidia Vargas, Omar Awad Sobih, Alma Valencia, Jafar Ziad Thawabi, Klimentina Suleska, Maria Patricia Quezada, Josselyn Russell, Cece Mumbi Maina, Esther Galvez, Nguyet Phan, Milton Alexi Guerrero, Lowel Alabastro Recososa, Carl Recososa, Manuel Miranda, and Manuel Pena.

Although each individual has sought to become a citizen of the United States for his or her own reasons, be it for education, occupation, or to offer their loved ones better lives, each is inspired by the fact that the United States of America is, as Abraham Lincoln described it, a country "... of the people, by the people, and for the people." They realize that the United States is truly a free nation. By seeking American citizenship, they have made the decision that they want to live in a place where, as guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution, they can practice religion as they choose, speak their minds without fear of punishment, and assemble in peaceful protest should they choose to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in

congratulating these individuals who became citizens of the United States of America on May 12, 2017. They, too, are American citizens, and they, too, are guaranteed the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We, as a free and democratic nation, congratulate them and welcome them.

IN MEMORIAM PETE GARCIA

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a community leader, a U.S. Army veteran, a native Arizonan and a tireless advocate for economic, racial and social justice. Pete Garcia is truly an Arizona legend and his contributions to our community will live on for generations to come.

Pete volunteered for the U.S. Army in 1962 and served in Germany. After his honorable discharge, he worked for the U.S. Postal Service while putting himself through Phoenix College.

Pete worked for many non-profit organizations in Phoenix including Phoenix Job Corps, Valle del Sol, and perhaps most notably, Chicanos Por La Causa (CPLC). Under his leadership at CPLC, the organization's operating budget grew from \$3 million to over \$60 million. In 2008 it was named the second largest Hispanic non-profit in the United States by Hispanic Business Magazine. During his tenure as President and CEO of the organization he received numerous awards and recognition, including being invited to participate in the Ditchley Foundation Conference in the United Kingdom three times. He was selected as a Johnson Fellow, named an AARP Inspire award recipient, received the Cesar E. Chavez Leadership Institute legacy award, Pioneer in Excellence by Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) and "One of the Valley's Most Influential People" by the Phoenix Business Journal, among many others.

Pete was a dedicated husband to Sarah and a devoted father to Daniel, Hilario, and Illana. He was also a grandfather to Brenna, Morgan, Pete, Leila and Alya. In his spare time he enjoyed coaching his children's Little League teams, playing basketball, and playing with his own kids as well as other neighborhood children.

After his tenure at CPLC ended, Pete went on to be a successful philanthropist in his "retirement." He started a whole new foundation focused on educational opportunities for underserved students, which he named the Victoria Foundation in honor of his own mother. From 2008–2017 Peter raised more than \$4 million to enable students to attend ASU, UA, NAU GCU, Maricopa County Community Colleges and several out of state schools. The foundation offered scholarships to 80 community college students, 60 university students, and 4 medical school students. Pete also raised money through the Victoria Foundation to provide 300 bikes for inner city youths, stockings to the elderly at Christmas, and to provide turkey dinners to veterans on Thanksgiving.

Pete leaves behind a legacy of generosity, advocacy, and hard work. Arizona is grateful for his contributions to our community. May his memory be a blessing to his friends and family.

RECOGNIZING AMINAH AL-JABER

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Aminah Al-Jaber for her hard work and dedication to the people of Colorado's Fourth District as an intern in my Washington, D.C. office for the Spring of 2017.

The work of this young woman has been exemplary, and I know she has a bright future. She served as a tour guide, interacted with constituents, and learned a great deal about our nation's legislative process. I was glad to be able to offer this educational opportunity, and look forward to seeing her build her career in public service.

Aminah plans to continue pursuing her degree at the end of this internship. I wish her the best as she pursues her career path. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Aminah Al-Jaber for her service the last several months to the people of Colorado's 4th district.

RECOGNIZING PICNIC CAFÉ AND DESSERTERY

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the success of a small business in Dahlonega, Georgia in honor of Small Business Week. The Picnic Café and Dessertery, owned and operated by Sam and Julia Norton, has been serving Dahlonega residents and tourists coffee, sweets, and lunchtime favorites since 2001.

The Picnic Café and Dessertery, often times simply called "Picnic" by its regulars, has won multiple awards for its food and desserts. Its place on the Dahlonega town square brings a warm and welcome presence to the center of one of the South's best small towns, as hailed by Southern Living magazine. From college students to cadets to tourists bound for the Appalachians, the Picnic Café offers guests a chance to rest and be refreshed.

Mr. and Mrs. Norton have called Dahlonega home for years, and their love for the town is evident in the passion with which they run their business. The Picnic Café has employed dozens of college students and Dahlonega residents, providing the Lumpkin County community with jobs and students with work experience.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the Nortons' commitment to their small business, and, in the spirit of Small Business Week, thank them for their dedication to serving the people of Dahlonega. I am looking forward to my next visit to the Picnic Café to see what's

new on the menu, and wish the Norton family continued success.

RECOGNIZING JAMES HICKS

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a man who has dedicated his life to protecting and educating the public. James Hicks will be retiring this May from the Pana Fire Department after 45 years of service.

During his career with the fire department, James pioneered an Explorer Post, which he led for 34 years. This program allows youth and young adults become involved with and learn more about firefighting and fire responder careers. Under James' leadership, many of the explorers were inspired to protect their communities and become firefighters.

Hicks has also worked to keep the area schools informed on fire prevention techniques and spent many hours volunteering with the Pana Ambulance Service as an Emergency Medical Technician.

I am honored to recognize Mr. Hicks and wish him all the best in his retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF SIMON EAGLIN FOR HIS LIFETIME OF SERVICE TO THE YPSILANTI COMMUNITY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Simon Eaglin, a prominent community leader who served Ypsilanti throughout his life. Mr. Eaglin served as Postmaster General for the Ypsilanti area for over two decades and provided impactful leadership to many local organizations and causes.

Born in 1917, Mr. Eaglin moved to Ypsilanti during the Second World War to work at the Willow Run Bomber Plant and aid the United States' war effort. After the end of the war, Mr. Eaglin became a radiation control technician at the University of Michigan medical center while working to complete his college degree at Eastern Michigan University. He was then named as the Ypsilanti Post Office's Postmaster in 1964, a position he served until his retirement in 1988. Mr. Eaglin was known for his efficient leadership in ensuring prompt delivery of mail and packages in the Ypsilanti area. He was also heavily involved in the Ypsilanti community, serving as a member of the local Kiwanis Club and spearheading several of the organization's outreach efforts and remaining involved with its committees.

As the first African-American Postmaster in Ypsilanti, Mr. Eaglin dedicated his life and career effectively served the public while helping to break down barriers. In addition to his pioneering career as Ypsilanti's postmaster, Mr. Eaglin was well-known as a kind, caring indi-

vidual whose service to the Ypsilanti community was instrumental to making the city a great place to live and work. In addition to his career as Ypsilanti's Postmaster, Mr. Eaglin volunteered for years with St. John's Catholic Church, the Housing Bureau of Seniors and several local hospitals. His legacy of public service, as well as his upbeat and friendly attitude, made him a beloved figure in the community, and he will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Simon Eaglin, Ypsilanti's former Postmaster and community leader. Mr. Eaglin went above and beyond to serve the city and its residents during his life.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DR. DAVID DiCHIERA

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. David DiChiera, who is retiring from the Michigan Opera Theatre. While he began his distinguished and impassioned career in California, he became known in Michigan and beyond as Mr. Opera. He is retiring from the Michigan Opera Theatre, which he founded in 1971 and which he served as General Director and Artistic Director. After completing his undergraduate studies in musical composition at UCLA, David DiChiera continued his scholarship in Italy on a Fulbright scholarship, and returned to UCLA to join the faculty and to complete his PhD in musicology. In 1962, Dr. DiChiera was recruited to join the faculty at Oakland University as a professor. He later became chairman of music at the university.

While at Oakland University, Dr. DiChiera created "Overture to Opera," a program featuring local opera singers which brought opera to communities throughout Michigan, and which planted the seeds for the creation of Michigan Opera Theatre. As Dr. DiChiera explained in an interview, "I would cast the wonderful local singers who otherwise had limited opportunities . . . we started taking this program to community centers—every year, I took it to The War Memorial and area schools. This was all throughout the 1960s. Then, in 1970, I thought it was time to do a full-length opera, and to create the beginnings of an opera company."

It is important to keep in mind the backdrop for Dr. DiChiera's efforts to create an opera company in Detroit. By 1971, when Michigan Opera Theatre was established, the city itself was experiencing a major loss of population and many people were skeptical that this endeavor could succeed. But Michigan Opera Theatre not only succeeded, it thrived—first at the Music Hall in downtown Detroit which was restored with the support of the Kresge Foundation and Detroit Renaissance, and later at the Detroit Opera House, which was formally opened on April 21, 1996 with a performance by the great tenor Luciano Pavarotti.

Dr. DiChiera's impact extends beyond his building of this important institution. He has been a vital center of gravity for arts and culture in and around the City of Detroit. He has

been committed to nurturing and showcasing the broad diversity of talent in opera, something which he viewed from the inception of Michigan Opera Theatre as central to its mission. "Building bridges into the community was a primary mission," he said in the Theatre's blog, "making sure that the African American community, the majority of Detroit's population, was represented on the stage." In addition to producing works which reflect the African American experience such as *Porgy and Bess* and *Tremonisha*, the Michigan Opera Theatre commissioned and produced the world premiere of *Margaret Garner*, based on the novel *Beloved* written by Nobel Laureate Toni Morrison. Ms. Morrison wrote the libretto for *Margaret Garner*, and the production starred famed mezzo-soprano Denyce Graves. Dr. DiChiera has ensured that Michigan Opera Theatre has performed works reflecting the rich cultural fabric of Metro Detroit, including the Armenian opera *Anoush*, King Roger and *The Haunted Castle*, which celebrate the region's Polish community, an opera based on the life of the Mexican artist *Frida Kahlo*, and *The Passenger*, an opera about the Holocaust.

In addition to founding, building, and leading Michigan Opera Theatre, Dr. DiChiera is a noted composer as well. In further tribute to him, the Michigan Opera Theatre is featuring this month Dr. DiChiera's full-length opera, *Cyrano*, based on Edmond Rostand's timeless play, *Cyrano de Bergerac*.

Mr. Speaker, like innumerable opera aficionados, I know that David DiChiera has brought boundless joy to experienced opera lovers while helping to create countless new ones. Along the way, he has nurtured young artists and has ensured that the Michigan Opera Theatre reflects the diversity of the community it serves. Dr. DiChiera built an enduring institution in Michigan Opera Theatre, and in so doing, he has established himself as one of Metro Detroit's true treasures. I encourage my colleagues to join me in congratulating and thanking much beloved Dr. David DiChiera for the immeasurable contribution he has made to the arts in Metro Detroit and far beyond.

HONORING THE 52ND ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the Head Start organization on its 52nd Anniversary.

Since its establishment, Head Start has been working to serve the country's most vulnerable families. In addition to working with organizations that provide learning, nutrition and general health assistance for children, Head Start has also helped to provide training, job development, and volunteer opportunities for low-income parents. These efforts are critical for establishing an environment in which every American is equipped to reach their full potential.

In my district, the Lewis County Head Start Center has strengthened our community by

working with over 180 families to provide learning opportunities for children and parents alike. Focusing on early childhood development programs, these centers partner with families to ensure that every child is prepared to take full advantage of their education.

I would like to thank Head Start for 52 years of commitment to children and families across the country. In New York's 21st District, we are grateful for their work to make sure every child has the opportunity to succeed. I wish Head Start a prosperous future and I am confident that it will continue making a positive impact on the lives of many Americans.

RECOGNIZING STEPHEN FRIEDMAN

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Stephen Friedman, who is retiring after a decade as President of Pace University with campuses in New York City and Pleasantville, New York.

Mr. Friedman has dedicated more than 13 years of service to Pace University, where he first served as dean of Pace University School of Law for three years before being named president in 2007. Under his leadership, Pace has significantly increased its enrollment numbers while maintaining its commitment to providing education access and opportunities to students from all backgrounds. During his tenure, President Friedman has revitalized the Pleasantville campus in my district and led efforts to expand the university's academic program offerings, including study abroad and other international opportunities for students. Pace's international enrollment is at its highest level in 15 years, with students coming from more than 100 countries. Another initiative which he spearheaded to advance the university's motto of "Opportunitas," has been the development of iPace, an online degree completion program for adult learners.

Before joining the Pace community, Mr. Friedman served as Commissioner of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Capital Markets Policy at the United States Treasury Department, and a law clerk for U.S. Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan, Jr. He has also lent his leadership to organizations such as the American Ballet Theatre, the National Museum of the American Indian in New York, and the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Friedman's numerous accomplishments have left a lasting impact on the communities he has served. I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding his years of leadership and service.

HONORING GLENN R. LITTLE ON THE AWARD OF THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL (POSTHUMOUS)

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I offer my heartfelt thanks and gratitude to the late Glenn R. Little, formerly of Hanover and Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, on the posthumous award of the Congressional Gold Medal for his service to the United States in the Civil Air Patrol during World War II.

Second Lieutenant Little was one of 120,000 men and women who joined the Civil Air Patrol during World War II. They helped to protect our Nation by warding off German U-boat attacks on American oil tankers bound for Allied nations. They also took to the skies to patrol America's borders, conduct search and rescue missions, and provide disaster relief. These brave and heroic citizen volunteers helped to preserve our Nation's freedom.

The Congressional Gold Medal is the highest civilian honor bestowed by the United States Congress, and legislation was signed into law in May 2014 that honored members of the Civil Air Patrol. Lt. Little's career and accomplishments during the War recently were celebrated at the Pennsylvania State Capitol in Harrisburg. His granddaughter, Mrs. Barbara Heffner of Gettysburg, accepted the award on his behalf.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, I thank and commend Glenn R. Little for his bravery and selfless service to the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING MS. JAN POHLMAN ON HER RETIREMENT

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my dear friend, Jan Pohlman, who is retiring this month after teaching in the Physical Education Department of Calhoun High School for the past 34 years.

Throughout her distinguished career, Jan has served as a strong role model in our community both inside and outside the classroom. During her time at Illinois College, where I had the pleasure of having her as a teammate and a Floor Monitor, Jan's leadership and passion allowed her to build a notable sports career for which she was inducted into the Illinois College Sports Hall of Fame. She was one of the first stars of the Illinois College women's track and field team where she served as senior captain, and set school records for the 400 meter run, the discus and the javelin, which earned her the status of NCAA Division III Illinois State Champion in 1981. Jan's love of sports naturally led to her teaching career at Calhoun High School where she has enriched the lives of her students by instilling values of teamwork and perseverance for more than three decades.

Jan's compassion and service to our community goes beyond the classroom. She always goes above and beyond to help others—evident in the integral role she plays in the annual James R. Pohlman Memorial Golf Outing, which raises money for Parkinson's disease research.

Jan has been a truly influential individual in the lives of so many people, and I am honored to be able to call her a friend. Mr. Speaker, I would like to again congratulate Jan on her well-deserved retirement and thank her for all of her contributions and service to our community.

GERMANTOWN FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the 125th Anniversary of the Germantown Fire Department.

The Germantown Fire Department was chartered on May 2, 1892. The first complement of members included 18 volunteer firefighters, and the first apparatus was a hand operated pump—which had to be loaded onto a horse-drawn wagon, so the first roster of members included one horse. The first motorized apparatus was a 1919 Ford Model-T truck, which is now a part of the collection of the Hall of Flame Museum in Phoenix, Arizona.

In its first days the department depended entirely on donations. The first apparatus and equipment were all donated and through the years the members held all sorts of fundraisers. In the 1930s and 1940s weekly "platform dances" were held to raise funds. This allowed the department to purchase a 1941 pumper truck, which was in use until 1988. The antique truck was sold, but later repurchased by department members.

In the early 1950s members raised funds to help build a new fire station, purchase a 1953-model pumper truck, and purchase the first fire department radio system in the county. In those days a normal year would include ten calls, and during one period the department went 18 months without a call. In 1952 the Germantown Rural Fire Protection District, a taxing district, was formed to provide a stable funding source for the department; however, donations remain a significant part of department finances.

In 1986, the Department began providing First Responder emergency medical services to the community. The Department also implemented the first fire department-based Automated External Defibrillator (AED) program in the region. And in 1989 the Department purchased, with donated funds, then only the second rescue tool "Jaws of Life" system in the county.

In 2002, the Department formed an Explorer post to expose youth ages 14 through 21 to the fire and rescue service. Today, 11 former Explorers are members of the department.

Currently, the Germantown Fire Department has 35 members and responds to an average of 110 calls per year. Current vehicles include

two pumpers, one pumper-tanker, one brush truck, one rescue vehicle, and one support SUV.

The Germantown Fire Department has planned a grand celebration in recognition of its anniversary. This celebration will begin on June 10th and last into the night. The celebration will include great food and an assortment of fun and educational activities.

I stand today to salute the Germantown Fire Department on its 125th Anniversary and to wish it the very best in the future.

IN TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL ROSEN

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Michael Rosen who was an economics professor at Milwaukee Area Technical College (MATC) for 29 years. He is president of MATC's faculty and staff union, American Federation of Teachers (AFT) Local 212 and is the longest-serving President in Local 212's proud history. He is retiring on May 31, 2017.

Dr. Rosen received his BA from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the school which both his parents attended. He received both his Masters and Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. He has fought for public education at all levels from K-12 through higher education. Dr. Rosen is a prominent critic of for-profit colleges and helped draft Milwaukee's groundbreaking legislation that denies for-profit colleges city subsidies. Dr. Rosen has authored a number of studies on the labor market, trade, taxation and economic issues and is a nationally recognized expert on the automobile industry. Dr. Rosen brought an unprecedented level of activism and awareness to AFT, Local 212 in order to insure excellent representation and contracts for their members. However, he also led Local 212 with compassion and a cooperative spirit, during the Great Recession the union gave back a previously-negotiated raise to allow MATC to serve more students, calling it a "\$5 million investment in our students."

He has served on numerous boards, commissions, and councils over the years including: AFT-Wisconsin Executive Board, the President's Cabinet for the MATC Promise, the C4 board of Voces de la Frontera which is Wisconsin's largest immigrant workers' rights organization, Wisconsin Technical College System Board, the Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership Board, the Wisconsin Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the Mayor's Task Force on Tax Incremental Financing Districts and Milwaukee's African American Employment Task force. Dr. Rosen has been a frequent commentator on Milwaukee and Wisconsin Public Radio and Milwaukee Public Television on economic issues and international trade and was a frequent contributor to Milwaukee Public Television's Fourth Street Forum and the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel.

I am grateful to have had the opportunity to know and work with Michael for over 30 years. Michael has provided invaluable counsel and

support over the years to me, other elected officials and community leaders. I have truly appreciated his candor and clear moral compass; he has truly stood for justice for all. I am so sorry I am unable to join him, his family, friends and colleagues at his retirement dinner celebration on May 25, 2017. However, I wish him much success as he transitions into a different phase of his life with more time to spend with his wife Glorie and children Corrine, Jesse, and Gina, stepson Miguel, stepdaughter-in-law Kelley and foster daughter Lila.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Michael and I am proud to call him friend. The citizens of the Fourth Congressional District and the State of Wisconsin are privileged to have someone of his ability and dedicated service working on their behalf for so many years. I am honored for these reasons to pay tribute to Michael Rosen.

HONORING JOAN WEICHMANN AS SHE IS RECOGNIZED BY THE AMHERST WOMEN'S INTERCLUB COUNCIL

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize the accomplishments of Joan Weichmann for her tireless work in the community as she is honored by the Amherst Women's Interclub Council during their annual Kentucky Derby Luncheon. Her lifetime of community service is commendable and worthy of praise.

Mrs. Weichmann was born in Marilla, New York on a dairy farm where she and her family produced maple syrup. She later graduated from East Aurora High School, and Bryant and Stratton College where she majored in Accounting.

Throughout her life, Mrs. Weichmann has served in many positions, such as her leadership as the former President of both the Amherst Dance Club and the Victorian Dance Company. Additionally, she formerly served as Vice President of both the German-American Society and the Club Lorelei German Club. Mrs. Weichmann continues to dedicate her time to these organizations as a board member.

Currently, Mrs. Weichmann is President of the Buffalo Federation of Women's Club, a member of the Bell Ski Club Board, the Lederhosen Ski Club, Second Vice President of Shea's Spotlight, Friends of Amherst Symphony and longtime member of the American Wine Society—Chaine des Rotisseurs. Mrs. Weichmann's many hobbies include skiing, swimming, dancing, golfing, hiking, and learning. Mrs. Weichmann resides in the Village of Williamsville with her husband Ron and their three dogs, two Afghans and one Greyhound.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize Joan Weichmann for her tireless, vital and wide-reaching work in our community. I wish her the best in all her future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING STAN RICHARDS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Stan Richards, the Richards Group's founder, principal and creative director as he was inducted into the American Advertising Federation's (AAF's) 68th annual Advertising Hall of Fame class on April 25, 2017 in New York. We, in Dallas Texas, call Stan Richards the "Father of Texas Design, Dallas adman and icon maker."

Stan founded The Richards Group as a freelance practice after graduating from Pratt Institute in New York. The Richards Group, located in Dallas, is the largest independent brand-building shop in the nation. Clients include the brands of Cardinal Health, Dr. Pepper Snapple Group, GameStop, The Home Depot, Motel 6, Orkin, Ram Trucks, The Salvation Army, Sub-Zero, Wolf and many others.

In 1976, the Richards Group became a full-service advertising agency. Stan's work has received awards in virtually every major competition in the world. In 1976, Stan was chosen by the Dallas Society of Visual Communications as "the single individual who, over his career, has made the most significant contribution to the advancement of creative standards in the Southwestern United States." In 1981, 1983, and 1984, Stan was named by Adweek to the Southwest Creative All-Stars Hall of Fame. In 1985, Stan was honored by Pratt Institute as a Distinguished Alumnus. In 1986, he was honored with an Advertising Age cover story.

Also in 1986, Adweek named him Executive of the Year, and he was included in The Wall Street Journal's "Giants of Our Time." In 1988, the firm was named Agency of the Year by Adweek. Again in 1990 and 1994. And once more in 2002. In 1995, Stan was named an Entrepreneur of the Year by Inc. magazine.

In 1996, Stan received the ALGA Gold Medal, the award for career achievement in design. In 1997, Graphis magazine named The Richards Group one of the ten best agencies in the world, and the American Association of Advertising Agencies honored the firm with its A+ Award, given annually to America's best agency. In 2007, Graphic Design USA named the firm one of America's six most influential agencies.

The University of Texas named him the 1996 recipient of its Reddick Award for leadership in communication. Previous honorees include Walter Cronkite, Ted Turner, and Bill Moyers. More recently, Southern Methodist University announced the Stan Richards Creative Chair. Also in 1996, Stan received the ALGA Gold Medal, the award for career achievement in design. In 1997, Graphis magazine named The Richards Group one of the ten best agencies in the world, and the American Association of Advertising Agencies honored the firm with its A+ Award, given annually to America's best agency. In 1999, Stan received the highest honor available to a creative with his election to the Art Directors Hall of Fame, joining such luminaries as Walt Disney, Norman Rockwell, and Andy Warhol. In

2007, Graphic Design USA named the firm one of America's six most influential agencies.

Stan serves, or has served, on many boards: The Salvation Army, Episcopal School of Dallas, YMCA, Cooper Aerobics Enterprises, Dallas Symphony Association, United Way, the Creative Committee of the AAAA, Pratt Institute Board of Trustees, and the Mayo Clinic Center for Innovation.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Stan Richards for his service in the community and his extraordinary career.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN ED YOUNG

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 2017, South Carolina honored distinguished Southern Gentleman and former Congressman Ed Young of Florence. He was a World War II hero, a dedicated family man, a committed Christian, a farmer, a real estate developer creating jobs, and a pioneer public servant who helped develop the two-party system in South Carolina.

The following thoughtful obituary was published May 11, 2017, in the Florence Morning News:

A hero was lost to the Florence community, the greater Pee Dee area, the state of South Carolina, and our nation when Edward Lunn Young died on May 9, 2017 at the age of 96. Surrounded by his loving family, he passed away in the home where he was born in 1920.

Ed grew up on his family's farm in the Ebenezer community and attended Florence High School. He enrolled in the Corps of Cadets at Clemson University, where he majored in dairying and played Reveille on the bugle each morning and Taps each night. He graduated in 1941 and, like many young men of his generation, went off to war. Ed joined the Army Air Corps and flew P-38 fighter missions in the South Pacific. After completion of his required missions, Ed requested to remain in the theater, flying a total of 195 combat missions. For his valor, Major Young was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal with nine Oak Leaf Clusters.

After the war, Ed returned to Ebenezer and the home where he grew up, following in his father's footsteps raising dairy cattle, and growing cotton, corn, soybeans, and tobacco. Although farming was a life calling for Ed, it was not his only calling. He became involved in state politics, serving in the South Carolina Legislature from 1957-1960. His service at the state level was followed by a term as his district's first Republican to the US Congress in 1973.

Mr. Young's devotion to service was hardly limited to politics. Among his many activities, he served frequently throughout his life as a Member or Chairman of the Board of Deacons of Ebenezer Baptist Church, President of Coble Dairy, President of the Florence County Farm Bureau, President of South Carolina Association of Young Farmers, Member of the South Carolina State Development Board and Chairman of the Greater Florence Chamber of Commerce, among many others.

Ed was selected Outstanding Young Farmer of the Year by South Carolina Association of Young Farmers and awarded Outstanding Man of the Year in Agriculture by Progressive Farmer magazine; he also received the Distinguished Service Award from Clemson University and the Distinguished Agricultural Award, presented by the South Carolina Cooperative Council.

Ed is perhaps best known in the Pee Dee area for his tenure as the host of the Southeast Almanac television show in the 1960s. He is also well known in the community for participating weekly for over 50 years on the live Sunday morning radio program, Radio Sunday School. Another weekly occurrence was his attendance at The Rotary Club of Florence, where he led the singing and eventually became a life member. In 1996, he was honored with the Rotarian President's Award for Distinguished Service.

In the business world, Ed was instrumental in several real estate developments including Oakdale Country Club, Forest Lake, as well as hotels in Florence and Surfside Beach. He combined his love of real estate projects and love of community by donating land for the Florence Civic Center and Veterans Military Park in Florence.

More than any of these interests, Ed's strongest and highest devotion was to Ebenezer Baptist Church. He and his wife, "Hatsy," taught Sunday School for over 50 years, and both were devoted members of the church choir.

While Ed Young has been a hero to his community and nation, he was more than any of these, a hero to his loving family. Ed is survived by his wife and "bride" of 71 years Harriet ("Hatsy") Yeargin Young, and his four daughters and sons-in-law: Dr. Claudia Venable & Dr. Greg Brigman of Atlanta, GA, Dr. John & Harriet Charles of Myrtle Beach, SC, Dr. Farrell & Virginia Gean of Simi Valley, CA, and Rev. Jay & Rebecca Madden of Atlanta, GA. Ed leaves behind seven adoring grandchildren: Julia Charles, Lillian Charles, Luke Venable, Austin Charles, Sarah Venable, Neale Madden, and William Madden. Ed's family attributes his success and long life to a grapefruit every morning, a nap every afternoon, and his never-failing optimistic spirit. He never met a stranger and everywhere he went, he would ask each person his or her name. Ms charm, handshake and the twinkle in his eye made everyone he met feel special.

He is predeceased by his three brothers: William (Bill) Young, James (Jay) Young, and John Young and his grandson, Henry Brockington (Brock) Madden.

The family extends their deepest gratitude to Dr. Steven Ross, not only for his excellent medical care, but also for his personal devotion and his wisdom over the past several years. Gratitude is also extended to the team that provided continuous care at his home and to McLeod Hospice for their superb caring attendance and reassurance during these final months. The family extends heartfelt love and admiration to Ed's dearest friend and coworker, Mr. Nathan Faison, for his lifelong friendship and support. They also thank the many along the way who have prayed and extended sweet thoughtfulness to the family.

In lieu of food and flowers, contributions may be sent to the Ebenezer Baptist Church Building Fund, 524 S. Ebenezer Rd., Florence, SC 29501.

The funeral service will be held at Ebenezer Baptist Church, 524 S. Ebenezer Rd. in Florence on May 12, 2017 at 2:00 pm, with burial following in the church cemetery with

full military honors. The Youngs will receive visitors after the funeral at their home until 5:30 pm.

Waters-Powell Funeral Home is entrusted with arrangements.

THE AMERICAN WRITERS MUSEUM—CELEBRATING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF LITERATURE TO OUR NATION

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today is the official opening of the American Writers Museum, a unique center that celebrates the many contributions that writers have made to our history, our culture, our understanding and our enjoyment. The American Writers Museum does not just document the wonderful record of literature in America, it will inspire this and future generations to read and to write, ensuring that our rich national tradition will continue.

The museum is the brainchild of Malcolm O'Hagan, a retired Irish manufacturing executive, who eight years ago decided that American writers deserved recognition. He knew that there was no museum to highlight our American literary legacy and, rather than just ask why not, he acted. As a result, beginning today, we will for the first time have a museum dedicated to showing the importance of stories, language and literature.

I am very proud that the decision was made to house this unique national museum in Chicago, recognizing the many wonderful writers based in the city and the importance of the Midwest in our nation's cultural history. The American Writers Museum is a wonderful addition to our city. As Mayor Rahm Emanuel has said, the "museum will complement the rich offerings of the city's theaters, museum, library and musical activities and add significantly to Chicago's vitality." I am reminded today of my predecessor, Representative Sidney Yates, a legendary champion of the arts. I know that he would be very happy to celebrate the opening of the American Writers Museum in Chicago and to recognize the importance of literature in our lives and in our national community.

I want to thank Mr. O'Hagan for his successful efforts and the board, designers, contributors and many volunteers who brought this Museum into being. I hope that people from around the country will come to Chicago to visit the American Writers Museum to learn, reflect, enjoy and be inspired to unleash their own creativity.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE GRAND OPENING OF EXPERIMAC

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the grand opening of Experimac in Manassas, Virginia, a retail and tech service

store specializing in preowned Apple computers and devices. In addition to preowned product sales, Experimac also offers a variety of services, including screen repairs, diagnostics and troubleshooting, software installation, and more. With its prime location on Sudley Road in Manassas, I look forward to the valuable services Experimac will afford many members of the Manassas community.

My constituents, Ron Mosley and his wife, Benita Fitzgerald Mosley, are the proprietors of this Experimac location, and given their illustrious careers and backgrounds, I am confident the store will be a tremendous success. Benita, currently the CEO of Laureus Sport For Good Foundation, was born and raised in Manassas and Woodbridge, Virginia and is an Olympic Gold Medalist, and Ron studied electrical engineering at Brown University and has worked as a sales and marketing executive for over 15 years. In 2016, the two decided to return to Virginia to start a business that would support their community through both job creation and service.

While Experimac itself operates under the United Franchise Group umbrella and has more than 170 locations across the country, the broader company's success speaks to the need for local technology experts in today's competitive secondhand tech market. I am grateful for the resources the Manassas location will provide everyday customers, schools, and businesses.

In today's competitive economy, businesses like Experimac not only assist people with the services they offer, but they also foster strong local and secondhand economies. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in applauding the Grand Opening of Experimac. I am very thankful for the broad range of opportunities it will afford my constituents of Virginia's 10th District, and I look forward to the positive impact it will have on individuals, schools, businesses, and our commonwealth as a whole.

H.R. 244, THE FY2017 CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT

HON. GARRET GRAVES

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I did not ultimately support this legislation, however, there is much contained within the bill's almost 1700 pages of statutory text in addition to the explanatory statement that will advance the safety, security and economy of our great nation.

The bill includes \$551.1 billion in base defense discretionary funding and \$76.99 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO)/Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) defense funding. The total FY2017 defense funding is \$598.5 billion, \$25.7 billion over FY16 levels, and includes \$21 billion in new funding requested by the Administration. These funds provide for our national defense, pay our troops, and provide the resources and equipment our military needs to restore readiness, and protect our national security. I support these amounts to ensure American troops

have what they need as we continue to engage threats to our national and homeland security around the world. Mr. Speaker, this bill also takes the first of many steps toward additional border security improvements by providing \$1.5 billion for critical funding for infrastructure, innovative technology, and agents at the border.

Other key provisions that I support include putting appropriate parameters in place for the Environmental Protection Agency; and providing \$50 million in additional current-year funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs to improve opioid and substance abuse prevention and treatment for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also and importantly provides \$57.7 billion for our nation's infrastructure, provides funding consistent with authorized levels in the FAST Act, which I was involved in crafting, and \$948 million in additional disaster relief for the Emergency Relief Program and Community Development Block Grant disaster recovery assistance. Importantly, the bill includes \$15 million that I requested for the state and local law enforcement agencies through the Bureau of Justice Assistance. These agencies experienced so many challenges over the last several months. These challenges include a police-involved shooting on July 5, 2016 and subsequent violent protests, the ambush and murder of Baton Rouge City Police and East Baton Rouge Parish Sheriff Deputies on July 17, 2016 and a 1000-year flood event in mid-August of the same year. Five of our officers were shot in the ambush and the flood resulted in the loss of an estimated 100 police vehicles, critical law enforcement equipment, weapons and personal and family losses for many of our peacekeepers.

Mr. Speaker, ultimately I could not vote for this bill despite the numerous provisions I support because appropriating over a trillion dollars in thousands of pages of new text over a few days does not afford the degree of transparency and consideration that I believe we should have. Further, the bill represents a lost opportunity to deliver on the commitment towards the recovery needs of tens of thousands of flood victims in my district and state of Louisiana. As I mentioned, there are provisions that can help, like providing some assistance through Community Development Block Grants—of which Louisiana victims will receive a small. Yet this funding varies wildly from the assessed needs of both HUD and the state. This is wholly inadequate given the scale of the flood event that struck Louisiana last August. That is why I offered four amendments to the bill that would have increased the total amount of Community Development Block Grants available to disaster impacted areas by \$750 million, made \$100 million available for Army Corps projects like the Corbitt River Diversion Canal to reduce the risk of future flood events, and provide much needed relief for our local school districts as they seek to rebuild and reopen 8 months after the flood. These amendments were not ultimately adopted, but I will continue to fight and advocate for these priorities and more as we work on a FY2018 funding bill.

Mr. Speaker, I feel strongly about the federal government's need to balance the budget, eliminate deficits and pay on the national debt.

There is this misconception that under-funding CDBG-DR recovery assistance saves money. The reality is that we requested a fraction of the per capita assistance afforded to the victims of Hurricane Sandy and this calculation excludes the tens of billions of recovery funding provided in other federal programs. We have no desire to be greedy, but Americans need to know that when a catastrophic event occurs their government will be there—that we have their back. We have already seen many leave our community, bankruptcies, homes foreclosed, flood victims selling their homes for a fraction of the pre-flood value and many still living in tents, travel trailers, gutted homes and other inappropriate conditions. Rather than tailoring an appropriate response for this extraordinary flood, our own government's bureaucracy at the state and federal level are contributing to the pain rather than easing it. We can and should do better.

CONGRATULATING TAIWAN PRESIDENT TSAI ING-WEN AND HEADWAY IN THE ARENA OF WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, since President Tsai Ing-wen assumed office last May, Taiwan has taken steps to bolster women's empowerment at home and abroad. In November 2016, Taiwan and the U.S. announced their intention to joint-

ly support the establishment of a subfund on women and the economy under the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC).

This joint initiative will allow the 21 members of APEC to apply for funding for new or existing programs with the aim of improving women's economic empowerment. The subfund, created through a mutually trusting relationship between Washington and Taipei, highlights Taiwan's meaningful participation in the international community. In particular, the subfund will promote women's empowerment in the areas of capital and market access, skills and capacity building, women's leadership and agency, and innovation and technology. Women's empowerment is a key area of collaboration under the Global Cooperation and Training Framework (GCTF) established by the U.S. and Taiwan that President Tsai's administration has been focusing on.

Taiwan continues to make significant headway in the arena of women's empowerment. I congratulate President Tsai on her first anniversary as the President of Taiwan, and I look forward to an even closer U.S.-Taiwan cooperation under her leadership in the years to come.

HONORING SCOUTMASTER JIM RICARD

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 2017, a Celebration of the

Resurrected Life of Jim Ricard took place at Faith Lutheran Church of West Columbia, South Carolina. Services were lovingly conducted by Pastor M. David Kiel who eulogized that Jim "made a difference in our part of the world." The Wilson family especially appreciates Jim's service as Scoutmaster of Troop 1, where our four sons achieved the rank of Eagle Scouts.

The following thoughtful obituary was included in the church bulletin:

Haskel James "Jim" Ricard Jr., a baptized Christian and lifelong member of Faith Lutheran Church, entered into God's loving embrace on May 12, 2017. He was born January 4, 1942 in Springdale, South Carolina. He was the oldest son of Hack and Melva Ricard.

Jim is survived by his wife of 52 years, JoAnn S. Ricard, and three children, Jamey Ricard (Jeanne), Juston Ricard (Tammy), and Joni Coleman (Brad). His grandchildren are Tanner, Jacob, Sydney, Josie, Jayne, and sister-in-law, Cindy. He was predeceased by his brother, Bobby Ricard.

After graduating from Brookland-Cayce High School, he worked for Baker Equipment Company before starting his own business, Ricard's Welding. After earning his Eagle Scout Award as a young man, he later served as Scoutmaster of Troop 1. He received both the Silver Beaver and Lamb Award. He served in the South Carolina National Guard in the 133rd MP Company.

Blessed be the memory of Haskel James "Jim" Ricard Jr.

SENATE—Wednesday, May 17, 2017

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

God and God alone, we praise You that You give power to the weak, and to those who have no might You increase their strength. Increase the stamina of our lawmakers when their hearts are overwhelmed by challenges.

May they look to You, the fountain of every blessing, to enable them to solve our national problems with wisdom and faithfulness. May they not be afraid or dismayed, always placing their trust in You. Lord, inspire them to remember that Your plans stand firm, as Your purposes prevail through all generations. Instruct them in the way they should go as You give them Your peace.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF RACHEL BRAND

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate voted to confirm Jeffrey Rosen as the Deputy Secretary of Transportation. In a couple of hours, we will take a cloture vote to advance another well-qualified nominee, Rachel Brand, to serve as the Associate Attorney General.

Rachel Brand's impressive background includes experience clerking for Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy, and she has already been confirmed by the Senate twice before. She is "extraordinarily talented," as Chairman GRASSLEY noted at her hearing, and "dedicated to the full and evenhanded enforcement of our laws."

Ms. Brand also has the support of a bipartisan group of former senior officials at the Justice Department, including Jamie Gorelick and Seth Waxman, who, in a recent letter on her be-

half, cited her "stellar reputation for . . . integrity, legal skills, and respect for the law."

As they pointed out, Ms. Brand's extensive private and public sector experience would serve her well as the Associate Attorney General. They also noted she would be a "trusted leader in the Department." I look forward to advancing her nomination later this morning.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, as I outlined last week, during the Obama years, the American people struggled with an economy that failed to meet its potential. It had the slowest recovery since World War II, the middle class losing its historic status as the majority in our country, too many out of a job and looking for work, too many giving up after years of fruitless searching, too many fortunate just to have a paycheck but not one large enough to keep pace with ever-rising health costs and energy bills. This is the Obama legacy on the economy.

Over 8 long years of failed leftwing policies on everything from regulations to taxes, a Democratic administration put on a virtual clinic in how not to get an economy moving again. No wonder the American people opted for a pro-growth direction in November.

Ever since, this Republican Congress has been working to get our economy moving again and spur job creation. Rather than bury our economy in an avalanche of redtape, like the last administration, it is time for a new direction on regulations—smarter and pro-growth. Already, we have taken action to kick-start those efforts, like passing important legislation to provide relief from Obama-era midnight regulations.

Rather than make our Tax Code more complex like the last administration, we think it is time for a new direction on taxes—simpler and pro-jobs. Passing tax reform legislation would mark a major achievement in bringing us closer to that goal. This Republican Congress and this administration made it a priority from the very start. Over the years, many of our Democratic friends have also expressed the view that we need tax reform.

For years, it has been clear that we should help American workers by reforming our outdated and convoluted tax system, which currently discourages investment here in America and deters companies from growing, creating jobs, and increasing wages.

For years, it has been clear that we should remove a huge drag on job cre-

ation by reforming our overly complex and punitive tax system, which currently undercuts employers that want to expand with new investments, jobs, wages, and employee benefits.

For years, it has been clear we should make taxes simpler and lower for both businesses and individuals; that we should strive for a tax code that works for American families and for American businesses, rather than working against them. This year, we finally have the perfect opportunity to achieve that goal. Rather than engage in blind opposition for its own sake on yet another issue, I hope Democrats will instead take the kind of constructive approach we saw the last time our country enacted comprehensive tax reform. Back then, both parties recognized the need to address the burden and growing complexity of our Tax Code, and they came together to actually do something about it. Republicans and Democrats worked side by side and across the aisle to move that tax legislation. It was a big win for both parties, for Ronald Reagan and the Republicans, for Tip O'Neill and the Democrats.

Now it is once again time we do something about the issue, and I would hope our Democratic colleagues will once again work on a bipartisan basis toward that end. This has been a growing problem for a number of years now. The American people deserve a tax system that allows them to keep more of their hard-earned money, that empowers them to invest in their futures, and actually makes it easier to succeed rather than harder.

We have to get this accomplished because Americans have waited long enough for an economy that finally lives up to its potential and finally allows them to realize theirs as well.

I appreciate the House under Speaker RYAN's leadership for the role it is playing in these efforts. That work continues now with a Ways and Means Committee hearing dedicated to tax reform tomorrow and more to follow in coming days.

I also appreciate the good work of Members in both the House and the Senate, particularly the Senate Finance Committee under Chairman HATCH, who has been leading our discussions. For years, the chairman has been hard at work with fellow Finance Committee members on both sides of the aisle on options for tax reform, and I am confident Senator HATCH will continue to lead the way on these efforts in the days and months ahead.

The task before us is certainly a significant one, but I am confident we are up to the challenge because we know

how important it is for us to get this done, and we know how long overdue this is as well.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Brand nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Rachel L. Brand, of Iowa, to be Associate Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided in the usual form.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

THOUGHTS AND PRAYERS FOR SENATOR TILLIS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I just heard that our friend and colleague from North Carolina has collapsed during a race in DC and is receiving medical attention. Until we hear further news, our hearts will be in our mouths, hoping for the best. Our thoughts and prayers, as a Senate family, are with the junior Senator from North Carolina and his family.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, on a different subject, the events of the last 2 weeks have shaken my confidence in this administration's competence and credibility. There has been revelation after revelation, allegation after allegation of misconduct on the part of the President and his team. In the past 2 days, it has reached new heights.

The President, according to reports in the Washington Post and the New York Times, may have divulged classified information to a known adversary and actively tried to quash an investigation of a close political ally.

From the President's own words, we already know that the Russia investigation was on his mind when he fired Mr. Comey. We now know it may not have been the first time the President has taken an action to impede an active investigation of his campaign or associates, if the reports in the New York Times are true.

Concerns about our national security, the rule of law, the independence

of our Nation's highest law enforcement agencies are mounting in this land. The stated explanations for these events from the White House have been porous, shifting, and all too often contradictory.

The country is being tested in unprecedented ways. What is now required are the facts and impartial investigations into these very serious matters. The White House should make available to the Intelligence Committees the transcripts and any related summaries of the Oval Office meeting between President Trump and the Russian Foreign Minister and Ambassador. We can then assess exactly what was said and understand the consequences of any intelligence that was shared with the Russians.

On the topic of Mr. Comey, if the President has tapes of his conversation with Mr. Comey, we ought to be able to review those tapes as well to see if the President pressured the FBI Director to shut down an active investigation. The Times reported that Mr. Comey kept contemporaneous memos of his conversation with the President, and Mr. Comey has a reputation for accuracy in those memos. Those memos should also be provided to the congressional Intelligence and Judiciary Committees, and Mr. Comey should testify before those committees in public. Indeed, providing the Congress the tapes and memos may be the only way for this administration to credibly make a case to a justifiably skeptical American public about its version of the story reported by the New York Times. The President says what Comey said was wrong. Prove it. It is easy to prove it, as long as there are tapes or transcripts of what happened. If the President is right, he will have no problem releasing memos, tapes, or transcripts that corroborate his story. But if he fails to release them, the American public will justifiably tend to side with Mr. Comey, not what the President had to say, particularly in light of so much backtracking, backsliding, and factual fabrication in this White House.

Finally, the events of this past week only heighten the need for a special prosecutor who is truly independent to run the Department of Justice's investigation into potential collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia. The American people must have faith in the integrity and impartiality of this investigation. We have learned, if the reporting is accurate, that the President is willing to directly interfere with an active investigation. Whether or not it breaks the law is not the point here. The point is, he was trying to interfere with an investigation. How can anyone trust someone in the President's chain of command, someone who the President has appointed, after those actions? The only way out is a special prosecutor. It is the right thing to do.

We know the President is willing to fire an FBI Director because of this investigation, in his own words. It makes all the sense in the world to have a special prosecutor who can be fired only for cause to lead the Russia investigation. That would help protect the integrity of the investigation by insulating it from a White House, which at the very minimum, is overreaching.

Given the circumstances, these requests are reasonable. They are modest. I hope—I really pray—that my friends on the other side of the aisle will see that now is the time to put party considerations aside and do what is right for our country. I know that several of my colleagues—Senators from Maine, Tennessee, Arizona—have expressed concerns. A few have gone further and endorsed some of the actions I have mentioned. It is a good first step, but it is not enough. In the past 24 hours, there has been more movement among Republicans in the House than here in the Senate. The Senate, by its traditions, should be leading this effort, not following. More of my Republican friends should join the Senators from Maine, Tennessee, and Arizona in speaking out about these events first but, far more importantly, helping us get to the bottom of them in an impartial, trusted, and respected way.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle: America needs you; America needs you now. America needs you to help pressure the Deputy Attorney General to name a special prosecutor to compel this White House to turn over the transcripts and tapes to Congress, to demonstrate that the Congress the American people elected, Democrats and Republicans, can come together to do the right thing when it matters most. I repeat to all of my colleagues: History is watching.

This is not a casual or usual time. As great as the desire would be to repeal ObamaCare or do tax reform, the very faith in the institutions of government now are being tested. They have been tested in the past. This is not the first time in American history they have been tested, but in the past, there have been people who rose above party, rose above an immediate interest to defend the needs of the Republic. Is it going to happen now?

History will judge on whether this Congress and these Senators have been able to do what so many Senators before us, Democrats and Republicans, have done in the past: Put country above party. Whether we have decided to act as an appropriate check and balance as the Founders intended or whether we will let this continue, history will judge us all. Whether we decide to act in the way that is appropriate, history will judge us. Whether, in this moment of trial, the Senate is able to rise above partisanship and achieve statesmanship, again, history will judge us.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be charged equally to both sides.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, more than 3 million Illinoisans—about 20 percent of the people in my State—currently depend on Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program for healthcare. That is one out of five people in my State who need these programs to have basic health insurance for themselves and their children.

This includes 300,000 Illinois seniors and people with disabilities, 650,000 who were recently added as part of the Affordable Care Act. It also includes 1.5 million children. Half of all the kids in Illinois are enrolled in Medicaid and the CHIP program, which in Illinois is called ALL Kids.

Nationwide, the Medicaid Program helps pay for two out of three seniors in their nursing homes. It pays for about half of all children born in this country. It is the primary payer of all mental health and opioid addiction treatment. It provides healthcare to 25 percent of people in rural communities. It pays for special education in nearly half of all school districts and provides critical support for veterans with chronic conditions.

What does the House of Representatives Affordable Care Act repeal do to the programs I have just described? It ends the expansion of Medicaid. It would eliminate coverage for 650,000 people in the State of Illinois. Think about that. We had seven of our Republican Congressmen vote for a program that will eliminate health insurance under Medicaid for 650,000 people in my State and cut \$840 billion in Federal

Medicaid funding. Well, if they are going to cut this money for Medicaid funding, what are they going to do with it? The House knew exactly what to do with it: They give it back in tax breaks to the wealthiest people in America. Is there justice in that decision? Is it too much to ask that those of us who are better off in life pay a little more in taxes so that those who are struggling have basic healthcare? I don't think so, but those who voted for the Republican House plan do. The bill cuts healthcare for struggling families, women, seniors, and children in order to give a tax break to the wealthiest people in America.

Illinois would lose \$40 billion over the next decade, and 3 million people would be at risk of losing their care. Absolutely no one believes Illinois is going to magically come up with \$40 billion to fill this Medicaid shortfall. I doubt many other States will be able to either. With funding cuts this dramatic, even Illinois's Republican Governor spoke out against the House action repealing the Affordable Care Act. He said it is going to force us to make significant changes in healthcare in Illinois. He would have to decide who gets healthcare and who doesn't. He would have to decide whether healthcare services are just too expensive to cover.

Hospitals, too, would be devastated by the proposed Medicaid cuts. I was born and raised in downstate Illinois. It doesn't look at all like the city of Chicago. I am proud to represent that city. I enjoyed being there and being a part of it. I grew up in smalltown America, and the congressional district I represented basically was smaller cities—no more than 100,000 population at the time—with a lot of smaller towns. I can't tell you the pride those communities take in downstate Illinois in their hospitals. Some of those hospitals are a lifeline—the only source of healthcare for miles around. They are great employers. They bring in medical specialists who are paid good salaries by local standards.

The Illinois Hospital Association is dead-set against what the House Republicans did in passing their repeal of the Affordable Care Act. They have told us that Illinois stands to lose up to 60,000 healthcare jobs because of that vote in the U.S. House of Representatives. Of course, that means that for many of the people who count on these rural hospitals, even inner city hospitals in Chicago, those services are going to be curtailed and denied.

When I sit down with people like Ed Curtis, who is the president of Memorial Medical Center in Springfield and speaks for Illinois hospital administrators across the State—he tells me the devastating impact it will have when Medicaid coverage is eliminated and sick people still show up for care. They will be taken care of; their expenses

will be shifted to other people. That is the way it used to be before the Affordable Care Act, before Medicaid expanded and gave these individuals in low-income situations basic health insurance.

Why would Republicans in the House of Representatives want to have such a devastating negative impact on Medicaid? So they can give tax cuts to wealthy people? That, to me, is inexplicable.

The Illinois Hospital Association speaks across our State for those who really care about those great institutions, but they are not alone in opposing this bill. The Illinois Nurses Association opposes it, as do the Illinois pediatricians and the Illinois Medical Society. Why does every medical advocacy group in Illinois oppose this bill, this so-called Republican reform of our healthcare system? Because they know it moves in the wrong direction. It eliminates healthcare coverage instead of expanding it. It makes healthcare too expensive and out of reach for people who are not lucky enough to have it at work and not wealthy enough to buy it on their own. It moves in the wrong direction. It is not a solution to any problem; it is a new and even worse problem than the ones we faced in the past.

Remember when Candidate Donald Trump tweeted in May of 2015: "I was the first and only potential GOP candidate to state there would be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid"? Then he tweeted in July of 2015—"The Republicans who want to cut Social Security and Medicaid are wrong," said Candidate Trump. He was right, but now he supports this bill which dramatically cuts Medicaid coverage across America.

What is going to happen to the elderly in nursing homes who, despite all their Social Security payments and despite all of their Medicaid reimbursement, still don't have enough resources for the basic care they need to stay alive? When they cut back on that Medicaid coverage, what happens to them? What do their families do to make up the difference? Reach into their savings? Bring mom home from the nursing home in the hopes that they can take care of her in their own home? Those are choices no family should face and no family need face.

I hope the Senate will show the courage and leadership on a bipartisan basis to say no to this terrible bill that passed the U.S. House of Representatives just 2 weeks ago. We need to put together a bill that expands the coverage of health insurance, gives people more peace of mind; a bill that addresses some of the built-in challenges we had with the Affordable Care Act, which is far from perfect. There are things we can do to improve it.

We need to do something about the cost of pharmaceutical drugs. The current law doesn't really affect that. They are out of control at this point.

Secondly, I think we ought to offer a public option. There ought to be a Medicare-type program available across the United States for those who wish it. Medicare enjoys a very positive reputation in America for good reason. Most Americans would feel honored and happy to be protected by a Medicare-type program.

We also need to go to those premiums that are too high and ask why. In many cases, there are individuals who are buying health insurance from very narrow pools of people who are older and sicker. We need to expand that pool so it is real insurance, and we can bring those premiums down. There are ways to do that.

There are many things we can do with reforming the Affordable Care Act, but what the House of Representatives did, what some want to do, is just repeal it and walk away. It would be devastating to the women in America who rely on Medicaid to pay for their delivery expenses, as well as prenatal and postnatal care. It would be devastating to seniors who are in nursing homes and are dependent on Medicaid supplements and for those who are disabled with chronic conditions and have to turn to Medicaid just to make sure they can maintain their lifestyle and still be productive, happy, and safe. These are the elements and these are the costs we would have to charge if we are not careful.

Wouldn't it be great, wouldn't it be terrific, wouldn't it be a headliner to say that Democrats and Republicans came together in the U.S. Senate to make the Affordable Care Act better, to make sure there was more accessible, affordable, quality coverage for more Americans? I think that is why we were elected, and I hope we can achieve that goal.

Mr. President, before I yield, I ask unanimous consent that the time during quorum calls until 12 noon today be charged equally to both sides.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

YEMEN

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, colleagues, I am very pleased to be joined on the floor today by Senator YOUNG. We are both members of the Foreign Relations Committee, and both have an

interest in Middle East security. We have joined together on the floor today to give remarks and perhaps have a short colloquy about a humanitarian crisis that is unfolding before our eyes in the Middle East.

Today, inside the country of Yemen—a country that, frankly, not a lot of our constituents give much thought to—every 10 minutes a child under the age of 5 is dying due to preventable causes. Today, 18 million Yemeni civilians—two thirds of the entire population of this country—cannot survive without humanitarian or protection support, and 7 million of those are on what we would call a starvation diet, which means that on a daily basis they don't know where their next meal is coming from. They don't have enough food to eat in order to remain healthy. Three million have already fled their homes because of the violence that has been caused by a civil war—that both Senator YOUNG and I will talk about—inside their country and the humanitarian catastrophe that has resulted from that civil war.

This is one of four current famines that exists in the world today. But I would argue that this particular humanitarian crisis is in some ways the most relevant to the discussions we will have here in the Senate because the United States is participating in the military campaign that is, in fact, causing in part this humanitarian crisis.

The United States is an active participant with a Saudi-led military campaign seeking to regain control of Yemen from a group called the Houthis, who overran the capital and now control large portions of the country.

We, of course, are allies of Saudi Arabia. The President will be visiting Saudi Arabia very soon to solidify that alliance. But it is time we started asking some really hard questions about the conduct of the Saudi campaign inside Yemen and whether we are, in fact, helping to create a humanitarian catastrophe on the grounds that is impossible to defend on moral grounds but also is hard to defend based on national security grounds as well.

Let's be honest about what is happening here. The Saudis are deliberately trying to create a famine inside Yemen in order to essentially starve the Yemenis to the negotiating table. Saudi Deputy Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman said:

Time is on our side. Being patient is in our interest. We have the supplies and we have the logistics and high morale. The enemy does not have supplies and funds and is impatient. Time is on our side and we will exploit the time to serve our interests.

What are the Saudis doing to try to exploit this question of time and supplies? First, they are coming directly after the main port city, which brings 70 percent of food into Yemen and

about 80 percent of all of the oil. That port city is called Hodeidah.

Senator YOUNG has been very good in meetings to draw issue with what is believed to be deliberate targeting by the Saudis of the cranes and infrastructure in this port which allow for the supplies to come off of boats and move into these desperately, desperately needy areas of the country.

Second, they are requiring an additional screening process for this humanitarian aid above and beyond the one the United Nations has put into place. The United Nations is vetting supply ships coming in to Hodeidah to make sure there is really food and aid on these ships, not weapons, and it is working. But the Saudis are putting an additional process on top that is adding up to a month from the time the aid gets off the ship and into the country. Between that and the military campaign targeting the port and its infrastructure, this has essentially resulted in an effective blockade being put in and around Hodeidah, such that humanitarian support cannot effectively get into the country. But that is just the beginning.

The Saudi bombing campaign has deliberately targeted roads and bridges throughout the country, many of them in and around north Yemen. There are reports that the bombers have engaged in something called double tapping, which is where you hit a humanitarian—a civilian—asset. You wait until the workers come to try to address that first strike, and then you hit it a second time to take out the civilians who have responded to the emergency. This isn't just my opinion of the situation. Representations have been made by multiple aid organizations on the ground, and, more importantly, by U.S. officials who have been embedded with the coalition.

This is a quote from Dafna Rand, the former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State who was in charge of the Saudi coalition portfolio at State:

In 2015, the U.S. Government offered technical training on cyber, ballistic missiles, border security, counterterrorism, and maritime security, [and] the precision guided munitions were transferred in 2015 on the hopes that they would enable better and more precise targeting by the coalition of the targets itself. [But instead,] what we have seen since is not an improvement in the targeting, and the issue itself is the target selection. It is not the precision of the target itself, but it is the choice of targets and adherence to the no-strike list.

That is a really important statement, a really important sentence, because what is happening is that the United States is telling the coalition: What are the civilian targets you should stay away from, so the humanitarian aid can move into the country? The coalition is deliberately ignoring that advice. It is not a matter of mistakes being made on the ground, though there have been mistakes. It is

also a matter of a no-strike list being ignored.

I mention that this is not just about the millions and millions of Yemenis who are starving today because of this civil war. It is also a question of whether this is accruing to the U.S. national security interests. Again, I am speaking just for myself on this matter.

We are allies of the Saudis, and there is no doubt that an Iranian proxy state inside Yemen presents a threat to the Saudi State. There is no doubt that Houthis have been launching attacks into Saudi Arabia. This is a real security threat for our allies. But we do have to acknowledge that there are other players that exist inside Yemen today. It is not just the Houthis and those Yemeni forces supported by the Saudis. There is also al-Qaida—a branch of al-Qaida we know well because it has traditionally been the piece of al-Qaida that has the most advanced threats to the U.S. homeland—and ISIS, which is growing inside Yemen. They have taken advantage of this civil war to fill in the ungovernable spaces.

Recently, with the help of the UAE, we have begun to hit back against al-Qaida and ISIS inside Yemen. But for a portion of time, they controlled a sizeable amount of territory and revenue inside that country. ISIS is growing as well.

As a group of Yemeni Americans told me in my office about a year ago, to Yemenis the bombing campaign is not perceived as a Saudi bombing campaign; it is seen as a U.S. bombing campaign or, at the very least, a U.S.-Saudi bombing campaign.

So when responsibility inside Yemen is allotted and attributed for this starvation campaign, it is placed upon the United States, as well as on Saudi Arabia. We have to think about what that means, given the fact that there is the potential for millions of Yemenis to be radicalized in a place with very sophisticated radical infrastructure. This is a real national security concern for the United States.

I think it is time for us to draw a hard line with this coalition and say that we will not continue to support it if there is not a real commitment made to change the way the targeting happens and to make sure that relief supplies can flow into that country to try to address this unfolding famine and humanitarian catastrophe. We can be allies with the Saudis. We can be military allies with the Saudis. But they have to understand and their partners need to understand that this humanitarian nightmare inside Yemen is both immoral—to participate in a campaign that perpetuates that kind of humanitarian crisis—but it also, in the end, doesn't benefit the long-term security of the United States or our partners in the coalition.

So we come down to the floor today to try to explain to our colleagues what is happening on the ground and to see if there is a bipartisan way for us to have a policy that brings significant relief to the suffering of the Yemeni people and strengthens our national security in the region.

With that, I notice Senator YOUNG is going to say a few words, and then I think we will engage in a colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator MURPHY to discuss the importance of this humanitarian crisis in Yemen. As he so cogently emphasized, this is, at once, a humanitarian crisis and also a security crisis in the region and beyond.

I am a new member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I have to say that I have quickly come to admire Senator MURPHY for his forceful advocacy of our values of universal human rights and of American international leadership. So I commend him for his leadership on this issue in particular.

I share many of the concerns articulated by Senator MURPHY with regard to the situation in Yemen and the Saudi-led coalition there in that country. Before getting into the specific situation in Yemen, however, I think it is important to step back and look at the big picture.

The world currently confronts humanitarian crises of a magnitude we haven't seen in many, many years. Parts of Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, and Yemen are all in famine or pre-famine stages. According to the United Nations, 20 million people are at risk of starvation within the next few months in these four countries.

The Director-General of the International Committee of the Red Cross appeared before our Senate Foreign Relations Committee just weeks ago, and he called the crises "one of the most critical humanitarian issues to face mankind since the end of the Second World War." He warned that "we are at the brink of a humanitarian mega-crisis unprecedented in recent history."

Each of these crises are unique. They have their unique man-made causes. But in each case, the crises are preventable. They have been exacerbated by war and restrictions on humanitarian access. Now, they are complicated. The situation in Yemen is certainly a complicated one. But the United Nations calls the situation in Yemen the largest humanitarian crisis in the world. According to their Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, Yemen has almost 19 million people in need of humanitarian or protection assistance, including approximately 10 million who require immediate assistance to save their lives or to sustain their lives.

This is an urgent matter, which is why I am so glad we have the leader-

ship of Senator MURPHY on this matter and some of my other colleagues on various fronts. This is why I led a 10-Member letter to Secretary Tillerson on March 23 calling for a diplomatic surge to address the political obstacles preventing the delivery of humanitarian aid. I note that Senator MURPHY joined me on that letter, which I personally hand-delivered to Secretary Tillerson. It is also why I raised the issue with Ambassador Haley in New York City. It is why I introduced a resolution on April 5 calling for the very same thing. Senators CARDIN, BOOZMAN, COONS, GARDNER, and RUBIO joined that resolution.

Throughout this process, rather than just studying the problem, I—working with my colleagues—have tried to focus on tangible steps we can take to save lives and address this very troubling national security situation. For that reason, on April 27, joined by Senator MURPHY and several other colleagues, I sent a letter to the incoming Saudi Ambassador. Noting the important security partnership between the United States and Saudi Arabia and Saudi Arabia's essential role as a regional leader and an ally and a partner, I asked Riyadh to consider five specific steps related to Yemen that would prevent thousands or even millions of additional people from starving there.

There is no doubt that the Houthis and the Iranians bear a very large portion of the blame for this whole situation. I asked our ally Saudi Arabia to take these steps because the United States has a valuable security relationship with Saudi Arabia and because we can oppose Iran's activities in Yemen while ending unnecessary delays in the delivery of desperately needed humanitarian assistance. These two goals are not mutually exclusive.

I didn't receive a satisfactory response, so I subsequently raised these issues with the Saudi Foreign Minister in a meeting on Capitol Hill. In that meeting, I cited the fact—confirmed again by the administration within the last week—that the Saudi-led coalition continues to impose significant delays on the delivery of humanitarian aid to the port of Hodeidah on the Red Sea. Again, this is important because the port of Hodeidah processes roughly 70 to 80 percent of Yemen's food and other critical imports. I mentioned to the Foreign Minister the U.S.-funded cranes for the port of Hodeidah that would dramatically improve the ability to offload humanitarian supplies at that port. I expressed concerns to the Foreign Minister about the humanitarian impact of an attack on the port of Hodeidah. Yet, as the suffering of the Yemeni people continues and even worsens, these issues regrettably remain unresolved.

According to the administration—confirmed again this morning—the Saudi-led coalition continues to be responsible for an average of 16 days of

additional delays to humanitarian shipments into the port of Hodeidah after vessels are cleared by the United Nations Verification and Inspection Mechanism for Yemen. Think about it. Your children are starving to death. Perhaps your entire village is starving to death. And you have a delay of an additional 16 days in humanitarian shipments. Think of the impact that has on security in the region as desperate people are forced to take desperate measures to associate themselves with bad actors in the area. It is certainly troubling to me.

For that reason, I have decided to cosponsor Senator MURPHY's legislation, S.J. Res. 40. Before the United States can transfer air-to-ground munitions to Saudi Arabia, the legislation requires the President of the United States to make a number of certifications. One of those includes a certification that Saudi Arabia and its coalition partners are making demonstrable efforts to facilitate the flow of critical humanitarian aid and commercial goods. I don't believe the President could credibly make that assertion until the Saudis take some of the steps I have called for.

As President Trump prepares his visit to Saudi Arabia, I urge him to raise these critical issues with the Saudi Government. I urge our President to emphasize that these are humanitarian and national security issues that are priorities of the American people. I urge the administration to ask the Saudi Government to take the following concrete actions: First, renounce any intention to conduct a military operation against the port of Hodeidah; second, redouble efforts to achieve a diplomatic solution; third, end any delays to the delivery of humanitarian aid caused by the Saudi-led coalition; and fourth, permit the delivery of much needed U.S. funded cranes to the port of Hodeidah that would permit the quicker delivery of food and medicine.

I have said it before: With more than 10 million Yemenis requiring immediate humanitarian assistance, there is no time to waste. I stand ready to work with our Saudi partners to fight Iran's malign influence and to take these specific steps to begin to address the catastrophic humanitarian situation in Yemen.

I again thank Senator MURPHY for his leadership and for the opportunity to join him on the floor today. I look forward to working together again in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Indiana. I think he walked through his thoughtful approach to this issue, which has led him to cosponsor this resolution placing these very commonsense conditions upon the transfer of further munitions.

I might ask him a question. In his list of steps he has asked the Saudis to take—I have joined him in that letter, as have many of our colleagues—amongst them is a commitment to not take military action against the port of Hodeidah.

We both met with the Foreign Minister, who talked about the need to use increased military pressure inside Yemen backed by U.S. participation in the coalition to try to draw the Houthis to the table. We have both expressed reservations about the effectiveness of that tactic, and we have something to say about it because none of this can occur without U.S. military support.

Can the Senator talk a little bit about our joint fears or his personal fears about a major new campaign on this port that brings in so much of this aid and how, in the end, that really doesn't further the goals of the coalition, the United States being amongst the partners?

Mr. YOUNG. It is a critical question, and it is one I have been asking so many stakeholders involved in this issue. No one has presented to me persuasive evidence indicating that a Saudi-led attack on the port would result in defeat of the Houthis-Saleh bloc. No one has presented to me evidence that I find compelling that that action would even force the Houthis bloc to the negotiating table.

The onus ought to be on those who might take a military action—which would exacerbate the worst humanitarian crisis in the world—to present that evidence. I have asked for it. I haven't received it.

I think it is just as likely that an attack would push the Houthis, as I alluded to earlier, into further alignment with and dependence on the Iranians, with whom they are allied. That is the exact opposite of what we are trying to accomplish in the region, as the Iranians continue to spread their influence and their terroristic activities across the Middle East. So this is not in the interests, as I see it, based on all the evidence available, of the United States, UAE, or Saudi Arabia, and it would result in both a humanitarian catastrophe and exacerbate the national security situation.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank Senator YOUNG for making it clear in his prepared remarks that while we are focusing on the Saudis because we are part of this coalition, the Houthis do not have clean hands here either. Part of the reason humanitarian supplies have a hard time getting to places that need them is because there are roadblocks put up by the Houthis as well. And there is this known connection between the Houthis and the Iranians—sometimes, in my opinion, a bit overplayed by some foreign policy thinkers, but it is real.

To your second point in answer to my question, Senator YOUNG, that is, to

my mind, also a likely result of a deepening of the military conflict. If the Houthis had nowhere to turn, then the calculation might be different, but because the Iranians are there as a support system to lean on, a continued military campaign against Hodeidah would push them deeper into a corner and just broaden the scope of the military conflict.

There ultimately has to be a political resolution here, and by simply upping the military ante and continuing the humanitarian crisis, you get further away from that political negotiating table rather than closer to it.

Mr. YOUNG. Indeed. The last thing we want to do is to exacerbate a situation where we already have 10 million desperate people on the cusp of starvation or passing away on account of a lack of medical supplies.

We need assistance here, which is why it is important for the President to elevate the importance of this issue in his conversation with the Saudis during his coming visit, and I believe he will do so. I believe he will do so because the international community, NGOs, understand the importance of this. Many at the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development have spoken about what a serious crisis this is. And we don't want to be shortsighted with respect to what a bombing of the port could catalyze.

We also need to recognize that there are other players in the Saudi coalition that can be constructive as well. The Emirates, I would note, have shown a willingness to be helpful on a couple of different fronts.

I had the opportunity to visit with the Crown Prince yesterday and received his assurance that he would seek to resolve without delay a situation related to the forward stationing of inspectors in his country so that they can pre-inspect cargo before it goes into the port of Hodeidah, and that would expedite the process and help mitigate a lot of the suffering that is occurring. Also, I had an opportunity to discuss with the Crown Prince this issue of four cranes. U.S. taxpayers paid for these cranes. I mentioned them in my prepared remarks earlier. And I have heard from the Crown Prince; he made a commitment there as well. So I am grateful for his commitment, and I look forward to following up with the UAE Government on this front. They are good allies to the United States.

Mr. MURPHY. It goes without saying that it is in no one's interests in the region for this civil war to continue at its current pace. So this is an important moment at the beginning of a new administration, with a pending arms sale on the table with the Saudis, to use that transition moment and the leverage that exists with this new proposal for major arms sales to the Saudis to make sure we get this right.

I think there is nothing political about this. We all join together in trying to abate humanitarian crises and famines around the world, and we all want a policy that is going to bring an end to this civil war because, as I said, it is just as important to remember that the most immediate enemies of the United States—those terrorist groups who want to do harm to us—find their most fertile ground today inside Yemen. The sooner we can put an end to this civil war and be able to have a central government structure that spreads across the scope of the country, the quicker we can all be focused on trying to eliminate the ISIS and al-Qaida presence—AQAP, as we refer to them—in Yemen from that battlespace.

I say to Senator YOUNG, I don't know if you have closing remarks, but I appreciate your willingness to speak up and your leadership here, and I hope we can get others on both sides of the aisle to propose and support these common-sense conditions upon this new military transfer so that we can get the situation right inside Yemen.

Mr. YOUNG. I say to the Senator, let me end by reiterating my gratitude to you, of course, for your exceptional leadership, for walking points on this issue, and I look forward to our continued work together.

I thank all our colleagues who have engaged on this matter. And I, of course, before the U.S. Senate here, want to invite others to engage in this. If they have questions with respect to this matter, which is critical for our national security, I know they can reach out to the Senator or me, and it is imperative that we send a respectful message to the administration that we think this is something that needs to be addressed in the near term.

I have nothing else to say.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. KENNEDY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1150 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if I came to you today and told you we had received a job application from somebody to work for the government, and you and I looked at her job application and we saw she had graduated from Harvard Law School, if we looked at her job application and we saw she had worked for a Presidential campaign, if we saw she had practiced law in the private sector, if we noticed from her

resume that she had actually worked as a counsel, as a lawyer, in the White House, if we saw she had clerked for a Supreme Court Justice, Justice Anthony Kennedy—each Justice of the United States, I think, has four law clerks every year. I don't know how many tens of thousands of lawyers and law students apply, but to be chosen is one of the highest honors you can receive as a young lawyer. If I told you this person who applied for a job in government used to work at the Department of Justice as Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Office of Legal Policy, if I told you she had also worked for one of the most prestigious law firms in the country, Wilmer, Cutler, Pickering, Hale & Dorr—I remember them as Wilmer, Cutler, but they have changed their name since then. They have been around forever. If I told you all of those things, I think any reasonable person would say: Wow, let's hire her here immediately. Let's do it before she finds another position. Well, that person has applied for a job in government. Her name is Rachel Brand. She has been nominated by President Trump to be Associate Attorney General.

That is a position that is vitally important within the Department of Justice. It is responsible for the oversight of the Civil Division, the Civil Rights Division, the Office on Violence Against Women, and many other important components of the Department of Justice. I think no matter what political party you happen to be in or whatever your political persuasion, we can all agree that right now it is particularly important not only to have a Department of Justice that is fully staffed but to have it fully staffed with extraordinarily qualified people whom every American can look at and go: Wow, is she qualified. I am so pleased she is working for the Federal Government and my tax dollars are being well spent.

Ms. Brand has broad experience, as I indicated, both within the Department of Justice and in the private sector. As I indicated—I am going to say it again—she worked for Justice Anthony Kennedy of the U.S. Supreme Court. Wow, what an honor. She has served as Assistant Attorney General under President George Bush. She has been in private practice, as I indicated. She has been chief counsel for Regulatory Litigation in the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and I could go on and on and on.

I fully support Ms. Brand's nomination. I sit on the Judiciary Committee, the committee of the Senate that vetted her. She is highly respected, she is whip smart, she is well qualified, and she is fully prepared to hit the ground running. That is exactly what we need.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Rachel L. Brand, of Iowa, to be Associate Attorney General.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, Jeff Flake, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, John Barrasso, Chuck Grassley, Mike Rounds, John Kennedy, John Thune, Pat Roberts, James E. Risch, Orrin G. Hatch, Shelley Moore Capito, Lindsey Graham, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Rachel L. Brand, of Iowa, to be Associate Attorney General, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea".

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 130 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Graham	Portman
Burr	Grassley	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Cassidy	Heller	Rounds
Cochran	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Strange
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Cantwell	Cortez Masto
Bennet	Cardin	Donnelly
Blumenthal	Carper	Duckworth
Booker	Casey	Durbin
Brown	Coons	Feinstein

Franken
Gillibrand
Harris
Hassan
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Manchin

Markey
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Peters
Reed
Sanders
Schatz

Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall
Van Hollen
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Hirono

Tillis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

The majority whip is recognized.

AMERICAN LAW ENFORCEMENT HEROES ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I know people outside the beltway think nothing ever happens here—and certainly that nothing ever happens on a bipartisan basis—but they would be wrong on both counts.

Last night, the Senate passed a piece of bipartisan legislation called the American Law Enforcement Heroes Act. It is a great example of legislation everyone can agree on and get behind.

The main goal is to connect veterans—those who have served in our military and have a passion for public service—to opportunities in State and local law enforcement. When we think about it, who better than our retiring military personnel who are accustomed to wearing one uniform, moving then into the civilian law enforcement world wearing another uniform but continuing their legacy of public service. That way, those who have voluntarily put themselves in harm's way to keep the peace and promote American interests abroad and defend our homeland can continue the record of public service at home.

For veterans, that can mean a rewarding job in law enforcement. Through their training, experience, and sacrifice, there is no doubt that our veterans are equipped with valuable skills to keep our communities safe. By prioritizing existing Federal funds for State and local law enforcement agencies to hire veterans, we can better serve them as they transition into civilian life. We know that can be a challenging transition, but that is exactly what the American Law Enforcement Heroes Act that we passed yesterday does.

For State and local law enforcement groups, that means they can attract the best qualified men and women who are eager to serve their country in a new way. So this is really a win-win.

Fortunately, this legislation builds on the good work already underway in places like my home State of Texas. Over the last several months, I have had a chance to visit cities and counties all over the State that are actively recruiting veterans to serve as police officers or sheriffs. That includes law enforcement leaders from San Antonio to Houston, to Fort Worth. As my colleagues may recall, following the ter-

rible killing of five police officers and shooting of seven more in Dallas, Police Chief David Brown made an appeal for people who were protesting or otherwise concerned about the law enforcement agencies involved to sign up and join them—to be a part of the solution and not just protesting the problem.

Thankfully, we have set a tremendous example in Texas of how hiring veterans to serve as law enforcement officers benefits all of our communities. I am glad this bill will follow their inspiration and help communities across the country hire more veterans.

I said before that this legislation is something everyone can agree on, in a polarized political environment, and that is of course evident by the broad bipartisan support it has received.

Let me express my gratitude to the senior Senator from Minnesota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, as well as the senior Senators from Connecticut and California—all Democratic colleagues—for being my original cosponsors on the bill. I am also grateful to my Republican colleagues, including Senator CRUZ, as well as the junior Senator from North Carolina and the senior Senators from Iowa, Utah, and Nevada, for working with us on this legislation.

My friend Congressman WILL HURD on the House side introduced the same bill there, and I am hopeful it will pass sometime today so we can get this to the President's desk for his signature without delay.

I would also note that the American Law Enforcement Heroes Act is backed by major law enforcement groups across the country, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the Major County Sheriffs of America, the Major City Chiefs Association, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I have been grateful for their help along the way toward passage of this bill.

I look forward to this bill becoming a law—hopefully, this week, as we continue to celebrate Police Week honoring the service of the men and women in blue who keep our communities safe—and making it clear that this Congress cares not only about our veterans but also our law enforcement officials as well.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, just last Wednesday, I spoke on the Senate floor about the extremely suspicious timing of the firing of FBI Director James Comey by President Trump.

In the past few days, President Trump's actions, statements, and changing of his story on the Comey firing has only strengthened the case for the appointment of a special counsel to investigate ties and collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russian Government in the 2016 Presidential

election. Congress should also establish an independent commission to get to the bottom of the Russian interference in our election. In addition, there needs to be an independent investigation into whether Mr. Trump abused power and played a role in obstruction of justice in terms of the ongoing criminal investigation at the Department of Justice.

Let me start by going back to the beginning of the Trump administration. According to news reports, on January 27, Mr. Trump invited Mr. Comey to a private dinner with him at the White House. Mr. Trump then asked Mr. Comey for his "loyalty," but Mr. Comey only promised to provide his "honesty" or his "honest loyalty." Why did the President allegedly ask Director Comey for his loyalty?

On March 4, President Trump tweeted without evidence that "how low has President Obama gone to tap my phones during the very sacred election process. This is Nixon/Watergate. Bad (or sick) guy!" On March 20, Mr. Comey testified he has "no information" to support Mr. Trump's claim. Why did the President try to distract the public's attention by blaming President Obama for the Russia investigation?

On April 12, in an interview, Mr. Trump said Mr. Comey "saved Hillary Clinton" during the campaign and said that "it's not too late" to remove Mr. Comey. Mr. Trump continued: "But, you know, I have confidence in him. We'll see what happens, you know, it's going to be interesting."

What changed between Mr. Trump having confidence in Mr. Comey in April and firing him in May?

On May 3, Mr. Comey testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee and said "it makes me mildly nauseous to think that we might have had some impact on the election."

On May 8, former Acting Attorney General Sally Yates and former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper both testified before the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. Yates testified about the warnings she gave to White House Counsel Don McGahn about how National Security Adviser Michael Flynn was compromised by the Russians and was lying to White House staff and the Vice President about his conversations and interactions with the Russians.

On May 9, we witnessed a series of three letters, all dated that day. The first letter was from Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein to Attorney General Jeff Sessions. The Rosenstein letter concludes that the FBI's reputation and credibility had suffered "substantial damage" due to Mr. Comey's actions during the Clinton email investigation. Notably, Rosenstein's memo does not explicitly recommend Mr. Comey's removal. That same day, Attorney General Sessions, who has recused himself from the Russia-Trump

campaign investigation, sent the Rosenstein letter to the White House, along with his own letter, concluding that “a fresh start is needed at the leadership of the FBI.” Again, on the same day that Mr. Trump fired Director Comey, the Trump letter includes a curious aside: “I greatly appreciate you informing me, on three separate occasions, that I am not under investigation.” Did Director Comey really give those assurances to President Trump when the criminal and counter-intelligence investigations into the Trump campaign and Russia connections are still active and ongoing?

At the same time, we heard from White House Press Secretary Sean Spicer and we heard from the Vice President of the United States that the reason for the firing of Mr. Comey was the recommendation of the Department of Justice. That is what they said it was, only to find the next day President Trump saying:

In fact, when I decided to just do it, I said to myself, I said “You know, this Russian thing with Trump and Russia is a made-up story, it’s an excuse by the Democrats for having lost an election that they should have won.”

Then he talked about Mr. Comey and said he had decided to fire him. So it was not the memos; it was what Mr. Trump had decided. So there is a lot of misinformation being sent out, which raises a lot of questions.

Over the weekend, former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper stated:

I think in many ways our institutions are under assault both externally—and that’s the big news here is the Russian interference in our election system—and I think as well our institutions are under assault internally.

So we have the former Director of National Intelligence, Mr. Clapper, saying we have some problems internally.

The only way we are going to get to the bottom of this, the only way we are going to find out what this loyalty oath is all about or how Mr. Trump came to the conclusion to fire Mr. Comey or, more recently, where we hear Mr. Comey has memos of a meeting in which the President asked him to go easy on an investigation, which could rise to obstruction of justice—the only way we are going to get to the bottom of all this is by having an independent special counsel prosecutor appointed by the Department of Justice. That is what needs to be done. The facts need to go where they take us, but we also have to have an investigation that has the credibility that it will not be interfered with by the President of the United States. The only way to do that is by having special counsel appointed by the Department of Justice. It is the only way to restore the reputation of the Department of Justice.

I might say that we also need to understand exactly what Russia was

doing here in the United States. There are so many examples of Russia being aggressive in our campaign. We know they wanted to discredit the American campaign. We know they took sides in favor of Mr. Trump over Mrs. Clinton. We know they hacked information. We know they used misinformation. We know they used cyber and social media in order to further their advancements. We also know they met with representatives of the Trump campaign. The American people have a right to understand exactly what those contacts were all about. That is why I filed the resolution, which is supported by many of my colleagues, to set up a 9/11 independent commission in order to get to the bottom of what is happening. That can be done simultaneously with the work being done by the Senate Intelligence Committee, which is important work for us to do, but we also need to have an independent commission in order to determine exactly what Russia was doing so we can take the necessary steps to prevent this from occurring in the future.

There are a lot of unanswered questions. People say: Well, how can you call for action if you don’t know all the facts? I am calling for us to know all the facts. I am calling for us to understand exactly why on one day the White House sends out one story that the Department of Justice recommended the firing of Mr. Comey, and then on the next day the President said: No, I decided that before I met with the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General.

We need to understand why there was a conversation in which Mr. Comey has notes that indicate Mr. Trump wanted him to go easy in an investigation. That is a pretty serious charge. We need to understand this information. That is why it is impossible for the Department of Justice to do an independent investigation. It will always be suspect as to whether that investigation of the President of the United States or the White House will have impact as to how that investigation is being done because there is already evidence that they tried to do that previously in this investigation.

The law is clear; the law is clear as to how special prosecutors and counsel are appointed where conflicts exist. The Department of Justice has this authority. We know that Attorney General Sessions has recused himself from the Russia investigation. Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein now has the authority to make that decision. He should clearly make that decision, not because it is the right thing to do—which it is, which it is—and we have the obligation to make sure the American people get all the facts as to what happened here, but it is also the reputation of the Department of Justice that is at stake.

I urge my colleagues to continue. I know we will have a chance tomorrow

in our meeting with Mr. Rosenstein, but I would urge us to listen to what the American people are saying and recognize that we are an independent branch of government, and one of our principal responsibilities is oversight—and oversight of the executive branch of government. I urge us to carry out that responsibility by collectively—it shouldn’t be partisan—collectively telling the Department of Justice: Get all the facts, do it in an independent way, appoint an independent prosecutor, let the facts lead us where they are going to lead us, and let’s not prejudge. But this is a serious, serious matter.

In order to protect ourselves from an aggressive enemy—and that is Russia, which is trying to bring down our democratic government, which has now been acknowledged not just by the intelligence community over and over again, but their ability to try to compromise our system is now much better understood—we need to have that independent commission devoted to giving us the recommendations to keep America safe.

I urge my colleagues to exercise that independent function and to set up an independent commission.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I rise today to honor our law enforcement officers during National Police Week and to talk about the importance of supporting law enforcement, including their mental health.

During National Police Week, we recognize and remember the sacrifices of the law enforcement officers we lost in the line of duty in 2016. Every day and through every night in communities across Indiana and our country, law enforcement officers are patrolling our streets, arriving at the scenes of challenging and often traumatic incidents, and even putting themselves in harm’s way as they do their best to keep our families safe. They help ensure that our children can be safe at the neighborhood playground and our seniors can sit peacefully on their front porch. They help keep drugs off our streets, they are called to the scenes of opioid and heroin overdoses, and they help stem the violence and crime that has plagued many of our communities for far too long.

Our law enforcement officers put on the uniform every day. They head out the door to serve us, while their family

members say a prayer hoping they come back safely into their family's loving arms at the end of their shift. Sadly, sometimes they do not.

In my home State of Indiana, our law enforcement lost one of their own last year when the Howard County sheriff's deputy, Carl Koontz, was shot and killed during a raid in Russiaville, IN, last March.

Deputy Koontz was only 27 years old, in the prime of his life, and had dedicated himself to serving and protecting the communities he loved. He left behind his wife Kassie and their young son Noah.

Deputy Koontz's loss was felt not just in Kokomo, not just in Howard County, but in cities and towns across our State. He represented the very best our State has to offer. He was smart, talented, and service driven, working to make his community a better place to live.

Mr. President, I know your State was stricken this past year, as well, with the loss of the same kind of extraordinary individuals who went and served every day. That is at the core of what law enforcement officers strive for and why it is so devastating when they are lost in the line of duty.

While we pay our respects to those we lost, it is our solemn duty to support those who serve our communities today. As law enforcement officers go through their work, they are sometimes confronted with challenging or even horrific situations.

Recently, I joined with my friend and colleague from Indiana, Senator TODD YOUNG, to introduce the bipartisan Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act. It provides tools for law enforcement agencies to help support the mental health and wellness of our brave men and women.

We were thankful to have the support from Senators BLUNT, COONS, CORNYN, and FEINSTEIN when we introduced the legislation. I am honored that Senators BLUMENTHAL, BOOKER, BROWN, CRUZ, HATCH, KLOBUCHAR, CORTEZ MASTO, DURBIN, and TESTER have added their support in the days since.

I say to the Presiding Officer, thank you for your support of our legislation.

I am very pleased to say that our bill passed the Senate unanimously late yesterday, and it is a major step forward. I am hopeful that our friends in the House of Representatives, where a companion piece was introduced by Congresswoman SUSAN BROOKS and Congresswoman VAL DEMINGS of Florida, who served as the first female chief of police in Orlando before coming to Congress—I am hopeful Congresswoman BROOKS and Congresswoman DEMINGS can shepherd this bill through that Chamber.

This legislation is also supported by a number of law enforcement organizations, including the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department, the Fra-

ternational Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the Major County Sheriffs of America, and more.

I am proud that this is a bipartisan effort, as evidenced by the Members supporting this legislation. It is time to get this to the President's desk to be signed into law as soon as possible.

The Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act is about providing resources to law enforcement agencies that want to better protect their officers' mental health, as well as the providers who strive to serve that unique population. It would direct the Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services to develop resources for mental health providers to educate them about law enforcement culture and evidenced-based therapies for mental health issues common to law enforcement. It would require the Department of Justice to study the effectiveness of crisis hotlines for law enforcement. It authorizes grants to initiate peer mentoring programs in law enforcement agencies. We are already seeing the success of these programs where the IMPD, the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department, is utilizing peer mentoring for officer mental health.

During my time in the Senate, our main legislative focus has been to improve the availability of mental healthcare services for servicemembers and their families. We have made great progress in recent years. I am proud that my bipartisan Jacob Sexton Military Suicide Prevention Act is now law.

As of this September, every servicemember—Active, Reserve, or Guard—is required to have an annual mental health assessment. The Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act builds upon the work our military has been doing to combat suicide and mental health challenges.

It requires the Department of Defense, the VA, and the Department of Justice to consult on military mental health practices that can be adopted by law enforcement agencies. Building on the Sexton Act that requires annual mental health assessments for servicemembers, the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act examines if having annual mental health checks for law enforcement officers would help save lives.

When Senator YOUNG and I announced this legislation last month, we had the honor of being joined by a number of law enforcement professionals, including the Indianapolis chief of police, Bryan Roach. Chief Roach shared some of his experiences. He said:

When I am came on, officers were taught to be in control of their emotions.

We still teach the IMPD to be in control of their emotions. But if you think about the day in, day out routine of the things they

participate in, and the things that they see, and they are confronted with on a day to day basis, it is difficult sometimes to control those emotions, but they do a very good job of it.

The problem is they take those things home. The things we're talking about are not just PTSD, but depression and anxiety.

As the chief stated, law enforcement officers—like the rest of us—don't just turn themselves off when they go home. The experiences they have every day impact them and their family and their friends.

Sheriff Mike Nielsen of Boone County—located in Central Indiana, right near Indianapolis—was also on hand that day with us to share his perspective. He said: In 2015, Captain Nanavaty and the office received national recognition, being awarded the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund's Annual Officer Wellness Award. IMPD's innovation and forward thinking have inspired police departments across the United States to follow their footsteps and undertake similar efforts to address law enforcement mental health and wellness. But this is just the beginning of these efforts.

I have seen things that cannot be unseen. The brave men and women of police, fire, EMS, are all public safety officers who put their lives on the line each and every day.

They endure more than anybody can imagine, and they must deal with the stresses of life both on the job and at home.

Sometimes it is really, really tough. Sheriff Nielsen continued:

We must all work hard to stop the stigma with mental health issues.

As administrators, we have to train our supervisors how to recognize signs of PTSD in our staff. We must administer standard officer wellness programs.

As administrators and public safety, we must lead from the front, and let our staff know that it is okay to struggle with issues. That we are only human.

Our emotional mental health heals just like a physical injury. With the proper treatment, and with time.

We must provide the funding and resources to go beyond the critical stress debriefing. We must do this for our officers.

Both Chief Roach's and Sheriff Nielsen's comments show us the importance of ending the stigma attached to mental health issues. We can't be afraid of talking about mental health and the ways we support our law enforcement officers as they work through these challenges.

Lebanon police officer Taylor Nielsen, who followed in the tradition of her dad, Sheriff Mike Nielsen—an extraordinary family, serving our State with their lives every day—was courageous enough to share her mental health struggles following a particularly tough assignment.

She recounted the questions that she was dealing with:

Why am I alone? Why isn't anybody else having these issues? Why can't I get this out of my head? What is wrong with me? These were the questions that repeatedly ran through my head on a daily basis last year.

Questions that made me believe that there was something fundamentally wrong with me.

She continued:

For those of you who feel you are fighting alone, know that there is relief out there. Please don't be afraid to seek out those resources. The battle will be hard, but it can be won.

Thanks to her strong will and the help of a trained therapist, Taylor was able to handle her mental health challenges. As she said, though, we have to work together as a team to beat these issues.

We will take time over Police Week to reflect on the law enforcement professionals we lost last year. As we do that, it is important that we take commonsense steps to support our law enforcement officers.

We took a major step forward with yesterday's passage of the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act in the Senate. I see my colleague TODD YOUNG, who was my teammate on that, in the Chamber as well. I am hopeful it will be enacted soon so we can bring more tools to law enforcement agencies across Indiana and our country. Congresswoman BROOKS and Congresswoman DEMINGS are working on it right now.

After the service and sacrifices law enforcement officers make every day, they have earned the resources we have, so that we can provide the very best to the very best.

Thanks again to Senator YOUNG for working with me on this effort, to the police and sheriffs in Indiana who have lent their support, to law enforcement officers protecting Hoosiers as we stand here at this moment.

May God bless all of these officers, and may God bless the family of Deputy Carl Koontz. May God bless Indiana, and may God bless America.

Mr. President, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to join the senior Senator from Indiana in voicing my strong support for the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017. During Police Week, I wish to take a minute to thank all of our men and women in blue who stand on the frontlines to protect our communities.

I have four young children. Since they could barely talk, my wife and I taught them that if they need help, they should dial 911, and the police would respond.

Every day our law enforcement communities around the country live their lives to answer these calls and to help our fellow citizens. Sometimes the job is as simple as reuniting a child with their parent at the park or at a store, but other times they see horrific scenes that no one should have to experience in their lifetimes or they experience traumatic stress in the performance of their jobs.

Ultimately, police officers see the best and the worst of humanity, which can take a heavy emotional toll, but who is there to answer the call for help when they need it after experiencing such trauma on a regular basis?

A couple of weeks ago, Senator DONNELLY and I introduced the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act. This legislation is for those who answer that call. This bill works with the relevant Federal agencies, mental health providers, and broader law enforcement communities to offer opportunities for care.

When our police force is healthy, when it is strong, our communities are healthy and strong as well. That is why it is vital that we provide our Nation's law enforcement with the resources they need as they put their health and their lives on the line in order to protect our communities day in and day out.

This includes supporting law enforcement agencies' efforts to protect and strengthen the mental health and wellness of their respective law enforcement officers. I am confident that this bill will have a positive impact on the mental health and wellness of law enforcement officers across the country.

I look forward to the findings of DOJ's collaborative reports, the efficacy of the peer mentoring pilot programs, and the results of the Department's study into the creation of a crisis hotline for law enforcement officers.

With that said, I thank Indiana's senior Senator for his hard work in drafting this legislation and allowing for my input and those of my colleagues. It has been my pleasure to work with Senator DONNELLY on this, and I look forward to continuing our work together on behalf of all Hoosiers in the future.

In fact, this legislation drew upon efforts undertaken by Hoosiers at the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department. In 2010, Indiana's IMPD recognized the need to address law enforcement mental health and wellness by creating the Office of Professional Development and Police Wellness. The IMPD captain, Brian Nanavaty, led the effort to establish the office and has recently promoted its motto: "Healthy Hire—Healthy Retire: Wellness is more than just an annual physical."

Senator DONNELLY and I are proud that the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act has passed the Senate and is one step closer to being signed into law, contributing to the efforts of the IMPD.

As I close, I want to recognize the leadership of a fellow Hoosier, U.S. Representative SUSAN BROOKS, and her colleagues in the U.S. House who introduced this legislation. This bill has received bipartisan, bicameral support in Congress, widespread support from sev-

eral law enforcement organizations, and, frankly, support across the country from rank-and-file Americans who understand that this is a problem we have an obligation to address. We are all with you. Now we call upon all of our colleagues in the House to act on this important legislation and send it to the President's desk for his signature.

Let me finish with these words of heartfelt gratitude: Thank you to our law enforcement community for always answering the call.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is considering Rachel Brand to be Associate Attorney General. Ms. Brand is a native Iowan, and I am proud to be supporting her nomination here today. She has had a distinguished legal career. In fact, she was appointed to Senate-confirmed positions by both President Bush and President Obama, and both times, she was confirmed by a voice vote in the Senate.

But it looks like this nomination somehow has become controversial. I don't understand. Ms. Brand has a broad range of legal experience that happens to be a broad range in both the government and the private sector.

With her previous positions in the White House, the Office of Legal Counsel, and the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, she has experience that touches almost every part of the Federal Government. As the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Policy, she was a member of the senior management team of the Department of Justice, working with components and law enforcement agencies throughout the entire Justice Department. Similarly, at the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, Ms. Brand worked with diverse agencies to ensure that privacy and civil liberties are taken into account while carrying out the important mission of protecting the Nation from terrorism.

During Ms. Brand's tenure in the private sector, she gained extensive litigation management experience that will serve her very well as she oversees the Department's civil litigation components.

She has seemingly become a little more controversial. Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said they aren't supporting her nomination because of the work she did with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Those views are utterly ridiculous. So I

will take a minute to address these concerns.

First, when she worked at the Chamber, all of her advocacy was done to represent the views of her client, the U.S. Chamber. Everybody expects that if you hire a lawyer, they are going to represent your views. We all know that we can't assume an attorney personally believes in what they are advocating for on behalf of their client, just ask criminal defense attorneys.

Furthermore, she was not involved in any policy or lobbying apparatus of the Chamber. Her role there was to bring lawsuits challenging rules that the U.S. Chamber believed were unlawful. At the same time, besides just arguing those lawsuits, she had to file a lot of amicus briefs providing the courts with the views of the business community.

During her time at the Chamber, she challenged a handful of the thousands of regulations promulgated by Federal agencies. The arguments Ms. Brand made in those lawsuits or amicus briefs were generally that the agency had acted beyond the scope of the authority Congress had granted that particular agency or had failed to follow the reasoned decisionmaking processes required by the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946. In many of those cases, the courts agreed with the Chamber that the government had acted unlawfully.

To summarize her work during that time at the Chamber, Ms. Brand argued that government agencies went beyond the authority Congress had given them. She also argued that these agencies weren't acting under the scope of the congressional authority granted to the agency, and she argued that congressional authority had to be respected. It seems to me that it is up to Congress to give these agencies more authority if we think they need it. But it is not a good reason to vote against Ms. Brand's nomination because she argued a very commonsense and constitutional position that Federal agencies need to follow the laws of Congress.

Finally, some Senators have maintained that they are concerned about her views on the Voting Rights Act. She responded very well to that. During her hearing, Ms. Brand told the committee that she shares concerns for anyone who would violate the Voting Rights Act and would suppress votes in the process of violating that act, and she believes "enforcement of that statute to be a core enforcement function of the civil rights division." I don't know about my fellow colleagues, but I take her at her word that she strongly believes in voting rights.

It is more than a little puzzling, then, that when Republicans opposed a woman for a government position, we heard from the other side. The Democrats would always bring up gender politics. But when they oppose a

woman for a position, that is somehow OK. I don't see how they can expect to have it both ways.

I believe Ms. Brand will be a superb Associate Attorney General—the first female in this role, I might add—and that she will serve the office with very great distinction. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 or 6 minutes to speak on another subject as in morning business.

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

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to share real stories of real hardships from hard-working families in my home State of Iowa. Seven years ago, Americans were promised that the Affordable Care Act would make health insurance cheaper and healthcare more accessible. Well, I won't pretend to break any news here; the facts speak very much for themselves. ObamaCare is not living up to its promises. When passing the law, the other side made promises that they knew wouldn't be kept.

The irony here is that, at the end of the day, the so-called Affordable Care Act is anything but affordable. Let's look at the word "affordable" in the Webster dictionary. It says "having a cost that is not too high." I have heard from many Iowans who tell me in no uncertain terms that they cannot afford to buy health insurance because ObamaCare is unaffordable. Ever since ObamaCare was enacted, I have received letters and calls and emails from Iowans who are frustrated about the soaring costs of their health plans.

Here is a prime example. One farmer's insurance premium went through the roof. It jumped 43 percent in 2017 from 2016. If somebody can explain how that is more affordable, I have an oceanfront property in my home county of Butler County, IA, to sell you.

Now, we have a chart here about another Iowan. This constituent from Garner, IA, wrote about her financial hardships. She said:

We are going to be paying over \$1,300 a month on premiums, plus a \$6,000 deductible. We don't have that much longer before we qualify for Medicare, but my concern is that until then, we will have to use so much of our hard-earned savings just to pay for healthcare. My fear is that those of us in the middle class will struggle with paying so much that it will wipe out our retirement savings accounts.

Another constituent nearby Garner, in Buffalo, IA, wrote to me saying:

I am forced to pay \$230 a month for a healthcare plan that covers nothing until I reach \$11,000 in deductible. So on top of paying 100 percent of my medical bills anyway, now I have to pay for insurance I can't use.

So the question is, How did we get to this point? Seven years ago, I stood right here on the Senate floor and predicted what would happen to the cost

of insurance if ObamaCare passed. Let's take a walk down memory lane for a moment. Here is what I said October 2009:

And while some of the supporters of these partisan bills may not want to tell their constituents, we all know that as national spending on healthcare increases, American families will bear the burden in the form of higher premiums. So, let me be very clear. As a result of the current pending healthcare proposals, most Americans will pay higher premiums for health insurance.

Now, I am not Nostradamus. I don't have a magic crystal ball, but it was easy to read the writing on the wall. I knew that layers of new taxes and, more importantly, burdensome new mandates in ObamaCare would lead us to where we find ourselves today: a broken healthcare system that is not better off than it was 7 years ago. For millions of Americans, it is much worse.

So where do we go from here? After 7 years of rapidly rising premiums, soaring deductibles, and climbing copays, Republicans are committed to fixing the damage caused by the Affordable Care Act. Instead of joining us in an effort to fix what is broken, the other side is doing their best to scare the living daylights out of Americans.

From the way they tell it, the House bill is "deadly." What is truly fatal is the death spiral the ObamaCare marketplace is in. Not only is it unaffordable for too many people, it is simply unsustainable. ObamaCare is unable to fulfill its promises to the American people. Here is what every lawmaker in Congress ought to agree on: Insurance is not worth having if patients cannot afford to use it.

The facts are very clear. A one-size-fits-all, government-run plan is driving insurers out of the exchanges, driving up premiums, driving away customers, and driving up the tab to the tax-paying public. I spoke 2 days ago about the impact of Obamacare in Iowa. Next year it is possible that 94 of our 99 counties will not have insurance plans on the Obamacare exchange.

So even if you benefit from the subsidy of ObamaCare, you are not going to have an insurance company to go to. All of this because ObamaCare has overregulated, overtaxed, and oversold its promises to the American people. ObamaCare has not healed what ails the U.S. healthcare system. It is time to move forward.

I urge my colleagues to drop the partisan charade and join us for the good of the American people. I will continue coming to the floor to share how ObamaCare is not working for Iowans, but in the meantime, the Senate will continue working to rescue our healthcare system that is sinking under this broken law.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. THUNE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1144 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. THUNE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, the Senate has under consideration the nomination of Rachel Brand to be Associate Attorney General of the United States, one of the very top positions in the Department of Justice and in law enforcement. It is a position of consummate trust and responsibility, requiring full public confidence. I will oppose this nomination, and I will oppose all nominations for the Department of Justice until public trust and confidence in the rule of law is restored and sustained by appointment of an independent special prosecutor to investigate Russian interference in our last election and potential links to the Trump campaign and Trump associates.

I opposed Rod Rosenstein's nomination. In fact, I was the only member of the Judiciary Committee to vote against it and one of six on the floor to oppose it for exactly the same reason. I stated to him publicly and privately that the only way to preserve his own reputation—well established over many years—and the trust and confidence in the Department of Justice was to appoint an independent prosecutor. So far, regrettably, he has failed to do so.

That question will be the first of my priorities when the full Senate meets with him tomorrow. We will demand to know from him what the timeline was for the firing of Director Comey, who said what to whom, why his memorandum was written, and whether he will now commit, after these most recent startling revelations just yesterday that the President of the United States suggested—indeed, explicitly demanded—that Director Comey stop his investigation involving potential ties of Michael Flynn to Russian interference in our election.

Chilling facts raised in the last several days now raise serious questions about obstruction of justice by the President of the United States. So we consider this nomination at a truly unusual, very likely unique and unprecedented time in our country.

The revelation last evening that President Trump asked the FBI Director to shut down the Federal investigation into his then-National Security Advisor, Michael Flynn, is evidence of severe political interference and possibly criminal wrongdoing in an ongoing

criminal investigation. The evidence of obstruction continues to mount. We are witnessing an obstruction of justice case unfolding before our eyes in real time. Revelation after revelation continues to shake this country's confidence in our government and in this administration's competence. The need for an independent special prosecutor has never been so clear and convincing and so unquestionably necessary.

I call on my Republican colleagues now to rise to this challenge, to shine in the light of history, and to commit that an independent special prosecutor will be appointed to uncover the truth and hold accountable anyone who has committed wrongdoing.

Because so far we have no such special prosecutor, I will oppose this nomination. But I also have disagreements with Rachel Brand. I respect her record of public service. I believe she is simply not the right person to serve as Associate Attorney General because of her longstanding, apparently deeply held philosophy on the use and proper application of government power. When the Federal Government engaged in actions that threaten the privacy rights of innocent Americans, Ms. Brand has advocated nonaction. I believe the United States must protect the privacy of her citizens, and that fact is only one among many that cause me to disagree with her.

The failure to nominate and appoint an independent special prosecutor will lead me to oppose all of the nominations that are set forth by this administration, including anyone nominated for the FBI. I think it should now be clear, if it was not before, that such an independent prosecutor is necessary.

Parallels have been drawn by Members on both sides of the aisle to the Watergate scandal. To this day, we don't know whether President Nixon ordered the Watergate break-ins or simply was a beneficiary of the crime, just as we don't know now whether Donald Trump colluded with Russian interference in the 2016 election or simply benefitted from Russia's criminal aggression. The Watergate scandal gave rise to the saying that "the cover-up is worse than the crime." In this instance, what we know is that the Russian interference was aimed at a wholesale theft of our democracy, far more serious than the Watergate break-in. What we do know about Nixon—and these facts became the basis for the first article of impeachment—is that he attempted to indirectly interfere with an FBI investigation into that break-in. Put very simply, while Nixon may not have directly threatened to fire the FBI Director if that Director continued to investigate Nixon associates, he made clear that his preference as head of the executive branch was that any such investigation should cease.

"History doesn't repeat, but it rhymes." That is a saying that has profound truth here. We now have credible reports that President Trump attempted to do directly what President Nixon sought to do indirectly. He stopped a lawful, ongoing criminal investigation. Nixon ordered his staff to work through the CIA to pressure the FBI to drop the Watergate investigation. President Trump simply summoned Director Comey into the Oval Office, according to reports that certainly need to be verified, and ordered everyone else to leave the room, suggesting then that the Director drop his investigation. He did so just 2 weeks after having told Director Comey that he might not have a place in the Trump administration and making clear that Director Comey's loyalty to him might well determine whether Comey would keep his job. When Director Comey rejected Trump's suggestion, in effect, he was fired. That is the line of facts established by this mounting evidence. It is a serious charge.

We should be cautious. If Director Comey did not write that memo or if, for some reason, there is a question about the truth, perhaps the suspicions are unfounded, but there is credible and significant evidence. Director Comey has established—to both his critics and his friends—that he is a man of probity and dedication to public service and to this Nation.

We cannot feel confident about nominations for any of these positions—whether it be Director of the FBI or Associate Attorney General—from a President who has demonstrated such contempt for the rule of law and for law enforcement, which is the job of the Department of Justice. The White House's timeline and justifications for the decision to fire Director Comey certainly now, at this moment, fail to meet the test of credibility.

We know from the President's own words in interviews he conducted late last week that the FBI investigation into possible collusion between individuals in the Trump campaign and the Russian Government was on the President's mind when he decided to fire the FBI Director. In at least two conversations, the President asked the FBI Director about this investigation and the related investigation into former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn.

Late last night the Times revealed the details of one such conversation. It occurred in the Oval Office the day after Flynn resigned. The account written by Director Comey, which seems to meet fully the test of credibility, is absolutely chilling. "I hope you can see your way clear to letting this go, to letting Flynn go," Mr. Trump told Mr. Comey, according to the memo reported in The New York Times. "He is a good guy. I hope you can let this go." When the FBI Director continued to pursue the investigation, President Trump fired him.

We are witnessing this obstruction of justice in realtime, and these revelations are shaking our country's faith in the independence of our Nation's highest ranking law enforcement agency, our rule of law, and our national security. It is a theft of our democracy—literally, a threat to our national security—from Russian meddling in the election, potential Trump ties, and links to that interference in our democracy—the core, foundational exercise of our democracy being voting—and then waiting for 2½ weeks when then-Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates warned that Michael Flynn was vulnerable to blackmail as National Security Adviser—blackmail from the Russians. She was fired only days later.

When the investigation into that Russian meddling and Trump's ties to it continued, Director Comey was summoned to be told that the investigation should be shut down, and he was fired when he refused to do so. Very likely, part of that decision related to the request for additional resources that Director Comey made to Rosenstein shortly before he was fired and his refusal to rule out the President as a target of that investigation when he came before the Judiciary Committee.

The facts will eventually form a mosaic, and that mosaic may dramatically show a picture of criminal conduct. That is the process of investigating and prosecuting criminal wrongdoing. Right now, that activity requires a fidelity to the rule of law in one's getting all of the evidence, including transcripts, tapes, memos, and other documents. They must be subpoenaed immediately so that they are not destroyed or concealed, so that they are preserved and produced. That must be done without delay, including there being testimony under oath, in public, from Comey, Attorney General Sessions, Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein, and Don McGahn, White House Counsel. They should be called to testify by the Judiciary Committee, under oath, and in public.

I hope that my colleagues will, indeed, rise to this challenge and shine in the light of history and commit now to an independent special prosecutor who can ensure that the truth is uncovered and that accountability is imposed for any criminal wrongdoing so that we will prevent any obstruction of justice because the American people deserve it, they need it, and they demand it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise to speak for a few minutes on the AHCA, which is the healthcare bill that was recently passed in the House.

I believe the letters stand for "anti-healthcare bill" as there are many troublesome aspects of this bill—kick-

ing something like 20 million people off of health insurance and compromising essential benefits. It is what I call a "fig leaf" preexisting condition provision, which does not provide adequate funding in order to actually protect people with preexisting conditions.

Yet what I really want to focus on today are two interrelated provisions—a massive cut to Medicaid and a massive tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. By the way, that tax cut gives a zero tax cut to anyone making less than \$200,000 a year. I will talk about that in a moment.

Let's talk about the Medicaid cuts, however. This is a part of the bill that has not gotten much attention. It is \$840 billion over 10 years. It will be about a 10-percent cut of Medicaid funds in Maine. It is hard to get an actual analysis of that, however, because the House bill was passed without any Congressional Budget Office analysis—none, zero. Unbelievably, the Members of the House voted for a bill that they, literally, did not know the financial effects of—how it would affect the States, how it would affect the people in their States. Maybe, next week, we will get that analysis. Certainly, this body will not act in that way with no Congressional Budget Office analysis.

Let's talk for a minute about who is on Medicaid, as 34 percent of the people on Medicaid are children, 20 percent are disabled people, and 18 percent are elderly. In other words, almost three-quarters—75 percent—are children, disabled, and elderly people. Many people talk about and think about Medicaid as some kind of welfare program. This is an essential lifeline for some of the most vulnerable people in our society—children, the disabled, and the elderly—75 percent—and 75 percent of the funding goes to disabled and elderly people.

The people who sponsored this bill and who are talking about it across the country talk about flexibility. Yes, there are some cuts, but we are giving the States flexibility. That is nonsense. They are giving the States flexibility to make decisions between funding programs for the elderly and programs for children, between cutting off programs for opioids and providing support for people who are disabled. That is not flexibility. That is just passing agonizing choices off to the States. I was a Governor, and I know about having to make these kinds of decisions. To cut this money by this huge amount—almost \$1 trillion over 10 years—and act as though it can all be made up through some kind of fake flexibility is just an unspeakably cruel way to shift this burden to the States.

The bill talks about saving on the deficit. It saves on the deficit because \$840 billion is shifted to the States. Let them pay it—shift and shaft. That is what it is—shift and shaft. Shift the cost and shaft the States, particularly

the people in those States who depend upon these programs—those people being the disabled, the elderly, children, people with disabilities, and those who are struggling to defeat the scourge of opioids and opioid addiction.

I want to talk about some people today. I want to talk about this guy, Dan Humphrey. He is 28 years old and lives in a group home in Lewiston, ME. He has autism and is nonverbal. He has some bipolar characteristics and a seizure disorder but is gentle and charming, and you can see his smile. He has very basic functional communication skills. He enjoys jumping on a trampoline and drumming. He performs all of his chores to care for himself, with prompting and guidance, such as laundry and grocery shopping. He is proud of his volunteer jobs. He serves Meals on Wheels to clients through the week, and he takes excess food from a nearby college to a local soup kitchen every Saturday.

Daniel needs around-the-clock support in order to maintain this quality of life. When this level of programming was unavailable or is unavailable, he regresses and becomes aggressive. Even at current funding, Daniel is one of the lucky ones, as he is not on a waiting list. Although he qualified for services, it took him 8 years to get a home and a community-based service waiver for him to be able to live the life he does. He is in a group home in the wonderful city of Lewiston, ME, where he lives today. He is contributing. He has a decent life.

By the way, this is all about people. It really bothers me that we talk about policy and ideology and free markets and flexibility. We are talking about people. We are talking about real people whose lives are on the line—people who are struggling with opioid addiction, elderly people who have no place to go, and disabled people like Dan and like Lidia Woofenden.

Here is Lidia. She graduated from Mt. Ararat High School in June. She turns 21 in August. That is the high school my kids went to. I had two boys graduate from that high school. When she was 4 years old, she was diagnosed with a delayed growth of myelin on her brain, and, at 15, she began having seizures and was diagnosed with a rare genetic disorder. She lives with intellectual disabilities, seizures, and their side effects, as well as with a general lack of physical coordination. Yet, as her mom says, that is not who she is. She is charming and funny. Her mom calls her friendly and goofy and the stubbornest cuss.

She was never expected to read but is now on her fourth Harry Potter book. She was never expected to ride a bike, but now she does. She even has a job. After years of volunteering at a local nursing home, she was offered a part-time job and is doing well. She is doing

this because she had support from Medicaid. She cannot cross a street by herself, and she needs to be reminded to brush her teeth. She has no sense of money or danger. On the one hand, she is 20 years old; on the other hand, she is 6 years old. In other words, like most young people, she is complicated. Everything she has achieved has been accomplished with the help of dedicated teachers and therapists and has been almost exclusively funded through special education in the public schools and by Medicaid.

By the way, Medicaid provides help to the tune of \$26 million a year to children in Maine schools who need it. One of the amendments passed at the last minute in the House puts that funding through the schools in jeopardy. She has made monumental gains, but she will never be able to live alone.

What happens when we make these cuts? What happens to Lidia? What happens to Dan?

In the old days, they were warehoused. They were in facilities that were far away—out of sight, out of mind—or with their parents, who had to bear the burden, who themselves could not work because they had to take care of the children. These are just two people—two examples—of what we are talking about here.

Who will speak for them? Who will stand up for them?

I will, and I hope this body will. We are the last bulwark between this terrible piece of legislation that was passed in the House and these people and millions like them across the country. Who will stand up for them?

Why are we doing this? Why are we putting States through the ringer of having to make decisions to choose between Lidia and an elderly person in a nursing home and between a child and a young man who is trying to beat opioids? Why are we forcing them to make those choices?

It is because we want to give a huge tax cut to the wealthiest Americans, and I am talking about a huge tax cut. It is the most skewed tax cut in history because it only goes to a few people. Seventy-nine percent of the benefit of this tax cut goes to millionaires, which is an average tax cut of \$54,000 a year. Now, \$54,000 a year to multimillionaires—the top one-tenth of 1 percent, those with incomes above \$6 million—would receive tax cuts of more than \$250,000 a piece in 2025 under this legislation.

We are putting people like this at risk in order to have somebody buy another Maserati. It is unbelievable that this body would even consider making that tradeoff. That is what we are talking about here. Let's be very clear. It is an equation of lost Medicaid benefits, a gigantic tax cut. That is what this bill is all about. If you make between \$500,000 and \$1 million, you will see a \$4,000 tax cut, which is not so egregious

as higher up, and if you are under \$200,000 a year, you get zero.

This doesn't even masquerade as a middle-class tax cut. This is one of the most inequitable, cruel, and unconscionable pieces of policymaking I have ever seen. I think we need to be clear about that. If we don't stand up for Dan, Lidia, and millions like them—old and young, living in the shadows of our society, asking for nothing more than the ability to do the slightest things we take for granted, like crossing the street, having a job, dressing, feeling they are contributing—to take that away, to force States to make those decisions—and make no mistake, they are going to have to make those decisions. You simply can't cut the amount of money that is proposed in this bill—which will expand over time, by the way—and still expect the services to be the same or better through some kind of flexibility. That is nonsense. It would be bad enough, except to do it because of a massive tax cut to the people who least need it—that is what really makes this unacceptable.

I know that people in this body are working on an alternative to the bill in the House, and I hope this can be an open process where all of us participate, where we are able to contribute ideas and amendments and thoughts. Particularly, I want us to think about the fact that we are the last line of defense. We are the last line of defense for people who can't speak up. In the case of my friend Dan, he literally can't speak up. We are who they are counting on, between us, and if it weren't for us, they would have no one to think about and demand that they be treated fairly and respectfully in the richest society on Earth. I hope we can do better. I know we can.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, there is a reason we are talking about healthcare, and we should be talking about healthcare. We should be looking for the gaps and trying to find those gaps. I had a long conversation this morning about people who have disabilities, adults who have disabilities, and the challenges they have always faced in the insurance marketplace. They are people like Dan and Lidia who have a hard time working or are unable to have a full-time job, who may be covered by insurance through their parents until they are too old, or they may not be covered because their parents aren't covered. But normally, if that has been the case, where you were able to share whatever coverage your parents had—and certainly this is an area we should work on, how we deal with those who are disadvantaged. On the Medicaid front, our goal should be to look at the House bill and make it better.

The people who were added to Medicaid under President Obama's

healthcare plan, decided by the States—the very group who my friend from Maine said shouldn't be making these kinds of decisions—the States made these decisions because it was left to them to make them. And they weren't children and they weren't old people; they were single adults who traditionally had not been covered by Medicaid. We can talk all we want to about how these cuts are going to affect children and old people, but that is not who would be affected.

There is a debate the States have already had. Some States added single adults for the first time, and others didn't. Many States believe they can make those decisions better in their own States, to have a healthcare home where somebody has a doctor they could go to. Having coverage doesn't matter if you can't get access to healthcare. Our debate here should be about access to healthcare, and it should be about people who, because of ObamaCare, are having problems with access to healthcare.

President Obama promised that the new plan would bend the cost curve. He said it would bend the cost curve and bring healthcare costs down. I think the topic he was discussing was healthcare coverage costs coming down by \$2,500 for the typical family. The cost curve got bent all right, but it didn't get bent down, it got bent up. In our State, just last year in Missouri, 25 percent was the average increase from one year to the next. The individual policies in many of our counties—84 percent have only one insurance company that is willing to offer a plan. That should tell us something right there about whether the exchange idea worked, the way it was put together. It is clearly not working.

We can continue to move forward and act as though that doesn't matter, but it matters a lot. We have 114 counties and the city of St. Louis, and our constitution functions as if it were a county. One-hundred and fifteen of those entities, the county-like entities—97 of them have only 1 company willing to offer insurance. In all of them, the average increase statewide was 25 percent 1 year over the next, and that is just 1 year, and it is not even next year. Every estimate says that those individual policies will go up even more next year than they did last year.

We can continue to act as though this system is working and not do anything about it, or we can do something about it.

When ObamaCare was implemented, I came to the floor almost every week for the first year to share story after story of people and families who were affected, who couldn't have the kind of healthcare or the kind of coverage—either one—they had before, and I could share those same stories now. I will share a couple of them today. They haven't stopped coming in. Many people have just decided: We are never

going to have the doctors we used to have. We are never going to have the insurance policy we used to have. The government has failed us.

They had a policy on which they were paying maybe a third of what they are paying now and which had higher coverage. But after a while, you quit complaining and understand that your government has actually come up with a system that—for your family, at least—was worse than the system they had.

We talk about cancellation notices being sent out by the thousands. Thousands of families and thousands of individuals got cancellation notices. Last year President Clinton, while campaigning for his wife for President, said: What a crazy system. The costs keep going up, and the coverage keeps going down.

There is clearly something wrong here. We need to do something about it. We should be working together to do something about it.

When I am home and talking to people about this or when people contact our office about this, they just continue to say over and over again that this has gotten worse. Now, we get some calls—and I am glad to get them—where people say: We want to be sure that you understand what happens to individuals like the two people my friend from Maine mentioned. And we are looking for ways to be sure they don't get left out. But let me tell you some of the people who have been left out.

Thomas and Kathy, a married couple from Kansas City, told me that their out-of-pocket costs have jumped from \$2,700 in 2014—that was the first year of this healthcare plan—to \$5,000 in 2017. In addition, their copays have increased—in their case, they appear to be lucky—by only 20 or 30 percent.

They are not by themselves. Tony, an insurance broker in Northwest Missouri, recently told me about a client who was shopping for coverage. The client realized that the only plan she could afford would force her to spend, for herself, almost \$5,000 a year in insurance premiums on top of having another \$5,000 deductible before that insurance she would be paying for every month would do any good. She said she would be spending almost \$10,000 without receiving anything, and it made absolutely no sense. Well, her insurance broker couldn't help but agreed with her that in her case it didn't make much sense, and I think all of us can see why it might not.

Yesterday at a press event here in the Capitol, I mentioned a farmer who called and said she had a \$12,000 deductible for her family and she was paying \$16,000 in annual premiums. So in her case, she could pay \$28,000 before she had any coverage at all, and that \$28,000 was money—she could be paying \$12,000 of it just for access to see a doc-

tor because her insurance company didn't help with that.

One final story I would like to share is from Rob, a small business owner in St. Joseph who pays half of his employees' medical, and his costs keep going up. His agent walks in every year, he told me, and says: Well, this year it went up 9 percent.

He said: That might have been acceptable, except it also went up 9 percent last year and 11 percent the year before that, and it was 9 percent the year before that.

Many of the losses in the individual market are being shifted to try to make the insurance market make up for what is happening on the individual side.

Year over year, we see premium increases, skyrocketing deductibles, and higher out-of-pocket costs. That is the status quo under what we have now, and it is unacceptable. That is why Republicans have made clear that we are going to move forward to solutions that will address some of the major issues in our healthcare system and look for ways to bring down costs and expand access to quality, affordable coverage, but more importantly, quality, affordable care.

I urge my colleagues to work with us and join in this effort to help us find solutions to be sure we don't leave people out who shouldn't be left out but that we also make access to healthcare more possible for more families and more individuals than it is today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, Republicans have been warning for years now about the grave damage ObamaCare has done to the American healthcare system. We have pointed out how the healthcare law's regulations are destabilizing the health insurance industry. We have warned that the ObamaCare markets are unstable. We have talked about the death spiral which has already doomed ObamaCare.

It seems like every day we get more proof that the collapse is well underway. Last week, the insurance company Aetna announced it was exiting the individual ObamaCare markets entirely. CNN did a story about this last Wednesday. The headlines said: "Aetna to ObamaCare: We're Outta Here." It is interesting because Aetna as a company was one of the cheerleaders for ObamaCare early on; they jumped in and said: We are very involved. We want to make this work. Here they are pulling out, saying it has failed.

Humana had already said it was quitting the exchanges, not just one place but everywhere.

In the past month or so, we have seen big companies drop out of the markets in Virginia and in Iowa. There is now just one company left selling in the exchanges for Nebraska and for Delaware. There is just one company selling in Alaska, in Missouri, in Alabama, in Oklahoma, in South Carolina, and in my home State of Wyoming.

For people living in all of these States, there is a monopoly for whom they get to buy their insurance from under the ObamaCare markets. That is not a marketplace, it is a monopoly.

The Associated Press looked at all of these companies dropping out. It now found that 40 percent of America—4 out of 10 counties in America—will have just 1 company selling insurance in the ObamaCare exchanges for next year; 4 out of every 10 counties in America. That is what you get with an ObamaCare exchange.

How is that supposed to bring down prices? Other companies have been saying how much they will need to charge if they are going to stick around for 1 more year under ObamaCare. It looks like we will have another year of incredible price increases. In Maryland, insurance companies are demanding average premium increases of anywhere between 18 and 59 percent. In Connecticut, they are asking for 15 to 33 percent more next year.

Democrats are desperate to blame the collapse of ObamaCare on President Trump. My question to the Democrats is this, What about all of the companies that dropped out of the marketplaces last year? What about the double-digit price increases Americans were paying year after year under ObamaCare?

The premium for the average benchmark plan in the exchanges went up 25 percent at the start of this year. Are Democrats going to try to blame that on someone else?

In March, the Kaiser Family Foundation reported the results of a poll on healthcare in America. In this poll, 4 out of 10 American adults with insurance under ObamaCare said they have trouble affording their deductible. They have ObamaCare insurance, but 4 out of 10 adults in America with ObamaCare insurance are having trouble affording their deductibles. Three out of every ten with insurance under ObamaCare said they have problems paying their medical bills. One in four Americans with insurance under ObamaCare said the costs have forced them to put off healthcare they needed or skip it entirely.

These people are suffering because of President Obama and the Democrats and what they passed. These Americans are struggling because of the flawed policies and regulations of the ObamaCare law that Democrats in Washington wrote.

Republicans are saying what we have said all along: Healthcare reform should be about helping people get the care they need, from a doctor they choose, at a lower cost. We need to do something to rescue the people who are being crushed under this collapsing ObamaCare system. That is why Republicans are the ones talking about solving the problems that have been caused by ObamaCare. The House of Representatives passed a bill that includes some important things that could help stabilize the markets. It includes things to stop these double-digit premium hikes that have been occurring every year.

In the Senate, we have already started mapping out the ideas. We are going to continue offering our ideas. We are going to continue debating them. I want to invite Democrats in the Senate to come to the floor and offer their ideas as well. It doesn't have to be a partisan fight. It shouldn't be a partisan fight that drags on for months and months. We need to find solutions for the American people who are suffering under President Obama's healthcare law.

For all the Democrats who are now trying to redirect the blame away from themselves, the problems they caused, trying to pass the buck, we are trying to pass a bill. I can tell from listening at home in Wyoming, where I will be again this weekend and was last weekend, people know who caused the problems of ObamaCare. The American people are looking for solutions. They don't care who offers it. They want solutions. I think if we can get a bipartisan solution, all the better. I invite the Democrats to come to the floor to give us their best ideas.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

WELCOMING BACK THE SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, before I move into my remarks, I would like to say welcome back to the Senator from North Carolina. We are happy to see him hale and hardy.

I was worried until I saw your little internet video and you looked fine. It is nice to see you. We welcome you back to the Senate floor—and looking more energetic than the rest of us, in any case. So happy to have you back, Senator TILLIS.

NET NEUTRALITY

Mr. President, in the rubble of this week, the Federal Communications Commission is going to formally start

the process of destroying net neutrality. A free and open internet is without question important to democracy and American innovation.

Apparently this FCC believes we no longer need the protections that keep internet service providers from discriminating against websites and online content, but these protections are what make the internet what it is today. They mandate, very simply, that ISPs have to treat websites the same, whether they are Twitter or Facebook, Breitbart or the New York Times. The FCC is supposed to be there to make sure ISPs follow this basic principle: Treat all content the same. But under this administration, these protections are being undermined.

It starts tomorrow when they will vote to begin the process to repeal net neutrality. I really don't know why the FCC thinks this is a good idea, because the internet is not broken. What problem were you trying to solve by getting rid of these protections, and on whose behalf are you working? There is not a single constituent in my State with whom I ever interacted—and I bet this is true for many other Members of the Senate and House—who says: You know those net neutrality protections? I hate them. You have to get rid of that net neutrality thing. It is bugging me and harming my access to the internet. I would like fast lanes and slow lanes. I would like my ISP to determine what I get to see and how quickly I get to see it.

There is literally no constituency for what is happening tomorrow, but there is one group that stands to gain here, and that is the ISPs, the companies that control your access to the internet. It is true that they are promising to keep the internet open and free. In fact, they did it just this week. A group of ISPs published a full page ad in the print version of the Washington Post reaffirming their commitment to voluntary net neutrality. In other words, they promised to be good to all of us as consumers. They are basically saying: You don't need the Federal Communications Commission to enforce any rule or law related to a free and open internet. We will do it voluntarily.

But here is the thing: Without net neutrality as a matter of rule and law, there is nothing that prevents them from treating content or websites differently. In fact, they will have financial incentives to do just that because making profits is their obligation. They have to maximize their profits. They have a fiduciary obligation to maximize profits. If there is an opportunity now or in the future to change the business model for internet service, changing the internet as we know it along the way, they are duty bound to pursue it. They do not have an obligation—a moral one or a statutory one or a legal one—to a free and open internet; they have an obligation to their shareholders and profits.

Here is what is going to happen if the FCC succeeds ending net neutrality once and for all: ISPs would be allowed to split content into two lanes—favorite content would be in the fast lane and everything else in the slow lane. Companies that need their content to be fast for video streaming or cloud services would have to pay to be in the fast lane. At the end of the day, the cost is going to be transferred to you, the consumer.

We would pay more for the same internet, but the issue here is bigger than a company that streams video asking an ISP to stream their content faster in exchange for more money. It is not just that. This is an era, as we all know, of corporate consolidation. The content companies and the ISPs are often one and the same. So it is not just that you would get Netflix negotiating with Comcast and maybe paying extra so they can stream their content so you can view it; it is also what happens when Comcast or some other company is also the content company.

I want everybody to think this through. If you were running a company that provided access to the internet and also owned content, wouldn't you be at least a little bit tempted—wouldn't your board of directors at least make you look at the possibility that if you have television shows and if you have websites and you depend on traffic, why in the world wouldn't you prioritize your own stuff? It is not apocryphal. It is not apocalyptic to imagine that a company would say: We are a vertical now, and we own content. Why are we going to put up our competitor's stuff at the same rates? The law doesn't provide for that anymore. Net neutrality is a thing of the past.

You don't have to imagine that these are bad people who are running these companies; you just have to imagine that they are businesspeople and that they run publicly traded companies that have to give quarterly earnings reports and have to show profit every single quarter. What better way to make profit than to create what they call on the internet a walled garden?

Everything seems like the internet you used to have, except it is all within one family of companies, and that is what net neutrality is designed to prevent. When you get on the internet, your ISPs can't tell you whether to go to Google or Bing or Yahoo or Facebook or Breitbart or the New York Times or the Honolulu Star-Advertiser or wherever it wants; you get it all at the same speed. That is what net neutrality is all about. But to the degree and extent that net neutrality protections are repealed as a matter of law, these companies can suddenly provide you with opportunities to see all their stuff and only their stuff. You will still have access to the other stuff. It might not stream very well or load very fast.

That is what net neutrality is all about.

Entrepreneurs and small business owners will also be hurt. Think about what it takes to start and grow a business. You don't have extra cash to hand over to your ISPs to make sure people can access your content. Without net neutrality, new services, new websites, new big ideas will have a harder time competing with established businesses. That is why more than 1,000 entrepreneurs, investors, and startups from every single State have signed a letter asking that the FCC protect net neutrality—because it is critical for innovation.

When you think about how quickly the internet of things is gaining steam, it is also a big deal for what they call IoT. We are at a historic moment in innovation in the digital space.

Kevin Kelly, internet pioneer, recently did an interview with Stephen Dubner of Freakonomics Radio. They talked about the fact that in 2015 alone, 5 quintillion transistors were added to devices that were not computers. A quintillion is a billion billion. That is such an enormous number, it is hard to fathom. That is how fast the internet of things is growing. That is the level of innovation that is taking place, but this innovation depends on a free and open internet.

So the degree and extent that individual ISPs are able to control who gets what and at what speed, all of that innovation at the app level, the IoT level, all the cool stuff you are looking forward to from Silicon Valley or wherever it may be, is in danger because then it becomes about paying tolls. Then it becomes about a commercial negotiation. Then it becomes about lawyering up. You have a really good idea? Lawyer up. You have a really good idea? Get people who have a master's in business administration. Forget the engineers. Forget the content developers. Forget the creative class. What you have to do is figure out how to get in on what will essentially be what they call a closed shop. And that is what net neutrality is all about.

What if your internet service provider has a relationship with one of these websites? What if an auto sales website is purchased by a media company or vice versa? If you try to purchase a car online, you may end up in an internet funhouse if the FCC takes away net neutrality. It will look like the internet, but you may not have complete access to all the options. The same idea applies to the internet of things. If every car connects to the internet, broadband providers could decide that it takes too much bandwidth and pick and choose which brands are allowed to connect to the internet. That is what can happen without net neutrality.

They could offer a basic internet package that limits customers to cer-

tain websites or content, sort of how you buy basic cable and then decide whether you want ESPN or HBO or whatever additional channels. It is not totally out of the question that that could be the way you access the internet in the future.

The thing is, it sounds so scary, it sounds so crazy that you can't imagine it would happen. And it is true that it didn't happen in the past, but that is because it wasn't in their commercial interest to do it. Think about towns where there are one or two ISPs. Think about a future 5 or 10 years from now when net neutrality is repealed. The moment it is in their commercial interest to do something to change the very nature of the internet is the moment they will be duty bound to consider going forward.

When net neutrality was adopted under the previous FCC, there were 3.8 million people who provided comment. This is a very unique process. When the law passed that allowed ISPs to sell your commercial data, to sell your browsing data to third parties—that happened in a 30-hour period—basically, nobody noticed. We tried to mobilize. We got the word out. They had the votes, and it happened very quickly. This is different. Under the law, there is a public comment period. There were 3.8 million people who commented on the last net neutrality debate. There are already 1 million people who have commented through the FCC's website.

Tomorrow, the FCC will take an action that will open up the comment period and provide people an opportunity to weigh in on this. I would just offer that I do not believe there is any real constituency for what the FCC is doing. I think people across the country—young and old; left, right, and center; Democratic and Republican; urban and rural—everybody who cares about a free and open internet ought to care about what is happening tomorrow.

With that, I would like to yield to a Member of the Senate who has many years of leadership in this space, someone who has authored some of the statutory architecture that has allowed this innovation on the internet to occur, someone who fights for consumers, the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I say to Senator SCHATZ, thank you for organizing our Senate net neutrality champions out here on the floor today so that we can all stand up and add our voices to your voice in speaking on this critical issue. Now, there are people watching the Senate floor right now by watching the live stream on c-span.org or on Facebook Live.

They might be engaged citizens, they might be political junkies, or maybe

they need something to help them to ensure that their newborn is going to go to sleep this afternoon. That is watching C-SPAN. That helps the family. Let's face it. The action in this most deliberative body can sometimes feel a little slow.

Now, imagine just a few companies deciding that c-span.org will be put in a slow lane, that the public interest content streamed out to the world from this Chamber will be sent out at an even more deliberative pace, all while kitten videos get priority in an internet fast lane.

When people talk about net neutrality, that is what we are talking about. Instead of an open and free internet where the billions of clicks, likes, and links made by customer and entrepreneurs in their living rooms and offices determines who wins and loses, it will be just a few companies in a few corporate boardrooms deciding who gets into the express lane and who falls behind in an internet traffic jam.

That is why we need a true open internet. That is exactly what I heard last month when I hosted a roundtable in Boston with a number of our tech firms—Carbonite, TripAdvisor, Wayfair, iRobot, and others. Their message was clear: Net neutrality impacts businesses across the entire internet ecosystem, and the ever-changing environment of entrepreneurship can be easily disrupted without this ingredient—net neutrality.

Today, essentially every company is an internet company. Consider these statistics. In 2016, almost one-half of the venture capital funds invested in this country went toward internet-specific and software companies. That is \$25 billion worth of investment.

At the same time, to meet America's insatiable demand for broadband internet, U.S. broadband and telecommunications industry giants invested more than \$87 billion in capital expenditures in 2015. That is the highest rate of annual investment in the last 10 years. So we have hit a sweet spot. Investment in broadband and wireless technology is high, job creation is high, and venture capital investment in online startups is high. Disrupting that formula now would only create chaos and uncertainty.

With strong net neutrality protections in place, there is no problem that needs to be fixed. But the Trump administration wants to upend this hallmark of American innovation and democratization by gutting net neutrality rules. Tomorrow, Chairman Ajit Pai and the Republican-controlled Federal Communications Commission will vote to begin a proceeding that will allow a few powerful broadband providers to control the internet.

Now, the big broadband barons and their Republican allies say: We don't need net neutrality. They say: What we really need is a "light touch" regulatory framework for broadband.

But let's be clear here. When the broadband behemoths say "light touch" what they really mean is "hands off". They really want hands off of their ability to choose online winners and losers.

That is what they really want, to allow AT&T, Verizon, Charter, Comcast, and all of the other internet service providers to set up internet fast lanes for those with the deepest pockets, pushing those who can't onto a slow gravel path. Then, they will just pass any extra costs onto the consumer. What they really want is to sideline the FCC, our telecommunications cop on the beat, and to create an unregulated online ecosystem where broadband providers can stifle the development of competing services that cannot afford an internet E-ZPass.

No one should have to ask permission to innovate. But with fast and slow lanes, that is precisely what an entrepreneur will need to do. Right now, the essence of the internet is to innovate and test new ideas first, and if an idea then takes off, the creator can attract capital and expand.

Creating internet fast and slow lanes would flip this process on its head. Instead, an entrepreneur would first need to raise capital in order to start innovating, because she would need to pay for fast lane access to have a chance for her product to be seen and to succeed. Only those with access to deep pockets would develop anything new. Imagine the stifling of creativity if startups need massive amounts of money even to innovate.

Now, Chairman Pai says he likes net neutrality. But in reality, his proposal would eliminate the very order that established today's network neutrality rules. That is like saying you value democracy but you don't see a need for a constitution. It makes no sense.

For Chairman Pai and the ISPs, title II is a bad word. It is some terrible thing. But for everyone else—consumers, activists, and entrepreneurs—title II is a reason to celebrate. Back in 2010, the FCC attempted to put net neutrality rules in place without reclassifying under title II of the Communications Act. The D.C. Circuit Court invalidated those rules. Then, in 2015, the Federal Communications Commission rightfully adopted the open internet order, which reclassified broadband under title II, and the D.C. Circuit upheld the rule in 2016.

The issue is settled. The FCC should not repeat past mistakes and instead should maintain the successful current regime. Why is title II appropriate? It was Congress's intent to preserve the FCC's authority to forestall threats to competition and innovation in telecommunications services, even as the technologies used to offer those services evolved over time.

Now, classifying broadband under title II is just a very fancy way of say-

ing broadband is like telephone service. It is a basic utility that Americans rely on every day to work, to communicate, and to connect. Broadband has become the single most important telecommunications service Americans use to transmit information from one to another. This is common sense to Americans around the country, with the only exception being high-powered telecommunications lobbyists inside the beltway here in Washington.

Chairman Pai also claims that he wants internet service providers to voluntarily decide to follow net neutrality principles. That is like asking a kid to voluntarily swear not to stick his hand in the cookie jar. It just won't happen. We know the broadband industry—your cable, wireless or telecommunications provider—can't self-regulate themselves. They struggle to even show up on time to install or fix your service. Do we really trust them to resist using their internet gatekeeper role and putting their online competitors at an unfair disadvantage?

This effort on net neutrality is just one piece of the Republicans' effort to dismantle the basic protections safeguarding American families. Instead of protecting our privacy, our healthcare, our environment, or our net neutrality, the Republicans want to give it all away to their friends and allies and big corporations.

The FCC has received more than 1 million comments already, and I am sure millions more will flow in the weeks and months to come, as the FCC comment period will stretch until at least August. Those are comments from every corner of the country and from every walk of life. They are standing up to say we need a truly open and free Internet.

Openness is the internet's heart. Nondiscrimination is its soul. Any infringement on either of those features undermines the spirit and intent of net neutrality.

So I proudly stand with my fellow netizens out on the Senate floor and all across America who oppose any efforts to undermine net neutrality. We are on the right side of history. I am ready for the historic fight to come.

Twelve years ago, I introduced the first net neutrality bill in the House of Representatives. In the Senate, the first net neutrality bill was introduced by the Senator from Oregon, RON WYDEN. This has been a long battle, a long struggle coming. We now have America in its sweep spot, with net neutrality on the books for software and broadband companies, which allows for a fair balance in terms of the competition in the marketplace.

So I now turn and yield for the Senator from Oregon, RON WYDEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for not

just today but all of the years in which he has led this battle. He is right. We have served together now in both Chambers and, in fact, when I was here and he was in the other body, we talked often about why this was such a bedrock principle.

You know, sometimes you listen to the head of the FCC and you get the sense that somehow he is saying that the internet either is broken or is about to break—that some horrendous set of problems are going to ensue without his ill-advised ideas. The fact is that the internet is not broken. The Federal Communications Commission is not trying to help consumers by rolling back net neutrality protections. They are doing it to make it easier for the big cable companies to be in a position to shove out true and real competition. That, I would say to my friend Senator MARKEY and my friend from Hawaii, Senator SCHATZ, who has been championing these efforts in the Commerce Committee, is what this is really all about.

You know, the reality is that the internet is now the shipping lane for the 21st century. It is that place—a global marketplace—where you have the free exchange of ideas, and today's rules protect that shipping lane of the 21st century—the freedom for Americans and people worldwide to compete online. It exists so that the powerful interests, those who have the deepest pockets, do not go out and swallow the little guys up every single time.

Now, as we talk about net neutrality and why it is so essential for jobs, free speech, political engagement, education, economic opportunity, and better competition, there are really just three points. First, protecting the free and open internet under Title II of the Telecommunications Act, in my view, is the best way to proceed at this point. It is the only way, at present, to ensure a free and open internet, and that is, by rejecting this idea that somehow the internet is broken and we should upend the current rules. The Federal Communications Commission should not only leave the current net neutrality rules in place, they ought to aggressively move against companies that violate those rules. As my friends from Massachusetts and Hawaii know, there is not exactly a lot of evidence that the Federal Communications Commission is doing that either.

Net neutrality, in short, protects the internet's ability to give a fair shake to every single person in America and literally in the world with a good idea—they don't have to have money. They don't have to have lobbyists. They don't have to have PACs. All they have to have with net neutrality and the internet is an idea to compete with the establishment. This level playing field is a prerequisite for protecting free speech.

A level regulatory playing field means that these powerful interests—

the cable companies, specifically—can't pick winners and losers because of their political or personal views. Our colleague, Senator FRANKEN of Minnesota, has correctly said that net neutrality is the First Amendment issue of our time, and I think he is spot-on on that matter.

Finally, because there really hasn't been the competition in the broadband marketplace that would best serve the consumer and the public, what you should definitely do is operate under the theory that you need strong rules. We all know that too many people don't have a choice when it comes to a broadband provider; often it comes down to Comcast or nothing. Without real competition, America needs strong net neutrality rules to prevent Comcast or AT&T from basically tossing consumer choice and free speech in the trash can to rake in even more profits.

A lack of broadband competition and consumer choice is clearly a problem you cannot solve by giving the big cable companies more freedom—freedom to run at will through the marketplace.

So the question now is—and I think my friend from Massachusetts just touched on it—what happens now? What happens now is making the American people aware that this is the time for their voices to be heard.

The fact is, there are two notions of political change in America. Some people think it starts in Washington, DC, and in government buildings in various capitals and then trickles down to the grassroots.

Senator SCHATZ, Senator MARKEY, and I take a different view with respect to how you bring about political change in America. It is not top-down; it is bottom-up. It is bottom-up as Americans from all walks of life weigh in with their legislators, weigh in with the Federal Communications Commission. My guess is that pretty soon—probably tomorrow—the future of the internet is going to be in the hands of the Federal Communications Commission.

I just want to wrap up my remarks by talking about how important it is for the American people to go online to the Federal Communications Commission website and file a comment, and visit my website—wyden.senate.gov—where you can get more information.

I will close with this: I think my friends—certainly Senator MARKEY and Senator SCHATZ—may have heard this. I want to talk about the fight against internet piracy because we are all against internet piracy. No one is in favor of that kind of thievery, but we didn't think it made sense to damage the architecture of the internet—the domain name systems and the fundamental principles by which the internet operates—in the name of fighting piracy.

When there was a bill with a short-sighted view—it was called SOPA and PIPA—and it was introduced, scores and scores of Senators supported it immediately. I put a hold on this bill. I put a public hold on the bill. I chaired a little subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee. There were close to a majority of Senators already in support of this flawed bill. We began to talk to those around the country who understand what it really means if you damage the internet and its architecture for a shortsighted and, in this case, unworkable approach.

Everybody thought we didn't have a chance of winning. There was very close to a majority in the Senate actually cosponsoring it. So a vote was scheduled on whether to lift my hold on this bill, the flawed PIPA and SOPA bill.

Four days before the vote was to take place on whether to lift my hold, 15 million Americans emailed, texted, called, went to community meetings. They went out all across the country. Mind you, these 15 million Americans were focused and spent more time online in a week than they did thinking about their U.S. Senator in a couple of years.

They said this defies common sense. We are not for internet piracy, but don't destroy the internet.

My hope is, once again, with the odds stacked against our side—the odds stacked against Senator SCHATZ, Senator MARKEY, and all the Senators who have been willing, on our side, to speak up against these powerful interests that really would like to gut net neutrality—that those who understand what the freedom of the net is all about, what it means to have this ability to communicate that is so vital to people without clout and power, will take the fight for the consumer, for the man and woman who just want a fair shake when they get an idea. My hope is, just as they did a few years ago in blocking this ill-advised SOPA and PIPA bill, that those who care so much about freedom and a fair shot for everybody will, once again, take the fight to the Federal Communications Commission, knowing that their voices can make a difference. They have made a difference in the past.

It is a real pleasure to be with Senator MARKEY and Senator SCHATZ.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. WYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, as the Senator from Oregon remembers so well, when he and I started in Congress, there was one telephone company.

Did we have innovation? Well, we had a company winning Nobel Prizes in basic research. Did we see applied research out there, new technologies? No. We saw a black rotary dial phone. So AT&T had to get broken up so there

would be new companies, new competition, new technologies.

Ultimately, because of all of that effort toward deregulation to let more companies in, more innovations, we now have devices that we walk around with, which are just minicomputers in our pocket. We have millions of apps that people sitting in any city and town all across our country can develop and get online to try to make a few bucks.

Ultimately, it is still that old AT&T mentality: How do we shut it down? How do we close it down? How do we make it hard for the entrepreneur, hard for the innovator, hard for that new idea to get out there that makes it more productive, easier for the American people to be able to have access to these new programs?

I agree with the Senator from Oregon that this is a pivotal time in our country's entrepreneurial history. We have learned this lesson over and over again. The Senator has been a great leader on these issues, and I just want to compliment him on that. I compliment the Senator from Hawaii for his leadership on the issue.

I yield back the remainder of my time to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Massachusetts. In fact, I have to leave the floor right now to wrap up business for a very important Finance Committee meeting tomorrow. It is a markup where we are going to be looking at ways as part of the transformation of Medicare—what I call updating the Medicare guarantee—that some of the technologies my friend from Massachusetts talked about are going to be available to seniors.

I know our friend from New Hampshire has arrived, and she has been a very strong advocate of principles of net neutrality.

I yield the remainder of my time to her.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I thank my friends from Oregon, Massachusetts, and Hawaii for their leadership on this very important issue concerning net neutrality.

Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the Federal Communications Commission's proposal to undermine critical net neutrality rules, which would change the internet as we know it today.

Tomorrow the FCC will vote on a notice of proposed rulemaking, which begins the unraveling of commonsense consumer protections that enhance our online experience. Net neutrality is a concept that requires internet service providers to provide equal access to online applications and content. It prevents internet service providers from discriminating against content and content providers, discrimination that

can take the form of making certain web pages, certain applications, or videos load faster or load slower than others.

Net neutrality is integral to promoting innovation, supporting entrepreneurs and small businesses, and encouraging economic growth in my home State of New Hampshire and across the entire Nation.

In March, Washington Republicans, with the support of the Trump administration, voted to take away critical online privacy protections giving ISPs the green light to collect and use a consumer's online data without the consumer's consent. So it is no surprise that what corporate ISPs want next is to remove baseline protections that allow even the softest voice to be heard or the smallest of businesses to thrive against larger competitors.

I have heard time and again from Granite Staters who call and write to my office that we must fight to protect the net neutrality rules, rules that create an even playing field and protect consumers from unfair practices.

What we are seeing here in Washington is different. At the request of big cable companies and internet service providers, the Republican-controlled FCC, led by Chairman Ajit Pai, is taking aim at commonsense consumer protections that could change the free and open internet as we know it. As rationale, Chairman Pai has claimed that since net neutrality rules went into effect 2 years ago, investments in U.S. broadband companies have dropped to historically low levels.

Quite the opposite has occurred. Since the rules went into effect, AT&T's share price has gone up more than 20 percent, Comcast has increased 26 percent, and several ISPs have reassured investors that net neutrality would have no impact on their broadband investments. So this is just another "gimme" to big cable and industry stakeholders who want to put profits ahead of customer service and consumer protections.

In New Hampshire, innovative, small businesses are the backbone of our economy, creating good jobs, stimulating economic growth, and net neutrality has been integral to their success. More than 1,000 startups, innovators, investors, and entrepreneurial support organizations from across the country, including the company Digital Muse, in New Hampshire, sent a letter to Chairman Pai urging him to protect net neutrality rules. I plan to fight to do just that.

In giving entrepreneurs a level playing field to turn an idea into a thriving business that reaches a global audience, net neutrality helps promote innovation and boost economic growth. By dismantling net neutrality rules, internet service providers will be allowed to force small service providers to pay to play online, causing insta-

bility to startups and entrepreneurs across the Nation who might not be able to afford such fees. Companies like Digital Muse should be able to compete based on the quality of their goods and services, not on their ability to pay tolls to internet service providers.

Net neutrality isn't just good for startups and entrepreneurs, it has also created a platform for traditionally underrepresented voices, including women and minorities, to be heard and, as important, to add to our economic strength. Last week, my friend Senator CANTWELL and I sent a letter with several of our colleagues to Chairman Pai highlighting the importance of net neutrality to women and girls across the country. An open internet serves as a platform to elevate voices that are underrepresented or marginalized in traditional media, an experience many women in the field know all too well.

When turned away from traditional media outlets, women can turn to the internet as an autonomous platform to tell their stories in their own voices thanks to the vast array of media platforms enabled by net neutrality. Between 2007 and 2016, while the total number of business firms in America increased by 9 percent, the total number of women-owned firms increased by 45 percent, a rate five times the national average. This growth in women-owned business mirrors the emergence of the free and open internet as a platform for economic growth. Net neutrality has been essential to the growth of women-owned, innovative businesses, ensuring them the opportunity to compete with more established brands and content.

In addition to empowering women economically, an open internet has the ability to empower all citizens civically. The National Women's March in January brought together hundreds of thousands of people to raise their voices and organize in marches across the country and around the world, largely through online activism. The Women's March and the many other marches that have followed since January demonstrate how an open internet can serve as a powerful mechanism for civic engagement and strengthening communities. The open and free internet is too powerful of a tool for civic engagement and social and economic mobility—especially for our underrepresented populations—to take away. Strong net neutrality rules are absolutely essential. They protect against content discrimination, they prevent internet toll lanes, they allow the FCC adequate room for oversight, and they require reasonable transparency from internet service providers. The rules also provide stability to our economy, to our entrepreneurs, and our innovative small businesses—enterprises that are integral to New Hampshire's and America's economic success.

I will continue fighting to ensure that our regulatory environment is one

that spurs innovation, fosters economic growth, supports our small businesses, and allows the next young person with a big idea to prosper. I strongly oppose rules that would undermine net neutrality, and I hope the FCC listens throughout the comment period to concerns from Granite Staters and Americans who feel the same way.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I see that my friend from Minnesota is here and wonder if he would like to speak to this issue as well.

Mr. FRANKEN. I would.

Ms. HASSAN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise to discuss the Trump administration's effort to undo the open internet order. Together we must protect net neutrality and ensure that all content on the internet receives equal treatment from broadband providers regardless of who owns the content or how deep their pockets are.

Two years ago, American consumers and businesses celebrated the FCC's landmark vote to preserve the free and open internet by reclassifying broadband providers as common carriers under title II of the Communications Act. The vote came after the SEC received nearly 4 million public comments, the vast majority of which urged the agency to enact strong rules protecting net neutrality.

Consumers urged the Commission to protect their unfettered and affordable access to content. A wide range of advocacy organizations pressed the Commission to ensure that broadband providers couldn't pick and choose which voices and ideas would actually reach consumers. Small and large businesses alike asked that the internet remain an open marketplace where everyone can participate on equal footing, free from discrimination by companies like Comcast, Verizon, and AT&T.

The FCC responded by establishing rules that are strong, clear, and enforceable; rules that prevent broadband providers from blocking or throttling lawful online content, and rules that stop providers from charging websites for access to fast lanes.

Perhaps, most importantly, the FCC implemented these rules within the time-tested legal framework that allows the agency to respond to challenges to net neutrality that arise in the future. Following the commonsense path I have long urged, the FCC recognized that broadband access is a title II service—a classification that the D.C. Circuit has upheld and had previously signaled was necessary in order to establish strong rules.

The FCC's vote to implement strong net neutrality rules was an important victory for American consumers and for American business, and that victory demonstrated the overwhelming

power of grassroots activism and civic participation. In 2014, millions of Americans from across the political spectrum organized to ensure that their voices were heard, and in the process, they redefined civic engagement in our country, but in the 21st century, that kind of participation requires an open internet, a place where people can freely share information and engage in meaningful public discourse.

Because of net neutrality, a handful of multibillion-dollar companies cannot bury sites offering alternative viewpoints or attempt to control how users get their information. Because of net neutrality, people from across the Nation can connect with each other, share their ideas on the internet, and organize a community effort.

I have always called net neutrality the free speech issue of our time because it embraces our most basic constitutional freedoms. Unrestricted public debate is vital to the functioning of our democracy. Now, perhaps more than ever, the need to preserve a free and open internet is abundantly clear. That is why I am so concerned about Chairman Pai's proposal to gut the strong net neutrality rules we fought so hard for.

Tomorrow, the FCC will vote officially to initiate a proceeding to undo the open internet order, but, importantly, American consumers and businesses will once again have an opportunity to make their voices heard. I hope the American people will contact the FCC, that they will remain engaged and willing to speak up, and that they will continue to use the internet to spread ideas, organize support, and ultimately counter the deep-pocketed ISPs and the politicians who seek to undermine net neutrality.

Two years ago, the best principles of our democracy won out. I do believe that with the same energy and determination that has gotten us this far, net neutrality supporters can garner another win for the American people.

I thank the Presiding Officer for this opportunity to speak.

I yield to my good friend from the State of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I thank Mr. FRANKEN for his leadership on this issue. He is a person who understands the content industry and has been a fierce defender of people's ability to view content online, people's ability to express themselves online, and understands that a fair and open media marketplace is central to our democracy.

I want to address one assertion that was made by the proponents of repealing net neutrality; that is, that somehow the investment climate under net neutrality was harmed. They say there is some reason to believe that under net neutrality, the investment climate

was diminished, but the Internet Association published research today that addressed this very issue, and their findings show that since 2015, when the rules went into place, telecommunications investment has actually increased. ISPs and their consumers are enjoying historically low production costs and innovation has increased. Free Press also published a report on this question earlier this week, and they found that investment in broadband by publicly traded companies actually went up after net neutrality went into place. Here is what the research director at the Free Press had to say: "If investment is the FCC's preferred metric, then there is only one possible conclusion—net neutrality and Title II are a smashing success."

Here is the point. The internet is not broken. There are parts of the economy that are not working well. We struggle with manufacturing. We need to invest in infrastructure. We have a trade imbalance. We have a higher education system that is not working for everybody. We need to do more work in these areas, but the part of our economy that is working great for consumers, for entrepreneurs, for the private sector, for engaged citizens is the internet itself. Tomorrow, the FCC is going to endeavor to break it.

Before I hand it over to someone who has been working on these issues for many years, I want to point out that nobody would have anticipated that the Affordable Care Act would still be on the books because of unprecedented online and inperson organizing.

The FCC has a very unique process where there is going to be a 3-month public comment period. The statute actually allows the public to go and weigh in on what they think. The last time this happened when net neutrality principles were being established, 3.8 million people commented. So far, before they even take their first formal action, there are 1.6 million people who have already commented. My guess is, by the time tomorrow is done—maybe the next day—we will be well into the 2 to 3 million comment range, and they still have 3 months to go. Understand the power in our democracy still resides with the people. Somebody who has been working in the trenches on this issue and many consumer issues for a very long time is my great colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut, and I will yield to him as I realize I think I am standing at his daïs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I begin by thanking my colleague and friend Senator SCHATZ for his extraordinary leadership in this area that has brought us to the floor. I am proud to speak against the Federal Communications Commission Chairman's proposed order that is in fact slated for a vote at

the open commission meeting tomorrow morning. That vote would undo the open internet order.

What is at stake here is, really, First Amendment rights to free speech. Those rights are threatened. Net neutrality has never been more important. Allowing broadband providers to block or discriminate against certain content providers is a danger to free speech and the freedom of our press. These principles are fundamental to our democracy. We should safeguard them by stopping this proposed repeal of the open internet order.

The internet's astonishing economic success is due to its being open and the access that it provides as an open platform. Anyone with a good idea can connect with consumers. Anyone who wants to reach across the globe to talk to others or to pitch and promote ideas and products encounters a level playing field, and that ought to be the reality.

On February 25, 2015, the FCC adopted the open internet order to preserve that open nature of the internet. The order, essentially, embodies three rules—no blocking, no throttling, no paid prioritization. Those principles are now at risk. In fact, they are in grave jeopardy. Those principles guarantee people, within the bounds of the law, access to different web content regardless of the political views expressed and regardless of the wealth of a site. They assure that the internet is open—that it is not a walled garden for wealthy companies. A lot is at stake here, and consumers and others should prevail because their interests are, ultimately, what is involved.

Ultimately, the Administrative Procedure Act requires, in my view, that Chairman Pai prove, through a fact-based docket, that something has significantly changed in the market since the open internet rule was established in February of 2015. Without that change in facts, the decimation of this rule cannot be justified. We cannot allow Chairman Pai to succeed in this plan to gut neutrality at the behest of moneyed internet service providers. Chairman Pai's proposal, if it succeeds tomorrow, will deprive the American people, startups, and businesses of important bright-line net neutrality rules. For that reason, I will fight it, and I hope my colleagues will join me in this effort.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise during Police Week to pay tribute to

our police officers around the country—the men and women in blue who serve us every day in Ohio and in every State represented in this Chamber.

In Ohio, this is a particularly difficult week. Here we are during Police Week, and we are, once again, mourning the loss of a police officer. This happened just last Friday. Last Friday, a gunman took two people hostage in the woods behind a nursing home in Kirkersville, OH, which is a small town about 25 miles east of Columbus.

The first one to arrive on the scene was the police chief of this small town. His name was Steven DiSario. Chief Steven DiSario confronted the assailant, and he was ambushed by this assailant. He was shot. He was killed. This gunman then went inside the nursing facility, and he murdered two staff members—a registered nurse, Marlina Medrano, and a nurse's aide named Cindy Krantz. Then he took his own life.

By the way, Police Chief Steven DiSario was 36 years old and had just become the police chief in Kirkersville a month ago. The women who were slain were Marlina Medrano, who had a son, and Cindy Krantz, who had five kids, including a 10-year-old son. Those kids had to spend Mother's Day preparing for their moms' burials.

On Monday, I went to Kirkersville and saw the memorial there for the officer. I also had an opportunity to meet with some of the officers who were from neighboring communities. There was just one police officer in Kirkersville—just the chief. I was able to express to them the sympathy and the gratitude of the people throughout Ohio. I had brought a flag that had been flown over the U.S. Capitol in honor of Chief DiSario, and that flag will go to his family as a very small token of the appreciation and gratitude of all of us for their father's and husband's service.

Chief DiSario had six kids, and his widow, Aryn, is currently pregnant with their seventh child—a child who is never going to know his or her dad. What he or she will know is that he died a hero, that he died a hero in risking his life to protect innocent people.

That is what police officers do every single day. They keep us safe. They take dangerous criminals and weapons and drugs off our streets. They enforce the law. Even their very presence helps to deter crime and keep our communities safer, but they do it all at great risk—at great risk to themselves and at great sacrifice to their families.

A little more than a year ago, I did a ride-along in Columbus with Officer Greg Meyer. He is one of those brave Columbus police officers who goes out every day to help keep our communities safe, and we were focused on a couple of issues that night in Columbus.

One was the drug trade, particularly the opioid crisis we face in Ohio. He

was able to show me where much of this activity occurs, and we were able to see with our eyes some of the people who were trafficking drugs, dispersing, and what goes on in our communities.

We were also talking about human trafficking and his work in that area. We were able to go to some particular places at which there had been trafficking in the past and where the police had broken up trafficking rings in which girls and women had been made to become dependent on heroin. Then the traffickers had them, often in a hotel for a week until they had moved on to another one and trafficked—sold—human beings, usually online, usually through the iPhone. Again, this police officer was able to tell me about what he has done and what his force has done to help protect these girls and women and to help get them out of that situation.

This was just a few hours for me, and I always enjoy doing these ride-alongs, but this is his life and their lives every day. They are out there doing their best to try to protect us and to make our communities safer.

The day before this tragedy occurred in Kirkersville, we had had a lot of police officers here in town because, on Thursday and Friday and over the weekend, police officers had been coming in for Police Week and Police Memorial Day, which was on Monday, so I had a chance to meet with a bunch of these officers and thank them for their service.

We talked about the fact that the job is dangerous and increasingly dangerous. Unfortunately, the numbers show that. Little did we know that, the day after we had been talking, there would have again been this tragedy in Ohio. We talked about the fact that some of their families have had sleepless nights because they do not know whether their husbands or their wives or their sons or daughters are going to be coming home.

In our Nation's history, more than 21,000 police officers have died in the line of duty. Think about that—21,000. We have already had 42 this year, 2017. In 2016, we lost 143, which is about one officer every 3 days. Again, last year, five of those fallen officers were from Ohio: Aaron Christian, a patrolman with the Chesapeake Police Department; Thomas Cottrell, a patrolman with the Danville Police Department; Sean Johnson, of the Hilliard, OH, Division of Police; Steven Smith, of the Columbus Division of Police; and Kenneth Velez, an Ohio State trooper.

I had the opportunity to meet with some of the families of these fallen officers to express our appreciation, to express our respect for them and the sacrifices that they bear. It takes courage to wear the badge, and those officers wear the badge day in and day out. They knew what they were getting into. Yet they wore that badge; they died wearing that badge.

Although these heroic men were taken from us, their examples can never be taken away and will not be. Ohioans are going to remember them as models of bravery and service, as examples of fellow citizens who, on behalf of all of us, were in the habit of walking into danger rather than running away from it.

We have an opportunity to do something that will make a difference for our police officers by supporting the Police Week resolution that the House and the Senate are working on. I urge all of my colleagues to support it, and I am sure they will. I think we need to show our men and women in blue, who are on the frontlines, that we do appreciate them.

There is also legislation that can be supported. Most recently, with the majority whip, I introduced legislation that is called the Back the Blue Act. It is very simple. It says, if you target law enforcement officers, you are going to have to pay a very high price. That is appropriate. We think the Back the Blue Act, which would increase penalties on those who would attempt to harm or kill a police officer, is going to make a difference because it will send a strong message and help deter some of these crimes. Ultimately, I think that it will make our heroes in blue safer and help save lives.

Again, I urge my colleagues to join me in the wake of this terrible tragedy we had in central Ohio. I know the people of Ohio are looking for Congress to stand tall and to stand with our police officers and to thank them for what they do to protect us every day.

Let's support this Police Week resolution. Let's support the Back the Blue Act. Let's do everything we can to ensure that our police officers know that we are with them—that we are at their side—as they do their job every day to protect us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, pending before the Senate is the nomination of Rachel Brand to be the Associate Attorney General of the United States—the United States, not of the President.

We once had an Attorney General who told us on the Judiciary Committee that as a member of the President's staff, it is not the Secretary of Justice; it is the Attorney General of the United States.

I say this because her nomination to the third most senior position at the Department of Justice comes at an unprecedented time of chaos and upheaval—not only at the Justice Department, but also at the White House, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and across much of this administration.

We should all agree that it is more important than ever that the Justice Department be led by public servants

with independence and integrity. Unfortunately, President Trump's Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General have failed this test. I did not expect Attorney General Sessions to show independence from the President, which is why I voted against his nomination.

But I had higher hopes for Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein. Mr. Rosenstein's role in the dismissal of FBI Director Comey and his willingness to provide pretext for President Trump's interference in the Bureau's ongoing Russia investigation has precipitated a crisis of confidence in the Department.

The Senate must take steps to restore the independence of the Department of Justice. After reviewing her record and hearing her testimony at her confirmation hearing, I am not confident that Rachel Brand is up to that task. Like so many of the President's nominees, she carries a heavily skewed, pro-corporate agenda that would do further harm to the Justice Department and its independence.

Ms. Brand has long championed deregulation and the rolling back of vital environmental, consumer, and labor regulations protecting the American people. Ms. Brand has justified indiscriminate surveillance of Americans and defended broad assertions of Executive power. She even refused to say whether she would recuse herself from matters involving the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber Litigation Center, her current employer. I cannot support a nominee who lacks an independent voice. I will therefore vote against her nomination.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, every day seems to bring new, disturbing revelations involving this President and his administration. I almost hesitate to say "every day" because sometimes it is every hour.

Yesterday's report that the President pressured former FBI Director Comey to terminate the ongoing investigation into Michael Flynn is extraordinary. If true, the President's conduct could warrant charges for obstruction of justice.

Now, the notion that the Russia investigation could be led by a political appointee of this President, who serves at the pleasure of this President, is preposterous; yet Senate Republicans have attempted to justify Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein's failure to appoint a special counsel. Their arguments are wrong. I want to take a few minutes to explain why.

The President says he fired James Comey because James Comey wouldn't pledge loyalty to him. Apparently, pledging loyalty to the rule of law was not as important. Most Americans don't care whether the Director of the FBI is a Republican or Democrat; they just want him or her to be committed

to upholding the law, not a political position.

Every lawyer knows that, when you are considering a legal question, you begin with a statute or regulation at issue. The relevant regulation, found in the Code of Federal Regulations, is worth reading in full.

I ask unanimous consent that the regulation be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

The rule requires that an independent special counsel be appointed if three conditions are met.

The first condition is that a "criminal investigation of a person or matter is warranted." This is not an open question in this instance—there is already an active investigation.

The second condition is met when an investigation by the Justice Department "would present a conflict of interest for the Department or other extraordinary circumstances." If Mr. Rosenstein, a political appointee, were to lead this investigation, he may be forced to investigate both his immediate supervisor, the Attorney General, and the President. That is the definition of a conflict of interest. That alone is enough.

But in this investigation, extraordinary circumstances abound. Last week, the President admitted that he fired the official leading this investigation because of "this Russia thing." His Deputy Press Secretary then said, "We want this to come to its conclusion. . . . And we think that we've actually, by removing Director Comey, taken steps to make that happen." Yesterday, we learned that President Trump may have also pressured the FBI Director to close the investigation into Michael Flynn's contacts with Russian officials. If these are not "extraordinary circumstances," then those words have no meaning at all.

The third condition is met when "it would be in the public interest to appoint an outside Special Counsel." I cannot recall a more serious national security investigation. Russian interference in our election, possible collusion with the Trump campaign and administration, and the President's repeated assaults on the rule of law have eroded trust in our democratic institutions like nothing I have seen. According to the President's own statements, this investigation has been repeatedly compromised by political interference.

Because all three conditions are met, the Deputy Attorney General does not have a choice in this matter. It is not discretionary. The regulation requires that Mr. Rosenstein appoint a special counsel. Each minute that he refuses to follow this rule, he further diminishes the integrity of this investigation, as well as the integrity of the Justice Department itself.

I would ask anyone who still claims that a special counsel is not required to reconcile their opinion with the Jus-

tice Department rules. We may disagree on policy matters, but I hope we all agree on the supremacy of the rule of law and that no person and no President should be above it.

I know some Republicans have expressed concerns about the integrity of this investigation in public, and many others have expressed it to me privately. At this critical time, we cannot stand on the sidelines. We have a constitutional requirement to act as a check and balance on the conduct of the President. That starts with joining the call for a special counsel.

Mr. President, I love the Senate. I think of the Senate as a place that can be the conscience of our Nation. But more than that, I love the system of government where we have real checks and balances. I respect the executive branch, the legislative branch, and the judicial branch, but in my decades here, I have never seen such an assault by the President of the United States on the integrity and the independence of our Federal court system; the assault on our free press, including the suggestion that we should pass new libel laws to go after members of the press who might dare criticize this administration; or the assault, of course, on the Congress; or the pitting of one religion against another—this undermines everything that has kept this nation strong. It is not just our weapons and our military. As General Clapper indicated the other day, if we break down our institutions of government, if we let them attack each other and break each other down, then they lose credibility, and we as a country suffer.

Our Nation is too great for this, and we Senators in both parties have to stand up and help bring the country back together.

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

28 C.F.R. §600.1 GROUNDS FOR APPOINTING A SPECIAL COUNSEL.

The Attorney General, or in cases in which the Attorney General is recused, the Acting Attorney General, will appoint a Special Counsel when he or she determines that criminal investigation of a person or matter is warranted and—

(a) That investigation or prosecution of that person or matter by a United States Attorney's Office or Litigating Division of the Department of Justice would present a conflict of interest for the Department or other extraordinary circumstances; and

(b) That under the circumstances, it would be in the public interest to appoint an outside Special Counsel to assume responsibility for the matter.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, over the weekend I heard a story I wanted to share with everyone here today. The story goes that there were three candles burning on a porch right across

the street from the Cornwell Funeral Home in Dardanelle, AR—my hometown, just a couple blocks away from my home. A family had lit them in the memory of the three people who were brutally murdered last week in Chickalaha, just a few miles outside of Dardanelle.

One of those slain was Lieutenant Kevin Mainhart of the Yell County Sheriff's Department, who was killed after he stopped a man wanted in a domestic disturbance. In honor of his 5 years of service to Yell County—on top of the 20 years of service he rendered to the West Memphis Police Department—his fellow officers escorted in their cruisers the white hearse carrying his body from the State crime laboratory in Little Rock back to Dardanelle.

The family across the street had lit a green candle, specifically for Lieutenant Mainhart, and the three candles burned all the night. But as the hearse pulled into the funeral home, the green candle suddenly went out.

You could say that it was nothing more than a strange coincidence, but I think there is something especially poignant about the sudden, tragic loss of Lieutenant Mainhart's life so close to National Police Week, which began on Sunday. Like that green candle, Lieutenant Mainhart lit up his community, and, like that flickering flame, his life was too brief.

Like every American this week, I wish to pay my respects to Lieutenant Mainhart and the noble profession he chose. One of the things which struck me about Lieutenant Mainhart's death was that it came so early in the morning. The stop occurred at 7:18 a.m. He had the whole day and his whole life in front of him.

He was only 46 years old, but he had made the most of his time on this Earth. He was a husband, a father, an Air Force vet, a beloved member of our community. Hundreds of people don't line the streets for just anybody. Yet, in a moment, he was gone—his family bereft, our community in mourning. It is a reminder of how precious and fragile every life really is.

It also goes to show just how brave every police officer really is, because this is the risk they take every morning. They put on the uniform, they kiss their families good-bye, and they go to work, never fully certain they will get home that night. Yet the ever-present threat of death doesn't hold them down. It doesn't hold them back. It doesn't dim the brilliance of their service. They give it their all, day after day, without giving it a moment's thought. That, to me, is the ultimate sign of character—when you do the right thing without even thinking about it.

People like this are hard to come by. The sad truth is, we need a lot of them. A free country always does, because

there is no freedom without security. We are so used to this basic fact—that for most of us, most of the time we are safe—that we forget how remarkable it is. Not so many people on God's green Earth can take that safety for granted. We often forget what it takes to secure it. We forget how easily we can lose it—and lose men and women like Lieutenant Mainhart—in an instant.

It is with this in mind—this grave understanding of what our safety requires—that I once again speak against continued efforts to water down Federal sentencing laws. I thought this ill-advised idea had expired last year, especially after Donald Trump's election. But advocates for criminal leniency are at it again, even though violent crime continued to rise in our cities for 2 years straight, and law enforcement officers are being killed in the line of duty.

I have already made my position clear. If we want to take a second look at punishments for first-time drug possession, let's do that. But we should know that fewer than 500 people are in Federal prison for such offenses. If we want to clean up our prisons, rehabilitate felons, and help them achieve redemption, by all means, let's do that, too. I would even consider a bill to speed up review of inmates' applications for pardons and commutations, to help the President exercise this constitutional authority. But we should not—we should not—lower mandatory minimums for violent crimes, repeat offenders, and drug trafficking. There is nothing compassionate about putting the lives of innocent people—and our law enforcement officers—at risk.

Lieutenant Mainhart isn't the only one. There were three police officers killed in the line of duty last year in Arkansas: Robert Barker in the McCrory Police Department, William Cooper in the Sebastian County Sheriff's Office, and Lisa Mauldin in the Miller County Sheriff's Office. Every one of these losses was too steep a price to pay, and unwise criminal leniency policies put at risk their fellow officers and our communities.

I know it is considered old-fashioned to be tough on crime—or, even worse, cold-hearted and mean. But a man doesn't put a lock on his door because he hates those on the outside. He does it because he loves those on the inside—his wife, his kids, all his family—because they are the joy of his life. The men and women of law enforcement don't just protect their own families—they protect all of our families. Every day those men and women put their lives on the line for their fellow citizens. The least we can do is to stand behind them and support them, both for the work they do and for the lives they lead.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the recent firing of FBI Director Jim Comey and Russian interference in our democracy. Jim Comey was my law school classmate, and I know that in my State he has a lot of respect from our agents and also from law enforcement in general in our State.

When we had the stabbing in the mall in St. Cloud, MN—it was just with our police chief from St. Cloud—it was the FBI that came in and helped at the crime scene and with other things, because for a smaller police department it is difficult to deal with something like that and because they also had work to do working with the community to calm people.

The result was a good one because of the courageous work of an off-duty police officer. While people were injured, no one was killed, and the investigation was completed.

This is just one example of the work the FBI has done when Director Comey was in charge. I think we focus very much on what goes on in this town, but there are a lot of agents and law enforcement out there who have deep respect for him.

Last week, when Director Comey was fired, I came to the floor and said that in the recent months foundational elements of our democracy—including the rule of law—have been questioned, challenged, and even undermined. Today I return to the floor with the same concern.

In the last 48 hours alone, we have learned that, in addition to sharing top secret intelligence information with Russia without checking about it ahead of time—and we know Presidents have the right to share information and declassify it, but in instances of which we are aware, the President checks with intelligence agencies ahead of time. Was this shared with an ally? No. This was shared with Russia, a country that 17 intelligence agencies in the United States of America established was trying to undermine our election; Russia, which was found responsible for trying to shoot down and successfully brought down a plane, killing innocent people in Ukraine; the same regime that has poisoned dissidents; the same regime that has put people to death for simply expressing an opinion that is different from Vladimir Putin's. That is the country with which the President chose to share this information.

What else happened in the last 48 hours? Well, President Trump allegedly urged Director Comey—this news

dropped in the last 48 hours—to end the investigation into ties between Russia and General Flynn and to put reporters who publish classified leaks in prison. This was information I didn't know before. It happened in the last few months, of course, but it all came out in the last 48 hours.

The American people are looking to Congress for answers in the face of this assault on our democracy. It is our job to give them the answers they deserve and to right this ship. That is why I continue to call for a special prosecutor. Ever since the Attorney General had to recuse himself because of his own meetings and ties with Russia and ever since this mess kept getting messier, I have been calling for a special prosecutor. I believe that is the way to go.

Also, I have long called for an independent commission, and this is for a different purpose. As the Senate Intelligence Committee continues its bipartisan work, a special prosecutor and the FBI would get to the bottom of any criminal investigation. To me, the purpose of an independent commission would be to set the rules of the road so that this doesn't happen again and so our country can protect itself. This would be a panel of experts appointed by both sides. Their focus could well be to take these facts but to put them into a future election, as in, what do we do when campaigns get information that clearly is from a cyber attack from a foreign power?

Our Founding Fathers have said that our elections are precious and that they should be protected from foreign powers. Way back then, they were thinking of Great Britain. Now we are thinking of Russia. Next time, it could be another country. We should have some rules of the road.

It is not that long ago that—I remember when Presidential campaigns would be given some information that they weren't supposed to get from the opposing side, and they would actually return it to the opposing side. We could go back to that kind of day.

We could also have the media have some rules of the road. Look at what happened with the recent French election when there was a cyber attack there. The media didn't put out every rumor and everything they got out of that cyber attack; they showed some discretion.

Those are the kinds of things we could do with an independent commission in addition to factfinding.

I will start with this special prosecutor. The stack of reasons why we need a special prosecutor is getting higher and higher every day. Aides and surrogates of the Trump administration during both the campaign and in the transition were in contact with officials from a foreign government that was actively working to tear our democracy apart. That is pretty much established.

We know that the campaign chair for the Trump campaign had to step down because of his ties to Russia. We know that General Flynn was on the phone with the Russian Ambassador on the very day President Obama declared he wanted to expand sanctions against Russia. We also know he then lied to the Vice President of the United States about it. Those things happened during the campaign and during the transition.

Last week, former Acting Attorney General Sally Yates and former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper reminded us—I was there in the Judiciary Committee—they reminded us that on the very day that President Obama imposed those sanctions, that was when General Flynn—the former National Security Advisor; the person charged with the most sensitive matters of U.S. national security—was contacted—the Ambassador—and then he later lied to the Vice President about that contact.

I actually asked them specifically that after the fact that Flynn knew he was on tape, that they knew that, that there was a tape of him saying one thing to the Russians and then another to a high-ranking official in America—that would be the Vice President—I asked them if that was material for blackmail. They both said definitively that it was.

Yet, when Sally Yates went to the administration twice for two formal meetings with other people—this wasn't just a little heads-up at a cocktail party; she actually went to the White House to inform them that she believed the National Security Advisor had been compromised. What happened? They let him stay on for 18 days. And 2 days in, he was on an hourlong call between Vladimir Putin and the President of the United States of America.

Then, of course, we have the fact that the Attorney General was forced to recuse himself from any involvement with the Russia investigation because he met with the Russian Ambassador.

I will note that he met with the Russian Ambassador just a few days after President Obama and President Putin had met at an international meeting. At that meeting and then publicly President Obama had said: No, I am not pulling back these sanctions. Then what happens? Jeff Sessions, who was closely affiliated with the Trump campaign, a surrogate for the campaign, goes and meets with the Russian Ambassador.

Because of that and some things that happened in his confirmation hearing, he has now recused himself from any matters regarding the investigation between Russia and this administration and the campaign.

In addition to the recusal, we have seen two people resign, as I noted: the

campaign manager, the campaign chair, and the National Security Advisor. The one thing they have in common is Russia and President Trump.

We have seen three people fired. One is Sally Yates, who was the Acting Attorney General of the United States. While the reasons given for her firing were, of course, related to the refugee order, in fact, she was fired on the very same day she had gone to the White House to talk to them about General Flynn. We have Preet Bharara, who was fired after saying he could stay on. He was the U.S. attorney in Manhattan, in a very major position to investigate these kinds of issues and crimes. And then, of course, we have Jim Comey. The one thing they all have in common is that they were all investigating various facets of this.

In fact, Director Comey, as I noted—who had gotten support and respect from law enforcement—was fired the same day Federal prosecutors issued grand jury subpoenas to Michael Flynn's associates, just days after Comey requested more resources, according to news reports, to carry out the Russia investigation, and 2 days before he was scheduled to testify publicly before the Senate Intelligence Committee, where Members of that committee were going to ask him about Russia.

Think about it. The independent government officials who are charged with getting to the truth, no matter where it leads, were fired. And the President of the United States reportedly now—and this is what we have learned in the last 48 hours, and of course we want to get to the bottom of the evidence, but according to news reports, he urged the FBI Director to end the investigation into the ties between Russia and Mike Flynn.

We owe it to the American people to get to the bottom of what is going on here. It is our job to get to the bottom of this. The President can't fire Congress. He can fire the Acting Attorney General. He can fire the FBI Director, although I think it is very important that we get to the bottom of why the FBI Director was fired and whether it was for the reasons that were given in the memo that was prepared by the Justice Department or whether it was because of what President Trump has said—that it was related to Russia—or whether was because at one point he said he wasn't doing his job, which is not what I have heard from agents on the street. The one group the President cannot fire is right here in this room. The President cannot fire the U.S. Senate. The President can't fire the House of Representatives. He is not above the law.

This administration cannot investigate itself. We have the ongoing and important investigation led by bipartisan leaders, Senator BURR and Senator WARNER. That is important and

must continue. We also need a special prosecutor to look into the President's most recent conduct and all contacts between Trump campaign aides and surrogates and Russian officials during the campaign, the transition, and the administration. This prosecutor must be fair and impartial and completely unattached to either political party. Above all, this prosecutor must be comfortable speaking truth to power.

In addition to a special prosecutor, we need an independent commission. When I came back from my trip with Senator MCCAIN and Senator GRAHAM to Ukraine, the Baltics, and Georgia, I made it very clear—I remember speaking to my colleagues about this—that what we saw there made me even more concerned about the finding of our intelligence agencies because those countries have seen this movie over and over again where Russia has cyber attacked them. It happened in Lithuania just because they had the audacity to invite members of the Ukrainian Parliament from Crimea, who were in exile in Kiev, for their 25th anniversary, and they got hacked into. It happened in Estonia, where they moved a bronze statue out of a public square and into the cemetery with other statues of soldiers. But this was a Russian soldier. The Russians didn't like it. This was in 2007. What did they do? They shut down the internet for the entire country. This is not just a single incident involving one candidate or one political party or one election or even one country; this is something widespread. It is an attack on democracy.

That is why, when I came back from that trip, I stood with Senator CARDIN and House Members ADAM SCHIFF and ELIJAH CUMMINGS to stand up for a bill, which has a number of other sponsors, to create an independent, nonpartisan commission to uncover all the facts and make sure future elections and political campaigns are safeguarded from foreign interference.

For months, U.S. intelligence agencies—17 of them—have said that Russia used covert cyber attacks, espionage, and harmful propaganda to try to undermine our democracy. Reports show it. The facts prove it. Some \$200 million dollars was spent alone on Russian TV on our own election. Much of it was passed out on the internet.

Last week, the former Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, testified that Russia will continue to interfere in our election system. This is what he said:

I believe [Russia is] now emboldened to continue such activities in the future both here and around the world, and to do so even more intensely. If there has ever been a clarion call for vigilance and action against a threat to the very foundation of our democratic political system, this episode is it.

Vigilance. He said that Russia felt emboldened by what happened. What happened in the last 48 hours? We find

out that he had given high-level intelligence to the Russians before we gave it to any of our allies, before we checked it out with intelligence agencies. That actually emboldens them. We find out that, in fact—because Director Comey kept such meticulous notes, we find out that allegedly the President asked him to discontinue the investigation into General Flynn. What does that do? That emboldens Russia even more.

What former Director Clapper was telling us was that we need vigilance. We need oversight. We need to send a clear message that they cannot continue doing this. We do not need to embolden them.

What message does it send when the President urges the person in charge of the investigation into Russia's election interference to let it go? It is not one of vigilance in seeking the truth and fighting against a foreign adversary.

An independent commission of non-partisan experts can get to the bottom of this and tell us how we can prevent this from happening again. They can provide recommendations to help prevent future attacks on our democracy from being successful.

In addition to a special prosecutor and independent commission, we also need our congressional committees to continue to exercise their oversight authority. Since the election, we have heard a lot about the three branches of government and our system of checks and balances. One of the fundamental jobs of Congress is to closely oversee the executive branch to ensure that the law is being properly followed and enforced. That means we need congressional committees to continue their investigation into Russian interference in our political system. We have subpoena power for that reason, and we need to use it. There are tapes. The President says there may be tapes. Of course, redact the classified information. We don't want to hurt anyone any further from what has been happening in the last few weeks. But we should see the transcripts. We should have the tapes. There is bipartisan support for turning over this material, including the memos prepared by Director Comey.

(Mr. LEE assumed the Chair.)

Today Senators GRASSLEY, FEINSTEIN, GRAHAM, and WHITEHOUSE sent a letter to the FBI and White House Counsel requesting these documents. Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand the importance of doing our jobs to get to the bottom of this. The ongoing bipartisan Intelligence Committee investigation is vital to addressing the covert and classified aspects of Russian interference, but we also need transparency because the American people deserve to know as much as possible about what happened and how we are going to prevent it in the future.

That is why I fully support the Judiciary Committee hearings that Sen-

ators GRAHAM and WHITEHOUSE have held in the Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism. I also believe, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, that if the Director is to testify—former Director Comey—he should come before the Judiciary Committee because these are matters related to his service as an FBI Director. They are related to the justice system, to the criminal justice system, and we should hear from him.

I hope Senator GRASSLEY has requested that he come before our committee. I am aware that the Intelligence Committee also would like him to come, but I think it is important, given the substance of what is at issue here. Yes, he should appear before Intelligence about ongoing matters related to the Russian investigation, but there is also the issue of the fact that he was fired. We heard one thing in a memo from the Justice Department, we heard one thing from the White House, we heard another thing from the White House, and then we heard another thing from the President. That is all true. We need to get to the bottom of this.

On Monday, Republican Senator BOB CORKER said that the administration was in a “downward spiral.” He used the word “chaos.” That was before we even knew that the President may have urged the FBI Director to end the Russia investigation and put reporters in prison. This is an unprecedented time in our country's history.

The Presiding Officer, having written a book on the Constitution, knows that one of our jobs is to stand by that Constitution. Yet we are witnessing a singular moment of constitutional and democratic unease.

On this day in 1973, the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities began televised hearings on Watergate. One week later, Professor Archibald Cox was sworn in as special Watergate prosecutor. Like Director Comey, who was leading the investigation into Russian interference in our election, Archibald Cox was eventually fired by the President for doing his job. The night that Archibald Cox was fired by President Nixon for investigating Watergate, he said: “Whether ours shall continue to be a government of laws and not of men is now for Congress and ultimately the American people.” He was right.

The American people deserve a thorough, independent investigation into whether this administration obstructed justice and the extent of Russia's interference in the 2016 Presidential election. They need to know it because we are a democracy. We don't hide things like this. We get the facts. We get the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. That is what our democracy is about, and that is what our justice system is about. But they also need to know it because our democracy is the

basis of our freedoms. If we don't protect our democracy in the coming elections, then we hurt those freedoms. The only way we figure out how we are going to protect that democracy is getting to the bottom of the truth, so we can figure out how to prevent it from happening in the future. This is not a partisan issue; this is an American issue, and Americans deserve answers.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID HANKERSON AND DAVID CONNELL

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, we debate a lot of heavy things in the United States Senate. We make tough decisions. Decisions of the fate of our country lie in the balance. But day in and day out, sometimes we go an entire day or week without talking about the people who make America work: the entrepreneurs, the employees, the employers, the people who run the businesses, pay the taxes, and employ the citizens who make this country go.

Today, I rise to talk about two citizens from my home county, Cobb County. First is David Hankerson. David announced this week his retirement after being employed by our county for 33 years. He came to the community development department of the county 33 years ago, and 11 years later, he became the first county manager of the county and served in that position for a record 24 years. During that time, the county doubled, not just in its population, but tripled and quadrupled in its revenue. It did new and different and innovative things. As tax rates went down, productivity went up. Its popularity as a place to locate became preeminent. He is one of the shining stars in the State of Georgia today, in Cobb County.

I rise for a special reason to pay tribute to David Hankerson, however, because he represents something I was a part of in 1984. At the time he was being hired, I did not know him as an employee for the county; I was in the State legislature, trying to change the government for our county from an elected CEO to an appointed county manager, a professional operator of the county. That had not been done in Georgia. In other parts of the country, it had been done successfully. You had continuity of leadership—someone whose job was to be a good leader, who wasn't an elected politician, someone who could do the job.

David Hankerson was hired to do that job in Cobb County, GA. He did one of the most remarkable jobs anyone has ever done. In fact, the great testimony is that every year since he was there—24 years ago as county manager—someone has tried to hire him away from Cobb County. Every year he decided to stay because he once had said: I have made a commitment. As

long as the commitment is returned by the community to me, I am going to stay and see it through.

On this day, as I rise on the floor of the U.S. Senate to pay tribute to David Hankerson, I pay tribute equally to all those who make our government work, our businesses work, our communities work, and our country work, to the men and women laboring in the fields and toiling in the vineyards, working in the shops, working in the offices who make America the great country it is today, and to the great chambers of commerce that make it happen as well.

I pay great tribute to David Hankerson and thank him for the contribution and sacrifice he made to the people of Cobb County, GA, and the State of Georgia.

Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to one other Georgian, the retiring chairman and CEO of the Cobb County Chamber of Commerce, David Connell. This is the kind of guy you really appreciate. He worked for 40 years at the Georgia Power Company. He had 12 different titles in 40 years. He was a great employee of that company, a great member of the community of Cobb County, a great private citizen, and great personal friend of mine.

After 40 years of working there and retiring, the county had a big problem. The chamber of commerce had a scandal. It couldn't find a leader and was losing its effectiveness. David volunteered to go in as a chamber board member and spent 1 year as chamber leader. He stayed there 15 years and led the chamber to new heights unprecedented in our State and in our county: an AAA bond rating in our county, new businesses coming and relocating, and even the now-famous relocation of the Atlanta Braves from downtown Atlanta to suburban Cobb County—one of the rare moves a professional team has ever made smoothly and easily. They made it because of David Connell.

David will tell you that when the chamber board found out the Braves were interested in maybe talking about building a \$750 million facility in the county, they asked David if he would stay until that was accomplished. He made the commitment to do so, and it took 3½ years—3½ long years. It was a lot of effort, all in a circuitous nature because of the popularity of the Braves and what would have happened had it gotten out as a rumor that they were coming.

David closed that deal this year. The Braves opened this season in a new stadium. With three-quarters of a billion dollar investment having been made, the county is more prosperous. David Connell made it happen.

He announced this week that he is retiring after 40 years at the power company and 15 years at the Cobb County Chamber of Commerce.

I want to take a moment on the floor of the Senate to say thank you to David Connell for what he has done for our county and our community, for our citizens and our families, and how proud I am as one of his friends. I thank him for a job well done.

David, thank you. We are proud of you. God bless you, and God bless the United States of America.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

WELCOMING BACK SENATOR ISAKSON

Mr. GARDNER. Thank you, Mr. President.

It is great to have our colleague from Georgia on the floor of the Senate once again, doing the outstanding job that he has always done for the people of Georgia, recognizing the great individuals back home who make Georgia such a great State, and we are just blessed to have him here. I thank him for his continued service for the people of Georgia and the people of this country.

WELL WISHES TO SENATOR TILLIS

I am also grateful to be standing at a desk that is next to the desk of our colleague THOM TILLIS, the Senator from North Carolina. I am glad he is "up and at 'em" today after a little bit of a startle this morning.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. President, I rise to talk about the sea of blue that is in Washington, DC, this week. Monday was National Police Day. This week, we celebrate National Police Week. Law enforcement personnel—men and women from around the country—are in Washington to share their incredible commitment, their stories of sacrifice, courage, and the work they have done to protect our communities. Indeed, they are the frontlines of protection for our communities.

These incredible men and women in Colorado and across the country put their lives on the line each and every day to keep us safe.

They put their lives on the line each and every day to keep us safe. While they don't do this work—this sacrifice, this commitment—selfishly or for credit or recognition, I think all of us in the Senate this week join together when we say that we are happy to see so many of them in the Nation's Capital for this National Police Week.

I will never forget one time when we were out in Colorado and we were at a September 11 commemoration service. Our son Thatcher—he is 5 years old now; at the time, he was probably about 4 years old. It was just last year that we walked by a group of police officers who were there working that day. We were talking about the loss of so many first responders and law enforcement personnel and that September 11 day in 2001, so many years ago now, it seems. But I remember telling our son Thatcher—I said: Thatcher,

what do we say to police officers? I was thinking his response would be, thank you. I said: You should go tell them that. You should go tell that to the police officer.

He walked up to the police officer and he got a little nervous—4 years old. I said: What do you say, Thatcher? Again, I was thinking he would say: Thank you. Instead, he looked up at the police officer and he said: You are a hero.

It kind of choked me up a little bit. I didn't say that to him; that was something that this 4 year old knew instinctively—knew from the work they had done around communities, the conversations he has been a part of. At 4 years old, he knew the work they do to protect us.

They are heroes. They show the highest amount of courage one can imagine. They run toward danger without hesitation to keep us safe and to protect our communities.

We ask an incredible amount of our law enforcement time and again. They are answering the call, whether that is a call wondering why someone hasn't moved a car for several days, a call to do a wellness check or maybe to ask why they haven't heard from an elderly relative or maybe a call because they saw a broken window and they are concerned about what is happening inside.

We call on them each and every day to protect our communities. While we honor and celebrate the men and women protecting us this week, we must also remember our fallen heroes. Their courage is unparalleled. They went to work each and every day facing risks that most of us find unimaginable, never expecting their end of watch to occur on that day.

In Colorado and across the country last year, tragedy struck far too many times. Last year, Colorado lost three men in the line of duty, three men who will never be forgotten by the people of Colorado or their families, their communities.

Earlier this week, I met with the family of one of these fallen heroes, Corporal Nate Carrigan. Nate Carrigan, a sheriff's deputy for Park County, was a role model in the community and someone who took great pride in protecting the people and the area he loved. The pride and love Nate's family have for the work their son did to keep his community safe is unexplainable.

We also lost a sheriff's deputy, Derek Geer, this past year in Colorado, and we lost Cody Donahue in Colorado in 2016. All of them were memorialized this week. We celebrated their lives this week, and I hope their families know and recognize that we will always hold them and their loved ones in our prayers. They will always be a part of our community's fabric, knowing each and every day we rely on them to provide our own families with protection.

Mr. President, thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Rachel Brand's nomination to the No. 3 spot in the Justice Department. Now, there are many reasons I am opposed to this nomination, but those reasons are all grounded in a central question facing America today: Whom does this government work for? Does it work just for the rich and powerful? Does it work just for the well connected? Does it work just for the billionaire in the White House or does it work for everyone?

One of the worst kept secrets in America is that there are two justice systems; one for the rich and powerful and one for everyone else. The first justice system is an exclusive club for giant corporations and wealthy individuals. In that justice system, serious crimes are punished with a slap on the wrist and a small fine. Taxpayers bail out corporations that stole the life savings, and wealthy criminals go back to their lives without missing a beat.

The second justice system is for those who can't buy their way out of prison time. In that system, minor, nonviolent offenses are punished with harsh prison sentences. When those individuals are eventually released, they are branded with the scarlet letter that closes doors to employment and opportunity. It is a system that swallows up people whole and spits them out with nothing.

Americans are very familiar with the difference between those two justice systems. We saw the difference after the worst financial crisis in a generation, when Wall Street tycoons who gambled away the life savings of working Americans walked away free as a bird. We saw it in the War on Drugs when countless Black and Brown people were shoveled into prisons, where they wasted their lives away.

We need to fix this problem. We should be devoting every resource we have to fixing this problem. That starts with the Justice Department, the agency responsible for ensuring that nobody is above the law, and everyone—everyone—is held accountable.

Unfortunately, it has been pretty clear to me for some time now that President Trump's Justice Department is pushing as hard as possible in the opposite direction. For much of President Obama's second term, prosecutors were allowed some discretion to consider the unique circumstances of each case and make a measured decision about when to ask for the most serious charge with the maximum penalty or when to ask for less.

It worked. Jail time for low-level drug offenses went down. States saved money, and lives were not irretrievably broken. Last week, that modest advance came to an end. Attorney Gen-

eral Sessions directed prosecutors to charge individuals with the harshest sentences possible. "Lock them up" seems to be his approach—but not in all cases. Jeff Sessions sings a very different tune when it comes to white-collar crime. He believes corporations should not be punished for the actions of their executives. Don't punish the companies for a few bad CEO apples.

In Jeff Session's world, we should throw the book at criminals, unless they are rich and powerful. Now, President Trump has chosen to somewhat help Jeff Sessions carry out his vision. His choice to be the third highest ranking official at the Justice Department is Rachel Brand, the nominee for Associate Attorney General.

She is well equipped to carry out that soft-on-white-collar-crime approach. She has extensive experience—years of experience—fighting on behalf of the biggest and richest companies in the world. She spent years leading the Chamber of Commerce's assault on the rules that protect working families, evidently deciding time after time that it is corporations that should get every break.

As the head of regulatory litigation of the chamber of commerce, Ms. Brand worked to dismantle environmental rules that prevent companies from poisoning our air and water. She worked to shield financial companies from accountability when they broke the law or did not play by the rules. She worked to end the employment rules that prevent companies from abusing their workers.

If she is confirmed to the No. 3 spot at the Justice Department, she can watch out for giant corporations from her perch right inside the government. The Brand nomination is just another predictable move from a President who clearly believes that one set of rules should apply to the rich and powerful, and another set of rules should apply to everyone else.

We all remember Donald Trump's promise during the campaign that he was going to drain the swamp. Well, it is 118 days in, and the swamp is bigger, deeper, uglier, and filled with more corrupt creatures than ever. Over the last several days, President Trump has made it perfectly clear that he believes he should be above the law.

After he fired FBI Director James Comey, Trump went on national television and told the world that he fired Comey, in part, because Comey was leading an investigation into ties between the Trump campaign, the Trump administration, and Russia. Trump said top of mind when he fired Comey was "this Russia thing with Trump."

Now we have learned that he apparently pressured Comey in private meetings to drop aspects of the Russia investigation before he fired him. It is a basic presumption of our democracy that politicians cannot interfere with

the law enforcement investigations into their own potential wrongdoing, but President Trump openly admitted trying to interfere with an ongoing investigation, and he clearly believes there should be no consequences for himself.

I understand that President Trump thinks he should be able to decide what investigations into his dealings go forward and what investigations get stopped on the spot. I understand that President Trump thinks he should be able to pack his Justice Department full of people who will watch out for billionaire CEOs and giant corporations. After all, he has packed other agencies with similar people.

I understand that is what President Trump thinks, but he is wrong. One of the things that makes our democracy strong is that we believe no one is above the law, not CEOs, not giant corporations, and not the President of the United States. It is up to the Senate to remind the President of that fact. We can start by rejecting the nomination of Rachel Brand to serve as Associate Attorney General. I ask everyone who believes in the promise of equal justice under the law to do the same.

(The remarks of Ms. WARREN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1162 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. WARREN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

VENEZUELA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak about an emerging crisis in our hemisphere in the nation of Venezuela. It has been covered extensively in the press. I wanted to come today with an update and a suggestion, a request of the administration about a step we can take.

First of all, I am very pleased that today our Ambassador to the United Nations, Nikki Haley, scheduled a discussion at the U.N. Security Council with regard to Venezuela. It was not an open press discussion. Again, it showed extraordinary leadership, and I thank her for her work and for doing so. This deserves attention.

By the way, Venezuela is a country that is blessed with natural resources. It was once Latin America's richest country, but today the people of Venezuela are literally starving, its financial system has collapsed, and there are, as you have seen from the press reports, massive protests in the streets. Its once proud democracy is now in the hands of a dictator, Nicolas Maduro, and his cronies and thugs, who have plunged that nation into a constitutional crisis. They are using violence and bloodshed to suppress and silence citizens speaking out against the regime's corruption and its abuse of political prisoners.

What the people of Venezuela are calling for is pretty straightforward:

free and fair elections as called for under the Constitution of that country, a return to representative democracy—the democracy they once had. They are paying for these requests with their blood and even their lives. According to the most recent reports, dozens of people have been killed, including teenagers. The Washington Post reported yesterday the recent deaths of 18-year-old Luis Alviarez, who was killed by a bullet to the chest, and 17-year-old Yeison Mora Cordero, who died from a bullet to the head.

There were two reports today in the press of great interest, one from the New York Times and one from the Washington Post. Both documented the plight of members of the national guard who have been tasked with the job of suppressing the protests in the street. The gist of the articles was this: These people who are putting on these uniforms—they didn't sign up for this. They signed up for security. They signed up to protect the people of Venezuela, not to oppress them.

They, too, are suffering from poor food. There was one article that said that basically breakfast in the morning for the national guard in Venezuela consists of a boiled carrot or a potato, and then they are sent to the streets for hours. Then they come back and maybe have an arepa, which is a corn cake, and, if they are lucky, some butter. They, too, are suffering from this.

Here is the most enlightening part of this: A lot of their family members—their mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, loved ones, husbands, wives, girlfriends, and boyfriends—are on the other side of the protest lines. Their fellow Venezuelans are on the other side, and they are being tasked to do this.

I just say to them: Remember what your oath was. To the members of the national guard in Venezuela, remember that your job is to protect the people of Venezuela, not to oppress them.

Beyond what we see there—the innocent people dying because of the dictatorship trampling the will of the people and destroying their democratic institutions—one of the specific things that Maduro has done to become a dictator is he has undercut and frankly tried to wipe out the authority of their National Assembly, which is their unicameral legislative body. The way he has done that is by highjacking the supreme court of the country, and they call it the Supreme Tribunal of Justice. It is packed with puppets who do his bidding. As an example, these puppets recently ruled that they would rescind the democratic powers vested to the elected members of the National Assembly by the constitution of that country. In essence, they ruled that the National Assembly no longer had legislative authority. The protests were so massive, even within the government, that they had to backtrack from that ruling.

Here is what is interesting. This is a recent opinion piece written by Francis Toro and Pedro Rosas in the Washington Post which said it best: "Be ware Maikel Moreno, the hatchet man who runs Venezuela's supreme court."

Here is what they wrote:

Moreno, a former intelligence agent, was tried and convicted of murder in 1987, though the corroborating documents from the court system are no longer available. . . . He spent just two years in jail before being released. He was then immediately implicated in a second killing, in 1989, for which he was charged but never tried.

He was a loyalist of Hugo Chavez, and he became a judge in the early 2000s. His "career as a judge hit a snag in 2007," Toro and Rosas note, "when he was removed from the bench for 'grave and inexcusable' errors after releasing two murder suspects against orders from the Supreme Tribunal. The government handed him a new job as a diplomat abroad. After a few years out of sight, he was appointed a supreme court justice in 2014."

Then in 2017, Moreno—not once but twice a killer—was appointed the chief justice of Venezuela's supreme court. The Venezuelan supreme court is run by a murderer. Think about that. A convicted criminal is presiding over Venezuela's supreme court. So it is no wonder that the court's members have acted as a rubberstamp for Maduro's illegitimate power grab, and they have created a political and a humanitarian crisis.

Venezuelans, as I said, are struggling to get basic goods, like food and medicine, and access to basic services. The Wall Street Journal reported that Venezuelans have lost, on average, 19 pounds in the last year—not due to some incredible new diet, but due to the country's food crisis. This is staggering. It is appalling. It is unconscionable. It cannot be tolerated.

The Venezuelan people deserve a return to democracy. They deserve a government that respects the rule of law and the constitution.

I believe it is the responsibility and the duty of the nations of the Western Hemisphere, including our Nation, to help the Venezuelan people. Article 20 of the Inter-American Democratic Charter states:

In the event of an unconstitutional alteration of the constitutional regime that seriously impairs the democratic order in a member state, any member state or the Secretary General may request the immediate convocation of the Permanent Council to undertake a collective assessment of the situation and to take such decisions as it deems appropriate.

This is what must be done because if we fail to help the Venezuelan people in their time of need and if the worst comes to pass, what will follow will not be confined to the Venezuelan borders.

The United States as a result, I hope, should impose sanctions against corrupt individuals—not the government,

not the people; individuals—responsible for human rights violations, narcotics trafficking, money laundering, undermining the country's democratic process. President Obama began that process. President Trump actually sanctioned some additional people earlier this year, including the kingpin drug dealer who is now the Vice President of Venezuela, Tareck El Aissami.

Here are some people who should be sanctioned by the current President. He should target for sanctions Chavista officials within the judiciary—all of these magistrates who have enabled Maduro's takeover. That includes the murderer who is the chief justice of their supreme court, Maikel Jose Moreno Perez, and others like him who are part of that so-called constitutional group within the supreme court of Venezuela, many of whom have access to money and use visas to travel freely within the United States. Among these names are Calixto Ortega, Arcadio Delgado, Federico Fuenmayor, Carmen Zuleta, Lourdes Suarez Anderson, and Juan Jose Mendoza. These are the people who have helped in this coup d'etat that has canceled the democratic order in Venezuela, and they should be punished for what they have done.

I will close by pointing to two things that are of deep concern. The first is this report today in *El Nuevo Herald* in Miami, which basically cites that Maduro has now ordered the militarization of a border region with Colombia. We are concerned about that because we have always feared he would create some sort of a military pretext to distract people from the crisis within the country.

Then there is this unusual behavior on the part of Maduro. For example, yesterday he said that the Chavistas—the followers of Hugo Chavez—are the new Jews of the 21st century. Basically he is comparing the Chavistas with the Jews who were exterminated during the Holocaust in World War II. These comments were broadcast on state television last night. It is incredible.

By the way, this is the same man who about a week ago was caught on camera, with a straight face, asking a cow to vote for a constitutional referendum he is seeking to pass. I don't even think the cow would support him at this point in Venezuela.

Mr. President, I hope President Trump in the next few days or weeks will act against these individuals who have carried out this coup d'etat against democracy in Venezuela and have plunged this proud nation and proud people into a constitutional, humanitarian, and economic crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the nomination of Rachel

Brand to be the Associate Attorney General.

The Associate Attorney General is the third-most senior position at the Department of Justice. During these troubling times, I cannot in good conscience support Ms. Brand's nomination.

The American public must have faith in its institutions, and unfortunately that trust is eroding more and more each and every day. For the first time in recent history, we are facing questions about a significant interference from a foreign government in an American Presidential election. Even more troubling, there have been serious questions about a Presidential campaign's potential collusion with Russia, a foreign adversary.

We have an idea of the potential problem here, and the Justice Department is supposed to be a part of the solution. Unfortunately, the recent conduct of the President's appointees to the Department of Justice have only added fuel to the fire.

First, Attorney General Jeff Sessions failed to reveal his communication with the Russians during his confirmation hearings. This omission led him to publicly pledge to recuse himself from Russia-related investigations.

Then, in an inexplicable turn of events, the Deputy Attorney General and the Attorney General advised the President to fire former FBI Director Jim Comey, who we know was in the midst of investigating the Trump campaign's relationship with Russia. Let me be clear: That was a firing that the President himself admitted was related to "the Russia thing."

Then the day after firing Director Comey, the President revealed highly classified information to Russian officials during a meeting in the Oval Office—a meeting that, I may add, was closed to the American press but oddly included only the Russian press.

You simply can't make this stuff up. The level of turmoil and the questionable behavior on the part of this administration are deeply disturbing, not just for Americans but for our allies all across the globe.

We are currently lurching from crisis to crisis, and we must pause for a moment and consider what is at stake; namely, the security and the future of our democracy.

My Democratic colleagues and I have repeatedly called for a special prosecutor to take over all of the Russia-related investigations, and recent events show that the need for a special prosecutor is greater now more than ever. It is time to put country over politics, and it is time for a transparent and thorough investigation into these concerns. If there is no wrongdoing, then the President should not be concerned about getting the American people the truth they deserve. Our constituents need to have their faith re-

stored in our institutions and that will require transparency, integrity, and professionalism from officials at the Department of Justice.

I joined the vast majority of my colleagues in supporting the confirmation of Rod Rosenstein to serve as Deputy Attorney General with the belief that he would bring a voice of reason to the Department of Justice. The results have been, needless to say, disappointing. With the current state of this Justice Department, I have no reason to believe Ms. Brand will fare much better.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider the very real challenges we face. This is not an issue of partisan politics or the outcome of a past election; this is about protecting the sanctity of our democracy from outside threats.

I believe we absolutely must work together to restore the credibility and the independence of the Justice Department. Until we have an independent special prosecutor and until we are confident that the Attorney General is truly honoring his recusal on the Russia investigation, I cannot support another senior political nomination to this Justice Department.

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, in light of National Police Week, I rise today in support of our men and women serving in law enforcement.

Police week is a good time for reflection and remembrance. It is a time to honor those who serve and protect us. While we honor our dedicated law enforcement officers this week, I want, specifically, to recognize those fallen officers who have given the ultimate sacrifice—their lives—for our safety.

In Arizona we lost three officers this year: Officer Leander Frank of the Navajo Nation Police Department, Officer David Van Glasser of the Phoenix Police Department, and Officer Darrin Reed of the Show Low Police Department. Today we honor the memory of these fallen heroes and pledge to never forget their sacrifice.

While the work we do in Congress pales in comparison to the service of these brave men and women, it is my privilege to sponsor several pieces of legislation to support our law enforcement officers. I have joined with Senator HATCH to introduce the Rapid DNA Act, a bill that gives State and local law enforcement agencies a way to upload a suspect's DNA analysis to a Federal offender database for immediate identification. This immediate cross-hit within the Federal system will help officers at the local level to process criminals faster and more accurately.

I have also teamed up with Senator FEINSTEIN to introduce the bipartisan

Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act. That legislation criminalizes the failure to report to law enforcement incidents of suspected child abuse in amateur athletics. In addition to helping prevent sexual abuse crimes, this bill will aid State and local law enforcement investigating allegations of child sexual abuse by providing them with more information faster.

I have also supported Senator CORNYN's American Law Enforcement Heroes Act. That bill affirms a well-established practice of hiring veterans at the local level to serve as new law enforcement officers. Together, these bills will enhance law enforcement investigations and encourage better hiring practices for new law enforcement jobs.

I also want to recognize the local police officers and sheriffs in Arizona, along with those on the border who are serving on the frontlines of immigration enforcement. These men and women put their lives on the line every time they go out on patrol. For them, immigration policy is not a hypothetical exercise.

Despite the critical role these entities play in assisting their Federal partners with immigration enforcement, current Federal policy leaves them exposed to the threat of costly litigation. That is because third-party groups that oppose detention have threatened local agencies that choose to comply with valid detainer requests with lawsuits. Using punitive legal action to punish law enforcement for good-faith efforts to keep people safe is wrong. That is why a group of Arizona sheriffs came to me for help, and with their guidance, we drafted a bill requiring the Department of Homeland Security to protect State and local law enforcement entities from lawsuits that uphold valid detainer requests from ICE. This solution will enable officers to fulfill their law enforcement responsibilities without second-guessing whether or not to keep potentially dangerous criminal aliens in custody. It is a recognition that local law enforcement shouldn't be left to shoulder the burden of Washington's failure to secure our borders and to implement a workable enforcement policy.

It has been my privilege to work on this effort with the Arizona Sheriffs Association, the Western States Sheriffs' Association, the Southwest Border Sheriff's Coalition, and the Texas Border Sheriff's Coalition. I want especially to thank Sheriff Mascher of Yavapai County, Sheriff Daniels of Cochise County, Sheriff Wilmot of Yuma County, and Sheriff Clark of Navajo County for their work on this bill.

To many, Police Week is an annual opportunity to recognize the service of the many selfless men and women in law enforcement, but it should also serve as a solemn reminder of the risks

they take and the sacrifices they make day in and day out. It is for this that they have my support, my respect, and my thanks, and they have it year-round.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, thank you for the opportunity to visit this evening with my Senate colleagues.

This is a special week in Washington, DC, and a number of my colleagues have paid tribute by attending the memorial or speaking of those who died in service as fallen police officers. This is our fallen officers' National Police Week.

In 1962, Congress and the then-President John F. Kennedy designated May 15 of each year to be Peace Officers Memorial Day, and the week of May 15 to be National Police Week. Each spring, we take time to recall the men and women of law enforcement who were lost in the previous year. Unfortunately, this list has become far, far too long.

Since our Nation's founding, more than 20,000 American law enforcement officers have sacrificed their lives in service to others. While I have paid many solemn visits to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, DC, to honor, respect, and remember fallen officers, my visit this year was especially somber. In 2016, Kansas suffered the loss of three law enforcement officials.

On the Senate floor today, I wish to recognize and to honor these fallen heroes: Detective Brad Lancaster of the Kansas City Police Department, Captain Robert "Dave" Melton of the Kansas City Police Department, and Master Deputy Sheriff Brandon Collins of the Johnson County Sheriff's Office. Their untimely deaths shook their families, the agencies where these men served, the neighborhoods they protected, and the communities they lived in. Brandon, Robert, and Brad were not only law enforcement officers, they were also sons and brothers, fathers, neighbors, mentors, and friends.

Robert Melton, Brad Lancaster, and Brandon Collins and the 140 other officers killed in the line of duty in 2016 are being honored this week in our Nation's Capital. The names of these fallen heroes will be physically inscribed into the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, set in stone as an eternal reminder to the Nation of the service of these men and the debt we owe for their sacrifice on our behalf. That debt, of course, can never be repaid, but it is certainly our duty to try.

As Americans honor these men during National Police Week, we must also remember their families, friends, and fellow officers and the loved ones they left behind. May God comfort them in their time of grief and be a source of

strength for them. May He also protect all those who continue to serve and to stand today in harm's way to protect our communities.

An inscription at the memorial reads: "In valor there is hope." The losses of Brad Lancaster, Robert Melton, and Brandon Collins have imposed tremendous sorrow, but our memory of their service to others and their acts of valor offer Americans hope and inspiration to carry on their missions, to better our communities, to protect the vulnerable, and to stand for what is right. As we remember, let us tirelessly pursue those ends and do all we can to honor the fallen.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

REMEMBERING WILBURN K. ROSS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to remember a noble Kentuckian and a decorated World War II veteran, Wilburn K. Ross, who passed away on May 9, 2017, just days before his 95th birthday. A native of Strunk, KY, Ross was awarded the highest decoration in the U.S. military, the Medal of Honor.

As a private, Ross gained national acclaim for his service in St. Jacques, France, on October 30, 1944. His company lost 55 of its 88 members fighting a group of German mountain troops. Ross' light machine gun was about 10 yards ahead of his supporting riflemen. As intense enemy fire fell around him, Ross repelled the enemy through seven German attacks. When the next attack came, many of his supporting rifleman had run out of ammunition. As his Medal of Honor citation read, "Pvt. Ross fought on virtually without assistance and, despite the fact that enemy grenadiers crawled to within 4 yards of his position in an effort to kill him with handgrenades, he again directed accurate and deadly fire on the hostile force and hurled it back." During the 5 hours of fighting, Ross killed or wounded at least 58 Germans and saved his brothers in arms.

Ross reenlisted in the Army to see action in Korea, serving another two decades. He retired from Active Duty in 1964 at the rank of master sergeant. He was awarded the Medal of Honor, "[f]or conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at risk of life above and beyond the call of duty."

Although he moved to DuPont, WA, after his retirement from the U.S.

Army, Ross made a trip back to his hometown in Kentucky nearly every year on his birthday. In his own words, he enjoyed coming back to the Commonwealth because, “[e]verybody here treats me well.”

He turned down offers to make his life into a Hollywood film, but Ross has been memorialized on a U.S. Postal Service stamp and by a section of Kentucky Route 92 in his home county. In 2014, Ross was a member of the inaugural class admitted to the Kentucky Veterans Hall of Fame.

Like so many other members of the Greatest Generation, Wilburn Ross answered the call to defend our Nation. Through his bravery and sacrifice, he helped secure freedom across the globe. The story of his courageous actions and selfless service will continue to be told, both in McCreary County and across the Commonwealth. Elaine and I send our condolences to his family and friends.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today, with great humility during National Police Week, I wish to recognize the brave men and women of law enforcement across the country. These individuals have answered the call to serve and every day they put their lives on the line to keep our communities safe. I especially want to honor those who have lost their lives in the line of duty and observe the sacrifices of their families.

First, I especially want to recognize three law enforcement officers who lost their lives in New Jersey last year. These three men made the ultimate sacrifice for their communities, and we owe them and their families our sincerest respect. On July 1, 2016, the New Jersey Department of Corrections lost Nikeelan “Nick” Semmon. On March 7, 2016, the New Jersey State Police lost Sean Cullen. On December 5, 2016, the New Jersey State Police also lost Frankie Williams.

These officers dedicated their lives to protecting our communities, and they served our State with valor and integrity. I feel privileged to call them fellow New Jerseyans, and my thoughts and prayers continue to be with the family and friends of these brave public servants. As we continue to mourn and remember Officer Semmon, Trooper Cullen, and Trooper Williams, let us pledge to honor their sacrifice by working every day to emulate their devotion to public service through acts of service and love.

It is in that spirit that I want to talk about the important work that still needs to be done to support law enforcement. Congress plays a critical role in supporting law enforcement, both at the Federal level and at the State and local level. There are few bills I want to mention that I believe

we must pass to uphold our commitment to brave men and women in law enforcement.

First, on February 16, 2017, I introduced the bipartisan Law Enforcement Officers’ Equity Act. Unfortunately, due to a technical error, nearly 30,000 Federal law enforcement officers classified as GS-0083 police officers did not receive enhanced benefits under the U.S. Code. For example, certain officers who work for Federal agencies, such as the Department of Defense, Department of Veterans Affairs, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Postal Service, U.S. Mint, National Institute of Health and many more, receive lower pensions as compared to other law enforcement officers with similar responsibilities.

The Law Enforcement Officers’ Equity Act would expand the definition of “law enforcement officer” for retirement purposes to include all Federal law enforcement officers. The change would grant law enforcement officer status to the following individuals: employees who are authorized to carry a firearm and whose duties include the investigation and/or apprehension of suspected criminals; employees of the Internal Revenue Service whose duties are primarily the collection of delinquent taxes and securing delinquent returns; employees of the U.S. Postal Inspection Service; and employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs who are department police offices. These officers face the same risks and challenges as the men and women currently classified properly under Federal law as law enforcement officers, and they deserve the same benefits. We must pass this bill.

I am also a proud cosponsor of the Children of Fallen Heroes Scholarship Act. This legislation would increase the amount of Pell grant funds available to children of fallen law enforcement officers, firefighters, EMS workers, and fire police. First responders across the country put their lives on the line every day to keep us safe. When most people are running away from danger, they are running towards it. For those who put themselves in danger on a daily basis, we must honor their sacrifice and support their families in times of tragedy. Helping children of first responders pay for an education is the least we can do to honor the sacrifice of someone who fell in the line of duty. We must pass this bill.

I am also a cosponsor of the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017, which I am pleased to say passed the Senate yesterday. We all know the stress and unique challenges police officers across our Nation face in doing their jobs. They risk their lives and are often exposed to traumatizing incidents. The Federal Government must do all it can to support police who suffer from trauma or other mental health issues due to the rigors and

dangers of their job. The Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017 would direct the Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Resources to provide support to State and local law enforcement to access mental healthcare services and make sure that hotlines are available for officers who are in need of help. I hope the House of Representatives takes up this bill soon and passes it.

I am proud to sponsor the Law Enforcement Officers’ Equity Act and cosponsor the Children of Fallen Heroes Scholarship Act and Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act. There is so much work for us to do to live up to our commitment to law enforcement across the country, and I am committed to continuing to work with my colleagues on these critical issues. Thank you.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, along with my dad, Clair, who started our family homebuilding business 45 years ago, I wish to congratulate the National Association of Home Builders on reaching its 75th anniversary.

For three-quarters of a century, NAHB has been fighting for the American dream, advocating for those who want to own a home for themselves and their families and advocating for homebuilders who provide jobs and make the homeowners’ dreams a reality.

Before coming to Congress, I worked for my dad in our family homebuilding business, and I have great respect for the work their members do in our communities. They truly are job creators, economic drivers, and dream makers.

I have been happy to meet with some of their members when they have come to Capitol Hill. I can tell you that it is helpful to have face-to-face meetings with their team to talk about the issues that matter to them the most. Though I have a background in homebuilding, many congressional and Presidential staff do not. It makes a difference to hear from folks on the ground in their business.

When it comes to homebuilding and homeownership, we all share the same goal—let’s keep home prices affordable.

Their advocacy has enabled millions of American families, like mine, to make one of the most important purchases of their lives: a home.

As you know, when people achieve the American dream of homeownership, they are on the path to wealth creation and upward mobility, not to mention the sense of pride that comes with having a place to call their own.

That sense of pride overflows to the way people invest in their communities, and we all benefit from a more

engaged neighbor. As they know better than anyone and Sir Winston Churchill once said, “We shape our dwellings, and afterwards our dwellings shape us.”

When the times are good or times are tough and through the general cyclical nature of the industry, NAHB has remained a steady advocate for the importance of affordable and quality housing, both for homeowners and renters. Thanks in part to them, builders and consumers are back up on their feet.

I am grateful for their commitment to serving our Nation by building safe and beautiful homes, and I am grateful for the 75 years of advocacy from NAHB.

Congratulations again on achieving this major milestone.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA GRIZZLIES SOFTBALL TEAM

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week, I have the distinct honor of recognizing the University of Montana Grizzlies softball team for their outstanding performance at the Big Sky Conference softball tournament. This team has come a long way in a short time, and their journey this season is something that all Montanans can appreciate.

Last week at Ogden, UT, the Grizzlies won the Big Sky Conference softball championship for the first time in the school's history. This accomplishment is highlighted by the fact that the softball program is only in its third year on campus. Four years ago, there was no team or coach; today they are conference champions.

Jamie Pinkerton, the Grizzlies' coach, was also voted the Big Sky Conference “Coach of the Year” for the second year in a row.

As conference champions, the Grizzlies will represent Big Sky in the 2017 NCAA Division I softball championship this Friday as they travel to Washington to challenge the Huskies in the regional qualifying round. The Grizzlies will have both the Big Sky State and the Big Sky Conference rooting for them. •

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:06 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 510. An act to establish a system for integration of Rapid DNA instruments for use by law enforcement to reduce violent crime and reduce the current DNA analysis backlog.

H.R. 1428. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1616. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the National Computer Forensics Institute, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 510. An act to establish a system for integration of Rapid DNA instruments for use by law enforcement to reduce violent crime and reduce the current DNA analysis backlog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1428. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1616. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the National Computer Forensics Institute, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVILEGED NOMINATION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

On request by Senator FEINSTEIN, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Congress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Stephen Elliott Boyd, of Alabama, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Peter Joseph Kadzik.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-1571. A communication from the Director, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Competitive and Noncompetitive Non-formula Federal Assistance Programs—General Award Administrative Provisions and Specific Administrative Provisions” (RIN0524-AA69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1572. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of twenty-six (26) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general, as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1573. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General James K. McLaughlin, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1574. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pur-

suant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13611 of May 16, 2012, with respect to Yemen; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1575. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014, with respect to the Central African Republic; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1576. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, with respect to the blocking of property of certain persons and prohibition of exportation and re-exportation of certain goods to Syria; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1577. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1578. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Department of Energy Activities Relating to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Fiscal Year 2016”; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1579. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of the Treasury, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1580. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Distribution of Stock and Securities of a Controlled Corporation” (Rev. Rul. 2017-09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1581. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Syndicated Conservation Easement Transactions Identified in Notice 2017-10” (Notice 2017-29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1582. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Extension of Eligibility Rule Waivers for Certain Automatic Changes Made To Comply with the Final Tangible Property Regulations” (Rev. Proc. 2017-36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1583. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “2018 Sec. 223 Inflation-Adjusted Item” (Rev. Proc. 2017-37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1584. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "List of Automatic Changes in Method of Accounting" (Rev. Proc. 2017-30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1585. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Mexico to support the integration, installation, operation, training, testing, maintenance, and repair of the Star Safire 380 HD camera system in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-107); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1586. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms, parts, and accessories to Qatar under Category I of the United States Munitions List in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-125); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1587. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Japan to support the integration, installation, and maintenance of the F135 Propulsion System for the J-35 in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-136); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1588. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Italy to support the manufacture, operation, test integration, evaluation, installation, assembly, and maintenance of the G-2000 Dynamically Tuned Gyroscope product family that incorporate or operate the gyroscope for end-use on the Joint Strike Fighter Turret Stabilization, ASPIDE missile, and ASTER missile programs (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-083); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1589. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a Determination and Certification under Section 40A of the Arms Export Control Act relative to countries not cooperating fully with United States antiterrorism efforts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1590. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Labeling of standard Menu Items in Restaurants and Similar Retail Food Establishments; Extension of Compliance Date; Request for Comments" ((RIN0910-ZA48) (Docket No. FDA-2011-F-0172)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1591. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm

Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report on the Status of Audits for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1592. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report on the Status of Audits for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1593. A communication from the Acting Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to *TC Reiner v. Saginaw Valley State University*, et al.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1594. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Victims of Crime Act Victim Assistance Program" ((RIN1121-AA69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 8, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1595. A communication from the Chief of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Payment or Reimbursement for Certain Medical Expenses for Camp Lejeune Family Members" ((RIN2900-AA79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2017; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1596. A communication from the Chief of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Pharmacy Copayments for Medications" ((RIN2900-AP87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2017; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1597. A communication from the Acting Chief, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "The Establishment of Policies and Service Rules for the Broadcasting-Satellite Service at the 17.3-17.7 GHz Frequency Band Internationally, and at the 24.75-25.25 GHz Frequency Band for Fixed Satellite Services Providing Feeder Links to the Broadcasting-Satellite Service and for the Satellite Services Operating Bi-directionally in the 17.3-17.8 GHz Frequency Band" ((IB Doc. No. 06-123) (FCC 17-49)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1598. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.3555(e) of the Commission's Rules, National Television Multiple Ownership Rule" ((MB Doc. No. 13-236) (FCC 17-40)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1599. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Promoting Diversification of Ownership in the Broadcasting Services; Amendment of Part 1 of the

Commission's Rules, Concerning Practice and Procedure, Amendment of CORES Registration System" ((MB Docket No. 07-294) (MD Docket No. 10-234) (FCC 17-42)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1600. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Seaway Regulations and Rules: Periodic Update, Various Categories" ((RIN2135-AA42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1601. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Penalties" ((RIN2135-AA40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1602. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tariff of Tolls" ((RIN2135-AA41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1603. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, U.S. Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to certification granted in relation to the incidental capture of sea turtles in commercial shrimping operations; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1604. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and Indian Creek, Miami, FL" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0768)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 12, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1605. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Navy UNDET, Apra Outer Harbor and Piti, GU" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0214)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 12, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1606. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, PA" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0152)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 12, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1607. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Bush River, Harford County, MD" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0067)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 12, 2017; to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1608. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Hebda Cup Rowing Regatta; Detroit River, Trenton Channel; Wyandotte, MI" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0305)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 12, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1609. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Chapel Street over Mill River Bridge Rehabilitation—New Haven, CT" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0257)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 12, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-17. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan memorializing the United States Congress to repeal the standards set forth by the United States Environmental Protection Agency on portable fuel container design; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 38

Whereas, The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) adopted rules to limit emissions from portable fuel containers, such as gas cans, in 2007. The standard was meant to force design changes in fuel containers to reduce evaporation, permeation, and spillage and was part of a larger package on reducing toxic air emissions from mobile sources like passenger vehicles. Since 2009, all containers manufactured now need to be designed to meet these standards; and

Whereas, Portable fuel containers are responsible for a relatively small portion of toxic air emissions from mobile sources. In 1999, these containers accounted for only 2 percent of these emissions. The EPA projects that the new portable fuel container standard will account for 6 percent of the reduction in toxic air emissions under the 2007 rule. Passenger vehicles and gasoline regulations will account for 94 percent of projected reductions; and

Whereas, Gas cans and other portable fuel containers designed to meet the new standard do not work effectively and are a continual source of frustration for consumers. To meet the standard, containers are being designed without a vent, resulting in slow, uneven flow out of the cans; and

Whereas, The portable fuel container emissions standard is not an effective way to limit toxic air emissions. Containers that work improperly may result in more spills as users are paying more attention to getting gas out of the container than how much gas is in the tank. Frustrated users may resort to modifying the container to create a vent, eliminating any environmental benefit from the design, or using other containers illegally; and

Whereas, The portable fuel container standards are yet another example of the

EPA adopting regulations without properly accounting for real life use and impact. These regulations provide minimal environmental gain and make something as simple as filling a lawn mower tank an exercise in frustration; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to repeal the standards set forth by the United States Environmental Protection Agency on portable fuel container design; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation. Adopted by the House of Representatives, May 4, 2017.

POM-18. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota requesting the United States Congress and the President of the United States to enact legislation to expand and extend the current federal tax credit for carbon capture, utilization, and storage under Section 45Q of the Internal Revenue Code; to provide appropriations to the United States Department of Energy Sufficient to achieve and sustain a robust carbon capture research, development, demonstration, and deployment program; to support the inclusion of economically and environmentally beneficial carbon capture projects in any forthcoming federal infrastructure initiative; to support policies to increase the operational efficiency; and to support the preservation of a fuel-diverse electric generation portfolio critical to our domestic economic, energy, and national security; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 3037

Whereas, fossil fuels including coal, natural gas, and oil provide more than three-quarters of global and United States' primary energy demand and, according to the International Energy Agency, will continue to do so for the next quarter-century or more under current energy and environmental policies; and

Whereas, recognition of the value and enduring role of fossil fuels as an essential source of energy around the world and in the United States for decades to come has led environmental advocates to support the accelerated development and broad deployment of carbon capture technologies for fossil fuels as part of a sustainable energy future; and

Whereas, recognition of the role carbon capture can play in creating new opportunities for fossil fuels has led fossil energy advocates to similarly support the development and deployment of carbon capture technologies for fossil fuels; and

Whereas, the United States and North Dakota have abundant supplies of fossil energy, the production and use of which provide important economic, energy, and national security benefits to our nation and our state; and

Whereas, North Dakota is the nation's 6th largest producer of fossil energy, 2nd largest producer of oil, 2nd largest producer of lignite coal, 11th largest producer of natural gas, the largest consumer of coal for industrial use, and the 10th largest consumer of coal for electricity generation; and

Whereas, according to the Department of Energy, "A diverse portfolio of energy resources is critical to U.S. energy and national policy . . . being more robust and resilient in comparison to a system that is heavily dependent on a limited set of energy resources . . . [and] helps insulate the economy from certain risks, including price vola-

tility and risks from supply disruptions"; and

Whereas, reliable and affordable electricity is vital to economic growth and job creation in North Dakota and the overall welfare of our citizens; and

Whereas, 73 percent of the electricity generated in North Dakota is produced from fossil fuels and the average residential price of electricity in North Dakota is the 6th lowest in the nation and is 18 percent below the national average; and

Whereas, continued research and development of carbon reduction strategies for fossil fuels is an essential element of a forward-looking sustainable energy strategy for North Dakota, our nation, and the world which will simultaneously maximize both environmental quality and economic opportunity; and

Whereas, the Energy and Environmental Research Center at the University of North Dakota, the Great Plains Synfuels Plant in Beulah, and the Lignite Energy Council are engaged in efforts to address environmental, health, and economic impacts of energy production and use through collaborations on applied carbon dioxide research, practical applications, workforce development, and public education; and

Whereas, legislation was introduced in the 114th Congress to enhance and extend federal tax incentives, under Section 45Q of the Internal Revenue Code, which serve to sustain and promote such collaborations and to encourage private industry in energy generation, manufacturing, and agriculture to adopt and deploy existing and emerging technologies that increase carbon capture, utilization, and storage; and

Whereas, the coming together of environmental and energy advocates in support of carbon capture is reflected in the groundbreaking coalition of environmental advocacy groups, labor unions, and energy producers from the coal, oil and gas, ethanol, and algae-biomass industries working together in support of federal legislation; and

Whereas, similar legislation is now under consideration in the 115th Congress, and Congress and the President also are considering enactment of a large-scale federal infrastructure initiative to strengthen our nation's transportation, public works, and energy infrastructure that also could serve as a vehicle for advancing "jobs-ready" carbon capture projects; and

Whereas, according to the Department of Energy, "A combination of tax incentives and research, development, demonstration, and deployment will be critical to developing transformational carbon capture technologies and to driving down the costs of capture"; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein: That the Sixty-fifth Legislative Assembly requests Congress and the President of the United States to enact legislation to expand and extend the current federal tax credit for carbon capture, utilization, and storage under Section 45Q of the Internal Revenue Code; to provide appropriations to the United States Department of Energy sufficient to achieve and sustain a robust carbon capture research, development, demonstration, and deployment program; to support the inclusion of economically and environmentally beneficial carbon capture projects in any forthcoming federal infrastructure initiative; to support policies to increase the operational efficiency, and thereby the environmental performance, of existing electric-generating units in the United States; and to

support the preservation of a fuel-diverse electric generation portfolio critical to our domestic economic, energy, and national security; and be it further

Resolved, that the Secretary of State forward copies of this resolution by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the President of the United States, the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary of the United States Department of Energy, and to each member of the North Dakota Congressional Delegation.

POM-19. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Florida condemning the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement and the increasing incidence of acts of anti-Semitism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 1184

Whereas, Floridians have, as a matter of public policy, long opposed bigotry, oppression, discrimination, and injustice, and

Whereas, Florida and Israel have enjoyed a long history of friendship and are great allies, each supporting the best interests of the other, and

Whereas, the State of Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East, is the greatest friend and ally of the United States in the region, and

Whereas, the elected representatives of the state recognize the importance of expressing Florida's unwavering support for the Jewish people and the State of Israel's right to exist and right to self-defense, and

Whereas, the incidence of acts of anti-Semitism is increasing throughout the world, including in the United States and in Florida, and is reflected in official hate crime statistics, and

Whereas, the international Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement is one of the main vehicles for spreading anti-Semitic perspectives and advocating the elimination of the Jewish State, and

Whereas, the level of activities promoting BDS against Israel has increased in this state, in communities and on college campuses, and contributes to the promotion of anti-Semitic and anti-Zionist propaganda, and

Whereas, the increase in BDS campaign activities on college campuses nationwide has resulted in an increase in confrontations with, intimidation of, and discrimination against Jewish students, and

Whereas, leaders of the BDS movement express that their goal is to eliminate Israel as the national home of the Jewish people, and

Whereas, the BDS campaign's call for academic and cultural boycotts has been condemned by many of our nation's largest academic associations, more than 250 university presidents, and many other leading scholars as a violation of the bedrock principle of academic freedom. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida: That the Florida Senate condemns the international Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement against the State of Israel and calls upon the governmental institutions of this state to denounce hatred and discrimination whenever they appear and be it further

Resolved that the Florida Senate urges the President of the United States to order withdrawal of the United States Customs and Border Protection statement dated January 23, 2016, entitled "West Bank Country of Origin Marking Requirements," so that goods made in the West Bank can continue to be

properly labeled "Made in Israel." and be it further

Resolved that copies of this resolution be presented to the President of the United States, the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, and the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to the Embassy of Israel in Washington, D.C., for transmission to the proper authorities of the State of Israel as a tangible token of the sentiments expressed herein.

POM-20. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Florida opposing United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 and requesting its repeal or fundamental alteration; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 574

Whereas, the United States has long supported a negotiated settlement leading to a sustainable two-state solution with the democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a demilitarized, democratic Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security, and

Whereas, since 1993, the United States has facilitated direct, bilateral negotiations between both parties toward achieving a two-state solution and ending all outstanding claims, and

Whereas, it is the long-standing policy of the United States that a peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict will only come through direct, bilateral negotiations between the two parties, and

Whereas, it was the long-standing position of the United States to oppose and, if necessary, veto United Nations Security Council resolutions dictating additional binding parameters on the peace process, and

Whereas, it was also the long-standing position of the United States to oppose and, if necessary, veto one-sided or anti-Israel United Nations Security Council resolutions, and

Whereas, the United States has stood in the minority internationally over successive administrations in defending Israel in international forums, including vetoing one-sided resolutions in 1995, 1997, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2006, and 2011 before the United Nations Security Council, and

Whereas, the United States recently signed a new memorandum of understanding with the Israeli government regarding security assistance, consistent with long-standing support for Israel among successive administrations and Congresses and representing an important United States commitment toward Israel's qualitative military edge, and

Whereas, on November 29, 2016, the United States House of Representatives unanimously passed House Concurrent Resolution 165, expressing and reaffirming long-standing United States policy in support of a direct, bilaterally negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and in opposition to United Nations Security Council resolutions that impose a solution to the conflict, and

Whereas, on December 23, 2016, the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations disregarded House Concurrent Resolution 165 and departed from long-standing United States policy by abstaining and permitting United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to be adopted under Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter, and

Whereas, the United States' abstention on United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 contradicts the Oslo Accords and its associated process that is predicated on resolv-

ing the Israeli-Palestinian conflict between the parties through direct, bilateral negotiations, and

Whereas, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 claims that "the establishment by Israel of settlements in the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem, has no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law and a major obstacle to the achievement of the two-State solution and a just, lasting and comprehensive peace," and

Whereas, by referring to the "4 June 1967 lines" as the basis for negotiations, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 effectively states that the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem and the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, are "occupied territory," thereby equating these sites with outposts in the West Bank which the Israeli government has deemed illegal, and

Whereas, passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 effectively legitimizes efforts by the Palestinian Authority to impose its own solution through international organizations and unjustified boycotts or divestment campaigns against Israel by calling "upon all States, bearing in mind paragraph 1 of this resolution, to distinguish, in their relevant dealings, between the territory of the State of Israel and the territories occupied since 1967," and will require the United States and Israel to take effective action to counteract the resolution's potential harmful impacts, and

Whereas, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 did not directly call upon Palestinian leadership to fulfill their obligations toward negotiations or mention that part of the eventual Palestinian state is currently controlled by Hamas, a designated terrorist organization, and

Whereas, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 sought to impose or unduly influence solutions to final-status issues and is biased against Israel. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida: That the Florida Senate finds that:

(1) The passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 undermined the long-standing position of the United States to oppose and veto United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to impose solutions to final-status issues or are one-sided and anti-Israel, reversing decades of bipartisan agreement.

(2) The passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 undermines the prospect of Israelis and Palestinians resuming productive, direct, bilateral negotiations.

(3) The passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 contributes to the politically motivated acts of boycotting, divesting from, and sanctioning Israel and represents a concerted effort to extract concessions from Israel outside of direct, bilateral negotiations between the Israelis and Palestinians, which must be actively rejected.

(4) Any future measures taken by any organization, including the United Nations Security Council, to impose an agreement or parameters for an agreement will set back the peace process, harm the security of Israel, contradict the enduring bipartisan consensus on strengthening the United States-Israel relationship, and weaken support for such organizations.

(5) A durable and sustainable peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians is only possible with direct, bilateral negotiations between the parties resulting in a Jewish, democratic state living next to a demilitarized Palestinian state in peace and security.

(6) The United States government should work to facilitate serious, direct, unconditional negotiations between the parties toward a sustainable peace agreement.

(7) The United States government should oppose and veto future one-sided, anti-Israel United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to impose solutions to final-status issues. And be it further

Resolved that the Florida Senate opposes and requests the repeal of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 or the fundamental alteration of the resolution so that it:

(1) Is no longer one-sided and anti-Israel.

(2) Authorizes all final-status issues toward a two-state solution to be resolved through direct, bilateral negotiations between the parties involved. And be it further

Resolved that copies of this resolution be presented to the President of the United States, the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and the Israeli Embassy in Washington, D.C., for transmission to the proper authorities of the State of Israel as a tangible token of the sentiments expressed herein.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 518. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for technical assistance for small treatment works (Rept. No. 115-71).

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 675. A bill to amend and reauthorize certain provisions relating to Long Island Sound restoration and stewardship (Rept. No. 115-72).

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 826. A bill to reauthorize the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program and certain wildlife conservation funds, to establish prize competitions relating to the prevention of wildlife poaching and trafficking, wildlife conservation, the management of invasive species, and the protection of endangered species, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-73).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 831. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Pike Street in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, as the "Police Officer Scott Bashioum Post Office Building".

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1143. A bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to prohibit discrimination on account of sexual orientation or gender identity when extending credit; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1144. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage business creation by allowing faster recovery of start-up and organizational expenses, to simplify accounting methods for small businesses, to expand expensing and provide accelerated cost recovery to encourage investment in new plants and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1145. A bill to require adequate information regarding the tax treatment of payments under settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1146. A bill to enhance the ability of the Office of the National Ombudsman to assist small businesses in meeting regulatory requirements and develop outreach initiatives to promote awareness of the services the Office of the National Ombudsman provides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 1147. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the expansion, intensification, and coordination of the programs and activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to Tourette syndrome; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KING, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1148. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing medical assistance at a residential pediatric recovery center to infants under 1 year of age with neonatal abstinence syndrome and their families; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1149. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to repeal a provision limiting the export of timber harvested from land conveyed to the Kake Tribal Corporation under that Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1150. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to impose a work requirement for able-bodied adults without dependents who are eligible for medical assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. CAPITO, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1151. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a nonrefundable credit for working family caregivers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1152. A bill to create protections for depository institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1153. A bill to prohibit or suspend certain health care providers from providing non-Department of Veterans Affairs health care services to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1154. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the housing treatment of members of the Armed Forces and their spouses and dependents undergoing a permanent change of station in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1155. A bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to increase the amount of financial support available for working students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 1156. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow rehabilitation expenditures for public school buildings to qualify for rehabilitation credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. JOHN-SON, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1157. A bill to establish the Vulnerability Equities Review Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COONS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1158. A bill to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1159. A bill to protect consumers from discriminatory State taxes on motor vehicle rentals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1160. A bill to include Livingston County, the city of Jonesboro in Union County, and the city of Freeport in Stephenson County, Illinois, to the Lincoln National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1161. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate copayments by the Department of Veterans Affairs for medicines relating to preventative health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr.

MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1162. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1163. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure compliance of medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs with requirements relating to the scheduling of appointments, to require appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate of certain health care officials of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. FISCHER, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1164. A bill to protect consumers from deceptive practices with respect to online booking of hotel reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1165. A bill to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Huntington, West Virginia, as the Hershel "Woody" Williams VA Medical Center; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1166. A bill to decrease the deficit by realigning, consolidating, disposing, and improving the efficiency of Federal buildings and other civilian real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1167. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to evaluate and consider revising regulations relating to emergency medical equipment requirements for passenger aircraft; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. COONS, Mr. HELLER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1168. A bill to facilitate efficient investments and financing of infrastructure projects and new, long-term job creation through the establishment of an Infrastructure Financing Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KING, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1169. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with an option to provide medical assistance to individuals between the ages of 22 and 64 for inpatient services to treat substance use disorders at certain facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 1170. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 167. A resolution relating to the recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and the relocation of the United States Embassy to Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. COONS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. WARNER):

S. Res. 168. A resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 169. A resolution congratulating Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory on 50 years of groundbreaking discoveries; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. Res. 170. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that defense laboratories are on the cutting-edge of scientific and technological advancement, and supporting the designation of May 18, 2017, as "Department of Defense Laboratory Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. HELLER):

S. Res. 171. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Travel and Tourism Week and honoring the valuable contributions of travel and tourism to the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 14

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 14, a bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills.

S. 122

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 122, a bill to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt.

S. 198

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 198, a bill to require continued and enhanced annual reporting to Congress

in the Annual Report on International Religious Freedom on anti-Semitic incidents in Europe, the safety and security of European Jewish communities, and the efforts of the United States to partner with European governments, the European Union, and civil society groups, to combat anti-Semitism, and for other purposes.

S. 244

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 244, a bill to repeal the wage requirement of the Davis-Bacon Act.

S. 317

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 317, a bill to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and areas of duplication among them, and for other purposes.

S. 324

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 324, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans.

S. 445

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 445, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 450

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 450, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to members of the Armed Forces who fought in defense of Guam, Wake Island, and the Philippine Archipelago between December 7, 1941 and May 10, 1942, and who died or were imprisoned by the Japanese military in the Philippines, Japan, Korea, Manchuria, Wake Island, and Guam from April 9, 1942 until September 2, 1945, in recognition of their personal sacrifice and service to the United States.

S. 455

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 455, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count resident time spent in a critical access hospital as resident time spent in a nonprovider setting for purposes of making Medicare direct and indirect graduate medical education payments.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr.

YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 546

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to reduce temporarily the royalty required to be paid for sodium produced on Federal lands, and for other purposes.

S. 652

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 652, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

S. 708

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 708, a bill to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 765

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 765, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for penalties for the sale of any Purple Heart awarded to a member of the Armed Forces.

S. 808

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 808, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

S. 936

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 936, a bill to designate certain National Forest System land and certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming as wilderness, wild and scenic rivers,

wildland recovery areas, and biological connecting corridors, and for other purposes.

S. 951

At the request of Mr. PAUL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 951, a bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1024, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1055

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1055, a bill to restrict the exportation of certain defense articles to the Philippine National Police, to work with the Philippines to support civil society and a public health approach to substance abuse, to report on Chinese and other sources of narcotics to the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1094, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1122

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1122, a bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to clarify when the time period for the issuance of citations under such Act begins and to require a rule to clarify that an employer's duty to make and maintain accurate records of work-related injuries and illnesses is an ongoing obligation.

S. 1137

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1137, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to include provisions relating to drinking water and wastewater infrastructure, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama

(Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 75, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, the largest organization of food and nutrition professionals in the world.

S. RES. 106

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 106, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate to support the territorial integrity of Georgia.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1144. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage business creation by allowing faster recovery of start-up and organizational expenses, to simplify accounting methods for small businesses, to expand expensing and provide accelerated cost recovery to encourage investment in new plants and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, there is no doubt that the last 8 years were not good ones for the American economy. Yearly economic growth under the Obama administration averaged just under 1.5 percent. That is less than half the growth needed for a healthy economy. That kind of weak growth has consequences: fewer jobs, fewer opportunities, and lower wages.

Wage growth was almost nonexistent during the Obama administration, and new jobs and opportunities were few and far between. There have been a few encouraging signs since the election. Both wage and job growth have shown some improvement, but we are still a long way from getting our economy back to full health. The GDP report for the first quarter of this year underscored the need to implement the kind of progrowth policies that were lacking during the Obama years.

One major way to spur economic growth and improve the health of our economy is to reform our Nation's Tax Code. Our current Tax Code is strangling businesses, both large and small. Our Nation has the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world, putting American businesses at a competitive disadvantage in the global economy.

Small businesses and family farms face high tax rates, at times exceeding those paid by large corporations. These tax policies have consequences. A small company that owes a large tax bill to the Federal Government is unlikely to be able to come up with the capital necessary to expand the business or hire new workers.

When American businesses are taxed at a far higher rate than their foreign

counterparts, it is likely to be the foreign rather than the American company that expands and thrives. Tax reform needs to address these obstacles to growth. Later this year, the Senate plans to consider a major tax reform package. Two of the most powerful tax-related things we can do to increase economic growth are lowering business tax rates and allowing business to recover their investments in inventory, machinery, and the like faster.

The Senate tax bill will do both. Today, I am introducing legislation that I hope will be a part of the final tax reform package in the Senate. My bill—I am calling it the Investment in New Ventures and Economic Success Today Act, or the INVEST Act for short—focuses on helping small- and medium-sized businesses by allowing them to recover their costs faster.

Earlier this year, the Economic Innovation Group released a report on economic dynamism. Economic dynamism, as the Economic Innovation Group defines it, refers to the rate at which new businesses are born and die. In a dynamic economy, the rate of new business creation is high and significantly outstrips the rate of business deaths, but that hasn't been the case in the United States lately.

New business creation has significantly dropped over the past several years. Between 2009 and 2011, business deaths outstripped business births. While the numbers have since improved slightly, the recovery has been poor and far from historical norms.

The Economic Innovation Group notes that 2012, the economy's best year for business creation since the recession, "fell far short of its worst year prior to 2008." Well, this is deeply concerning because new businesses have historically been responsible for a substantial part of the job creation in this country, not to mention a key source of innovation.

When new businesses are not being created at a strong rate, workers face a whole host of problems. A less dynamic economy—the Economic Innovation Group notes—"is one likely to feature fewer jobs, lower labor force participation, slack wage growth, and rising inequality, exactly what we see today." Again, that is from the Economic Innovation Group.

Well, starting a new business always has a substantial element of risk. We don't need to make it harder by throwing up tax and regulatory obstacles. If we want to see our economy thriving again, we need to be encouraging the creation of new businesses, but our Tax Code, too often, does the opposite.

My bill, the INVEST Act, would encourage new business creation by allowing new enterprises to deduct a substantial part of their startup costs within the first year. Under current law, new businesses are only able to deduct \$5,000 of their startup costs within

their first year. Any startup expenses above that amount can be deducted, but that deduction is stretched out over a 15-year period. That is a long time.

The faster a new business can recover its startup costs, the faster it can establish itself on a secure footing. Entrepreneurs are far more likely to take the risk of starting a new venture if they know they will be able to recover their startup costs quickly. My bill would substantially increase the amount of a business's startup costs that can be deducted in the first year from \$5,000 to \$50,000.

Plus, any additional startup costs can be deducted over a 10-year period instead of the current 15. This will go a long way toward encouraging new business creation and the economic dynamism that comes along with it.

The second part of my bill focuses on increasing cashflow for businesses, farms and ranches, and particularly those that operate as corporations and partnerships, by allowing them to use the so-called cash method of accounting. Under current law, these businesses, farms, and ranches are generally forced to use what is called accrual accounting. Basically, what that means is, a business has to pay tax on income before it receives the cash, and it cannot deduct all of its expenses when it pays the invoice.

For a company with inventory, this means it has to deduct the investments it makes over an extended period of time. A small business might have to spend the majority of its available cash on inventory but be unable to fully deduct that expense until all of that inventory is sold.

In the case of some businesses, it might be well beyond the current tax year before that substantial investment can be fully deducted. That can leave a business increasingly cash poor. Cash poor businesses don't expand. They don't hire new workers. They don't increase wages.

Well, the INVEST Act would allow businesses to deduct investments and inventory up front, leaving them with more cash on hand to put back into their operations. It would also reduce the need for businesses to hire armies of lawyers and accountants to ensure that they have properly adhered to complex accounting rules.

Finally, the INVEST Act would substantially reform the depreciation and expensing rules. Traditionally, farms and businesses have been forced to deduct expenses like machinery, property, or agricultural equipment over an extended period—anywhere from 5 to 10 years or as many as 39 years for commercial buildings. That could leave a farm or a business with its cash tied up for years in all the property it takes to run the enterprise. Of course, that means a farm, LLC, or S corporation can spend years without being able to

increase its investment in a business or to hire new workers.

My bill would permanently allow all businesses to deduct 50 percent of their investment in equipment, vehicles, machinery, and certain other kinds of property during the year in which they are purchased. It would also help small and medium-sized farms and businesses to recover an even greater portion of their capital investments by allowing them to deduct at least \$2 million of new investments in business property.

My bill expands current law so additional building improvements—things like roofs, heating, and air conditioning units would qualify for immediate expensing. Farmers and ranchers who may reach the limit on full expensing are not forgotten either. The bill substantially increases the rate at which they can deduct the costs of tractors, combines, and other machinery.

Finally, for those farms and businesses that rely on cars, light trucks, and vans, this bill would substantially increase the amount of their vehicle investment that can be deducted when the business determines its taxable income each year. Currently, a light truck used on a farm or ranch could cost upwards of \$30,000. Yet a farmer is only allowed to deduct \$19,000 of that cost over the required recovery period for a business vehicle. My bill would substantially increase that limit to bring it more in line with the real-world costs of business vehicles.

These changes to expensing rules all have one goal: putting more money back in the hands of business owners—particularly, small business owners, farmers, and ranchers. Forcing business owners, farmers, and ranchers to lock up their capital for 5, 10, or nearly 40 years discourages growth and job creation. Under my bill, businesses, farms, and ranches would be able to re-deploy that hard-to-raise capital back into business expansion, increase in wages, new jobs, and even new ventures.

The Congressional Budget Office predicts that the economy will grow at a rate of just 1.9 percent over the next 30 years. That is a full percentage point lower than the average growth rate over the past 50 years, which was over 3 percent, or between 3.2 and 3.5. That will mean decades of fewer jobs and opportunities, low wage growth, and a reduced standard of living. We don't want to resign ourselves to that, and we don't have to. If we eliminate the antigrowth features of our Tax Code, if we lift the regulatory burdens facing American businesses and free up businesses to grow and create jobs, we can achieve a future of strong economic growth—the kind of strong growth that will fuel employment and wage growth, along with greater opportunities for American workers.

I hope the INVEST Act will help us develop the kind of tax reform legislation that will help us restore strong, sustainable economic growth, and I am looking forward to working with Chairman HATCH and all of my colleagues on the Senate Finance Committee to put together the final bill and to get it to the President.

It is time that we give the American people a tax code that actually works for them.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1150. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to impose a work requirement for able-bodied adults without dependents who are eligible for medical assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to talk today about the need for a work requirement in our Medicaid Program. In 1969, President Lyndon Johnson addressed the American people, and he talked about breaking the cycle of poverty. This is what President Johnson said:

I believe . . . that the key to success in this effort is jobs. It is work for people who want to work.

President Johnson, as we know, was a Democrat. He fervently believed that the people of Louisiana didn't want handouts. Most people want a chance to support themselves. President Johnson also believed that Medicaid, as originally envisioned, would be a safety net for the disabled, the elderly, and people with small children. Medicaid is not exactly that; it is dramatically different.

Whether you agree or disagree with what has happened to Medicaid, the fact is that it has turned into a health insurance program for about 20 percent of all Americans. Think about that. We have roughly 320 million people in our country, and fully 25 percent are on Medicaid. It gets bigger and bigger every year, and it gets more expensive every year. You can see that the numbers speak for themselves. You can see the trend. You can certainly see that we started in 1966, and you can particularly see the trend beginning in 1996 and its trajectory.

It also became more expensive. The cost of our Medicaid Program in 1966 was \$1 billion. That is a lot of money. This is the cost of last year: \$576 billion and climbing.

Let me talk about our State alone. In Louisiana, the cost of Medicaid has increased from \$5.9 billion in 2008 to \$10.7 billion today, and 65 percent of all of the babies born in Louisiana every year now are born on Medicaid. Think about that.

We know that Medicaid is a Federal-State program. The Federal Government puts up some of the money; the State puts up some of the money, as well. In Louisiana, we put up about one-third of the money. In Louisiana

dollars, in 2008, we were putting up \$1.7 billion in State money. It is called the match for the Medicaid Program. Today, the State of Louisiana is paying \$3.3 billion. You can do the math. That is about a 10 percent increase every year.

If we are spending \$3.3 billion of State money, that means every year, just like clockwork, we have to come up with an extra \$330 million. I can tell you where that money comes from. It comes out of public schools, it comes out of universities, it comes out of our budget for roads, and it comes out of our budget for public safety.

We have a choice in America. Either Medicaid is going to be, as we originally envisioned it, a safety net for the old, the disabled, and mothers with babies or it is going to be a health insurance program for the masses.

If the American people and Congress decide that Medicaid is going to be a health insurance program for the general population, then it needs to operate as health insurance does in the private sector. In other words, able-bodied adult enrollees in Medicaid should be required to work in order to receive their benefits, if they are able.

I am filing a bill that is going to be entitled the "Medicaid Reform and Personal Responsibility Act of 2017." It is going to create a work requirement for Medicaid. My reason is simple. I want Americans to prosper. I don't want our people to remain mired in poverty. I want to break poverty's back by creating a system that doesn't force the American people to subsist on handouts from government, and the best way to do that is to provide an incentive for able-bodied Americans to know the dignity of work because a person without a job is neither happy, nor is he free.

I think my bill is a commonsense approach to reducing America's reliance on entitlement programs. The work requirement will be very simple. It will be similar to the program that we have in place—the work requirement we have in place right now for food stamps.

This is what my bill would require: If you are on Medicaid or want to receive Medicaid, and you are an adult between the ages of 18 and 55, and you are able-bodied, you are not disabled, and you don't have any dependents, you don't have any children—so if you are 18 to 55, you are not disabled, and you don't have any children, then in order to receive Medicaid or to continue to receive Medicaid, you have to either work 20 hours a week—not 40 hours a week but 20 hours a week—you have to look for a job or you have to go back to school if you don't want to work. Or if you don't want to go back to school or you don't want to look for a job or you don't want to get a job, you have to perform community service for 20 hours a week. My goal is to get people

off Medicaid and into the workforce, so they can support themselves and not need Medicaid.

I don't want to take Medicaid away from people in need. I do want fewer people to need Medicaid. So if you are disabled, if you are pregnant, if you are elderly, if you are caring for a child, my bill doesn't apply to you. I am not talking about telling a mother with a baby in her arms that she has to go find a job, and I am not going to ask an elderly person in a nursing home to leave the nursing home and go get a job in order to receive Medicaid. All my bill says is that if you are young by today's standards, between 18 and 55, you are able-bodied and you have no children or dependents, then you have to go get a job or you have to go to school or you have to perform community service.

I want to be very clear about something else. In my State, we have a lot of flood victims. We had terrible flooding last year. In my State, Louisiana, we have a depression in the oil and gas industry; indeed, we do throughout America, and I know we do in the great State of Alaska as well. I am not looking to add to their hurt. I am working very hard, as are you, Mr. President, to put our oilfield workers back to work and to get our flood victims the assistance they need to recover from the tragedy that has befallen them. This bill is not about them. This bill is about able-bodied adults between the ages of 18 and 55 who have no dependents and who have been unemployed for years, in many cases, by their own choosing.

Our country has grown a lot and evolved a lot since Medicaid was introduced in 1965. We now face new challenges, both at home and abroad. We know that. Medicaid has grown, as well, but it hasn't evolved in a positive way, in my opinion. Just 3 years after Medicaid was founded, we knew we were going to have a problem finding the money, given the exponential growth in the program, and more than 50 years later, it is way past time to do something about it.

We have to break the back of poverty. This is not about throwing people out into the cold. This is about helping them to know that they can get work because the best program—the best social program in the entire world is a job. By implementing a work requirement for able-bodied adults, Medicaid will evolve to the next logical step. Our goal ought to be to ensure, of course, that people are healthy. That is what Medicaid exists for, but if you are healthy, then the next step is to help you join the workforce.

The simple fact is, this is nothing new or extraordinary. We already have work requirements—required by acts of this Congress—for unemployment assistance, for welfare benefits, for subsidized housing, and for food stamps.

Now, these requirements have been a success. We all know that, not just for stemming the costs of those programs but also for helping people—helping Americans build careers.

Yet we do not have a requirement—a work requirement—for Medicaid. If my bill passes, we will. Work requirements exist because these programs are supposed to be safety nets. That is what a social program is, a safety net. They are not supposed to exist to permanently support you if you can support yourself.

Our social programs in America are meant to be bridges. In way too many respects, they have become parking lots. Medicaid costs are not just a national problem. The program's expansion is clipping the wings of States like Louisiana and like Alaska because, as I pointed out, the States have to put up a substantial amount of the money.

We are becoming a country in which people subsist instead of thrive because they don't know the rewards of work. We have become a country in which poverty is a way of life for way too many people. That is just sad. More than 50 years after Medicaid began, it is time to break the back of poverty once and for all. We can start with a work requirement for Medicaid.

Thank you.

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

S. 1156. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow rehabilitation expenditures for public school buildings to qualify for rehabilitation credit; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, today I want to discuss legislation I am introducing, the School Infrastructure Modernization Act.

To claim the federal tax credit for historic preservation, a building renovation must be for a different purpose than that for which the building was previously used, a requirement known as the "prior use" rule. This bill waives that requirement for renovations of K-12 public school buildings. This will make it easier to restore historic-but-dilapidated school buildings across the country so our children have safe, modern spaces in which to learn.

As a Richmond City Council member and later Mayor, I faced challenges familiar to many municipalities—overcrowded schools, aging buildings, and limited dollars in the budget. But in one particular case, I and a group of local stakeholders identified a creative solution. On one hand we had an overcrowded Thomas Jefferson High School with in-zone and magnet students. On the other hand, we had a closed Maggie Walker High School that needed renovations. We put together a financing package that made use of federal and state historic tax credits to renovate Maggie Walker High School and satisfied the prior use rule by consolidating

the magnet program from Thomas Jefferson into a new Maggie Walker Governor's School for Government and International Studies. Today, some 20 years later, this is one of America's highest performing public high schools. Without the federal historic tax credit, this would have been too expensive to make happen.

This bill will make it easier to do similar projects around the country. More modern school buildings will bolster the quality of public education, and carrying out these projects will generate private sector infrastructure investment and jobs. In Virginia alone, according to a 2013 study, more than 800 K-12 schools are at least 50 years old, representing some 40% of all the K-12 schools in the Commonwealth.

As the Senate considers tax reform and a comprehensive infrastructure package, I encourage my colleagues to support this common-sense incentive that is good for education, good for infrastructure, and good for jobs.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COONS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1158. A bill to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, April was Genocide Awareness and Prevention Month. It commemorated some of the most horrific genocides and atrocities of the 20th century: the siege of Sarajevo in April 1992, the Rwandan genocide in April 1992; the Cambodian genocide in April 1975; and, the Armenian genocide in April 1915. Last, Yom Hashoah or Holocaust Remembrance Day fell during the month of April this year.

We must remember the past. And we must also be mindful of the present and the future. As we know all too well, criminal atrocities persist around the globe. In South Sudan, the world's youngest nation, a political and ethnic conflict is now in its fourth year. Tens of thousands of civilians were killed in mass atrocities and thousands more have fled the country fearing for their lives. In Iraq, ISIS has committed genocide against Yazidis, Christians, and Shiite Muslims, a determination made by former U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry last year. ISIS has killed, expelled, raped, and enslaved Yazidi

men, women, and children in northern Iraq, and has committed similar atrocities against other groups living in areas under its control.

In Burma, the Rohingya Muslim community faces such severe violence and dehumanization, including slaughtering and sequestration, that many experts believe their suffering amounts to genocide. Moreover, in Syria, repeatedly, we see a government committing atrocities against its own people. Children are being gassed. Hospitals are being bombed. Innocent people are being tortured to death.

Too often, we have done too little, waited too long, or been caught unprepared by events that should not have surprised us. We continue to forget the lessons of the past and fail to live up to the post-Holocaust pledge of "Never Again." Ignoring the genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity that continue to rage around the world sends a message to the global community that criminal atrocities are tolerable. We must do better to see that atrocities never again occur on our watch.

On April 7, I introduced the Syrian War Crimes Accountability Act, which expands the tools the U.S. government is using to document atrocities in Syria and hold President Bashar al-Assad and other perpetrators accountable. Today, under the heavy cloud of atrocities occurring in South Sudan, Iraq, Burma, Syria, and elsewhere, I am introducing another atrocity-related bill, the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2017. This bill—named in honor of the courageous, inspiring Holocaust survivor and Nobel Laureate Elie Wiesel—strengthens the U.S. government's infrastructure to prevent and respond to mass atrocities, wherever they may occur.

I am here today to stress that our job, our responsibility, is to make sure the United States has the full arsenal of tools—diplomatic, economic, and legal—to take meaningful action before atrocities occur. The costs—both human and economic—of addressing these atrocities too late or after-the-fact are skyrocketing. The United States must do a better job of responding earlier and more effectively to these crimes—when warning signs begin to point towards possible atrocities occurring, and when strategic investments can have a greater impact in promoting stability and security. Essential to this effort is ensuring that the United States Government has structures in place and mechanisms at hand to better prevent and respond to potential atrocities.

Atrocity prevention has long been a bipartisan cause. In 1988, President Reagan signed implementing legislation allowing the United States to become a party to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. In the 2006 National

Security Strategy, President George W. Bush highlighted the “moral imperative that states take action to prevent and punish genocide.” In 2008, the bipartisan Genocide Prevention Task Force, which was co-chaired by former Secretary of Defense William Cohen and former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, stated: “Genocide and mass atrocities . . . threaten core U.S. national interests.” In 2010, the Senate unanimously passed a resolution recognizing “the United States national interest in helping to prevent and mitigate acts of genocide and other mass atrocities against civilians, and supporting and encouraging efforts to develop a whole of government approach to prevent and mitigate such acts.” In 2011, President Obama declared: “Preventing mass atrocities and genocide is a core national security interest and a core moral responsibility of the United States of America.” The same year, former U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations Samantha Power stated that preventing genocide “required a degree of governmental organization that matches the kind of methodical organization that accompanies mass-killings.”

We need to continue taking proactive steps to enhance our Nation’s capacity to quickly anticipate and address genocide and other atrocity crimes. I am introducing the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2017 to ensure that we do just that. I am joined in this effort by Senators YOUNG, TILLIS, DURBIN, RUBIO, MENENDEZ, MURKOWSKI, BLUMENTHAL, WARREN, WHITEHOUSE, GILLIBRAND, KLOBUCHAR, SHAHEEN, FRANKEN, PETERS, COONS, STABENOW, BOOKER, MARKEY, BROWN, BALDWIN, and WYDEN. This bill does a number of things. First, the bill authorizes the creation of a Mass Atrocities Task Force, which is a transparent, accountable, proactive, high-level, interagency body that includes representatives at the assistant secretary level or higher from departments and agencies across the U.S. Government. The Task Force would work collaboratively with representatives of governmental as well as non-governmental organizations to oversee the development and implementation of U.S. policy on atrocity prevention and response.

Second, this bill gives our Foreign Service Officers the training they need to recognize patterns of escalation and early warning signs of potential atrocities and conflict. With this training, we will, over time, build atrocity prevention into the core skillset of our people on the ground. They will be better equipped to see warning signs, analyze events, and engage early.

Third, this bill calls on the Director of National Intelligence to include in his or her annual testimony to Congress on threats to U.S. national security a review of countries and regions

at risk of mass atrocities as well as, whenever possible, specific risk factors, potential groups of perpetrators, and at-risk target groups. With this information, Congress will be better informed and better able to respond to mass atrocities that are brewing.

Finally, this bill authorizes the Complex Crises Fund, which is a specifically dedicated portion of our foreign assistance budget for mitigating conflict. The Complex Crises Fund enables us to rapidly respond to emerging crises overseas, including potential atrocities. We have already used the Complex Crises Fund to respond to crises in the Central African Republic, Cote d’Ivoire, Guinea, Kenya, Sri Lanka, and elsewhere. Without this important tool, our ability to effectively prevent and mitigate crises is severely constrained.

Mr. President, this is a good bill. It does good things, and places the United States on solid moral ground. However, the moral argument is not the only reason to support this bill. We must also remember that America’s security, and that of our allies, is impacted when civilians are slaughtered. Our security is impacted when desperate refugees stream across borders. Our security is affected when perpetrators of extraordinary violence wreak havoc on regional stability, destroying communities, families, and livelihoods. We have seen groups like ISIS systematically targeting communities because of their ethnicity or religious beliefs and practices, and yet, we still lack a comprehensive framework to prevent and respond to genocide and other atrocity crimes. So, let this bill act as our framework, and our call to action, so that when we use the phrase “never again,” we know that we are taking meaningful preventative action.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1162. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to announce the reintroduction of the Bank on Students Emergency

Loan Refinancing Act of 2017. This legislation would allow student loan borrowers to take advantage of lower interest rates, and I urge both my Senate colleagues and the Trump administration to support it. In a few short months, millions more college graduates will be hit with their first student loan bills.

Already, more than 44 million Americans have student loans, and many are struggling to pay loans that are running at interest rates of 6 percent, 8 percent, 10 percent and even more. It is time for real action to help struggling borrowers. That is why, today, I join 36 of my Democratic colleagues in the Senate and 98 of my Democratic colleagues in the House of Representatives to reintroduce our plan to allow borrowers to lower their monthly payment by refinancing their existing loans to today’s lower interest rates, 3.76 percent for undergrads, a little higher for graduate students.

Supporting America’s students should not be a political food fight. In fact, President Trump talked about student loans when he was on the campaign trail, including a plan to reduce the maximum number of years for repayment for most students.

As a candidate, Donald Trump said that “students should not be asked to pay more on the debt than they can afford.” I agree with that, which is why Congress should allow students to lower their monthly payments by refinancing to today’s lower interest rates. Donald Trump also said that “student loan debt should not be an albatross around student’s necks for the rest of their lives.”

I agree with that too. The legislation I am introducing today would lower the outstanding balance for millions of Americans, allowing them to get out from under their student loans faster. Here is one more. Donald Trump said that it is “terrible that one of the only profit centers we have is student loans.” He also said that “it is not fair and that should not take place.”

Unfortunately, right now, that is exactly what is happening. According to a recent analysis of Congressional Budget Office data by the Institute for College Access and Success, after all the costs are accounted for, the Federal Government is now on track to make \$81 billion off student loans over the next 10 years.

That is obscene. The Federal Government should not be making a profit off the backs of our students, period. Yes, Candidate Trump talked a lot about this problem, but talk is cheap, and President Trump has not done a thing to fix the problem. In fact, he seems to have lost all interest in students and their student loans. Since his election in November, he has not even mentioned his campaign promises about student loans.

Instead, he and Education Secretary DeVos have gone in the opposite direction, using their short time in office to deliver one blow after another to hard-working Americans who are struggling with student debt. Back when he was running for President, Donald Trump made a lot of promises, but empty promises don't help the students who have been punched in the gut by Secretary DeVos's decision to roll back critical consumer protections for borrowers.

Hollow campaign pledges do not help the students, the veterans, the members of our Armed Forces when they are hurt by student loan companies, like Navient, that break the law and brazenly announce to the world that they don't think they have a responsibility to act in the best interests of students.

Rally speeches don't mean much when this administration is ripping up policies that would have made it harder for greedy student loan companies to rake in lucrative government contracts while cheating students. Last year's rhetoric means nothing to the struggling borrowers who can now be charged sky-high fees—as high as 16 percent—by student loan collection companies thanks to yet another policy Betsy DeVos ripped up.

Students know what is going on. The loan companies know too. Industry stocks have skyrocketed since November. Mr. President, keep your promise and start by supporting this refinancing bill.

For nearly 4 years, Republicans have filibustered this bill and refused to even debate it, despite its overwhelming public support. Meanwhile, congressional Republicans have offered nothing—nothing—to seriously address the problems of student loan borrowers. Those problems keep getting worse. Today's students are wrestling with \$1.4 trillion in student loan debt, and every year the student loan debt increases by nearly \$100 billion.

Interest rates are scheduled to jump up again later this summer, meaning the urgency for Congress to act and allow borrowers to access today's rates is stronger than ever. The Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act would give millions of borrowers across this country a chance to save hundreds and in some cases thousands of dollars a year. That is real money, money they can put toward paying down the balance on their debt, money they can use to save for a home, money they can spend on buying a car, money they can put toward building a solid future.

By refusing to act and ignoring this debt crisis, Republicans threaten to bury the hopes of an entire generation. It is time for Congress to step up and fix this problem. It is also time for the President to step up as well.

President Trump, you campaigned on the idea that the Federal Government

should not be making a profit off the backs of hard-working students. So support this legislation. Put it in your annual budget, this proposal. Call on Members of your own party who have held up this bill to get on board. Demand action to refinance student loan debt, and keep the promises you made to America's young people.

Thank you, Mr. President.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1163. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure compliance of medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs with requirements relating to the scheduling of appointments, to require appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate of certain health care officials of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

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

S. 1163

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Health Care Integrity Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. COMPLIANCE OF MEDICAL FACILITIES WITH REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO SCHEDULING OF APPOINTMENTS FOR HOSPITAL CARE AND MEDICAL SERVICES.

(a) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the director of each medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs annually certifies to the Secretary that—

(A) the medical facility is in full compliance with all regulations and other provisions of law relating to scheduling appointments for veterans to receive hospital care or medical services, including Veterans Health Administration Directive 1230 or any successor directive; and

(B) any official data on wait times for appointments to receive hospital care or medical services submitted by the director to the Secretary during the year preceding the submittal of the certification is true and accurate to the best of the director's knowledge.

(2) PROHIBITION ON WAIVER.—The Secretary may not waive any regulation or other provision of law described in paragraph (1) for a medical facility of the Department if such regulation or other provision of law otherwise applies to the medical facility.

(b) EXPLANATION OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—If a director of a medical facility of the Department does not make a certification under subsection (a)(1) for any year, the director shall submit to the Secretary a report containing—

(1) an explanation of why the director is unable to make such certification; and

(2) a description of the actions the director is taking to ensure full compliance with the regulations and other provisions of law described in such subsection.

(c) PROHIBITION ON BONUSES BASED ON NON-COMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a director of a medical facility of the Department does not make a certification under subsection (a)(1) for any year, no covered official described in paragraph (2) may receive an award or bonus under chapter 45 or 53 of title 5, United States Code, or any other award or bonus authorized under such title or title 38, United States Code, during the year following the year in which the certification was not made.

(2) COVERED OFFICIAL DESCRIBED.—A covered official described in this paragraph is each official who serves in the following positions at a medical facility of the Department during a year, or portion thereof, for which the director does not make a certification under subsection (a)(1):

(A) The director.

(B) The chief of staff.

(C) The associate director.

(D) The associate director for patient care.

(E) The deputy chief of staff.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not less frequently than annually, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report containing, with respect to the year covered by the report—

(1) a list of each medical facility of the Department for which a certification was made under subsection (a)(1); and

(2) a list of each medical facility of the Department for which such a certification was not made, including a copy of each report submitted to the Secretary under subsection (b).

SEC. 3. UNIFORM APPLICATION OF DIRECTIVES AND POLICIES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall apply the directives and policies of the Department of Veterans Affairs to each office or facility of the Department in a uniform manner.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—If the Secretary does not uniformly apply the directives and policies of the Department pursuant to subsection (a), including by waiving such a directive or policy with respect to an office, facility, or element of the Department, the Secretary shall notify the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives of such nonuniform application, including an explanation for the non-uniform application.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENT FOR APPOINTMENT AND CONFIRMATION OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY FOR HEALTH.—Subsection (c) of section 7306 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), appointments under subsection (a) shall be made by the Secretary.

"(2) Appointments under subsection (a)(1) shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(3) In the case of appointments under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (8) of subsection (a), such appointments shall be made upon the recommendation of the Under Secretary for Health."

(b) OTHER DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY POSITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Operations and Management of the Department of Veterans

Affairs, the Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Policy and Services of the Department, the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Benefits of the Department, the Deputy Under Secretary for Disability Assistance of the Department, and the Deputy Under Secretary for Field Operations of the Department shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the establishment of any new position within the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) **APPLICATION.**—Subsection (b) and the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to appointments made on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. FISCHER, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1164. A bill to protect consumers from deceptive practices with respect to online booking of hotel reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

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

S. 1164

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stop Online Booking Scams Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Internet has become an important channel of commerce in the United States, accounting for billions of dollars in retail sales every year.

(2) Hotel reservation transactions can be easily made online and online commerce has created a marketplace where consumers can shop for hotels, flights, car rentals, and other travel-related services and products across thousands of brands on a single platform.

(3) Consumers should be able to clearly identify the company with which they are transacting business online.

(4) Actions by third-party sellers that misappropriate brand identity, trademark, or other marketing content are harmful to consumers.

(5) Platforms offered by online travel agencies provide consumers with a valuable tool for comparative shopping for hotels and should not be mistaken for the unlawful third-party actors that commit such misappropriation.

(6) The misleading and deceptive sales tactics companies use against consumers booking hotel rooms online have resulted in the loss of sensitive financial and personal information, financial harm, and other damages for consumers.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) consumers benefit from the ability to shop for travel-related services and products on the innovative platforms offered by online travel agencies;

(2) sellers on the Internet should—

(A) provide consumers with clear, accurate information; and

(B) have an opportunity to compete fairly with one another; and

(3) the Federal Trade Commission should revise the Commission’s Internet site to make it easier for consumers and businesses to report complaints of deceptive practices with respect to online booking of hotel reservations.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **AFFILIATION CONTRACT.**—The term “affiliation contract” means, with respect to a hotel, a contract with the owner of the hotel, the entity that manages the hotel, or the franchisor of the hotel to provide online hotel reservation services for the hotel.

(2) **COMMISSION.**—The term “Commission” means the Federal Trade Commission.

(3) **EXHIBITION ORGANIZER OR MEETING PLANNER.**—The term “exhibition organizer or meeting planner” means the person responsible for all aspects of planning, promoting, and producing a meeting, conference, event, or exhibition, including overseeing and arranging all hotel reservation plans and contracts for the meeting, conference, event, or exhibition.

(4) **OFFICIAL HOUSING BUREAU.**—The term “official housing bureau” means the organization designated by an exhibition organizer or meeting planner to provide hotel reservation services for meetings, conferences, events, or exhibitions.

(5) **PARTY DIRECTLY AFFILIATED.**—The term “party directly affiliated” means, with respect to a hotel, a person who has entered into an affiliation contract with the hotel.

(6) **THIRD-PARTY ONLINE HOTEL RESERVATION SELLER.**—The term “third-party online hotel reservation seller” means any person that—

(A) sells any good or service with respect to a hotel in a transaction effected on the Internet; and

(B) is not—

(i) a party directly affiliated with the hotel; or

(ii) an exhibition organizer or meeting planner or the official housing bureau for a meeting, conference, event, or exhibition held at the hotel.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENTS FOR THIRD-PARTY ONLINE HOTEL RESERVATION SELLERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall be unlawful for a third-party online hotel reservation seller to charge or attempt to charge any consumer’s credit card, debit card, bank account, or other financial account for any good or service sold in a transaction effected on the Internet with respect to a hotel unless the third-party online hotel reservation seller—

(1) clearly and conspicuously discloses to the consumer all material terms of the transaction, including—

(A) before the conclusion of the transaction—

(i) a description of the good or service being offered; and

(ii) the cost of such good or service; and

(B) in a manner that is continuously visible to the consumer throughout the transaction process, that the person—

(i) is a third-party online hotel reservation seller; and

(ii) is not—

(I) affiliated with the owner of the hotel or the entity that provides the hotel services or accommodations; or

(II) an exhibition organizer or meeting planner or the official housing bureau for a meeting, conference, event, or exhibition held at the hotel; or

(2) includes prominent and continuous disclosure of the brand identity of the third-

party online hotel reservation seller throughout the transaction process, whether online or over the phone.

(b) **ENFORCEMENT BY COMMISSION.**—

(1) **UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.**—A violation of subsection (a) by a person subject to such subsection shall be treated as a violation of a rule defining an unfair or deceptive act or practice prescribed under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)).

(2) **POWERS OF COMMISSION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall enforce this section in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

(B) **PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES.**—Any person who violates this section shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.).

(C) **RULEMAKING.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission may promulgate such rules as the Commission considers appropriate to enforce this section.

(ii) **PROCEDURES.**—The Commission shall carry out any rulemaking under clause (i) in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) **ENFORCEMENT BY STATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In any case in which the attorney general of a State has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of the State has been or is being threatened or adversely affected by the engagement of any person subject to subsection (a) in a practice that violates such subsection, the attorney general of the State may, as *parens patriae*, bring a civil action on behalf of the residents of the State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate relief.

(2) **RIGHTS OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—

(A) **NOTICE TO FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (iii), the attorney general of a State shall notify the Commission in writing that the attorney general intends to bring a civil action under paragraph (1) before initiating any civil action against a person subject to subsection (a).

(ii) **CONTENTS.**—The notification required under clause (i) with respect to a civil action shall include a copy of the complaint to be filed to initiate the civil action.

(iii) **EXCEPTION.**—If it is not feasible for the attorney general of a State to provide the notification required by clause (i) before initiating a civil action under paragraph (1), the attorney general shall notify the Commission immediately upon instituting the civil action.

(B) **INTERVENTION BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—The Commission may—

(i) intervene in any civil action brought by the attorney general of a State under paragraph (1); and

(ii) upon intervening—

(I) be heard on all matters arising in the civil action; and

(II) file petitions for appeal of a decision in the civil action.

(3) **INVESTIGATORY POWERS.**—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prevent the attorney general of a State from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general by the laws of the State—

(A) to conduct investigations;

(B) to administer oaths or affirmations; or

(C) to compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary or other evidence.

(4) **STATE COORDINATION WITH FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—If the Commission institutes a civil action or an administrative action with respect to a violation of subsection (a), the attorney general of a State shall coordinate with the Commission before bringing a civil action under paragraph (1) against any defendant named in the complaint of the Commission for the violation with respect to which the Commission instituted such action.

(5) **VENUE; SERVICE OF PROCESS.**—

(A) **VENUE.**—Any action brought under paragraph (1) may be brought in—

(i) the district court of the United States that meets applicable requirements relating to venue under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code; or

(ii) another court of competent jurisdiction.

(B) **SERVICE OF PROCESS.**—In an action brought under paragraph (1), process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

(i) is an inhabitant; or

(ii) may be found.

(6) **ACTIONS BY OTHER STATE OFFICIALS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to civil actions brought by attorneys general under paragraph (1), any other officer of a State who is authorized by the State to do so may bring a civil action under paragraph (1), subject to the same requirements and limitations that apply under this subsection to civil actions brought by attorneys general.

(B) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit an authorized official of a State from initiating or continuing any proceeding in a court of the State for a violation of any civil or criminal law of the State.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, the travel and tourism industry is a pillar of Montana's economy. Our wealth of public lands, first-class fishing, hiking and skiing, and our breathtaking natural landscapes make Montana a special place for people to visit. Last year alone, visitors to Montana spent \$3.46 billion in our state. And Montana is not alone. The travel and tourism industry plays a significant role in the United States economy as well, contributing over \$503 billion to the U.S. GDP just last year.

With advancements in technology and the increased use of online marketplaces, travelers have the ability to do more research, plan trips, and book reservations online. Online platforms allow customers to compare thousands of brands in one place and as a result the number of hotel reservations made online has surged over the past several years, many of which are on legitimate third-party websites. However, as the ease and number of online bookings has increased, so has the number of online booking scams.

Illegitimate reservation sellers pose as hotel websites, leading consumers to believe they are booking directly with the hotel, when in fact they are booking with an unrelated third party. Transactions on these sites can result in additional hidden fees, loss of expected loyalty points, or even con-

firmed reservations that were never made. One study found that as many as fifteen million bookings a year are affected by fraudulent websites. In Montana, you expect to get what you pay for. When you book a hotel online only to find out you are not on the list when you arrive, you not only lose your money, but you lose the positive experience tourism awards.

That is why I am proud to introduce the Stop Online Booking Scams Act of 2017 along with my colleagues Senators NELSON, FISCHER, and KLOBUCHAR. This bill requires third-party sites to disclose that they are not affiliated with the hotel, providing clarity and transparency to consumers booking online. It also empowers State attorneys general to pursue cases on behalf of consumers who have been scammed. Providing clear disclosures that reveal the true identity of websites will give confidence to the millions of consumers who make reservations online every year. I ask my colleagues who have not yet done so to join me in cosponsoring this much-needed legislation. Thank you, Mr. President.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KING, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1169. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with an option to provide medical assistance to individuals between the ages of 22 and 64 for inpatient services to treat substance use disorders at certain facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

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

S. 1169

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Medicaid Coverage for Addiction Recovery Expansion Act”.

SEC. 2. STATE OPTION TO PROVIDE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR RESIDENTIAL ADDICTION TREATMENT FACILITY SERVICES; MODIFICATION OF THE IMD EXCLUSION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1905 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(16)—

(A) by striking “and, (B)” and inserting “, (B)”;

(B) by inserting “, and (C) effective January 1, 2019, residential addiction treatment facility services (as defined in subsection (h)(3)) for individuals over 21 years of age and under 65 years of age, if offered as part of a full continuum of evidence-based treatment services provided under the State plan, including residential, outpatient, and community-based care, for individuals with substance use disorders” before the semicolon; and

(2) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (16) of subsection (a)” and inserting “subsection (a)(16)(A)”;

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

“(3)(A) For purposes of subsection (a)(16)(C), the term ‘residential addiction treatment facility services’ means, subject to subparagraph (B), inpatient services provided—

“(i) to an individual for the purpose of treating a substance use disorder that are furnished to an individual for not more than 2 consecutive periods of 30 consecutive days, provided that upon completion of the first 30-day period, the individual is assessed and determined to have progressed through the clinical continuum of care, in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary, in consultation with the American Society of Addiction Medicine, and requires continued medically necessary treatment and social support services to promote recovery, stable transition to ongoing treatment, and discharge; and

“(ii) in a facility that is accredited for the treatment of substance use disorders by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities, the Council on Accreditation, or any other accrediting agency that the Secretary deems appropriate as necessary to ensure nationwide applicability, including qualified national organizations and State-level accrediting agencies.

“(B) The State agency responsible for administering the State plan under this title shall establish procedures to ensure that, with respect to any facility providing residential addiction treatment facility services in a fiscal year, the average monthly number of beds used by the facility to provide such services during such year is not more than 40.

“(C) The provision of medical assistance for residential addiction treatment facility services to an individual shall not prohibit Federal financial participation for medical assistance for items or services that are provided to the individual in or away from the residential addiction treatment facility during any 30-day period in which the individual is receiving residential addiction treatment facility services.

“(D) A woman who is eligible for medical assistance on the basis of being pregnant and who is furnished residential addiction treatment facility services during any 30-day period may remain eligible for, and continue to be furnished with, such services for additional 30-day periods without regard to any eligibility limit that would otherwise apply to the woman as a result of her pregnancy ending, subject to assessment by the facility and a determination based on medical necessity related to substance use disorder and the impact of substance use disorder on birth outcomes.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to items and services furnished on or after January 1, 2019.

SEC. 3. GRANT PROGRAM TO EXPAND YOUTH ADDICTION TREATMENT FACILITIES UNDER MEDICAID AND CHIP.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish a program under which the Secretary shall award grants to States for the purpose of expanding the infrastructure and treatment capabilities, including augmenting equipment and bed capacity, of eligible

youth addiction treatment facilities that provide addiction treatment services to Medicaid or CHIP beneficiaries who have not attained the age of 21 and are in communities with high numbers of medically underserved populations of at-risk youth.

(2) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Grant funds awarded under this section may be used to expand the infrastructure and treatment capabilities of an existing facility (including through construction) but shall not be used for the construction of any new facility or for the provision of medical assistance or child health assistance under Medicaid or CHIP.

(3) **TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION; DURATION.**—

(A) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall award grants under the grant program.

(B) **DURATION.**—The Secretary shall award grants under the grant program for a period not to exceed 5 years.

(b) **APPLICATION.**—A State seeking to participate in the grant program shall submit to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary shall require, an application that includes—

(1) detailed information on the types of additional infrastructure and treatment capacity of eligible youth addiction treatment facilities that the State proposes to fund under the grant program;

(2) a description of the communities in which the eligible youth addiction treatment facilities funded under the grant program operate;

(3) an assurance that the eligible youth addiction treatment facilities that the State proposes to fund under the grant program shall give priority to providing addiction treatment services to Medicaid or CHIP beneficiaries who have not attained the age of 21 and are in communities with high numbers of medically underserved populations of at-risk youth; and

(4) such additional information and assurances as the Secretary shall require.

(c) **RURAL AREAS.**—Not less than 15 percent of the amount of a grant awarded to a State under this section shall be used for making payments to eligible youth addiction treatment facilities that are located in rural areas or that target the provision of addiction treatment services to Medicaid or CHIP beneficiaries who have not attained the age of 21 and reside in rural areas.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

(1) **ADDICTION TREATMENT SERVICES.**—The term “addiction treatment services” means services provided to an individual for the purpose of treating a substance use disorder.

(2) **CHIP.**—The term “CHIP” means the State children’s health insurance program established under title XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.).

(3) **ELIGIBLE YOUTH ADDICTION TREATMENT FACILITY.**—The term “eligible youth addiction treatment facility” means a facility that is a participating provider under the State Medicaid or CHIP programs for purposes of providing medical assistance or child health assistance to Medicaid or CHIP beneficiaries for youth addiction treatment services on an inpatient or outpatient basis (or both).

(4) **MEDICAID.**—The term “Medicaid” means the medical assistance program established under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(5) **MEDICAID OR CHIP BENEFICIARY.**—The term “Medicaid or CHIP beneficiary” means an individual who is enrolled in the State

Medicaid plan, the State child health plan under CHIP, or under a waiver of either such plan.

(6) **MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.**—The term “medically underserved populations” has the meaning given that term in section 330(b)(3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b(b)(3)).

(7) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this section. Funds appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 167—RELATING TO THE RECOGNITION OF JERUSALEM AS THE CAPITAL OF ISRAEL AND THE RELOCATION OF THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY TO JERUSALEM

Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 167

Whereas each sovereign nation, under international law and custom, may designate its own capital;

Whereas, since 1950, the city of Jerusalem has been the capital of the State of Israel;

Whereas the city of Jerusalem is the seat of Israel’s President, Parliament, Supreme Court, and the site of numerous government ministries and social and cultural institutions;

Whereas the city of Jerusalem is the spiritual center of Judaism and is also considered a holy city by members of other religious faiths;

Whereas Jerusalem must remain an undivided city in which the rights of every ethnic and religious group are protected as they have been by Israel since 1967;

Whereas, this year, we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem and reaffirm the congressional sentiment that Jerusalem must remain an undivided city;

Whereas every citizen of Israel should have the right to reside anywhere in the undivided city of Jerusalem;

Whereas the President and the Secretary of State should publicly affirm as a matter of United States policy that Jerusalem must remain the undivided capital of the State of Israel;

Whereas the President should immediately implement the provisions of the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-45) and begin the process of relocating the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem;

Whereas United States officials should refrain from any actions that contradict United States law on this subject; and

Whereas any official document of the United States Government which lists countries and their capital cities should identify Jerusalem as the capital of Israel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) it should be the policy of the United States to recognize Jerusalem as the undi-

vided capital of the State of Israel both de jure and de facto; and

(2) the United States Embassy should be relocated to Jerusalem.

SENATE RESOLUTION 168—SUPPORTING RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND ENCOURAGING INCLUSIVE GOVERNANCE IN ETHIOPIA

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. COONS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. WARNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 168

Whereas the first pillar of the 2012 United States Strategy Toward Sub-Saharan Africa is to strengthen democratic institutions, and the United States Agency for International Development Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance Strategy states that strong democratic institutions, respect for human rights, and participatory, accountable governance are crucial elements for improving people’s lives in a sustainable way;

Whereas the third pillar of the 2012 United States Strategy Toward Sub-Saharan Africa is to advance peace and security, including supporting security sector reform;

Whereas democratic space in Ethiopia has steadily diminished since the general elections of 2005;

Whereas elections were held in 2015 in which the ruling Ethiopian People’s Revolutionary Democratic Front and its affiliates claimed 100 percent of parliamentary seats;

Whereas the 2016 Department of State Human Rights Report on Ethiopia cited serious human rights violations, including arbitrary arrests, killings, rape, and torture committed by security forces as well as increased restrictions on freedom of expression and freedom of association, politically motivated trials, harassment, intimidation, and arrest of opposition members and journalists;

Whereas the Government of Ethiopia has repeatedly abused laws such as the 2009 Anti-Terrorism Proclamation to limit press freedom, silence independent journalists, and persecute members of the political opposition;

Whereas laws such as the 2009 Charities and Societies Proclamation have been used to restrict the operation of civil society and nongovernmental organizations in Ethiopia across a range of purposes, particularly those investigating alleged violations of human rights by governmental authorities;

Whereas the case of the “Zone 9 Bloggers”, whose arrest and detention in 2014 and subsequent trials on terrorism charges brought international attention to the restrictions on press freedom in Ethiopia, is indicative of the coercive environment in which journalists continue to operate;

Whereas the arrest, detention, and demeaning treatment of hundreds of dissidents, including leaders of legally registered opposition parties such as Bekele Gerba, arrested in December 2015, and Merera Gudina, arrested in November 2016, of the Oromo Federalist Congress, Yonatan Tesfaye Regassa, arrested in December 2015, of the Semayawi Party (the Blue Party), and the arrest and sentencing of Okello Akway Ochalla, former

governor of the Gambella region, are indicative of repressive political conditions that prevail in the country;

Whereas the Ethiopian Human Rights Council reported last year at least 102 protestor deaths from November 2015 to February 2016 across 9 administrative zones, Human Rights Watch reports that Ethiopian security forces have killed at least 500 peaceful protesters, and Amnesty International reported that more than 800 protesters have been killed since November 2015 and that number is likely higher;

Whereas, on October 9, 2016, the Government of Ethiopia imposed a far-reaching, six-month State of Emergency that restricted a broad range of actions, including blocking mobile Internet access and social media communications, undermining freedoms of association, expression, and peaceful assembly, which led to the arrest of over 26,000 persons, and which was extended by four months on March 30, 2017;

Whereas, on October 10, 2016, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on freedom of peaceful assembly and of association and the United Nations Working Group on enforced or involuntary disappearances and on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions publicly called on the Government of Ethiopia to allow an international commission of inquiry to investigate the protests and the violence used against peaceful demonstrators;

Whereas former detainees report torture, lack of rations, and other forms of serious abuse in detention facilities;

Whereas state-sponsored violence against citizens exercising their rights to peaceful assembly in Oromia and elsewhere in the country, and the abuse of laws to stifle journalistic and political freedoms, stand in direct contrast to democratic principles and in violation of Ethiopia's constitution;

Whereas serious abuses have been and continue to be committed in the Somali regional state by Ethiopian federal and regional security forces, some of which may constitute war crimes and crimes against humanity;

Whereas to date, the Government of Ethiopia has held no one accountable for any of the aforementioned abuses; and

Whereas, during President Barack Obama's historic visit to Addis Ababa in July 2015, Prime Minister Hailemariam Desalegn expressed his government's commitment to deepen the democratic process and work towards the respect of human rights and improving governance, and noted the need to step up efforts to strengthen institutions, but the Government of Ethiopia has failed to take concrete actions to follow through with this commitment: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns—

(A) killings of peaceful protesters and excessive use of force by Ethiopian security forces;

(B) arrest and detention of journalists, students, activists and political leaders who exercise their constitutional rights to freedom of assembly and expression through peaceful protests; and

(C) abuse of the Anti-Terrorism Proclamation to stifle political and civil dissent and journalistic freedoms;

(2) urges protesters in Ethiopia to refrain from violence, and to refrain from encouraging or accepting any and all violence in demonstrations;

(3) calls on the Government of Ethiopia to—

(A) fully lift the state of emergency;

(B) end the practice of excessive force by security forces;

(C) grant the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and United Nations Special Rapporteurs full access to conduct a comprehensive independent examination of the state of human rights in Ethiopia;

(D) conduct a full, credible, and transparent investigation into the killings and instances of excessive use of force that took place as a result of protests in the Oromia and Amhara regions and hold security forces accountable for wrongdoing through public proceedings, and to publicly release the findings through a written report;

(E) release all dissidents, members of the political opposition, activists, and journalists who have been jailed, including those arrested for reporting about the protests, for exercising constitutional rights;

(F) respect the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and guarantee freedom of the press and mass media in keeping with Articles 30 and 29 of the Ethiopian constitution;

(G) engage in open and transparent consultations relative to its development strategy, especially those strategies that could result in people's displacement from land, offering those displaced from their land the right to seek remedy or redress in courts and providing a transparent means to access justice for those displaced; and

(H) repeal proclamations that—

(i) can be used as a political tool to harass individuals or organizations that engage in peaceful political dissent or advocate for greater political freedoms; or

(ii) prohibit or otherwise limit funding for civil society organizations working on, supporting, or advocating for respect for constitutional rights, the rule of law, and protection of human rights;

(4) calls on the Secretary of State to share with Congress the results of a review of security assistance to Ethiopia in light of these developments and to improve transparency with respect to the purposes of such assistance to the people of Ethiopia;

(5) calls on the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to immediately lead efforts to develop a comprehensive strategy to support improved democracy and governance in Ethiopia;

(6) calls on the Secretary of State, in conjunction with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, to improve oversight and accountability of United States assistance to Ethiopia pursuant to expectations established in the President's 2012 Strategy Toward Sub-Saharan Africa;

(7) calls on the President to apply appropriate sanctions on foreign persons or entities responsible for extrajudicial killings, torture, or other gross violations of internationally recognized human rights committed against any nationals in Ethiopia as provided for in the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328); and

(8) stands by the people of Ethiopia, and supports their peaceful efforts to increase democratic space and to exercise the rights guaranteed by the Ethiopian constitution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 169—CONGRATULATING FERMI NATIONAL ACCELERATOR LABORATORY ON 50 YEARS OF GROUNDBREAKING DISCOVERIES

Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following

resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 169

Whereas, in 2017, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory (referred to in this preamble as "Fermilab") celebrates the 50th anniversary of the date on which the first employees of Fermilab started work in Illinois, June 15, 1967;

Whereas Fermilab drives scientific discovery by building and operating world-leading particle accelerator and detector facilities, performing pioneering research with national and global partners, and developing new technologies for science that support the industrial competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas Fermilab provides research facilities for 4,500 scientists from 50 countries;

Whereas research at Fermilab led to the discovery of the 3 building blocks of the universe, the bottom quark in 1977, the top quark in 1995, and the tau neutrino in 2000;

Whereas superconducting magnets developed at Fermilab led to the advancement of magnetic resonance imaging medical diagnostics;

Whereas Fermilab contributed critical components, computing capabilities, and scientific expertise to the 2012 discovery of the Higgs boson in Geneva, Switzerland;

Whereas Fermilab continues to lead scientific discoveries, including planning construction for the Long-Baseline Neutrino Facility to power the Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment; and

Whereas Fermilab demonstrates its strong commitment to developing a diverse workforce for the future in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics through educational programs that bring more than 15,000 K-12 students to visit Fermilab each year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory on the semicentennial of the Laboratory; and

(2) wishes the Laboratory success in continuing to help the people of the United States understand the mysteries of matter, energy, space, and time.

SENATE RESOLUTION 170—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT DEFENSE LABORATORIES ARE ON THE CUTTING-EDGE OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENT, AND SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 18, 2017, AS "DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LABORATORY DAY"

Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 170

Whereas the national network of laboratories and engineering centers that are owned and operated by the United States Armed Forces (referred to in this preamble as the "defense laboratories") should be commended for the unique role that the defense laboratories have played in countless innovations and advances in the areas of defense and national security;

Whereas technological progress is responsible for up to 50 percent of the growth of the United States economy and is the principal driving force behind long-term economic growth and increases in the standard of living in the United States;

Whereas research and development supported by the Department of Defense has led to new products and processes for state-of-the-art Armed Forces weapons and technology;

Whereas defense laboratories frequently partner with State and local governments and regional organizations to transfer technology to the private sector;

Whereas defense laboratories have earned prestigious national and international awards for research and technology transfer efforts and lead the way in cutting-edge science and technology;

Whereas the innovations that are produced at defense laboratories fuel economic growth by creating new industries, companies, and jobs;

Whereas, since the global leadership and national security of the United States is dependent on innovation and new industries, the work of the national network of defense laboratories is essential to the continued prosperity of the United States; and

Whereas May 18, 2017, is an appropriate day to designate as “Department of Defense Laboratory Day”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of the “Department of Defense Laboratory Day” in celebration of all of the work and accomplishments of the national network of laboratories and engineering centers that are owned and operated by the United States Armed Forces (referred to in this resolution as the “defense laboratories”);

(2) recognizes that a key to maintaining United States Armed Forces superiority, innovation, and competitiveness in a global economy is to continue to support federally sponsored research and development;

(3) acknowledges that the knowledge base, technologies, and techniques generated in the national network of defense laboratories serve as a foundation for additional efforts relating to the Armed Forces in the defense industrial base;

(4) commits to find ways to increase investment in the national network of defense laboratories in order to increase support of federally sponsored research and development critical to the national security interests of the United States;

(5) encourages defense laboratories, Federal agencies, and Congress to hold an outreach event on May 18, 2017, “Department of Defense Laboratory Day”, to make the public more aware of the work of the national network of defense laboratories; and

(6) recognizes the outstanding dedication, qualifications, service, and accomplishments of the scientists, technicians, and support staff of the defense laboratories.

SENATE RESOLUTION 171—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM WEEK AND HONORING THE VALUABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TRAVEL AND TOURISM TO THE UNITED STATES

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. HELLER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 171

Whereas National Travel and Tourism Week was established in 1983 through the enactment of the Joint Resolution entitled “Joint Resolution to designate the week beginning May 27, 1984, as ‘National Tourism Week’”, approved November 29, 1983 (Public Law 98-178; 97 Stat. 1126), which recognized the value of travel and tourism;

Whereas National Travel and Tourism Week is celebrated across the United States from May 7 through May 13, 2017;

Whereas more than 400 celebrations throughout the United States are scheduled in honor of National Travel and Tourism Week;

Whereas 1 out of every 9 jobs in the United States depends on travel and tourism and the travel and tourism industry supports 15,300,000 jobs in the United States;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry employs individuals in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and all the territories of the United States;

Whereas international travel to the United States—

(1) is the single largest export industry in the United States; and

(2) generates a trade surplus balance of approximately \$87,000,000,000;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry, Congress, and the President have worked to streamline the visa process and make the United States welcoming to visitors from other countries;

Whereas travel and tourism provide significant economic benefits to the United States by generating nearly \$2,300,000,000,000 in annual economic output;

Whereas leisure travel allows individuals to experience the rich cultural heritage and educational opportunities of the United States and its communities; and

Whereas the immense value of travel and tourism cannot be overstated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Travel and Tourism Week;

(2) commends the travel and tourism industry for its important contributions to the United States; and

(3) commends the employees of the travel and tourism industry for their important contributions to the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have 10 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 17, 2017, to conduct a hearing entitled “Aging With Community: Building Connections that Last a Lifetime.”

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is author-

ized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 17, 2017, at 10 a.m. in Room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 17, 2017, at 10 a.m. in Room 406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Improving America’s Transportation Infrastructure: The Road Forward.”

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 17, 2017, at 2 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled “Nominations.”

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 17, 2017, at 10 a.m. for a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 17, 2017, in Room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 17, 2017, in Room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct an oversight hearing on “High Risk, No Reward: GAO’s High Risk List for Indian Programs.”

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 17, 2017, at 2:30 p.m. in SR-418, to conduct a hearing on pending legislation.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

The Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 17, 2017, at 3:30 p.m., in open session, to receive testimony on United States Military Small Arms Requirements.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 17, 2017, at 2 p.m., in open session, to receive testimony on Military Space Organization, Policy, and Programs.

SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 18, 2017, AS “DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LABORATORY DAY”

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 170, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 170) expressing the sense of the Senate that defense laboratories are on the cutting-edge of scientific and technological advancement, and supporting the designation of May 18, 2017, as "Department of Defense Laboratory Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 170) was agreed to.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM WEEK

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 171, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 171) supporting the goals and ideals of National Travel and Tourism Week and honoring the valuable contributions of travel and tourism to the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 171) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 18, 2017

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, May 18; further, that following the prayer and

pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Brand nomination, with the time until 12 noon equally divided in the usual form; further, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the postcloture time on the Brand nomination expire at 12 noon tomorrow; finally, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:56 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 18, 2017, at 10 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, May 17, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 17, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

LADIES IN WHITE 2017 FREEDOM AWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, last night I had the honor of presenting the International Republican Institute's 2017 Freedom Award to great freedom fighters in my native homeland of Cuba, the Ladies in White, las Damas de Blanco, although my dear friend Berta Soler, the leader of the Ladies in White, was not able to be there. Why? Because the Cuban regime refused to allow her to leave the island. We were lucky enough to have one of the organization's founding members, Blanca Reyes Castanon, with us accepting the award on the group's behalf.

I have had the privilege of knowing both Blanca and Berta for so many years, and it has been an honor for me to be able to raise awareness about the brave and inspiring Ladies in White, whether I do it here from the House floor or by hosting them here in our Nation's Capital or in my district in Miami, Florida.

Each Sunday in Cuba, the Ladies in White fight for their relatives and all political prisoners in Cuba, demonstrating peacefully as they walk to church.

Yet each Sunday, Mr. Speaker, they are harassed. They are beaten. They are arrested by the regime's thugs.

As a Cuban refugee myself, fleeing the island with my parents when I was only 8 years old, I have seen how the regime has morphed and evolved its methods of repression over the years.

Its treatment of the Ladies in White is emblematic of how it treats all political dissidents, with intimidation, with harassment, with arbitrary arrests, with short-term detentions, with denying them the ability to travel, by trying to bully dissidents into silence.

It attempts to disguise its tactics of repression, trying to fly under the radar so that outside eyes are fooled or placated or feel that they can simply look the other way. But we won't, Mr. Speaker. We won't look the other way.

Despite all of the propaganda, despite all of the misguided policy over the past years, the reality is that the regime's repression is only getting worse, and dissidents like the Ladies in White are bearing the brunt of the regime's intimidation and violence.

The regime is terrified of anyone who speaks for their God-given human rights in Cuba. It wants to project an image to the outside world that the situation in Cuba is improving, but we must not be fooled, Mr. Speaker. The regime will do whatever it takes to remain in power. That is its sole desire, to remain in power. We must be clear-eyed.

We must be honest about what is really going on in Cuba. We must not be placated by the regime's lies or by those who repeat them. We must fight for the truth and show the Cuban people that they are not alone, that together we all stand in solidarity with them in the pursuit of freedom, in the pursuit of democracy and the ability to practice their religion, to live without fear of arbitrary arrests, to live without fear of torture, and finally one day to be able to choose their own leaders.

And we can start by supporting the faces of Cuba's future, the dissidents, the human rights champions, the defenders of freedom, like the brave women of the Ladies in White. They represent the true Cuba. They are Cuba's future. And it was my honor to present them with the IRI's 2017 Freedom Award last night.

Congratulations to las Damas de Blanco, the Ladies in White.

CALLING FOR IMPEACHMENT OF THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart. I rise today with a sense of responsibility and duty to the people who have elected me, a sense of duty to this country, a sense of duty to the Constitution of the United States of America.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to call for the impeachment of the President of the United States of America for obstruction of justice. I do not do this for political purposes, Mr. Speaker. I do this because I believe in the great ideals that this country stands for, liberty and justice for all, the notion that we should have government of the people, by the people, for the people.

I do it because, Mr. Speaker, there is a belief in this country that no one is above the law, and that includes the President of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, our democracy is at risk. Mr. Speaker, this offense has occurred before our very eyes. It is conspicuous. It is easy to understand.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a President who fired the FBI Director who was investigating the President for his connections to Russian involvement in the President's election.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about the President firing the FBI Director because he was investigating someone else. It is because the FBI Director was investigating the President himself. And after firing the Director, he went on to let us know that he considered the investigation when he fired him. And then he tweeted language that would be intimidation or a warning, an admonition, very strong, to say the very least.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow this to go unchecked. The President is not above the law. It is time for the American people to weigh in.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are a part of this democracy. This is a participatory democracy. The American people don't participate on election day only. The American people participate daily, and this is your day to act. This is your day. I am speaking to the American people. It is time for you to act. It is time for you to let us know where you stand.

I have seen a poll that indicates that a majority of those who are being polled are for impeachment. And I have

seen another poll that says a plurality of those. Whether it is a majority or a plurality, let us let the American people weigh in. The American people should speak up, speak out, stand up so that we will get a sense of what the American people want.

This is not something to be taken lightly, and I do not. I think this is one of the highest callings that a Member of Congress has to address. I believe that this is where your patriotism is shown, where you demonstrate to the American people where you really stand. So I take this stand. It is a position of conscience for me. I have not talked to another person in Congress about this. Each Member of Congress has to make his or her own decision, so this is not about my encouraging other people to do things, other than the American people.

This is about my position. This is what I believe. This is where I stand. I will not be moved. The President must be impeached.

For those who do not know, impeachment does not mean that the President will be found guilty. It simply means that the House of Representatives will bring charges against the President. It is similar to an indictment but not quite the same thing.

Once a President is impeached, then the Senate can have a trial to determine the guilt or innocence of the President; whether he is guilty or not guilty, to be more specific. But the House of Representatives has a duty that it can take up, and that is of impeachment.

I stand for impeachment of the President. How can you weigh in? Well, you can contact my good friends over at Free Speech For People. At that organization, they have a petition. The petition would allow you to weigh in and become a part of the nearly 1 million people who have already said the President ought to be impeached. You can weigh in at impeachdonaldtrumpnow.org. And believe me, if a plurality of the people are saying it now, and that is the poll that I really put my emphasis on, the one that says a plurality believes that the President should be impeached, more than 40 percent, I think that can grow. I assure you, once you weigh in, American people, there will be a difference in the attitudes about this.

I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity because but for this opportunity, you might not hear my voice. I am a voice in the wilderness, but I assure you that history will vindicate me. I assure you that righteousness will prevail. I assure you that no lie can live forever, and truth crushed to Earth will rise again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President, such as accusations that he committed an impeachable offense.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in recognition of National Police Week and in honor of National Peace Officers Memorial Day, which was this past Monday. National Police Week was established by President Kennedy in 1962, as a day for Americans to remember police officers who lost their lives in the line of duty over the previous year.

This year's Peace Officers Memorial Day was especially somber in my district in western North Carolina as it was the first time since Shelby police officer Tim Brackeen was killed.

Officer Brackeen was a dedicated law enforcement officer who began his career with the Cleveland County Sheriff's Office and later joined the Shelby Police Department where, in 2012, he was honored as the officer of the year.

Last September, Officer Brackeen was working with his canine partner Ciko when he was killed in the line of duty, leaving behind his young wife and his 4-year-old daughter.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Officer Brackeen and all of the officers throughout our country who serve us so diligently every day who lost their lives serving our communities. It is really important for us as Americans to thank those who put themselves in harm's way so we may live peaceful lives for our own benefit and for the benefit of our communities.

Our men and women in blue put their lives on the line each and every day to keep us safe. When shots are fired, they run toward the sound of the gun while others are running away. I thank them for their dedicated service, and I pray each day for their continued safety.

HOLDING WHITE HOUSE ACCOUNTABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is a separate and coequal branch of government. We don't work for Donald Trump; we work for the people of this great Nation. The events of the last few months have been deeply troubling. I am trying to figure out when will my colleagues on the other side of the aisle decide that it is time to do your jobs and hold the White House accountable for its actions. When will you do your job?

Seventeen different intelligence agencies concluded that Russia interfered with our election for the purpose of helping to elect Donald Trump, but that was not enough. High-level Trump allies such as Carter Page, his foreign policy adviser; Michael Flynn, his first

National Security Advisor; Jeff Sessions, his Attorney General; Paul Manafort, his campaign chairman; Michael Cohen, his personal attorney; Roger Stone, his longtime political confidant; Jared Kushner, his senior adviser and son-in-law—top Trump allies were having communications with the Russians at the same time that they were hacking into our election. But apparently, that was not enough.

□ 1015

Michael Flynn, the first National Security Advisor, was demonstrated to have had an illegal conversation with the Russian Ambassador in December of 2016. He then lied about it to the Vice President, who then delivered misleading information to the American people. But guess what. For my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that was not enough.

The Attorney General testified under oath before Congress, and he said he had no communications with the Russians during the campaign. It was subsequently proven that he communicated with them twice at the Republican National Convention and then a few months later in his office. He either lied under oath, committed perjury, or delivered misleading information to Congress, which would be a misdemeanor. Either way, he likely committed a crime. Silence from the other side. Apparently that was not enough.

Donald Trump refuses to release his tax returns, unlike every other President since Gerald Ford, Republicans and Democrats.

What is the President hiding?

We can't figure it out. And apparently for the other side, that is not enough.

The Deputy Attorney General, Sally Yates, was fired by the President shortly after she went to the White House and revealed her suspicion that Michael Flynn may be a Russian asset. But apparently that was not enough.

The President fired Preet Bharara, the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York, shortly after it was publically revealed that his office was investigating one of Trump's Cabinet Secretaries and close allies at FOX News. But for my Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that was not enough.

The former FBI Director revealed that the Trump campaign was under criminal investigation for possible collusion with the Russians. But for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, even that was not enough.

Then the President fires the FBI Director who is leading the investigation into his campaign after it appears he urged the FBI Director to drop the case against his buddy Michael Flynn. But even for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that is not enough.

Mr. Speaker, there is a cloud of corruption hanging over 1600 Pennsylvania

Avenue. We are in the midst of a constitutional crisis. It is time for the Speaker to get his head out of the sand. It is time for House Republicans to do the right thing. Support our demand for a special prosecutor. Support our legislation for an independent commission. It is time for House Republicans to put their country ahead of their party.

SAUK RAPIDS' CITIZEN OF THE YEAR, JODI SPEICHER

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sauk Rapids' Citizen of the Year, Jodi Speicher.

The Sauk Rapids Chamber of Commerce started this award in 1986 to recognize individuals who have influenced the community for the better.

Jodi, a resident of Sauk Rapids over the past 15 years, is known for her many contributions to this wonderful community. Whether she is striving for economic prosperity by working with the Sauk Rapids Chamber of Commerce, fighting to end disease through her work with the Alzheimer's Association and the Walk to End Alzheimer's, helping to put on St. Cloud's Expo for Seniors, or advocating for our children by serving on the Community Education board for the Sauk Rapids-Rice School District, Jodi is always putting her community first.

It takes a very special person to dedicate so much of their time to helping and supporting others. I am proud to recognize that kind of accomplishment here today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Jodi for all she does for our community. She is truly deserving of this award. Keep up the great work.

TEACHING LIFE LESSONS THROUGH ART

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate an educator in my district who was recently named Minnesota's Middle Level Art Teacher of the Year by the Art Educators of Minnesota.

Pam Schwandt began her teaching career 31 years ago at Lincoln Elementary School for the Arts in Anoka, Minnesota, where she was a favorite teacher of one of my staffers. After 13 years in Anoka, Pam moved to Roosevelt Middle School, where she has been for the past 18 years.

While Pam recognizes that not all of her students will become artists, she believes many life lessons can be taught through art. Pam has been helping students learn how to find joy, in addition to nurturing their creative thinking and problem-solving skills through art.

Mr. Speaker, I speak for all Minnesotans when I say: Thank you, Pam.

The best teachers are the ones who go above and beyond just teaching a

subject. The best teachers are the ones like Pam, who teach lessons and skills that our students will carry with them for the rest of their lives. Pam's award is well deserved.

OVERCOMING OBSTACLES

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the strength and resolve of Forest Lake Patrol Officer Troy Meyer for not only overcoming adversity over the past 3 years, but for his amazing perseverance.

Troy has escaped death not just once, not twice, but three times by overcoming a severe brain infection, a lung infection, and a double lung transplant a year later. He also had surgery to repair a hole in his heart just 6 months after that.

Despite his challenges, Troy always moved ahead, determined to live life to the fullest and to help as many people as possible. He has done that by returning to his job on the police force only 13 months after his third surgery.

Mr. Speaker, Officer Meyer is an example of the resiliency of the human spirit. We are so thankful that he has made a full and miraculous recovery. Forest Lake, the police department, and the State of Minnesota are fortunate to have an individual like Troy Meyer in our community.

SERVING TO SERVE OTHERS

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend several police officers in my district for receiving the U.S. Department of Defense's Patriot Award.

Police Chief Todd Schwieger and Police Reserve Captain Richard Johnson both received the distinguished Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve's Patriot Award for their efforts helping an Active-Duty soldier work in their department while continuing his service to our country through the Army Reserve.

Created in 1972, the Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve was created to help employers understand the obligations of their Active-Duty employees and how to meet any challenges that may arise for those employees.

St. Francis Reserve Officer and Army Reserve Staff Sergeant Richard Sieber, whom they had been helping, nominated Chief Schwieger and Captain Johnson for this award. Serving in our Nation's Armed Forces is one of the most noble ways one can assist our Nation, and it is imperative that we help the brave individuals who choose to serve our country in any way that we can.

Mr. Speaker, I thank both Todd Schwieger and Richard Johnson for their dedication to our servicemembers, as well as their own service to our community through their work in the St. Francis Police Department. Their work hasn't gone unnoticed.

WE CANNOT "LET THIS GO"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this is a very troubling time in American history. Our national security is endangered, the very future of our democracy is at stake, and without the continued engagement of millions of people across this country, this troubling time could become much worse.

There is an old adage: "Loose lips sink ships." But it is also true that when it comes to the abuse of Presidential power, sealed lips can sink a democracy.

We have gone through a period where it would appear that some of our Republican colleagues are in a witness protection program because they have been unable to come forward with any words to comment on the continued abuse of power that we see played out each day, with one being more incredible than the one before.

All United States intelligence services agree that the Russians interfered in our last election. Russia deserves sanctions, not secrets, not rewards. A President of the United States invited Putin's gang right into the Oval Office. We don't know what they left behind to listen to the rest of the conversations, although they may not need to learn them surreptitiously since President Trump, in such a cavalier way, proceeded to share secrets with them.

At long last we wonder, what will awaken these Republicans from their partisan stupor? We need them to speak out as well.

Last night we learned that Trump asked FBI Director James Comey, before firing him, to drop the investigation into National Security Advisor Michael Flynn, whom Trump had been advised before he fired him that he was subject to being compromised by the Russians in his operations.

Our Republican colleagues need to decide whether they want to be accessories to Trump's obstruction of justice as he continues to endanger our national security.

Trump's firing of Director Comey is a shocking example of incredible duplicity that threatens the very fabric of the future of American democracy. It is a Nixonian dismissal that is designed to obstruct further inquiry into collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia.

Trump even said himself during his NBC interview with Lester Holt that, "regardless of the recommendation from the Department of Justice," he was prepared and planning to fire the FBI Director because of what he was doing with the Russian investigation.

And that is part of a pattern: he fired the U.S. Attorney in New York City, he fired Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates, and he then fired Mr. Comey. If

you are perceived as crossing the line with President Trump, it is like an episode out of that old TV series "The Apprentice." You are fired.

But this is not make-believe. This is the future of American democracy.

Every day we hear new coverage evidence. What could possibly explain the continued Republican silence, the callous indifference?

Well, Trump is the Republican's gold-en ticket to denying healthcare coverage to 24 million Americans and, at the same time, already showering, with a bill passed in this House, almost \$1 trillion of tax breaks to the superrich and a handful of special interests.

He is their winning ticket to awarding multinational tax dodgers more tax breaks while blowing a hole in the deficit that can change Medicare and Social Security forever.

Trump reportedly told Comey: "I hope you can let this go."

My fellow Americans, FBI Director Comey could not let it go; and now that he is gone. We cannot let this go. This is not business as usual. This is not just more tax breaks for the superrich, as Republicans are urging at a hearing tomorrow in this House. We cannot let this go.

History will be unkind to those who could not find their voice at this critical time in American history. I say it is time to truly put America first. Reject Putin. Reject partisanship. Help restore confidence in our democracy by supporting an independent special counsel and the type of independent, nonpartisan, nonpolitical inquiry that I have been calling for since last November into this Russian interference.

Mr. Speaker, too much is at stake to remain silent. We must join together to address this challenge to our future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of our Nation's teachers. Teachers change lives every day across our Nation and around the world, shaping our students and our communities.

Each of us can remember a teacher who made an impression on our life as an educator, a coach, or a mentor, often beyond the walls of the classroom.

Last week, in honor of Teacher Appreciation Week 2017, I had the opportunity to travel the Eighth District to see firsthand the amazing work that teachers do across Bucks and Montgomery Counties.

Throughout the week, I had the opportunity to read to preschool students

at the Elbow Lane School in War-
rington to discuss our national debt
with eighth graders in Newtown Middle
School, marked the Sanctuary Model
accreditation of the Valley Day School
in Morrisville, and held a student
townhall with the AP government class
students at Bensalem High School.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize
Teacher Appreciation Week, and I call
on every American to carry out that
appreciation for our teachers all year
long.

□ 1030

MY CONSTITUENTS DESERVE ANSWERS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I
rise today because this week marks the
1-year anniversary since the EPA es-
tablished the health advisory level of
70 parts per trillion to limit the life-
time exposure to perfluorinated com-
pounds like PFOA and PFOS.

To some, these acronyms and this an-
niversary may mean nothing, but to
me and my constituents—more than
70,000 Pennsylvanians in Bucks and
Montgomery Counties—it has been a
year of confusion, concern, and anger
sparked by the rightful fear that their
health has been endangered by these
PFCs.

The use of firefighting foam at mili-
tary bases in and around our district
has contaminated dozens of public
wells and over 140 private wells with
these compounds, leaving many resi-
dents scared and municipalities and
local governments looking for answers.

Mr. Speaker, every American de-
serves access to clean, safe drinking
water. Yet, for too many of my con-
stituents, these elevated levels of PFCs
have put them and their families at
risk.

While work has been done, there is
still far more work to do; and I am
pleased that the recent government
funding measure included directions
for the Secretary of Defense to con-
tinue addressing these pressing issues,
specifically by requiring all military
services to establish procedures for
prompt and cost-effective remediation
of PFC contamination, and also by de-
livering a report to Congress by the
end of the summer assessing the num-
ber of military installations across the
country impacted and the effect on
drinking water in the surrounding
communities, as well as department-
wide plans for community notification
of contamination and procedures for
timely remediation.

However, our work cannot stop here.
Not only should a health study be ex-
ecuted to know if PFOS and PFOA have
compromised my constituents' long-
term health, other issues must be ad-
dressed, including interacting with the
Department of Veterans Affairs regard-
ing service-connected condition care
for military veterans potentially im-
pacted and finding ways to offset trick-
le-down costs for those forced to con-
nect to public water in impacted areas.

After a year, my constituents deserve
more answers, and we will give them to
them. They demand action. I will fight
for both.

QUESTIONS FOR PRESIDENT TRUMP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from
Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, let me
raise several questions for President
Donald Trump. The American people
and Members of Congress would like to
know the answers.

I am deeply concerned the President
is compromising the national security
of our Nation. Why would a President
share intelligence information with the
highest ranking operatives of Russia
close to President Vladimir Putin?

Though the President's cavalier and,
frankly, outrageous behavior conven-
iently sucked up the airwaves last
week, Americans cannot be distracted
from his simultaneous firing of FBI Di-
rector James Comey, an official who
spent his life protecting and defending
the Constitution of our country on lib-
erty's behalf.

Let me ask: Why were no U.S. jour-
nalists allowed into the President's
historic meeting with the Russian For-
eign Minister Lavrov and Russia's Am-
bassador to the United States for many
years, Ambassador Kislyak, one of
probably the highest ranking intel-
ligence officers as well as Ambassador
from Russia to the United States? To
my knowledge, no U.S. President has
ever received officials from Russia in
the Oval Office and then brought only
Russian journalists with digital record-
ing equipment into that office. Let me
repeat that. We don't know who they
were, but they brought equipment, dig-
ital recording equipment.

Think about that. Think about that.

Meanwhile, the President excluded
American press. Not a single journalist
from this country was allowed in. He
replaced them with Russian state
media operatives. Today, CNN reports
that, how conveniently, President
Vladimir Putin has now said he will
make available to America the tran-
script of that meeting. He is willing to
share it. Well, isn't that nice?

It is further alarming that his Na-
tional Security Advisor, General
McMaster, said that, despite the Presi-
dent being unaware of the source of the
information, at that meeting he made
a spur-of-the-moment decision to tell
the Russians what he knew about very
important intelligence we received
from an ally.

It is starting to pile up, Mr. Presi-
dent: more and more reckless and cava-
lier behavior every day with America's
security stakes very high.

I don't have to remind my colleagues,
it is on the record. Russia has been
buzzing into U.S. airspace over Alaska.

Her submarines are along the East Coast. This isn't exactly a friend to us. If you want to make America great again, you do not compromise America's national security.

Not only is the President struggling for a coherent foreign policy that keeps Americans safe and secure and doesn't make our allies quizzical, he fails to keep his attention on promises to working Americans here on home turf, particularly on trade and jobs. Let's take the promises he made to our steelworkers in Ohio, that they will not lose their jobs, that America will be great again, that the coalfields will just boom; right?

Well, in Lorain, Ohio, thousands of steelworkers are losing their jobs, with hundreds more, as I stand here today, being pink-slipped and getting termination notices unless the President takes action by the end of the first week in June. This is not the only community in America facing this, but it is not getting any publicity because all this other stuff is all over the front pages.

We know we need direct and immediate action to save America's steel industry that has been dumped on by Chinese, Russian, and South Korean steel for years now. We need to stop foreign-dumped steel. These workers' jobs are directly impacted by what is happening at our borders with all that stuff coming in here.

I have invited the President and his Commerce Secretary, Wilbur Ross, to Lorain, Ohio, to witness firsthand this unfolding tragedy. Well, no promises are firm yet, not getting any acceptances while our workers need to be thrown a life raft in the typhoon that they are enduring. Perhaps it is hard to make America great again if you are moving from one self-made crisis to another and losing attention on the homeland.

Lorain County carried for Hillary Clinton, but only by 104 votes. It is a Democratic county. They were hoping jobs might actually begin to be increased in that area, not zeroed out.

So let's recap: a roller coaster foreign policy confusing not just us, but our allies, and broken promises regarding jobs.

How about healthcare? Well, let's take this—more confusion.

We can be certain TrumpCare removes—removes—protections for our seniors and does not address the rising costs of medications. His bill will take away assistance that closed the Medicare prescription drug hole after seniors reach a level of \$2,500, costing them over \$1,000 more a year.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve security, they deserve jobs, they deserve affordable education, and there is no better time to start than today.

HABITAT FOR HUMANITY HELPS VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, too many men and women who have served our Nation in uniform find themselves without stable, secure housing. Statistics show a veteran is almost twice as likely as a civilian to experience homelessness.

I rise today to recognize the work the Huntington, West Virginia, Area Habitat for Humanity is doing to reduce veterans' homelessness thanks to its Veterans Housing Initiative. Because of this Habitat initiative and support from the Huntington VA Medical Center's Homeless Veterans Resource Center, veterans can now make down payments and complete volunteer hours to buy their homes.

I recently toured some of the homes built through this program in the historic Fairfield neighborhood in my hometown of Huntington. So far, 10 homes have been built, and 5 are now called home by veterans and their families.

The housing not only helps veterans, but it also helps the community. These homes will help revitalize the neighborhood, an area filled with possibilities. It also frees up more housing for other veterans in need. As a veteran moves into one of these homes, his or her previous rental or apartment or room is now available to someone else in need.

I am grateful to all the Habitat volunteers and staff who are part of this life-changing project. Thank you for what you are doing to give back to those who gave so much for our Nation. Veterans in Huntington now have a brighter future and a path to homeownership.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day and May 14 through 20 as National Police Week. I stand in support of those who put their lives on the line day in and day out for the protection of those within the State of Nebraska and all over the United States.

My district is home to two sheriff's offices, a large urban police force, numerous community police departments, the Nebraska State Patrol, and a handful of Federal agencies. They have unique differences in their responsibilities, yet they are strikingly similar in how they function. The different shapes of the badges they wear on their chests proudly proclaim their distinct alliance to their home agency, but it is also a symbol that binds them all together into one brotherhood.

These gallant law enforcement professionals are driven to serve the public of their jurisdictions. They protect the life, limb, and property in their assigned patrol areas during their long hours for which they have this solemn duty. To those on the front line of our safety, it is not about the pay, the hours, or the conditions they work in. What is of importance to them is the satisfaction of making the world a better and safer place. They are the thin blue line that stands between us and some of the darkest parts of our society.

When one of these brave individuals puts on the uniform and departs their home for the streets, they are not worried about their own safety. They know their fellow officer has their back when needed. At great personal sacrifice, they are pained by missing the baseball games or recitals of beloved children, the birthdays and the holidays that they have worked instead of being home with their family.

I, like so many other members of the military, have a very personal connection and appreciation for those who choose this profession. I spent nearly 30 years in the military, and much of that time was deployed with combat forces protecting our freedoms overseas. The men and women in the military uniform depend on those back home in the blue uniform.

Like so many others in the military, when I was overseas, I left my wife and children in the U.S. As a five-time former commander, I can tell you that the fastest way to negatively affect a soldier, sailor, airman, or marine within a combat situation was to have them worry about their family back home. Our great police officers allow the military to be a success. I am in awe of the dedication that each officer displays daily. When our military is reunited with their family after a deployment, they can relax knowing their fellow public servants provide a shield of protection.

This is a profession that takes a different type of individual: someone who is consistently putting their life on the line, someone that I have always looked up to, and a group of individuals that I cannot thank enough for the blanket of security they provide.

There are members of the law enforcement community who serve, retire, and move on with their lives. Eventually they go home, lay down their badge in retirement, but they will no longer miss those family functions and events. These professionals have the gratitude of the constituents of my district, and I want to thank them for their dedication to protect and serve.

I would like to honor some of these courageous people who have long, distinguished careers or who have recently retired: Sergeant Joe Eaton from the Sarpy County Sheriff's Office, 38 years and retired; Sergeant Troy

Kister, Omaha Police Department, 29 years and retired; Captain Kevin Pokorny, LaVista Police Department, 32 years and retired; Deputy Stephanie Squiers, Sarpy County Sheriff's Office, 32 years and retired; Sergeant Don Voss, Sarpy County Sheriff's Office, 39 years and will soon retire; Deputy Dennis Yeaman, Douglas County Sheriff's Office, 42 years and still serving, nearing retirement.

I want to thank these officers and all others for their service and sacrifice.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I am often asked, as a 30-year, retired military officer, to pay tribute to our law enforcement and to compare. And what strikes me is I used to operate or train in the safety of home, but we would deploy into harm's way. Our law enforcement, every single day, put themselves in harm's way. So we love our law enforcement, we respect them, and we thank them.

REMEMBERING AND HONORING ENDY EKPANYA

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, as National Police Week ends, the 800,000 Texans I work for back home want to say "thank you" to all of the Americans who came to Washington, D.C., and all those that rose up in hometowns all across America to support our police officers—our sheriffs, our JPs, our consuls—and to join our heroes on that thin blue line.

In Pearland, Texas, we want to thank all Americans for remembering and honoring one of our own: Pearland Police Officer Endy Ekpanya. In 2016, 145 police officers were killed all across America. Endy, sadly, joined that group.

Endy was killed at 3:15 in the morning on Sunday, June 12, 2016, end of watch, 339 days ago. He was killed on a nonemergency call by a driver who was high on drugs or booze. She T-boned his car. He was 30 young years old.

Endy left behind the love of his life, his fiancée, Lucy, and his 2-year-old son, Julian. They mourned in front of Endy's flag-draped coffin at his service back home the week of his death.

Endy's loss brought out the best in Pearland, Brazoria County, in southeast Texas. They shared tears with Lucy and Julian. They swarmed them with love. Every single Pearland police officer left duty on that day to be there, but Pearland was protected by police officers all over southeast Texas rising to the occasion.

We continue working to ensure the woman who killed Endy goes to prison for a long time. The people of Pearland are building a memorial at their police station with Endy's life on one wall. He

will be there with two others who lost their lives in Pearland, Texas: Officer Henry Wendell, Jr., end of watch, November 6, 1967; and Officer James Cassidy, Jr., end of watch, May 16, 1973.

I have kept up with Lucy. The last time we talked was early January. I called to tell her that the entire Texas House delegation—36 strong, Republicans and Democrats—signed my bill to name the post office in Pearland after Endy. She was happy, but she still felt pain. That was the first Christmas back home with Endy's parents in New York.

Sadly, losses like Endy are still happening. This week, we learned that a deputy sheriff in Montana was shot and killed during a routine traffic stop; and a police chief was shot in response to a domestic violence incident in upstate New York. And that was just yesterday. This violence against our law enforcement officials must end.

During National Police Week, we honor these heroes, the ones we have lost, and we say a humble "thank you" to their families. We will never, ever forget their sacrifice. We pray for the day that Lucy and Julian can join Endy in Heaven. God bless Endy Ekpanya and all of the heroes who gave their lives on duty.

HONORING PETER CYBULSKI AND HAMEED ARMANI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, many Americans, when faced with that split-second decision to act in a crisis with selfless valor, or to flee, answer the call of duty in service to their fellow man.

In June 2016, NYPD Officers Peter Cybulski and Hameed Armani, both of whom I had the privilege to meet last month, were on patrol in Times Square when a suspected bomb was thrown into their vehicle. Rather than vacating their vehicle in place, these officers selflessly drove their car one-and-a-half blocks away from the public in a crowded Times Square.

In that moment, when others might have simply fled the scene to save their own lives, Officers Cybulski and Armani were prepared to sacrifice everything to save the people they were sworn to protect. This selfless act of bravery is just one of so many acts of heroism by our police officers every single day.

This week is National Police Week, where we honor our members of law enforcement and remember the sacrifices of those who have lost their lives in the line of duty. The brave men and women protecting our communities deserve recognition for their selfless acts of courage and commitment to serving our Union.

This special week began in 1962, when President John F. Kennedy signed a

proclamation which designated May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day. Every year, the week on which that date falls is designated as National Police Week. Since then, thousands of our officers and their families from all across our great Nation come to Washington, D.C., during this week to be recognized for their selfless duty and to honor those who have fallen in service to their community.

I have always believed that our Nation has a perennial obligation to provide our police officers with every ounce of support that we have to offer. These heroes deserve to know that the people of this Nation, for whom they have given so much, are forever grateful. It really is the least that we can do for these brave men and women.

As a Member of Congress, I have committed myself to ensuring law enforcement is given all of the support necessary, and more, to carry out their selfless mission. Last year, around this time, we passed five key pieces of legislation which both honor our police and ensure those still serving possess the tools and equipment needed to carry out this responsibility.

Some of these bills included the Fallen Heroes Flag Act of 2016, the Federal Law Enforcement Self-Defense and Protection Act, and the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program and Reauthorization Act. And again this year, this week, we are doing the same: passing legislation to protect our law enforcement who sacrifice so much to protect us.

In recent years, our Nation has become fractured, and our police have been subject to acts of violence and hatred. It is more important now than ever before that law enforcement receives our unwavering appreciation, support, and respect. Courage, leadership, and a commitment to service, these are the qualities embedded within our members of law enforcement, the traits by which they uphold deeply with dignity and honor.

This week, and every week, it is so important to honor those who have put themselves into harm's way to protect us, our families, and our communities. Their sacrifices will, and should, be revered for generations to come.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Rabbi Thomas A. Louchheim, Congregation Or Chadash, Tucson, Arizona, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, each day raise up these good women and men who are serving our country with honor. Renew in them the faith, hope, and love that brought them to this vital work. Rekindle in them the passion that first called them to serve.

May you, our elected Representatives from every State in our great Nation, be granted today the courage of your convictions; and may your eyes, your ears, and your hearts be open to the possibilities not yet imagined.

Compassionate God, may our fellow Americans remember that these, Your servants, are each made in the divine image. They are our brothers and sisters in a family bridging all philosophical lines. May we treat them with respect, for we know not the hard battles they must fight.

May Your blessings be on our military and diplomats serving overseas. Keep them safe from harm. Keep their souls strong, and strengthen them to serve with honor and courage.

May our prayers for kindness, justice, freedom, and peace, be answered in our own day.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILLIAMS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING RABBI THOMAS A. LOUCHHEIM

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rabbi Thomas Louchheim, who led us in the opening prayer. He is a rabbi at the Congregation Or Chadash in Tucson, Arizona. Rabbi Louchheim moved to Tucson with his wife, Marcia, in 1989 and has been a pillar in our community ever since.

Having served as a rabbi at Temple Emanu-El and as an executive for

Handmaker Hospice, he is a strong advocate for peace and religious harmony. He worked closely with the Muslim community in the aftermath of September 11 and has continued to promote understanding by organizing annual Muslim-Jewish peace walks.

He founded the first Jewish-Christian-Muslim Scriptural study group in our community and has contributed to interfaith literature. In a world where religion too often divides us, Rabbi Louchheim has shown that we are all stronger together.

Rabbi Louchheim's influence extends past southeastern Arizona. In fact, his influence reaches beyond this Earth. The rabbi is a namesake for the only space object in the universe named after a rabbi, Asteroid 9584 Louchheim.

I was honored to join Rabbi Louchheim in a Holocaust Remembrance walk last year. I have personally witnessed his compassion and leadership in the faith community in southeastern Arizona. I am honored to welcome him to the House of Representatives today and to personally thank him for offering this morning's prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL
POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand before the House today to recognize National Police Week.

Every year at this time, law enforcement officials from around the country gather here to pay tribute to their fallen brethren and to stand with their families. It is yet another measure of their commitment to protect and serve.

Over just this last year, four of Wisconsin's finest have lost their lives in the line of duty: Trooper Anthony Borostowski of the Wisconsin State Patrol; Deputy Dan Glaze of the Rusk County Sheriff's Office; Officer Michael Venture of the Town of Salem's Department of Public Safety; Detective Jason Weiland of the Everest Metropolitan Police Department.

Earlier this year, Detective Weiland was killed establishing a perimeter during a standoff with a shooter who took the lives of three people. Jason left behind a wife and two children.

Anna, his daughter, almost 11 years old, spoke at the funeral: "Our dad was an amazing man that saved lives every

day," she said. "We all know he is always and will be forever in our hearts. He'll be looking down on us, laughing and crying."

Looking down that day, Anna's dad saw some remarkable things: He saw thousands of people, many of whom he had never met, lined up to pay their respects; he saw cops in uniform from all over the country, from New York, Chicago, Oregon, and Canada; he saw mourners and even pallbearers in green and gold to honor his love of the Green Bay Packers; and he saw blue ribbons everywhere.

In a time when law enforcement is targeted and too often politicized, we must never take for granted the dangers that they face. Every day and every night, they leave their homes and their families to protect ours. They put their lives on the line to protect ours.

For their loved ones, all they hope for, all they pray for, is to hear the car pull into the driveway and see that familiar face come through the door.

And when the unspeakable happens, when their watch is cut short, ours is only beginning. The support that we give to their families, the respect and the appreciation we show for their fellow officers—it is the least we can do as citizens, and must do, this week and every week.

Today I ask the whole House to join me in expressing our profound gratitude to law enforcement officers here in the Capital and across the Nation.

CELEBRATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY
OF REUNIFICATION OF JERUSALEM

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

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce bipartisan H. Res. 328 with my colleague from Florida, FRANCIS ROONEY, celebrating the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem.

For centuries, the Jewish people yearned to pray at the Western Wall, the only remaining connection to the Great Temple destroyed in 70 A.D., a cry that infused their daily prayers.

Fifty years ago, in 1967, this mere hope became a reality when Jerusalem was finally reunified at the conclusion of the Six-Day War.

Of that precious moment, Yitzhak Rabin recounted: "We stood among a tangle of rugged, battle-weary men who were unable to believe their eyes or restrain their emotions. Their eyes were moist with tears, their speech incoherent. The overwhelming desire was to cling to the Wall, to hold on to that great moment as long as possible."

The reunification of Jerusalem restored the city as a beacon of religious freedom for all of the Abrahamic religions and the rights of Jews, Muslims,

and Christians to pray at their respective holy sites.

We share the joy of our brothers and sisters as we celebrate this special milestone and as we continue to strive for a two-state solution between Israelis and Palestinians. In a world of increasing instability, our enduring relationship with Israel was never more vital, and I am honored to stand with our close friend and ally.

HONORING BRANCH COUNTY SHERIFF POSSE DEPUTY MICHAEL WINTER

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Branch County, Michigan, Sheriff Posse Deputy Michael Winter, who lost his life in the line of duty. He is survived by his wife, Connie, and two daughters, Cheyenne and Sierra.

Deputy Winter was known as a committed family man with a sense of humor and a big smile. He loved being around horses and loved the posse.

From his time in the United States Navy to the Branch County Sheriff's Posse, Deputy Winter was the type of person who put his community and country before himself. He is a hero in every sense of the word.

This week, during National Police Week, his name was carved into the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial here in Washington, D.C. It is a lasting tribute to those who paid the ultimate sacrifice to protect us.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful nation, we honor Deputy Winter's memory and his service to Branch County and our country. He will not be forgotten.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT SHOULD APPOINT AN INDEPENDENT PROSECUTOR

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, last night we learned that President Trump may have tried to interfere with an ongoing investigation, asking the FBI Director to end an investigation into his former National Security Adviser's ties to Russia.

The Justice Department today should appoint an independent prosecutor to aggressively pursue the truth. There are a lot of informational dots. They either connect or they don't.

There is no dispute that Russia interfered with the United States' Presidential election. The question is: Did Russia interfere with the Presidential election in coordination with the Trump campaign?

It is deeply troubling that the Attorney General recused himself—a self-de-

clared conflict—from the Russian investigation and then played a role in firing the man leading it.

The American people rightfully suspect the decision to fire the FBI Director is part of a coverup. Appoint a special prosecutor to pursue the truth.

Despots all over the world like Putin want to discredit American democracy to keep their own people from wanting it. We as Americans, Republicans and Democrats all, cannot allow this to happen, ever.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of law enforcement not only in my district, but around the Nation.

This week is National Police Week, and it marks an important time for our country. These men and women are an elite group worthy of our praise and recognition. They are true American patriots whose acts of courage must be honored and acknowledged.

Too many heroes lost their lives in the line of duty last year. Multiple of them were in my home State of Texas, as well as in my district.

Every single day, Federal, State, and local police officers around the country put their lives on the line to protect their fellow Americans. Mr. Speaker, I came up here to speak on behalf of all Americans and express our appreciation for our law enforcement. These are the men and women who dedicate their lives to keeping the peace and carrying out justice.

Congress has worked and will continue to work hard to guarantee that these brave men and women are provided with the tools needed to do their jobs and maintain public safety. We will also remain persistent to ensure those who harm law enforcement officers are brought to justice.

I applaud those in law enforcement who have voluntarily put their lives on the line for all of us.

In God we trust.

IT IS TIME TO PUT COUNTRY BEFORE PARTY

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it seems like, with this White House, there is a new crisis every single day.

On Monday, it was reported that the President revealed classified information in the Oval Office to Russians, compromising our national security, compromising our ability to gather intelligence on ISIS, compromising our ability to keep America safe.

Now we learn that the President tried to interfere with an ongoing in-

vestigation, asking the head of the FBI to lay off his National Security Adviser, Mr. Flynn, to leave it alone, to let it go.

This is an abuse of power, there is no two ways about it, and Democrats and Republicans have to stand up and do our constitutional duty to protect this democracy. Partisanship has to be set aside. We have to do our job. We have to serve the American people, and we have to protect this precious democracy and do our constitutional duty. Democrats and Republicans both have to stand together on this.

We need an independent commission to investigate this problem, and we need to do it now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President of the United States.

HONORING KIRKERSVILLE POLICE CHIEF STEVEN DISARIO

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, this week is Police Week, a time we honor all our officers, especially those who have fallen in the line of duty keeping us safe. So today I rise in honor and remember Kirkersville, Ohio, Police Chief Steven Eric DiSario.

Chief DiSario, a father of five with a baby on the way, was killed in the line of duty on May 12, 2017. He died at the hands of a gunman who also killed two employees at a local nursing home, Marlina Medrano and Cindy Krantz.

This is a tragedy that truly tests the strength of a community, the strength of neighbors, and the strength of our law enforcement community.

To Chief DiSario's family: I can't imagine the grief and the anguish you must be feeling. We are heartbroken for your loss. Please know that your husband, your father, your son, was an American hero. His memory will never be forgotten, and it is there that I pray you find hope. Today and every day, may God bless you and all our police officers and their families.

□ 1215

AMERICA'S DRINKING WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call urgent attention to America's drinking water infrastructure. Every day, more than 700 water mains break in cities, towns, and villages across our great country. Every day, 7 billion gallons of clean drinking water are lost due to leaks and breaks in our water infrastructure. That is treated water and our tax dollars down the drain.

With as many as 10 million lead service lines in use today and dozens of new unregulated contaminants, the threat to public health goes far beyond Flint, Michigan, and Hoosick Falls, New York. Our Federal Government has a duty to protect the people of this country. We must act decisively to address this growing challenge.

We maintain roads and bridges and ports and railways and so much more, but our investment in our water systems has not kept up, and now these systems are failing. Many State and local governments can't keep up. They need our help. This job needs to get done now, this year, in this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to join me in supporting H.R. 1071, the AQUA Act. Let's respond to these great Nation's drinking water challenges with strength, compassion, and passion.

IVY FRANCES SHOEMAKER AKA NUMBER 12

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, she was born at evening time as a full Moon rose over Texas. Ivy Frances Shoemaker joined the world weighing 7 pounds and was 20 inches long. Her birth was on May 9 in Dallas.

The miracle of birth is God's blessing to the rest of us. It is a blessing to Ivy's parents, Kellee and Anthony, and her sisters, Olivia and Rosalyn.

Ivy, of course, is a beautiful, smart-looking baby. She has the privilege to be born to wonderful parents who will raise her to grow in wisdom and stature in the Lord.

My wife, Carol, and I are the proud grandparents of Ivy, whom I will call from time to time, number 12.

Mr. Speaker, you see, I refer to my other grandchildren by their birth numbers as well. There are 11 of them.

My hope for Ivy is that she sees the importance of being good to others; that she makes the world a better place; that she is faithful to the Lord; that she appreciates her heritage; and that, of course, she always lives in Texas.

And that is just the way it is.

THE OPIOID CRISIS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in the middle of a public health crisis. Drug overdoses are now killing more Americans each year than car accidents. And 336 Rhode Islanders died last year as a result of a drug overdose. That is up from 290 in 2015 and 238 deaths in 2014.

Nationwide, overdose deaths involving prescription and illicit opioids have

quadrupled since 1999. This is a crisis that threatens Americans of all different backgrounds—young and old, Black and White, urban and rural. It is a crisis, plain and simple.

All of us who serve the government have a responsibility to stop it. That is why I was so alarmed earlier this month when I learned that President Trump is considering slashing funding for the Office of National Drug Control Policy by 95 percent. Slashing funding for the lead Federal agency in this fight would have a devastating impact on families in Rhode Island and all across our country.

Let's work together. Let's work across the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, to defeat this short-sighted proposal and, instead, advance real, comprehensive solutions to this public health epidemic.

THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the mutual relationship between the United States and Taiwan—enshrined in the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 and reinforced by the Six Assurances of 1982—has endured, due to our shared beliefs in democratic government, freedom of expression, the rule of law, and a market economy.

It is my hope that this relationship will continue to deepen and strengthen in all areas. I hope the Trump administration will move expeditiously with a military sales package that will help to guarantee Taiwan's security and freedom for the future.

The people of Taiwan have great friends in the people of the United States. I know many of my colleagues will join me in expressing our shared desire to work together with our friends on the old and new challenges that Taiwan faces.

Mr. Speaker, I wish President Tsai and the people of Taiwan all the best on their first anniversary of her administration.

HONORING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

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

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is National Police Week, and I rise to honor law enforcement officials who protect our communities. I also pay tribute to the thousands of men and women who have died in the line of duty. There are few jobs more important or more perilous than that of a police officer.

Since I took office in January, there have been at least four incidents in or near my central Florida district where a police officer was shot. In one of those

cases, an officer, Orlando Police Lieutenant Debra Clayton, lost her life.

Because they run towards danger, police officers face unimaginable challenges. Last June, an armed attacker entered the Pulse nightclub in Orlando and opened fire, killing 49 people. Showing no regard for their own safety, Orlando officers charged into the club, eventually bringing that long, dark night to an end.

Mr. Speaker, despite the risks, they put on their uniforms every day. So to all the brave officers around this country, I say: Thank you.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Police Week, a time to honor and thank law enforcement officers for all they do in service to our communities.

As a former State and Federal prosecutor, I have worked with law enforcement officers at every level: local, State, and Federal. I watched as they tirelessly worked to carry out justice and keep our communities safe.

As a Member of Congress, I have the privilege of representing a district that is both rural and urban. I have seen the different challenges that our officers have faced. They have done it in a tremendous way, both at the local police level and at the sheriff level. The work and effort put in by the officers in each community never ceases to amaze me. It is a big reason why our district has continued to thrive with vibrant and safe communities.

This work does not come without its risks. Far too many officers pay the ultimate price. Last year in South Jacksonville, Illinois, in my district, one of its own was killed in the line of duty. Losses like this are devastating for both the families and our communities. We must never forget their sacrifices and we must continue to work to keep our officers protected.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work the House is doing this week to do just that. I thank every law enforcement officer for their commitment and dedication towards keeping America safe.

OUR WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, today we are talking about infrastructure. I want to focus on one aspect of infrastructure that touches the lives of all Americans, especially in my home State of California, and that is water.

I know firsthand the urgent challenges facing our water infrastructure.

The crippling recent drought and subsequent record rainfall has prompted more discussion on a need for a smart water management strategy to improve drinking water, water reuse, and recycled water systems for communities across the United States.

We must take meaningful steps to increase our water conservation, reduce unnecessary energy use, and cut costs for Americans. Let's commit to investing in technology and science-based solutions that will address the weaknesses in our water drinking systems from threats like climate change, crumbling pipes, and water source contamination.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to focus on legislation that will put Americans back to work building the systems we need to support the future of this great country.

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in celebrating the fifth annual National Infrastructure Week and to highlight the urgent need for Congress to pass a comprehensive transportation and infrastructure bill.

Mr. Speaker, in the summer of 2003, a power outage swamped the Eastern United States and Canada, including Detroit, which I represent, and left 50 million people without power for several days.

In 2007, a bridge on I-35 West in Minneapolis collapsed into the Mississippi River. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, these are not isolated incidents.

In my home State of Michigan, our cities are home to some of the worst roads in the country. A recent study by a nonprofit ranked Detroit's roads the fourth worst in the country.

Mr. Speaker, Michigan deserves better, and Americans across the country deserve and demand more. I, as an excited member of the Congressional Infrastructure Committee, stand ready to work on future infrastructure bills and to work for the needs of the people.

FOCUSING ON OUR INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this month, President Trump promised an infrastructure package "in the next 2 to 3 weeks, maybe sooner."

Here we are into week three and in the middle of National Infrastructure Week. So, Mr. President, where is the plan?

I wish we were spending today working together to create jobs by making

meaningful investments in our roads, our bridges, our rail, and our airports. That is what the hardworking men and women I represent wish Washington would focus on, too. But, instead, at breakfast tables all over the country, moms and dads turn on the morning news and have to explain to their kids what is an obstruction of justice before putting their kids on the school bus and traverse our bumpy and potholed roads.

This is a dark moment in our Nation's history. History demands that we rise to the occasion. Nobody is above the law, not even the President of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do the right thing for the good of our country. Join us in demanding a true and independent investigation to get to the bottom of the President's ties to Vladimir Putin and any possible attempted coverup.

THE NEED FOR INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT

(Ms. ESTY of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize National Infrastructure Week and to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work together and pass a bipartisan infrastructure bill.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we cannot run a 21st century economy on a mid-20th century infrastructure.

Our roads are filled with potholes, costing commuters, on average, \$520 a year in repairs. Traffic congestion adds another \$960 per year in fuel and lost productivity.

Too many of our bridges are structurally deficient and past their 50-year lifespan. As the Flint lead crisis painfully demonstrated, our water infrastructure is failing to provide too many Americans with water that is safe to drink.

It is time to stop talking about infrastructure. It is time for Congress to act. The systems that allow us to travel from place to place, provide us with clean drinking water, and dispose of waste are not luxuries; they are essentials.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass a bipartisan infrastructure plan. Let's invest in safety, jobs, and the competitiveness of American businesses.

INVESTING IN OUR NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize National Infrastructure Week.

In my first few months in Congress, I made it a priority to meet with elected

officials from every municipality and jurisdiction in my Washington State congressional district. I met with them to understand their critical transportation and infrastructure needs. Today I am releasing a report on those needs.

I am proud that my district continues to draw in more and more people and that we have assets like a natural deep water port that facilitates commerce from across our State.

Unfortunately, between 1990 and 2015, as our State's population increased by 45 percent, Seattle has now got the second worst evening rush hour traffic in the country. We have failed to invest in our infrastructure.

This administration made promises but has done nothing to actually fulfill those promises to invest in infrastructure and to ensure that our country actually moves forward. Instead, it has just been lurching from crisis to crisis.

Investing in infrastructure is not only essential, it creates jobs. I intend to do everything I can to make sure that I fight for my district's priorities and to ensure that Congress invests in our infrastructure.

□ 1230

COMPROMISING SENSITIVE INFORMATION

(Ms. ROSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I find it deeply disturbing that highly classified intelligence information from Israel, our indispensable ally, was carelessly compromised by President Trump in a meeting with Russian officials.

By recklessly sharing this sensitive intelligence, the President has not only endangered our troops, intelligence officials, and sources who risk their lives every day to keep us safe, but he has jeopardized the relationship we have with our most important ally in the Middle East, Israel.

If we wish to defeat ISIS, the President must rectify this unacceptable blunder. The American people must receive immediate assurances that this administration is doing everything necessary to repair any damage caused by the President's reckless actions.

The role of Commander in Chief is one that must be taken seriously and should never result in the compromising of our most sensitive information, especially to a foreign adversary at the expense of one of our strongest allies.

HONORING JONATHAN DE GUZMAN AND ALL OFFICERS DURING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, every day men and women in the

police force put their lives on the line to keep us safe. Let me tell you about one of these extraordinary heroes: San Diego Police Department Officer Jonathan De Guzman, or JD, as his friends knew him.

JD dedicated his life to protecting the San Diego community he loved. His bravery shows the kind of unique selflessness found in police officers. After suffering a brutal stabbing from a suspect, JD went back to the force, and that same year he won the San Diego Police Department Purple Heart award for bravery in the line of duty.

Tragically, on July 28, 2016, Officer De Guzman, a 16-year veteran of the force, was shot and killed, a hero taken from us too early.

There is a special honor in representing those who serve us every single day, those like San Diego's own JD, Officer De Guzman. Thank you to the brave men and women of our police force. Your sacrifice and your strength keep us safe.

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, today I urge President Trump again to make good on his promise of partnering with Congress to invest \$1 trillion in America's infrastructure.

This week marks National Infrastructure Week; and yet, disappointingly, little action has been taken by this President and the majority in Congress to provide substantive funds for our Nation's crumbling infrastructure. Easing congestion on our highways is just one investment that will have a significant return, getting central coast residents to their jobs and back home to their families faster.

This is also an issue of safety for our constituents. California currently has over 1,300 structurally deficient bridges, 678 high-hazard dams, and 50 percent of its nearly 200,000 miles of public roads are in poor condition.

I urge my colleagues to work together in a bipartisan way to address the infrastructure crisis in our country.

HONORING BEN AND DAN MATHESON

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the House's attention two fine Texans who are sitting up in the House gallery, Ben and Dan Matheson.

Ben has been on my Air Force advisory committee down in Texas for the entire 32 years that I have been in Congress. He and the other two members of

that nominating committee have recommended to me over 100 young men and women whom we have nominated to the Air Force Academy and who are now serving, defending our Nation.

His son is Dan Matheson, one of my best friends, a proud graduate of the University of Texas Law School, former head of the Texas State Fed office, and a successful practicing attorney in Austin, Texas.

I am very proud to have their friendship, and I am glad to bring to the attention of the House these two fine Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members not to refer to persons in the gallery.

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, this is National Infrastructure Week; yet, at the same time, our current President promised that, as soon as he took office, he was going to put forth a trillion-dollar infrastructure package. Where is that package? We haven't seen it.

The economy is the number one thing we should all be focusing on. Everything else should fall into place after that. Yet this White House is too busy in turmoil to take care of the core business of this country.

It is actually White House crisis week again. That is a sad comment, but it is the truth. Once again we hear about a President who is not respecting the fact that we have allies around the world who are there sharing information that should not be shared with the Russians, and yet, at the same time, this President chooses to violate that responsibility.

The American people and economy are losing confidence in our President and our White House. They shouldn't be given these disturbing reports that come out almost every day. The actions are undermining our economy. It is undermining the confidence in our infrastructure, and it is undermining our confidence of the United States around the world.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 17, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of

the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 17, 2017, at 9:20 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 419.

That the Senate passed S. 583.

That the Senate passed S. 867.

That the Senate agreed to S.J. Res. 22.

Appointments:

Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff
Commission on Native Children.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 115, THIN BLUE LINE ACT

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 323 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 323

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 115) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-17 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

As a former Federal and State prosecutor, I often hear how Americans value and respect our law enforcement officers, firefighters, and first responders. We talk about their heroism, their

selflessness, their willingness to protect and serve no matter the cost.

These fearless individuals truly are the fabric that holds our communities together. However, in recent years, a violent and disturbing trend has developed. Law enforcement officers, firefighters, and first responders are increasingly being targeted for violence and cruelty based solely on the uniform they wear.

According to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, there were 64 police shooting deaths in 2016. That number is 56 percent higher than the previous year. The National Association of Police Organizations also notes that ambush-style killings of law enforcement officers increased by 167 percent in 2016.

Allowing this appalling trend to continue unchecked is not only unacceptable, it is indefensible. Congress must take concrete steps to address this deadly problem.

Current Federal law provides 16 aggravating factors that a jury must consider when deciding whether a death sentence is warranted. These factors include whether the defendant acted in an especially heinous, cruel, or depraved manner; whether the defendant engaged in substantial planning and premeditation; whether the victim was particularly vulnerable; whether the victim was a high public official, which includes high-ranking public persons, from the President to a foreign head of state, to a judge or a Federal law enforcement officer. However, State and local police officers, firefighters, prosecutors, and first responders are excluded from these protections.

In response, my friend, Mr. BUCHANAN, introduced H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act. This legislation amends Federal law to include murdering, attempting to murder, or targeting of State and local law enforcement officers, firefighters, prosecutors, and first responders as an aggravating factor a jury must consider when determining whether a death sentence is justified. Furthermore, these protections extend to all public safety officers who are murdered or targeted while engaging in their official duties, because of the performance of their duties, or because of their status as a public official or employee.

This bill sends a clear message: Those who target our police officers, firefighters, or first responders with violence will be met with an equally harsh punishment.

We offer our thoughts and prayers to the families of our fallen officers, but we must do more to protect these brave individuals. We can't stand idly by as the individuals who protect our homes and communities are targeted because of the uniform they wear. We must act to ensure those individuals who would commit an act of violence against our public safety officers know they will

face the gravest of sentences if they go through with their heinous plot.

We must send the message that Congress stands with those fearless individuals who dedicate their lives to protecting our communities, no matter the cost. We can't continue allowing them to suffer the price of our inaction. I support this effort and thank Chairman GOODLATTE and the Committee on the Judiciary for bringing this bill to the floor.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate the rule for consideration of H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act.

Mr. Speaker, law enforcement and first responders play an important role in the safety and security of our communities. I know about that because of the reason that, when I was a lawyer, I had the privilege of representing a firefighters association and a police officers association.

I have represented police officers in court, and I have been in situations where I have interfaced with them as a lawyer in other circumstances. They are an invaluable resource represented by the hard work of dedicated men and women across our Nation.

Most importantly, our admiration for police officers is not a partisan issue. We universally agree that those officers who diligently work to protect our communities warrant our praise as we honor them on this National Police Week.

□ 1245

They are our friends, our neighbors, our family, and they are even our colleagues. I am honored to serve in this institution with a number of persons who, in their other activities, were either police officers or police chiefs that served in that capacity in law enforcement.

We have a new Member here from my State, my good friend, Representative VAL DEMINGS, a career law enforcement officer herself—27 years she served—serving as Orlando's first female chief of police. I have just a footnote to add to that. Val's husband is the sheriff of Orange County.

It is because of this admiration and bipartisan support that, in some respects, I was dismayed to see that, as we celebrate National Police Week, my Republican colleagues decided now was the time to bring this, in my view, unnecessary messaging bill to the floor simply to score political points.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 115 would add the murder, attempted murder, or targeting of a law enforcement official, first responder, or firefighter as an aggravating factor when determining if a

death sentence is warranted for a defendant convicted of murder in Federal court.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is this bill is unnecessary. It is, in short, really good messaging, but bad policy. Under current law, there is already an exhaustive list of 16 statutory aggravating factors for homicide for a jury or court to consider.

Having been involved in the justice system for a protracted time in my career, I am trying to think of a time that a police officer was killed and a person was tried and convicted; and I ask my colleagues to answer that question, that anybody that was convicted for killing a police officer didn't get the death penalty. I know in my State, in every instance that that occurred—and they were too numerous, and I regret that they occurred at all—all of those people got the death penalty.

We also remember that Federal prosecutors can and do seek the death penalty in the killing of law enforcement or first responders, as our friends from Massachusetts are well aware after a death sentence was handed down in the case involving the Boston Marathon bomber. And that was in Massachusetts, a nondeath penalty State.

Mr. Speaker, on this front, the system is working. Federal prosecutors already have the tools to seek the death penalty in cases where a first responder or law enforcement official was murdered. What's more, they are using these tools.

Given this duplicity, it is a shame that we are here today debating the need for a seventeenth new aggravating factor to keep members of the law enforcement community safe when we could be considering measures that would actually keep them and their communities they protect far safer.

Let's be clear. This legislation does nothing to keep law enforcement officers and first responders safe. By its own purported purpose, this bill addresses the tragic scenario in which the officer has already been killed. We need to be working together to create legislation that has a real impact on keeping our communities and police safer, as opposed to slapping a catchy name on an unnecessary bill and pretend we are doing something.

If my Republican colleagues were serious about advancing protections for law enforcement during National Police Week, we would be discussing providing them with the tools, the resources, and the training to engage in beneficial community policing initiatives. Our law enforcement officers and the communities they police deserve more than messaging. They deserve real action.

I ask one more question. Ask police officers what their attitude is about assault weapons. I think you would find that, if we passed an assault weapons measure, we would be pleasing police

officers a great deal more than mes-
saging to them our concern for their
safety.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, we are here
because we are making sure that local
police officers, sheriff's deputies, pros-
ecutors, first responders, and fire-
fighters have the same protections that
those in the Federal system have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the
gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, law en-
forcement officers across this country
go to work every day to serve and pro-
tect our communities. These brave men
and women risk everything to keep our
communities and our families safe and
secure, and they do it selflessly.

I recently attended a ceremony in
Putnam County, Indiana, honoring the
service and sacrifice of the Indiana
State Police officers who have given
their lives in the line of duty. Yester-
day I was at the White House with Vice
President PENCE to recognize the ded-
ication of the Indiana Fraternal Order
of Police and to remember the service
of the late sheriff's deputy of Howard
County, Carl Koontz, who was killed in
the line of duty.

Events like these are somber remind-
ers of what these heroes who stand on
the thin blue line, and their families,
sacrifice on our behalf. We should all
be grateful.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation ensures
that officers who fall in the line of
duty, and their families, receive the
justice they deserve. I urge all of my
colleagues to support this legislation
that confirms the United States Con-
gress stands behind our law enforce-
ment.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield
myself such time as I may consume,
and then I will yield to a speaker to
speak for the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, it may sound like we
are getting ready to change the sub-
ject; and, to a relative degree, we are.

We are in very interesting and trou-
bling times in this Nation, and we have
some concerns that need to be ad-
dressed. One of the things that is al-
lowed to the minority is an oppor-
tunity to present a previous question.

In this particular instance, we are
deeply concerned by last night's revela-
tions that, earlier this year, President
Trump may have attempted to ob-
struct justice when he asked then-FBI
Director James Comey to end the Bu-
reau's investigation of former National
Security Advisor Flynn's ties to Rus-
sia. This news came only days after the
President acknowledged that he later
fired Director Comey over the Bureau's
investigation into the links between
the Trump campaign and Russia, and
only a day after we learned the Presi-
dent shared highly classified intel-
ligence with Russian officials last
week.

I served for 8 years on the Intel-
ligence Committee in this Congress,
and the kind of information that the
President shared with the Russians—
even as an Intelligence member, I saw
secret, I saw top secret, I saw high se-
cret, but I did not see code word infor-
mation, the highest that is only shared
with a few people in the congressional
body—that is what was allowed to be
transmitted.

It is time that the Republican-con-
trolled Congress does its job and acts
to defend our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the pre-
vious question, I am going to offer an
amendment to the rule to bring up a
bipartisan bill, H.R. 356, which would
create a nonpartisan commission to in-
vestigate Russian interference in our
2016 election. This marks the seventh
time we tried to bring this bill to the
House floor. On the previous six occa-
sions, the Republican majority regret-
tably refused the House to even debate
this important legislation.

As more and more facts have come to
light, I hope my colleagues will finally
put country ahead of party and get se-
rious about this investigation. My
goodness, the allegation here is that
people impacted our fundamental
premise of our existence: our elections.
We need to create this commission
with legislation rather than just
tweeting about the need for facts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous con-
sent to insert the text of the amend-
ment in the RECORD, along with extra-
neous material, immediately prior to
the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield
5 minutes to the distinguished gen-
tleman from California, (Mr.
SWALWELL), a member of the Intel-
ligence Committee of the House, to dis-
cuss our proposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before
recognizing the gentleman from Cali-
fornia, Members are reminded to re-
frain from engaging in personalities to-
ward the President.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have
a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gen-
tleman will state his parliamentary in-
quiry.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have
heard that often. Will the Speaker di-
rect me to what I said that was any-
thing more than what is a fact here.
Can the Chair tell me what I said that
was dealing with the personality of the
President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gen-
tleman may have, perhaps not in
words, but perhaps gave some indica-
tion of illegal activities by the Presi-
dent.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr.
Speaker, I thank the gentleman from
Florida for yielding.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the
previous question and allow an amend-
ment to come forward so that we can
debate having an independent commis-
sion on Russia's interference in our
past election.

The events over the past few weeks
have demonstrated that there is a high
cost—a cost that is too high to bear
with regard to the White House and its
ties with Russia.

What is the cost exactly?

What is the cost of alleged abuses
and the President's firing of Acting At-
torney General Sally Yates and Direc-
tor James Comey?

What is the cost of the question
swirling around the President's ties to
Russia?

Well, the cost, clearly, with the leak-
ing that occurred in the Oval Office, is
now our national security.

The cost is our democracy has been
left in ruins. It is a mess right now
here in Washington.

The cost is that this House is unable
to bring forward legislation to do any-
thing to help people put food on the
table, to seek to put a roof over their
home, and to provide opportunity to
their children.

It is a high cost that we are paying
right now for all these questions. It is
too much for us to bear.

The best thing we can do is to char-
ter an independent commission to take
this outside of Congress so that they
can follow the facts and the evidence
and report back to the American peo-
ple just exactly how we were so vulner-
able this last election.

What was our response?

Were any U.S. persons involved?

And, most importantly, what are we
going to do?

What reforms can we make?

What awareness should we all have so
that we never find ourselves in a mess
like this again?

It is not disputed, Russia attacked
our democracy. It was ordered by
Vladimir Putin. They used a multi-
faceted campaign of social media
trolls, the dissemination of fake news,
the hacking of Democratic emails, and
the breaking into State voter registra-
tion systems. They had a preferred can-
didate in mind in Donald Trump. And
they didn't do it because they were
bored. They didn't do it because they
were testing software. They did it be-
cause they wanted something in re-
turn. They saw a candidate who ad-
mired their President, they wanted
sanctions rolled back, and they wanted
to reduce the role of NATO.

But the most disturbing and the
most bone-chilling finding that the in-
telligence community made was that
Russia intends to do it again. And by
the looks of things, they will be more
successful next time because, since this
past attack, we have done nothing to
improve the structural integrity of our
elections. We have done nothing to

have a frank conversation with the American people about how we all need to be more aware about what a foreign adversary's intent is when they hack emails and then disseminate fake news.

This is a time for Republicans and Democrats to unite. Democrats may have been the victim of this most recent attack. If history has its way, another adversary perhaps could attack us and Republicans may be the victim.

□ 1300

But the constant should always be that both parties say we will never tolerate foreign interference. The first step to doing that is to defeat this previous question, allow an amendment to take place so we can debate having an independent commission, a commission that would be bipartisan appointed, have a wide mandate to follow the evidence, explore all the facts, and then report to the American people recommendations so that this never happens again. We have a discharge petition right now to also do that. There are a number of names on it.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I saw how our country responded after the last serious attack that occurred on September 11. Outside, on the Capitol steps, Republicans and Democrats joined hands. They sang "God Bless America." But more importantly were the reforms that they undertook over the next few years to understand the vulnerability, to put policies in place to make sure we were never vulnerable again, and report to the American people what they had done.

We have an opportunity again to unite. Our constituents are counting on us to show that unity, to wear the same uniform, and make sure that this democracy is still one we protect.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT) to get this debate back on track and to protect local law enforcement officials.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I come to you, not just as a Representative from my district today but someone who served for 18 years as a Los Angeles police officer on the streets, someone who has been in uniform, at attention, at several police officer and deputy funerals as tears were rolling down my face, and looking side to side and seeing the same of my brothers and sisters in law enforcement.

I am sure that everyone who speaks today will have a story, a horrible story that affected their community. On October 5 of last year, one such story happened in our community. Sergeant Steve Owen was basically executed. He was shot from a far distance, and then the killer came up and put four more shots into him at close range to make sure that he was dead.

These are the types of things that we are seeing in our communities across this country at an alarmingly high rate over the last few years.

I think that the Thin Blue Line Act is one more of those types of issues that we can do to protect our first responders, our police officers, our firefighters, to give these people justice, to give their families justice, so I urge you to support the Thin Blue Line Act.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair be so kind as to advise my good friend and I what amount of time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 14½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 24½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend that I anticipate one more speaker, but at this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule to consider H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act, introduced by my friend and colleague from Florida, Mr. VERN BUCHANAN.

Mr. Speaker, this week, National Police Week, we take time to honor our Nation's law enforcement officers for the work they do and the sacrifices they make to keep us safe on a daily basis. It is unconscionable that law enforcement officers are being targeted and are making the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty; and this bill aims to make the killing or attempted killing of a law enforcement officer an aggravating factor for the imposition of the death penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I served for 6 years as a city commissioner and two of those as the mayor of my small town of Johnson City, Tennessee, and had the privilege of working with first responders, firemen, and police officers every day. It was a privilege to do it. I put on a scrub suit to go to work. They put on a Kevlar vest and put their lives in danger. I cannot say thank you enough to them and their families for the sacrifices that they make.

I commend my colleague on introducing this legislation and for the House considering it today. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation in honor of our law enforcement officers.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act, which will act as a deterrent against criminals who seek to harm first responders. Increasing the Federal penalties that can be imposed

against those who would kill or attempt to kill policemen, firemen, or first responders is a just response to such heinous crimes.

This week is National Police Week, and I am reminded of the words etched on the National Law Enforcement Memorial in Washington, D.C., which states: "The wicked flee when no man pursueth, but the righteous are bold as a lion." This is from the Book of Proverbs.

It takes a special kind of person to willingly run toward danger and to shield the innocent from the wicked. That is what our law enforcement and first responders do every day.

I am very grateful for the men and women who serve and protect our communities; and I was honored to be present for Police Week in a small town in our district, Green Cove Springs, in Clay County, Florida, where they had the Police Memorial; and on that was a verse from John 15:13: "Greater love has no one than this: to lay down one's life for one's friends."

I hope that God watches over our first responders and keeps them safe to bring them home to their families.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as a former Tuscaloosa County prosecutor and Madison County district attorney, I fully understand the importance of the rule of law that, in turn, protects us from anarchy, crime, destruction, and death. Without the rule of law, criminal brute force prevails.

Unfortunately, leftist political forces who care more about inciting racial division for political gain and less about crime and terror victims regularly second-guess those who wear the uniform to protect and serve.

For emphasis, antipolice, leftist political rhetoric has helped incite ambush-style attacks against police in places like Dallas, Baton Rouge, Des Moines, and Palm Springs.

I support the Thin Blue Line Act because I appreciate the sacrifice of law enforcement officers, and because it is morally right to help protect officers who risk their lives to protect ours.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with our law enforcement officers and in support of the rule and passage of the Thin Blue Line Act. This bill makes sure that anyone who targets and attacks a State or local law enforcement officer is held accountable.

The men and women who serve in our local police forces put their lives on the line to keep us safe. They are our everyday heroes, Mr. Speaker.

In 2014, Tarpon Springs Police Officer Charles Kondek was shot and killed by a fugitive while on duty. Officer Kondek represented Tarpon Springs. He worked there for 17 years and did a wonderful job keeping us safe.

These ambush-style killings of law enforcement officers have increased across the country by 167 percent. This is unacceptable.

The Thin Blue Line Act brings us one step closer to justice for these horrific crimes, so let's pass this bill. Of course, we have to pass the rule first so that we can pass this good bill.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN).

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Thin Blue Line Act, which will make murder or attempted murder of a law enforcement officer, or first responders, an aggravating factor in death penalty determinations.

The officers of the thin blue line put their lives at risk every day and are willing to make the ultimate sacrifice so that we can rest easy at night. Our law enforcement and first responders run into danger so that others can run away from it. They do this despite the risk in violence against them.

We have witnessed a 167 percent increase in ambush-style killings of police officers in 2016 alone. This is tragic, and it is unacceptable.

The Thin Blue Line Act will hold cop killers accountable and seek justice for those murdered in the line of duty, and it will show our resolve as citizens to protect the officers who have sworn to protect us.

During this week, National Police Week, we can also show our gratitude to law enforcement and their families by passing the Thin Blue Line Act. It is an honor to represent them in Congress.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, at this time in our Nation, protecting our local law enforcement and first responders could not be more important. Tens of thousands of law enforcement and first responders around the country put their lives on the line every single day to serve their communities. Sadly, statistics show that simply doing their jobs has become very dangerous for these individuals.

In 2016, police officer shootings increased by 56 percent nationally, with ambush-style killings of law enforcement officers increasing by a staggering 167 percent. These dramatic

numbers demonstrate that more protection is needed for our law enforcement officers.

In my home State of Texas, 17 law enforcement officers gave their lives just last year, including five who were killed in the horrible assault that targeted police officers in Dallas, Texas. On Monday, in recognition of National Police Week, we honored fallen law enforcement officers at a memorial ceremony in Deer Park, Texas, in my district.

We need the Thin Blue Line Act, which would make the killing of a local or State law enforcement officer or first responder an aggravating factor in Federal death penalty determinations. It is important that our local and State police officers and first responders have the same safeguards that Federal law enforcement officers already have.

The local law enforcement and first responders that I know in my district not only serve their communities through their jobs but also give back to their communities in positions such as Little League coaches, City Council members, Sunday-school teachers, and in countless other positions of service. These individuals put their communities first, Mr. Speaker, and they deserve to be protected by much stronger laws.

I rise in strong support of the Thin Blue Line Act and encourage my colleagues in the House to support its passage today.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), a former special agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. BUCK, for his leadership on this important issue, and I rise in strong support.

Mr. Speaker, my great-uncle, Phil Fitzpatrick, was a proud patrolman with the NYPD. He was also a poet, often referring to police officers as soldiers of peace. This week, as we recognize Police Week 2017, I find myself thinking of him and a line from one of his poems, where he wrote: "When he kisses his wife and children goodbye, there's the chance he will see them no more."

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, these words were true for my family. This month marks 70 years since my great-uncle was shot while attempting to disarm a robber in a Manhattan bar, a fatal injury he succumbed to days later.

Mr. Speaker, for too long, law enforcement across this country has been forgotten or, worse yet, ostracized. At the same time, their vital mission continues, and it continues to grow more dangerous. Just last year, ambush-style killings of law enforcement offi-

cers increased by 167 percent, according to the National Association of Police Organizations. Despite all this, each day, tens of thousands of brave women and men continue to put their lives on the line to serve and protect our communities.

This week, we recognize Police Week 2017, but the dedication and sacrifice of our blue line deserves to be respected every day. As a former law enforcement officer, I am proud to stand here today in support of those brave women and men.

Today, the House has a chance to take decisive action to protect our law enforcement officers by passing the legislation before us. The Thin Blue Line Act sends a clear message to those who intentionally target our police officers. Vicious attacks on law enforcement officers will be met with justice.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for law enforcement today, support this rule, and pass H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act. The bipartisan support it deserves must be delivered today.

□ 1315

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) for his efforts and leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I think it is really important that we talk about law enforcement; we talk about what their role is. These are the peacekeepers. The men and women right here on Capitol Hill, the Capitol Police, they are the ones who prevent chaos, that allow for order to stand here in the Capitol complex.

In the State of Louisiana, in my hometown of Baton Rouge, back on July 17, we had an extraordinary event. We had five of our law enforcement officers who were responding to a shooter with a long gun; clearly, someone that was dressed and armed in a way to not be helpful to the community. While the rest of us were running away from that shooter, these five men were running toward him.

As a result of that, Deputy Brad Garafola lost his life, and his wife, Tonja, is right now a widow.

Matthew Gerald lost his life, and Dechia, his wife, is now a widow. Dechia found out 2 weeks after his death that she was pregnant, and he has never seen that baby. That baby doesn't have a father today.

We had Montrell Jackson, another Baton Rouge police officer, who lost his life, and his wife, Trenisha, is now a widow.

We had Bruce Simmons who got shot, and while he did survive, he is still struggling with recovery, and he and

his wife, Pam, continue to go through that from the July 17 shooting from last year.

Nick Tullier was also involved in that shooting, and I have been wearing my "Pray for Nick" band now for months. Nick Tullier continues to be in the hospital even today.

This bill allows for the protection of our officers. It clearly distinguishes that these are the peacekeepers, these are the people who are putting their lives on the line to make sure that we have order, no longer chaos.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important piece of legislation, and I urge everyone to support this unanimously.

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

I am sure that my friends across the aisle have their hearts in the right place, but we need to be clear that these messaging bills do little to nothing to protect our police officers.

If we truly wanted to help our brave officers and first responders, we would pass sensible gun reform legislation. We would take guns out of the hands of the mentally ill and domestic abusers; not make it easier for them to acquire such weapons as my friends across the aisle have done on so many occasions.

If we truly wanted to protect our officers and first responders, we would work diligently to provide them with the best mental health and wellness programs money can buy rather than leaving them to mend unseen wounds on their own.

If my friends across the aisle truly wanted to help this country's law enforcement officers, they would champion funding for community policing initiatives because I think we all know that a community that trusts its police officers, and police officers who trust their community, will live a far safer and richer life.

I might add, my colleague DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and I, along with law enforcement officials in south Florida, have been about the business of trying to make that a reality, and funding for those programs is particularly important to all of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, we all applaud and thank our law enforcement officers and first responders for the brave and invaluable work that they do, day in and day out, in our communities.

But we cannot bury our heads in the sand any longer and believe that, by simply passing messaging bills, we are actually making our communities safer for our officers or the citizens for whom they swear an oath to protect.

We have heard outstanding comments from our friends and our colleagues who came to speak today. All of them spoke of heartfelt circumstances regarding fallen officers. And toward that end, there is absolutely nothing that I disagree with that has been said.

I just simply ask that we take into consideration how we can best help and keep safe law enforcement officers.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I include in the RECORD four letters which I will briefly describe:

The first is from the Major County Sheriffs of America, supporting the Thin Blue Line Act; the second is from the National Association of Police Organizations, Inc., again, supporting the Thin Blue Line Act; the third is from the National Fraternal Order of Police, supporting H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act; and then finally, from the Sergeants Benevolent Association in strong support of H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act.

MAJOR COUNTY SHERIFFS
OF AMERICA,
April 25, 2017.

Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUCHANAN: I write to you today on a matter of significant importance to the Major County Sheriffs of America (MCSA) and all of America's law enforcement professionals. MCSA is an association of elected Sheriffs representing the Nation's largest counties with populations of 500,000 or more. Collectively, we represent more than 100 million Americans.

As Vice President in charge of Government Affairs for the MCSA, I am pleased to express our association's support of your legislation, the Thin Blue Line Act. This legislation would make the murder of law enforcement officers, firefighters and other first responders an aggravating factor in capital punishment determinations.

In 2016, one hundred forty-four officers died in the line of duty and to date, line of duty deaths are up 10 percent. The targeting of law enforcement officers is unconscionable and those who commit such heinous acts should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. Law enforcement officers and other first responders have the right to go home to their families at the end of their shifts.

The Thin Blue Line Act is a step in the right direction and your work on this legislation is sincerely appreciated. We value your support and look forward to working with you in the future.

MICHAEL J. BOUCHARD,
Sheriff, Oakland County (MI),
Vice President—Government Affairs.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
POLICE ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,
Alexandria, VA, January 5, 2017.

Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUCHANAN: On behalf of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), I am writing to you to express our strong support for the Thin Blue Line Act.

NAPO is a coalition of police units and associations from across the United States that serves to advance the interests of America's law enforcement through legislative and legal advocacy, political action, and education. Founded in 1978, NAPO now represents more than 1,000 police units and associations, including the Florida Police Benevolent Association, 241,000 sworn law enforce-

ment officers, and more than 100,000 citizens who share a common dedication to fair and effective crime control and law enforcement.

The Thin Blue Line Act increases penalties on those who harm or target for harm public safety officers by making the murder or attempted murder of a local police officer, firefighter, or first responder an aggravating factor in death penalty determinations.

This bill is critical, as law enforcement officer assaults, injuries, and deaths have increased sharply in recent years. In 2016 alone, ambush-style killings of law enforcement officers increased by 167 percent. Establishing stricter penalties for those who harm or target for harm law enforcement officers will deter crime. Any persons contemplating harming an officer must know that they will face serious punishments. NAPO strongly believes that increased penalties make important differences in the attitudes of criminals toward public safety officers, and ensure protection for the community.

We thank you for your continued support of the law enforcement community and we look forward to working with you to pass this important legislation. If we can provide any assistance, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM J. JOHNSON,
Esq., CAE, Executive Director.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL
ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2017.

Hon. VERNON G. BUCHANAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BUCHANAN: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our strong support for H.R. 115, the "Thin Blue Line Act."

The "Thin Blue Line Act" increases the penalty for an individual who targets, kills, or attempts to kill a person who is a law enforcement officer, firefighter or any other public safety officer, while he or she was engaged in the performance of his or her official duties, because of the performance of his or her official duties, or because of his or her status as a public official or employee.

Law enforcement officers have always faced threats while on duty but within the past few years, officers have become a target for violence solely because of the uniform they wear. As you know, the FOP has called upon Congress to expand the current Federal hate crimes law to include law enforcement officers for this very reason.

Of the 63 deaths by gunfire suffered by law enforcement in 2016, 21 of them—that's 33%—were ambush killings. These were deliberate and sadly successful efforts by individuals who set out to kill a police officer:

The ambush attack against the Dallas Police Department; the deadliest day for law enforcement since 9/11 that saw 5 officers killed from gunfire;

The ambush attack against members of the Baton Rouge Police Department that saw 3 officers killed from gunfire;

The ambush attack against 2 Iowa police officers, Scott Martin and Anthony Bemino who were killed as they sat in their respective patrol cars;

Officer Thomas Cottrell of the Danville Police Department (OH) was killed by ambush.

All of these officers died because of the uniforms they were wearing. Those in our profession have always been in harm's way. It is our job to protect others but it should not be "part of the job" to be a target of

someone who is looking simply to kill a cop. We do not accept that our uniforms alone make us targets because someone was driven to rage over a perceived injustice or desires to strike a blow against our civil government.

On behalf of more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I want to thank you for introducing this legislation and amendment. If I can be of any further help, please do not hesitate to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

SERGEANTS BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION,
POLICE DEPARTMENT, CITY
OF NEW YORK,

New York, NY, January 17, 2017.

Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BUCHANAN: I am writing on behalf of the more than 13,000 members of the Sergeants Benevolent Association of the New York City Police Department to advise you of our strong support for H.R. 115, the "Thin Blue Line Act."

For too long, members of the NYPD, along with law enforcement officers across this nation, have been targets. There has been a proliferation of groups and pundits impugning the motives and mission of law enforcement. They do so with no regard for the impact it has on our ability to protect life, property, and the freedoms we all hold dear. These constant attacks and the excessive, exaggerated rhetoric of anti-police elements have led some to declare an open season on police officers, and to welcome with cheers and praise the cowardly criminals who target law enforcement officers with acts of violence. We saw this first hand in New York City in December 2014, when Officers Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos were ambushed and senselessly murdered as they sat in their radio car on a Brooklyn street corner. Unfortunately, they are not alone. According to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, in 2016 there were 21 police officers killed in ambush-style attacks. Shockingly, 20 of these officers were killed in eight multiple-shooting death incidents—such as those that claimed the lives of 8 officers in Baton Rouge, LA and Dallas, TX—the highest total of any year since 1932.

It is for these reasons and many others that the legislation you have introduced is so important. The "Thin Blue Line Act" would make the murder or attempted murder of police officers, prosecutors, firefighters, and other first responders at any level of government an aggravating factor in federal death penalty determinations. The bill applies to things like the interstate homicide of an officer, and is applicable whether the officer is murdered on duty, because of the performance of their duty, or because of their status as a public official. While we know that law enforcement officers will continue to be targets, regardless of their uniform and whether they are on duty or off, active or retired, this legislation sends the message that any action to target law enforcement officers for murder or violence will be met with the harshest of penalties. And that is a message that is long overdue.

On behalf of the membership of our organization, thank you for your leadership on this important issue. We look forward to working with you to see it swiftly enacted into law.

Please do not hesitate to contact me, or our Washington Representatives Andrew Siff and Chris Granberg if we can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

ED MULLINS,
President.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the rule before the House today is simple. It provides for the consideration of the Thin Blue Line Act. We often talk of how resolute our law enforcement officers, firefighters, and first responders are in the face of immense danger. These heroic individuals charge into burning buildings, face down violence, and stand ready to jump into the fray at a moment's notice.

Simply putting on a uniform should not be one of those dangers. It is our duty to ensure that law enforcement officers, firefighters, and first responders have every tool at their disposal to do their job safely and effectively and to ensure they return home to their families.

Countless spouses and children kiss their loved ones good-bye as they head to work, praying that it will not be their last day. We must never forget this as we work to ensure our police officers, firefighters, and first responders have every possible protection.

There is no greater deterrent than the threat of losing one's life. It is my hope that this legislation makes individuals who would consider taking the life of an officer stop to consider the consequences before going through with an attack; that we one day reach a point where our Nation's finest can go to work without worrying about being targeted because of the uniform on their back; that one day our officers' families have one less reason to worry.

But until that day, we must continue standing resolutely against this evil. I ask my colleagues in the House to support our law enforcement community, firefighters, and first responders. Protect them from the heinous acts of violence. Give their families some assurance that we have their backs. Vote "yes" on the resolution, vote "yes" on the underlying bill, vote "yes" to give our law enforcement officers the protections they so desperately need.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Chairman SESSIONS for bringing this bill before us.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the rule for H.R. 115, "Thin Blue Line Act of 2017."

I would like to acknowledge and commend our law enforcement officers in the room today and across this country who have worked tirelessly on our behalf.

I know personally the level of stress and challenges posed, because I have many friends that have and are currently serving my Congressional district in Houston and our country very well and with great distinction.

I support our policies that are necessary so long as we are doing so with fairness, in accordance with our Constitution, and in a man-

ner that is not duplicative of statutory measures already in place.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 115 imposes the death penalty for the killing or targeting of law enforcement officers, firefighters, and first responders as a 17th aggravated factor for homicide.

H.R. 115 is duplicative and unnecessary because under 18 U.S.C. 3592(c), there already exists an aggravated factor that achieves the goal of punishing by death, a defendant who kills a law enforcement officer, thereby, making.

This bill does nothing to protect our law enforcement; instead, it raises constitutional questions as to its validity because "targeting law enforcement" is substantially vague language that will subject many innocent lives to death, based purely on their desire to exercise their First Amendment rights about the well-documented racial disparity in treatment throughout our communities.

We must ensure that we do not create legislation of broad scope and vagueness that will have a chilling effect on an insular group.

H.R. 115 is laced with a discriminatory effect that will trigger strict scrutiny under the 14th Amendment, and open the gateway for draconian habeas laws.

This bill will create a slippery slope, further adding to recent turbulence caused by Attorney General Jeff Session's memo and destroying whatever trust remains between law enforcement and communities.

This bill sends troubling messages around the world about how we view and measure life in America in this 21st century.

It is time to get serious about this epidemic and not hide behind vague language because 'all' lives matter, blue, black, brown, white.

Mr. Speaker, while some may say that any adverse effects of the bill before us are de minimis, and thus, will not severely impact the racial disparity found in the use of the death penalty, it is neither the amount of words in this bill nor the amount of time used to utter them that is significant; rather, it is the discriminatory effect that will result in communities disproportionately impacted by the death penalty.

Let us take for example, the case of *Buck v. Davis*, 580 U.S. ____ (2017) where the death penalty verdict was based merely on 'whether defendant is likely to commit acts of violence in the future' and a psychologist opined that being black did increase the probability. The trial court reasoned that "introduction of any mention of race was de minimis," in other words, insignificant.

As Chief Justice John Roberts stated for the Court in reversing the lower court, "Some toxins can be deadly in small doses."

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 115 is extremely deadly because it will undoubtedly contribute to the continuation of well-documented and pervasive racial disparities in the imposition of the death penalty.

Since 1976 only 20 white prisoners have been executed for the murder of an African American victim, while an alarming 286 African American prisoners have been executed for the death of white victims, and 42% of African Americans currently remain on death row.

Death penalty generally, has been criticized over the years by legal scholars and by Supreme Court Justices who have opined in several instances, that 'the death penalty violates

the Eighth Amendment, which prohibits cruel and unusual punishment.'

Even in 1958, when the Court first explicitly spoke about the death penalty as having constitutional challenges, it said in *Trop v. Dulles*, "the Eighth Amendment's Cruel and Unusual Punishment clause must draw its meaning from the 'evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society' rather than from its original meaning."

Mr. Speaker, there is no argument that we have evolved and matured significantly since we first implemented the death penalty in the 1600s and thus, we must evaluate cautiously, laws that seek to further advance this flawed, astronomically costly and unjust practice.

Capital punishment does not work; it is discriminatory and is used disproportionately against the poor, minorities and members of racial, ethnic and religious communities.

Since the U.S. Supreme Court reinstated the death penalty in 1976, 82% of all executions have occurred in the South (37% in Texas alone), which contributed to the United States status as one of five countries in the world to account for the most executions in 2012.

FBI data has shown that the death penalty is not a deterrent and in fact, 14 states without capital punishment in 2008, had homicide rates at or below the national rate.

Taking another life does not stop violence.

Like mandatory minimums, public opinion for the death penalty is currently at its lowest with a 42% opposition, evidenced in a 2016 Pew Research report, which found that the U.S. now dropped to number seven worldwide in countries accountable for the most executions.

Mr. Speaker, over two-thirds of the world's countries have abolished the death penalty either in law or practice, and the U.S. is the only Western country that still uses the death penalty.

Even family members of murder victims and other individuals who have witnessed live executions of death row inmates, particularly, in the recent botched and questionable executions, have called for a repeal of this practice and ask instead for alternative sentencing.

In fact the death penalty solves nothing, and may even perpetuate the suffering of the parents, children, or siblings left behind.

We do not need to expand the use of the death penalty where public opinion is at its lowest, but instead, implement sound and practical legislation that will save lives of our officers and the people they serve, where public opinion for this measure is extremely high.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 323 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 356) to establish the National Commission on Foreign Interference in the 2016 Election. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to

the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 356.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amend-

ment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of the adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 189, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]

YEAS—230

Abraham	Collins (GA)	Gohmert
Aderholt	Collins (NY)	Goodlatte
Allen	Comer	Gosar
Amash	Comstock	Gowdy
Amodel	Conaway	Granger
Arrington	Cook	Graves (GA)
Babin	Costello (PA)	Graves (LA)
Bacon	Cramer	Graves (MO)
Banks (IN)	Crawford	Griffith
Barletta	Culberson	Grothman
Barr	Curbelo (FL)	Guthrie
Barton	Davidson	Harper
Bergman	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Biggs	Denham	Hartzler
Bilirakis	Dent	Hensarling
Bishop (MI)	DeSantis	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Hice, Jody B.
Black	Diaz-Balart	Higgins (LA)
Blackburn	Donovan	Hill
Blum	Duffy	Holding
Bost	Duncan (SC)	Hollingsworth
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Hudson
Brat	Dunn	Hultzenga
Bridenstine	Emmer	Hultgren
Brooks (AL)	Estes (KS)	Hunter
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	Hurd
Buchanan	Faso	Issa
Buck	Ferguson	Jenkins (KS)
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (WV)
Budd	Fleischmann	Johnson (LA)
Burgess	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Byrne	Fortenberry	Jordan
Calvert	Fox	Joyce (OH)
Carter (GA)	Franks (AZ)	Katko
Carter (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (MS)
Chabot	Gaetz	Kelly (PA)
Cheney	Gallagher	King (IA)
Coffman	Gibbs	King (NY)

Kinzingler
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nunes

NAYS—189

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell

Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson

Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cole
Garrett

Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Gutiérrez
Johnson, Sam
Lieu, Ted
Napolitano

Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Newhouse
Pelosi
Shuster

Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nunes
O'Halloran
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe

Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker

Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—11

□ 1349

Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Ms. BONAMICI changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 184, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

AYES—233

Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halloran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panic
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barietta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook

Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Dham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper

Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzingler
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Eshoo

NOES—184

Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui

McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panic
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko

Torres	Velázquez	Waters, Maxine
Tsongas	Visclosky	Watson Coleman
Vargas	Walz	Welch
Veasey	Wasserman	Wilson (FL)
Vela	Schultz	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Chaffetz	Gutiérrez	Newhouse
Chu, Judy	Harris	Pelosi
Cole	Johnson, Sam	Takano
Ellison	Lieu, Ted	
Franks (AZ)	Napolitano	

□ 1357

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 260.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2266) to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2266

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

SEC. 2. CONVERSION OF THE TEMPORARY OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGE TO THE PERMANENT OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGE IN CERTAIN JUDICIAL DISTRICTS.

(a) DISTRICT OF DELAWARE.—

(1) The temporary office of 4 bankruptcy judges authorized for the district of Delaware by section 1223(b)(1)(C) of Public Law 109–8 (119 Stat. 197; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), and extended by section 2(a)(1)(C) of Public Law 112–121 (126 Stat. 346; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), is converted hereby to the permanent office of bankruptcy judge and represented in the amendment made by section 3(1) of this Act, and may be filled.

(2) The temporary office of bankruptcy judge authorized for the district of Delaware by section 3(a)(3) of Public Law 102–361 (106 Stat. 966; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), and extended by section 1223(c)(1) of Public Law 109–8 (119 Stat. 198; 28 U.S.C. 152 note) and section 2(b)(1) of Public Law 112–121 (126 Stat. 347; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), is converted hereby to the permanent office of

bankruptcy judge and represented in the amendment made by section 3(1) of this Act, and may be filled.

(b) SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.—The temporary office of 2 bankruptcy judges authorized for the southern district of Florida by section 1223(b)(1)(D) of Public Law 109–8 (119 Stat. 197; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), and extended by section 2(a)(1)(D) of Public Law 112–121 (126 Stat. 346; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), is converted hereby to the permanent office of bankruptcy judge and represented in the amendment made by section 3(3) of this Act, and may be filled.

(c) DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.—The temporary office of 1 bankruptcy judge first appointed as authorized for the district of Maryland by section 1223(b)(1)(F) of Public Law 109–8 (119 Stat. 197; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), and extended by section 2(a)(1)(F) of Public Law 112–121 (126 Stat. 346; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), is converted hereby to the permanent office of bankruptcy judge and represented in the amendment made by section 3(4) of this Act, and may be filled.

(d) EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN.—The temporary office of bankruptcy judge authorized for the eastern district of Michigan by section 1223(b)(1)(G) of Public Law 109–8 (119 Stat. 197; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), and extended by section 2(a)(1)(G) of Public Law 112–121 (126 Stat. 346; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), is converted hereby to the permanent office of bankruptcy judge and represented in the amendment made by section 3(5) of this Act, and may be filled.

(e) DISTRICT OF NEVADA.—The temporary office of bankruptcy judge authorized for the district of Nevada by section 1223(b)(1)(T) of Public Law 109–8 (119 Stat. 197; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), and extended by section 2(a)(1)(Q) of Public Law 112–121 (126 Stat. 346; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), is converted hereby to the permanent office of bankruptcy judge and represented in the amendment made by section 3(6) of this Act, and may be filled.

(f) EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA.—The temporary office of bankruptcy judge authorized for the eastern district of North Carolina by section 1223(b)(1)(M) of Public Law 109–8 (119 Stat. 197; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), and extended by section 2(a)(1)(J) of Public Law 112–121 (126 Stat. 346; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), is converted hereby to the permanent office of bankruptcy judge and represented in the amendment made by section 3(7) of this Act, and may be filled.

(g) DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO.—

(1) The temporary office of bankruptcy judge authorized for the district of Puerto Rico by section 1223(b)(1)(P) of Public Law 109–8 (119 Stat. 197; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), and extended by section 2(a)(1)(M) of Public Law 112–121 (126 Stat. 346; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), is converted hereby to the permanent office of bankruptcy judge and represented in the amendment made by section 3(8) of this Act, and may be filled.

(2) The temporary office of bankruptcy judge authorized for the district of Puerto Rico by section 3(a)(7) of Public Law 102–361 (106 Stat. 966; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), and extended by section 1223(c)(1) of Public Law 109–8 (119 Stat. 198; 28 U.S.C. 152 note) and section 2(b)(1) of Public Law 112–121 (126 Stat. 347; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), is converted hereby to the permanent office of bankruptcy judge and is represented in the amendment made by section 3(8) of this Act, and may be filled.

(h) EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA.—The temporary office of bankruptcy judge authorized for the eastern district of Virginia by section 1223(b)(1)(R) of Public Law 109–8 (119 Stat. 197; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), and extended by section 2(a)(1)(P) of Public Law 112–121 (126 Stat. 346; 28 U.S.C. 152 note), is converted hereby to the permanent office of bankruptcy judge and is represented in the amendment made by section 3(9) of this Act, and may be filled.

SEC. 3. PERMANENT OFFICE OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGE AUTHORIZED.

To reflect the conversion of the temporary office of bankruptcy judge to the permanent office of bankruptcy judge made by the operation of section 2, and to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges, section 152(a)(2) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended—

- (1) in the item relating to the district of Delaware by striking "1" and inserting "8",
- (2) in the item relating to the middle district of Florida by striking "8" and inserting "9",
- (3) in the item relating to the southern district of Florida by striking "5" and inserting "7",
- (4) in the item relating to the district of Maryland by striking "4" and inserting "5",
- (5) in the item relating to the eastern district of Michigan by striking "4" and inserting "6",
- (6) in the item relating to the district of Nevada by striking "3" and inserting "4",
- (7) in the item relating to the eastern district of North Carolina by striking "2" and inserting "3",
- (8) in the item relating to the district of Puerto Rico by striking "2" and inserting "4", and
- (9) in the item relating to the eastern district of Virginia by striking "5" and inserting "6".

SEC. 4. BANKRUPTCY FEES.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 28 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 1930(a)(6) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended—

- (1) by striking "(6) In" and inserting "(6)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in", and
- (2) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) In any fiscal year, the quarterly fee payable for a quarter in which disbursements equal or exceed \$1,000,000 shall be 1 percent of such disbursements or \$250,000, whichever is less, unless the balance in the United States Trustee System Fund as of September 30 immediately preceding such fiscal year exceeds \$200,000,000."

(b) DEPOSITS OF CERTAIN FEES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 THROUGH 2022.—Notwithstanding section 589a(b) of title 28 of the United States Code, for each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022—

- (1) 97.5 percent of the fees collected under section 1930(a)(6) of such title shall be deposited as offsetting collections to the appropriation "United States Trustee System Fund", to remain available until expended, and
- (2) 2.5 percent of the fees collected under section 1930(a)(6) of such title shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION AMENDMENTS.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall take effect on July 1, 2017, or on the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

(2) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to quarterly fees payable under section 1930(a)(6) of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by this section, for disbursements made in any calendar quarter that begins on or after the effective date of the amendments made by this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2266, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

We are here today to address an imposing threat to one of the foundational aspects of our economy, the national bankruptcy system. A well-functioning bankruptcy system provides relief to consumers, allows businesses to reorganize, preserves jobs, maximizes the value of assets, and ensures the proper allocation of resources. Our bankruptcy judiciary is the heartbeat that keeps this system moving. If that judiciary is strained and undermanned, that system will grind to a halt, eliminating the essential benefits it provides and sending repercussions throughout the economy.

There are presently 29 temporary bankruptcy judgeships in the bankruptcy system with a lapse date of May 25. These temporary judgeships comprise more than 8 percent of the current bankruptcy judgeships nationwide. After May 25, 2017, these judgeships are at risk of being permanently lost, resulting in larger caseloads shared by fewer judges and causing further strain on our judiciary system.

The Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2017 converts 14 of the existing temporary judgeships to permanent status and creates 4 new permanent bankruptcy judgeships in districts with some of the highest caseloads in the country. In fact, since the enactment of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005, when a majority of the temporary judgeships were created, these districts have seen weighted filings increase by more than 55 percent.

This bill is based on a comprehensive study of judicial resource needs conducted by the Judicial Conference and is supported by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. The Conference has assured us that its request comes only after it has taken steps to maximize all other alternatives to reduce judicial workloads. Moreover, the Conference has demonstrated that, while a district may have a permanent judgeship, it will not be filled unless completely necessary.

Importantly, this bill will not present any new costs for the taxpayers. The Bankruptcy Judgeship Act includes an increase in the quarterly U.S. Trustee fees for large chapter 11 debtors, excluding small businesses. This fee increase is directly tied to the balance of the United States Trustee System Fund and will only be applied when the balance of the fund falls below a \$200 million threshold, thereby ensuring that the Office of the U.S. Trustee is properly funded.

These temporary bankruptcy judgeships were first set to lapse in 2010. Most have been extended for over 12 years, and some even longer. Despite this committee's efforts to address the issue, to date there have been only limited, short-term fixes. Additional permanent bankruptcy judgeships have not been authorized since 1992.

The time has come for Congress to address bankruptcy judgeship needs more permanently. We need a bankruptcy system that has a sufficient number of judges to be able to manage the caseloads in a just, economical, and timely manner. The efficiency of this system is too important to our economy to risk. This bill helps ensure that we have such a system.

I would like to thank Ranking Member CONYERS for his efforts on this issue. I would also like to thank Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Subcommittee Chairman MARINO and Ranking Member CICILLINE for joining me as original cosponsors of the bill. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this important legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2266, the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2017, which would make 14 temporary bankruptcy judgeships permanent and authorize four additional bankruptcy judgeships.

I introduced this bipartisan legislation together with the support of Judiciary Committee Chairman GOODLATTE, along with Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Subcommittee Chairman MARINO and Ranking Member CICILLINE. H.R. 2266 warrants the support from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for several reasons.

To begin with, this measure reflects the recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States with respect to the judicial resource needs of our Nation's bankruptcy courts. These recommendations are themselves based on a comprehensive survey of all judicial circuits.

This analysis consists of two components. The first is premised on a case-weight formula devised by the Federal Judicial Center that is intended to provide a more accurate and useful measure of judicial workload than a mere count of case filings.

The second component considers a broad array of other factors, including the nature of a court's caseload, filing trends, demographic considerations, geographic issues, and economic aspects, among other items.

Taken together, the resulting analysis provides a reliable basis upon which Congress may assess the necessity of authorizing additional judgeships and extending temporary judgeships.

In addition, H.R. 2266 addresses an immediate need. All of the temporary judgeships addressed in H.R. 2266 will lapse as of May 25, which is just a week away.

Once a temporary judgeship lapses, any ensuing vacancy may not be filled, which presents a serious concern. As the Judicial Conference warns, these bankruptcy courts would "face a serious and, in many cases, debilitating workload crisis if their temporary judgeships were to expire."

This is particularly true with respect to the Eastern District of Michigan, which has a weighted caseload well in excess of the minimum necessary to trigger additional judicial resources.

Although Congress has previously extended temporary bankruptcy judgeships from time to time, some have also lapsed as a result of Congress' failure to timely act. So to avoid future lapses in judicial resources, my legislation converts 14 of these temporary judgeships to permanent status.

Finally, I am pleased to report that H.R. 2266 pays for all of these judgeships without having to require consumer debtors to bear that expense. The cost of this legislation is offset by increasing the quarterly fees that the largest 10 percent of chapter 11 debtors pay to the United States Trustee System Fund, a proposal initially made by the Obama administration as part of the President's budget request for 2017.

Specifically, the fee increase would apply only to chapter 11 debtors that have quarterly disbursements in excess of \$1 million and only during the period when the fund has less than \$200 million.

For all of these various reasons, I support this legislation.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Judicial Conference.

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 3, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On behalf of the Judicial Conference of the United States, I write to transmit the Conference's bankruptcy judgeship recommendations and corresponding draft legislation for the 115th Congress. The Conference recommends to Congress that it authorize four additional permanent bankruptcy judgeships and convert 14 existing temporary bankruptcy judgeships to permanent status, as set forth in the enclosures.

The preservation of current on-board resources in these courts is of great concern to the Conference. All 14 temporary bankruptcy

judgeships included in the Conference's recommendation have a lapse date of May 25, 2017. These bankruptcy courts would face a serious and, in many cases, debilitating workload crisis if these temporary judgeships were to expire. The U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, for example, would be crippled as five of their six authorized judgeships are temporary, all with the risk of expiring in 2017.

Although bankruptcy filings nationwide have been declining in recent years, the districts included in these recommendations generally have experienced an increase in filings resulting in stress on existing judicial resources. Indeed, since the enactment of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act in 2005, Pub. L. No. 109-8—the last time additional judgeship resources were authorized for most of the courts included in the Conference's recommendation—these districts have seen weighted filings increase by more than 55 percent.

Section 152(b)(2) of title 28, United States Code, requires the Judicial Conference to recommend to Congress the authorization of additional bankruptcy judgeships. Following a formal survey of all judicial circuits, the Conference determines where additional resources are needed based upon the circuit councils' requests and established criteria including each court's workload and case filing statistics, geographic needs, and pertinent additional factors. As part of this survey, the Judicial Conference also considers requests from the circuits to convert or extend existing temporary bankruptcy judgeships based upon the district's needs for stable judicial resources.

The Judicial Conference respectfully requests that you give your full consideration to the Judiciary's resource needs as identified in this proposed legislation. Additional caseload information concerning these recommendations is available upon request.

If we may be of further assistance to you in this or any other matter, please do not hesitate to contact me or the Office of Legislative Affairs, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. DUFF,
Secretary.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. CONYERS and my colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee for their work on this important legislation and for bringing this bill to the floor today.

An efficient bankruptcy system is important to the smooth functioning of our economy. The preservation and addition of these positions will add needed certainty to our legal system.

As the Judicial Conference of the United States highlighted in their report to Congress, these resources will benefit individuals and corporations, and are necessary to keep this system working. I am proud of the work that the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware does to protect jobs, creditors, and economic engines in our communities across the country.

This legislation is a perfect example of Congress hearing the needs of independent experts in the judiciary and acting in a bipartisan, collaborative manner to address a looming problem.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on other pressing

problems for our constituents in such collaborative ways. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2017.

□ 1415

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I am pleased to note that H.R. 2266 is supported by the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, the American College of Bankruptcy, and the National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges.

I want to also express appreciation to our Judiciary chairman, Mr. GOODLATTE, to Chairman MARINO and Ranking Member CICILLINE, as well as their staffs, for their cooperative efforts in working with me on this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, given the time-sensitive nature of the temporary judgeships addressed by H.R. 2266 and the immediate need for additional bankruptcy judgeships to be authorized, it is my hope that our colleagues in the Senate will expeditiously consider this important legislation. I urge all of the Members here to support this measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, permanent bankruptcy judgeships have not been authorized since 1992. Over the past 25 years, we have limited our protection of the bankruptcy system to short-term temporary fixes. A well-functioning bankruptcy system, however, is too important to our economy to risk. Now is the time for Congress to address bankruptcy judgeship needs more permanently.

The Bankruptcy Judgeship Act is a measured, long-term solution carefully crafted and based on the well-developed recommendation of the Administrative Office of the Courts. Not only does it ensure the viability of our bankruptcy system, but it also addresses the funding concerns of the Office of the United States Trustee.

This bill is a bipartisan measure that enjoys broad support from outside groups, including the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, the National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges, and the American College of Bankruptcy. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this important legislation.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2266, the "Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2017," which authorizes the establishment of four additional permanent bankruptcy judgeships and converts 14 temporary bankruptcy judgeships to permanent status.

I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this legislation, which is a necessary response to alleviate the strain on certain bankruptcy

courts that have experienced a significant increase in bankruptcy filings over the past decade or more.

Importantly, this legislation adopts the recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the national policymaking body of the federal courts, and does not impose additional fees on ordinary consumer debtors or small businesses.

As the Conference notes in support of this measure, while bankruptcy filings have decreased nationwide, the bankruptcy courts that would receive permanent or new judgeships under this legislation "have seen weighted filings increase by more than 55 percent."

Furthermore, without this legislation, all 14 temporary judgeships covered by this bill will lapse later this month on May 25.

Allowing a lapse in these judgeships would have potentially crippling effects on the bankruptcy system.

For example, five of the six authorized judgeships of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court of the District of Delaware—the preferred venue for corporate reorganization under Chapter 11—are temporary.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I thank Ranking Member CONYERS, the bill's sponsor, for his leadership on this bill, along with Judiciary Committee Chairman GOODLATTE and Subcommittee Chairman MARINO for their support.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2266, the "Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2017."

H.R. 2266, the "Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2017," would authorize four additional permanent bankruptcy judgeships and convert 14 temporary bankruptcy judgeships to permanent status based on the most recent recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

H.R. 2266 was introduced on May 1, 2017 by Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS, Jr. (D-MI) together with Chairman BOB GOODLATTE and Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Chair TOM MARINO (R-PA) and Ranking Member DAVID CICILLINE (D-RI) as original cosponsors.

This bipartisan legislation is time-sensitive as the temporary judgeships are due to expire on May 25, 2017. No hearing has been held on this legislation.

A bankruptcy judge may hear and determine all cases arising under the Bankruptcy Code and certain related proceedings. A district court, however, may withdraw—in whole or in part—any case or proceeding referred to a bankruptcy judge. If designated by the district to exercise such authority, a bankruptcy judge may conduct a jury trial on consent of all the parties.

Currently pending before Congress is H.R. 244, the "Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017," which extends for one year the temporary judgeships for the District of Delaware (two judgeships), the Southern District of Florida (two judgeships); the Eastern District of Michigan; the District of Puerto Rico; and the Eastern District of Virginia.

In analyzing bankruptcy judgeship needs, the Judicial Conference employs, as a first step, a case weight formula devised by the Federal Judicial Center that is intended to provide a more accurate and useful measure of

judicial workload than a mere count of filings does.

Pursuant to Conference policy, “if a district’s annual weighted caseload per authorized judgeship is 1,500 weighted filings or more, the district will receive consideration for an additional judgeship.”

With respect to the Conference’s current request for additional bankruptcy judgeships, the weighted case filings have increased by more than 55 percent for most of these districts since the last time additional judgeships were authorized in 2005, according to the Conference.

In addition, all 14 of the temporary bankruptcy judgeships that the bill converts to permanent status are set to lapse as of May 25, 2017.

To offset the cost of this legislation, H.R. 2266 increases the quarterly fee payable that chapter 11 debtors pay to the United States Trustee System Fund, but only with respect to debtors that have quarterly disbursements in excess of \$1 million dollars during the period when the Fund has less than \$200 million.

This provision is substantively identical to a legislative proposal made by the prior Administration as represented in President Barack Obama’s budget request for 2017.

Taken together, the resulting analysis provides a reliable basis upon which Congress may assess the necessity of authorizing additional judgeships and extending temporary judgeships.

For all of these reasons, I support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2266, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS’ BENEFITS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 419) to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers’ Benefits program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 419

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Public Safety Officers’ Benefits Improvement Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. REPORTS.

Section 1205 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “Rules, regulations, and procedures issued under this part may include regulations based on standards developed by another Federal agency for programs related to public safety officer

death or disability claims.” before the last sentence;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” before “In making”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) In making a determination under section 1201, the Bureau shall give substantial weight to the evidence and all findings of fact presented by a State, local, or Federal administrative or investigative agency regarding eligibility for death or disability benefits.

“(3) If the head of a State, local, or Federal administrative or investigative agency, in consultation with the principal legal officer of the agency, provides a certification of facts regarding eligibility for death or disability benefits, the Bureau shall adopt the factual findings, if the factual findings are supported by substantial evidence.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(e)(1)(A) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Bureau shall make available on the public website of the Bureau information on all death, disability, and educational assistance claims submitted under this part that are pending as of the date on which the information is made available.

“(B) Not less frequently than once per week, the Bureau shall make available on the public website of the Bureau updated information with respect to all death, disability, and educational assistance claims submitted under this part that are pending as of the date on which the information is made available.

“(C) The information made available under this paragraph shall include—

“(i) for each pending claim—

“(I) the date on which the claim was submitted to the Bureau;

“(II) the State of residence of the claimant;

“(III) an anonymized, identifying claim number; and

“(IV) the nature of the claim; and

“(ii) the total number of pending claims that were submitted to the Bureau more than 1 year before the date on which the information is made available.

“(2) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Bureau shall publish on the public website of the Bureau a report, and shall update such report on such website not less than once every 180 days thereafter, containing—

“(A) the total number of claims for which a final determination has been made during the 180-day period preceding the report;

“(B) the amount of time required to process each claim for which a final determination has been made during the 180-day period preceding the report;

“(C) as of the last day of the 180-day period preceding the report, the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau on or before that date for which a final determination has not been made;

“(D) as of the last day of the 180-day period preceding the report, the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau on or before the date that is 1 year before that date for which a final determination has not been made;

“(E) for each claim described in subparagraph (D), a detailed description of the basis for delay;

“(F) as of the last day of the 180-day period preceding the report, the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau on or before that date relating to exposure due to the September 11th, 2001, terrorism attacks for

which a final determination has not been made;

“(G) as of the last day of the 180-day period preceding the report, the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau on or before the date that is 1 year before that date relating to exposure due to the September 11th, 2001, terrorism attacks for which a final determination has not been made;

“(H) for each claim described in subparagraph (G), a detailed description of the basis for delay;

“(I) the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau relating to exposure due to the September 11th, 2001, terrorism attacks for which a final determination was made during the 180-day period preceding the report, and the average award amount for any such claims that were approved;

“(J) the result of each claim for which a final determination was made during the 180-day period preceding the report, including the number of claims rejected and the basis for any denial of benefits;

“(K) the number of final determinations which were appealed during the 180-day period preceding the report, regardless of when the final determination was first made;

“(L) the average number of claims processed per reviewer of the Bureau during the 180-day period preceding the report;

“(M) for any claim submitted to the Bureau that required the submission of additional information from a public agency, and for which the public agency completed providing all of the required information during the 180-day period preceding the report, the average length of the period beginning on the date the public agency was contacted by the Bureau and ending on the date on which the public agency submitted all required information to the Bureau;

“(N) for any claim submitted to the Bureau for which the Bureau issued a subpoena to a public agency during the 180-day period preceding the report in order to obtain information or documentation necessary to determine the claim, the name of the public agency, the date on which the subpoena was issued, and the dates on which the public agency was contacted by the Bureau before the issuance of the subpoena; and

“(O) information on the compliance of the Bureau with the obligation to offset award amounts under section 1201(f)(3), including—

“(i) the number of claims that are eligible for compensation under both this part and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 (49 U.S.C. 40101 note; Public Law 107-42) (commonly referred to as the “VCF”);

“(ii) for each claim described in clause (i) for which compensation has been paid under the VCF, the amount of compensation paid under the VCF;

“(iii) the number of claims described in clause (i) for which the Bureau has made a final determination; and

“(iv) the number of claims described in clause (i) for which the Bureau has not made a final determination.

“(3) Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, and 2 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

“(A) conduct a study on the compliance of the Bureau with the obligation to offset award amounts under section 1201(f)(3); and

“(B) submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subparagraph (A) that includes an assessment of whether the Bureau has provided the information required under subparagraph (B)(ix) of paragraph (2) of this subsection in each report required under that paragraph.

“(4) In this subsection, the term ‘nature of the claim’ means whether the claim is a claim for—

“(A) benefits under this subpart with respect to the death of a public safety officer;

“(B) benefits under this subpart with respect to the disability of a public safety officer; or

“(C) education assistance under subpart 2.”.

SEC. 3. AGE LIMITATION FOR CHILDREN.

Section 1212(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796d-1(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “No child” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), no child”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) DELAYED APPROVALS.—

“(A) EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE APPLICATION.—If a claim for assistance under this subpart is approved more than 1 year after the date on which the application for such assistance is filed with the Attorney General, the age limitation under this subsection shall be extended by the length of the period—

“(i) beginning on the day after the date that is 1 year after the date on which the application is filed; and

“(ii) ending on the date on which the application is approved.

“(B) CLAIM FOR BENEFITS FOR DEATH OR PERMANENT AND TOTAL DISABILITY.—In addition to an extension under subparagraph (A), if any, for an application for assistance under this subpart that relates to a claim for benefits under subpart 1 that was approved more than 1 year after the date on which the claim was filed with the Attorney General, the age limitation under this subsection shall be extended by the length of the period—

“(i) beginning on the day after the date that is 1 year after the date on which the claim for benefits is submitted; and

“(ii) ending on the date on which the claim for benefits is approved.”.

SEC. 4. DUE DILIGENCE IN PAYING BENEFIT CLAIMS.

Subpart 1 of part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1206. DUE DILIGENCE IN PAYING BENEFIT CLAIMS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Bureau, with all due diligence, shall expeditiously attempt to obtain the information and documentation necessary to adjudicate a benefit claim filed under this part, including a claim for financial assistance under subpart 2.

“(b) SUFFICIENT INFORMATION UNAVAILABLE.—If a benefit claim filed under this part, including a claim for financial assistance under subpart 2, is unable to be adjudicated by the Bureau because of a lack of information or documentation from a third party, such as a public agency, and such information is not readily available to the claimant, the Bureau may not abandon the benefit claim unless the Bureau has utilized the investigative tools available to the Bureau to obtain the necessary information or documentation, including subpoenas.”.

SEC. 5. PRESUMPTION THAT OFFICER ACTED PROPERLY.

Section 1202 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796a) is amended—

(1) by striking “No benefit” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—No benefit”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) PRESUMPTION.—In determining whether a benefit is payable under this part, the Bureau—

“(1) shall presume that none of the limitations described in subsection (a) apply; and

“(2) shall not determine that a limitation described in subsection (a) applies, absent clear and convincing evidence.”.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.

The amendments made by this Act shall—

(1) take effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to any benefit claim or application under part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796 et seq.) that is—

(A) pending before the Bureau of Justice Assistance on the date of enactment; or

(B) received by the Bureau on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 419, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, in 1976 Congress passed and the President signed into law the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act. The act was designed to offer peace of mind to men and women seeking careers as public safety officers, namely, that if something happened to them in their dangerous roles, their families would have support.

It shows that America places enormous value on those in our communities who protect and serve, those whose response to danger is to face it head-on and who put others before themselves daily.

The PSOB program, administered by the Department of Justice, provides death benefits in the form of a one-time financial payment to eligible survivors of public safety officers who have died in the line of duty.

The program also provides benefits to public safety officers who are permanently and totally disabled because of injuries sustained in the line of duty.

Finally, the PSOB program provides financial assistance to help pay higher education costs for the spouses and children of public safety officers who have died or been injured in the line of duty.

It is a program that is meant to help the loved ones of fallen officers move forward in the aftermath of tragedies.

Unfortunately, in recent years, the PSOB program has had some incidents of delay, and some families were left in the dark about the status of applications. These families were unable to move forward after their tragic losses, and we recognize that is not acceptable for a family that has sacrificed so much for their communities.

Legislation was introduced in the last Congress, and again this Congress as S. 419, to address these regrettable failings. This bill provides for transparency in the processing of claims in the PSOB program and codifies measures to ensure the system is streamlined and operates in a fair manner.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for their work and strong support of these law enforcement families. I would especially like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) for his unwavering support of the families of law enforcement.

In his second inaugural address, President Lincoln reminded the American people: “To care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan.” This legislation is designed to do exactly that for the brave men and women in blue who protect and serve all of us every day.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday this bill passed the Senate unanimously. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation today.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today also in strong support of S. 419, the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvement Act, a bill which was just passed by the Senate yesterday.

Each day, public safety officers put their lives on the line for the greater good of those whom they have taken an oath to serve and protect. Unfortunately, for some of these brave men and women, the ultimate sacrifice is made, and they will die while in the line of duty.

The Public Safety Officers' Benefits program, which is administered by the Justice Department's Bureau of Justice Assistance, was established in 1976 to provide certain benefits to the families of these officers as well as to officers who are disabled as a result of their service.

The death benefit is provided to eligible survivors of public safety officers whose deaths are a direct and proximate result of a traumatic injury sustained in the line of duty or death from certain heart attacks, strokes, and vascular ruptures sustained while on duty.

An education benefit is provided to spouses and children of public safety officers killed or disabled while on duty. The program provides disability benefits to officers catastrophically injured in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, I support S. 419 because it will significantly improve in several respects how benefits claims of fallen and injured officers are processed under the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program. To begin with, the bill responds to the fact that, all too often, these officers and their families, after experiencing a loss of life or traumatic injury, must then endure months, sometimes years, of uncertainty and delay concerning their benefit claims.

S. 419 requires the Bureau to give substantial weight to evidence and facts presented by a Federal, State, or local agency when determining eligibility for death or disability benefits. In addition, the measure authorizes the Bureau of Justice Assistance to establish rules based on standards for the Benefits program. These two requirements will help facilitate and expedite the Benefits program claims processed and, thereby, reduce the backlog of families awaiting a decision on their benefit claims.

S. 419 also increases transparency of the Bureau's claims processing. It requires, for example, the Bureau to publish and update a report with information on the status of pending claims regarding death, disability, and educational claims submitted, which will increase transparency.

As we all know, transparency often leads to accountability, and this bill will make the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the Department of Justice more accountable to the families of fallen and traumatically injured officers, Congress, and the public as well. By requiring that updates or pending benefit claims be posted on public websites, Congress and the public will be able to evaluate the performance of the Bureau in timely processing pending claims.

Finally, S. 419 will help ensure that families, who are the ultimate victims of those who sacrifice their lives for our protection, are not deprived of benefits they are due under the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program.

We all have a responsibility to take care of surviving family members when a first responder is tragically killed or injured in the line of duty. This bill is a step in the right direction of ensuring that families are not overly burdened and that the public is aware of how the Bureau and the Justice Department are handling claims submitted by family members.

Mr. Speaker, the sacrifice of these first responders should not be taken for granted, and their families should not be unduly burdened when applying for benefits under the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program. Accordingly, I support S. 419. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, it is particularly significant to note that S. 419 is being considered in the midst of National Police Week, a period dedicated to honor

our Nation's fallen law enforcement heroes.

President John Kennedy, by proclamation signed in 1962, designated May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the week in which that date falls as National Police Week.

S. 419 memorializes our commitment to public safety officers, who daily risk their lives for us, by removing barriers that prevent beneficiaries under the Benefits program from obtaining the benefits they so justly deserve. Families of our first responders deserve timely consideration of benefit claims when their loved ones give the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this measure so that it may be sent to the President for signature.

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

□ 1430

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time only to say that I very much appreciate the work on both sides of the aisle, particularly the gentleman from Michigan.

This is a good, bipartisan bill which should be passed today. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 419, the "Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvement Act of 2017".

The Public Safety Officers' Benefits program or PSOB Program provides death, disability, and education benefits to public safety officers and their survivors.

The PSOB Program is administered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, or BJA, which is a component of the Department of Justice.

Under the Program, the death benefit is provided to eligible survivors of public safety officers whose death was a direct and proximate result of a traumatic injury sustained in the line of duty or certain work-related heart attacks or strokes.

The Program provides a disability benefit to public safety officers who have been permanently and totally disabled as the direct and proximate result of a catastrophic injury sustained in the line of duty, if that injury permanently prevents the officer from performing any gainful employment.

The education benefit provides assistance to spouses and children of public safety officers killed or disabled in the line of duty who attend an educational program at an eligible education institution.

All too often, these first responders and their families needlessly suffer months and years of uncertainty after experiencing a loss of life or a traumatic injury.

This bill is a show of appreciation for the brave men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice while serving in the line of duty as well as an expression of appreciation and support to the families of these first responders.

S. 419 improves how the Department of Justice processes claims under the PSOB Program.

The measure authorizes the Bureau of Justice Assistance to establish rules based on standards for the PSOB Program and it requires the Bureau of Justice Assistance to give substantial weight to evidence and facts presented by a federal, state, or local agency when determining eligibility for death or disability benefits.

These two requirements will decrease the time in which claims are processed, thereby reducing the backlog of families awaiting a decision on their benefits claim.

S. 419 also increases the level of transparency regarding claims processed by requiring the Bureau of Justice Assistance to publish and update information on the status of pending claims.

By requiring that updates on pending benefits claims be posted on public websites, the public will be able to evaluate the performance of the Bureau of Justice Assistance in timely processing claims.

As we honor our fallen heroes this week during National Police Week, I think now is as greater a time as any to ensure that we remove barriers that hinder their families from obtaining benefits we promised them when we enacted the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act.

Accordingly, I strongly support S. 419.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 419.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMASINA E. JORDAN INDIAN TRIBES OF VIRGINIA FEDERAL RECOGNITION ACT OF 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 984) to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 984

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2017".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978.

TITLE I—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE

Sec. 101. Findings.

Sec. 102. Definitions.

Sec. 103. Federal recognition.

Sec. 104. Membership; governing documents.

Sec. 105. Governing body.

Sec. 106. Reservation of the Tribe.

Sec. 107. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE II—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE—EASTERN DIVISION

Sec. 201. Findings.
 Sec. 202. Definitions.
 Sec. 203. Federal recognition.
 Sec. 204. Membership; governing documents.
 Sec. 205. Governing body.
 Sec. 206. Reservation of the Tribe.
 Sec. 207. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE III—UPPER MATTAPONI TRIBE

Sec. 301. Findings.
 Sec. 302. Definitions.
 Sec. 303. Federal recognition.
 Sec. 304. Membership; governing documents.
 Sec. 305. Governing body.
 Sec. 306. Reservation of the Tribe.
 Sec. 307. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE IV—RAPPAHANNOCK TRIBE, INC.

Sec. 401. Findings.
 Sec. 402. Definitions.
 Sec. 403. Federal recognition.
 Sec. 404. Membership; governing documents.
 Sec. 405. Governing body.
 Sec. 406. Reservation of the Tribe.
 Sec. 407. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE V—MONACAN INDIAN NATION

Sec. 501. Findings.
 Sec. 502. Definitions.
 Sec. 503. Federal recognition.
 Sec. 504. Membership; governing documents.
 Sec. 505. Governing body.
 Sec. 506. Reservation of the Tribe.
 Sec. 507. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE VI—NANSEMOND INDIAN TRIBE

Sec. 601. Findings.
 Sec. 602. Definitions.
 Sec. 603. Federal recognition.
 Sec. 604. Membership; governing documents.
 Sec. 605. Governing body.
 Sec. 606. Reservation of the Tribe.
 Sec. 607. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE VII—EMINENT DOMAIN

Sec. 701. Limitation.

SEC. 2. INDIAN CHILD WELFARE ACT OF 1978.

Nothing in this Act affects the application of section 109 of the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1919).

TITLE I—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE

SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) in 1607, when the English settlers set shore along the Virginia coastline, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe was one of about 30 tribes that received them;

(2) in 1614, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe entered into a treaty with Sir Thomas Dale, Governor of the Jamestown Colony, under which—

(A) the Chickahominy Indian Tribe agreed to provide 2 bushels of corn per man and send warriors to protect the English; and

(B) Sir Thomas Dale agreed in return to allow the Tribe to continue to practice its own tribal governance;

(3) in 1646, a treaty was signed which forced the Chickahominy from their homeland to the area around the York Mattaponi River in present-day King William County, leading to the formation of a reservation;

(4) in 1677, following Bacon's Rebellion, the Queen of Pamunkey signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation on behalf of the Chickahominy;

(5) in 1702, the Chickahominy were forced from their reservation, which caused the loss of a land base;

(6) in 1711, the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg established a grammar school for Indians called Brafferton College;

(7) a Chickahominy child was one of the first Indians to attend Brafferton College;

(8) in 1750, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to migrate from King William County back to the area around the Chickahominy River in New Kent and Charles City Counties;

(9) in 1793, a Baptist missionary named Bradby took refuge with the Chickahominy and took a Chickahominy woman as his wife;

(10) in 1831, the names of the ancestors of the modern-day Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to appear in the Charles City County census records;

(11) in 1901, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe formed Samaria Baptist Church;

(12) from 1901 to 1935, Chickahominy men were assessed a tribal tax so that their children could receive an education;

(13) the Tribe used the proceeds from the tax to build the first Samaria Indian School, buy supplies, and pay a teacher's salary;

(14) in 1919, C. Lee Moore, Auditor of Public Accounts for Virginia, told Chickahominy Chief O.W. Adkins that he had instructed the Commissioner of Revenue for Charles City County to record Chickahominy tribal members on the county tax rolls as Indian, and not as White or colored;

(15) during the period of 1920 through 1930, various Governors of the Commonwealth of Virginia wrote letters of introduction for Chickahominy Chiefs who had official business with Federal agencies in Washington, DC;

(16) in 1934, Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins wrote to John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, requesting money to acquire land for the Chickahominy Indian Tribe's use, to build school, medical, and library facilities and to buy tractors, implements, and seed;

(17) in 1934, John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, wrote to Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins, informing him that Congress had passed the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the "Indian Reorganization Act") (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), but had not made the appropriation to fund the Act;

(18) in 1942, Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins wrote to John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, asking for help in getting the proper racial designation on Selective Service records for Chickahominy soldiers;

(19) in 1943, John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, asked Douglas S. Freeman, editor of the Richmond News-Leader newspaper of Richmond, Virginia, to help Virginia Indians obtain proper racial designation on birth records;

(20) Collier stated that his office could not officially intervene because it had no responsibility for the Virginia Indians, "as a matter largely of historical accident", but was "interested in them as descendants of the original inhabitants of the region";

(21) in 1948, the Veterans' Education Committee of the Virginia State Board of Education approved Samaria Indian School to provide training to veterans;

(22) that school was established and run by the Chickahominy Indian Tribe;

(23) in 1950, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe purchased and donated to the Charles City County School Board land to be used to build a modern school for students of the Chickahominy and other Virginia Indian tribes;

(24) the Samaria Indian School included students in grades 1 through 8;

(25) in 1961, Senator Sam Ervin, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional

Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, requested Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins to provide assistance in analyzing the status of the constitutional rights of Indians "in your area";

(26) in 1967, the Charles City County school board closed Samaria Indian School and converted the school to a countywide primary school as a step toward full school integration of Indian and non-Indian students;

(27) in 1972, the Charles City County school board began receiving funds under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458aa et seq.) on behalf of Chickahominy students, which funding is provided as of the date of enactment of this Act under title V of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458aaa et seq.);

(28) in 1974, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe bought land and built a tribal center using monthly pledges from tribal members to finance the transactions;

(29) in 1983, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe was granted recognition as an Indian tribe by the Commonwealth of Virginia, along with 5 other Indian tribes; and

(30) in 1985, Governor Gerald Baliles was the special guest at an intertribal Thanksgiving Day dinner hosted by the Chickahominy Indian Tribe.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

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

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term "tribal member" means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term "Tribe" means the Chickahominy Indian Tribe.

SEC. 103. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to the existence of a reservation for the Tribe.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, and Henrico County, Virginia.

SEC. 104. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 105. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures

specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 106. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the Tribe, the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) shall take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe that was acquired by the Tribe on or before January 1, 2007, if such lands are located within the boundaries of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, or Henrico County, Virginia; and

(2) may take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe, if such lands are located within the boundaries of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, or Henrico County, Virginia.

(b) DEADLINE FOR DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall make a final written determination not later than three years of the date which the Tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust under subsection (a)(2) and shall immediately make that determination available to the Tribe.

(c) RESERVATION STATUS.—Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall, upon request of the Tribe, be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(d) GAMING.—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 107. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE II—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE—EASTERN DIVISION

SEC. 201. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) in 1607, when the English settlers set shore along the Virginia coastline, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe was one of about 30 tribes that received them;

(2) in 1614, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe entered into a treaty with Sir Thomas Dale, Governor of the Jamestown Colony, under which—

(A) the Chickahominy Indian Tribe agreed to provide 2 bushels of corn per man and send warriors to protect the English; and

(B) Sir Thomas Dale agreed in return to allow the Tribe to continue to practice its own tribal governance;

(3) in 1646, a treaty was signed which forced the Chickahominy from their homeland to the area around the York River in present-day King William County, leading to the formation of a reservation;

(4) in 1677, following Bacon's Rebellion, the Queen of Pamunkey signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation on behalf of the Chickahominy;

(5) in 1702, the Chickahominy were forced from their reservation, which caused the loss of a land base;

(6) in 1711, the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg established a grammar school for Indians called Brafferton College;

(7) a Chickahominy child was one of the first Indians to attend Brafferton College;

(8) in 1750, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to migrate from King William County back to the area around the Chickahominy River in New Kent and Charles City Counties;

(9) in 1793, a Baptist missionary named Bradby took refuge with the Chickahominy and took a Chickahominy woman as his wife;

(10) in 1831, the names of the ancestors of the modern-day Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to appear in the Charles City County census records;

(11) in 1870, a census revealed an enclave of Indians in New Kent County that is believed to be the beginning of the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division;

(12) other records were destroyed when the New Kent County courthouse was burned, leaving a State census as the only record covering that period;

(13) in 1901, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe formed Samaria Baptist Church;

(14) from 1901 to 1935, Chickahominy men were assessed a tribal tax so that their children could receive an education;

(15) the Tribe used the proceeds from the tax to build the first Samaria Indian School, buy supplies, and pay a teacher's salary;

(16) in 1910, a 1-room school covering grades 1 through 8 was established in New Kent County for the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division;

(17) during the period of 1920 through 1921, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division began forming a tribal government;

(18) E.P. Bradby, the founder of the Tribe, was elected to be Chief;

(19) in 1922, Tsena Commocko Baptist Church was organized;

(20) in 1925, a certificate of incorporation was issued to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division;

(21) in 1950, the 1-room Indian school in New Kent County was closed and students were bused to Samaria Indian School in Charles City County;

(22) in 1967, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe and the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division lost their schools as a result of the required integration of students;

(23) during the period of 1982 through 1984, Tsena Commocko Baptist Church built a new sanctuary to accommodate church growth;

(24) in 1983 the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division was granted State recognition along with 5 other Virginia Indian tribes;

(25) in 1985—

(A) the Virginia Council on Indians was organized as a State agency; and

(B) the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division was granted a seat on the Council;

(26) in 1988, a nonprofit organization known as the “United Indians of Virginia” was formed; and

(27) Chief Marvin “Strongoak” Bradby of the Eastern Band of the Chickahominy presently chairs the organization.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

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

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term “tribal member” means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division.

SEC. 203. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all future services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to the existence of a reservation for the Tribe.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, and Henrico County, Virginia.

SEC. 204. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 205. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 206. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the Tribe, the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) shall take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe that was acquired by the Tribe on or before January 1, 2007, if such lands are located within the boundaries of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, or Henrico County, Virginia; and

(2) may take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe, if such lands are located within the boundaries of New Kent County, James City County, Charles City County, or Henrico County, Virginia.

(b) DEADLINE FOR DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall make a final written determination not later than three years of the date which the Tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust under subsection (a)(2) and shall immediately make that determination available to the Tribe.

(c) RESERVATION STATUS.—Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall, upon request of the Tribe, be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(d) GAMING.—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 207. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE III—UPPER MATTAPONI TRIBE

SEC. 301. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) during the period of 1607 through 1646, the Chickahominy Indian Tribes—

(A) lived approximately 20 miles from Jamestown; and

(B) were significantly involved in English-Indian affairs;

(2) Mattaponi Indians, who later joined the Chickahominy Indians, lived a greater distance from Jamestown;

(3) in 1646, the Chickahominy Indians moved to Mattaponi River basin, away from the English;

(4) in 1661, the Chickahominy Indians sold land at a place known as “the cliffs” on the Mattaponi River;

(5) in 1669, the Chickahominy Indians—

(A) appeared in the Virginia Colony’s census of Indian bowmen; and

(B) lived in “New Kent” County, which included the Mattaponi River basin at that time;

(6) in 1677, the Chickahominy and Mattaponi Indians were subjects of the Queen of Pamunkey, who was a signatory to the Treaty of 1677 with the King of England;

(7) in 1683, after a Mattaponi town was attacked by Seneca Indians, the Mattaponi Indians took refuge with the Chickahominy Indians, and the history of the 2 groups was intertwined for many years thereafter;

(8) in 1695, the Chickahominy and Mattaponi Indians—

(A) were assigned a reservation by the Virginia Colony; and

(B) traded land of the reservation for land at the place known as “the cliffs” (which, as of the date of enactment of this Act, is the Mattaponi Indian Reservation), which had been owned by the Mattaponi Indians before 1661;

(9) in 1711, a Chickahominy boy attended the Indian School at the College of William and Mary;

(10) in 1726, the Virginia Colony discontinued funding of interpreters for the Chickahominy and Mattaponi Indian Tribes;

(11) James Adams, who served as an interpreter to the Indian tribes known as of the date of enactment of this Act as the “Upper Mattaponi Indian Tribe” and “Chickahominy Indian Tribe”, elected to stay with the Upper Mattaponi Indians;

(12) today, a majority of the Upper Mattaponi Indians have “Adams” as their surname;

(13) in 1787, Thomas Jefferson, in Notes on the Commonwealth of Virginia, mentioned the Mattaponi Indians on a reservation in King William County and said that Chickahominy Indians were “blended” with the Mattaponi Indians and nearby Pamunkey Indians;

(14) in 1850, the census of the United States revealed a nucleus of approximately 10 families, all ancestral to modern Upper Mattaponi Indians, living in central King William County, Virginia, approximately 10 miles from the reservation;

(15) during the period of 1853 through 1884, King William County marriage records listed Upper Mattaponis as “Indians” in marrying people residing on the reservation;

(16) during the period of 1884 through the present, county marriage records usually refer to Upper Mattaponis as “Indians”;

(17) in 1901, Smithsonian anthropologist James Mooney heard about the Upper Mattaponi Indians but did not visit them;

(18) in 1928, University of Pennsylvania anthropologist Frank Speck published a book on modern Virginia Indians with a section on the Upper Mattaponis;

(19) from 1929 until 1930, the leadership of the Upper Mattaponi Indians opposed the use

of a “colored” designation in the 1930 United States census and won a compromise in which the Indian ancestry of the Upper Mattaponis was recorded but questioned;

(20) during the period of 1942 through 1945—

(A) the leadership of the Upper Mattaponi Indians, with the help of Frank Speck and others, fought against the induction of young men of the Tribe into “colored” units in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) a tribal roll for the Upper Mattaponi Indians was compiled;

(21) from 1945 to 1946, negotiations took place to admit some of the young people of the Upper Mattaponi to high schools for Federal Indians (especially at Cherokee) because no high school coursework was available for Indians in Virginia schools; and

(22) in 1983, the Upper Mattaponi Indians applied for and won State recognition as an Indian tribe.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

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

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term “tribal member” means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Upper Mattaponi Tribe.

SEC. 303. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to the existence of a reservation for the Tribe.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area within 25 miles of the Sharon Indian School at 13383 King William Road, King William County, Virginia.

SEC. 304. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 305. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 306. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the Tribe, the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) shall take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe

that was acquired by the Tribe on or before January 1, 2007, if such lands are located within the boundaries of King William County, Caroline County, Hanover County, King and Queen County, and New Kent County, Virginia; and

(2) may take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe, if such lands are located within the boundaries of King William County, Caroline County, Hanover County, King and Queen County, and New Kent County, Virginia.

(b) DEADLINE FOR DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall make a final written determination not later than three years of the date which the Tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust under subsection (a)(2) and shall immediately make that determination available to the Tribe.

(c) RESERVATION STATUS.—Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall, upon request of the Tribe, be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(d) GAMING.—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 307. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE IV—RAPPAHANNOCK TRIBE, INC.

SEC. 401. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) during the initial months after Virginia was settled, the Rappahannock Indians had 3 encounters with Captain John Smith;

(2) the first encounter occurred when the Rappahannock weroance (headman)—

(A) traveled to Quiyocohannock (a principal town across the James River from Jamestown), where he met with Smith to determine whether Smith had been the “great man” who had previously sailed into the Rappahannock River, killed a Rappahannock weroance, and kidnapped Rappahannock people; and

(B) determined that Smith was too short to be that “great man”;

(3) on a second meeting, during John Smith’s captivity (December 16, 1607, to January 8, 1608), Smith was taken to the Rappahannock principal village to show the people that Smith was not the “great man”;

(4) a third meeting took place during Smith’s exploration of the Chesapeake Bay (July to September 1608), when, after the Moraughtacund Indians had stolen 3 women from the Rappahannock King, Smith was prevailed upon to facilitate a peaceful truce between the Rappahannock and the Moraughtacund Indians;

(5) in the settlement, Smith had the 2 Indian tribes meet on the spot of their first fight;

(6) when it was established that both groups wanted peace, Smith told the Rappahannock King to select which of the 3 stolen women he wanted;

(7) the Moraughtacund King was given second choice among the 2 remaining women, and Mosco, a Wighcocomoco (on the Potomac River) guide, was given the third woman;

(8) in 1645, Captain William Claiborne tried unsuccessfully to establish treaty relations with the Rappahannocks, as the

Rappahannocks had not participated in the Pamunkey-led uprising in 1644, and the English wanted to "treat with the Rappahannocks or any other Indians not in amity with Opechancanough, concerning serving the county against the Pamunkeys";

(9) in April 1651, the Rappahannocks conveyed a tract of land to an English settler, Colonel Morre Fauntleroy;

(10) the deed for the conveyance was signed by Accopatough, weroance of the Rappahannock Indians;

(11) in September 1653, Lancaster County signed a treaty with Rappahannock Indians, the terms of which treaty—

(A) gave Rappahannocks the rights of Englishmen in the county court; and

(B) attempted to make the Rappahannocks more accountable under English law;

(12) in September 1653, Lancaster County defined and marked the bounds of its Indian settlements;

(13) according to the Lancaster clerk of court, "the tribe called the great Rappahannocks lived on the Rappahannock Creek just across the river above Tappahannock";

(14) in September 1656, (Old) Rappahannock County (which, as of the date of enactment of this Act, is comprised of Richmond and Essex Counties, Virginia) signed a treaty with Rappahannock Indians that—

(A) mirrored the Lancaster County treaty from 1653; and

(B) stated that—

(i) Rappahannocks were to be rewarded, in Roanoke, for returning English fugitives; and

(ii) the English encouraged the Rappahannocks to send their children to live among the English as servants, who the English promised would be well-treated;

(15) in 1658, the Virginia Assembly revised a 1652 Act stating that "there be no grants of land to any Englishman whatsoever de futuro until the Indians be first served with the proportion of 50 acres of land for each bowman";

(16) in 1669, the colony conducted a census of Virginia Indians;

(17) as of the date of that census—

(A) the majority of the Rappahannocks were residing at their hunting village on the north side of the Mattaponi River; and

(B) at the time of the visit, census-takers were counting only the Indian tribes along the rivers, which explains why only 30 Rappahannock bowmen were counted on that river;

(18) the Rappahannocks used the hunting village on the north side of the Mattaponi River as their primary residence until the Rappahannocks were removed in 1684;

(19) in May 1677, the Treaty of Middle Plantation was signed with England;

(20) the Pamunkey Queen Cockacoeske signed on behalf of the Rappahannocks, "who were supposed to be her tributaries", but before the treaty could be ratified, the Queen of Pamunkey complained to the Virginia Colonial Council "that she was having trouble with Rappahannocks and Chickahominies, supposedly tributaries of hers";

(21) in November 1682, the Virginia Colonial Council established a reservation for the Rappahannock Indians of 3,474 acres "about the town where they dwelt";

(22) the Rappahannock "town" was the hunting village on the north side of the Mattaponi River, where the Rappahannocks had lived throughout the 1670s;

(23) the acreage allotment of the reservation was based on the 1658 Indian land act,

which translates into a bowman population of 70, or an approximate total Rappahannock population of 350;

(24) in 1683, following raids by Iroquoian warriors on both Indian and English settlements, the Virginia Colonial Council ordered the Rappahannocks to leave their reservation and unite with the Nanzatico Indians at Nanzatico Indian Town, which was located across and up the Rappahannock River some 30 miles;

(25) between 1687 and 1699, the Rappahannocks migrated out of Nanzatico, returning to the south side of the Rappahannock River at Portobacco Indian Town;

(26) in 1706, by order of Essex County, Lieutenant Richard Covington "escorted" the Portobaccos and Rappahannocks out of Portobacco Indian Town, out of Essex County, and into King and Queen County where they settled along the ridgeline between the Rappahannock and Mattaponi Rivers, the site of their ancient hunting village and 1682 reservation;

(27) during the 1760s, 3 Rappahannock girls were raised on Thomas Nelson's Bleak Hill Plantation in King William County;

(28) of those girls—

(A) one married a Saunders man;

(B) one married a Johnson man; and

(C) one had 2 children, Edmund and Carter Nelson, fathered by Thomas Cary Nelson;

(29) in the 19th century, those Saunders, Johnson, and Nelson families are among the core Rappahannock families from which the modern Tribe traces its descent;

(30) in 1819 and 1820, Edward Bird, John Bird (and his wife), Carter Nelson, Edmund Nelson, and Carter Spurlock (all Rappahannock ancestors) were listed on the tax roles of King and Queen County and taxed at the county poor rate;

(31) Edmund Bird was added to the tax roles in 1821;

(32) those tax records are significant documentation because the great majority of pre-1864 records for King and Queen County were destroyed by fire;

(33) beginning in 1819, and continuing through the 1880s, there was a solid Rappahannock presence in the membership at Upper Essex Baptist Church;

(34) that was the first instance of conversion to Christianity by at least some Rappahannock Indians;

(35) while twenty-six identifiable and traceable Rappahannock surnames appear on the pre-1863 membership list, and twenty-eight were listed on the 1863 membership roster, the number of surnames listed had declined to twelve in 1878 and had risen only slightly to fourteen by 1888;

(36) a reason for the decline is that in 1870, a Methodist circuit rider, Joseph Mastin, secured funds to purchase land and construct St. Stephens Baptist Church for the Rappahannocks living nearby in Caroline County;

(37) Mastin referred to the Rappahannocks during the period of 1850 to 1870 as "Indians, having a great need for moral and Christian guidance";

(38) St. Stephens was the dominant tribal church until the Rappahannock Indian Baptist Church was established in 1964;

(39) at both churches, the core Rappahannock family names of Bird, Clarke, Fortune, Johnson, Nelson, Parker, and Richardson predominate;

(40) during the early 1900s, James Mooney, noted anthropologist, maintained correspondence with the Rappahannocks, surveying them and instructing them on how to formalize their tribal government;

(41) in November 1920, Speck visited the Rappahannocks and assisted them in organizing the fight for their sovereign rights;

(42) in 1921, the Rappahannocks were granted a charter from the Commonwealth of Virginia formalizing their tribal government;

(43) Speck began a professional relationship with the Tribe that would last more than 30 years and document Rappahannock history and traditions as never before;

(44) in April 1921, Rappahannock Chief George Nelson asked the Governor of Virginia, Westmoreland Davis, to forward a proclamation to the President of the United States, along with an appended list of tribal members and a handwritten copy of the proclamation itself;

(45) the letter concerned Indian freedom of speech and assembly nationwide;

(46) in 1922, the Rappahannocks established a formal school at Lloyds, Essex County, Virginia;

(47) prior to establishment of the school, Rappahannock children were taught by a tribal member in Central Point, Caroline County, Virginia;

(48) in December 1923, Rappahannock Chief George Nelson testified before Congress appealing for a \$50,000 appropriation to establish an Indian school in Virginia;

(49) in 1930, the Rappahannocks were engaged in an ongoing dispute with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the United States Census Bureau about their classification in the 1930 Federal census;

(50) in January 1930, Rappahannock Chief Otho S. Nelson wrote to Leon Truesdell, Chief Statistician of the United States Census Bureau, asking that the 218 enrolled Rappahannocks be listed as Indians;

(51) in February 1930, Truesdell replied to Nelson saying that "special instructions" were being given about classifying Indians;

(52) in April 1930, Nelson wrote to William M. Steuart at the Census Bureau asking about the enumerators' failure to classify his people as Indians, saying that enumerators had not asked the question about race when they interviewed his people;

(53) in a followup letter to Truesdell, Nelson reported that the enumerators were "flatly denying" his people's request to be listed as Indians and that the race question was completely avoided during interviews;

(54) the Rappahannocks had spoken with Caroline and Essex County enumerators, and with John M.W. Green at that point, without success;

(55) Nelson asked Truesdell to list people as Indians if he sent a list of members;

(56) the matter was settled by William Steuart, who concluded that the Bureau's rule was that people of Indian descent could be classified as "Indian" only if Indian "blood" predominated and "Indian" identity was accepted in the local community;

(57) the Virginia Vital Statistics Bureau classed all nonreservation Indians as "Negro", and it failed to see why "an exception should be made" for the Rappahannocks;

(58) therefore, in 1925, the Indian Rights Association took on the Rappahannock case to assist the Rappahannocks in fighting for their recognition and rights as an Indian tribe;

(59) during the Second World War, the Pamunkeys, Mattaponis, Chickahominies, and Rappahannocks had to fight the draft boards with respect to their racial identities;

(60) the Virginia Vital Statistics Bureau insisted that certain Indian draftees be inducted into Negro units;

(61) finally, 3 Rappahannocks were convicted of violating the Federal draft laws

and, after spending time in a Federal prison, were granted conscientious objector status and served out the remainder of the war working in military hospitals;

(62) in 1943, Frank Speck noted that there were approximately 25 communities of Indians left in the Eastern United States that were entitled to Indian classification, including the Rappahannocks;

(63) in the 1940s, Leon Truesdell, Chief Statistician, of the United States Census Bureau, listed 118 members in the Rappahannock Tribe in the Indian population of Virginia;

(64) on April 25, 1940, the Office of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior included the Rappahannocks on a list of Indian tribes classified by State and by agency;

(65) in 1948, the Smithsonian Institution Annual Report included an article by William Harlen Gilbert entitled, "Surviving Indian Groups of the Eastern United States", which included and described the Rappahannock Tribe;

(66) in the late 1940s and early 1950s, the Rappahannocks operated a school at Indian Neck;

(67) the State agreed to pay a tribal teacher to teach 10 students bused by King and Queen County to Sharon Indian School in King William County, Virginia;

(68) in 1965, Rappahannock students entered Marriott High School (a White public school) by Executive order of the Governor of Virginia;

(69) in 1972, the Rappahannocks worked with the Coalition of Eastern Native Americans to fight for Federal recognition;

(70) in 1979, the Coalition established a pottery and artisans company, operating with other Virginia tribes;

(71) in 1980, the Rappahannocks received funding through the Administration for Native Americans of the Department of Health and Human Services to develop an economic program for the Tribe; and

(72) in 1983, the Rappahannocks received State recognition as an Indian tribe.

SEC. 402. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

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

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term "tribal member" means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "Tribe" means the organization possessing the legal name Rappahannock Tribe, Inc.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term "Tribe" does not include any other Indian tribe, subtribe, band, or splinter group the members of which represent themselves as Rappahannock Indians.

SEC. 403. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal

members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to the existence of a reservation for the Tribe.

(2) SERVICE AREA.—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of King and Queen County, Caroline County, Essex County, and King William County, Virginia.

SEC. 404. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 405. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 406. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the Tribe, the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) shall take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe that was acquired by the Tribe on or before January 1, 2007, if such lands are located within the boundaries of King and Queen County, Stafford County, Spotsylvania County, Richmond County, Essex County, and Caroline County, Virginia; and

(2) may take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe, if such lands are located within the boundaries of King and Queen County, Richmond County, Lancaster County, King George County, Essex County, Caroline County, New Kent County, King William County, and James City County, Virginia.

(b) DEADLINE FOR DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall make a final written determination not later than three years of the date which the Tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust under subsection (a)(2) and shall immediately make that determination available to the Tribe.

(c) RESERVATION STATUS.—Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall, upon request of the Tribe, be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(d) GAMING.—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 407. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE V—MONACAN INDIAN NATION

SEC. 501. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) in 1677, the Monacan Tribe signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation between Charles II of England and 12 Indian "Kings and Chief Men";

(2) in 1722, in the Treaty of Albany, Governor Spotswood negotiated to save the Virginia Indians from extinction at the hands of the Iroquois;

(3) specifically mentioned in the negotiations were the Monacan tribes of the Totero (Tutelo), Saponi, Ocheneeches (Occaneechi), Stengenocks, and Meipontskys;

(4) in 1790, the first national census recorded Benjamin Evans and Robert Johns, both ancestors of the present Monacan community, listed as "white" with mulatto children;

(5) in 1782, tax records also began for those families;

(6) in 1850, the United States census recorded 29 families, mostly large, with Monacan surnames, the members of which are genealogically related to the present community;

(7) in 1870, a log structure was built at the Bear Mountain Indian Mission;

(8) in 1908, the structure became an Episcopal Mission and, as of the date of enactment of this Act, the structure is listed as a landmark on the National Register of Historic Places;

(9) in 1920, 304 Amherst Indians were identified in the United States census;

(10) from 1930 through 1931, numerous letters from Monacans to the Bureau of the Census resulted from the decision of Dr. Walter Plecker, former head of the Bureau of Vital Statistics of the Commonwealth of Virginia, not to allow Indians to register as Indians for the 1930 census;

(11) the Monacans eventually succeeded in being allowed to claim their race, albeit with an asterisk attached to a note from Dr. Plecker stating that there were no Indians in Virginia;

(12) in 1947, D'Arcy McNickle, a Salish Indian, saw some of the children at the Amherst Mission and requested that the Cherokee Agency visit them because they appeared to be Indian;

(13) that letter was forwarded to the Department of the Interior, Office of Indian Affairs, Chicago, Illinois;

(14) Chief Jarrett Blythe of the Eastern Band of Cherokee did visit the Mission and wrote that he "would be willing to accept these children in the Cherokee school";

(15) in 1979, a Federal Coalition of Eastern Native Americans established the entity known as "Monacan Co-operative Pottery" at the Amherst Mission;

(16) some important pieces were produced at Monacan Co-operative Pottery, including a piece that was sold to the Smithsonian Institution;

(17) the Mattaponi-Pamunkey-Monacan Consortium, established in 1981, has since been organized as a nonprofit corporation that serves as a vehicle to obtain funds for those Indian tribes from the Department of Labor under Native American programs;

(18) in 1989, the Monacan Tribe was recognized by the Commonwealth of Virginia, which enabled the Tribe to apply for grants and participate in other programs; and

(19) in 1993, the Monacan Tribe received tax-exempt status as a nonprofit corporation from the Internal Revenue Service.

SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

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

(2) TRIBAL MEMBER.—The term "tribal member" means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) TRIBE.—The term "Tribe" means the Monacan Indian Nation.

SEC. 503. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) **FEDERAL RECOGNITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) **APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.**—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) **FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to the existence of a reservation for the Tribe.

(2) **SERVICE AREA.**—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of all land within 25 miles from the center of Amherst, Virginia.

SEC. 504. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 505. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 506. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon the request of the Tribe, the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) shall take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe that was acquired by the Tribe on or before January 1, 2007, if such lands are located within the boundaries of Amherst County, Virginia; and

(2) may take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe, if such lands are located within the boundaries of Amherst County, Virginia, and those parcels in Rockbridge County, Virginia (subject to the consent of the local unit of government), owned by Mr. J. Poole, described as East 731 Sandbridge (encompassing approximately 4.74 acres) and East 731 (encompassing approximately 5.12 acres).

(b) **DEADLINE FOR DETERMINATION.**—The Secretary shall make a final written determination not later than three years of the date which the Tribe submits a request for land to be taken into trust under subsection (a)(2) and shall immediately make that determination available to the Tribe.

(c) **RESERVATION STATUS.**—Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall, upon request of the Tribe, be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(d) **GAMING.**—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 507. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing,

trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE VI—NANSEMOND INDIAN TRIBE**SEC. 601. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds that—

(1) from 1607 until 1646, Nansemond Indians—

(A) lived approximately 30 miles from Jamestown; and

(B) were significantly involved in English-Indian affairs;

(2) after 1646, there were 2 sections of Nansemonds in communication with each other, the Christianized Nansemonds in Norfolk County, who lived as citizens, and the traditionalist Nansemonds, who lived further west;

(3) in 1638, according to an entry in a 17th century sermon book still owned by the Chief's family, a Norfolk County Englishman married a Nansemond woman;

(4) that man and woman are lineal ancestors of all of members of the Nansemond Indian tribe alive as of the date of enactment of this Act, as are some of the traditionalist Nansemonds;

(5) in 1669, the 2 Nansemond sections appeared in Virginia Colony's census of Indian bowmen;

(6) in 1677, Nansemond Indians were signatories to the Treaty of 1677 with the King of England;

(7) in 1700 and 1704, the Nansemonds and other Virginia Indian tribes were prevented by Virginia Colony from making a separate peace with the Iroquois;

(8) Virginia represented those Indian tribes in the final Treaty of Albany, 1722;

(9) in 1711, a Nansemond boy attended the Indian School at the College of William and Mary;

(10) in 1727, Norfolk County granted William Bass and his kinsmen the "Indian privileges" of clearing swamp land and bearing arms (which privileges were forbidden to other non-Whites) because of their Nansemond ancestry, which meant that Bass and his kinsmen were original inhabitants of that land;

(11) in 1742, Norfolk County issued a certificate of Nansemond descent to William Bass;

(12) from the 1740s to the 1790s, the traditionalist section of the Nansemond tribe, 40 miles west of the Christianized Nansemonds, was dealing with reservation land;

(13) the last surviving members of that section sold out in 1792 with the permission of the Commonwealth of Virginia;

(14) in 1797, Norfolk County issued a certificate stating that William Bass was of Indian and English descent, and that his Indian line of ancestry ran directly back to the early 18th century elder in a traditionalist section of Nansemonds on the reservation;

(15) in 1833, Virginia enacted a law enabling people of European and Indian descent to obtain a special certificate of ancestry;

(16) the law originated from the county in which Nansemonds lived, and mostly Nansemonds, with a few people from other counties, took advantage of the new law;

(17) a Methodist mission established around 1850 for Nansemonds is currently a standard Methodist congregation with Nansemond members;

(18) in 1901, Smithsonian anthropologist James Mooney—

(A) visited the Nansemonds; and

(B) completed a tribal census that counted 61 households and was later published;

(19) in 1922, Nansemonds were given a special Indian school in the segregated school system of Norfolk County;

(20) the school survived only a few years;

(21) in 1928, University of Pennsylvania anthropologist Frank Speck published a book on modern Virginia Indians that included a section on the Nansemonds; and

(22) the Nansemonds were organized formally, with elected officers, in 1984, and later applied for and received State recognition.

SEC. 602. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) **TRIBAL MEMBER.**—The term "tribal member" means—

(A) an individual who is an enrolled member of the Tribe as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) an individual who has been placed on the membership rolls of the Tribe in accordance with this title.

(3) **TRIBE.**—The term "Tribe" means the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

SEC. 603. FEDERAL RECOGNITION.

(a) **FEDERAL RECOGNITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Federal recognition is extended to the Tribe.

(2) **APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.**—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.)) that are not inconsistent with this title shall be applicable to the Tribe and tribal members.

(b) **FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, the Tribe and tribal members shall be eligible for all services and benefits provided by the Federal Government to federally recognized Indian tribes without regard to the existence of a reservation for the Tribe.

(2) **SERVICE AREA.**—For the purpose of the delivery of Federal services to tribal members, the service area of the Tribe shall be considered to be the area comprised of the cities of Chesapeake, Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Suffolk, and Virginia Beach, Virginia.

SEC. 604. MEMBERSHIP; GOVERNING DOCUMENTS.

The membership roll and governing documents of the Tribe shall be the most recent membership roll and governing documents, respectively, submitted by the Tribe to the Secretary before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 605. GOVERNING BODY.

The governing body of the Tribe shall be—

(1) the governing body of the Tribe in place as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) any subsequent governing body elected in accordance with the election procedures specified in the governing documents of the Tribe.

SEC. 606. RESERVATION OF THE TRIBE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon the request of the Tribe, the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) shall take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe that was acquired by the Tribe on or before January 1, 2007, if such lands are located within the boundaries of the city of Suffolk, the city of Chesapeake, or Isle of Wight County, Virginia; and

(2) may take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe any land held in fee by the Tribe, if such lands are located within the boundaries of the city of Suffolk, the city of Chesapeake, or Isle of Wight County, Virginia.

(b) **DEADLINE FOR DETERMINATION.**—The Secretary shall make a final written determination not later than three years of the date which the Tribe submits a request for

land to be taken into trust under subsection (a)(2) and shall immediately make that termination available to the Tribe.

(c) **RESERVATION STATUS.**—Any land taken into trust for the benefit of the Tribe pursuant to this paragraph shall, upon request of the Tribe, be considered part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(d) **GAMING.**—The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities as a matter of claimed inherent authority or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SEC. 607. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, GATHERING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this title expands, reduces, or affects in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water rights of the Tribe and members of the Tribe.

TITLE VII—EMINENT DOMAIN

SEC. 701. LIMITATION.

Eminent domain may not be used to acquire lands in fee or in trust for an Indian tribe recognized under this Act.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 984, the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2017 will extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Tribe, the Eastern Chickahominy Tribe, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

My district, the First Congressional District of Virginia, includes the historical tribal areas of several of these tribes. The six tribes are culturally and historically significant to the Commonwealth of Virginia and to the story of America itself. Ancestors from these tribes populated coastal Virginia when Captain John Smith settled at Jamestown in 1607. They were also the first of the American Indian tribes that entered into peace agreements, actually entered into peace agreements with the Crown of England because United States, at that time, was not formally a nation yet. So they were peace-loving even before the United States came of age.

Also, the connections that these tribes have with the Nation and the settlement of the Nation are extraor-

dinarily important. If you go back in time, you know that six of these tribes were part of the Powhatan Nation. We know famously that Pocahontas was a member of the Powhatan Nation, and also there in Werowocomoco, there on the shores of the York River, saved the life of Captain John Smith; so we can see the significant impact that these tribes have had on the Nation's history and where we are today.

They are called first-contact tribes because they were the first tribes to contact the settlers as they came here to America to settle our land. In Jamestown there, the first connection they had was with these Virginia tribes. These first-contact tribes, as I have said, are intertwined with the birth of our Nation over 400 years ago, and they continue today to preserve a culture and heritage integral to Virginia and to the Nation. They are very proud of their history, and the tribal members today do much for our State in many different ways, as well as for our Nation, and are passionate about making sure that they are recognized, as other tribes are, in their critical nature to the government and Nation that we have today.

It is notable that many tribal members have also served our country bravely as part of the United States military. It is unacceptable that these tribal members, who selflessly and proudly served under the American flag during our Nation's conflicts, from the Revolutionary War to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, have not been officially recognized by the Federal Government.

Congressional recognition is also necessary because the record requirements by the Bureau of Indian Affairs administration process unfairly penalizes these Virginia tribes. Tribal records of these tribes were destroyed during the Civil War when many eastern Virginia courthouses were destroyed. Additionally, early 20th century Virginia racial purity laws barred Native Americans from identifying as Indian on State-issued birth certificates.

It is for these reasons that I am proud to have worked along with several of my Virginia colleagues in the House and the Senate to introduce this legislation that has received wide bipartisan support, including from former and current Virginia Governors who strongly supported this effort to recognize these tribes.

During the 114th Congress, the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular, and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing on Virginia tribal recognition. Most recently, the committee marked up and reported the Virginia tribal recognition as part of Chairman BISHOP's Tribal Recognition Act in December. During the legislative hearing, the previous administration's Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs testified that they did not object to action by Con-

gress to enact the bill, given Congress' authority under the Constitution to recognize tribes. At the hearing, members of the committee also expressed bipartisan support for recognizing these six first-contact Virginia tribes.

Additionally, this legislation previously passed the House in both the 110th and the 111th Congress. It is clear that there is wide bipartisan support for this issue across the Commonwealth, across our Nation, and here in Congress.

Federal recognition would acknowledge and protect historical and cultural identities of these tribes for the benefit of all Americans. It would affirm the government-to-government relationship between the United States and these first-contact Virginia tribes as a matter of respect out of what they did in working to make this Nation what it is today and also in helping create opportunities to enhance and protect the well-being of tribal members.

This legislation will also provide certainty and finality on the gaming issue for the six Virginia tribes. H.R. 984 clearly prohibits the tribes from conducting gaming activities under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. The Federal Government's failure to recognize the Virginia tribes is a serious injustice, but it is one that we here today can correct.

Congress retains the authority to recognize Indian tribes, and I believe that it is right and just for us to continue to exercise that authority under the Constitution and recognize these six first-contact Virginia tribes. These first-contact tribes deserve equity and parity under the law. It is absolutely long overdue.

I urge your support for H.R. 984.

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

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

We are here today, more than 400 years after the first English settlers landed in what became Jamestown, Virginia, to finally establish a government-to-government relationship with the Indian tribes who greeted those settlers.

The Virginia tribes that are recognized in this bill have treaties with the King of England that date back to the early 1600s. Their ancestors were there at Jamestown and facilitated the very founding and early development of our Nation.

These tribes have been unable to claim their rightful Indian identity in relation to the Federal Government, due in great part to the machinations of one man, Walter Ashby Plecker, the State registrar for the Commonwealth in the early 20th century. Plecker, an avowed White supremacist, ran Virginia's Bureau of Vital Statistics for over 34 years. From 1912 to 1947, Plecker set out to rid the Commonwealth of any documents that recorded

the existence of Indians or Indian tribes living therein.

He was instrumental in ensuring passage of the Racial Integrity Act in 1924, making it illegal for individuals to classify themselves or their newborn children as Indian. But he went even further and spent decades removing the category of Indian from birth and marriage records. Although this paper genocide, as it has been termed, attempted to erase the Virginia Indians from history, the tribal members held firm to their culture and to their identity.

In 1997, State legislation was passed to help correct the records of the Virginia Indians. Soon after, the Virginia Indians began their quest for Federal recognition. Passage of this legislation will finally put to end their 20-year struggle.

I commend and thank our colleague from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) for bringing forth this bill. I also want to give special thanks to former Congressman Jim Moran, who spent several years in this body championing this legislation and tirelessly working toward its goals.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to finally put this issue to rest and correct a historical injustice by extending Federal recognition to these six Virginia tribes. I urge all of my colleagues to join me and support this bill.

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

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN).

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SOTO for yielding. I also want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), my friend and colleague, for bringing this legislation forward.

I rise, 410 years after the first English settlers landed in what became Jamestown, Virginia, to finally grant Federal recognition to some of the Native American tribes who met those early settlers. Today, with the passage of H.R. 984, we are recognizing the rightful status of Virginia tribes in our national history.

It is largely a historical accident that the tribes of Virginia are not recognized. The six tribes have treaties that predate the United States, but because of the systematic destruction of their records, they have been denied Federal recognition for the services that come along with it. We are fixing this injustice today by passing H.R. 984.

Federal recognition will provide what the government has long denied: legal protections and financial obligations. Federal recognition will provide financial assistance for the tribes' social services, their healthcare, their housing needs, educational opportunities,

and repatriation of the remains of their ancestors in a respectful manner.

These opportunities will allow Virginia's tribes to flourish culturally and economically. These opportunities will lead to a better, brighter future for the next generation. Federal recognition is an issue I have cared deeply about since my time in the Virginia General Assembly. I am proud and humbled to cosponsor this legislation.

We have waited too long, Mr. Speaker, to recognize Virginia tribes. I urge my colleagues to support passage.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Virginia for his leadership on this very important piece of legislation, important not only for the Commonwealth of Virginia but for the rights of all Americans, beginning with the original Americans.

When we talk about the Americas, we sometimes talk as if the Americas began in the early 17th century, with Jamestown, with Plymouth, and with the subsequent colonization of the East Coast. But, in fact, there were millions of Native Americans here long before European colonization. They had rich culture. They had incredible artistic expression. They had a way of life. It was disrupted by European colonization.

As if some genocidal policies of the 18th and 19th century weren't bad enough in terms of their terrible impact on this population, the racism my friend from Florida described that went on shamefully in the Commonwealth of Virginia in the early 20th century deeply compounded the problem by denying the identity of individuals and communities as Native American so that the battle for them to have their rights restored that my good friend, Mr. WITTMAN, is trying to right today was made so much more difficult and complex.

□ 1445

If I destroy your identity papers, I destroy your ability to prove who you are. That is the dilemma and that is the catch-22 in which we find ourselves today.

This is a matter of simple justice. This is a matter of Congress righting a wrong. It is a proud moment to stand shoulder to shoulder, Republican and Democrat from Virginia, to want to right this wrong. And I know we are joined by all of our colleagues and former colleagues, including our friend Jim Moran for his great leadership in this matter.

So I am proud to support the efforts of my colleague. I urge all Members of the House to support this legislation, and let's turn a page in history the right way.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, it is time to right this wrong injustice and bring truth back into our history.

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

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

I would like to also recognize the leaders of our Virginia tribes today. Several of those members are with us here in the gallery today to witness a long overdue action by Congress to formally recognize those Virginia tribes. Those Virginia tribal leaders have been tremendous in their resolve and in their support to make sure that we right this injustice.

I want to thank them for what they have done. They have been tireless in their support for the things that they have done to make sure that we all appreciate and understand the great history with these Virginia tribes.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention that those members of the tribes today, a number are getting smaller and smaller. And this is really only about making sure we are doing what is right for those tribes and making sure that they get that formal recognition because of many injustices that have happened in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 984. And I believe with the passage out of the House—and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to do likewise—today will be a very proud day for our Nation in coming about and recognizing these Virginia first-contact tribes that has been long overdue.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 984, the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act and I want to thank my fellow Virginian, Congressman ROB WITTMAN for introducing this bill, and the gentleman from Utah, Chairman Bishop and the gentleman from Arizona, Ranking Member GRIJALVA, for their leadership and cooperation in bringing the bill to the floor.

Four hundred ten years ago, the first English settlers founded Jamestown, Virginia. The founding of Jamestown represented a first step in the creation of our great Republic, and the success of this colony is owed to the help of the indigenous people of Virginia.

With this assistance, the Jamestown colony weathered a difficult first few years in the New World before expanding, with English colonists pushing further inland. The same Native Americans who had helped those first settlers were pushed from their land without compensation. Treaties, many of which precede our own constitution, were made in an effort to compensate Virginia's Native Americans. Unfortunately, as history has repeatedly shown, these treaties were not often honored.

Like many other Native Americans, and many other groups who were not white, and despite their contributions to the founding of our nation, Virginia's Indian Tribes were pushed to the fringes of society. They were deprived of their land, prevented from getting an education, and denied a role in our society. Virginia's Native Americans were denied their

very fundamental human rights and the very freedoms and liberties enshrined in our Constitution.

This bill will finally grant federal recognition to the Chickahominy Tribe, the Eastern Chickahominy Tribe, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Tribe.

Federal recognition of Virginia's Indian Tribes will promote tribal economic development and allow Virginia's tribes to flourish culturally. Federal recognition, a process that has been ongoing for these tribes for over 30 years, will lead to a bright future for a whole new generation of tribe members.

Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Virginia General Assembly in 1983 when many of these tribes first gained formal recognition from the Commonwealth of Virginia, and I am proud to be here today supporting federal recognition for these tribes.

The time has come for this Congress to act, and I therefore urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. McEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I spoke during debate on H.R. 984, the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2017.

I rise, 410 years after the first English settlers landed in what became Jamestown, Virginia, to finally grant federal recognition to some of the Native American tribes who met those early settlers.

Today, with passage of H.R. 984, we are recognizing the rightful status of Virginia's tribes in our national history.

These six tribes have treaties that predate the United States but because of the systemic destruction of their records, they have been denied federal recognition and the services that come along with it.

We are fixing this injustice by passing H.R. 984.

Federal recognition will provide what the government has long denied—legal protections and financial obligations.

Federal recognition will provide financial assistance for the tribes' social services, health care and housing needs, educational opportunities, and repatriation of the remains of their ancestors in a respectful manner. These opportunities will allow Virginia's tribes to flourish culturally and economically. These opportunities will lead to a better, brighter future for the next generation.

Federal recognition is an issue I have cared about deeply since my time in the Virginia General Assembly and I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation.

We have waited too long to recognize Virginia's tribes. I urge my colleagues to support passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 984.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further pro-

ceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MODERNIZING GOVERNMENT TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 2017

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2227) to modernize Government information technology, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2227

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017" or the "MGT Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government spends nearly 75 percent of its annual information technology funding on operating and maintaining existing legacy information technology systems. These systems can pose operational risks, including rising costs and inability to meet mission requirements. These systems also pose security risks, including the inability to use current security best practices, such as data encryption and multi-factor authentication, making these systems particularly vulnerable to malicious cyber activity.

(2) In 2015, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) designated Improving the Management of IT Acquisitions and Operations to its biannual High Risk List and identified as a particular concern the increasing level of information technology spending on operations and maintenance, making less funding available for development or modernization. The GAO also found the Government has spent billions on failed and poorly performing information technology investments due to a lack of effective oversight.

(3) The Federal Government must modernize Federal IT systems to mitigate existing operational and security risks.

(4) The efficiencies, cost savings, and greater computing power offered by modernized solutions, such as cloud computing, have the potential to—

(A) eliminate inappropriate duplication and reduce costs;

(B) address the critical need for cybersecurity by design; and

(C) move the Federal Government into a broad, digital-services delivery model that will transform the ability of the Federal Government to meet mission requirements and deliver services to the American people.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are the following:

(1) Assist the Federal Government in modernizing Federal information technology to mitigate current operational and security risks.

(2) Incentivize cost savings in Federal information technology through modernization.

(3) Accelerate the acquisition and deployment of modernized information technology solutions, such as cloud computing, by addressing impediments in the areas of funding, development, and acquisition practices.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF AGENCY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION AND WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.

(a) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM MODERNIZATION AND WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The head of a covered agency may establish within such agency an information technology system modernization and working capital fund (in this section referred to as the "IT working capital fund") for necessary expenses described in paragraph (3).

(2) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—The following amounts may be deposited into an IT working capital fund:

(A) Reprogramming and transfer of funds made available in appropriations Acts subsequent to the date of the enactment of this Act, including transfer of any funds for the operation and maintenance of legacy information technology systems, in compliance with any applicable reprogramming law or guidelines of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(B) Amounts made available to the IT working capital fund through discretionary appropriations made available subsequent to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—An IT working capital fund established under paragraph (1) may be used, subject to the availability of appropriations, only for the following:

(A) To improve, retire, or replace existing information technology systems in the covered agency to enhance cybersecurity and to improve efficiency and effectiveness.

(B) To transition legacy information technology systems at the covered agency to cloud computing and other innovative platforms and technologies, including those serving more than one covered agency with common requirements.

(C) To assist and support covered agency efforts to provide adequate, risk-based, and cost-effective information technology capabilities that address evolving threats to information security.

(D) To reimburse funds transferred to the covered agency from the Technology Modernization Fund established under section 4, with the approval of the Chief Information Officer of the covered agency.

(4) EXISTING FUNDS.—An IT working capital fund may not be used to supplant funds provided for the operation and maintenance of any system within an appropriation for the covered agency at the time of establishment of the IT working capital fund.

(5) PRIORITIZATION OF FUNDS.—The head of each covered agency shall prioritize funds within the IT working capital fund to be used initially for cost savings activities approved by the Chief Information Officer of the covered agency, in consultation with the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government. The head of each covered agency may reprogram and transfer any amounts saved as a direct result of such activities for deposit into the applicable IT working capital fund, consistent with paragraph (2)(A).

(6) RETURN OF FUNDS.—Any funds deposited into an IT working capital fund shall be available for obligation for three years after the last day of the fiscal year in which such funds were deposited.

(7) AGENCY CIO RESPONSIBILITIES.—In evaluating projects to be funded from the IT working capital fund, the Chief Information Officer of the covered agency shall consider, to the extent applicable, guidance issued pursuant to section 4(a)(1) to evaluate applications for funding from the Technology Modernization Fund established under that

section that include factors such as a strong business case, technical design, procurement strategy (including adequate use of incremental software development practices), and program management.

(b) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every six months thereafter, the head of each covered agency shall submit to the Director the following, with respect to the IT working capital fund for the covered agency:

(A) A list of each information technology investment funded with estimated cost and completion date for each such investment.

(B) A summary by fiscal year of obligations, expenditures, and unused balances.

(2) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The Director shall make the information submitted under paragraph (1) publicly available on a website.

(c) **COVERED AGENCY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered agency” means each agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF TECHNOLOGY MODERNIZATION FUND AND BOARD.

(a) **TECHNOLOGY MODERNIZATION FUND.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the Treasury a Technology Modernization Fund (in this section referred to as the “Fund”) for technology-related activities, to improve information technology, to enhance cybersecurity across the Federal Government, and to be administered in accordance with guidance issued by the Director.

(2) **ADMINISTRATION OF FUND.**—The Commissioner of the Technology Transformation Service of the General Services Administration, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council and with the approval of the Director, shall administer the Fund in accordance with this subsection.

(3) **USE OF FUNDS.**—The Commissioner shall, in accordance with the recommendations of the Technology Modernization Board established under subsection (b), use amounts in the Fund for the following purposes:

(A) To transfer such amounts, to remain available until expended, to the head of an agency to improve, retire, or replace existing Federal information technology systems to enhance cybersecurity and improve efficiency and effectiveness.

(B) For the development, operation, and procurement of information technology products, services, and acquisition vehicles for use by agencies to improve Government-wide efficiency and cybersecurity in accordance with the requirements of such agencies.

(C) To provide services or work performed in support of the activities described under subparagraph (A) or (B).

(4) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; CREDITS; AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—

(A) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Fund \$250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

(B) **CREDITS.**—In addition to any funds otherwise appropriated, the Fund shall be credited with all reimbursements, advances, or refunds or recoveries relating to information technology or services provided through the Fund.

(C) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Amounts deposited, credited, or otherwise made available to the Fund shall be available, as provided in appropriations Acts, until expended for the purposes described in paragraph (3).

(5) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—

(A) **PAYMENT BY AGENCY.**—For a product or service developed under paragraph (3)(B), including any services or work performed in

support of such development under paragraph (3)(C), the head of an agency that uses such product or service shall pay an amount fixed by the Commissioner in accordance with this paragraph.

(B) **REIMBURSEMENT BY AGENCY.**—The head of an agency shall reimburse the Fund for any transfer made under paragraph (3)(A), including any services or work performed in support of such transfer under paragraph (3)(C), in accordance with the terms established in a written agreement described in paragraph (6). Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an agency may make a reimbursement required by this subparagraph from any appropriation made available subsequent to the date of the enactment of this Act for information technology activities, consistent with any applicable reprogramming law or guidelines of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate. An obligation to make a payment under a written agreement described in paragraph (6) in a fiscal year after the date of the enactment of this Act shall be recorded pursuant to section 1501 of title 31, United States Code, in the fiscal year in which the payment is due.

(C) **PRICES FIXED BY COMMISSIONER.**—The Commissioner, in consultation with the Director, shall establish amounts to be paid by an agency and terms of repayment for use of a product or service developed under paragraph (3)(B), including any services or work performed in support of such development under paragraph (3)(C), at levels sufficient to ensure the solvency of the Fund, including operating expenses. Before making any changes to the established amounts and terms of repayment, the Commissioner shall conduct a review and obtain approval from the Director.

(D) **FAILURE TO MAKE TIMELY REIMBURSEMENT.**—The Commissioner may obtain reimbursement by the issuance of transfer and counterwarrants, or other lawful transfer documents, supported by itemized bills, if payment is not made by an agency—

(i) within 90 days after the expiration of a repayment period described in a written agreement described in paragraph (6); or

(ii) within 45 days after the expiration of the time period to make a payment under a payment schedule for a product or service developed under paragraph (3)(B).

(6) **WRITTEN AGREEMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Before the transfer of funds to an agency under paragraph (3)(A), the Commissioner (in consultation with the Director) and the head of the requisitioning agency shall enter into a written agreement documenting the purpose for which the funds will be used and the terms of repayment, which may not exceed five years unless approved by the Director. An agreement made pursuant to this subparagraph shall be recorded as an obligation as provided in paragraph (5)(B).

(B) **REQUIREMENT FOR USE OF INCREMENTAL DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES.**—For any funds transferred to an agency under paragraph (3)(A), in the absence of compelling circumstances documented by the Commissioner at the time of transfer, such funds shall be transferred only on an incremental basis, tied to metric-based development milestones achieved by the agency, to be described in a written agreement required under subparagraph (A).

(7) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall publish and maintain a list of each project funded by the Fund on a public website, to be updated

not less than quarterly, that includes a description of the project, project status (including any schedule delay and cost overruns), and financial expenditure data related to the project.

(b) **TECHNOLOGY MODERNIZATION BOARD.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established a Technology Modernization Board (in this section referred to as the “Board”) to evaluate proposals submitted by agencies for funding authorized under the Fund.

(2) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The responsibilities of the Board are the following:

(A) Provide input to the Director for the development of processes for agencies to submit modernization proposals to the Board and to establish the criteria by which such proposals are evaluated, which shall include addressing the greatest security and operational risks, having the greatest Governmentwide impact, and having a high probability of success based on factors such as a strong business case, technical design, procurement strategy (including adequate use of incremental software development practices), and program management.

(B) Make recommendations to the Commissioner to assist agencies in the further development and refinement of select submitted modernization proposals, based on an initial evaluation performed with the assistance of the Commissioner.

(C) Review and prioritize, with the assistance of the Commissioner and the Director, modernization proposals based on criteria established pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(D) Identify, with the assistance of the Commissioner, opportunities to improve or replace multiple information technology systems with a smaller number of information technology systems common to multiple agencies.

(E) Recommend the funding of modernization projects, in accordance with the uses described in subsection (a)(3), to the Commissioner.

(F) Monitor, in consultation with the Commissioner, progress and performance in executing approved projects and, if necessary, recommend the suspension or termination of funding for projects based on factors such as failure to meet the terms of a written agreement described in subsection (a)(6).

(G) Monitor operating costs of the Fund.

(3) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Board shall consist of eight voting members.

(4) **CHAIR.**—The Chair of the Board shall be the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government.

(5) **PERMANENT MEMBERS.**—The permanent members of the Board shall be the following:

(A) The Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government.

(B) A senior official from the General Services Administration having technical expertise in information technology development, appointed by the Administrator of General Services, with the approval of the Director.

(6) **ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD.**—

(A) **APPOINTMENT.**—The other members of the Board shall be appointed as follows:

(i) One employee of the National Protection and Programs Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security, appointed by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(ii) One employee of the Department of Defense, appointed by the Secretary of Defense.

(iii) Four Federal employees primarily having technical expertise in information technology development, financial management, cybersecurity and privacy, and acquisition, appointed by the Director.

(B) **TERM.**—Each member of the Board described in paragraph (A) shall serve a term of

one year, which shall be renewable up to three times, at the discretion of the appointing Secretary or Director, as applicable.

(7) **PROHIBITION ON COMPENSATION.**—Members of the Board may not receive additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Board.

(8) **STAFF.**—Upon request of the Chair of the Board, the Director and the Administrator of General Services may detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, any of the personnel of the Office of Management and Budget or the General Services Administration (as the case may be) to the Board to assist the Board in carrying out its functions under this Act.

(c) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMISSIONER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to the responsibilities described in subsection (a), the Commissioner shall support the activities of the Board and provide technical support to, and, with the concurrence of the Director, oversight of, agencies that receive transfers from the Fund.

(2) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The responsibilities of the Commissioner are the following:

(A) Provide direct technical support in the form of personnel services or otherwise to agencies transferred amounts under subsection (a)(3)(A) and for products, services, and acquisition vehicles funded under subsection (a)(3)(B).

(B) Assist the Board with the evaluation, prioritization, and development of agency modernization proposals.

(C) Perform regular project oversight and monitoring of approved agency modernization projects, in consultation with the Board and the Director, to increase the likelihood of successful implementation and reduce waste.

(D) Provide the Director with information necessary to meet the requirements of subsection (a)(7).

(d) **AGENCY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “agency” has the meaning given that term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **CLOUD COMPUTING.**—The term “cloud computing” has the meaning given that term by the National Institute of Standards and Technology in NIST Special Publication 800-145 and any amendatory or superseding document thereto.

(2) **COMMISSIONER.**—The term “Commissioner” means the Commissioner of the Technology Transformation Service of the General Services Administration.

(3) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(4) **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.**—The term “information technology” has the meaning given that term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

(5) **LEGACY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM.**—The term “legacy information technology system” means an outdated or obsolete system of information technology.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to re-

visé and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 2227, the Modernizing Government Technology Act, or the MGT Act.

Each year, the Federal Government spends over \$80 billion a year on information technology, with nearly 75 percent of that directed just towards operating and maintaining existing IT systems. Couple this with innovation and management strategies that are decades behind the private sector when it comes to IT, and the increasing cost of maintaining these aging and insecure systems, this is unsustainable.

These systems pose increasing operational and security risks for the Federal Government, as we saw with the devastating OPM data breach, which impacted over 20 million people.

As we see cybersecurity attacks on the rise across the globe, it is imperative that we modernize and protect our information technology systems. The American people deserve better from their government, especially on an issue that is completely solvable. Our government needs to be able to introduce cutting-edge technology into their networks to improve operational efficiency and decrease operational cost.

This bipartisan IT reform package is designed to reduce wasteful IT spending and strengthen information security by accelerating the Federal Government's transition to modern technology, like cloud computing. This legislation is an innovative solution and a tremendous step forward in strengthening our digital infrastructure.

This bill passed the House on voice vote last year and passed out of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee by voice this year. Unfortunately, we ran out of time on this bill last Congress with the Senate, but we have an opportunity to act this year with an improved bill.

H.R. 2227 authorizes two types of funds to modernize legacy IT and incentivize IT savings in Federal agencies. The bill authorizes funds within individual CFO Act agencies, and it authorizes a centralized fund located within Treasury and overseen by OMB. The two funds will incentivize IT savings and reward cost-sensitive and responsible chief information officers.

Under MGT, savings obtained by Federal agencies, by doing things like streamlining IT systems, replacing legacy products, and transitioning to cloud computing, can be placed in a working capital fund that can be accessed for up to 3 years for further modernization efforts.

This approach eliminates the traditional use-it-or-lose-it approach that has plagued government technology for decades. This approach to technology investments will transform government technology by keeping our information and digital infrastructure secure from cyber attacks while saving billions of taxpayer dollars.

This important bill has enjoyed widespread support from colleagues in the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY), my friend, for her support on this. I thank the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for all he has done. I especially thank Chairman CHAFFETZ and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for their support.

The majority leader, KEVIN MCCARTHY, and the minority whip, STENY HOYER, have been vital to the success of getting this bill moving forward.

I thank all of the other Members as well who have provided support and leadership for the MGT Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the **RECORD** letters of support from a number of industry and trade groups in support of this bill.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES COUNCIL,
Arlington, VA, April 27, 2017.

Hon. JERRY MORAN,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. WILL HURD,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Information Technology, Washington, DC.

Hon. TOM UDALL,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. GERRY CONNOLLY,
Ranking Member, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS MORAN AND UDALL, CHAIRMAN HURD AND RANKING MEMBER CONNOLLY: On behalf of the over 400 member companies of the Professional Services Council (PSC), I write to convey our association's strong support for your legislation, the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017 (the “MGT Act”), and to thank you for your continued leadership to advance policies that will upgrade the government's legacy IT systems.

The MGT Act would establish a critical source of dependable funding for federal agencies to invest in IT system modernization, incentivize agencies to utilize the funds for agency priorities, and accelerate the transition to the cloud.

PSC supports the Act because we believe the bill will help make government more effective and its networks more secure, while reducing overall costs. Enactment would be a much-needed and critical step to begin addressing the immense challenges associated with upgrading federal information technology systems and limiting cybersecurity vulnerabilities inherent in the government's outdated computer systems.

PSC looks forward to working with you to see this legislation enacted. Thank you for your leadership and attention to this important issue. If you or your colleagues have

any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to reach out to me.

Yours Respectfully,
DAVID J. BERTEAU,
President and CEO.

IT ALLIANCE
FOR PUBLIC SECTOR,
Washington, DC, April 28, 2017.
Re The Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017 (MGT Act).

Hon. WILL HURD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Information Technology, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBIN KELLY,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Information Technology, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HURD AND RANKING MEMBER KELLY: On behalf of the member companies of the Information Technology Alliance for Public Sector (ITAPS), I am writing to express our strong support for the Modernizing Government Technology (MGT) Act of 2017. We appreciate all the time, effort, and commitment you have dedicated to reforming how the federal government funds and invests in information technology (IT). This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would enable new means to fund IT solutions, including for IT modernization efforts, and provide funding availability to permit government IT to better keep pace with innovation. We commend your staffs for collaborating and working with ITAPS and our members.

The time is ripe to transform the way the federal government acquires IT, and this bipartisan legislation is a substantial step toward that transformation. The federal government today spends about \$60 billion dollars annually sustaining their existing IT and their funding streams allow them to either continue to sustain those systems or modernize, but they do not have the funding to do both at the same time. The MGT Act creates the necessary new options for agencies to be able to sustain what is necessary for their mission, while investing in modernizing and transforming IT capabilities in the federal government for the digital era.

Again, thank you for the engagement you and your staff afforded ITAPS and our members. We look forward to continuing to work with you further as the bill advances through the legislative process.

Sincerely,
A.R. "TREY" HODGKINS, III, CAE,
Senior Vice President, Public Sector.

Adobe applauds Congressman Will Hurd (Texas) for reintroducing the Modernizing Government Technology Act, H.R. 2227, and urges Congress to move quickly to enact this important piece of legislation. Modernizing the federal IT infrastructure is crucial to ensuring a stronger cyber security foundation. The federal government on average spends nearly 80 percent of its IT budget on servicing and maintaining legacy IT systems, drowning out investments in newer technologies that often deliver better, more secure and less costly services to citizens.—Adobe VP & Public Sector Chief Technology Officer John Landwehr

AMAZON WEB SERVICES,
Herndon, VA, April 28, 2017.

Re Support for H.R. 2227, the Modernizing Government Technology Act.

Hon. WILL HURD,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBIN KELLY,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GERRY CONNOLLY,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JERRY MORAN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. TOM UDALL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HURD, CONGRESSWOMAN KELLY, CONGRESSMAN CONNOLLY, SENATOR UDALL, AND SENATOR MORAN: On behalf of our customers, we applaud your leadership and commitment to transforming federal information technology (IT) through the Modernizing Government Technology Act (MGT Act), H.R. 2227. At Amazon Web Services, we believe in putting our customers first by giving them the right tools to enable success, and similarly this bipartisan and bicameral legislation gives our customers the funding mechanisms they need to move to more modern and secure federal IT systems and services.

The MGT Act allows agencies to modernize aging and vulnerable systems and migrate to innovative technologies such as commercial cloud computing. By giving agencies more control over IT investments, the bill creates more strategic, efficient, and common-sense incentives for agency buyers without compromising transparency and oversight. Flexible funding mechanisms like the agency working capital funds in this piece of legislation enable the adoption of the most secure, cutting-edge commercial technologies that the private sector has long adopted.

The commitment of both Republican and Democrat members in both the House and the Senate on the MGT Act and previous versions of the legislation represents an acknowledgment that Congress must act to improve and secure federal IT. This bill gives the federal government the chance to provide better constituent services that citizens have grown to expect and deserve.

Again, we applaud the introduction of the MGT Act and urge Congress to act this year to pass the legislation.

Sincerely,

STEVE BLOCK,
AWS Public Policy.

BROCADE,
April 27, 2017.

Re Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives.

Hon. WILL HURD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Information Technology, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives.

Hon. ELIJAH CUMMINGS,
Ranking Member, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives.

Hon. ROBIN KELLY,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Information Technology, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHAFFETZ, CHAIRMAN HURD, RANKING MEMBER CUMMINGS AND

RANKING MEMBER KELLY: On behalf of Brocade, I am writing in support of the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017. This bipartisan bill is an important step forward to accelerate the modernization of federal IT networks. The Modernizing Government Technology Act will provide federal agencies with critical and flexible financing mechanisms to help break the cycle of federal IT investment in outdated technologies. By facilitating federal agency IT modernization, the bills will help agencies improve IT effectiveness, bolster security, reduce maintenance spending and better serve citizens, warfighters and veterans.

As an active partner in federal agency network modernization, Brocade appreciates your leadership in moving this bill forward this year. Brocade is committed to working with other stakeholders to achieve the objectives of the Modernizing Government Technology Act to help agencies transition to modern networks that leverage open standards, multivendor networks, and software-based technologies to achieve their mission.

Sincerely,

JEFF RANGEL,
Senior Director, Corporate Affairs.

CA TECHNOLOGIES,
May 1, 2017.

Hon. WILL HURD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Information Technology, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GERALD CONNOLLY,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HURD AND RANKING MEMBER CONNOLLY: I am writing to express our support for H.R. 2227, the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017 (MGT Act). This Act will help address a vital challenge the Federal government faces in providing better services for its citizens.

According to the Government Accountability Office, the Federal government spends more than 75 percent of its IT budget on operations and maintenance, rather than on expenditures for new technologies. This limits the ability of the government to provide innovative and efficient services to citizens and it puts federal IT infrastructure at risk.

The MGT Act will enable agency officials to acquire and deploy new technologies in ways that will help them provide better services and cost savings to citizens in a more secure fashion.

We want to thank you and your staffs for your tireless work and active engagement with industry on this bill. CA Technologies looks forward to continuing to work with Members of the Committees and with House leadership as this bill moves forward in the legislative process.

With warmest regards,

BRENDAN PETER,
Vice President, Global Government Relations.

[From Ian J. Rayder, Government Affairs,
Cisco]

Cisco supports the important goals of the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017, which was introduced with bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate. If passed, the bill will accelerate a pivot away from outmoded legacy systems to modernized solutions, which should cut costs, improve security and boost operational efficiency. The MGTA can help the federal government change the status quo where nearly

80% of IT spending is used to maintain aging, insecure, and expensive legacy federal IT systems. We thank Information Technology Subcommittee Chairman Hurd, Ranking Member Kelly, Government Operations Subcommittee Ranking Member Connolly, and Oversight and Government Reform Chairman Chaffetz for their leadership on this important issue.

COMPUWARE,
MAY 1, 2017.

Hon. WILL HURD,
Washington, DC.

CONGRESSMAN HURD: Compuware, the world's leading mainframe-dedicated software company, is pleased to see the introduction of the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017. As you know, we are headquartered in Detroit, Michigan with 99% of our development team onsite. Our innovative mainframe software assist the world's largest banks, insurance companies and retail, transportation and government organizations by enabling them to deliver mainframe-supported products and services more quickly, cost-effectively and with a higher level of quality.

A new generation of Federal IT leaders will soon assume responsibility for guiding the agencies through modernization efforts that meet citizens' increasingly tech-centric demands. Having forged their careers in a period of intensive technological innovation, these leaders are by and large well-prepared to do so and the MGT Act provides a viable funding path to support modernization efforts.

We are encouraged that the MGT Act suggests that an IT modernization plan should pair the right applications with the right platforms. One of the major platforms being modernized is the mainframe. The reality is, a large percentage of the mission-critical applications and systems that run on the mainframe today will remain there for decades to come. Organizations and agencies should build on what works well and continue to leverage the decades of investment in business rules and intellectual property.

Mainframe longevity is no accident. No other computing platform comes close to delivering the performance, scalability, reliability and security of the post-modern mainframe. None offers a lower marginal cost. Nor has any other platform come close to demonstrating a similar ability to adapt to the changes in the world around it decade after decade. The correct course of action is to diligently and smartly leverage a post-modern mainframe for what it does best.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments and we look forward to providing additional information for the Committee Report. Compuware is always available to testify.

Sincerely,

CHRIS O'MALLEY,
CEO, Compuware.

Sincerely,

PETER PITTSCH,
Executive Director,
Federal Relations.
Associate General
Counsel, Intel Corporation.

CSRA,

Falls Church, VA, April 28, 2017.

Re the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017.

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

Hon. ELIJAH CUMMINGS,
Ranking Member, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Hon. WILL HURD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Information Technology, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Hon. ROBIN KELLY,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Information Technology, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS: On behalf of CSRA, I write today to express my strong support for the Modernizing Government Technology Act (MGT Act), which is a shining example of forward-looking leadership from Congress to help move the government into the 21st century. As one of the leading providers of next generation technology to the federal government, CSRA wants to partner in providing solutions that save taxpayer dollars and facilitate a better customer experience for our citizens. The MGT Act is a crucial step forward in creating our shared future of innovation.

Investing in the transformation of aging IT infrastructure, as the MGT Act will do, will help protect networks currently vulnerable to cybersecurity threats and make government more efficient and effective for the American people. We know that investments like these make highest and best use of the taxpayer dollar, saving enormous sums of money down the line. Innovation has long fueled the American economy; technology can now make possible the achievement of national priorities.

I salute Congressman Will Hurd, Congresswoman Robin Kelly, Senator Moran, Senator Udall, and the entire bipartisan, bicameral coalition who have brought us to this moment of opportunity. We urge the support of the entire Congress for this legislation, which is a kick-start in creating a government as dynamic and innovative as America itself.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE B. PRIOR.

INTEL CORPORATION,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2017.

Hon. WILL HURD,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HURD: Intel Corporation commends your leadership in enabling the Federal Government to upgrade its legacy IT Infrastructure through the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017.

Your bill would enable the retirement, replacement, and modernization of legacy IT that is difficult to secure and expensive to maintain. This bill would strengthen the incentives and wherewithal of federal agencies and organizations to invest prudently in IT, thereby saving money and increasing the performance of their IT systems.

Intel applauds your bi-partisan, bi-cameral effort aimed at making our government work better for all citizens by providing the means to enable it to keep pace with IT innovation.

Sincerely,

PETER PITTSCH,
Executive Director,
Federal Relations.
Associate General
Counsel, Intel Corporation.

MICROSOFT,

Redmond, WA, May 2, 2017.

Rep. WILL HURD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Information Technology, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Rep. ROBIN KELLY,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Information Technology, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HURD AND RANKING MEMBER KELLY: On behalf of Microsoft Corporation, I am writing to congratulate you on introduction of the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017 (H.R. 2227). Microsoft fully understands the promise modern technology holds for enabling more efficient and effective results for taxpayers and supports your efforts. We commend you for including in the bill a fund to support IT modernization, as it's critically needed by agencies that need to improve their systems but are unable due to budget constraints.

Microsoft also applauds you for working with the White House Office of American Innovation on this legislation. Having strong bipartisan, bicameral partners, combined with Executive Branch support, demonstrates your commitment to improve the federal information technology procurement process.

We look forward to working with you and your bipartisan colleagues in the House and Senate as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,
FREDERICK S. HUMPHRIES, JR.,
Corporate Vice President,
U.S. Government Affairs (USGA).

UNISYS,
April 28, 2017.

Hon. WILL HURD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBIN KELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES HURD AND KELLY: On behalf of the Unisys Corporation, thank you for introducing the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017 (MGT Act). Unisys strongly supports enactment of the MGT Act because it provides needed flexibility and funding resources to enable the Federal Government to modernize its legacy IT systems and leverage government-wide resources to gain efficiencies.

As a global information technology company that provides leading edge security solutions to the government and commercial markets, Unisys recognizes that one of the major challenges facing clients is how to fund modernization investments while maintaining existing mission critical IT systems. The MGT Act addresses this challenge by authorizing new modernization funding mechanisms for Federal agencies that will allow them to build in cyber security by design, effectively share government data, create long-term savings and eliminate duplication.

Thank you again for introducing this much needed legislation.

Sincerely,
VENKATAPATHI PUVVADA,
President, Federal Systems.

LEVEL 3 STATEMENT ON MGT ACT OF 2017

Today, Representatives Will Hurd (R-TX), Robin Kelly (D-IL) and Gerry Connolly (D-VA), and Senators Jerry Moran (R-KS) and Tom Udall (D-NM), introduced the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017 to

provide federal agencies additional resources and flexibility to modernize outdated information technology systems. Below is a statement from Level 3 Communications:

"Level 3 Communications applauds Representatives Hurd, Kelly and Connolly, and Senators Moran and Udall, for championing federal IT reform and their commitment to maximizing the value of taxpayer dollars by transforming how the government invests in technology. Level 3 stands ready to continue our collaboration with federal agencies to transform their networks to improve efficiency, reduce costs and maximize security."

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

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

I thank my friends, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY), for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

Of course, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 2227, the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, we have all witnessed the chaos and havoc that sophisticated cyber attacks can, and do, wreak on our Nation and around the world.

Just this past week, there was a massive ransomware attack that hit 200,000 victims in 150 countries, and those numbers are expected to grow exponentially. This is just the latest in a string of high-profile attacks, including Sony, Yahoo, the OPM data breach, and even efforts to influence our elections and those in Europe.

These attacks jeopardize America's safety, privacy, and cost untold millions of dollars in the private sector and public sector as well. These attacks affect both the public and private sector, and bad actors repeatedly target our Federal Government. Those attacks often succeed because Federal computer systems are so outdated that they cannot implement network defenses as basic as encryption. Some legacy systems go back a half a century.

The Federal Government spends nearly \$60 billion a year sustaining its existing IT systems. When agencies are forced to spend nearly 80 percent of that to maintain legacy computer systems, they have fewer resources to modernize and reinvest. As a result, agencies cannot afford to invest in the modern technologies that other large enterprises need to survive. Many Federal agencies do not use cloud computing to help secure computer networks and improve our ability to deliver services to the American people.

The MGT Act we are talking about today and on which I am proud to be one of the lead Democratic cosponsors is a critical step to help improve the Federal Government's IT systems. The MGT Act of 2017 will help our cyber defenders protect our most important digital resources.

This bill marries two bills from the previous Congress, both of which I was proud to be an original cosponsor of—the IT Modernization Act and the MOVE IT Act. The MGT Act establishes a clear role for both of these pieces of legislation to improve Federal IT systems.

I was an original cosponsor for Minority Whip STENY HOYER's IT Modernization Act, which created a revolving fund using \$3 billion appropriations for Treasury to replace legacy systems.

I was pleased to join my friend, Ms. KELLY, the ranking member of the Information Technology Subcommittee, and Mr. HURD, on the MOVE IT Act, which revived a proposal first discussed during the consideration of the legislation FITARA, the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act.

These two bills were different, but complementary, and worked, ultimately, to join the two to create this act in front of us today, the MGT Act. That act lays the foundation for the future of IT modernization funding and reinvestment and investment by the Federal Government long overdue. The act will authorize an upfront investment to retire minimal large-scale legacy systems and affect multiple agencies.

This bipartisan, bicameral legislation will provide mechanisms and much-needed funding for agencies to speed up that slow process of moving from legacy IT systems to cutting-edge, 21st century technologies. It would also provide needed reporting requirements to ensure that agencies are acquiring modern technology and that we can measure that it is being done in a cost-effective way. It places an emphasis on following the practices of private industry and moving toward cloud computing solutions.

The MGT Act language will allow agencies to reinvest those savings, as my friend just indicated, and that is a commonsense proposal, but not one we find commonly in the Federal Government.

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

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Virginia has a few more speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend, the distinguished whip on the Democratic side.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HURD for his leadership on this issue. I am pleased to work with him on it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

It will not be a controversial bill. It will not make the front page of the paper tomorrow. People will not be seized of this bill passing. But this bill may well have a very great con-

sequence to it and to the efficiency and effectiveness of our Federal Government.

Last July, I outlined a series of reforms to renew America's faith in their government, which included modernizing government technology. Not long after, I introduced the Information Technology Modernization Act to achieve that goal; and, of course, Mr. CONNOLLY was a cosponsor with me on that bill.

I am glad that this bill on the floor today includes my legislation. It would be a major step toward ensuring that our government is using the latest technology systems, is well protected from cyber threats, and can serve the American people more effectively.

□ 1500

Mr. HURD came over to me on the floor and we talked about our two ideas. As the gentleman from Virginia has said, they were complementary, and I am pleased that we could work together to put these bills together and that we now have agreement with the Senate. We passed a bill through the House.

Last week's major global cyber attack was yet another reminder of how critical it is that our government's technology systems are upgraded to the latest and most secure technology. If any lesson was needed, we got it.

Americans count on government agencies to protect their personal data, and our security agencies rely on our government systems to safeguard classified and sensitive information. Unfortunately, our government technology systems are now far behind the latest technology and are in desperate need of upgrades.

I congratulate the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for her work on this effort.

What this legislation does is authorize the creation of a technology modernization fund to finance rapid upgrades of government technology systems similar to funds that are available in the private sector so they can move quickly and seize the best and latest technology available. It would prioritize the systems that are the most vulnerable, and it would implement best practices from the private sector. In other words, those that are working least well will be the first addressed.

Once upgrades are completed, agencies will pay back into the fund from the savings achieved through greater efficiency, i.e., a revolving fund, making it possible then to finance additional projects in a way that is self-sustaining after the initial investment. All of this would be done in a way that is transparent and accountable.

Once this bill is enacted, we must take the next step and provide, of course, that initial funding.

I have been proud to work across the aisle with Majority Leader MCCARTHY,

Chairman CHAFFETZ, Mr. HURD, and, of course, my dear, dear friend from Virginia, my colleague in the Washington metropolitan area, Representative CONNOLLY on our side.

Representative KELLY, whom I just mentioned, and Congressman TED LIEU have also been champions of this effort, and I thank them for their input and their strong support as we worked to bring it to the floor in a bipartisan fashion.

Again, I want to say how pleased I am to work on these issues with all of my colleagues, but particularly with the majority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, my friend from California, and thank him for his leadership.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the Modernizing Government Technology Act, and I hope the Trump administration will include investment to capitalize this new fund in their fiscal 2018 budget.

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, before the minority whip departs, I want to thank him for his work on this. This has really been a bipartisan effort, and it is really putting the country first. The gentleman is correct: This might not make headlines, but this will have a greater effect on our government being more efficient, effective, and accountable. We thank him for his work on it.

Mr. Speaker, there are some things we get used to hearing, but when you think about it, it is amazing just how much things have changed.

I hear a friend say that all of the photos he took on his phone automatically updated to his cloud—not surprising there. But how long ago was it that we couldn't even take pictures on our phone, much less have them saved automatically on a cloud?

Nowadays, it is not uncommon to cash your checks online, manage your accounts on Mint, pay individuals back online. Many millennials don't even carry cash anymore. That is a revolution in money management that just happened in a matter of years.

So, Mr. Speaker, why in the world would the Department of Defense use a 54-year-old system as a backup to send and receive emergency messages for our nuclear forces, a 54-year-old system that relies on floppy disks? Why would the master file of the public's taxes at the IRS run on a 1950s code?

Eighty percent of the \$80 billion we spend each year on IT is used to maintain legacy systems, to buy expensive parts that nobody uses anymore for a 54-year-old system we shouldn't even have.

We would expect more from the private sector. We would expect mobile cameras, cloud computing, online banking. Heck, we would even expect

to upgrade our phones and apps and technology on a rolling basis every single week. Well, why should we expect less from the Federal Government?

I would say this is about more than expectations. We all saw what happened over the weekend with the massive global cyber attack: hospitals shut down, transportation systems. This is a government service issue. It is a government waste issue. It is a national security issue.

Now, government may never be like Silicon Valley, but it should not be stuck in the age of "Mad Men." That is not only costly, it is dangerous.

WILL HURD, an individual that has served his Nation in some of the most dangerous parts of the world, an individual who worked in the private sector when it came to technology, an individual who serves in this body and, I will say this based upon everybody else I have served, probably has the most bipartisan approach of anyone I have ever seen serve in that position—he doesn't care about party. It is just as the time when he worked in the CIA. He cares about his country. He has seen the most deadly things happen, and, through his technology company, he has seen that people fight wars new ways.

So he took it upon himself—it is not the issue that people would campaign upon, but it is an issue that he saw needed a solution. He worked with both sides of the aisle, and he said: Why can't we modernize our own technology?

The Veterans Administration was created in 1921, and if somebody that was a veteran had a problem and a claim, they would write it on a piece of paper. In 1921, on a warm day like today, we would have fans going to try to cool ourselves down. We would rush, after we got done voting, to turn on our radios to see what the news was saying.

Well, the world all changed. We can look at our phones and get the news instantaneously. We got central air to cool ourselves down. And if you have a claim with the VA, lots of times they write it on a piece of paper.

Well, do you know what? That is all going to stop today. That is going to stop because we are going to make a smart investment. We are going to make the Federal Government have the same accountability that we expect in business or anywhere else.

And do you know what will happen? Government will become more effective, more efficient, more accountable, and more transparent.

So I want to tip my hat to both sides of the aisle, and especially to Congressman WILL HURD. He took the leadership, had the tenacity to stay with it and the ability to work with all on, really, the issue that people wouldn't talk about but expect to happen, and he was the right person at the right

time to make the push. That is why I support this bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY. May I inquire of the Speaker how much time is left on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). The gentleman from Virginia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 5½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY), my good friend.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this common-sense, bipartisan bill that updates our woefully outdated IT infrastructure.

I want to say thank you to my good friend and partner on the IT subcommittee, Chairman HURD, for his leadership on this very important measure and to my colleagues who worked so hard on this bill: Chairman CHAFFETZ, Ranking Member CUMMINGS, our House leadership stewards—Democratic Whip HOYER from the majority, Mr. MCCARTHY—and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia for his energy and work in dealing with this bill. I also want to give a special thanks to all of the staff and a special shout-out to my staff: Jay Cho and Zach Ostro.

The Modernizing Government Technology Act has come a long way from the early days when it was called MOVE IT. It has been a tough and sometimes frustrating journey, but we have made it, and we have a good bill in front of us.

Last year, the House passed this bill only to have it die in the Senate. Despite these roadblocks, we kept working because it is worth it. This bill will revolutionize and upgrade our outdated IT fractured while bringing cost-saving innovation and greater security to government agencies.

In my years serving as the ranking member of the Oversight Committee's IT Subcommittee, I have learned one thing: We need to get back to basics, and this bill does just that.

Our current use-it-or-lose-it approach to Federal IT just isn't working. It is no secret that Federal agencies are struggling to stay up to date, especially when compared to the private sector.

Each year, we spend \$80 billion in taxpayer dollars to maintain legacy IT systems that are vulnerable to cyber attacks; and each year that we don't upgrade these systems, they become even more difficult and expensive to secure. This is unacceptable and a waste of taxpayer dollars.

For too long, we have kicked the can down the road and left our outdated IT systems vulnerable to costly attacks. The dangers of our system are clear. Every day we are reminded of the importance of having modern IT systems and robust cybersecurity practices in place.

In 2015, hackers made off with the personal information of more than 20

million Americans, including congressional staffers, in the OPM data breach. Just this past week, as you have heard, a global ransomware attack, WannaCry or WannaCrypt, wreaked havoc worldwide, paralyzing businesses and governments alike. These attacks will only grow more frequent and more difficult to combat.

The MGT Act is a major step in the right direction. It will cut costs and enhance our security. It builds on prior work like Clinger-Cohen and FITARA, and it gives agencies the flexibility needed to modernize vulnerable systems and develop cost savings for taxpayers.

Under this bill, agencies can take the savings from upgrading their systems and reinvest them into their working capital fund for future IT modernization. We are going to go from an outdated method of purchasing IT to one that empowers CIOs to make smart, strategic investments in innovative technologies; and as an end result, our data will be more secure and our government more efficient.

I am proud of this bill, and I am proud of the bipartisan work that made it possible, proud of what we accomplished by working together on the IT Subcommittee.

The MGT Act is a necessary component to strengthening our cybersecurity that saves taxpayers money. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my friend from the Commonwealth that I have no further speakers and am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In closing, I think this is an important piece in the information technology modernization effort that our committee and this body has undertaken for the last 5 or 6 years. One of the key pieces of legislation undergirding today's bill is the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act I was proud to cowrite and coauthor with then-Chairman DARRELL ISSA.

I am equally proud today to have worked with my friend Mr. HURD from Texas, my friend Ms. KELLY from Illinois, and, of course, Mr. STENY HOYER, the Democratic whip, in forging this additional piece that we believe will bring the Federal Government into the 21st century—technologically literate and protecting the databases that protect the American people.

Hundreds of millions of pieces of data are at risk in the current cyber environment, and some simple but critical investments can make all the difference. That is what we are voting for today.

I urge passage of the legislation and, again, congratulate my colleagues and friends for working together in a bipartisan way to bring this bill to fruition.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have some young folks in the Chamber right now, and I hope they recognize that this is how their government is supposed to work: people working together, putting their differences past them for the betterment of our great Nation.

It is an honor for me to have this opportunity to do this with so many of my friends that I have grown to love and respect over these last 2 years. And we get to save government money, protect our digital infrastructure, and make sure that our government is providing the kind of services we should and that the American people demand.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the MGT Act and of continued efforts to improve the federal government's cybersecurity posture. I would like to thank Mr. HURD for his tireless efforts advocating for this bill and his partners on the Oversight Committee, Mr. CONNOLLY and Ms. KELLY for their cybersecurity leadership. I also must acknowledge the House's Minority Whip and my good friend, Mr. HOYER, for his work pushing for IT modernization.

The idea for the kind of revolving fund included as part of the MGT Act grew out of President Obama's Cybersecurity National Action Plan, itself issued in direct response to the massive breach of the Office of Personnel Management. OPM was yet another wake up call to the government about the lax attitude toward security present at many agencies, but, to the prior administration's credit, the CNAP contained a number of needed policy shifts, including the creation of a federal Chief Information Security Officer and the use of DHS's authority to conduct a government-wide review of high value assets.

Central to the CNAP, though, was the realization that attempting to secure antiquated federal IT systems was a losing proposition. Just as the Internet—developed in the 1970s—was not created with security in mind, so, too, are many older government systems devoid of even basic security controls. When we think about the fact that the iPhone turns ten next month and the huge improvements that have been made from the first generation model to today's, it's easy to see how systems that are two or three decades old can hamper security.

Using outdated software also compromises efficiency. There's a reason businesses keep up to date with technology—it saves them money. The cleverness of the revolving fund approach is that it uses these savings to drive further upgrades in a virtuous cycle. I hope that the MGT Act is viewed as a pilot program, as there is a lot more technical debt we have incurred than will be solved by \$250 million per year. But it is a very important first step, and I commend the sponsors for their work. And I hope that federal agencies view this bill as license to be innovative in their upgrade planning and to bring us a more efficient—and secure—government.

□ 1515

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2227, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VACATING DEMAND FOR YEAS AND NAYS ON H.R. 984, THOMASINA E. JORDAN INDIAN TRIBES OF VIRGINIA FEDERAL RECOGNITION ACT OF 2017

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the ordering of the yeas and nays on the motion that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 984) to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe, be vacated, to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 984.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL AGENCY MAIL MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 194) to ensure the effective processing of mail by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 194

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Agency Mail Management Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. RECORD MANAGEMENT.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 9 of the Presidential and Federal Records Act Amendments of 2014 (44 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) in paragraph (7), by striking ‘the Administrator or the Archivist’ and inserting ‘the Archivist or the Administrator’.”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) The Archivist shall provide guidance and assistance to Federal agencies with respect to ensuring—

“(1) economical and effective records management;

“(2) adequate and proper documentation of the policies and transactions of the Federal Government; and

“(3) proper records disposition.”;

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

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1), the following new paragraph:

“(2) in subsection (b), by striking ‘effective records management by such agencies’ and inserting ‘effective processing of mail by Federal agencies’;”;

(D) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “‘subsections (a) and (b)’” and inserting “‘subsection (a)’”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(E) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(F) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) The Administrator, in carrying out subsection (b), shall have the responsibility to promote economy and efficiency in the selection and utilization of space, staff, equipment, and supplies for processing mail at Federal facilities.”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “; and” at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

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

“(3) by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) The Administrator (or the Administrator’s designee) may inspect the mail processing practices and programs of any Federal agency for the purpose of rendering recommendations for the improvement of mail processing practices and programs. Officers and employees of such agencies shall cooperate fully in such inspections of mail processing practices and programs.”;

(4) by striking subsection (f); and

(5) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (f).

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the Presidential and Federal Records Act Amendments of 2014 (Public Law 113-187).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I present today H.R. 194, the Federal Agency Mail Management Act of 2017. Approximately 2 years ago, President Obama signed into law the Presidential and Federal Records Act Amendments of 2014.

The law modernized and improved Federal recordkeeping statutes by codifying agency responsibilities that have been in practice for decades. Once the law was enacted, the General Services Administration, or GSA, identified technical provisions in the law that the agency interpreted as limiting its ability to regulate Federal agency mailroom operations.

The GSA has been responsible for the regulation and oversight of Federal agency mail management for many years. Congress did not intend for the 2014 law to change the mail management structure.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 194 provides clarification to ensure that the GSA is responsible for mailroom management oversight, and not the National Archives and Records Administration. Both GSA and the National Archives have worked with Congress to make the correction, and both entities support H.R. 194.

Mr. Speaker, an identical bill was passed by the House with unanimous voice vote near the end of last Congress. We hope that this legislation will be signed into law this Congress to correct the unintended consequences of a previous law.

This corrective measure has bipartisan support, and I appreciate having my friend and colleague, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, join me as a cosponsor.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Federal Agency Mail Management Act, which I introduced along with, of course, the author of the bill, Representative STEVE RUSSELL. I want to thank Representative RUSSELL for working in a bipartisan manner on this legislation.

The bill would make a technical correction to clarify that the Administrator of the General Services Administration is responsible for managing mail in the executive branch. The Administrator of GSA has historically had this responsibility, but when the Federal Records Act was updated in 2014, changes made to the statute left it unclear whether the Administrator’s role had changed.

You would think it is a simple commonsense measure, but it requires an act of Congress to clarify. Congress

never intended to take away the Administrator’s authority to manage mail. The bill was approved by the House without opposition last year. We are hoping the same will pertain this year.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates this bill would cost the Federal Government nothing, because GSA already processes mail for Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the bill and give clarity to the GSA and the National Archives, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 194.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL REGISTER PRINTING SAVINGS ACT OF 2017

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 195) to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 195

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Register Printing Savings Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. RESTRICTIONS ON DISTRIBUTION OF FREE PRINTED COPIES OF FEDERAL REGISTER TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) **RESTRICTIONS.**—Section 1506 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “The Administrative Committee” and inserting “(a) COMPOSITION; DUTIES.—The Administrative Committee”;

(2) in subsection (a)(4), by striking “the number of copies” and inserting “subject to subsection (b), the number of copies”; and

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

“(b) **RESTRICTIONS ON DISTRIBUTION OF FREE PRINTED COPIES TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES.**—

“(1) **PROHIBITING SUBSCRIPTION TO PRINTED COPIES WITHOUT REQUEST.**—Under the regulations prescribed to carry out subsection (a)(4), the Director of the Government Publishing Office may not provide a printed copy of the Federal Register without charge to any Member of Congress or any other officer of the United States during a year unless—

“(A) the Member or officer requests a printed copy of a specific issue of the Federal Register; or

“(B) during that year or during the previous year, the Member or office requested a subscription to printed copies of the Federal Register for that year, as described in paragraph (2).

“(2) ADMINISTRATION OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.—The regulations prescribed to carry out subsection (a)(4) shall include—

“(A) provisions regarding notifications to offices of Members of Congress and other offices of the United States of the restrictions of paragraph (1);

“(B) provisions describing the process by which Members and other offices may request a specific issue of the Federal Register for purposes of paragraph (1)(A); and

“(C) provisions describing the process by which Members and other offices may request a subscription to the Federal Register for purposes of paragraph (1)(B), except that such regulations shall limit the period for such a subscription to not longer than 1 year.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect January 1, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

My bill, H.R. 195, the Federal Register Printing Savings Act of 2017, will save taxpayers dollars while providing needed reform in how we conduct day-to-day business in Congress.

The Federal Register contains a large amount of information, including proposed rules and public notices, regulations, executive orders, and Presidential documents. This information is compiled by the National Archives and published daily by the Government Publishing Office, or the GPO. Often described by the National Archives as “the daily newspaper of the Federal Government,” this service enables Members, staffs, and agencies to keep track of activity across government.

In 1994, the GPO began publishing the Federal Register online. To improve user experience, the digital version has been enhanced over time to provide navigational aids that include links to related content.

The Federal Register is now fully searchable and downloadable, making for quick access to any document. But sadly, Mr. Speaker, despite the advance of technology, Members of Congress and Federal offices across the entire government still receive printed copies of the Federal Register every day.

In the course of a year, this stack of Registers would be 16-feet high. This results in thousands of copies going directly into the trash each week, unless occasionally used as doorstops. Subscriptions to the Federal Register cost about \$1,000 annually, meaning hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars are wasted each year. This same money could pay for the salaries of 50 soldiers who defend our Republic in a given year.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 195 makes a small but significant change to fix the problem and ensure that we operate in the 21st century. Instead of automatically receiving printed copies, Members or offices of the Federal Government who want to continue to receive copies need only submit a request. There will be an opt-in, instead of an opt-out.

Current print and on-demand technologies make this possible. The subscriptions will last for 1 year to ensure Members and offices are able to evaluate if they want to continue the service. For Members in offices that do not use or want the printed version, they will not receive it and will still have full access to the searchable digital version which most Members use.

This change will reduce unnecessary printing and, in context, will prevent 96 Americans from having to work each year so that we can throw Registers in the trash.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 195, the Federal Register Printing Savings Act. My friend, Mr. RUSSELL, is going to develop a reputation around here for being just too commonsense. This bill would prohibit the Government Publishing Office from sending printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other Federal offices unless they wanted them.

The Federal Register includes rules, regulations, executive orders, and other Federal documents. It is a very important and useful publication. It does not make sense, however, as my friend from Oklahoma has pointed out, for GPO automatically to send it to offices that don't want it and end up putting it in the garbage, hopefully recycling.

The Federal Register is available online, as my friend has pointed out, which significantly cuts down on the need for printed copies for most of us. This bill would reduce waste both in paper and in Federal dollars.

The Congressional Budget Office says this bill would reduce Federal spending by \$1 million a year. It was the late Everett Dirksen of Illinois who said: “A billion here, a billion there, pretty soon it adds up to real money.” CBO also estimates this bill would result in 1,000 fewer copies of the Federal Register being printed each day.

This bill is good for the environment, good for taxpayers, and a useful discipline for us all in terms of excess we don't need.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. RUSSELL for his leadership, his common sense, and his collaboration on this committee, and I urge all Members to support the bill.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 195.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL INTERN PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 653) to amend title 5, United States Code, to protect unpaid interns in the Federal Government from workplace harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 653

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Intern Protection Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2302 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g)(1) All protections afforded to an employee under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (D) of subsection (b)(1) shall be afforded, in the same manner and to the same extent, to an intern and an applicant for internship.

“(2) For purposes of the application of this subsection, a reference to an employee shall be considered a reference to an intern in—

“(A) section 717 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16);

“(B) sections 12 and 15 of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 631, 633a); and

“(C) section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 791).

“(3) In this subsection, the term ‘intern’ means an individual who performs uncompensated voluntary service in an agency to earn credit awarded by an educational institution or to learn a trade or occupation.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3111(c)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting “section 2302(g) (relating to prohibited personnel practices),” before “chapter 81”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 653, the Federal Intern Protection Act of 2017, sponsored by my colleague from the Oversight Committee, Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS of Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is well served by interns who provide invaluable assistance to agencies across the Federal Government. Our interns work alongside us and other Federal employees helping conduct agency business on behalf of the American people.

Internship programs also help to identify and develop the next generation of Federal employees. In exchange, interns gain invaluable work experience in a field that they might hope to enter upon graduation and credit they can apply at their institution of learning.

Unfortunately, there are no existing provisions in Federal law that protect interns working at Federal agencies against harassment or discrimination.

In the case of *O'Connor v. Davis*, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit upheld a decision finding an intern could not bring sexual harassment claims under Federal law.

□ 1530

The court reasoned that since the intern was not a Federal employee, that person was not covered by existing law. It concluded that: "It is for Congress, if it should choose to do so . . . to provide a remedy. . . ."

Mr. Speaker, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee heard testimony showing the damage this loophole can have at Federal agencies. In a 2015 hearing on Environmental Protection Agency mismanagement, witnesses described allegations of sexual harassment against interns. According to testimony, "one former intern stated that because of this harassment, she changed her mind about not only about working for EPA but also for working in the Federal sector at all."

This is simply unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Intern Protection Act of 2017 ensures that interns working for the Federal Government receive anti-discriminatory and anti-harassment protections. Specifically, the bill prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national

origin, age, or handicapping condition for interns working at Federal agencies. These protections are already in place for Federal employees.

I thank my friend and colleague, the ranking member, Mr. ELIJAH CUMMINGS, for his leadership and commitment in protecting interns who work for the Federal Government.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 653, the Federal Intern Protection Act. In fact, it is hard to believe we need this legislation at this point in the 21st century, but we do.

Under current law, Federal employees are protected from discrimination on the basis of race, religion, age, and sex. Unfortunately, interns don't qualify. They have no such protections.

I appreciate the wonderful work of our distinguished ranking member, Representative ELIJAH CUMMINGS of Maryland, on this important measure. I am not surprised, and neither are my colleagues, that he would pick up on this and see the need for this protection to be extended to young men and women who want maybe to pursue a career or part of their career in the Federal Government. They need these protections like the employees they are working with side by side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his kind words. I thank Mr. RUSSELL also for his very kind words.

The bill before us, the Federal Intern Protection Act, would close a loophole in Federal employment law that currently leaves unpaid interns open to discrimination and sexual harassment with no legal recourse. It is interesting. As I listened to Mr. CONNOLLY, he is absolutely right: it is surprising that they don't already have this protection.

Last year, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee held a hearing at which we heard testimony about sexual harassment and retaliation in an EPA regional office. During the hearing, both Chairman CHAFFETZ and I expressed our disgust at the exploitation of these young women and demanded action to prevent this abuse in the future.

Unfortunately, the act of harassing unpaid interns on the basis of race, religion, age, or, in this case, sex is not prohibited by Federal law. Under current law, victims rely on the discretion of managers to prevent this behavior, which is something that doesn't always occur.

As one witness testified before our committee: "Even after finding out about the numerous harassment vic-

tims, the direct reporting manager continued to feed the harasser a steady diet of young women."

That is a very sad commentary. As I have often said, we are better than that.

We saw at our hearing that allowing this kind of behavior to go unchecked can have serious consequences on the lives and careers of those who are interested in government service. What we want to do is encourage young people to come into government service. We want them to come in and do what will feed their souls by making life better for the general population. The last thing we want to do is anything that would cause them to say this is something they don't want to do.

Many interns are willing to work for the Federal Government without receiving any pay. That is the other piece: so many of these young people come looking for experience, looking for opportunity. They simply want a chance to get their foot in the door. We must protect them from this kind of despicable behavior. Our bill will afford Federal interns protections in the same manner and to the same extent as Federal employees.

I want to take this moment to thank the chairman for moving this bill expeditiously through our committee, where it was adopted unanimously, and for bringing it to the floor today.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to laud my friend from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for his perspicacity in ferreting out this issue. It is a very important one.

The use of internships in the Federal Government is a very underutilized tool when compared to the private sector. Many private sector companies will use internships for recruiting the talent it needs for the future. In many cases, 70 to 80 percent of those who intern for private sector corporations end up being hired because they have a carefully monitored program from orientation and recruitment to the tasks at hand during the pendency of the internship. The Federal Government does no such thing systematically.

At the very beginning, if we are going to use internships as creatively as the private sector to recruit the next generation of Federal employees, since one-third of the current workforce is eligible for retirement over the next several years, we have to follow the lead my friends, Mr. CUMMINGS of Maryland and Mr. RUSSELL of Oklahoma, have just given us, and that is to make sure it is a safe workplace. Otherwise, who would be attracted to it?

This piece of legislation is critical to our making Federal internships a meaningful tool in their recruitment and retention, so long as that workforce is protected by the same norms and same regulations as any Federal employee.

I thank my friend, Mr. CUMMINGS, for bringing this to our attention, and I thank Mr. RUSSELL for his leadership.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill. I thank Mr. CUMMINGS for his hard work on this measure. I also thank the committee for their broad, bipartisan, unanimous support and hard work in bringing this practical measure. I urge adoption of it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 653.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVING FUSION CENTERS' ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2169) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance information sharing in the Department of Homeland Security State, Local, and Regional Fusion Center Initiative, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2169

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Improving Fusion Centers' Access to Information Act".

SEC. 2. ENHANCED INFORMATION SHARING IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY STATE, LOCAL, AND REGIONAL FUSION CENTER INITIATIVE.

Subsection (b) of section 210A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124h) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: "and conduct outreach to such fusion centers to identify any gaps in information sharing and consult with other Federal agencies to develop methods to address such gaps, as appropriate";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (12) as paragraphs (4) through (13), respectively; and

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

"(3) identify Federal databases and datasets, including databases and datasets used, operated, or managed by Department components, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Department of the Treasury, that are appropriate, in accordance with Federal laws and policies, to address any gaps identified pursuant to paragraph (2), for inclusion in the information sharing environment and coordinate with the appropriate Federal agency to deploy or access such databases and datasets;"

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2169, the Improving Fusion Centers' Access to Information Act.

In the years since 9/11, Congress and the executive branch have taken many steps to address information shortfalls and information-sharing shortfalls. However, we know that silos remain.

The purpose of H.R. 2169 is to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security is truly serving as a State and local information-sharing advocate, as originally intended by the Homeland Security Act.

This bill requires the DHS to regularly review information-sharing efforts with the National Network of Fusion Centers and then work with other Federal agencies to close any identified gaps.

State and local fusion centers have grown in maturity and number during the last 16 years since 9/11. There are now 78 fusion centers within the national network. As the network has matured, fusion centers have established themselves as a critical conduit for sharing terrorism, homeland security, and criminal information with Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial partners. As the threat environment continues to evolve, it is vital they have access to the tools and information systems to stay ahead of threats to the homeland.

Despite existing requirements for DHS to share intelligence and information with State and local entities, I have found that the Department does not regularly assess if fusion centers have access to necessary information or databases held by other Federal agencies. H.R. 2169 addresses this deficiency by requiring the Secretary to conduct outreach to the fusion centers to identify information-sharing gaps and work with the appropriate Federal agencies to address these gaps.

Additionally, the Secretary is required to identify Federal databases and datasets that should be included in the information-sharing environment and coordinate with the appropriate Federal agency to deploy such systems.

H.R. 2169 includes input from the fusion centers, Department of Homeland Security, and other Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Fusion Center Association, and I am pleased they have endorsed the bill.

NATIONAL FUSION
CENTER ASSOCIATION,
April 28, 2017.

Re Support for H.R. 2169—Improving Fusion Centers' Access to Information Act.

Hon. JOHN KATKO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KATKO: On behalf of the National Fusion Center Association (NFCA), I write in support of your legislation—H.R. 2169—to enhance information sharing and analysis among fusion centers and federal agencies by encouraging appropriate fusion center access to federally managed information systems. As you know, the National Network of Fusion Centers (NNFC) is a focal point for analytical collaboration and information sharing on threats to public safety among federal, local, state, territorial, and tribal public safety agencies.

The NFCA has worked closely with DHS, the FBI, and other partners to develop strong information sharing pathways. We have made significant strides to improve daily working relationships with our federal partners. The flow of information from state and local public safety agencies to appropriate federal agencies continues to improve, and the same is true with information coming from federal agencies to local and state jurisdictions. We are also seeing enhanced analytical collaboration.

Still, challenges remain that should be addressed. Your legislation will provide important support in this effort by encouraging improved access to data from federally managed information systems that our analysts need to do their jobs in the most effective manner possible. It is crucial for Congress to consistently support a strong information sharing environment, and this legislation would assist in that effort.

We appreciate your dedication to effective information sharing and analysis and look forward to working with you to move your legislation forward and accomplish our shared mission of protecting America.

Sincerely,

MIKE SENA,
President.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to report that H.R. 2169 is a very bipartisan bill that passed the Committee on Homeland Security unanimously.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2169, the Improving Fusion Centers' Access to Information Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, today we consider H.R. 2169, a bill that seeks to authorize DHS' State, Local, and Regional Fusion Center Initiative. The bill requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to carry out outreach to identify gaps in information sharing.

This measure highlights the importance of equipping fusion centers so that they can quickly adapt to the ever-evolving terrorist threat landscape. Congress has given particular

attention to fusion centers and, in the 114th Congress, enacted measures to support fusion centers.

Fusion centers operate as State and major urban area focal points for the receipt, analysis, gathering, and sharing of threat-related information between Federal, local, and private sector partners.

I want to particularly highlight a provision of this bill focused on improving the interagency collaboration by requiring the DHS Secretary to consult with other Federal partners in order to develop new methods to address such gaps.

DHS must continue to address and improve the Nation's fusion centers' capabilities in gathering, analyzing, and sharing threat-related information between partners on every level.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to again express my support for this bill and thank Mr. KATKO for his efforts in bringing this bill forward.

We live in a time when the threats we face as a nation remain complex, and this bill is an important tool to ensure our law enforcement professionals have the resources and methods to prevent and deter terror threats.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2169.

Before I close, I want to note that I routinely engage in bipartisan efforts on behalf of Homeland Security with Congressman VELA and others. The committee works in a very bipartisan manner to do what is best for this country to keep it safe, and this bill is one of those bills that helps keep our country safe.

It is critical that we ensure the proper flow of information to all law enforcement agencies, that they properly use that information, and that they have access to it on a regular basis no matter whether they are a local police officer who is working at a fusion center or whether it is an FBI agent. Everyone should have access to that information because we are all on the same team to keep this country safe.

I think our bipartisan efforts that we engage in with Homeland Security on a regular basis are a good example of the good things that happen in Congress. I am proud to be a part it, and I am proud to have Mr. VELA as my colleague on that as well.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in support of H.R. 2169, the "Improving Fusion Centers Access to Information Act of 2017," which would enhance information sharing in the Department of Homeland Security State, Local and Regional Fusion Center Initiative.

This bill requires outreach to be conducted to fusion centers in order to identify gaps in information sharing and consultation with other Federal agencies to develop methods to address such gaps.

Additionally, it requires the DHS Secretary to coordinate with the heads of other federal departments and agencies to provide operational and intelligence advice to fusion centers and support their efforts to operate efficiently and effectively.

H.R. 2169 requires the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis (I&A) to ensure fusion centers have access to Homeland Security information sharing centers and that DHS personnel are deployed to support fusion centers in a manner consistent with the department's mission and statutory limits.

Fusion centers provide the means to local, state, and tribal law enforcement to bring together information from distributed federal and private sector sources for the purpose of collection, retention, analysis, and dissemination. The term fusion centers first coined by the Department of Defense (DOD) refer to the fusing of information for analysis purposes.

The Houston Regional Intelligence Service Center is a Fusion Center.

The mission of the Houston Regional Intelligence Service Center is to provide security to the Houston area by gathering, developing and sharing intelligence regarding the capabilities, intentions, and actions of terrorist groups and individuals which pose threats.

Houston hosted the 51st Super Bowl earlier this year and the Houston Regional Intelligence Service Center was on duty for this major national event.

This year's Super Bowl had:

10,000—volunteers;

140,000—visitors; and

1 million—people who participated in at least one Super Bowl event.

The Super Bowl took place free of incidents, which is a testament to the collaborative work of federal, state, and local law enforcement through the Houston Fusion Center.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not only good for our country, but it also will greatly benefit the citizens of Houston, Texas.

If local law enforcement is given the proper resources, information, and intelligence, they will know how to properly handle terrorism threats.

H.R. 2169 will strengthen our economy while keeping our fellow citizens safe.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting H.R. 2169 because the safety of citizens from potential threats is critical to the security of the homeland and strength of our economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2169, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BORDER ENFORCEMENT SECURITY TASK FORCE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2281) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reauthorize the Border Enforcement Security Task Force program within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2281

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Border Enforcement Security Task Force Reauthorization Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. MODIFIED INSTRUCTIONS.

(a) UPDATED CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITS.—Paragraph (2) of section 432(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 240(c)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "the Secretary shall consider" and inserting "the Secretary shall apply risk-based criteria that takes into consideration"; and

(2) in subparagraph (A), by inserting before the semicolon the following: ", including threats posed by transnational criminal organizations";

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking "and" after the semicolon;

(4) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

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

"(E) the extent to which the BEST unit would advance the Department's homeland and border security strategic priorities and related objectives; and

"(F) whether departmental Joint Task Force operations as established pursuant to section 708 and other joint cross-border initiatives would be enhanced, improved, or otherwise assisted by the BEST unit to be established."

(b) PORT SECURITY.—Subsection (c) of section 432 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 240) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) PORT SECURITY BEST UNITS.—A BEST unit established pursuant to paragraph (2) with a port security nexus shall be composed of at least one member of each of the following:

"(A) The Coast Guard Investigative Service.

"(B) The geographically-responsible Coast Guard Sector Intelligence Office."

(c) UPDATED REPORT ELEMENTS.—Subsection (e) of section 432 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 240) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section and annually thereafter for the following five years, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that includes the following:

"(1) A description of the effectiveness of BEST in enhancing border security, disrupting and dismantling transnational criminal organizations, and reducing drug trafficking, arms smuggling, illegal alien trafficking and smuggling, violence, and kidnapping along and across the international borders of the United States, as measured by

crime statistics, including violent deaths, incidents of violence, and drug-related arrests.

“(2) An assessment of how BEST enhances information-sharing, including the dissemination of homeland security information, among Federal, State, local, tribal, and foreign law enforcement agencies.

“(3) A description of how BEST advances the Department’s homeland and border security strategic priorities and effectiveness of BEST in achieving related objectives.

“(4) An assessment of BEST’s joint operational efforts with departmental Joint Task Force operations established pursuant to section 708 and other joint cross-border initiatives.”

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2281, the Border Enforcement Security Task Force Reauthorization Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in unprecedented times. A quick glance of recent headlines shows that our Nation is suffering from the largest heroin epidemic in the history of the United States. In fact, just last week, Bloomberg Businessweek reported that heroin has become so pervasive in our cities and so profitable for the cartels that supply it that even our local law enforcement officers are disheartened and admit that sporadic street-level arrests seem to have little to no effect.

Recently, in my district and because of the hard work of our men and women in law enforcement, we witnessed the dismantling of a large-scale organization. News reports indicate 52 individuals are facing charges for about 370 crimes, including operating as drug dealers and traffickers.

Mr. Speaker, if these individuals had not been stopped, their nefarious activities would have broken the dreams of children across America, and their criminal enterprise would have caused millions in economic loss through increased incarceration, rehab, and medical expenses. If they had not been stopped, their actions would have continued to introduce poison into our communities and shattered lives.

Even worse, a recent trend shows that the heroin hitting our streets is becoming more lethal as drug cartels have now begun lacing heroin with

fentanyl, a synthetic opioid making doses more addictive and cheaper to produce.

I might add parenthetically that, for 20 years as a Federal prosecutor, I prosecuted every possible drug organization known to man. I have never seen anything with the lethality that is heroin.

This epidemic is, in large part, due to the stream of illegal narcotics that is flowing across our Nation’s borders. However, there are steps that can be taken to shut down these illicit pathways. Thankfully, there is a Federal task force dedicated to this singular purpose.

In 2005, in response to the increase in violence along the southwest border of Mexico, the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Homeland Security Investigations, in partnership with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, as well as other Federal, State, local, and international law enforcement officials, created what is known as BEST, the Border Enforcement Security Task Force.

To date, a total of 44 BEST units have been deployed across 16 States and in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. My home State of New York is well served by three BEST teams, two of which are situated on the northern border and one of which I helped stand up in Massena, New York.

Nationwide, BEST teams comprise over 1,000 members who represent over 100 law enforcement agencies that have committed to jointly investigate transnational criminal activity along the southwest and northern borders and at our Nation’s major seaports.

Since inception, their collective efforts have initiated more than 10,654 investigations which have resulted in almost 13,000 criminal arrests, the seizure of 1.2 million pounds of narcotics, and more than \$130 million. The street value of 1.2 million pounds of narcotics is astronomical.

This is an impressive feat by any measure; however, as we are considering reauthorizing this important task force, it is important to highlight where there is some room for improvement. Every Congress looks at existing programs and makes adjustments when needed. That is exactly what we are proposing to do here today.

Of the 44, total, BEST units, 20 of them are designated by Homeland Security Investigations as having a maritime security focus. While the Coast Guard provides critical support to Federal, State, and local partners through a majority of the maritime BESTs, not every maritime BEST is currently benefiting from Coast Guard participation.

This bill mandates the participation of both a Coast Guard Investigative Service special agent and a uniformed Coast Guard intelligence officer on every maritime BEST. By utilizing both plainclothes investigators and uniformed intelligence officers, BEST

will be able to partner with the Coast Guard in ongoing criminal investigations and the generation of actionable maritime intelligence.

The Coast Guard is the only agency within DHS that is also an independent member of the intelligence community. This unique position, coupled with the fact that the Coast Guard has unparalleled maritime domain awareness through daily interaction with mariners and facility operators, makes it imperative that they are included in all maritime BESTs in a mandatory fashion.

As we find ourselves halfway through Police Week this week, I want to take a second to pause and thank the men and women of law enforcement throughout this great Nation—many of whom I have stood side by side with for over 20 years—for all they do in keeping our country safe.

I would also like to thank the ranking member, Mr. VELA, for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the law enforcement community and vote in favor of reauthorizing this important task force.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, May 15, 2017.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I write concerning H.R. 2281, the Border Enforcement Security Task Force Reauthorization Act of 2017. This legislation includes matters that I believe fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 2281, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure agrees to forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill would not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee’s Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

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

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2281, the “Border Enforcement Security Task Force Reauthorization Act of 2017”. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the

House of Representatives. I understand that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, will not seek a sequential referral on the bill. We appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

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

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

Sincerely,

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2281, the Border Enforcement Security Task Force Reauthorization Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 2281, seeks to reauthorize the Border Enforcement Security Task Force, or BEST, program within the Department of Homeland Security.

U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement leads 42 BEST units across 16 States within the United States and Puerto Rico. Each unit is comprised of members from ICE's Homeland Security Investigations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, as well as other Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies who investigate criminal activity along the southwest and northern borders and at the Nation's major seaports.

These units play a critical role in advancing DHS' border security efforts by ensuring all levels of domestic law enforcement are sharing information and leveraging resources. BEST units have been instrumental in coordinating joint operations with our law enforcement partners in Mexico to thwart threats posed by transnational criminal organizations.

This legislation is in furtherance of my efforts as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security to bolster law enforcement collaboration on cross-border threats and to ensure that resources are used in a strategic manner to effectively mitigate such threats, particularly in response to the drug cartels.

Those of us representing border districts are well aware that cartels adapt quickly to exploit real or perceived weaknesses in our security. As they shift their criminal operations to new locations along our land borders, smuggle their contraband into the United States through our ports of entry, or utilize maritime routes into this country, DHS must be at the ready to quickly intercept and disrupt their operations.

This legislation seeks to ensure that DHS continues to use BEST units to maximum effect. This bill instructs DHS, before standing up a BEST unit,

to consider the cross-border threats posed by transnational criminal organizations, the Department's homeland and border security strategic priorities, as well as the operations of DHS' joint task forces and other multi-agency efforts.

H.R. 2281 also updates existing reporting requirements so that Congress has better information on how effectively BEST units are reducing criminal activity, such as the traffic of drugs, weapons, and people along our borders; enhancing information sharing among law enforcement partners; coordinating with the Department's joint task forces; and generally advancing the DHS homeland security and border security strategic priorities.

I also want to thank my colleagues on the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee who have cosponsored this legislation, including Subcommittee Chairwoman MARTHA MCSALLY. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2281.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2281, the Border Enforcement Security Task Force Reauthorization Act of 2017, is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that seeks to maximize the effectiveness of the successful border security program and ensure that, going forward, the program continues to contribute to making our Nation more safe and secure.

H.R. 2281 was approved by voice vote by the full committee on May 3 and enjoys broad, bipartisan support.

Before I yield back, I would like to thank Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON, as well as Subcommittee Chairwoman MCSALLY, for their work on this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to adopt this legislation.

I want to note that, back in the mid-nineties when I was starting out my career as a Federal organized crime prosecutor, I was set on the border in El Paso, Texas, and I had a frontline view, as I was going after cartel-level drug traffickers back then, of just what a problem the border is.

Many people think of the border's primary problem being illegal aliens, but I can tell you firsthand—and I think my colleague from Texas will agree with me—that drug trafficking remains a gigantic issue, and the poison that is killing our kids is streaming across the southwest border in particular.

It is imperative that bills like this continue. It is imperative that Congressman VELA, Congresswoman MCSALLY, and the others on their subcommittee continue their great work identifying issues along the border, both north and south, and that the BEST concept continues and, indeed,

hopefully, expands in the future. Targeted law enforcement that involves people on both sides of the border and law enforcement is the only way we are ever going to solve this problem. I commend them for their work on this.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2281 the "Border Enforcement Security Task Force Reauthorization Act of 2017."

As a Senior Member on the House Committee on Homeland Security; and former Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I know well the importance of protecting our nation's borders.

I thank my colleague Congressman VELA for sponsoring this bipartisan legislation, which reauthorizes the Border Enforcement Security Task Force (BEST) program.

An escalation in drug trafficking and transnational criminal activity along our nation's southern border has led to record levels of violence and drug trafficking-related homicides.

Despite significant efforts to combat the drug trade, many governments in the region suffer from overwhelmed criminal justice systems and law enforcement agencies.

There must be a multi-pronged approach to solving the drug crisis in the United States, it must include treatment upon demand; education; increase resources for border interdiction and seizure of illicit drugs and advanced technology to detect and track those who may be engaged in illegal activity along the border.

The Border Enforcement Security Task Force is accomplishing the important law enforcement component of border security.

The Border Enforcement Security Task Force achieves its goal of border security enhancement by facilitating collaboration among federal, state, local, tribal, and foreign law enforcement agencies to execute coordinated activities in furtherance of border security and homeland security; and enhancing information-sharing, including the dissemination of homeland security information among such agencies.

The BEST program is currently administered by DHS, and involves information sharing and law-enforcement operations between personnel from federal, state, local, tribal, and foreign law-enforcement agencies to combat criminal activity near the United States borders.

This program has established teams of law enforcement agents from over 100 law enforcement agencies that form units to investigate transnational criminal activity.

This approach supports better cooperation and collaboration among federal, state, local and tribal law enforcement agencies when investigating criminal activity along the southwest and northern borders, as well as at the nation's major seaports.

Since their inception, BEST Units have collectively initiated more than 10,654 cases.

These actions have resulted in more than:

2,718 criminal arrests
7,245 administrative arrests
110,711 pounds of cocaine
5,517 pounds of ecstasy
1,764 pounds of heroin

1,036,749 pounds of marijuana
6,325 pounds of methamphetamine
2,988,561 rounds of ammunition
4,657 vehicles
\$130.2 million in U.S. currency
15,062 weapons

This bill instructs the Secretary of Homeland Security to also consider:

The cross-border threats posed by transnational criminal organizations;

The Department's homeland and border security strategic priorities; and

The departmental Joint Task Forces and other multi-agency cross-border operations when establishing new BEST Units.

In addition, this bill would update the Secretary's existing reporting requirement to provide an assessment of how BEST Units enhance information-sharing among law enforcement partners, coordinate with Departmental Joint Task Forces, and advance the Department's homeland and border security strategic priorities.

This legislation will improve and update the information sharing practices between our law enforcement agencies so they will operate in a cohesive manner.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2281 the BEST program because it had proven throughout the years to improve our border security, along with improving how our law enforcement agencies operate and share vital information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2281, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1600

REMOVING OUTDATED RESTRICTIONS TO ALLOW FOR JOB GROWTH ACT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1177) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States the condition that certain lands conveyed to the City of Old Town, Maine, be used for a municipal airport, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1177

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Removing Outdated Restrictions to Allow for Job Growth Act".

SEC. 2. RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST.

(a) RELEASE.—Notwithstanding section 32(c) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1011(c)), if the City of Old Town, Maine, makes a written request to the Sec-

retary of Agriculture, the Secretary shall release, convey, and quitclaim, without monetary consideration, all rights, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands specified in subsection (b).

(b) LANDS SPECIFIED.—The lands subject to subsection (a) include only the lands—

(1) conveyed by the United States to the City of Old Town, Maine, under section 32(c) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1011(c)) by the deed dated June 5, 1941;

(2) proposed for conveyance by the City of Old Town, Maine, for the purpose of economic development; and

(3) described in the written request submitted by the City of Old Town, Maine, to the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to subsection (a).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1177, Removing Outdated Restrictions to Allow for Job Growth Act.

In the early 1980s, the city of Old Town, Maine, purchased land from the Federal Government to be part of the Old Town airport. The deed included a use restriction, as required by a 1941 amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937, limiting use of the land to a municipal airport or other public use.

Old Town has invested heavily in this land in order to attract businesses, but the outdated deed restriction needs to be lifted before further economic development can occur.

H.R. 1177 provides for the removal of the deed restriction on the parcel of land around the Old Town airport to allow for business development. The bill allows the City of Old Town to send a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture detailing which lands it would like released from the deed restriction and directs the Secretary to release that land to the city of Old Town.

Passage of this commonsense provision will allow economic development in Old Town to move forward, creating as many as 200 much-needed jobs. This legislation will provide certainty to private investors in the community and help the local economy thrive.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) for addressing this issue, and our chairman on the

House Agriculture Committee, Chairman CONAWAY, for moving this bill forward.

This is a good government bill that eliminates red tape to unleash private investment. At a time when rural America is struggling—it is people like Representative POLIQUIN and all of us—we must do all we can to encourage growth and development in rural communities, many that we all serve, but also the one that Representative POLIQUIN serves in Old Town, Maine. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1177 is a bill that will allow the city of Old Town, Maine, to move forward with economic development plans that have been hampered by Federal red tape. H.R. 1177 removes the current deed restriction on the land surrounding the Old Town airport. This will allow the city to implement economic development initiatives that will create jobs and spur economic activity in the area.

As a pilot, I am glad to see that the airport will not be impacted by this change and will continue to meet the region's air transportation needs. Again, H.R. 1177 is common sense, reasonable legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) for supporting this legislation.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), who actually was the one who brought this bill to the attention of the House Agriculture Committee and to the floor here today. It is his hard work, and there are not many in this institution who work harder than Representative POLIQUIN in addressing the needs of rural America.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for those kind remarks.

I am so proud to represent the most honest and hardworking Americans you can find anywhere. Maine's Second Congressional District is, if not the largest, the second largest congressional district east of the Mississippi River. It is about an 8-hour drive from Fryeburg to Madawaska, and you are going to spend about half your time dodging moose and other critters on the road. We are tough, we are rugged, but we need jobs. We need jobs.

We have had a situation in our State for the past 30 years where many of our paper mills and sawmills and textile mills and leather tanneries have closed. We have a handful left. And right smack in the middle of our State is the great city of Old Town, Maine,

just a little bit north of Bangor. Old Town has also suffered the closure of a significant mill—or two, actually.

Ron Harriman, who is the economic development director of Old Town, reached out to our office and said: Bruce, we have a problem here. We have a terrific piece of property surrounding our airport. We have gone through extensive work and cost to the town to extend utilities to this piece of land. But lo and behold, there is a Federal deed restriction on that land that dates back decades that doesn't allow us to sell the land and develop it for more jobs.

I don't doubt at the time, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government that was buying up local property across the country, reclaiming it and turning it into agricultural land, I don't question the purpose of that and the good intentions of that; but that was a long time ago.

We now have a situation where the city of Old Town needs to be able to sell this property in order to attract other investment and other jobs to help our families in central Maine. Removing this deed restriction will allow that to happen.

I am asking everybody in this Chamber, Republicans and Democrats—and I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON)—please support H.R. 1177. There are many times, Mr. Speaker, when all the government needs to do is get out of the way. This is one example. Let the Federal Government get out of the way. We know how to create jobs in the State of Maine. Let's remove this red tape. Let's let this land be sold for folks who want to create jobs. I would be very grateful for everybody in this Chamber to support H.R. 1177 and let the people of central Maine live better lives with more jobs and more freedom.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support passage of this commonsense legislation, H.R. 1177.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1177.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

EDWARD T. SCHAFFER AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2154) to rename the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, as the Edward T. Schaffer Agricultural Research Center, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2154

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

SECTION 1. RENAMING OF THE RED RIVER VALLEY AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER IN FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA AS THE EDWARD T. SCHAFFER AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER.

(a) **RENAMING.**—*The Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Edward T. Schaffer Agricultural Research Center".*

(b) **REFERENCES.**—*Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to the Edward T. Schaffer Agricultural Research Center.*

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 2154, to rename the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, as the Edward T. Schaffer Agricultural Research Center. And this, Mr. Speaker, is in spite of the fact that it is located at North Dakota State University, which, in January of 2015, beat my Illinois State Red Birds for the FCS football championship and caused me to have to bring cupcakes from Normal, Illinois, to pay a bet with my colleague who is the author of this bill, Congressman KEVIN CRAMER. So I still support this bill in spite of those actions because it is a good bill, Mr. Speaker.

Ed Schaffer served as North Dakota's Governor from 1992 to 2000, and as our Nation's Secretary of Agriculture from 2008 to 2009. Renaming the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, to honor Sec-

retary Schaffer is a fitting tribute to his distinguished career in public service.

Located in Secretary Schaffer's home State and at one of the Nation's premier land grant universities, this research center continues to advance its vital work on improving crops to strengthen our Nation's food security. I greatly appreciate the work—in spite of the cupcakes—that Congressman KEVIN CRAMER has put forth on this bill, his leadership, and I urge my colleagues to join me today in supporting this legislation.

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

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

H.R. 2154 recognizes former U.S. Department of Agriculture Secretary and former North Dakota Governor Ed Schaffer by renaming the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in his honor.

The research center serves the region, including my district in Minnesota, by coordinating five research units in two Fargo laboratories. The center does a wide range of work with a focus on animal metabolism-agricultural chemicals, cereal crops, insect genetics and biochemistry, sugar beet and potato, and sunflower and plant biology research.

I worked closely with Ed Schaffer when he was at USDA and also during the time he was North Dakota's Governor. We worked on many things together. Some of them were pleasant and some of them not so pleasant, such as floods and so forth.

I think it is a fitting recognition for an outstanding career in government, and I am happy to be here to support this bill.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) for supporting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the author of this bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. DAVIS and my colleague, Mr. PETERSON, from across the Red River in Minnesota for their support for this renaming of the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center. For all of the reasons that Representative PETERSON talked about, it is a world-class facility in a world-class town, and I think it should be named after a world-class guy, and I think Ed Schaffer is that.

I had the opportunity to serve under Ed when he was Governor for 8 years. I served in his cabinet. His intellect and his common sense are matched only by his boundless energy and his eternal optimism, qualities he brings to every job he does, including his work at the Department of Agriculture.

When he was recognized by his former Governor colleague, President

George W. Bush, and asked to join the administration in that department, it was a remarkable thing not just for agriculture, not just for Ed, but for our State. North Dakota is number one in the production of many crops. Agriculture is the number one industry in our State. It is what makes North Dakota what North Dakota is: the ability to feed hungry people in a growing world. Ed brought that common sense to USDA and that work ethic that works the land so effectively.

I feel like this is a fitting tribute to him. It is a celebration not only of his accomplishments, but a celebration of agriculture in North Dakota and the entire Red River Valley, including Congressman PETERSON's district, and really for our world.

I would note that our two Senators, while it is easy for me to get unanimity in the House for the North Dakota House caucus since I am the only one, North Dakota's two Senators have a companion bill in the Senate introduced by Senator HOEVEN and cosponsored by Senator HEITKAMP, and they support this effort as well.

I appreciate the work of the committee and the work of Ed Schafer, and I look forward, hopefully, to a celebration of the renaming.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this side. Again, I thank the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) for bringing this forward. Mr. Schafer is a great member of our community. He spends some time in my hometown every year and I have gotten to know him very well. He very much deserves this honor. I am happy to support this bill, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

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

□ 1615

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleagues from Minnesota and North Dakota. I urge all Members to support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2154, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMBATING EUROPEAN ANTI-SEMITISM ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 672) to require continued and enhanced annual reporting to Congress in the Annual Report on

International Religious Freedom on anti-Semitic incidents in Europe, the safety and security of European Jewish communities, and the efforts of the United States to partner with European governments, the European Union, and civil society groups, to combat anti-Semitism, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 672

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Combating European Anti-Semitism Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) During the past decade, there has been a steady increase in anti-Semitic incidents in Europe, resulting in European Jews being the targets of physical and verbal harassment and even lethal terrorist attacks, all of which has eroded personal and communal security and the quality of daily Jewish life.

(2) According to reporting by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), between 2005 and 2014, anti-Semitic incidents increased in France from 508 to 851; in Germany from 60 to 173; in Belgium from 58 to 130; in Italy from 49 to 86; and in the United Kingdom from 459 to 1,168.

(3) Anti-Zionism has at times devolved into anti-Semitic attacks, prompting condemnation from many European leaders, including French Prime Minister Manuel Valls, British Prime Minister David Cameron, and German Chancellor Angela Merkel.

(4) Since 2010, the Department of State has adhered to the working definition of Anti-Semitism by the European Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC). Some contemporary examples of anti-Semitism include the following:

(A) Calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews (often in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion).

(B) Making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such, or the power of Jews as a collective, especially, but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government, or other societal institutions.

(C) Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, the State of Israel, or even for acts committed by non-Jews.

(D) Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.

(E) Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interest of their own countries.

(5) On October 16, 2004, the President signed into law the Global Anti-Semitism Review Act of 2004. This law provides the legal foundation for a reporting requirement provided by the Department of State annually on anti-Semitism around the world.

(6) In November 2015, the House of Representatives passed H. Res. 354 by a vote of 418-0, urging the Secretary of State to continue robust United States reporting on anti-Semitism by the Department of State and the Special Envoy to Combat and Monitor Anti-Semitism.

(7) In 2016, the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA), comprised of 31 member countries, adopted a working definition of anti-Semitism which stated: "Anti-Semitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of anti-Semitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities."

(8) The IHRA further clarified that manifestations of anti-Semitism might also target the State of Israel, conceived of as a Jewish collectivity. Anti-Semitism frequently charges Jews with conspiring to harm humanity, and it is often used to blame Jews for "why things go wrong". It is expressed in speech, writing, visual forms, and action, and employs sinister stereotypes and negative character traits.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national interest of the United States to combat anti-Semitism at home and abroad;

(2) anti-Semitism is a challenge to the basic principles of tolerance, pluralism, and democracy, and the shared values that bind Americans and Europeans together;

(3) there is an urgent need to ensure the safety and security of European Jewish communities, including synagogues, schools, cemeteries, and other institutions;

(4) the United States should continue to emphasize the importance of combating anti-Semitism in multilateral bodies, including the United Nations, European Union institutions, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe;

(5) the Department of State should continue to thoroughly document acts of anti-Semitism and anti-Semitic incitement that occur around the world, and should continue to encourage other countries to do the same, and share their findings; and

(6) the Department of State should continue to work to encourage adoption by national government institutions and multilateral institutions of a working definition of anti-Semitism similar to the one adopted in the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance context.

SEC. 4. ANNUAL REPORTING ON THE STATE OF ANTI-SEMITISM IN EUROPE.

Paragraph (1) of section 102(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6412) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(G) ANTI-SEMITISM IN EUROPE.—In addition to the information required under clause (vii) of subparagraph (A), with respect to each European country in which verbal or physical threats or attacks are particularly significant against Jewish persons, places of worship, schools, cemeteries, and other religious institutions, a description of—

"(i) the security challenges and needs of European Jewish communities and European law enforcement agencies in such countries to better protect such communities;

"(ii) to the extent practicable, the efforts of the United States Government over the reporting period to partner with European law enforcement agencies and civil society groups regarding the sharing of information and best practices to combat anti-Semitic incidents in Europe;

"(iii) European educational programming and public awareness initiatives that aim to collaborate on educational curricula and

campaigns that impart shared values of pluralism and tolerance, and showcase the positive contributions of Jews in culture, scholarship, science, and art, with special attention to those segments of the population that exhibit a high degree of anti-Semitic animus; and

“(iv) efforts by European governments to adopt and apply a working definition of anti-Semitism.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking my colleagues NITA LOWEY and Chairman Emeritus ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for their leadership on the Bipartisan Task Force for Combating Anti-Semitism and for their good work on this timely and important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will lay out this case, but it is one we are familiar with. Hostility towards the Jewish people in some European cities is very deep, making Jews in certain areas look over their shoulders, afraid to walk the streets at night. In recent years, this surge in anti-Semitism has led to an outbreak of violent attacks.

Those violent attacks are targeting certain Jewish neighbors. They are targeting places of worship. I think back to 2015, the deadly attacks on the kosher supermarket in Paris and, later on, the synagogue in Copenhagen.

European governments have since passed laws designed to better protect their Jewish citizens, designed to punish those who perpetrate anti-Semitic incidents, but much more work remains to be done because there needs to be a better coordination on these efforts between Jewish communities and law enforcement and more comprehensive reporting on the incidents to identify trends, to identify problematic regions.

In addition, in order to consistently apply anti-Semitism laws throughout Europe, there needs to be a uniform legal understanding of what constitutes anti-Semitism.

Let me explain. We must be clear on this. The fire bombing of synagogues is not a political protest. The defacing of cemeteries, the yelling slurs at rabbis, the threatening of Jewish school children, this is not political protest. This is anti-Semitism, and it must be stopped.

Absent a clear-eyed definition of anti-Semitism, perpetrators of violent acts have, at times, been given a pass for their actions due to the flimsy defense of political protest.

Adoption across Europe of a single definition of anti-Semitism would provide an important foundation for law enforcement officials, enabling them to better enforce laws and develop strategies for improved security for the Jewish community.

This bill, H.R. 672, the Combating European Anti-Semitism Act of 2017, calls for these fundamental improvements, and it reaffirms the U.S. commitment to combating anti-Semitism. It urges European nations to adopt a working definition of anti-Semitism. It calls for increased reporting on it.

Anti-Semitic incidents in Europe have to be reported in a way in which people can be held accountable. Collaborative efforts between U.S. and European law enforcement and the efforts to improve security for Jewish communities is another important aspect of this legislation.

Now is the time to act and pass this important measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. Let me start by thanking the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my good friend and neighbor, the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

I also want to thank Chairman ROYCE for his steadfast support in bringing this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, it is so shocking and so heartbreaking to me that, in the year 2017, we wake up day after day to read about anti-Semitic vandalism and violence, anti-Semitic slurs on Munich buses, Russian so-called law makers pedaling anti-Semite conspiracy theories, horrific murders in a kosher market in Paris 2 years ago. Of course, Mr. Speaker, here in our own country, bomb threats to Jewish community centers, desecration of cemeteries. Actually, I can hardly believe it.

We know this ancient hatred has never been extinguished. It has always found some dark corner in which to fester until some new group on the fringe tries to pull it back into the mainstream. I fear we are seeing that sort of resurgence right now.

When we hear these toxic ideas emanating from major political parties and governing bodies in Europe, we know it is time for action. It needs to be stopped, and this bill will help.

This legislation builds on the 1998 International Religious Freedom Act, which established annual reporting on religious freedom worldwide, as well as the 2004 Global Anti-Semitism Review Act, which required the State Department to report every year on anti-Semitism around the world.

This measure calls for continued and enhanced reporting on anti-Semitic incidents in Europe. We want to focus on what has been a hotbed of anti-Semitism in recent years so that no active anti-Semitic hatred goes unnoticed.

This bill also expresses our view in Congress that it is in our country's interest to combat anti-Semitism here and abroad; that it is critical to ensure the safety of European Jewish communities; that multilateral organizations like the U.N. and OSCE have an important role to play in combating anti-Semitism; that we should continue to report anti-Semitic acts worldwide; and that our allies should follow our lead and document anti-Semitic acts when they take place so we can share our findings amongst ourselves.

We also call on the State Department to adopt the working definition of anti-Semitism used by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, because words do matter when it comes to the way we talk about this challenge.

It is absolutely amazing that 70-some-odd years after World War II ended—and that decade culminated in the murder of 6 million Jews in Europe in the Holocaust, men, women, and children—it is absolutely unbelievable that 70 years later you would see anti-Semitism in the same places in Europe rear its ugly head by stupid people who don't know what they are saying or doing. It is just amazing. You think there would be some kind of sensitivity about the Holocaust and about all the innocent people who were murdered for just the one reason that they were Jewish, and yet you see no-nothings, as far as I am concerned, popping up again with their anti-Semitic hatred. It is bad wherever it goes, but it is especially repugnant to have it in Europe, the site of the murder of 6 million Jewish people.

I am very grateful to Representative LOWEY for her hard work on this bill. I am pleased to support it.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), chairman of the Foreign Affairs' Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time, and I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their comments on this legislation. The bill promotes religious freedom throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned, it has been 60 to 70 years since the Jewish community in Europe was decimated by the Holocaust. Now, more than ever, the Jewish community is under assault yet again.

In Europe, anti-Semitic individuals are back like never before. A study commissioned by the German parliament this year found that there

were 644 anti-Semitic offenses in the country in 2016 alone.

In countries like Holland, Jewish schools and synagogues need to be protected by special forces because of fear of attack on those schools.

And, unfortunately, our country has not been immune. Jewish community centers across the country have been targets of bomb threats, even recently in Houston, Texas, my hometown, such bomb threats.

This past Sunday, a historic synagogue in New York City was attacked and burned down by arsonists. That is why this bill, the Combating European Anti-Semitism Act, is so important. We must continue to partner with our European friends to ensure that we stamp out the cancer of anti-Semitism.

As a representative of a country founded on religious freedom, we, as Members of Congress, must send a clear message to Jews and non-Jews, from Houston to Amsterdam, that we will not allow the horrors of the Holocaust to repeat themselves in this generation.

Mr. Speaker, we must reiterate the commitment the free world made over 60 years ago: Never again. Never again.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1630

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my good friend, my fellow New Yorker, the author of this bill, and the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friends, Chairman ED ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL, and all those involved in advancing this important legislation.

I rise in support of H.R. 672, the Combating European Anti-Semitism Act, which was introduced by the co-chairs of the Bipartisan Taskforce for Combating Anti-Semitism.

With the rising threat of anti-Semitism in Europe, this bill would require enhanced reporting to Congress on anti-Semitic incidents in Europe, the safety and security of European Jewish communities, and the efforts of the United States to partner with European entities to combat anti-Semitism. This bill also urges the Department of State to continue encouraging European governments and multilateral institutions to adopt a clear and comprehensive working definition of anti-Semitism.

I find it hard to believe that in the 21st century European Jews worry about whether or not there is a future for their communities in Europe. But with increased anti-Semitic sentiments throughout Europe and many Jews becoming the targets of verbal, physical, and even deadly terrorist attacks, the security and quality of life for European Jewish communities has deteriorated. This is simply unacceptable.

Anti-Semitism is not simply a Jewish problem. Xenophobia and other forms of racism are never far behind when this pernicious threat rears its ugly head. The United States must remain a leader in the fight against anti-Semitism wherever it occurs to ensure that our commitment to "never again" remains a reality.

Finally, I want to express my appreciation to my fellow co-chairs of the Bipartisan Taskforce for Combating Anti-Semitism, Representatives SMITH, ENGEL, GRANGER, DEUTCH, ROS-LEHTINEN, VEASEY, and ROSKAM. The task force remains committed to working across regions, religions, and party lines to condemn all anti-Semitism and fight for the right of Jews to live freely without fear at home and abroad.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa and is our chairman emeritus.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for working to help bring this important bill to the floor in a timely manner and, more importantly, for conducting the affairs of our full committee in an even-tempered, professional manner that is an example to the rest of the House. It is an honor to serve under their leadership.

I also want to thank my good friend NITA LOWEY because she is the author of this bill, but I want to thank her for her leadership in fighting anti-Semitism across the world. She has been at this fight for many a year. We have worked closely together on defeating this hatred, one of the world's oldest forms of discrimination. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of her bill, and I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an important initiative for our Bipartisan Taskforce for Combating Anti-Semitism, a task force of which I am proud to be a co-founder and a co-chair along with Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ENGEL, of course CHRIS SMITH, TED DEUTCH, KAY GRANGER, PETER ROSKAM, MARC VEASEY, so many good Members. But more than that, Mr. Speaker, it is an important initiative for the Jewish communities across Europe who have been facing a troubling increase in anti-Semitic incidents and attacks over the past years that have put their safety and their security at risk.

Mr. Speaker, all across Europe, Jews have been targeted. Their places of worship have been targeted, their homes, targeted; their businesses, targeted. Why? Because of their faith.

They have been the target of deadly attacks in European cities, democratic societies that we call allies: France, Belgium, Denmark, elsewhere—horrific. This is simply unconscionable, Mr. Speaker.

There is no time to delay in taking action. We cannot allow for an atmosphere of intolerance and hatred to once again rear its ugly head in Europe. That is why this bill is an important first step.

We have identified growing anti-Semitism as a problem before, but this bill will enhance reporting requirements so that we can more acutely identify the problems and, equally important, Mr. Speaker, we can identify the security challenges facing these Jewish communities. Then we can learn how to best tackle this, and we can learn how we can partner with our European allies and our friends and local law enforcement, along with civil society, to protect against anti-Semitic acts. We can get a better understanding of how our partners in Europe can better educate their children. We can get a handle on how to better promote awareness in their societies to the dangers of such blind hatred.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the first step in fighting anti-Semitism is identifying the problem areas and then developing a plan to address it. This bill will help us identify the problem. It is an important first step in taking the necessary action to protect the Jewish communities of Europe. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Let me first say, I agree with all the eloquent statements made by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle pertaining to this bill.

I want to thank Mrs. LOWEY, again, because it is a really important bill. It is really important that we don't sweep this under the rug. It is really important that we don't try to hide it or sugarcoat it. Whether it happens here, whether it happens in Europe, no matter where it happens, any form of anti-Semitism, any form of hatred of one group toward another needs to be roundly condemned and stopped. That is what we are trying to do here.

It hasn't even been a century since we heard this canary in the coal mine: political parties scapegoating Jews; insidious campaigns that question the humanity of Jewish populations or their legitimacy as members of certain societies; governments, popularly elected governments, saying that it was okay to hate.

We don't think it is okay to hate. That is why we are doing this. What we hear today is unnerving in light of that history.

Mr. Speaker, we know what happened when too few good people stood up and spoke out. We cannot allow that history to repeat. We must do whatever it takes to ensure that it doesn't.

This bill will help us address a part of this growing concern. It will shine a bright light on the resurgence of anti-

Semitism in Europe. It is just a piece of the puzzle, but it is a good start.

I am proud to stand with my colleagues today to support this measure. I urge all Members to do the same.

I thank the others on this side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle who have spoken on this, especially Chairman ROYCE.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, let me say that the words just spoken by Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL are precisely the sentiment that I think we all wish to convey. We must do all we can to combat anti-Semitism in all of its insidious forms, and we do it because the consequences, the horrifying consequences of doing nothing in the face of such evil, are unconscionable. We must not repeat the mistakes of the past by remaining silent, as this same poison affects our communities today.

Passage of this bill sends a clear signal that anti-Semitism has no place in free societies and urges our European partners to provide practical guidance that will empower law enforcement and better equip them to tackle this rising problem, and it sends the message that our own law enforcement is willing to work hand in hand with theirs in order to tackle this problem.

I appreciate the work of Congresswoman LOWEY and Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN and, of course, Mr. ENGEL, the ranking member. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 672, the Combating Anti-Semitism Act of 2017, sponsored by my friend NITA LOWEY. I and all of our fellow Co-Chairs of the Bi-Partisan Task Force for Combating Anti-Semitism are original co-sponsors.

Among its provisions, the bill would require the State Department to include in existing annual reports information about the security challenges and needs of European Jewish communities and European law enforcement. This report would also document related U.S. government efforts to partner with European law enforcement agencies and civil society groups.

H.R. 672 is important and timely. As witnesses testified at a hearing I chaired in March on "Anti-Semitism Across Borders," physical attacks on European Jewish communities, and other forms of anti-Semitic hatred, remain rampant on the continent. Rabbi Andy Baker, Personal Representative of the OSCE Chairperson-in-Office on Combating Anti-Semitism and Director of International Jewish Affairs at the American Jewish Committee noted that even after the deadly anti-Semitic attacks in Paris, Brussels and Copenhagen, "prob-

lems still remain. Governments have taken different approaches, and some only in stop-gap measures." Rabbi Baker also emphasized that "We need to be clear-eyed in confronting and combating anti-Semitism, which manifests itself on both the right and the left."

At the same hearing, Paul Goldenberg, Director of the Security Community Network and Senior Advisor to the Rutgers University Faith-Based Communities Security Program, warned that "Ever-more connected, extremist groups in the United States are borrowing, adapting and enhancing the tactics and strategies adopted in Europe." This is an especially sobering warning, given the man recent anti-Semitic incidents here in the United States.

Mark Weitzman, Director of Government Affairs for the Simon Wiesenthal Center, emphasized that "Fighting antisemitism has always been a bipartisan commitment and in today's fractured political world it is more necessary than ever that the U.S. maintain its diplomatic and moral leadership in this issue. . . . we would strongly suggest that the position [of Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism] even be upgraded, to that of Ambassador, thus demonstrating the importance attached by our government to this issue."

H.R. 672 is an example of such bi-partisan ship. It would ensure that the Special Envoy, other U.S. officials, the Congress, and civil society—especially European Jewish communities that their security groups—have key information to act fully and effectively. With the right information, and robust action, the United States can help ensure the safety and security of Jewish communities in Europe and elsewhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 672, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE FIGHT AGAINST CORRUPTION IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 145) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the fight against corruption in Central America, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 145

Whereas according to Transparency International's 2016 Corruption Perception Index, the citizens of Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua perceive high levels of government corruption;

Whereas widespread corruption in Central America weakens citizens' faith in public in-

stitutions, limits government capacity to advance development goals, and allows drug traffickers and other criminals to thrive;

Whereas the International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala (CICIG) was created at the request of the Guatemalan Government in 2007, and has strengthened the capacity of Guatemalan institutions, especially the Office of the Attorney General, to combat corruption;

Whereas the Office of the Attorney General of Guatemala and CICIG have recently collaborated to investigate and prosecute a series of corruption cases involving high-level government officials, demonstrating that it is possible for governments in Central America to confront entrenched corruption, and that no one is above the law;

Whereas the Attorney General of El Salvador has made significant progress in tackling corruption at the highest levels;

Whereas after thousands of Hondurans joined street protests against corruption and in favor of an International Commission against Impunity in Honduras, the Honduran Government reached an agreement with the Organization of American States to create the Mission to Support the Fight against Corruption and Impunity in Honduras (MACCIH);

Whereas MACCIH has begun to assist the Office of the Attorney General of Honduras with the investigation into the more than \$300,000,000 that was embezzled from the Institute of Social Security; and

Whereas the leadership of CICIG and MACCIH and the attorneys general of Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador have faced significant challenges, including credible threats against their lives, attempts to publicly discredit their work, or efforts to remove them from their posts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms that combating corruption in the Northern Triangle is an important policy interest for the United States;

(2) acknowledges that the International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala (CICIG) and the Mission to Support the Fight against Corruption and Impunity in Honduras (MACCIH) are currently making important contributions to this effort;

(3) urges the Government of Guatemala to continue to cooperate with CICIG and the Government of Honduras to continue to cooperate with MACCIH; and

(4) encourages the Governments of Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador to—

(A) publicly support efforts to fight corruption;

(B) respect the independence of the judicial branch and the Office of the Attorney General; and

(C) ensure that the Office of the Attorney General in each Northern Triangle country receives sufficient domestic budget allocations to carry out its core responsibilities and that budgeted funds are delivered in a timely manner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and

to include any extraneous materials in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 145, which affirms this body's support for the independent anticorruption commissions in Central America that seek to combat corruption and combat impunity in the countries of the Northern Triangle region.

I would like to commend the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), a new member of the committee, for her work on this important resolution. Of course, I appreciate Mr. ENGEL, the ranking member and the former chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, for his long-time focus on this critical region.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the U.S. has seen a surge in illegal migration from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. Now, that is the Northern Triangle of Central America.

Many of these migrants are fleeing violence. They are fleeing criminality and institutionalized corruption. More than anything, the citizens of these countries want governments that will work for them.

As a result of these governments, the international community has responded. Governments in the region, including the United States, have helped to establish the International Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala—that is called CICIG—and the Mission to Support the Fight against Corruption and Impunity in Honduras, known as MACCIH.

Both of these organizations are making important contributions to tackling the culture of corruption and impunity in their respective countries and are working to give the citizens of these countries confidence in their own judiciary. These organizations have put politicians and public servants on notice that nobody should be above the law and that their citizenry demands transparency.

For example, this special body in Honduras has begun to assist the Office of the Attorney General with the investigation into the more than \$300 million that was embezzled from the Institute of Social Security and, in Guatemala, has trained the prosecutors that successfully built high-profile corruption cases against multiple government officials, including the former Guatemalan President, President Molina.

□ 1645

Once again, I want to thank Representative TORRES for bringing this measure forward and for her efforts in working with the Northern Triangle countries to urge greater respect for an

independent judiciary and to bring greater security and prosperity to the people of the Northern Triangle countries.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure.

Let me start by thanking the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, ED ROYCE, from California. I am also especially grateful to another colleague from California, NORMA TORRES, a valuable member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for authoring this bipartisan resolution, and also for her leadership as the founding co-chair of the Central America Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, when a child from El Salvador, Guatemala, or Honduras arrives at our southern border, he or she didn't get there because it was an easy journey. It was because poverty, crime, or lack of opportunity at home left that child no option but to face that long, dangerous trek. No child anywhere should be forced to make that heartbreaking choice.

The best way to ensure that this doesn't happen is not to build a wall or isolate ourselves from our neighbors. It is to stop children from having to make that journey in the first place. It is by making long-term, strategic investments in a more secure and prosperous Central America.

Over the last 2 years, Democrats and Republicans in Congress have come together to do just that. We made a bold, new foreign assistance commitment to Central America that helps address the root causes of child migration from the region.

A big part of this effort is supporting those individuals who are working day in and day out to root out corruption in Central America: the attorneys general in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras; the heads of the International Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala; and the Mission to Support the Fight Against Corruption and Impunity in Honduras.

These brave individuals put their lives on the line on a daily basis. This resolution that we are voting on signals that the United States agrees with them and has their backs.

To Guatemala's Attorney General Thelma Aldana, Honduran Attorney General Oscar Chinchilla, Salvadoran Attorney General Douglas Melendez, CICIG Commissioner Ivan Velasquez, and MACCIH Chief of Mission Juan Jimenez: Today we come to the floor of the House of Representatives to say thank you and to proclaim that we stand with you and your institutions in the fight against corruption.

This measure sends a strong message that our Congress, which has the ultimate say over funding for Central America, stands with those who are

committed to putting an end to corruption in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras.

We may have a new President in the White House and a new Secretary of State at Foggy Bottom, but Congress continues to have the power of the purse; and Democrats and Republicans, alike, believe that continued international support for the attorneys general and CICIG and MACCIH is key to the continued success of the Alliance for Prosperity in the Northern Triangle.

In December, I led a letter to the attorneys general from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, along with Representative ROS-LEHTINEN and several other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, commending their efforts, pledging our ongoing support, and, most importantly, noting how crucial it is that they be able to carry out their work free from any interference from political leaders in their countries. With passage of H. Res. 145, the entire House of Representatives can and will send that same message.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time.

I applaud the work that both Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL have done in helping to focus more of our foreign policy priority here in our own Western Hemisphere.

I also applaud Congresswoman NORMA TORRES for authoring the measure that we have before us today, H. Res. 145, reaffirming our dedication to the fight against corruption in Central America. It is an important measure, Mr. Speaker, and it is an important fight.

For years, I have been a strong advocate for this fight because, where corruption is allowed to spread, drug trafficking and crime inevitably thrive; and this is negative for our neighbors, it is bad for us, and it is bad for our interests. That is why it is vital that we make battling corruption in the region more of a priority of our foreign policy.

In fact, earlier this year, I traveled to Honduras and Guatemala with my good friend ALBIO SIREs, and we saw firsthand how these governments are attempting to tackle corruption in their countries. It is not easy, Mr. Speaker. They are making progress and taking some of the tough decisions necessary, but there is so much more to be done and so much more that they need to do, but they need help from the United States.

That is what we heard when we hosted the attorneys general from the

Northern Triangle countries here in Washington, D.C., just last month to discuss what they are doing to fight corruption and what assistance they might need from us. That is why this resolution before us is so important and so timely.

We must urge the governments of Central America to do more to battle corruption, but we also must pledge to do more ourselves because they cannot do it alone. Central American governments must take a stand and voice their support for anticorruption programs. They must respect and defend the authority of the judicial branch, and they must make it a priority. That is not easy for them to do.

Some of these governments have shown a willingness to take these steps, but, sadly, Mr. Speaker, not all of them have. While we urge willing partners to take the steps necessary to fight corruption, we must be willing to do more for those unwilling.

That is why I have reintroduced my NICA Act, which aims at tightening the economic screws on the Ortega regime until we see some drastic reforms, including efforts to end corruption. It is our duty to support our neighbors so that our partners to the south can live in far more open, free, and democratic societies.

It is also in the benefit of our security and it is in the benefit of our national interests to do so. That is why I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 145. I also urge my colleagues to support my NICA Act and to take a more engaged role in our foreign policy interests in our own Western Hemisphere.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), the author of this resolution, a leader on Central American issues, and a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 145, expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the fight against corruption in Central America.

In too many Central American countries, it has become common practice for government officials to use public office to enrich themselves instead of serving the public good. For too long, corruption has allowed violence and poverty to hold these countries back.

But recently, the people of Central America have made it clear that they are ready for a change. In the last 2 years, young people from across the region have taken to the streets and demonstrated, and some real progress has been made.

In Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador, the attorneys general have demonstrated independence and real courage.

In Guatemala, Attorney General Thelma Aldana has worked closely

with CICIG, the International Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala. Under the leadership of Ivan Velasquez, CICIG has been instrumental in improving the capacity of Guatemala's prosecutors and has assisted with effective investigations into corruption and human rights violations.

In Honduras, Attorney General Oscar Chinchilla has worked with the Mission to Support the Fight Against Corruption and Impunity in Honduras, MACCIH, since 2016. Led by Juan Jimenez, MACCIH has promoted important legal reforms and is assisting with the investigations of high-profile corruption cases.

In El Salvador, Attorney General Douglas Melendez has made significant progress in tackling high-level corruption cases. I hope that the Government of El Salvador will recognize the value of CICIG and MACCIH and accept the international assistance that the attorney general and his prosecutors so clearly need.

Mr. Speaker, the countries of the Northern Triangle are at a crucial point in this fight against corruption, and we cannot turn back the progress that has been made. This resolution will send a very clear message that the United States will be a steadfast partner in its support for the fight against corruption in Central America.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their support and hard work in advancing this resolution.

Additionally, I thank Congressman MOOLENAAR, who worked with me to draft and introduce this resolution and who has been a strong supporter and advocate of the fight against corruption in Central America.

I also thank all of the cosponsors of this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman NORMA TORRES for authoring this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I also thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for supporting this bipartisan resolution and moving it through the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I especially want to thank Congresswoman TORRES for her leadership as a true champion on this issue and helping us all understand the importance of this.

This resolution makes it clear that the United States strongly supports the anticorruption efforts in the Northern Triangle of Central America. Already, officials across the region are making headway. The attorney general of Guatemala, in particular, has made progress in taking on corruption at the highest levels of government.

This resolution will reinforce support for these efforts in the region and will send a clear message to the millions of people who live in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras that the United States wants them to have a safe country, free of corrupt officials who steal from them.

By supporting the efforts of our allies to fight corruption, it is my hope that these governments will continue to promote respect for the rule of law, thereby making it better for residents to live, work, and raise a family in their homelands.

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

Let me say that, as a father, I cannot imagine being faced with the choice of letting my children risk violence or death from criminal gangs or malnutrition, or taking a dangerous journey hundreds of miles on their own. No parent or child should ever be forced to make this choice. Unfortunately, far too many families in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras must do so on a daily basis.

The good news is that our Congress has decided to make a much-needed, long-term investment in Central America. At the core of these efforts is our commitment to support institutions and individuals that are rooting out corruption.

H. Res. 145 makes it clear that our continued investment in Central America will depend on support for anticorruption efforts from the Salvadoran, Guatemalan, and Honduran Governments.

Let me finally note that I am heartened that the fight against corruption in the hemisphere is not just limited to Central America. From Brazil to Chile to the Caribbean, the citizens of the Americas have finally had enough and have vowed to put an end to corruption once and for all. The least that our Congress can do is support these valiant efforts.

I again thank Chairman ROYCE for working so well with me, putting our heads together over time, and passing good resolutions and legislation like this.

I again thank Congresswoman TORRES for introducing this crucial resolution and for her hard work on it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1700

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

Mr. Speaker, this important measure by Congresswoman NORMA TORRES affirms this body's support for all efforts to combat corruption in Central America. The people of this region have been living in societies that, because of corruption, and that corruption has become endemic, has led to gang violence, to criminality, to high levels of

impunity. And these conditions directly affect the ability of these governments to bring peace and prosperity to all of its citizens, and that, in turn, fuels the flows of those who leave illegally, migrants, to the Northern Hemisphere—well, to the United States.

So the citizens of Northern Triangle countries, those in this region, want to live in safety in their own countries, and we can help by supporting efforts by the International Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala and its counterpart in Honduras, and those others in the region that are fighting for these efforts that enable an independent judiciary and a judiciary that combats corruption.

NORMA TORRES' work on Central America has helped to build capacity in these countries to begin providing security for its citizens, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 145, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAESAR SYRIA CIVILIAN PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1677) to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, encourage a negotiated political settlement, and hold Syrian human rights abusers accountable for their crimes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1677

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2017”.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Sense of Congress.
- Sec. 3. Statement of policy.

TITLE I—ADDITIONAL ACTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SYRIA

Sec. 101. Sanctions with respect to Central Bank of Syria and foreign persons that engage in certain transactions.

Sec. 102. Prohibitions with respect to the transfer of arms and related materials to Syria.

Sec. 103. Rule of construction.

Sec. 104. Definitions.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO SYRIA HUMAN RIGHTS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2012

Sec. 201. Imposition of sanctions with respect to certain persons who are responsible for or complicit in human rights abuses committed against citizens of Syria or their family members.

Sec. 202. Imposition of sanctions with respect to the transfer of goods or technologies to Syria that are likely to be used to commit human rights abuses.

Sec. 203. Imposition of sanctions with respect to persons who hinder humanitarian access.

Sec. 204. Report on certain persons who are responsible for or complicit in certain human rights abuses in Syria.

TITLE III—REPORTS AND WAIVER FOR HUMANITARIAN-RELATED ACTIVITIES WITH RESPECT TO SYRIA

Sec. 301. Briefing on monitoring and evaluating of ongoing assistance programs in Syria and to the Syrian people.

Sec. 302. Assessment of potential methods to enhance the protection of civilians.

Sec. 303. Assistance to support entities taking actions relating to gathering evidence for investigations into war crimes or crimes against humanity in Syria since March 2011.

TITLE IV—SUSPENSION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO SYRIA

Sec. 401. Suspension of sanctions with respect to Syria.

Sec. 402. Waivers and exemptions.

TITLE V—REGULATORY AUTHORITY, COST LIMITATION, AND SUNSET

Sec. 501. Implementation and regulatory authorities.

Sec. 502. Cost limitation.

Sec. 503. Authority to consolidate reports.

Sec. 504. Sunset.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Bashar al-Assad's murderous actions against the people of Syria have directly contributed to the deaths of more than 480,000 civilians, led to the destruction of more than 50 percent of Syria's critical infrastructure, and forced the displacement of more than 14,000,000 people, precipitating one of the worst humanitarian crises in more than 60 years;

(2) international actions to protect vulnerable populations from attack by uniformed and irregular forces associated with the Assad regime, including Hezbollah, on land and by air, including through the use of barrel bombs, chemical weapons, mass starvation, industrial-scale torture and execution of political dissidents, sniper attacks against pregnant women, and the deliberate targeting of medical facilities, schools, residential areas, and community gathering places, including markets, have been insufficient to date;

(3) Assad's use of chemical weapons, including chlorine, against the Syrian people violates the Chemical Weapons Convention, to which Syria is a party;

(4) Assad's abhorrent use of chemical weapons, most recently on April 4, 2017, in an attack on the town of Khan Shakhyn in which more than 90 people died, including women and children, and more than 600 hundred people were injured, is condemned in the strongest terms;

(5) violent attacks resulting in death, injury, imprisonment or threat of prosecution against humanitarian aid workers and diplomatic personnel, as well as attacks on humanitarian supplies, facilities, transports, and assets, and acts to impede the access and secure movement of all humanitarian personnel are in violation of international humanitarian law and impede the lifesaving work of humanitarian organizations and diplomatic institutions; and

(6) Assad's continued claim of leadership and war crimes in Syria have served as a rallying point for the extremist ideology of the Islamic State, Jabhat al-Nusra, and other terrorist organizations.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States that all diplomatic and coercive economic means should be utilized to compel the government of Bashar al-Assad to immediately halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people and to support an immediate transition to a democratic government in Syria that respects the rule of law, human rights, and peaceful co-existence with its neighbors.

TITLE I—ADDITIONAL ACTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SYRIA

SEC. 101. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CENTRAL BANK OF SYRIA AND FOREIGN PERSONS THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

(a) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN MEASURES TO CENTRAL BANK OF SYRIA.—Except as provided in subsections (a) and (b) of section 402, the President shall apply the measures described in section 5318A(b)(5) of title 31, United States Code, to the Central Bank of Syria.

(b) BLOCKING PROPERTY OF FOREIGN PERSONS THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on and after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose on a foreign person the sanctions described in subsection (c) if the President determines that such foreign person, on or after such date of enactment, knowingly engages in an activity described in paragraph (2).

(2) ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.—A foreign person engages in an activity described in this paragraph if the foreign person—

(A) knowingly provides significant financial, material or technological support to (including engaging in or facilitating a significant transaction or transactions with) or provides significant financial services for—

(i) the Government of Syria (including government entities operating as a business enterprise) and the Central Bank of Syria, or any of its agencies or instrumentalities; or

(ii) a foreign person subject to sanctions pursuant to—

(I) the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) with respect to Syria or any other provision of law that imposes sanctions with respect to Syria; or

(II) a resolution that is agreed to by the United Nations Security Council that imposes sanctions with respect to Syria;

(B) knowingly—

(i) sells or provides significant goods, services, technology, information, or other support that directly and significantly facilitates the maintenance or expansion of the Government of Syria's domestic production of natural gas or petroleum or petroleum products of Syrian origin in areas controlled by the Government of Syria or associated forces;

(ii) sells or provides to the Government of Syria crude oil or condensate, refined petroleum products, liquefied natural gas, or petrochemical products that have a fair market value of \$500,000 or more or that during a 12-month period have an aggregate fair market value of \$2,000,000 or more in areas controlled by the Government of Syria or associated forces;

(iii) sells or provides aircraft or spare parts, or provides significant goods, services, or technologies associated with the operation of such aircraft or air carriers to any foreign person operating in areas controlled by the Government of Syria or associated forces that are used, in whole or in part, for military purposes; or

(iv) sells or provides significant goods, services, or technology to a foreign person operating in the shipping (including ports and free trade zones), transportation, or telecommunications sectors in areas controlled by the Government of Syria or associated forces;

(C) knowingly facilitates efforts by a foreign person to carry out an activity described in subparagraph (A) or (B); or

(D) knowingly provides significant loans, credits, including export credits, or financing to carry out an activity described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(c) **SANCTIONS AGAINST A FOREIGN PERSON.**—The sanctions to be imposed on a foreign person described in subsection (b) are the following:

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of the foreign person if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—

(A) **VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—An alien who the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) knows, or has reason to believe, meets any of the criteria described in subsection (a) is—

- (i) inadmissible to the United States;
- (ii) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and
- (iii) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(B) **CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The issuing consular officer, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) shall revoke any visa or other entry documentation issued to an alien who meets any of the criteria described in subsection (a) regardless of when issued.

(ii) **EFFECT OF REVOCATION.**—A revocation under clause (i)—

- (I) shall take effect immediately; and
- (II) shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(3) **EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.**—Sanctions under paragraph (2) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, be-

tween the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

(4) **PENALTIES.**—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that knowingly violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations promulgated under section 501(a) to carry out paragraph (1) of this subsection to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that knowingly commits an unlawful act described in section 206(a) of that Act.

SEC. 102. PROHIBITIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSFER OF ARMS AND RELATED MATERIALS TO SYRIA.

(a) **SANCTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning on and after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose on a foreign person the sanctions described in subsection (b) if the President determines that such foreign person, on or after such date of enactment, knowingly exports, transfers, or provides significant financial, material, or technological support to the Government of Syria to—

(A) acquire or develop chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons or related technologies;

(B) acquire or develop ballistic or cruise missile capabilities;

(C) acquire or develop destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons; or

(D) acquire defense articles, defense services, or defense information (as such terms are defined under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.)), if the President determines that a significant type or amount of such articles, services, or information has been so acquired.

(2) **APPLICABILITY TO OTHER FOREIGN PERSONS.**—The sanctions described in subsection (b) shall also be imposed on any foreign person that is a successor entity to a foreign person described in paragraph (1).

(b) **SANCTIONS AGAINST A FOREIGN PERSON.**—The sanctions to be imposed on a foreign person described in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall exercise all powers granted by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to freeze and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of the foreign person if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—

(A) **VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.**—An alien who the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) knows, or has reason to believe, meets any of the criteria described in subsection (a) is—

- (i) inadmissible to the United States;
- (ii) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and
- (iii) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(B) **CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The issuing consular officer, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) shall revoke any visa or other entry documentation issued to an alien

who meets any of the criteria described in subsection (a) regardless of when issued.

(ii) **EFFECT OF REVOCATION.**—A revocation under clause (i)—

- (I) shall take effect immediately; and
- (II) shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(3) **EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.**—Sanctions under paragraph (2) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

(4) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out this section shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

SEC. 103. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit the authority of the President pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

SEC. 104. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **ADMITTED; ALIEN.**—The terms “admitted” and “alien” have the meanings given such terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) **FINANCIAL, MATERIAL, OR TECHNOLOGICAL SUPPORT.**—The term “financial, material, or technological support” has the meaning given such term in section 542.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as such section was in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) **FOREIGN PERSON.**—The term “foreign person” means any citizen or national of a foreign country, or any entity not organized solely under the laws of the United States or existing solely in the United States.

(4) **GOVERNMENT OF SYRIA.**—The term “Government of Syria” has the meaning given such term in section 542.305 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as such section was in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(5) **KNOWINGLY.**—The term “knowingly” has the meaning given such term in section 566.312 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as such section was in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(6) **PERSON.**—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

(7) **PETROLEUM OR PETROLEUM PRODUCTS OF SYRIAN ORIGIN.**—The term “petroleum or petroleum products of Syrian origin” has the meaning given such term in section 542.314 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as such section was in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(8) **SIGNIFICANT TRANSACTION OR TRANSACTIONS; SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL SERVICES.**—A transaction or transactions or financial services shall be determined to be a significant for purposes of this section in accordance with section 566.404 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as such section was in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(9) **SYRIA.**—The term “Syria” has the meaning given such term in section 542.316 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as such

section was in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(10) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means any United States citizen, permanent resident alien, entity organized under the laws of the United States (including foreign branches), or any person in the United States.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO SYRIA HUMAN RIGHTS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2012

SEC. 201. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN PERSONS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR OR COMPLICIT IN HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES COMMITTED AGAINST CITIZENS OF SYRIA OR THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 702(c) of the Syria Human Rights Accountability Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8791(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall exercise all powers granted by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to freeze and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person on the list required by subsection (b) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(2) ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

“(A) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien who the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) knows, or has reason to believe, meets any of the criteria described in subsection (b) is—

“(i) inadmissible to the United States;

“(ii) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

“(iii) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

“(B) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The issuing consular officer, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) shall revoke any visa or other entry documentation issued to an alien who meets any of the criteria described in subsection (b) regardless of when issued.

“(ii) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—A revocation under clause (i)—

“(I) shall take effect immediately; and

“(II) shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

“(3) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of this section or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out this section shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

“(4) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The President shall, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, promulgate regulations as necessary for the implementation of this section.

“(5) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Sanctions under paragraph (2) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement re-

garding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

“(6) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), relevant Executive orders, regulations, or other provisions of law.”.

(b) SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES DESCRIBED.—Section 702 of the Syria Human Rights Accountability Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8791) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES DESCRIBED.—In subsection (b), the term ‘serious human rights abuses’ includes—

“(1) the deliberate targeting of civilian infrastructure to include schools, hospitals, markets, and other infrastructure that is essential to human life, such as power and water systems; and

“(2) the deliberate diversion, hindering, or blocking of access for humanitarian purposes, including access across conflict lines and borders.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to the imposition of sanctions under section 702(a) of the Syria Human Rights Accountability Act of 2012 on after such date of enactment.

SEC. 202. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSFER OF GOODS OR TECHNOLOGIES TO SYRIA THAT ARE LIKELY TO BE USED TO COMMIT HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.

Section 703(b)(2)(C) of the Syria Human Rights Accountability Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8792(b)(2)(C)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “or” at the end;

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) any article—

“(I) designated by the President for purposes of the United States Munitions List under section 38(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(1)); and

“(II) with respect to which the President determines is significant for purposes of the imposition of sanctions under subsection (a); or

“(iv) other goods or technologies that the President determines may be used by the Government of Syria to commit human rights abuses against the people of Syria.”.

SEC. 203. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO HINDER HUMANITARIAN ACCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Syria Human Rights Accountability Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8791 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 705 and 706 as sections 706 and 707, respectively;

(2) by inserting after section 704 the following:

“SEC. 705. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO HINDER HUMANITARIAN ACCESS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose sanctions described in section 702(c) with respect to each person on the list required by subsection (b).

“(b) LIST OF PERSONS WHO HINDER HUMANITARIAN ACCESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2017, the

President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of persons that the President determines have engaged in deliberate diversion, hindering, or blocking of access for humanitarian purposes for the United Nations, its specialized agencies and implementing partners, national and international nongovernmental organizations, and all other actors engaged in humanitarian relief activities in Syria, including through the deliberate targeting of such humanitarian actors and activities in Syria and across conflict lines and borders.

“(2) UPDATES OF LIST.—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an updated list under paragraph (1)—

“(A) not later than 300 days after the date of the enactment of the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2017 and every 180 days thereafter; and

“(B) as new information becomes available.

“(3) FORM.—The list required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.”; and

(3) in section 706 (as so redesignated), by striking “or 704” and inserting “704, or 705”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Syria Human Rights Accountability Act of 2012 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 704 the following new item:

“Sec. 705. Imposition of sanctions with respect to persons who hinder humanitarian access.”.

SEC. 204. REPORT ON CERTAIN PERSONS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR OR COMPLICIT IN CERTAIN HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN SYRIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report with respect to whether each person described in subsection (c) meets the requirements described in section 702(b) of the Syria Human Rights Accountability Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8791(b)) for purposes of inclusion on the list of persons who are responsible for or complicit in certain human rights abuses under such section.

(b) JUSTIFICATION.—The President shall include in the report required by subsection (a) a description of the reasons why any of the persons described in subsection (c) do not meet the requirements described in section 702(b) of the Syria Human Rights Accountability Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8791(b)), including information on whether sufficient credible evidence of responsibility for such abuses was found or whether any of the persons described in subsection (c) have been designated pursuant to—

(1) Executive Order 13572 of April 29, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 24787; relating to blocking property of certain persons with respect to human rights abuses in Syria);

(2) Executive Order 13573 of May 18, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 29143; relating to blocking property of senior officials of the Government of Syria);

(3) Executive Order 13582 of August 17, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 52209; relating to blocking property of the Government of Syria and prohibiting certain transactions with respect to Syria); or

(4) Executive Order 13606 of April 22, 2012 (77 Fed. Reg. 24571; relating to blocking the property and suspending entry into the United States of certain persons with respect to grave human rights abuses by the Governments of Iran and Syria via information technology).

(c) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—The persons described in this subsection are the following:

- (1) Bashar Al-Assad.
- (2) Asma Al-Assad.
- (3) Rami Makhlouf.
- (4) Bouthayna Shaaban.
- (5) Walid Moallem.
- (6) Ali Al-Salim.
- (7) Wael Nader Al-Halqi.
- (8) Jamil Hassan.
- (9) Suhail Hassan.
- (10) Ali Mamluk.
- (11) Muhammed Khadour, Deir Ez Zor Military and Security.
- (12) Jamal Razzouq, Security Branch 243.
- (13) Munzer Ghanam, Air Force Intelligence.
- (14) Daas Hasan Ali, Branch 327.
- (15) Jassem Ali Jassem Hamad, Political Security.
- (16) Samir Muhammad Youssef, Military Intelligence.
- (17) Ali Ahmad Dayoub, Air Force Intelligence.
- (18) Khaled Muhsen Al-Halabi, Security Branch 335.
- (19) Mahmoud Kahila, Political Security.
- (20) Zuhair Ahmad Hamad, Provincial Security.
- (21) Wafiq Nasser, Security Branch 245.
- (22) Qussay Mayoub, Air Force Intelligence.
- (23) Muhammad Ammar Sardini, Political Security.
- (24) Fouad Hammouda, Military Security.
- (25) Hasan Daaboul, Branch 261.
- (26) Yahia Wahbi, Air Force Intelligence.
- (27) Okab Saqer, Security Branch 318.
- (28) Husam Luqa, Political Security.
- (29) Sami Al-Hasan, Security Branch 219.
- (30) Yassir Deeb, Political Security.
- (31) Ibrahim Darwish, Security Branch 220.
- (32) Nasser Deeb, Political Security.
- (33) Abdullatif Al-Fahed, Security Branch 290.
- (34) Adeeb Namer Salamah, Air Force Intelligence.
- (35) Akram Muhammed, State Security.
- (36) Reyad Abbas, Political Security.
- (37) Ali Abdullah Ayoub, Syrian Armed Forces.
- (38) Fahd Jassem Al-Freij, Defense Ministry.
- (39) Issam Halaq, Air Force.
- (40) Ghassan Al-Abdullah, General Intelligence Directorate.
- (41) Maher Al-Assad, Republican Guard.
- (42) Fahad Al-Farouch.
- (43) Rafiq Shahada, Military Intelligence.
- (44) Loay Al-Ali, Military Intelligence.
- (45) Nawfal Al-Husayn, Military Intelligence.
- (46) Muhammad Zamrini, Military Intelligence.
- (47) Muhammad Mahallah, Military Intelligence.

(d) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary.

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

- (1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and
- (2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

TITLE III—REPORTS AND WAIVER FOR HUMANITARIAN-RELATED ACTIVITIES WITH RESPECT TO SYRIA

SEC. 301. BRIEFING ON MONITORING AND EVALUATING OF ONGOING ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN SYRIA AND TO THE SYRIAN PEOPLE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall brief the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on the monitoring and evaluation of ongoing assistance programs in Syria and for the Syrian people, including assistance provided through multilateral organizations.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The briefing required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the specific project monitoring and evaluation efforts, including measurable goals and performance metrics for assistance in Syria;

(2) a description of the memoranda of understanding entered into by the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and their respective Inspectors General and the multilateral organizations through which United States assistance will be delivered that formalize requirements for the sharing of information between such entities for the conduct of audits, investigations, and evaluations; and

(3) the major challenges to monitoring and evaluating such programs.

SEC. 302. ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL METHODS TO ENHANCE THE PROTECTION OF CIVILIANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(1) assesses the potential effectiveness, risks, and operational requirements of the establishment and maintenance of a no-fly zone over part or all of Syria, including—

(A) the operational and legal requirements for United States and coalition air power to establish a no-fly zone in Syria;

(B) the impact a no-fly zone in Syria would have on humanitarian and counterterrorism efforts in Syria and the surrounding region; and

(C) the potential for force contributions from other countries to establish a no-fly zone in Syria;

(2) assesses the potential effectiveness, risks, and operational requirements for the establishment of one or more safe zones in Syria for internally displaced persons or for the facilitation of humanitarian assistance, including—

(A) the operational and legal requirements for United States and coalition forces to establish one or more safe zones in Syria;

(B) the impact one or more safe zones in Syria would have on humanitarian and counterterrorism efforts in Syria and the surrounding region; and

(C) the potential for contributions from other countries and vetted non-state actor partners to establish and maintain one or more safe zones in Syria;

(3) assesses the potential effectiveness, risks, and operational requirements of other non-military means to enhance the protection of civilians, especially civilians who are in besieged areas, trapped at borders, or internally displaced; and

(4) describes the Administration's plan for recruitment, training, and retention of partner forces, including—

(A) identification of the United States partner forces operating on the ground;

(B) the primary source of strength for each armed actor engaged in hostilities;

(C) the capabilities, requirements, and vulnerabilities of each armed actor;

(D) the United States role in mitigating vulnerabilities of partner forces; and

(E) the Administration's measures of success for partner forces, including—

(i) increasing Syrian civilian security; and

(ii) working toward an end to the conflict in Syria.

(b) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be informed by consultations with the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of Defense, and international and local organizations operating in Syria or in neighboring countries to alleviate the suffering of the Syrian people.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

SEC. 303. ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT ENTITIES TAKING ACTIONS RELATING TO GATHERING EVIDENCE FOR INVESTIGATIONS INTO WAR CRIMES OR CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY IN SYRIA SINCE MARCH 2011.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor and the Assistant Secretary for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, is authorized to provide assistance to support entities that are conducting criminal investigations, building Syrian investigative capacity, supporting prosecutions in national courts, collecting evidence and preserving the chain of evidence for eventual prosecution against those who have committed war crimes or crimes against humanity in Syria, including the aiding and abetting of such crimes by foreign governments and organizations supporting the Government of Syria, since March 2011.

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall brief the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on assistance provided under subsection (a).

TITLE IV—SUSPENSION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO SYRIA

SEC. 401. SUSPENSION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO SYRIA.

(a) SUSPENSION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) NEGOTIATIONS NOT CONCLUDING IN AGREEMENT.—If the President determines that internationally recognized negotiations to resolve the violence in Syria have not concluded in an agreement or are likely not to conclude in an agreement, the President may suspend, as appropriate, in whole or in part, the imposition of sanctions otherwise required under this Act or any amendment made by this Act for a period not to exceed 120 days, and renewable for additional periods not to exceed 120 days, if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees in writing a determination and

certification that the Government of Syria has ended military attacks against and gross violations of the human rights of the Syrian people, specifically—

(A) the air space over Syria is no longer being utilized by the Government of Syria and associated forces to target civilian populations through the use of incendiary devices, including barrel bombs, chemical weapons, and conventional arms, including air-delivered missiles and explosives;

(B) areas besieged by the Assad regime and associated forces, including Hezbollah and irregular Iranian forces, are no longer cut off from international aid and have regular access to humanitarian assistance, freedom of travel, and medical care;

(C) the Government of Syria is releasing all political prisoners forcibly held within the Assad regime prison system, including the facilities maintained by various security, intelligence, and military elements associated with the Government of Syria and allowed full access to the same facilities for investigations by appropriate international human rights organizations; and

(D) the forces of the Government of Syria and associated forces, including Hezbollah, irregular Iranian forces, and Russian government air assets, are no longer engaged in deliberate targeting of medical facilities, schools, residential areas, and community gathering places, including markets, in flagrant violation of international norms.

(2) NEGOTIATIONS CONCLUDING IN AGREEMENT.—

(A) INITIAL SUSPENSION OF SANCTIONS.—If the President determines that internationally recognized negotiations to resolve the violence in Syria have concluded in an agreement or are likely to conclude in an agreement, the President may suspend, as appropriate, in whole or in part, the imposition of sanctions otherwise required under this Act or any amendment made by this Act for a period not to exceed 120 days if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees in writing a determination and certification that—

(i) in the case in which the negotiations are likely to conclude in an agreement—

(I) the Government of Syria, the Syrian High Negotiations Committee or its internationally-recognized successor, and appropriate international parties are participating in direct, face-to-face negotiations; and

(II) the suspension of sanctions under this Act or any amendment made by this Act is essential to the advancement of such negotiations; and

(ii) the Government of Syria has demonstrated a commitment to a significant and substantial reduction in attacks on and violence against the Syrian people by the Government of Syria and associated forces.

(B) RENEWAL OF SUSPENSION OF SANCTIONS.—The President may renew a suspension of sanctions under subparagraph (A) for additional periods not to exceed 120 days if, for each such additional period, the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees in writing a determination and certification that—

(i) the conditions described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) are continuing to be met;

(ii) the renewal of the suspension of sanctions is essential to implementing an agreement described in subparagraph (A) or making progress toward concluding an agreement described in subparagraph (A);

(iii) the Government of Syria and associated forces have ceased attacks against Syrian civilians; and

(iv) the Government of Syria has publicly committed to negotiations for a transitional government in Syria and continues to demonstrate that commitment through sustained engagement in talks and substantive and verifiable progress towards the implementation of such an agreement.

(3) BRIEFING AND REIMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(A) BRIEFING.—Not later than 30 days after the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a determination and certification in the case of a renewal of suspension of sanctions under paragraph (2)(B), and every 30 days thereafter, the President shall provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees on the status and frequency of negotiations described in paragraph (2).

(B) RE-IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—If the President provides a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees under subparagraph (A) with respect to which the President indicates a lapse in negotiations described in paragraph (2) for a period that equals or exceeds 90 days, the sanctions that were suspended under paragraph (2)(B) shall be re-imposed and any further suspension of such sanctions is prohibited.

(4) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR DETERMINING A TRANSITIONAL GOVERNMENT IN SYRIA.—It is the sense of Congress that a transitional government in Syria is a government that—

(1) is taking verifiable steps to release all political prisoners and is providing full access to Syrian prisons for investigations by appropriate international human rights organizations;

(2) is taking verifiable steps to remove former senior Syrian Government officials who are complicit in the conception, implementation, or cover up of war crimes, crimes against humanity, or human rights abuses and any person subject to sanctions under any provision of law from government positions;

(3) is in the process of organizing free and fair elections for a new government—

(A) to be held in a timely manner and scheduled while the suspension of sanctions or the renewal of the suspension of sanctions under this section is in effect; and

(B) to be conducted under the supervision of internationally recognized observers;

(4) is making tangible progress toward establishing an independent judiciary;

(5) is demonstrating respect for and compliance with internationally recognized human rights and basic freedoms as specified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

(6) is taking steps to verifiably fulfill its commitments under the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and is making tangible progress toward becoming a signatory to Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction, entered into

force March 26, 1975, and adhering to the Missile Technology Control Regime and other control lists, as necessary;

(7) has halted the development and deployment of ballistic and cruise missiles; and

(8) is taking verifiable steps to remove from positions of authority within the intelligence and security services as well as the military those who were in a position of authority or responsibility during the conflict and who under the authority of their position were implicated in or implicit in the torture, extrajudicial killing, or execution of civilians, to include those who were involved in decisionmaking or execution of plans to use chemical weapons.

SEC. 402. WAIVERS AND EXEMPTIONS.

(a) EXEMPTIONS.—The following activities and transactions shall be exempt from sanctions authorized under this Act or any amendment made by this Act:

(1) Any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.), or to any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) Any transaction necessary to comply with United States obligations under—

(A) the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947;

(B) the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967; or

(C) any other international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(b) HUMANITARIAN, STABILIZATION, AND DEMOCRACY ASSISTANCE WAIVER.—

(1) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to fully utilize the waiver authority under this subsection to ensure that adequate humanitarian relief or support for stabilization and democracy promotion is provided to the Syrian people.

(2) WAIVER.—Except as provided in paragraph (5) and subsection (d), the President may waive, on a case-by-case basis, for a period not to exceed one year, and renewable for additional periods not to exceed one year, the application of sanctions authorized under this Act with respect to a person if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a written determination that the waiver is necessary for purposes of providing humanitarian or stabilization assistance or support for democracy promotion to the people of Syria.

(3) CONTENT OF WRITTEN DETERMINATION.—A written determination submitted under paragraph (2) with respect to a waiver shall include a description of all notification and accountability controls that have been employed in order to ensure that the activities covered by the waiver are humanitarian or stabilization assistance or support for democracy promotion and do not entail any activities in Syria or dealings with the Government of Syria not reasonably related to humanitarian or stabilization assistance or support for democracy promotion.

(4) CLARIFICATION OF PERMITTED ACTIVITIES UNDER WAIVER.—The President may not impose sanctions authorized under this Act against a humanitarian organization for—

(A) engaging in a financial transaction relating to humanitarian assistance or for humanitarian purposes pursuant to a waiver issued under paragraph (2);

(B) transporting goods or services that are necessary to carry out operations relating to humanitarian assistance or humanitarian purposes pursuant to such a waiver; or

(C) having incidental contact, in the course of providing humanitarian assistance or aid for humanitarian purposes pursuant to such a waiver, with individuals who are under the control of a foreign person subject to sanctions under this Act or any amendment made by this Act unless the organization or its officers, members, representatives or employees have engaged in (or the President knows or has reasonable ground to believe is engaged in or is likely to engage in) conduct described in section 212(a)(3)(B)(iv)(VI) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(iv)(VI)).

(5) **EXCEPTION TO WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—The President may not exercise the waiver authority under paragraph (2) with respect to a foreign person who has (or whose officers, members, representatives or employees have) engaged in (or the President knows or has reasonable ground to believe is engaged in or is likely to engage in) conduct described in section 212(a)(3)(B)(iv)(VI) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(iv)(VI)).

(c) **WAIVER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may, for periods not to exceed 120 days, waive the application of sanctions under this Act with respect to a foreign person if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such waiver is vital to the national security interests of the United States.

(2) **CONSULTATION.**—

(A) **BEFORE WAIVER ISSUED.**—Not later than 5 days before the issuance of a waiver under paragraph (1) is to take effect, the President shall notify and brief the appropriate congressional committees on the status of the foreign person's involvement in activities described in this Act.

(B) **AFTER WAIVER ISSUED.**—Not later than 90 days after the issuance of a waiver under paragraph (1), and every 120 days thereafter if the waiver remains in effect, the President shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the status of the foreign person's involvement in activities described in this Act.

(3) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

(d) **CODIFICATION OF CERTAIN SERVICES IN SUPPORT OF NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS' ACTIVITIES AUTHORIZED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), section 542.516 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to certain services in support of nongovernmental organizations' activities authorized), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall—

(A) remain in effect on and after such date of enactment; and

(B) in the case of a nongovernmental organization that is authorized to export or reexport services to Syria under such section on the day before such date of enactment, shall apply to such organization on and after such date of enactment to the same extent and in the same manner as such section applied to such organization on the day before such date of enactment.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Section 542.516 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as codified under paragraph (1), shall not apply with respect to a foreign person who has (or whose officers, members, representatives or employees have) engaged in (or the President knows or has reasonable ground to believe is engaged in or is likely to engage in) conduct described in section 212(a)(3)(B)(iv)(VI) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(iv)(VI)).

(e) **STRATEGY REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing a strategy to ensure that humanitarian organizations can access financial services to ensure the safe and timely delivery of assistance to communities in need in Syria.

(2) **CONSIDERATION OF DATA FROM OTHER COUNTRIES AND NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.**—In preparing the strategy required by paragraph (1), the President shall consider credible data already obtained by other countries and nongovernmental organizations, including organizations operating in Syria.

(3) **FORM.**—The strategy required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

TITLE V—REGULATORY AUTHORITY, COST LIMITATION, AND SUNSET

SEC. 501. IMPLEMENTATION AND REGULATORY AUTHORITIES.

(a) **IMPLEMENTATION AUTHORITY.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) for purposes of carrying out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) **REGULATORY AUTHORITY.**—The President shall, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations as necessary for the implementation of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(c) **BRIEFING TO CONGRESS.**—Not less than 10 days before the promulgation of regulations under subsection (a), the President shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the proposed regulations and the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act that the regulations are implementing.

(d) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 502. COST LIMITATION.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

SEC. 503. AUTHORITY TO CONSOLIDATE REPORTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Any reports required to be submitted to the appropriate congressional committees under this Act or any amendment made by this Act that are subject to a deadline for submission consisting of the same unit of time may be consolidated into a single report that is submitted to appropriate congressional committees pursuant to such deadline. The consolidated reports shall contain all information required

under this Act or any amendment made by this Act, in addition to all other elements mandated by previous law.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 504. SUNSET.

This Act shall cease to be effective beginning on December 31, 2021.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by commending the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the ranking member, for his leadership in authoring this critical legislation. Mr. ENGEL has long been the voice on Syria, and I must mention that the outline that he has given in terms of the initial problems when we saw those citizens on the streets of Damascus, walking, saying, “Peaceful, peaceful,” and then, as we saw on CNN, the automatic weapons open up and saw the Assad regime mow those civilians down—he was the first to begin to ring the alarm. I wish this body, and previous administrations as well, had done more to heed his calls.

For 6 years, we have watched the Syrian regime launch wave after wave of unrelenting destruction on the people of Syria. Airstrikes, chemical weapons attacks, forced starvation, industrial-scale torture, the deliberate targeting of hospitals, schools, marketplaces, and this done with precision bombs and with crude barrel bombs, and, as a consequence, Syrians suffering every day.

Now, just last month, we saw footage of entire families killed, suffocated by sarin gas, a chemical weapon that Assad supposedly gave up under a deal brokered by Russia and the previous administration. The number of dead is estimated now to be close to 500,000, and another 14 million have been driven from their homes.

And while ISIS plays a role in the violence in Syria, it is Bashar al-Assad and his backers—among them, Russia, Iran, and Hezbollah—who are the main drivers of this death and destruction.

ISIS has no airplanes. It is Russian and Syrian fighter planes and helicopters that drop those bombs on those hospitals and schools.

It is Hezbollah and Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps fighters who attack cities, who burn crops, who prevent food and water and medical supplies from reaching vulnerable civilians.

It is Assad's secret police and intelligence groups who kidnap and torture and murder civilians from every ethnic group and political party, Sunni, Shia, Christians, Alawite; none are safe.

One of the worst facilities is just 20 miles from Damascus, Sednaya, a prison, a place so terrible that it is called a human slaughterhouse. Thousands and thousands of people have been tortured and hung and shot and left to starve to death within the prison. And the numbers are so high that, in 2013, Assad began constructing a crematorium to dispose of the bodies.

Over the past 4 years, our committee heard agonizing testimony from Syrians caught up in this horror, including the brave Syrian defector known to the world as Caesar and for whom this bill is named. Caesar testified about the shocking scale of torture being carried out within the prisons of Syria.

We saw his photographs and the tens of thousands of photographs he took with those bodies numbered numerically. I don't know what it is about totalitarian regimes that leads them to want to number their dead and catalog it, but, because of his bravery, we have those photographs.

We have also heard from doctors who treat victims of chemical attacks, volunteers who dig through rubble with their bare hands to rescue those trapped within, and we have heard from the survivors of torture in Assad's prisons.

As Syria drags on and on, vital U.S. national security interests are at stake. Assad's brutality is both a magnet for terrorist recruitment and a destabilizing force driving tens of millions of refugees out of that country. We have 14 million Syrians, as I said, who are displaced right now, many of them still in the country, and millions outside of the country, yet we have taken no steps to apply the economic tools that are available to us with respect to Assad and his backers.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed to increase the cost to Assad and to those outside backers by targeting the sectors of the economy that allow Assad to murder with impunity. Under the bill, foreign companies and banks will have to choose between doing business with the regime or with the United States. It would also sanction anyone who flies weapons or sends fighters into Syria to support the Assad regime.

This bill is also about creating economic leverage to push the parties to

negotiate, creating the conditions for a negotiated peace. It is about finding a way forward to be determined by the Syrian people that does not allow Assad to exterminate his own community; it does not allow him to do it with impunity; does not guarantee ISIS a safe space from which to operate; and does not drive another 10 million people from their homes.

For there to be peace in Syria, the parties must come together, and so long as Assad and his backers can slaughter the people of Syria with no consequences, there is no hope for peace.

As we speak, Russia and Iran have proclaimed themselves the guarantors of peace and have promised to create de-escalation zones where military operations can be curtailed and civilians can seek safety. But these zones would be policed by the Syrian Army, supported by Russian military police, by Hezbollah fighters, and IRGC, Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps commanders, backed by those Shia militias—the very same people who have murdered thousands of Syrian civilians with impunity throughout this conflict and who are actively engaged in fomenting sectarian-based violence throughout the region. With this scenario, peace does not have a chance.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is long overdue. And last year, ELIOT ENGEL and I brought this up, and we passed it unanimously, yet the other body did not take it up before we adjourned.

I urge all Members to support this legislation as we seek to ease the suffering of the Syrian people.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, April 20, 2017.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I write with respect to H.R. 1677, the "Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act." As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions within H.R. 1677 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I forego any further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1677 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1677 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be in-

cluded in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1677.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, April 24, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee on agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1677, the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1677 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2017.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing concerning H.R. 1677, the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2017.

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions in the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forgo action on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1677 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1677 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be placed in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2017.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1677, the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1677 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2017.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing with respect to H.R. 1677, the "Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2017." As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions on which the Committee on Ways and Means has a jurisdictional interest, I will not request a sequential referral on this measure.

The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1677.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2017.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee on H.R. 1677, the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2017, and for agreeing to forgo a sequential referral request so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your declining to pursue a sequential referral in this case does not diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on this bill into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on Ways and Means as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful that the House is considering my bill today, the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act.

I want to thank my friend, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, ED ROYCE, for joining as the lead Republican cosponsor of this measure. I am proud that we are bringing it up to the floor with 108 cosponsors, Members from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, every week, more and more bad news pours in about the civil war in Syria. I am grateful to Chairman ROYCE for making the comments he just made because my heart has been bleeding for Syria, or crying out for Syria, for 4 or 5 years now, ever since, as Mr. ROYCE said, there were peaceful demonstrations and they were mowed down by the Assad regime.

The United States didn't do much. We sort of watched and retreated and perhaps were afraid that we would be bogged down in another war. But we should have, at that point, in my estimation, helped the free Syria Army, which begged us for help, not people, not troops, but help, and we didn't do it. We didn't give it to them.

We thought that Assad would fall on his own, ultimately, but he didn't, and we are bearing the price today. We are paying the price today. The people of Syria, unfortunately, are the ones paying the price. Millions of people have died and have been misplaced and just the horrors of war and the horrors of civilians. So my heart really bleeds for the Syrian people.

This week, it was the revelation of a crematorium, a furnace where the criminals who do Assad's bidding can pile the bodies and try to burn away the evidence of their atrocities.

Also this week, Russia announced that they will work with Iran, Iraq, and Assad to open a secure road from Baghdad to Damascus. What that really means, Mr. Speaker, is a road from Beirut to Tehran in Iran, a permanent Iranian foothold right in the Middle East, a permanent Iranian foothold

right on Israel's border, a permanent Iranian foothold to do mischief and the usual nefarious things that the Iranian Government does.

This crisis has been burning out of control for six long years. I was an early vocal supporter, as I mentioned before, of arming the moderate Syrian opposition. I thought we should have done much more to help push Assad out of power and help the Syrian people chart the course for their country's future. When we didn't, I spoke out.

Since then, Assad has plowed ahead with his campaign of carnage. The few times he appeared to be taking on water, he was given a lifeline by his devoted enablers, Russia and Iran, through its terrorist proxy, Hezbollah. Every time Assad seemed to be losing, he was given a lifeline and, as I just mentioned, by Hezbollah, also given a lifeline by the Russians who came in.

So while it was suspected in the highest annals of Washington that Assad wouldn't last more than a few months, no one would have imagined that 4 and 5 years later there would be Assad winning the war, again, with the help of Russia, Iran, and their terrorist proxy.

It is a disgrace, Mr. Speaker, and we need to act out. We need to help.

Today, we find ourselves no closer to a solution, and 4 months into the new administration, we have yet to hear a strategy for dealing with Syria. The Tomahawk missile strike last month was an appropriate response to the chemical weapons attack, although I believe the administration's policy shift, with respect to Assad, emboldened Assad to launch that attack, and a single missile strike is not a strategy.

We need a plan to stop the violence, push a political transition that sees the end of Assad's rule and helps the Syrian people recover and move forward. My bill, this bill, would be part of that strategy.

□ 1715

It is named, as Mr. ROYCE pointed out, for Caesar, a former Syrian Government photographer. Fed up with documenting the brutality of the Assad regime, he defected and escaped so he could show the world exactly what was happening to the regime's victims.

I will never forget the images he showed us when he came to the Foreign Affairs Committee. Those images are still seared in my brain and I will never forget them; the depth of brutality and indifference to human life.

We have named this bill after him because we want to send a message. If you are supporting this murder, if you are enabling the butcher in Damascus to continue waging that sort of violence against his own people, you are going to face consequences.

This bill would sanction anyone who provides material support for the Assad regime. We want to go after the actual

hardware that keeps his war machine running, the planes and bombs that terrorize the Syrian people, and the spare parts and oil that keep everything running. If you do business with Assad, the blood of the Syrian people is on your hands and you are going to get caught up in these sanctions. Yes, that means Iran and Russia.

If conditions on the ground change and negotiations were in sight, it might be useful to dial back these sanctions in order to help end the violence. So we have built in some degree of flexibility. The measures are tough, but we all want them to be a roadblock to peace.

This bill also seeks to provide some relief to the Syrian people who are now suffering terribly. It would improve oversight of assistance flowing into Syria and evaluate the feasibility of a no-fly zone.

We also need to think about what must happen after the violence has ended, about who must be held accountable. So this bill requires reporting on human rights violators, and would support efforts to gather evidence of crimes against humanity. This bill isn't a silver bullet. It isn't a strategy for resolving the crisis in Syria.

Congress can do a lot, though, when it comes to foreign policy. We can give an administration tools and resources, but it is up to the White House to lead on this issue. If the first step in a serious strategy is stopping the violence—and I think it is—this legislation can help dial up pressure on those driving the war.

So I continue to push ahead; Mr. ROYCE at my side, and I am grateful to my colleagues for their support. I am grateful to the Foreign Affairs Committee for moving this swiftly.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and an Air Force pilot.

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the chairman. I want to commend Mr. ENGEL for his foresight in this bill and for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I was just recently in Auschwitz. It was my first visit to Auschwitz and, obviously, seeing something like that is not something you are going to forget very quickly. Seeing something like that and an industrial machine put together to eliminate people is not something that people thought humanity was capable of until they found out that it actually was possible.

So in preserving Auschwitz, the purpose was to say: Hey, this is possible. Never forget that this can happen again.

Mr. Speaker, it was just recently that we learned about the crematorium that was built in the Syrian prison.

Now, why was this built?

It was built to hide the massive amounts of bodies coming out, tortured to death; destroyed the lives cut short in this Syrian prison. It was used to disguise that. It was used to prevent mass graves from being dug.

I think that proves that Bashar al-Assad is actually a modern-day Hitler. In fact, if you look at when, as was mentioned prior, Caesar came to our committee and showed us the images of brutality—the government cataloging the victims of the Syrian regime with markers written on the body, a numbering system, and a catalog to say, in essence, document these massive amounts of death—it became very clear to us in a very visual sense what was going on in Syria.

Mr. Speaker, oftentimes it is easy in the United States of America, where we have a lot of comforts and we have a lot of things granted to us that we take for granted, to look at a situation happening overseas and think it doesn't apply to us or doesn't affect us; and it is really tempting sometimes to get into that because it is easy sometimes to pretend something doesn't affect us. But it does.

We see the massive amounts of migration from Syria, the young 7-, 8-, and 9-year-olds who are not going to school now because they have been disrupted and their lives have been disrupted, and in 5 or 6 years, if they don't get an education and don't get hope and opportunity, they will provide now the next recruiting ground for ISIS, or ISIS two, or al-Qaida three, because people without hope and without opportunity are easy to bring into a terrorist ideology like those.

Mr. Speaker, the President rightly decided to enforce the red line in Syria when it came to the use of chemical weapons—something that the Western world has held very dear, that chemical weapons on the battlefield have no place—and he destroyed a Syrian airfield. It was the right move. It began to shift the balance of power in Syria, but way more needs to be done.

I have called for action in Syria, as many on this committee have for a very long time, and this, the Caesar bill, is a fantastic first step to doing it. It would increase sanctions on the Assad regime and its supporters for continued atrocities committed against the Syrian people. It requires this administration and any future administration to stand up and impose costs on the Russians, on the Iranians, and on the Syrian backers for the barrel bombing and gassing of innocent civilians.

Think about that, a barrel filled with explosives dropped indiscriminately on a population center intended to commit the largest amounts of casualties possible; a GPS-guided bomb, or a laser-guided bomb intentionally dropped into a hospital, and then a

delay of 20 minutes so they can hit it again, or hit areas where first responders have responded to.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't a legitimate way of fighting war, if there is a legitimate way of fighting war. This is brutality to the top level, and this is a great step for this Congress to take. We unanimously passed this the last time. I sure hope we can do that again.

Again, I thank the leadership for leading on this. I thank Mr. ENGEL and Chairman ROYCE for their leadership.

I ask my colleagues to join me and join us in supporting this very important bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip, someone who I know, through our meetings, feels so strongly about this and feels as we do.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York, the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee for yielding. I thank Mr. KINZINGER for his leadership as well as his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan legislation, which will impose tough sanctions on entities aiding the Assad regime in Syria.

Bashar al-Assad is brutal murderer. Very frankly, there are too many countries facilitating and complicit in the murders that he perpetrates. He has gassed his own people and waged a civil war that has displaced millions from their homes and their country.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of meeting some of the White Helmet civil defense workers who are risking their lives daily to rescue civilians caught in the crossfire and targeted by government forces; facilitated, I might say, by Mr. Putin's troops in Syria.

The Assad regime is being propped up by Iran and Russia in a dangerous and destabilizing geopolitical game. There are reports that the Assad government is now cremating victims of mass murder in an attempt to hide the evidence of its numerous crimes. While this is taking place, Americans watched in disbelief; frankly, as President Trump met in the Oval Office with those who are protecting, aiding and abetting Bashar al-Assad and those committing atrocities by his command and in his name.

Not only does that show how little this President understands about the conflict in Syria and its broader complexities, it also reminds us that he has articulated no clear strategy on how to end that conflict and to defeat ISIS.

Having said that, let me congratulate the President for taking the actions against the airfield after the chemical attack. But, frankly, that was a significant, but small, step.

The continuation of the war that the Assad government is waging against its

own people only makes it harder to defeat the terrorists who threaten America, the region, and the world. Today's legislation will help address this problem.

I see on the floor, my friend, Chairman ROYCE, who is a great leader on issues relating to our foreign policy and to human rights. I congratulate him for his leadership. Working with his partner, Mr. ENGEL, we have taken significant steps to raise both the moral and the foreign policy issues that need to be raised. The efforts are bipartisan and reflect hard work on the part of the ranking member, the chairman, as well as members of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I thank them for their efforts, and I urge my colleagues to join in strong and, hopefully, unanimous support of this important resolution.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE again for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL's Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act, H.R. 1677, of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor, and I commend him and the chairman for all of their hard work in authoring the bill and bringing it before us today.

During our committee's hearing on Syria in April—and we have had so many hearings—one of our witnesses made a point that I think bears repeating, a point that highlights the importance of the ranking member's bill before us today. As long as Assad remains in power, there is very little chance that we will be able to defeat ISIS or its offshoots because Assad, in many ways, has facilitated the growth of the very jihadist groups for which he claims are protecting Syria. Hogwash.

As we talk about how to stop the slaughter in Syria, we must remember that no one bears more responsibility for that slaughter than Assad. He and his regime are the ones dropping barrel bombs. They are the ones unleashing chemical weapons on their own people. And if we want to have any chance of stopping the bloodbath, of defeating ISIS, or of putting an end to the immense humanitarian challenges spreading throughout the region and beyond, we must put a stop to Assad.

This bill ratchets up the pressure on Assad and his collaborators, especially his main allies—Russia and Iran—while expanding on the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act, a bill which I authored and which became law in 2012. It gives the administration new tools to go after individuals and entities working with Assad in the finance, aircraft, transportation,

telecom, and energy sectors, as well as it gives them the tools to target individuals complicit in human rights abuses.

I am glad to have worked with the ranking member and our esteemed chairman to include my amendments in this bill, amendments that would determine that denying or hindering access to humanitarian aid is a serious human rights violation, and, as such, it would allow the administration to sanction any individual responsible for doing so.

All of these tools, Mr. Speaker, are vital components of doing something that we still desperately need in Syria: a comprehensive, holistic strategy that looks beyond short-term tactical successes and, instead, targets the foundation of so many of the problems ripping through the region.

If we continue to narrowly focus on ISIS without getting at the root of the Syrian conflict—Assad, Russia, and Iran—then we will only be treating the symptoms instead of the disease.

□ 1730

If we are to have any hope of finding a solution in Syria, the kind of pressure that this bill would achieve is an essential piece of that puzzle.

I offer my full support for this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I certainly add my voice to that of my colleagues in support of this important legislation. Syria is a mess. It does affect all of us, as Mr. KINZINGER said, whether we like it or not. It is destabilizing the entire region. I believe this bill can be a useful tool in our diplomatic efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), my friend and colleague.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair and ranking member for their great leadership.

Mr. Speaker, imagine a mother crying in despair while holding her child in her arms, a child who is gasping for his last breath, an innocent victim of a barrel bomb filled with sarin gas dropped on his school.

The situation in Syria is the worst humanitarian crisis since World War II. President Assad's brutal regime has killed half a million innocent victims and displaced 14 million more, with millions fleeing into Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, and over Europe, straining their resources, threatening regional stability, weakening European institutions, and undermining United States economic and security interests.

We must hold Assad and his supporters responsible for their atrocities. American leadership is needed more

now than ever. I urge my colleagues to support the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that one day we will look back and we will ask: Why did we not do more?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) has reclaimed the time from the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2017.

Since 2011, the Assad regime's forces have killed an estimated 500,000 people, mostly civilians, by unconscionably targeting and attacking major population centers. According to Human Rights Watch, last month, the Syrian regime used a nerve agent in northwest Syria that killed at least 92 people, including 30 children.

Even more heartbreaking is the fact that this was not the first chemical weapons attack by the Syrian Government against its own people. To the contrary, reports suggest that the Assad regime's use of chemical weapons has become "widespread and systematic," and it has dropped bombs with nerve agents on at least four other occasions since December 12.

Just yesterday, our own State Department revealed that the Syrian regime is actively using a large crematorium to dispose of the remains of thousands of Syrian men, women, and children, whom they continue to slaughter.

Not only has the Syrian Government become a source of such crimes against humanity, but Syria has also indisputably become a hotbed for terrorist activity, propped up by Iran, Russia, and Hezbollah. Both ISIS and al-Qaida are operating near the Syria-Israel border, putting the Jewish State of Israel and our regional security in grave danger.

As a mother and a Jew, I cannot turn my cheek to this unadulterated evil. As a Member of the United States Congress, I have a duty to keep the American people safe and hold the Assad regime accountable for its war crimes and brutality. That is why I strongly support this critical legislation, and I thank Ranking Member ENGEL for all of his hard work in sponsoring it.

This bipartisan legislation would expand sanctions on those individuals who commit such monstrous acts of violence and inflict such extreme suffering upon innocent Syrians. It would ensure that the United States has the tools it needs to reach its ultimate goal of ending the Assad regime's campaign of carnage once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this important legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard both sides simply agree. This is as bipartisan as you can get. It is as unanimous, hopefully, as you can get.

Six years into the Syrian civil war, with hundreds of thousands dead and millions more driven from their homes, we cannot waste time looking backward or just simply placing blame. We need to face the reality of this crisis today and do all we can to forge a new strategy to deal with it.

Three, four, five years ago, no one would have imagined that Assad would still be clinging to power over more and more deaths of his own people. We need to find a way to push for an end to the violence and bring about a political resolution that gets Assad out of power. By the way, that is going to be harder to do because the Russians and Ukrainians are really backing him.

Let's allow the Syrian people to start their long journey forward. This legislation will help us meet that challenge. It will impose a new cost on those who so far have aided the Assad regime with impunity. It will apply new pressure to the regime, which relies on the patronage of its enablers in Moscow. It will signal to the Syrian people that we share a vision of a future in which they make the decisions and Assad has no role.

The bill passed the House unanimously a year ago. I am hopeful we will soon pass it in a little while again overwhelmingly. I urge the other body to act on it without delay so we can get it to the President's desk.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to once again recognize the work of Ranking Member ENGEL and the other committee members who have contributed to this bill.

Our committee has heard the firsthand accounts of the suffering. We heard the testimony from Raed Saleh of the Syrian White Helmets as he spoke of their efforts to rescue and treat those who were killed and injured in Assad's brutal air assaults. When the bombs come in, as they often do, his organization, which was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize, runs toward those shelters being destroyed to provide relief for the victims and to pull them out.

We have heard of the terror. More than a year ago, Dr. Mohamed Tennari of the Syrian American Medical Society described for the committee the sound of helicopters overhead, the thump of exploding bombs, and the overpowering smell of bleach in the

air. This brave doctor described the horrendous effects this toxic gas has on the human body and the slow, agonizing deaths as the chlorine gas turned to hydrochloric acid in the lungs of victims.

Many of those victims he spoke of were children. They were targeted by the regime. People were targeted as they slept in their beds in their neighborhoods. Just a few weeks ago, one family lost 20 relatives in a single sarin gas attack. Of the 92 victims of that attack on that day, 23 were children.

Mr. Speaker, in 2016, efforts to establish a lasting cease-fire failed, resulting in an aggressive campaign by Syrian and Russian air assets against eastern Aleppo. U.N. officials described that assault as “crimes of historic proportions.”

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1677 “Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2017.”

This bill, introduced by my colleague, Foreign Affairs Committee Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL, uses sanctions to put pressure on the Syrian government and anyone supporting it to stop committing war crimes against humanity.

I support this legislation for its important and necessary purpose to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, encourage a negotiated political settlement, and hold Syrian human rights abusers accountable for their crimes.

The Syrian government, empowered with support from Iran and Russia, has pursued a strategy of targeting civilians to eliminate any opposition to its rule, including arresting anyone who opposes it.

The Syrian Observatory for Human Rights has reported the deaths of 60,000 people in prisons since the start of the conflict.

The Syrian government is the main aggressor in a conflict that has resulted in at least 400,000 dead and 14 million Syrians displaced; between 2011 and 2015, the Syrian Network for Human Rights attributed 96 percent of civilian deaths to the Syrian regime.

Additionally, President Bashar al-Assad has blocked United Nations humanitarian aid from reaching the intended recipients.

Who is Caesar? Caesar, who uses the pseudonym to remain anonymous as a way to protect his family, defected from the Syrian military in 2013.

He worked as a crime scene photographer for the Assad government after joining the military, years before the current conflict began.

As the conflict escalated, so did the number of bodies he would photograph each day.

Photographing the torture and rising death began to change his attitude towards the regime and in 2013, with help from the opposition, he faked his own death and defected from the Syrian military.

When he fled in August 2013, Caesar had collected over 53,000 photographs of detainees who had been tortured and killed.

He handed these photographs over to an anti-government political group, the Syrian Na-

tional Movement, who then distributed the photographs to other groups, including Human Rights Watch (HRW).

With these photographs, HRW “found evidence of widespread torture, starvation, beatings, and disease in Syrian government detention facilities.”

With the conflict in Syria in its fifth year, the U.S. House of Representatives introduced a bill intended to punish the Assad regime and its supporters and based it on both Caesar's photographs and his testimony in front of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs this past July.

The photographs and testimony show a clear connection between the reported human rights violations and the Assad government, legitimizing the bill and giving clear evidence to the international courts if President Assad stands trial for international war crimes.

H.R. 1677 is intended to sanction both the Syrian regime and any actors, what the bill refers to as a “foreign person,” who support its human rights violations by imposing sanctions on them.

This support can be in any capacity, such as economic or military support.

H.R. 1677 is important and necessary as the United States cannot sit in silence while tens of thousands innocent civilians are slaughtered by Assad's authoritative regime.

Assad's crimes are not only against humanity but also against democracy, and I fully support legislation aiming to stop these atrocities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1677, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately disclose his tax return information to Congress and the American people.

Whereas, in the United States' system of checks and balances, Congress has a responsibility to hold the Executive Branch of government to the highest standard of transparency to ensure the public interest is placed first;

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed their tax return information to the public;

Whereas, tax returns provide an important baseline disclosure because they contain highly instructive information including whether the candidate paid taxes, what they own, what they have borrowed and from whom, whether they have made any charitable donations, and whether they have taken advantage of tax loopholes;

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns could help those investigating Russian influence in the 2016 election understand the President's financial ties to the Russian Federation and Russian citizens, including debts owed and whether he shares any partnership interests, equity interests, joint ventures or licensing agreements with Russia or Russians;

Whereas, the President fired FBI Director James Comey last week, whose FBI was investigating whether the Trump campaign colluded with Russia to influence the 2016 election;

Whereas, Attorney General Jeff Sessions, who made the recommendation to fire Director Comey, during sworn testimony neglected to mention his contacts with the Russian ambassador and recused himself from anything involving the Russian investigation;

Whereas, Senate Russia investigators have requested information from the Treasury Department's criminal investigation division, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, or FinCEN, which handles cases of money laundering, for information related to President Trump, his top officials and campaign aides. FinCEN has been investigating allegations of foreign money-laundering through purchases of U.S. real estate;

Whereas, the President's tax returns would show us whether he has foreign bank accounts and how much profit he receives from his ownership in myriad partnerships;

Whereas, the President hired a law firm to send a letter to Senator Lindsey Graham to fight suggestions he has Russian business ties; this letter left open the question whether Mr. Trump or his firms received Russian income or loans or derived income from Russian-linked partnerships.

Whereas, Donald Trump Jr. said the Trump Organization saw money "pouring in from Russia" and that "Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets."

Whereas, the White House will not confirm whether the President has filed a 2016 tax return;

Whereas, Congress gave itself the authority to review an individual's tax returns to investigate and reveal possible conflicts of interest of executive branch officials involved in the Teapot Dome scandal.

Whereas, President Donald Trump's executive order on the Review of designations under the Antiquities Act has directed the U.S. Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke to review national monuments that presidents have designated or expanded since 1996.

Whereas, this review was praised by industry groups who could benefit financially from oil, gas and mining and condemned by environmental organizations concerned this review will scrap or scale back critical federal designation to protect tribal and historic lands.

Whereas, the American people are in the dark to knowing if this review was started to justify selling or leasing public lands to private corporations that could enrich the President or his business partners without reviewing the President's tax returns.

Whereas, it has been reported that federal prosecutors have issued grand jury subpoenas to associates of former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn seeking business records as part of the ongoing probe into Russian involvement in the 2016 election;

Whereas, according to his 2016 candidate filing with the Federal Election Commission, the President has 564 financial positions in

companies located in the United States and around the world;

Whereas, against the advice of ethics attorneys and the Office of Government Ethics, the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his businesses; and can still withdraw funds at any time from the trust of which he is the sole beneficiary;

Whereas, the Emoluments Clause was included in the U.S. Constitution for the express purpose of preventing federal officials from accepting any "present, Emolument, Office, or Title . . . from any King, Prince, or foreign state";

Whereas, the most signed petition on the White House website calls for the release of the President's tax return information to verify compliance with the Emoluments Clause, with 1 million, 94 thousand signatures as of date of this resolution;

Whereas, the Chairmen of the Ways and Means Committee, Joint Committee on Taxation, and Senate Finance Committee have the authority to request the President's tax returns under Section 6103 of the tax code;

Whereas, the Joint Committee on Taxation reviewed the tax returns of President Richard Nixon in 1974 and made the information public;

Whereas, the Ways and Means Committee used IRC 6103 authority in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas, the American people have the right to know whether or not their President is operating under conflicts of interest related to international affairs, tax reform, government contracts, or otherwise: Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives shall—

1. Immediately request the tax return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015 for review in closed executive session by the Committee on Ways and Means, as provided under Section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code, and vote to report the information therein to the full House of Representatives.

2. Support transparency in government and the longstanding tradition of Presidents and Presidential candidates disclosing their tax returns.

□ 1745

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New Jersey wish to present argument on the parliamentary question whether the resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House?

Mr. PASCRELL. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, the stunning conflicts of interest are piling up as the President, his family, and his friends profit in their personal business endeavors while serving in public office.

Under rule IX, clause 1, questions of the privileges of the House are "those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings." There is nothing more of a threat to the integrity of this House than ignoring our duty to provide a check and balance to the executive branch. To restore the dignity of the House, we must use our authority to request President Trump's

tax returns and begin to give the American people the transparency they deserve. That is what we should be giving them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is evidence time. Today there is in The Wall Street Journal an article entitled, "Russian State-Run Bank Financed Deal Involving Trump Hotel Partner." It is a very interesting article, I advise, and I want to put it into the RECORD with your permission.

Mr. Speaker, a letter was sent just recently from Mr. Trump's lawyers to Mr. Trump and then on to Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM. That letter was supposed to be an explanation of the President of the United States' involvement in the finances and vice versa of Russia and President Trump. It does not in any manner, shape, or form, Mr. Speaker, go into any partnership which may exist. There is nothing about that. There is nothing about the Russian state-run bank financing a deal involving Mr. Trump's hotel partner in Toronto.

Number three, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, FinCEN as it is called, which is part of the Treasury Department but independent—indeed—has independent investigative powers. They are looking into the money laundering in that situation. They are already investigating that with these Russian oligarchs—very interesting.

Also we know of what happened—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's remarks must be confined to the question of order. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. PASCRELL. Well, I would like to know, Mr. Speaker—I am sure you would, Mr. Speaker—how foreign investments have enriched the President of the United States. That is the only way we are going to find out the conflicts of interest—the only way.

So I have heard some House leaders argue that the House should not concern itself with things outside of its control. But section 6103 of the IRS Code is very much within the control of the House, if you have read it, giving specific responsibility to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and the American people are demanding the Congress request the President's tax returns be exercised for several reasons.

Mr. Trump has not divested himself from his businesses as was recommended by the Office of Government Ethics.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is relevant if we look at what was produced—remember, it is evidence time—what was produced on January 21, 2009, the ethics commitments by executive branch personnel and what has been committed and produced under this administration. They have laughed at Mr. Shaub,

who is the ethics commission chairman. They have laughed at him because it is almost like Cornelius Vanderbilt: You have the law; I have the power.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair will hear argument only on whether this resolution qualifies under the rule—

Mr. PASCRELL. On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the question of order.

Mr. PASCRELL. I'm sorry to interrupt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will only hear—

Mr. PASCRELL. On a question of privilege—I am talking about the privilege of this House. I am talking about the privilege of Republicans and Democrats. We are all alike. We are all equal. Nobody is better than anybody else.

What I am saying to you tonight, Mr. Speaker, is that this goes to the very heart of the issue and why this is a privileged resolution because we have a right to know, we have a right to uphold the integrity of this institution—everybody—not just some.

Mr. Trump has not divested himself from his businesses as was recommended by the Office of Government Ethics. We need to see how our President—our President—would personally benefit from changes to our Tax Code. Tax Code changes proposed by his administration could lower his own personal tax bill by tens of millions of dollars. The American people have a right to know that.

We have learned that earlier this year the President apparently asked Mr. Comey to cease his investigation of Trump National Security Advisor Flynn. In a surprise move last week, Mr. Trump fired the Director of the FBI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded that remarks must be confined to the question of order.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I am saying here and very specifically, we have no way of knowing whether Mr. Trump or his firms have received Russian income. It is an insult to the integrity of this House—Republicans and Democrats alike. We need to know this. We need to know that the President of the United States is beyond question in his objectivity with any nation, and particularly those who are pretty shaky in relationship with, like Russia.

A certified letter from paid attorneys that actually confirms the President, in fact, does have financial ties to Russia does nothing to assuage these concerns.

The legislative branch has the responsibility—it has the authority—to check the executive branch, and section 6103(f)(1) is very clear, very dis-

tinct, the privilege of the House—the privilege of the Tax Code—which allows for an examination of the tax returns, the authority put in place specifically so Congress could examine conflicts of interest in the executive following the Teapot Dome scandal. As I mentioned before, the possible sale of public lands under this administration is not very different than the biggest scandal of the 20th century at Teapot Rock, Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be more of a threat to the integrity of this distinguished—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has heard the gentleman's argument and is prepared to rule.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I have only 2 more minutes. May I finish?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman confines his remarks to the question of order, the gentleman may conclude his argument.

Mr. PASCRELL. I am confining my remarks to the question of privileges which I said last night. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield on that issue. That is all I am doing—no more, no less. This is not a court. All I am saying is putting forth the rationale behind the resolution which I have put forth today—put forth yesterday and was read today.

We have nothing but evidence to justify an examination, Mr. Speaker. This is not hot air. If and when such conflicts are revealed, I do not want to say to our constituents that we had the power to review these conflicts, but we did nothing. I for one do not want the integrity—my integrity, the integrity of my colleagues, and the integrity of this House—to be demeaned by such a shameful failure. That goes to the very heart in their own words of what of a privileged resolution is.

To restore the dignity of the House, we must use our authority to request President Trump's tax returns and give the American people the transparency they deserve.

My concluding statement is this, Mr. Speaker: I mentioned Vanderbilt before because that is a very powerful statement he made—a very rich guy. He felt he could do anything: The law? What law? I am all the power.

This is not the United States of America, this is not our democracy, and this is not what Republicans and Democrats have fought for since they have been in this House and before. I stand with us in only getting what we deserve, and then we decide whether we will communicate it to the American people through the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your courtesies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The material referenced by the gentleman's earlier unanimous consent request will be inserted following disposition of the question of order.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New Jersey seeks to offer a resolution as a ques-

tion of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

As the Chair ruled most recently on April 5, 2017, the resolution directs the Committee on Ways and Means to meet and consider an item of business under the procedures set forth in 26 U.S.C. 6103 and, therefore, does not qualify as a question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rothfus moves that the appeal be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1177.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 188, answered “present” 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

YEAS—229

Abraham	Collins (GA)	Gohmert
Aderholt	Collins (NY)	Goodlatte
Allen	Comer	Gosar
Amash	Comstock	Gowdy
Amodel	Conaway	Granger
Arrington	Cook	Graves (GA)
Babin	Costello (PA)	Graves (LA)
Bacon	Cramer	Graves (MO)
Banks (IN)	Crawford	Griffith
Barletta	Culberson	Grothman
Barr	Curbelo (FL)	Guthrie
Barton	Davidson	Harper
Bergman	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Biggs	Denham	Hartzler
Bilirakis	Dent	Hensarling
Bishop (MI)	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Hice, Jody B.
Black	Donovan	Higgins (LA)
Blackburn	Duffy	Hill
Blum	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Bost	Duncan (TN)	Hollingsworth
Brady (TX)	Dunn	Hudson
Brat	Emmer	Hultzena
Bridenstine	Estes (KS)	Hultgren
Brooks (AL)	Farenthold	Hunter
Brooks (IN)	Faso	Hurd
Buchanan	Ferguson	Issa
Buck	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (KS)
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Jenkins (WV)
Budd	Flores	Johnson (LA)
Burgess	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Byrne	Fox	Jordan
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Joyce (OH)
Carter (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Katko
Carter (TX)	Gaetz	Kelly (MS)
Chabot	Gallagher	Kelly (PA)
Cheney	Garrett	King (IA)
Coffman	Gibbs	King (NY)

Kinzingers
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Noem

NAYS—188

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell

Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Sanford

NOT VOTING—12

Chaffetz
Cole
DeSantis
Gutiérrez
Higgins (NY)
Johnson, Sam
Napolitano
Newhouse
Nunes
Payne
Pelosi
Schiff

□ 1821

Ms. SPEIER changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. POSEY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The material previously referred to by Mr. PASCRELL is as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

RUSSIAN STATE-RUN BANK FINANCED DEAL INVOLVING TRUMP HOTEL PARTNER

(By Rob Barry, Christopher S. Stewart and Brett Forrest)

VEB, a Russian state-run bank under scrutiny by U.S. investigators, financed a deal involving Donald Trump's onetime partner in a Toronto hotel tower at a key moment for the project, according to people familiar with the transaction.

Alexander Shnaider, a Russian-Canadian developer who built the 65-story Trump International Hotel and Tower, put money into the project after receiving hundreds of millions of dollars from a separate asset sale that involved the Russian bank, whose full name is Vnesheconombank.

Mr. Shnaider sold his company's share in a Ukrainian steelmaker for about \$850 million in 2010, according to S&P Global Market Intelligence. According to two people with knowledge of the deal, the buyer, which hasn't been identified publicly, was an entity acting for the Russian government. VEB initiated the purchase and provided the money, these people say.

U.S. investigators are looking into any ties between Russian financial institutions, Mr. Trump and anyone in his orbit, according to a person familiar with the probe. As part of the investigation, they're examining interactions between Mr. Trump, his associates and VEB, which is now subject to U.S. sanctions, said another person familiar with the matter. The Toronto deal adds a new element to the list of known connections between Mr. Trump's associates and Russia.

After Mr. Shnaider and his partner sold their stake in the steelmaker, Mr. Shnaider injected more money into the Trump Toronto project, which was financially troubled. Mr. Shnaider's lawyer, Symon Zucker, said in an April interview that about \$15 million from the asset sale went into the Trump Toronto project. A day later, he wrote in an email: “I am not able to confirm that any funds” from the deal “went into the Toronto project.”

A spokesman for the Trump Organization, the family's real-estate firm, said Mr. Trump

had no involvement in any financial dealings with VEB and that the Trump company “merely licensed its brand and manages the hotel and residences.” VEB didn't respond to requests for comment.

Mr. Trump has said he has no dealings with Russia. “To the best of my knowledge, no person that I deal with does,” he said in February. On Friday, Mr. Trump's lawyers released a two-month-old letter stating that 10 years of his tax returns show little income, investments or debt from Russian sources beyond items already known to the public.

VEB has long been viewed by Russian analysts as a vehicle for the Russian government to fund politically important projects, including the 2014 Winter Olympics in Sochi. A VEB executive in New York was sentenced to prison last year after pleading guilty to conspiring to act in the U.S. as a Russian agent without notifying U.S. authorities.

In the wake of U.S. intelligence agency findings that Russian government-directed hackers interfered in the 2016 election, several agencies, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, are conducting a counter-intelligence probe into whether Mr. Trump's campaign staff had any contact with Russian officials. Committees in the House of Representatives and the Senate also are investigating the matter. Russian authorities have denied any interference.

At the time of Mr. Shnaider's steelmaker deal, Russian President Vladimir Putin was chairman of VEB's supervisory board, and major deals would have been approved by him, according to a former Russian government official and several Russian government and economic experts. The bank later was placed on the U.S. sanctions list after Russia's intrusion into Ukraine and its annexation of Crimea in 2014. American entities are barred from financial involvement with the bank.

VEB made headlines when it emerged that its chairman met with Mr. Trump's son-in-law, Jared Kushner in December. A bank spokesperson has said VEB's leaders met Mr. Kushner and numerous global financial executives as it developed a new strategy for the bank. Mr. Spicer has said Mr. Kushner's meeting was part of his role during the Trump transition as the “primary point of contact with foreign government officials.”

The Toronto project was billed in 2007 as a joint venture between Mr. Trump and Mr. Shnaider and was projected to cost about 500 million Canadian dollars. Mr. Trump said at the time he would manage the hotel's operations and Mr. Shnaider planned to develop the tower, which also would include condominiums, through his company, Talon International Development Inc.

The project has been dogged by financial problems. In November, it entered insolvency proceedings, and a judge in March approved its sale.

Alan Garten, the Trump Organization's general counsel, said the company “was not the owner, developer or seller” of the project. While The Wall Street Journal and others reported in 2011 and 2012 that Mr. Trump had a minor ownership stake in it, Mr. Garten now says Mr. Trump “did not hold” equity and had no involvement with the financing.

The Trump Toronto Hotel Management Corp. has received at least \$611,000 in fees from the project since 2015, federal financial-disclosure forms filed last May show. The forms don't disclose the company's total income from the deal.

Shortly after the project broke ground in 2007, about 85% of the units were presold.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARRINGTON). Is there objection to the

request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 583

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “American Law Enforcement Heroes Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. PRIORITIZING HIRING AND TRAINING OF VETERANS.

Section 1701(b)(2) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(b)(2)) is amended by inserting “, including by prioritizing the hiring and training of veterans (as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code)” after “Nation”.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRESS MUST FINISH REFORM OF THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, last week a Federal court temporarily overturned the termination of the fired Phoenix VA hospital director, Sharon Helman. Helman was relieved of her duties in 2015 after a whistleblower disclosed a string of scandals, including manipulation of wait times to collect performance bonuses. Even worse, in a separate court case, she pled guilty and was convicted of accepting over \$50,000 in illegal gifts. For this, she is currently on probation.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must take swift action to ensure former and current VA employees like Ms. Helman are held accountable. Those who disregard their duty to our Nation's veterans should never be allowed to keep their jobs, salaries, or benefits after proven dereliction of duty. Our veterans do not deserve—and they cannot afford—VA leaders who put profit and expediency over the health of those who have worn our Nation's uniform.

Congress has taken steps to reform the Veterans Administration, but we must finish our job. That is why I was proud to vote “yes” on H.R. 1259, the VA Accountability First Act. American veterans are counting on us to keep our promises and protect them from self-serving bureaucrats. I intend to do just that.

REMEMBERING FALLEN POLICE OFFICERS

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

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, during National Police Week, it is important

we continue to remember the brave men and women who were killed while protecting us.

Last year, 145 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty. One of these officers, Lesley Zerebny, 27 years old, was an officer with the Palm Springs Police Department. She was responding to a domestic disturbance call when she was gunned down. She was killed just days after returning from maternity leave and left behind a 4-month-old daughter.

Her fellow officer, Jose Gilbert Vega, was also murdered in the shooting. A devoted father, Vega was just days away from retiring.

Of the officers killed last year, 10 were State troopers. One of them was Trooper Timothy Pratt of the New York State Police. Trooper Pratt was struck by a car as he was on the side of the road assisting a stopped vehicle. Pratt had 30 years on the job.

Our law enforcement officers don't know what they will encounter when they respond to any call. We applaud them for the bravery and courage they display in the face of danger. Mr. Speaker, let us not forget their sacrifices.

VETERANS DESERVE THE BEST CARE POSSIBLE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Mental Health Awareness Month to talk about a growing group of individuals who need our help: our veterans.

More than 16 percent of veterans have been diagnosed with a depressive disorder. Up to 43 percent struggle with symptoms of mental health issues, such as drinking excessively, smoking, or sleeplessness. These struggles have resulted in an unacceptably high suicide rate for our veterans. Every day, 20 veterans take their own lives, which is almost double the rate of non-veterans.

Mr. Speaker, this is heartbreaking. It is unacceptable, and we must act. That is why I was proud today to join with Congressman TIM RYAN in introducing the Veterans Wellness Act of 2017.

This bill brings mental healthcare to our veterans by establishing a 2-year grant program to provide wellness care and additional therapies at veteran service organizations like the American Legion, the VFW, and AMVETS. Many offer skilled assistance with VA enrollment that could help our veterans get the care that they so desperately need.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House to ensure our veterans receive the best care possible.

OUR NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with hundreds of business, labor, and advocacy organizations to recognize National Infrastructure Week. The purpose of this week is to highlight the state of the Nation's infrastructure and its critical importance to our economy and well-being.

Building and strengthening our infrastructure is vital to all of us, but it oftentimes goes unnoticed. Our Nation's deteriorating infrastructure is hampering our ability to compete in the thriving global economy and create jobs that our Nation needs. As an example, in my home State of Ohio, we face significant challenges: 17 percent of the public roads are in poor condition, and almost 7 percent of all the bridges are structurally deficient.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to turn a blind eye to our Nation's infrastructure needs. Congress must work together to upgrade our Nation's highways, bridges, airports, water systems, energy grid, broadband network, and the like so that our economy can continue to lead the world in the 21st century and beyond.

LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS DESERVE OUR GRATITUDE

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during National Police Week to pay tribute to the Nation's law enforcement men and women.

Established in 1962 by President Kennedy, National Police Week serves as a reminder of the incredible sacrifice our police officers make every day to serve and protect the people in our States and communities.

Just last week, Lieutenant Kevin Mainhart of the Yell County Sheriff's Department was killed in the line of duty during a traffic stop in Dardanelle, Arkansas. This tragedy reminds us of the danger that all of our men and women who police our streets have to face.

Every American should be proud of our neighbors and fellow citizens who get up every morning, put on their uniform and badge, leave their families, and serve us all, keeping our cities and towns safe and trying to build the trust and faith among our citizens.

I respect and appreciate the important work of our police and our law enforcement men and women in Arkansas and throughout the Nation. They deserve our gratitude.

PANDEMONIUM COMING OUT OF THE WHITE HOUSE

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, when I was sworn in to office, I made a commitment to support and defend the Constitution of these United States. Our President's latest actions have shown us that we cannot trust him to do the same.

Whether it is a lapse of judgment or just plain inexperience, the pandemonium coming out of the White House is worse than a scene from "House of Cards."

The method in which Trump chose to reveal classified intelligence to Russian officials—impulsive;

The way Trump chose to fire FBI Director Comey—imprudent;

And, if the latest reports are true, the way Trump chose to interfere with the FBI investigation of National Security Adviser Michael Flynn—impeachable.

I don't use this last "i" word lightly, but for love of country and democracy, and as an American, I hope this is not true. If it is, this is a blatant obstruction of justice and a grave, grave offense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

THANK YOU TO LAW ENFORCEMENT PROFESSIONALS

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, during this National Police Week, I wish to, on behalf of myself and the fine citizens of the Fifth District of Virginia, extend our thank-you.

Since 1791, greater than 22,000 law enforcement professionals have given their lives in the line of duty—over 70 in a single day in 2001, including 37 from the NYPD and 23 from the Port Authority Police—an average of over 140 a year. And yet these men and women who look like us—every race, every color, every gender—are the best of us because every day they get up and go to work again.

Mr. Speaker, when I served in the military, I became familiar with Isaiah 6:8, and I cite that verse in thanking our law enforcement professionals:

And then the voice of the Lord spoke to us and said, "Whom shall I send? And who will go for us?" And I said, "Here am I. Send me."

Mr. Speaker, take that as a thank-you from myself and the citizens of the Fifth District of Virginia to those professional men and women who serve us every day.

HOKA HEY

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, it is time that all of America knows a phrase that the Manvel Mavericks in the 22nd District of Texas know well. The phrase is "Hoka Hey. Hoka Hey." That means be unselfish; compete for team, school, and town. Hoka Hey carried the Mavericks to the men's track and field team title for Texas 5A. That happened last week.

The team started rough. After seven events, they had 8 points. They were in 10th place. But the spirit of Hoka Hey came back during the relays. Our guys burned up the track. When the relays were over, the Mavs had 50 points and Port Arthur Memorial, 41.

Hoka Hey had 85 points when the meet was over. They were the State champions. Congratulations, Hoka Hey Manvel Mavericks, State champions, Texas 5A.

□ 1845

GIVE BACK THE FUTURES OF HARDWORKING AMERICANS

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

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because, after coming back from Indiana for the last 8 days, I wanted to report what I saw.

What I saw was too much hopelessness, too much despair, in the eyes of too many hardworking Hoosiers, who no longer feel that they have control of their financial future, who no longer feel that they can participate in the American Dream, and who no longer feel that they can start small businesses of their own. But I told them every single day when I was back home this past week what we are doing to change that to roll back the provisions of Dodd-Frank that have put undue burdens on lenders trying to help small businesses across Indiana's Ninth District, and across this country, grow and get started; to help hardworking Hoosiers be able to start small businesses so they have control over their families' future again; to help individuals be able to get jobs at growing enterprises because they have access to capital.

Over the past few years, loan growth has stagnated. In the past 100 years, coming out of recessions, we have typically seen a loan growth of 63 percent, but it has only been 18 percent. It is the difference between those two that has curtailed the futures of many hardworking Americans. I want to make sure we give that back to them. That is why I am voting in support of the CHOICE Act, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

HONORING LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday this week, hundreds of families, friends, colleagues, and loved ones from every corner of the country gathered at the United States Capitol for the 36th annual National Peace Officers Memorial Day. They were here to honor all of those names at the memorial, 21,000 names, Mr. Speaker. And this year, 394 more were added. Now, some of those are over past years—not this past year, but prior years—but 394 additional names were added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. Their names will ever be etched in our hearts and on the walls of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, and, as I said, with 21,000 others who came before them.

People who walk by and view these names may not recognize the names or may not know all of the names. They may have a special loved one whose name appears on those hollowed walls. But the thing to remember here is that these are brothers, sisters, mothers, fathers, and some even grandfathers. They are real people who sacrificed their lives. Some were ambushed and executed, and some lost their lives responding to a call to save a life or someone who called for help. These are the men and women who gave their lives so we could, in many cases, keep ours.

I have a lot more to say on this, and we have some time. I am going to yield to other Members, Mr. Speaker, who arrived here tonight to share their stories and remember the officers who served their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Chairman GOODLATTE, chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to DAVE REICHERT for taking the lead on this very appropriate Special Order to recognize our Nation's law enforcement. No one better represents that law enforcement here in the United States Congress than former Sheriff REICHERT. And I thank him for not only his leadership in the House but also for his service as a sheriff for many years prior to his election to Congress.

Our Nation was founded on the rule of law. The Preamble to the United States Constitution stated that its purpose was, in part, to “establish justice” and “insure domestic tranquility.” Every day, law enforcement officers carry out this legacy. They fight crime, promote justice, and keep the peace. They patrol late at night and early in the morning, while we sleep in the comforts of our homes.

And over the past 16 years, our Nation’s law enforcement officers have often been the first to respond to terrorist attacks. On that fateful day, nearly 16 years ago, first responders were running into the crumbling towers as everyone else was running out. Following the Boston Marathon bombings in April of 2013, Boston police responded immediately to aid the wounded and implement emergency plans. That legacy has carried on through the recent catastrophes in San Bernardino, Orlando, and too many others.

Sadly, many law enforcement officers have made the ultimate sacrifice on our behalf. Just this year already, 50 law enforcement officers have died in the line of duty, including Deputy Sheriff Curtis Allen Bartlett of Carroll County, Virginia, who was killed in a vehicle crash while responding to assist another deputy and a Virginia State Police trooper who were involved in a pursuit. These are tragic reminders that our law enforcement professionals face danger every day as they carry out their duties.

Chillingly, in recent years, police officers have increasingly become targets for violence and ambush-style attacks. Tomorrow, this House will vote to ensure that State and local law enforcement officers receive the same protections as their Federal counterparts. In fact, this week, the House will pass more than half a dozen bills to help officers do their jobs and return home safely.

As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I have the privilege to work with Federal law enforcement. All too often, we fail to recognize how the dedicated men and women of law enforcement make sacrifices to promote law and order and keep our neighborhoods safe. That is true at every level: our local police and sheriff’s deputies, our State police, and Federal law enforcement officers in many different departments of the Department of Justice and other agencies.

As a father, grandfather, husband, and citizen, the men and women in blue have my profound respect and sincere thanks.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. I thank him for all his hard work in his committee to support law enforcement across the country. I look forward to working with him on some of the law enforcement reforms that his committee is looking at. I appreciate it.

It is an honor for me, Mr. Speaker, to lead this Special Order. I am very humbled at the response that we have received tonight by the Members who want to be here and talk about their law enforcement officers in their communities.

Another one of our Members who wants to share his thoughts and feelings is the son of a State trooper from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a special time as a trooper’s kid. When I think about that and I think about this wall and I think about the heroes that I am looking at standing here, I am thinking about my own father who I just talked to a few moments ago—31 years as a Georgia State patrol. My mom is with him right now. They have been the example of what law enforcement goes through so many times.

I will share, in just a few more minutes, about that, but I did want to remind you why we are here, and thinking about this memorial, Georgia officers who have fallen in 2017 already: Deputy Sheriff Michael Butler, Lowndes County Sheriff’s Office; and Sergeant Gregory Michael Meagher, Richmond County Sheriff’s Office.

In 2016, we saw Jody Carl Smith, Georgia Southwestern State University Department of Public Safety; Officer Nicholas Ryan Smarr, Americus Police Department; Deputy Sheriff Justin Scott White, Newton County Sheriff’s Office; Deputy Sheriff Daryl Wayne Smallwood, Peach County Sheriff’s Office; Sergeant Patrick Michael Sondron, Peach County Sheriff’s Office; Officer Timothy Kevin Smith, Eastman Police Department; Investigator Anthony Joseph Freeman, Bibb County Sheriff’s Office; and Major Gregory Eugene Barney, Riverdale Police Department.

And then one, Mr. Speaker, that came at a time in which the Sheriff and I were on the Police Working Group. We were in Atlanta. We were going through discussing the issues that police are going through and how communities are coming together, and we got word of a shooting in south Georgia.

At the time, we just got a name, and we weren’t really sure what had gone on, but we found out there was a shooting and there was a fatality involved. What I came to find out later was that the gentleman who was killed was Deputy Commander U.S. Marshal Patrick Carothers of the Southeast Regional Task Force. He was a leader who didn’t even have to be there that day. He could have taken a step back. Instead, he led the charge. He went in first, as a leader does, and was killed.

As it became more and more clear, I began to realize I had another special connection to Marshal Carothers. Just

a few months earlier, I had the privilege of appointing his son to the United States Naval Academy.

It is a matter of family. It is a matter of heart. As someone growing up, who thought that it was sort of awkward having your dad come and pick you up at school in his State patrol car, and he thought it was pretty cute when he put you in the back seat, and the kids were laughing. They would talk about it, and they would say: A State trooper is coming to pick you up. I would look at them and say: It is my dad. But what they didn’t also see were the times when he would come home, and I would wake up at night, and my dad would be coming home to change his shirt because it was ripped and torn and bloody from where he had been involved in a fight. What they didn’t know was a young son, who had listened to all of the things people would say about police officers, and say: They are talking about my dad.

As one who has supported me all of my life, I cannot pass this time up without recognizing those who gave the ultimate sacrifice and those who continue to serve every day. It still amazes me the Georgia State patrol has gone on. And now folks, when I look in those blue and gray cars and the sheriff’s deputy cars, and those that I grew up watching, they were my big brothers. Now I look in there and say: Who are those younger people riding in their cars? They are just carrying on that blue line tradition. They are just carrying on that public service that means so much.

So tonight, Sheriff, you have done a wonderful job of getting us here, because these folks have families, they have kids, they have a responsibility, and they never turn from it. I thank the families who have lost and gave their loved ones, and I thank the families who get up every day still with their loved ones in the fight, and I thank my father who gave so much.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia. As he shared his story about his father, it reminded me of my own story of coming home to my three young kids and my uniform being torn and bloodied, in some cases. I never really thought about what my kids or my spouse was thinking when I came home. I was still wrapped up in the shift that I had just come from and the struggles that I had been through on the streets.

□ 1900

I served for 33 years in the King County Sheriff’s Office, and I would do that job all over again, Mr. Speaker. I loved it.

But I wanted to share another story, too, of Officer Jake Gutierrez from the Tacoma Police Department, which is a city just south of Seattle. Officer Gutierrez tragically died in the line of duty. He lost his life while protecting a

woman from domestic violence. Jake was supposed to exchange wedding vows with his fiancée just a few weeks later. Instead, his fiancée, his three daughters, and his granddaughter attended his funeral. They struggled—and I am thinking they are still struggling today—to picture a life without him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY). Our U.S. Attorney, prosecutor, knows law enforcement well, and he has a story to tell about one of his officers.

Mr. GOWDY. Thank you, Sheriff. I want to start by thanking you for your service as a law enforcement officer and in Congress. And I call you sheriff when I pass by you because I always believe in calling people by their highest title. And as much as it is wonderful, and I am sure the people in your family are proud of your service in the United States Congress, I am proudest of your willingness to sacrifice for the people of Washington as their sheriff.

Kevin Carper was a uniform patrol officer with the Spartanburg County Sheriff's Office. He was not a detective. He was not in management. He was just a regular police officer like the ones we see every day in our towns and cities.

Kevin responded to a domestic violence call. Those who are unfamiliar with law enforcement have a tendency sometimes to refer to those as routine calls. There is nothing routine about a domestic violence call, and everyone in law enforcement knows it.

Off of Airport Road in Spartanburg, South Carolina, Kevin and his partner arrived to find William Seich on the front porch of his small home pointing a large caliber gun at his wife, Judy.

Judy was crouched down in the front yard, trying to protect herself, trying to shield herself behind a tree, and William was pointing the gun at her and, alternatively, pointing the gun at law enforcement who had just arrived on the scene.

You know, Sheriff REICHERT and Mr. Speaker, it all seems so easy in hindsight. Do you shoot? Do you pull the trigger? Is the gun real? You have split seconds to make these decisions only to have them second-guessed for months, if not years afterward. Is the gun real? Is it loaded?

William Seich finally turned the gun toward his wife and he shot her. As he was turning the gun towards law enforcement, no doubt to shoot them, they returned fire. They struck William Seich. As one officer ran toward his fallen wife, Judy, Kevin Carper ran to the front porch to make sure that William Seich didn't shoot anybody else.

As he got on the front porch, Mr. Speaker, he heard the cries of children. Unbeknownst to Kevin and his partner, there were children inside that mobile home, and the bullets from one of the

officer's guns had struck one of the children.

William Seich survived and was charged with murder. Both of the little girls ultimately survived, although one was badly injured.

I met Kevin when we were preparing for trial. He was an essential witness, so I needed to prepare him for what would come during this trial. He would be second-guessed. His every move would be scrutinized. In a very real sense, he would not only be blamed for Judy Seich's murder, he would be blamed for shooting one of the little girls inside that home, and then he would be blamed for not doing enough to protect Judy Seich, not making the right split-second decision.

I tried to prepare Kevin for what would be a grueling cross-examination, and it was clear to me his mind and heart were somewhere else. So, finally, I said: Kevin, you didn't do anything wrong. You didn't have a choice.

He said: I know, Solicitor GOWDY.

He had tears streaming down his face in my office.

He said: I know, Solicitor GOWDY, but I shot that little girl.

Objectively, Kevin Carper did everything right that night. He responded to an incredibly tense domestic call. He was confronted with a man holding a gun. Was it a real gun? Was it loaded? All of these thoughts going through his mind; and as soon as William Seich shot and murdered his wife, he returned fire.

Objectively, we know everything he did was right, but it didn't matter how many times I told Kevin: You did the right thing. Deputy Kevin Carper heard me. Father, husband, Kevin Carper had tears streaming down his face at the thought that he would have hurt a child.

Well, we went through the trial, and he was, as you might imagine, an indispensable witness.

Mr. Speaker, he could not have done a better job in that murder trial. Yeah, he was a tough police officer in a uniform, but when it came time to describe walking on the front porch and hearing the cries of children, he became a husband and a father again, and in front of a jury, Sheriff—and you know this is hard for police to do in front of a jury—this tough, brave man broke down in tears, and the jury had a chance to see the humanity of police officers. The jury had a chance to see that “protect and serve and defend” part of police officers.

William Seich was convicted, in no small part, because of Kevin Carper's help. In South Carolina, the sentencing takes place immediately after the trial, so there was family to talk to and to prepare them for the sentencing hearing so they could allocute on what Judy Seich's life meant to them and what the proper punishment should be.

Mr. Speaker and Sheriff REICHERT, I wanted to tell Kevin what a great job

he had done. I wanted to tell Kevin how impressed I was with his humanity. I wanted to tell Kevin—I intended to tell Kevin that he took a cynical old prosecutor and he made him believe again that there are women and men who go into this line of work for all the right reasons. That is what I intended to tell him. But in the hustle and bustle of sentencing, he slipped out the back of the courtroom and we went on with the sentencing hearing.

But I knew that I would see him again and I would have a chance to tell him. I would have a chance to tell his boss: You need to watch that guy, make him a homicide detective. He is really good.

I would have a chance to tell him he did great by those little girls. I knew I would see him again and I would have a chance to tell him again.

And I did see him again, laying beside a roadside, shot to death during a routine traffic stop. He was shot by a man who had been arrested more than 30 times.

If you have ever attended an officer's funeral, the finality of that death hits you the very hardest at the end where they do the radio call: Deputy Kevin Carper, do you read? Deputy Kevin Carper, can you hear us? And, of course, there is silence. And then at the end, it is: Deputy Kevin Carper, you are clear to go home.

I never told Kevin what I should have told him. Deputy Kevin Carper, you were a credit to law enforcement. Husband, father, Kevin Carper, you are a credit to humanity and your family. I wish I had told you when I should have told you.

I hope that all of my other friends in prosecution and in law enforcement now will not wait too long to tell the men and women of law enforcement how grateful they are for their service.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. GOWDY, I have a feeling that Kevin knew anyway when he left that courtroom how you felt. Thank you for sharing that powerful story. I think it really clearly points to a lot of things:

One, the job is tough and you have got to make those split decisions, and they are life and death decisions;

Two, that the human side of the police officer is not very often recognized; that the connection to their family—as I said in my opening statement, these are people that are fathers, they are sons, they are sisters, they are mothers, in some cases they are grandparents.

Sometimes we see a person just wearing a uniform, but there is a human being inside that uniform wearing that badge and carrying that gun to make sure that we can get home to our families and enjoy our families.

I lost a best friend and partner in 1982. It still hurts today. If I can get past the emotional part, I might share that story a little bit later.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Thank you, Sheriff.

I appreciate your comments, Lawyer GOWDY; as I call him, his comments.

I know that the outlaws in Washington State are glad you are in Congress and you are not back in Washington arresting them and putting them in the jailhouse where a lot of them belong. But thank you for the opportunity to speak at this very important Special Order.

As you know, while you were a sheriff in Washington, I was down at the courthouse in Texas, first as a prosecutor, like Lawyer GOWDY, and then, for 22 years, I tried criminal cases, felonies, everything from stealing to killing.

I met a lot of police, as I call them, during that time. Some of them, as Mr. GOWDY has pointed out, gave their lives in the line of duty. I met them in the middle of the night when they would come bringing a warrant to me to sign so they could go arrest somebody while the rest of us all slept. They are doing what they do best, and that is protecting and serving our communities.

A lot of police officers—and I don't think it has been said yet—their job is being a police officer, but most of them have other jobs just to make ends meet. They have an extra job, as we call it, because they don't make a lot being a police officer. None of them ever do it for the money—none of them anywhere in the world do it for the money. So to support their families, they have to have other jobs to do that.

I think we as a nation need to understand and appreciate that they do what they do because they feel, and it is, an important service to our community.

Last year, 135 police officers throughout the Nation were killed; 64 of them were shot and killed, and 21 of those were ambushed.

Among the States, my home State of Texas had the most police officers killed. Twenty-one were killed last year in the line of duty. We also had five canines that were killed that worked with police.

I have here a photograph—or a poster of the 21 officers killed in the line of duty in the State of Texas last year; all races, both sexes, all ages throughout the State of Texas. Last year, we saw probably more than I can remember, this phenomena of hate and ambush of police officers.

□ 1915

On July 7, 2016, five Dallas police officers were shot and killed as they were protecting a protest demonstration in downtown Dallas.

What occurred was a sniper who had been preparing, obviously for some time, was watching this procession go by and he opened fire on those police officers. Other than 9/11, this was the

most deadliest day for police officers in the United States.

Shortly before 9 p.m., a domestic terrorist—and I am not going to give his name. His name is not important. The names of the officers are what is important—parked his black SUV on Lamar Street. He put on his body armor. He got his automatic weapon ready to fire, and he started stalking Dallas police officers.

As those Dallas police officers and a DART officer—DART is Dallas Area Rapid Transit officer—marched along with the protesters, he opened fire on them with the intent to kill as many as he could. So gunfire rang out and bullets struck and killed Senior Corporal Lorne Ahrens, Officer Michael Krol, Officer Patrick Zamarripa, and three Dallas police officers were wounded, along with a civilian.

But the sniper wasn't through yet. He headed back up Lamar Street—and that is in downtown Dallas—shooting out the windows of a nearby college campus, El Centro College campus. During that time, he injured two El Centro College police officers trying to get into the school.

He had continued on his quest to kill officers and he snuck up behind a DART officer—his name, Brent Thompson—and shot him in the back and killed him. He then turned his way on to Elm Street nearby and shot his way back into El Centro College.

All of this took about 20 minutes. Police officers were following this sniper, trying to capture him, but this individual went up to the library in the school and started firing down. His next victim was Officer Michael Smith, and he injured yet another DART officer.

He was cornered in the library. Chief of Police Brown said: During that 2-hour-long negotiation, the individual lied to us, played games, laughed at us, sang, and continually asked how many of those coppers did he kill?

Eventually, the Dallas SWAT team took care of the sniper, and he was killed.

In total, five officers were killed, seven others were wounded. And these officers were killed for the sole reason that they wore a uniform, that they wore a badge or a star over their heart, symbolizing protecting us from the do-bads. That is why that badge is there over their heart. They were willing to give their life so that we might have peace, order, and safety; and on that day, five of them did.

In total, like I mentioned, 21 officers were killed in Texas last year, the most in any State. I include in the RECORD their full background and the departments that they worked with.

Their names are: Officer David Hofer, Patrolman David Ortiz, Trooper Jeffrey Nichols, Border Patrol Agent Jose Barraza, Officer Endy Ekpanya, Sergeant Stacey Baumgartner, Officer

Calvin McCullers, Jr., Sergeant Michael Smith, Officer Michael Krol, Officer Patricio Zamarripa, Officer Brent Thompson, Senior Corporal Lorne Bradley Ahrens, Officer Marco Zarate, Correctional Officer Mari Johnson, Officer Justin Ryan Scherlen, Officer Amir Abdul-Khaliq, Deputy Sheriff Kenneth Maltby, Corporal Robert Ransom, Border Patrol Agent David Gomez, Commander Kenneth Starrs, and Detective Benjamin Marconi.

ROLL CALL OF HEROES

1. Officer David Stefan Hofer, Euless Police Department. End of Watch: March 1, 2016.
2. Patrolman David Ortiz, El Paso Police Department. End of Watch: March 14, 2016.
3. Trooper Jeffrey Don Nichols, Texas Department of Public Safety—Texas Highway Patrol. End of Watch: March 26, 2016.
4. Agent Jose Daniel Barraza, United States Department of Homeland Security—Customs and Border Protection—United States Border Patrol, US. End of Watch: April 18, 2016.
5. Officer Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya, Pearland Police Department. End of Watch: June 12, 2016.
6. Sergeant Stacey Allen Baumgartner, Patton Village Police Department. End of Watch: June 19, 2016.
7. Officer Calvin Marcus McCullers, Jr., Southern Methodist University Police Department. End of Watch: July 5, 2016.
8. Sergeant Michael Joseph Smith, Dallas Police Department. End of Watch: July 7, 2016.
9. Officer Michael Leslie Krol, Dallas Police Department. End of Watch: July 7, 2016.
10. Officer Patricio Enrique Zamarripa (Zamarreepa), Dallas Police Department. End of Watch: July 7, 2016.
11. Officer Brent Alan Thompson, Dallas Area Rapid Transit Police Department. End of Watch: July 7, 2016.
12. Senior Corporal Lorne Bradley Ahrens (Lorn Bradley Aarons), Dallas Police Department. End of Watch: July 8, 2016.
13. Officer Marco Antonio Zarate (Zah-rot-ee), Bellaire Police Department. End of Watch: July 12, 2016.
14. Corrections officer Mari Anne Johnson, Texas Department of Criminal Justice. End of Watch: July 16, 2016.
15. Officer Justin Ryan Scherlen, Amarillo Police Department. End of Watch: August 4, 2016.
16. Officer Amir Abdul-Khaliq (kah-leek), Austin Police Department. End of Watch: September 4, 2016.
17. Deputy Sheriff Kenneth Hubert Maltby, Eastland County Sheriff's Office. End of Watch: September 7, 2016.
18. Corporal Robert Eugene Ransom, Gregg County Sheriff's Office. End of Watch: September 30, 2016.
19. Agent David Gomez, United States Border Patrol, US. End of Watch: November 16, 2016.
20. Commander Kenneth Joseph Starrs, South Texas Specialized Crimes and Narcotics Task Force. End of Watch: November 16, 2016.
21. Detective Benjamin Edward Marconi, San Antonio Police Department. End of Watch: November 20, 2016.

K9

1. K9 Ogar, Smith County Sheriff's Office. End of Watch: January 19, 2016.
2. K9 Ledger, La Salle County Sheriff's Office. End of Watch: May 29, 2016.
3. K9 Rex, San Juan Police Department. End of Watch: June 2, 2016.

4. K9 Bruno, Amarillo Police Department. End of Watch: June 12, 2016.

5. K9 Mojo, Arlington Police Department. End of Watch: July 19, 2016.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, these were real people. And as Sheriff REICHERT said earlier, these people have families.

Lastly, I would like to mention one other officer whose name I read. His name was Sergeant Stacey Baumgartner. He worked at a little bitty police department called Patton Village in Texas, right outside of Houston, and he was killed when his patrol car collided with another vehicle while he was involved in a hot pursuit.

He is survived by his wife, his son, and his daughter, Chloe. This is a photograph of Chloe taken last week in Austin, Texas, at the Texas Peace Officers Memorial Service event. This is her. It was posted by the police chief of Patton Village, Texas. It expresses the families, the humanity of their fathers and their mothers, and how we as a people need to understand the consequences when people murder our finest.

God bless the thin blue line.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Judge POE for his words. When he mentioned police officers don't do this for the money, I always considered it a calling. And I think if you talked to any police officer or deputy out on the street today, I think they would tell you that they felt called to serve, and called to serve in the uniform, and called to put their life on the line and to risk their life for others.

I was going to share the story of my partner, Sam Hicks, who was killed in 1982. He left behind five sons. He was ambushed and shot in the chest and killed instantly.

The killer was a man who was already wanted for murder. One of the hardest things I ever did—I was the only homicide detective at the scene when they captured him—was to sit in the back seat with this killer, advise him of his rights, and get him a glass of water and something to eat because he had been on the run for 3 days. I spent an hour in the back seat of that cop car with this killer, knowing that Sam's five sons no longer had a father.

Thank you for your words tonight, Judge.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Jacksonville, Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD), the second sheriff in the House.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be here this evening with my friend, Sheriff DAVE REICHERT, and all of my colleagues who stand with our law enforcement officers, their families, and their communities for this National Police Week.

It is a time where we come together as a country to recognize the sacrifices our police officers make for us every time they put on that uniform.

Last week I had the privilege of attending the Nassau County Sheriff's Office Law Enforcement Memorial Service in Florida, where we recognized those who have lost their lives in the line of duty. And in a very special way, we honored the life of Officer Eric James Oliver, who was killed in the line of duty on November 22, 2016.

Officer Oliver died doing what he loved, protecting and serving his community. Before he joined the sheriff's office, Officer Oliver served our Nation in the United States Navy. But his most important job, Mr. Speaker, was being the loving father to his 6-year-old daughter, Shelby.

Tonight I commend the many sacrifices made by each and every law enforcement officer in Florida's Fourth District, but this year we give special recognition to Officer Eric Oliver and the great loss felt by his family, his Nassau County Sheriff's Office colleagues, and our entire northeast Florida community.

Tonight I also want to honor in a special way two Department of Homeland Security officers who lost their lives in service to their country.

First, I rise to honor Special Agent Jeremy Scott McGuire. Scott served with the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, assigned to the National Security Investigations Division at the Homeland Security Investigations office in New Orleans, Louisiana.

On January 25, 2016, Special Agent Scott McGuire lost his life while on special assignment in Miami, Florida. In his final assignment, he was conducting investigations to identify, disrupt, and dismantle transnational criminal enterprises and terrorist organizations that threatened the security of the United States.

He is survived by his wife, Suzy, and son, Finn. Special Agent McGuire earned an extensive list of awards and accolades in recognition of his academic accomplishments, and his investigative successes. In fact, posthumously, Scott received the HIS national award for top illicit drug trade investigator of 2016.

Special Agent McGuire left behind the greatest legacy a man can live. He was truly a man of distinction and a man of devotion to not only his work, but also to his family and friends, and he lives on as a hero.

Second, I rise to honor fallen Officer Brian Beliso, a U.S. Immigration and Customs enforcement officer assigned to the Fugitive Operations Unit at the Enforcement and Removal Operations office in San Francisco. Officer Beliso began his work with ICE in 2007. Very early in his career, Brian distinguished himself as a charismatic leader and a dedicated employee who always went above and beyond in all of his duties.

In his final assignment, Officer Beliso conducted field operations to locate at-large criminal and fugitive

aliens who are in violation of our Nation's immigration laws. He was directly responsible for prosecutions of numerous criminal aliens who illegally reentered the country following their deportation.

On June 8, 2016, Officer Beliso died in the line of duty. Not only was Brian greatly respected by his colleagues and superiors, he was also known for his selfless service to his family and community. He was a beloved husband and father. He is survived by his wife, Christina, and their three children, Noah, Sophia, and Bella.

Mr. Speaker, law enforcement is a noble profession, and it is a noble profession not only because these men and women serve, but because they serve with self-sacrifice. Officer Oliver, Officer Beliso, and Special Agent McGuire laid their lives on the altar of freedom, and we must never forget them and the many other men and women who have lost their lives so that we may experience the safety and freedoms that we enjoy today.

On behalf of a very grateful nation, we thank them for their noble service and we honor them for their duty and sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I didn't mention two other officers. I had the great honor for 12 years of being sheriff of the Jacksonville Sheriff's Office in Jacksonville, Florida.

□ 1930

During my tenure, I was deeply saddened to bury two of my officers who died in the line of duty. They were Officer Scott Bell, who gave his life in service in 2007, and Officer Christopher Kane in 2008.

I say again, on behalf of a very grateful nation, we thank them for their noble service, and we honor them for their duty and sacrifice.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the sheriff for being here tonight honoring those who fell in his community and under his command. I thank him for his 40 years with the Jacksonville Sheriff's Office. I am proud to serve with him in Congress. We need more sheriffs in Congress, by the way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank the gentleman from Washington for organizing this event for us to thank the brave men and women who keep our community safe day in and day out. Like him, I have the honor and privilege of serving with Sheriff RUTHERFORD and Chief DEMINGS. It is quite an honor to be with both of them in the 115th Congress.

The men and women of law enforcement are moms and dads, sons and daughters, siblings and friends to the very people who they serve. We ask these brave men and women to uphold the law, but so often this seemingly

straightforward mandate sends them into the most difficult and tragic situations that our society faces: terrible accidents, domestic disputes, and the strife that threatens the hearts of our towns and communities. Their bravery and courage is unimaginable to someone like me. The complexity of their jobs and the tolls that it takes on their lives is often underestimated.

Having a safe community offers our citizens more than just peace of mind. It offers them a place to live, grow their businesses, provide a living for their family, and to be not only economically secure but socially secure. Law enforcement officers play a very critical role in community development.

Each generation of our law enforcement community evolves as society changes and their technology and training improve. This allows them to police our communities more responsibly, effectively, and sometimes even to right wrongs of the past generation.

I want to highlight one specific example in my district, Georgia's Third District.

Nearly eight decades ago, an African-American man named Austin Callaway was lynched in the town of LaGrange, Georgia. This terrible crime has been a dark part of the town's history for a long time. Recently, law enforcement officials have taken steps to begin the reconciliation process.

LaGrange Chief Louis Dekmar partnered with the president of the county NAACP chapter, Ernest Ward, to facilitate an official apology to the Callaway family from the police force for failing to investigate the lynching nearly 77 years prior.

I commend Chief Dekmar and Mr. Ward for their actions to begin to heal this old wound. I am proud to represent this community that has engaged in the hard work of reconciliation.

Police officers like Chief Dekmar do so much more than enforce the law. They work actively every single day to bring the communities they serve together. I am so proud that there are such great examples of law enforcement in the Third District of Georgia.

Law enforcement officers do more than just keep us safe. They help our communities, they show love and compassion, they bring us together. We owe them a debt of gratitude. I am proud that there are such brave men and women willing to serve in all of our communities and hometowns. I want to extend my deep gratitude for the hard work of these brave men and women and offer a special thanks and special prayer to their families.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DESJARLAIS).

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Police Week and the courageous law enforcement officers who protect the great State of Tennessee.

This week, we have thousands of police from across the country here in Washington, D.C., to honor the valiant men and women in blue.

Among the 145 heroes who lost their lives in the line of duty in 2016, six hail from the Volunteer State. I would like to recognize Special Agent Frazier with the Tennessee Bureau of Investigation, Sergeant Allred with the Livingston Police Department, Deputy Sheriff Larned with the Jackson County Sheriff's Office, Officer Moats with the Maryville Police Department, Sergeant Smith with the Memphis Police Department, and Deputy Sheriff Sturgill with the Humphrey County Police Department. I stand today to recognize their service and extreme sacrifice.

Tennessee law enforcement officers often risk their own lives to protect the safety of others. I honor and respect these brave men and women, and I pray for them and their families.

Mr. Speaker, during National Police Week, and throughout the year, let us all remember to "Back the Badge."

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF).

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the sheriff so much for his leadership tonight and throughout the course as we honor law enforcement and police here and across the country.

I rise today to honor the brave men and women of our police forces in the Eighth Congressional District and across the Nation.

I have got to tell you that it is challenging to find the right words to thank those who literally lay their lives on the line for others each and every day—most of the time for people who they have never met.

This past Monday, I had the incredible privilege of joining the Jackson Police Department and the Madison County Sheriff's Office at a memorial service in Jackson, Tennessee. I was moved to see not just the active and retired officers there but also the family members of those who died in the line of duty.

During the ceremony, there was a wreath for all those who have lost their lives in the line of duty in the Jackson and Madison County area. The names of those officers, sheriff's deputies, and law enforcement officials who laid their lives on the line, going back to the 1800s, were read. For some of those who died many years ago, there were no family members there. There were family members for those who died going back 60 and 70 years ago in the line of duty.

Each of those family members were given a rose that they would place in a wreath—a memorial for all those who have died in the line of duty. It was very moving to see those family members and, obviously, to hear the names

of those people who have given their lives in the line of duty.

The ceremony reminded me of the daily sacrifices that our law enforcement make in order to protect and serve their communities, their State, and their country. These men and women have families, hobbies, and places of worship. They are heroes living among us who deserve our praise each and every day.

During my time as the United States Attorney for the Western District of Tennessee, I worked closely with our police departments and law enforcement agencies to tackle violent crime. Our men and women in law enforcement were on the front lines of some of the most incredibly dangerous and sensitive situations. I feel fortunate to have seen how their tireless work saves lives and changes communities for the better.

I also want to take time to thank those in the United States Capitol Police here in Washington, D.C. They are some of the finest, sharpest men and women in the country. We can rest easier knowing they are watching closely over our Nation's capital and protecting our democracy.

This is a pivotal time for our country. We must not forget the significance of maintaining law and order. At a time when it seems so many in our society have grown distrustful and disrespectful of law enforcement, the overwhelming majority of the people in the country respect our law enforcement. They need to know that they have our support now more than ever. Too often, their courage and selfless deeds go unnoticed and unacknowledged. Whether it is bringing violent criminals to justice, rushing to the scene of a terrible incident, or keeping constant watch over our schools and neighborhoods, our police officers serve with such distinction. We must not take their service and steady presence for granted.

I have never been more appreciative of law enforcement for all that they do to keep us safe. National Police Week is a solemn time as we remember those we have lost. We must also celebrate our active police officers and law enforcement who will continue to serve our country for future generations.

I thank the sheriff for allowing me to speak this evening on behalf of all those in law enforcement. We truly appreciate their service.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Police Week. It is also Mental Health Awareness Month. I want to thank my colleague, whom we affectionately call sheriff, who served his great State for 33 years.

I want to express my profound gratitude to the men and women in uniform

and their families who serve and sacrifice so much to protect our safety.

I think we also need to talk about a way that we can repay these men and women for their sacrifice by making mental health services more available to our law enforcement officers so that they have the resources to handle so many difficult on-the-job situations that they deal with every single day.

Police officers are under constant attack, often on the job, caught literally in the crossfire of violent domestic violence disputes; violent crime; finding and recovering bodies of murder victims, some of whom are young children; targets for lone wolf shootings and attacks; injecting Narcan, the overdose reversal drug, into people who have overdosed on heroin, trying to save them.

Think about all of the different things that the men and women in uniform have to do day in and day out. For most people, just one of these experiences would be enough to cause trauma. But our police officers face these and other unthinkable situations daily, sometimes leading to significant mental health challenges for officers like suicidal thoughts, anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder, and depression.

Fortunately, we have many law enforcement groups, including the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department and the Indiana Fraternal Order of Police, who are working to offer our officers the support and treatment they need to continue to protect themselves and our communities.

Since 2010, officers in Indianapolis have been able to receive counseling and referrals to doctors and clinicians through unique, in-house programs staffed by fellow trained officers.

To help police departments develop and implement similar programs, I have introduced, along with my good friend, a new Member of Congress from Florida, VAL DEMINGS, the former police chief of Orlando, H.R. 2228, the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act.

This bill will improve the sharing of Federal best practices by the Department of Justice, the Department of Defense, and the VA with local police departments. It will make grants available to initiate peer-mentoring pilot programs and develop training for mental health providers specific to law enforcement, study the effectiveness of crisis hotlines, and get officers mental health checkups.

If our police officers are healthy, our communities will be even safer. We owe it to all of our heroes in law enforcement across the country to protect their mental health and well-being, and I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR). The gentleman from Washington has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS), the former police chief of Orlando.

□ 1945

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, one of my greatest honors was serving as a police officer in Orlando for 27 years. My husband is a sheriff in Orange County, and he has been serving for 35 years in law enforcement. But today I am here to talk about how we can better take care of our law enforcement officers as they continue to take care of us.

Our law enforcement officers are called to some of the most horrific situations and run into harm's way to protect us and our families every day. Almost a year ago, officers responded to the Pulse nightclub shooting, known now as the site of the deadliest mass shooting in our Nation's history: 49 persons lost their lives that night and more were severely injured.

Imagine the scene as the officers responded. One officer said one thing he will never forget is hearing the sound of the cellphones ringing as loved ones called the victims, but, of course, the victims could not answer.

During the most dangerous and most tragic of circumstances, our law enforcement officers may appear superhuman, but they are only human, and responding to scenes like this—or any other horrific scene—no one can really prepare for that. It is just one example of what our officers face.

I believe we have a responsibility to our first responders. That is why I am very proud to cosponsor H.R. 2228, the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017, with my good friend SUSAN BROOKS from Indiana. The bill would direct the Departments of Justice, Defense, and Veterans Affairs, as you have heard, to share best practices that can help law enforcement officers in tragic situations.

I am so proud to share this legislation with my good friend and urge other colleagues within Congress to join us to make this vision a reality. Mr. Speaker, we must do everything we can to protect the men and women who keep our cities, our towns, and our communities safe.

Again, I thank the sheriff so much for his service, and I thank the gentleman for helping us to honor the men and women who are so deserving of this honor.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chief. It is an honor to serve with the gentlewoman. I know the gentlewoman has a special quality about her now that I heard her husband was a sheriff. The gentlewoman is all thumbs up on my team, and I thank her for her sincere, thoughtful comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) who is a former Chicago police officer.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington and the sheriff.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the men and women who have paid the ultimate sacrifice to protect our communities.

In 2016, two brave Arizona officers died as they responded to calls: David Van Glasser, Phoenix Police Department; and Darrin Reed, Show Low Police Department, which is in my district. Both of those men left behind family and loved ones.

As a former police officer and homicide investigator, National Police Week has a special meaning to me. I have lost friends, partners, brothers, and sisters in the line of duty. I have grieved with their families during the most difficult times, and I have experienced firsthand the real sacrifices they make.

Each of the 135 officers from across the country who died in the line of duty in 2016 worked to keep our neighborhoods safe. While we can never repay the debts we owe them and their families, we will forever remember their service.

As we look to the future, it is important to highlight the work being done in cities and towns across the country to not only better protect our families, but also the lives of our law enforcement officers. In Arizona, successful community policing programs in Flagstaff, Phoenix, and countless other cities and towns have improved relationships.

I am proud to join my colleagues from both sides of the aisle on the House Law Enforcement Caucus. I look forward to continuing the bipartisan work we are doing to identify and solve the challenges facing our law enforcement community.

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

ALLEGED RUSSIAN COLLUSION

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to join my colleagues in honoring our law enforcement officers across America, particularly in my home State, and look forward to providing that tribute in days to come. I thank my colleague, the sheriff, for his work.

I have come to the floor today, however, to again comment on the appointment of a special counsel to investigate the Russian collusion, alleged Russian collusion of the President's campaign operatives and the President as relates to the 2016 election.

Director Mueller is a well respected law enforcement leader. I look forward to his quick response. But I believe it is important for this Congress, and I ask Speaker RYAN to ensure, that the

committees of jurisdiction—Oversight and Government Reform, House Judiciary Committee, and House Intelligence Committee—do their work as well. That work would include hearings on the issues before us and an impeachment inquiry to determine the facts.

I believe that we can do this together, Mr. Speaker, not as Republicans and Democrats, but as Americans. The truth must be found, and America will be better for it.

INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is Infrastructure Week in the United States, and while Hallmark may not quite yet be making cards to observe Infrastructure Week, I hope those of us here in Congress can take a moment to recognize that this is a unique opportunity to talk about the importance of the state of our Nation's infrastructure.

This is a time, as I was mentioning, really to focus on all modes of transportation and our utility systems that most of us only tend to notice when they are broken.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of broken infrastructure in our country to notice lately. In fact, even President Donald Trump has recognized that the roads, bridges, and all the other underpinnings that make our modern world possible are crumbling and need urgent attention.

So the President has vowed repeatedly, both as a candidate and as President, to invest at least \$1 trillion in our infrastructure system. That was a key promise of his campaign and critical to his appeal to working class Americans, including in my home State of Pennsylvania.

But that promise is, so far, as broken as our Nation's infrastructure. Instead, 4 months into his administration, this President is laying the groundwork to shortchange American workers and manufacturers. Mr. President, it is most disappointing.

I stood Monday morning at Philadelphia International Airport. I stood with the former Governor of our State, Ed Rendell, who is part of a bipartisan

group called Building America's Future. I stood with both Democratic and Republican Members of this body who happen to represent the greater Philadelphia area. I also stood with Senator COONS of Delaware, who, himself, lives not too far from the Philadelphia International Airport. We used that setting to talk about the importance of Infrastructure Week and reinvesting in our Nation's infrastructure today and for tomorrow.

I mentioned in those remarks something that I am going to mention here tonight: 100 years ago, there was no doubt that the United States of America was the leader in the world when it comes to infrastructure. Our roads, our bridges, our waterway systems, our mass transit, and our gas lines were rated number one. Today, if you seek out the report of the American Society of Civil Engineers—these are not Democrats; they are not Republicans; they are really nonpartisan; they are civil engineers—we are rated a D-plus.

The International Civil Engineers do not rate the United States of America in the top 20 when it comes to infrastructure. That should bother all of us, whether you are Democrat or Republican or Independent or nonpolitical.

I have to say, as someone who believes in this country and believes that we should always strive to be number one, not even being in the top 20 bothers me, and it is simply not good enough. It is unwise economic policy.

Part of why the 20th century became known as the American Century is because we were the number one world leader when it came to our infrastructure. How are we supposed to compete today and in the future if we are not even in the top 10 or the top 20?

Mr. Speaker, for the needs of our infrastructure and for a myriad of other issues related to this, I have cofounded the Blue Collar Caucus. I have spoken on this House floor about the need for our country's leaders to pay attention again to our blue-collar workers and our blue-collar economy.

I am so happy that, while tonight might be specifically about infrastructure and that sliver of the overall blue-collar economy, I am joined in this effort with my cofounder, the co-chairman of this caucus, MARC VEASEY of Texas. He will be speaking in a moment, as well as a few other members of our caucus, about the importance of reinvesting in our Nation's infrastructure and why that is critical to our economy.

Mr. Speaker, if we really want to put Americans back to work and put them back to work not in low-paid jobs but in good-paying jobs—family-sustaining jobs—the way to do it is to reinvest in our Nation's infrastructure. I have many other things to say on this topic that I will be saying throughout the next hour or so.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), the co-chair-

man of our Blue Collar Caucus. He is someone who has been a real leader on this issue and feels just as passionately about it as I do.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from the great State of Pennsylvania for helping cofound the Blue Collar Caucus and just doing a tremendous job. As you know, the hardworking men and women of Pennsylvania, and particularly the Philadelphia area, have been so responsible for many of the things that have really made our country what it is, many of the great public works, many of the amazing museums, and many of the amazing things, bridges, just things like that that people take for granted that there was someone that built those things, there was someone that toiled possibly in the heat and in the snow, but they were able to bring home a good wage doing it. They were able to take care of their families. They were able to send their kids to college.

I love when the gentleman talks about his family and the sacrifices that the gentleman's parents made working in a blue-collar job that ultimately helped him go to one of the most prestigious universities—Notre Dame. So I just really appreciate the fact that the gentleman appreciates the hardworking men and women that really make this country great.

We need to do more for them. One of the ways that we can do more for them is to pass an infrastructure bill. I don't think that there is any doubt about that.

We know that this is Infrastructure Week. With roughly \$700 billion a year that is being invested at the local, State, and Federal level, infrastructure is vitally important to our economy. We have to have good infrastructure to meet the basic needs of the American people. That may sound like quite a bit of money, but we can't spend enough money to repair and replace our crumbling roads, bridges, and other critical infrastructure.

I listened to ELIZABETH ESTY last night, one of our colleagues from Connecticut, talk about the dangers that are involved in not investing in infrastructure and some of the deaths that tragically have occurred on American roads because of collapsing bridges and things like that. That is not what we want.

We need for the American taxpayer to have confidence that the roads that they are driving on and that the airports that they are using are up to date, that we have the best ports, that we have the best transit systems in this country, and that we have the money to keep those things world-class systems and efficient systems in our country. They have to be safe.

□ 2000

According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, one out of every five

miles of highway pavement in our Nation is in poor condition. That is an estimated 56,000 of the Nation's bridges that are structurally deficient. Think about the truck driver who drives every day, think about the person who makes their living on the road. Think about how many families want their loved ones to travel on safe roads. Think about all of the families who depend on their loved ones to make a living on those roads. That is how they put food on the table at the end of the week, at the end of every 2 weeks, at the end of the month, however they get their check. They need to be safe. Those families need to know that those hardworking men and women who work on those roads every day and use them to help fuel American exceptionalism, they need to know that those roads are safe.

Some estimates say that modernizing our infrastructure to meet our needs is going to require an additional \$5 trillion in Federal spending over the next decade. Federal investment in infrastructure is an economic boost that can also create good-paying jobs for blue-collar workers.

I have to tell you, many were encouraged, a lot of people that I know—Democrats, Republicans, Independents—they were very encouraged when the Trump administration floated the idea of a \$1 trillion infrastructure plan. But instead of presenting a detailed infrastructure plan that puts Americans back to work, the Trump administration has basically offered a plan that lacks details. It doesn't really go into how we are going to get this done.

The reports that I have seen say that the Trump plan, if you want to call it a plan, like I said, contains very few details. It contains tax incentives for private industries that make up as much as 80 percent of the cost of the bill.

Let me tell you two reasons why that is bad. It would simply enrich companies that would have built their projects anyway, and the only private investment it would encourage is for projects that contain a funding stream such as toll roads.

I have to say, if toll roads are the only choice that people have, they will maybe take them. But I know that a bipartisan group of Texans, and I saw this especially when I was in the State legislature before I came to Congress, they are really upset with toll roads. They feel we have too many of them, and they want to see the infrastructure investment that we need in this country to get our roads back up to par and to help relieve congestion.

Encouraging private investment in infrastructure is not necessarily a bad idea, but it requires the proper oversight and the selection of the right kinds of projects. I have to tell you, there is a bipartisan group that believes in that. Both the Obama admin-

istration under Secretary Foxx and the Bush Transportation Secretary, Mary Peters, they both agree that public-private partnerships are only able to address a small segment of what is needed.

Without careful attention, we risk wasting taxpayer funds by giving big tax breaks to companies on the backs of hardworking American families.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk some more later about job creation and about Davis-Bacon and about some other things that need to be addressed, but I want to be sure that we hear from another one of our colleagues and friends from the Rust Belt, Ms. MARCY KAPTUR who is here. So I am going to turn it back over to you so you can introduce her. When she talks about what is going on in the heartland and in Ohio, she works directly with those men and women who work in manufacturing and who work in construction. I bet you she has some things that we need to hear about dealing with infrastructure and how it can help our States and help our country.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. As my colleague was just mentioning, someone who has really been a champion on these issues for decades, someone who intellectually gets it, but also speaks on these issues not just with her head but with her heart, and now as the climate in our country has, I think, evolved on some of these issues, some people are recognizing that what she was talking about for quite a while has been proven to be correct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) who I am honored to serve with.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman BOYLE and Congressman VEASEY for their leadership and the new energy and the innovative ideas that they bring here from their constituency on behalf of our country. It is a privilege to join you tonight and talk about the infrastructure of our country, a major infrastructure bill, and it is certainly appropriate during this infrastructure week.

The whole vital topic of investing in a national infrastructure plan and investing in those who will help to modernize America translates into good jobs, as Congressman VEASEY has talked about, and progress for America that Congressman BOYLE has talked about.

When we think about infrastructure, some people only think about roads and bridges, and we certainly need attention to those across our country. So many places throughout our Nation are in desperate need of repair. Frankly, the street I live on, there is a big sinkhole at the end of the street.

Mr. Speaker, 17 percent of the roads in Ohio, my home State, are in poor condition, according to the American

Society of Civil Engineers. They estimate that the average Ohio driver pays an extra \$475 a year from driving on roads in need of repair. Look no further than me. I had to pay \$500 for a whole front end because of hitting a big pothole driving at home at night. So we know how much it costs.

Let me urge President Trump and the administration not to limit their thinking on an infrastructure bill. Infrastructure should be about our roads and bridges for sure, but it should go far beyond that for modernizing the Nation.

As the ranking member on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Energy and Water Development, I take very seriously America's responsibility to modernize the country for this new century.

Our energy grid desperately needs an update, and power outages across this country attest to that. Our waterways need help, too. And our drinking water infrastructure, just in Ohio it is estimated will cost \$12.2 billion over the next 20 years.

As hard as it is to fathom, and I am sure the President hasn't had a chance to read the fine print on this, but the President's budget office proposed to zero out the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative which is so vital to fresh drinking water in our vast region. The President has said he wants to help the people in Flint, Michigan. He campaigned there several times. But it is not an either/or. It is both/and. You have to have funding in the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative to take care of the water issues confronting the Great Lakes where algal blooms get larger and larger every year due to phosphorus and nitrogen runoff.

Our waterways, our drinking water, are vital components of our national infrastructure. Over 11 million people just on Lake Erie alone, the lake that I represent, need that fresh water. The systems are very old. Some estimate in the cities, cities are losing 30 percent or more of the water distribution underground because of aging pipelines. We truly need to look both above the ground and underneath it.

Through many of the counties that I represent, there are old septic systems in place, and 40 percent or more of them are leaking. They contribute to some of the problems that we are having in our fresh water systems. These communities need a helping hand and extra financing to help put their wastewater systems into compliance.

I have also proposed a bill for a 21st century civilian conservation corps for needed investments in our States and national parks and forests. Ohio and Michigan alone need to plant 20 million trees to replace those that have been damaged by invasive species.

I wanted to also mention, I represent, and I know Congressman BOYLE and Congressman VEASEY, we represent

urban communities, and many of those communities have housing that is 100 years old. Some a little more, some a little less. Imagine if infrastructure could include weatherization so we could place new roofs on millions of homes across this country. We could train people how to do this. We could help bring up the younger generation.

Also windows and insulation. If we look at the condition of America's housing stock, particularly following the collapse of 2008, if we look at saving Americans money that they currently spend on wasting energy because they can't afford to put on a new roof, windows, or insulate their homes, we could help millions of Americans. As we help to improve America's infrastructure, I really believe housing has an important role to play in this regard, especially with energy conservation.

Honestly, as I close my remarks tonight, and I thank Congressman BOYLE and Congressman VEASEY for their leadership, Mr. Speaker, it is not only rewarding to work with them, it is fun, too.

Mr. Speaker, Americans have been waiting for us and the Federal Government to really give them a helping hand up. I know working together on a bipartisan basis, we can produce an infrastructure bill that the country has been waiting for, as Congressman BOYLE says, for decades. I know that our mayors, our county commissioners, and our Governors across the country would work hand in hand with us, and I think Americans from coast to coast would applaud what we are able to do here in order to help our country rebuild itself in this new century.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman KAPTUR.

I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, at the very beginning of my remarks that we kicked off infrastructure week on Monday morning at an event at Philadelphia International Airport. One of those Members of Congress who joined me for that event is the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS), someone who practices what he preaches when it comes to the issues that most concern the Blue Collar Caucus, and someone who can really speak about infrastructure from many different perspectives.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that kind introduction. It was a remarkable time sitting at the airport right there on the Delaware River and understanding how much we depend on safe, secure travel in those airports around the country.

But to both MARC and BRENDAN, thank you for the Blue Collar Caucus and bringing to light many of the issues that at times we as a nation might have forgotten, quite frankly,

those who work with their hands, those who are getting up each and every morning and going to work, having a job, taking care of their family, and I think focusing on that is so important.

I am myself involved with the Building Trades Caucus, and we are talking about something that is near and dear to everybody's heart, and it is called infrastructure.

In this day and age when people are wondering about what is going on in the country, I want to talk about the "t" word. No, it is not Donald Trump; it is a trillion dollars, and that is the number that people have been talking about that we need for infrastructure.

Infrastructure means many things to many different people. If you are in Flint, Michigan, it is about having clean water. The pipes need to be replaced. We have a growing infrastructure that is many years old.

When we think back about one of the major components of infrastructure in this country, during the Eisenhower administration, it was building the interstate system, from north to south, from east to west, connecting coasts, connecting cities, connecting States. And that is something that has been so important to us. But apparently not important enough to keep and maintain.

I am very familiar with the systems that we have. I went to the other 4-year school; it was called an apprenticeship program, an electrical apprenticeship that I spent 4 years in. After graduating, I worked up and down the Delaware River at refineries, on bridges, and on our infrastructure. We know how important it is.

But in Congress, because of the Blue Collar Caucus and many others, we need to remember that the dignity of a job is so important. We have 211 attorneys here in Congress, but there is only one electrician. There is only one carpenter. There is only one ironworker, and there is only one painter. Diversity comes in many shapes and sizes, and our Founding Fathers understood how important that was. They were farmers, printers, attorneys, doctors, all coming together and bringing those experiences into this very House, this very floor, to remember why we are here.

Anybody who drove on a road to get here today understands what infrastructure means.

□ 2015

But somehow we haven't paid attention. We had the American Society of Civil Engineers brief us a few weeks ago to the Building Trades Caucus on the report card that they give each and every year: aviation, a D; bridges, a C-plus; ports, a C-plus; energy, a D; transit, a D. The overall report card was a D.

If I had come home with a D on my report card, I know what my parents

would have done to us. But somehow having the D on the report card for the very infrastructure here in the United States has been acceptable.

Well, it is not. We are deferring this problem to the next generation when we owe them a responsibility of turning over our world to them in a little bit better shape, not worse shape.

So when we look at that investment in roads, rails, ports, airports, it does something more than just to fix the very problems that we look at each and every day. It is about a job. What better way to put America back to work than fixing our own infrastructure. Nobody does it better than the building trades who have the training programs second to none and does not use one dime of public investment. All funded privately. Fifteen different trades coming together to fix our infrastructure.

In addition to that, they do something that is really special. We all know the figure when it comes to those who put the uniform on to help protect our country is less than 1 percent. We have so many of those men and women who are coming home today, and there is a program that the Building Trades Caucus have put together called Helmets to Hardhats. Taking those who want to come home and start a career, took their helmet off and go right into an apprenticeship program, put the hardhat on. What better way to say to those veterans they are welcome home than to give them a job? But not just a job, a career.

So as we continue to have the discussions day-to-day, the "t" word is about trillion dollars. It is about putting back into our country the investment that it is due.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank my colleagues for coming here today to make sure that we remember those men and women who don't necessarily put on a suit and tie but have the dignity of going to work each day as blue-collar workers, and we are damn proud of it.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. I should have mentioned when I was introducing Mr. NORCROSS that he is the founder and the chairman of the Building Trades Caucus. When he talked about that one electrician, he was talking about himself. I understand from some of his former electrician buddies that he was a top-rated electrician. He is someone who has literally walked the walk.

It now gives me a real pleasure to introduce someone who has represented Chicago and the Chicagoland area for a number of years, someone who also gets it when it comes to the issues that most concern the Blue Collar Caucus, and then specifically what we are addressing tonight in the Special Order, the need to reinvest in our Nation's infrastructure and put people back to work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to say, first of all, it is an honor to follow Mr. NORCROSS. As Mr. BOYLE said, one of the very few in this body who is an actual member of the building and construction trades. I didn't intend to talk about this originally, but I just want to say it is very important that all of us in this Nation give more respect to the building and construction trades, and all the men and women in the trades who have built this Nation. These are great jobs that provide a good living for families, and they are building our Nation. We need to encourage more young people to go into the building and construction trades.

I used to teach college. I was a college professor, but I know we need to make sure that young people today understand what a great life they can have, what great jobs these are in the trades.

I want to thank Mr. NORCROSS for the work that he has done helping to build this Nation and now working here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. BOYLE and Mr. VEASEY for their work on the Blue Collar Caucus. There are a lot of people in this country who think Washington has forgotten them, many blue-collar men and women who turned out in the election and I think were motivated in many ways by that feeling that they have been forgotten. Many of these are the blue-collar men and women who work so hard every day.

We are here tonight to say we have not forgotten. We understand how important you are to our Nation and the work that you do, and especially tonight to talk about how important the work you do building and repairing our infrastructure is to all of us.

There is a lot of infrastructure we have in this Nation that needs to be fixed, to be built. Ms. KAPTUR talked about many of these different areas. One of them, of course, is in drinking water and sewers. So much of it was built right after either the early part of the 20th century or after World War II, and now it is deteriorating. I hear the stories all the time from some of my municipalities back home, saying that they are afraid that the pipes are completely gone, the water right now is just running through the hole that was left from the pipes. There is so much infrastructure we need to build.

I want to focus especially tonight on transportation. I sit on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. President Trump promised that he would have a \$1 trillion bill to fund infrastructure. I think it is critical that, in these days where we have so many other things that we are focused on, we don't forget—and we have not forgotten—the fact that we need to do this infrastructure bill.

Focusing on transportation, we all know we need our transportation infra-

structure to get anywhere we are going. You get up in the morning, you take your kids to school, you go to work, you are going to the store, you are going to church on Sunday, anywhere you go, you need the transportation infrastructure. If it wasn't there, you couldn't get there.

So we are talking not just about roads and bridges, we are talking about public transit. Public transit systems in many of our big cities are crumbling. We know that in Chicago. We know all the problems right now from that crumbling infrastructure. Something we oftentimes don't think about is that public transit, how critical it is, how important it is. So let's remember all of that. Let's remember the sidewalks, the bike and pedestrian paths, everything that gets people to where they need to go.

Everybody knows the problems that we face. Everyone knows in their daily lives what we need to do, how much transportation infrastructure needs work. Chicago is oftentimes labeled the most congested city in America. If it is not number one, it is in the top three. We know it, but people all across the country know it. We need to do this work. If we do this work, first of all, we are putting people to work immediately building the roads, bridges, repairing the infrastructure, the rails.

We also need to talk about the locks and dams on our inland waterways, things that many of us never see because we just pass over our waterways on the road, on bridges, and don't even see the vital waterways that also serve important roles in our country. And the ports. We need to invest in all of these.

We put people to work immediately. But also what is important, besides the fact it helps us get around, helps us get to wherever we are going every day, is it also makes our economy more efficient. It makes American business more efficient. If we have an efficient transportation system in our country, American business is more efficient. And that is why so many of them, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, have been on this for a number of years, that we need to improve our transportation system so American business can thrive. And if American business thrives, more Americans get hired by businesses. Not just building the transportation infrastructure, not just working on it, but all businesses in America are more efficient, can hire more people. It makes our economy run.

This is something critical. With everything else that is going on right now—and we know what that is, and we never know what is coming day-to-day—all these other things are important that we are talking about and that we are looking at. But we cannot forget—and the American people know this—that we need to do our work here

and we need to pass an infrastructure bill, including a big transportation component to that.

We are going to continue to fight for that. No matter what else is going on here, no matter what else you hear people talking about, we are here to say we need to do this. The American people know we need to do this. It helps all Americans, but especially the blue-collar Americans, the ones who have been suffering for many years in our country.

One other thing. President Trump talks about buy American. I am happy that he came out last month and said the administration is going to look at how we can improve our buy American law so that when the Federal Government buys things, they are going to buy American-made products.

But I have to say, if we want to do something immediately, I have a bill that I introduced, the Buy American Improvement Act, which closes a lot of the loopholes that exist right now in our domestic content, buy American laws. It extends buy American laws, domestic content laws to Federal spending that it is not applied to right now. For example, Drinking Water State Revolving Fund for drinking water.

It is important that we use American tax dollars to put Americans to work. It is great that the administration is looking at what can be done; but I have to say, this bill, the Buy American Improvement Act, we can get this done, get this passed, get this into law. When we pass that infrastructure bill, we will make sure Americans are being put to work with American taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank the Blue Collar Caucus and Mr. BOYLE and Mr. VEASEY for all the work that they are doing, and the most important thing is for the American people. The American people need to know that we are here fighting for them, especially those blue-collar workers who think they have been forgotten.

You have not been forgotten.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. LIPINSKI for his words, and I appreciate his membership in the Blue Collar Caucus.

In going through this entire discussion on infrastructure, because there are so many things that we could talk about as part of this, certainly I would encourage those interested in this topic to read the report of the American Society of Civil Engineers. It is an overwhelming case for why we need at least a \$1 trillion infrastructure plan really making up for decades upon decades of underinvestment in our Nation's infrastructure. We could certainly talk about that and talk about many different aspects of it.

In the few minutes that we have remaining, I want to talk about its overall effect on our country. I am not

talking about dollars and cents. I am not talking about in a tangible way. I mean something that is not tangible, that you can't exactly put your fingers on; and that is the spirit of America.

Mr. Speaker, something that Americans have always been known for is our eternal optimism. So much so that if you are friends with folks in Europe and in other places, they would always gently make fun of Americans for being so optimistic, for our undeniable, unending belief in the power of the future; that tomorrow will always be better than today.

□ 2030

Yet we know, Mr. Speaker, in recent times too few Americans are feeling optimistic about our country's future. All the polls are showing that. There has been a pretty dramatic turn in just the last 20, 30 years in how Americans feel about their own personal futures and the future of this country.

Part of what leads to that, part of it is stagnant economic wages. I have talked about that at length on the floor as part of a previous Blue Collar Caucus hour. Part of that also, though, is the sense that we are not building anymore; that 100 years ago we were building, that we were launching the first airplane; that 50 years ago we were going to the Moon.

In the Eisenhower era we were building the world's best highways. But in today's day and age, we don't build anymore. That growth is happening in Asia and in other parts of the world.

So just imagine what that would do not just for the economy, not just for our infrastructure, but imagine what it would do for the spirit of America if they saw a trillion-dollar infrastructure bill take hold, if they saw our roads being rebuilt and new roads being built, if they saw the investments that we can make in our mass transit and our intercity rail.

I happen to represent a district smack dab in the middle of the Northeast corridor. I met today in my office with the chairman of The Northeast Maglev project, a project to take a technology that exists today in Japan, build it here in the United States, and make it possible that you could get from New York City to my district in Philadelphia in a half hour, that you could get from New York City to Washington, D.C., in 1 hour instead of the 3 hours that it takes today. That would have a transformative effect. No other place in the world has the maglev. Even in Japan, which has invented the technology, it is only in a small snippet.

So making sure that we can move forward in a bipartisan way, actually achieving something with Democrats and Republicans working together with this administration, we would send such a signal beyond the substance of the issue itself. I believe that we would

have a dramatic effect in improving the way that the American people feel about their future and the future of our country.

Mr. Speaker, literally, over a million jobs will be created by a \$1 trillion infrastructure bill. I wanted to speak about the importance of making sure that those are high-paying jobs and why the Davis-Bacon Act is linked to that, but knowing that my co-chairman will speak about this issue, I am happy to turn that over to him now to speak about that issue and others that are affected by this.

As it may be my last time speaking on this, I thank my colleagues for their passion on this issue. I appeal to the White House, to President Trump specifically: Please work with us on this issue. It is, I believe, the single best way we could unite Democrats and Republicans in the House and the Senate. We can get this done. It is something that must get done. It would put millions of Americans—that is not an exaggeration, by the way. It would put over a million Americans back to work. It is critically needed for today and tomorrow, and I appeal to this White House, even in this hyperpartisan, fractured time, to work with us on this issue and finally, 4 months after taking office, unveil your infrastructure plan.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), my colleague and co-chairman.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BOYLE. I really appreciate the points he has made tonight, just so timely. It is so important that we talk about those things during Infrastructure Week and the Blue Collar Caucus and the role that the caucus is playing in pointing out a lot of these things that need to be talked about.

Again, when you talk about the infrastructure bill, if we had a legitimate trillion-dollar infrastructure program and it were enacted, we could put the United States back on a prerecession job growth path and, some people say, create close to 11 million jobs.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, infrastructure spending today—that is what we spend on infrastructure spending right now—is directly responsible for about 15.5 million direct and indirect U.S. jobs, and you are talking about average salaries of \$68,000 per year. That is 28 percent above the U.S. median income. We know that infrastructure jobs pay well. There is absolutely no doubt about that.

Investment in infrastructure also adds more indirect jobs in manufacturing, logistics, transportation, and an increasing demand for steel, glass, concrete; and all those things get the job growth growing in America.

According to Georgetown University, more than half of the new infrastructure jobs will go to high school grad-

uates and even high school dropouts. So many of our young men who find themselves dropping out end up in the incarceration system, but we know that, if we can find high school dropouts a job and they are not left behind due to economic changes and economic factors, we can help those young men.

According to that same analysis, jobs and occupations that are expected to grow with greater infrastructure investment pay more than typical wages for high school graduates. Engineering and management jobs, which usually require higher levels of education, also offer good opportunities. However, even construction and transportation jobs associated with infrastructure projects provide higher earnings than an average job for high school graduates. The Blue Collar Caucus advocates not only more jobs but, again, better quality jobs.

I used to hear people talk around the dinner table or the domino table or the card table when I was growing up. People wanted to know where the good jobs were, how can you get on at a good job. That is what I am talking about: how we are going to create more of those.

The Davis-Bacon Act, you heard Representative BOYLE talk a little bit about that earlier, about how important that is. We should be troubled. When you start talking about good jobs, good-paying jobs, we should be troubled that congressional Republicans have taken steps to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act.

I want to talk a little bit about the Davis-Bacon Act, but first I want to talk about why the Davis-Bacon Act is important. A lot of times in Washington, D.C., we start talking about these terms. People at the Chamber of Commerce, they know what Davis-Bacon is, but maybe the average person has no idea what Davis-Bacon is.

People don't come up to me at the Dollar Store in Fort Worth and say: Hey, Congressman VEASEY, hey, MARC, what are we going to do to protect Davis-Bacon? But people do stop me at the Dollar Store and say: Hey, MARC, what are we going to do about putting some more money in our pockets?

That is what Davis-Bacon is all about. That is where the Republicans fail the American worker.

The Davis-Bacon Act requires that certain contractors and subcontractors responsible for carrying out Federal contracts pay their laborers and mechanics the prevailing wages for the area. That is what I am talking about when I say putting more money in your pocket, putting more food on the table, being able to make that light bill, being able to make that car bill, being able to make that truck payment.

I want to sell more cars. We have a General Motors plant in Arlington, Texas, that makes some very good SUVs, good-paying union jobs, good

union-made SUVs, American-made SUVs, and you don't get that with lower rates. You get that with the prevailing wage rates that Republicans are trying to do away with. That is what everybody needs to understand.

Ensuring workers are paid a fair wage is extremely important, especially for blue-collar workers. Prevailing wage laws provide protections for both construction workers and the taxpayers. They ensure that all contractors bidding on public construction projects will pay family-supporting wages and that they also ensure projects will be built to the highest standards by skilled, safe, and well-trained construction workers.

Numerous studies have shown, contrary to the claims of corporate interests, that Davis-Bacon wage protections do not increase taxpayers' costs. That is the one thing that you are going to hear from Republicans and downtown business interest people when they want to keep income inequality growing in this country instead of trying to stop income inequality is that Davis-Bacon drives up wages because it allows families to put more food on their table. I think that is a doggone shame.

Fairly paid craftsmen added value to our investments in infrastructure, and Davis-Bacon must continue to be included in any infrastructure plan. Repeal of Davis-Bacon would decrease the quality of blue-collar jobs, and that is a loss that we cannot afford. A repeal of Davis-Bacon would decrease the amount of money that you take home every week or that you take home every 2 weeks, however often you get that check, however often you look for that direct deposit so you can make those bills. If we repeal Davis-Bacon, you will not be making those bills as easy as you were before.

You need to let your Republican Member of Congress know that you want to bring more money home, that you want these prevailing wages, that you do not want to lose these, that it would be absolutely devastating for your family.

Another area that Blue Collar Caucus has talked about, another area that we are going to continue to talk about and that Congress should press forward on in great speed is the Buy America provisions. They have to be in any infrastructure package that we pass.

Buy America generally requires that projects carried out by State and local governments use U.S.-made iron and steel and that they also require domestic production and assembly of other manufactured goods be made right here in the good old USA.

These projects—again, mainly highways, public transportation, aviation—are vitally important to our economy, and ensuring that these projects are made with quality American-made goods means that we get better value

and that we put our own people to work. All of this means more and better jobs for hardworking Americans out there.

As we set about rebuilding America's infrastructure, we have to make sure that we are building an economy that works for everyone and not just the corporate interests in this country because, again, we have to do something about income inequality in this country. It is very real. Productivity is up. People's paychecks are stagnant. That is why people still feel the economic pinch and the economic pain, because they see the growth, they see the technology, but they don't see their paychecks getting any fatter—but they do feel themselves struggling more and more and more. We have got to change that.

I would like to again thank Representative BOYLE just for being an advocate for the hardworking citizens in the Philadelphia area in his district, just for being a voice on this, and other Members of Congress that came out tonight—Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, and others—because we know that this is important.

We have to keep talking about this. We cannot continue to let the American worker fail. We cannot continue to let the American worker's dollar not grow while we see our economy grow and while we see new technology and fat cats getting rich, seeing corporate America getting rich but the average, everyday American just continues to fall further and further behind. It has to end. It has to end.

Congress needs to work together to do something about that. I am glad that the Democratic Party in the United States House of Representatives is taking the lead on this issue.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A Bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 867. An act to provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 18, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1359. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing 26 officers to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1360. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Indirect Food Additives: Polymers [Docket No.: FDA-2016-F-1805] received May 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1361. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Food Labeling; Nutrition Labeling of Standard Menu Items in Restaurants and Similar Retail Food Establishments; Extension of Compliance Date; Request for Comments [Docket No.: FDA-2011-F-0172] (RIN: 0910-ZA48) received May 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1362. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting the Army's proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of India, Transmittal No. 17-08, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1363. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, transmitting the 2016 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, pursuant to the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1364. A letter from the Chairperson, Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, transmitting the Council's FY 2016 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1365. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's Inspector General's semi-annual report for October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1366. A letter from the Acting Officer, Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's FY 2016 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1367. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's resolution of interim final rule — Extension of Pharmacy Copayments for Medications (RIN: 2900-AP87) received May 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-

121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1368. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Payment or Reimbursement for Certain Medical Expenses for Camp Lejeune Family Members (RIN: 2900-AO79) received May 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 195. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-128, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 227. A bill to modernize Government information technology, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-129, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2266. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes (Rept. 115-130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on House Administration discharged from further consideration H.R. 195 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Appropriations discharged from further consideration H.R. 2227 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. VELA, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. COHEN, Mr.

BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCEachin, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LOEBSSACK, Ms. MOORE, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 2475. A bill to provide for the long-term improvement of public school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 2476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HOYER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOEBSSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BASS, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HECK,

Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 2477. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 2478. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to clarify the distance requirement with respect to determining the eligibility of veterans to receive hospital care and medical services from non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LOEBSSACK, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 2479. A bill to rebuild and modernize the Nation's infrastructure to expand access to broadband internet, rehabilitate drinking water infrastructure, modernize the electric grid and energy supply infrastructure, redevelop brownfields, strengthen health care infrastructure, create jobs, protect public health and the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Transportation and Infrastructure, Ways and Means, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2480. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include an additional permissible use of amounts provided as grants under the Byrne JAG program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 2481. A bill to establish the Vulnerability Equities Review Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 2482. A bill to extend temporarily the Federal Perkins Loan program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself and Mr. BUCSHON):

H.R. 2483. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for

the establishment of a third-party quality system assessment program for devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROYCE of California, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 2484. A bill to ensure that the United States promotes the meaningful participation of women in mediation and negotiation processes seeking to prevent, mitigate, or resolve violent conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. FASO):

H.R. 2485. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to evaluate and consider revising regulations relating to emergency medical equipment requirements for passenger aircraft; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SABLON, and Ms. ADAMS):

H.R. 2486. A bill to amend title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to restore the right to individual civil actions in cases involving disparate impact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 2487. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the housing treatment of members of the Armed Forces and their spouses and dependents undergoing a permanent change of station in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DUFFY, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 2488. A bill to provide for small business concerns located in Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2489. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and the Small Business Act to include small business investment companies in the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 2490. A bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to increase the amount of financial support available for working students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr.

HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SIRE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2491. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2492. A bill to amend chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to require the forfeiture of worker's compensation benefits under such chapter by any individual who, while serving as a Member of Congress, converted campaign funds to personal use in violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 or engaged in other offenses relating to the abuse of the public trust, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 2493. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require individuals nominated or appointed to Senate-confirmed positions or to positions of a confidential or policymaking character to disclose certain types of contributions made or solicited by, or on behalf of, the individuals; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2494. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the President to place any financial conflicts of interest into a blind trust, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2495. A bill to protect consumers from deceptive practices with respect to online booking of hotel reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 2496. A bill to prohibit assessed or voluntary contributions to the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 2497. A bill to prohibit assistance for the Palestinian Authority and the West

Bank and Gaza, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself, Mr.

JEFFRIES, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HIMES, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MENG, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 2498. A bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to prohibit discrimination on account of sexual orientation or gender identity when extending credit; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms.

WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 2499. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to meet standards for the location and operation of polling places used in elections for Federal office, including a standard requiring States to ensure that no individual waits for longer than one hour to cast a vote at a polling place, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 2500. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit high-level Federal employees from participating in any matter substantially related to the appointee's former employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia (for

himself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2501. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing medical assistance at a residential pediatric recovery center to infants under 1 year of age with neonatal abstinence syndrome and their families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2502. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. KIND, and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California):

H.R. 2503. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to promote health care technology innovation and access to medical devices and services for which patients choose to self-pay under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself and Mr. POLIQUIN):

H.R. 2504. A bill to ensure fair treatment in licensing requirements for the export of certain echinoderms; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. SÁNCHEZ):

H.R. 2505. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a nonrefundable credit for working family caregivers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2506. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to award grants to nonprofit veterans service organizations to upgrade the community facilities of such organizations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 2507. A bill to provide for a technology demonstration program related to the modernization of the electric grid; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. EVANS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2508. A bill to provide discretionary authority to an immigration judge to determine that an alien parent of a United States citizen child should not be ordered removed, deported, or excluded from the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2509. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 190-day lifetime limit on inpatient psychiatric hospital services under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDD:

H. Res. 329. A resolution recognizing the significance of the hundredth anniversary of the Soda Cheerwine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. Res. 330. A resolution authorizing and directing certain authorizing committees to review laws within their jurisdiction and submit to the Committee on Oversight and

Government Reform changes in such laws necessary to eliminate excessive Executive Branch discretion in the application of those laws; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H. Res. 331. A resolution expressing the policy of the United States with respect to a two-state solution between the State of Israel and the Palestinian people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA,

Mr. KILDEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FOGLEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. HANABUSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H. Res. 332. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the International Day Against Homophobia and Transphobia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H. Res. 333. A resolution expressing support for States to adopt "Racheal's Law"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mr. LATTA):

H. Res. 334. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding grid modernization; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. MAST,

Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. JONES, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. EVANS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. PANETTA):

H. Res. 335. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Purple Heart Recognition Day; to the Committee on Armed Services.

mitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 2477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 2478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of our Land and Naval Forces.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof. [Page H1244]

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 3 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 2481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 2482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 2483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 2484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2485.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2486.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 2487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are sub-

Article 1, Section 8; and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 2490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 6, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 2494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

or

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:

H.R. 2495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, respectively giving Congress the authority to regulate interstate commerce and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers of Congress.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 2496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 2497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 2498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 2500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office thereof.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia:

H.R. 2501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 2504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution and the 16th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 2507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 2508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress shall have the power "to Establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization," and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which states that Congress shall have the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations."

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 77: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 83: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 91: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 100: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 106: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 108: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 154: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 179: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 203: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 214: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 227: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 299: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. STIVERS, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 305: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 314: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 367: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 389: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 400: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 414: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 429: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 468: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 490: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 568: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 613: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 619: Mr. LATTI, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 632: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 638: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 672: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 681: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 721: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 747: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 750: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 807: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. PERRY, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 812: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 813: Mr. CORREA, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 816: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. PANNETTA.

H.R. 821: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 828: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 849: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 851: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 856: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 866: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 916: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 924: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 927: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 952: Mr. LAWSON of Florida and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 968: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 980: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1000: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1017: Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1046: Ms. DEGETTE.

- H.R. 1057: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 1069: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
- H.R. 1090: Mr. KNIGHT.
- H.R. 1098: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
- H.R. 1116: Mr. GALLAGHER.
- H.R. 1130: Mr. MARSHALL.
- H.R. 1148: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. PAULSEN.
- H.R. 1156: Mr. BARR and Ms. CHENEY.
- H.R. 1164: Mr. BRAT and Mr. RUSSELL.
- H.R. 1185: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 1186: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 1200: Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 1212: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
- H.R. 1231: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
- H.R. 1235: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. REED, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. YODER, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. HUIZENGA.
- H.R. 1253: Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 1267: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 1296: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
- H.R. 1300: Mr. CRIST.
- H.R. 1318: Mr. PETERS and Ms. PINGREE.
- H.R. 1334: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
- H.R. 1339: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
- H.R. 1361: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
- H.R. 1405: Mr. ESPAILLAT and Ms. PINGREE.
- H.R. 1406: Mr. KILMER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. PETERS.
- H.R. 1409: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COFFMAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. YODER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
- H.R. 1422: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
- H.R. 1432: Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 1443: Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 1456: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H.R. 1460: Mr. BRAT.
- H.R. 1486: Mr. ELLISON.
- H.R. 1491: Mr. KNIGHT.
- H.R. 1498: Mr. HECK.
- H.R. 1528: Mr. KING of New York.
- H.R. 1539: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H.R. 1545: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1555: Mr. YOHO and Mr. LABRADOR.
- H.R. 1565: Mr. RENAOCCI.
- H.R. 1566: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
- H.R. 1606: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 1626: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 1652: Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 1673: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 1697: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
- H.R. 1698: Mr. HARPER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
- H.R. 1699: Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 1711: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
- H.R. 1734: Mr. MOULTON.
- H.R. 1759: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
- H.R. 1772: Ms. STEFANIK and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 1777: Mr. BRAT, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
- H.R. 1793: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 1811: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, and Mr. MOULTON.
- H.R. 1815: Ms. MENG.
- H.R. 1838: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. WESTERMAN.
- H.R. 1876: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
- H.R. 1904: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1920: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
- H.R. 1928: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LANCE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
- H.R. 1939: Mr. TIPTON.
- H.R. 1953: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
- H.R. 1955: Ms. STEFANIK.
- H.R. 1957: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DENT, and Ms. DEGETTE.
- H.R. 1968: Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. BACON.
- H.R. 1972: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
- H.R. 1993: Ms. MOORE and Mr. TURNER.
- H.R. 1997: Mr. SHIMKUS.
- H.R. 1999: Mr. ROKITA.
- H.R. 2004: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. ISSA.
- H.R. 2022: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
- H.R. 2023: Mr. OLSON and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 2029: Mr. BARTON.
- H.R. 2040: Mr. GROTHMAN.
- H.R. 2043: Ms. DEGETTE.
- H.R. 2051: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. DEGETTE.
- H.R. 2062: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
- H.R. 2063: Mr. DEUTCH.
- H.R. 2079: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
- H.R. 2090: Mr. LAMALFA.
- H.R. 2107: Mr. ABRAHAM.
- H.R. 2133: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.
- H.R. 2142: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
- H.R. 2151: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
- H.R. 2155: Mr. BYRNE.
- H.R. 2170: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. GIBBS.
- H.R. 2200: Mr. MEEHAN and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
- H.R. 2223: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. NOLAN.
- H.R. 2225: Mr. JONES, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANCE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KNIGHT, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
- H.R. 2226: Mr. ROSS.
- H.R. 2230: Mr. ROKITA.
- H.R. 2245: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 2262: Ms. PLASKETT.
- H.R. 2268: Ms. STEFANIK.
- H.R. 2272: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 2319: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
- H.R. 2327: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MARINO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
- H.R. 2353: Mr. GROTHMAN.
- H.R. 2358: Mr. BEYER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. COOK, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 2359: Mr. TIPTON.
- H.R. 2386: Mr. MARCHANT.
- H.R. 2395: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 2410: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
- H.R. 2421: Mr. DENT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
- H.R. 2428: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE, and Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 2431: Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 2432: Ms. STEFANIK.
- H.R. 2450: Mr. ROYCE of California and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 2460: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. MULLIN.
- H.J. Res. 51: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.
- H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. CORREA.
- H. Res. 15: Mr. KILMER.
- H. Res. 30: Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. KENNEDY.
- H. Res. 31: Mr. CRIST and Mr. PANETTA.
- H. Res. 69: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
- H. Res. 128: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H. Res. 161: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
- H. Res. 165: Ms. PINGREE.
- H. Res. 220: Mr. NUNES.
- H. Res. 259: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
- H. Res. 279: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H. Res. 285: Mr. CUMMINGS.
- H. Res. 320: Mr. KATKO.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on roll call vote No. 258, I would have voted Yea on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 1616, Strengthening State and Local Cyber Crime Fighting Act of 2017.

LEE COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an important leader in our southwest Florida community.

T. Wayne Gale serves our community as Executive Director of the Lee County Mosquito Control District (LCMCD), one of the largest mosquito control districts in the United States, with a budget of \$23 million. LCMCD monitors threats posed by these insects and controls populations to reduce mosquito-borne diseases. Additionally, Mr. Gale serves as President of the American Mosquito Control Association.

This is a very important role as mosquito season approaches, given the threat of Zika in Florida. This dangerous mosquito-borne virus can have devastating effects on infected individuals and presents a severe risk for expectant mothers. The LCMCD is proactive in spreading awareness to our community to make sure citizens are informed about how best to prevent infections, and is one of the most advanced mosquito control districts in the country.

We are thankful for dedicated leaders such as Mr. Gale in our community, and appreciate his leadership in the mosquito control industry.

RECOGNIZING THE PASSING OF
MR. JAMES GREGORY "GREG"
LEWIS OF REEDVILLE, VIRGINIA

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the passing of Mr. James Gregory "Greg" Lewis of Reedville, Virginia on March 30th, 2017. Greg is survived by his wife, Donna Garber Lewis; two daughters, Kelly Lewis Minor, of Reedville, Virginia, and Amanda Lewis Stalnaker of Tappahannock; two

brothers, Evans Lewis (Faye) and Larry Lewis (Janet); two sisters, Barbara Lewis Schools and Janice Lewis Zumot, and four much-loved grandchildren, Corrie Minor, Cameron Minor, Jaxen Stalnaker and Brent Stalnaker and many nieces and nephews.

Greg graduated from Rappahannock High School in 1970 and from Smithdeal Business College in Richmond. He served the Virginia Army National Guard for six years. Greg established Little River Seafood in 1983 as an oyster and crab picking facility. With a strong entrepreneurial spirit, Greg grew the operations into an importer and distributor of his crabmeat and products and, eventually, included value-added products as well. Greg proudly served on the Richmond County School Board for 15 years. He was a Deacon and Trustee of Bethany Baptist Church in Callao, Virginia and was a member of The Gideons International. Greg also served as a member on the Virginia Seafood Council.

I had the pleasure of knowing Greg for many years and know his service to this nation and dedication to his community and church have impacted countless lives. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing the life and honoring the memory of James Gregory "Greg" Lewis.

HONORING DR. JOHN S.
OSTROWSKI

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. John S. Ostrowski, a retired Navy Captain who will celebrate his 75th Birthday on May 28th. He has lived a life of service to his country, and has produced a legacy of continued service to our Nation through his family as a result of his example, inspiration and guidance.

As an officer in the United States Navy, Captain Ostrowski served his country honorably for 26 years as a dentist, with tours of duty on ship, ashore at various Naval Hospitals, and overseas in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. He pioneered the use of dental implants in the U.S. Navy, and in the latter phase of his career, taught a new generation of Navy Dentists to prepare them for service to their fellow Sailors and Marines. Following his Navy career, Dr. Ostrowski opened his own private practice in Annapolis Maryland, which he successfully operated for over 25 years, providing services for the patients in his community. He was often known to provide his dental services for free to those in need—an expression of the importance he has consistently placed on charity and compassion to others.

Dr. Ostrowski and his wife Maeve raised five children—four sons and one daughter. His

oldest son is a 28-year active duty Marine pilot who has achieved the rank of Colonel and served in Iraq, Haiti, Okinawa, and on multiple shipboard deployments. His second son joined the Navy, also as a pilot, attained the rank of Commander and commanded a squadron in Oceana Virginia before tragically losing a battle with cancer. His 3rd son is an automobile mechanic who has owned and operated a successful auto repair business in Annapolis for the past 20 years. His fourth child, his daughter, has been a successful school teacher, principal and executive school administrator. She has recently pursued her entrepreneurial interests and founded a small business as a nutrition specialist and coach. Finally, his youngest son is a successful executive and partner in a financial services company.

His legacy has extended to his grandchildren, of which he has 21, with number 22 on the way this fall. Included in this number are 3 Naval Academy Midshipmen and a scholarship student at Temple University. High school baseball, softball, football and lacrosse athletes, student government representatives, gymnasts, and cheerleaders are counted among his other grandchildren.

On behalf of the State of Maryland, the County of Anne Arundel, and our constituents, I want to extend my heartfelt gratitude for Dr. Ostrowski's commitment to public service and inestimable contributions as a father, grandfather, dentist, Naval Officer, mentor, counselor, and advisor. Not only has he led an exemplary life of service, charity, and industry, but he has inculcated those same qualities into his children and grandchildren, thus perpetuating the highest ideals of service and citizenship in subsequent generations of Naval officers and his family. As he celebrates his milestone 75th birthday, I congratulate him on a life well lived and look forward to his continuing contributions to our communities, and wish him, his wife Maeve, his children and his grandchildren all the best in his years ahead.

IN HONOR OF THE YEARGIN
FAMILY'S ACHIEVEMENT

HON. DAVID KUSTOFF

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jay and Alice Anne Yeargin of Weakley County, Tennessee. The Yeargin's were named runner-ups in the Achievement contest at this year's Annual Meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation in Phoenix, Arizona.

The Yeargins farm approximately 5,000 acres where they raise corn, soybeans, wheat, and cattle. They also host groups on their farm each year, including the Tennessee Governor's School for the Agricultural Sciences, to

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

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

share the story of agriculture. The Achievement Award recognizes young farmers and ranchers who have excelled in their farming or ranching operations and exhibited superior leadership abilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have such a family as a member of our community and want to recognize them for their service to West Tennessee and to the agriculture industry.

HONORING THE 2016–2017 GRADUATES OF THE CONGRESSIONAL YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my fellow colleagues to join me in commending the 2016–2017 Congressional Youth Advisory Council. This year, 47 Collin County students from public and private schools in grades 9 through 12 made a significant impact in their community, their country, and their Congress by participating in CYAC. Through the CYAC program, these students volunteered their talent, expertise, and time to engage on issues that are important to their generation.

I continue to be inspired by the high-caliber students who partake in my CYAC program, and this year was no exception. We had a diverse group of students who already participate in a multitude of activities including student government, community service, honor societies, athletics, fine arts, and language clubs. It was exciting to see them apply their experiences and interests to CYAC. They were always excited to share their ideas about how to create a lasting and sustainable future for our country, and it was encouraging to see their determination, knowledge, and willingness to help those around them. Throughout the past school year, the students met to discuss issues that affect our everyday lives. They then applied their knowledge to various homework assignments and group activities.

Our first meeting focused on Homeland Security—a hot topic of great interest for many CYAC students. They heard from special guests District Attorney Greg Willis, new Collin County Sheriff Jim Skinner, and FBI Special Agent in Charge Tom Petrowski. The students learned about national security at the local level and how Americans' security is a team effort between local, state, and federal leaders. The meeting concluded with a tour of the Collin County Detention Center.

Their second meeting began with the Congressional Veterans Commendation Ceremony. At this event, they learned about local veterans' inspiring stories and helped honor these veterans' unique legacies of service. Following the ceremony, students met with my Chief of Staff and Legislative Director for an insider's view on what it's like to work in the halls of Congress. The students' first semester closed with Captain Sam Brown sharing his testimony of military and civilian service. He also encouraged them to tackle obstacles and embrace taking on leadership roles.

The CYAC students kicked off the spring semester with a Mock Congress. During this event, students learned firsthand the legislative process and how Congress operates. Each student was assigned to a committee with jurisdiction over bills that they were able to amend, debate, and ultimately vote on. Lastly, the students gave back to their hometowns by completing CYAC in the Community—service projects where they volunteered their time to community service work. Altogether, our CYAC students donated over 185 community service hours to Collin County.

I thank each member of the Congressional Youth Advisory Council for making this year a success. They are the voices of the future, and I'm proud of them for all that they've achieved. God bless them and God bless America. I salute them.

Kayla Adams, Shambhavi Badi, Shree Balaji, Brooklyn Baum, Joshua Brock, Reagan Cantrell, Allison Chang, Brandon Chen, Catherine Chen, Zachary Clonch, Emily Crone, Matthew Daley, Niruti Dhoble, Austin Dwiggin, Sam Fanatico, Nicholas Garcia, Sreeragini Ghantasala, Emma Guerra, Luke Harrell, Alice Hou, Timothy Interrante, Austin Katzer, Ruxton Kelly, Abby Kistner, Tatiana Laporte, Olivia Larson, Nicholas Le.

I-Jung Lin, David Lorenz, Jonathan Lu, Rahul Naik, Swetha Pamidimukkala, Padmashree Pandey, Purvee Patel, Jackson Pierce, David Qian, Ben Randoing, Elizabeth Reed, Emiko Rinkliff, Jakob Shackleton, Cameron Stapleton, Parker Stevens, Nicolas Teachenor, Sai Vogirala, Scott Walker, Emily Ward, Trent Yarbrough.

HONORING PRESIDENT TSAI ING-WEN'S 1ST ANNIVERSARY IN OFFICE

HON. SCOTT DesJARLAIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, since President Tsai Ing-wen of Taiwan assumed office one year ago, she has continued to bolster the robust and beneficial relationship between the United States and Taiwan.

President Tsai has repeatedly stated over the past year her commitment to the status quo across the Taiwan Strait. To help Taiwan support this goal, we must ensure that its legitimate defense requirements are adequately addressed. This is an ironclad commitment that is unequivocally articulated in the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances. In fact, in March of this year, two of our upgraded *Oli-ver Hazard Perry*-class frigates were delivered to Taiwan, highlighting our existing strong military and security ties.

Looking forward, we are confident that the U.S. and Taiwan will build on our already solid foundation and continue to foster our bilateral relations across a wide ranging number of fields. I look forward to hearing the Trump Administration's plans for deepening this relationship in the years ahead.

I congratulate President Tsai on her first anniversary as the President of Taiwan, and look forward to even closer U.S.-Taiwan coopera-

tion under her leadership in the years to come.

CONGRATULATING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS ON ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Association of Home Builders on its 75th Anniversary.

Founded in 1942, NAHB represents the interests of the nation's home building industry and helps create a business environment that facilitates home building, enables more Americans to achieve homeownership, and provides rental housing at all price points.

As an organization, NAHB is much more than builders and remodelers. Its membership includes building trades professionals, architects and designers, developers, and representatives of countless industries that provide goods and services in support of the residential construction industry. This includes engineering, insurance, financial services, building product supply, transportation and many others.

The goal set forth in the Housing Act of 1949 of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family" has been a guiding principle for NAHB and its members, and they have made great strides in achieving that goal. During NAHB's 75 years, the total number of housing units in the United States has more than tripled, growing from about 35 million to almost 136 million.

The nation's standard of living has also increased significantly as a result of the hard work of NAHB members, who build roughly 80 percent of the new homes constructed in the U.S. each year. A look back shows how far we have come since 1942, when more than 30 percent of the nation's homes had no running water or flush toilets, almost 40 percent had no bathtub or shower, 18 percent needed major repairs, almost 60 percent lacked central heat, and 20 percent of occupied units were overcrowded. Now, virtually all homes have complete plumbing systems and central heating, and many fewer homes are considered overcrowded or in need of major repairs.

NAHB members were instrumental in these significant advances in the quality of the nation's housing and the resulting improvement in the quality of life and standard of living in our country. Through the decades, those same members have also been at the forefront of innovation, helping to make the nation's homes significantly more resource efficient and sustainable.

Equally important, NAHB members are vital to the social fabric of their local communities and are actively involved in a multitude of civic and philanthropic endeavors. America's home builders are also essential to the nation's economic health. Home building accounts for roughly 16 percent of the total U.S. economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor and congratulate NAHB on the organization's 75th Anniversary. I ask my colleagues in the House to

join me in acknowledging the important role that the residential construction industry has played over the last 75 years in the nation's economy and the lives of its citizens.

And I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking the National Association of Home Builders and its members for serving the nation through their ongoing commitment to building the nation's homes and communities and in urging them to remain steadfast in their efforts to meet the housing needs of all American families.

HONORING BREALAND PENDLETON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable student, Brealand Pendleton. Brealand Pendleton is the daughter of Mr. Christopher and Aubrey Pendleton of Terry, MS. She is one of four siblings: Chris, Braydon and Aubrey Pendleton. Currently, Brealand is a Senior of Terry High School where she will be graduating 6th out of a class of 320.

Brealand Pendleton is a very outgoing young lady that has served in several capacities in her school. Brealand has been a member of the Band, Flag Team (Senior Captain), Tennis Team (Senior Captain), Beta Club (Senior Secretary), National Honor Society (Junior Treasury, Senior Vice-President), Interact Club (Senior Secretary) and the National Society of High School Scholars. Brealand has over 40 hours of community service which varies from local school participation, helping at the Food Network, serving at Stewpot, working with the school blood drive, contributor to the Angel Tree and other various community projects.

Brealand will continue her education at Xavier University in Louisiana, where she will major in Biochemistry. Brealand is a shining example for Terry High School and her community as she works to make it a better place.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a remarkable student, leader and community volunteer, Ms. Brealand Pendleton, for her hard work and dedication at Terry High School and throughout the communities of Mississippi.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 75th anniversary of the evacuation and incarceration of Japanese-Americans during World War II, recognized today as the Day of Remembrance. Thousands of Japanese-Americans gather on this day to mark the solemn occasion of one of the darkest moments of American history.

On February 19, 1942 President Franklin Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, following the attack on Pearl Harbor. The order allowed for forced removal and internment of anyone of Japanese descent, many of whom were American citizens and legal permanent residents. A total of 120,000 Japanese-Americans were imprisoned between 1942 and 1946. All those held were never charged with any crime, their only "crime" having been their cultural heritage. Innocent families were forcefully stripped of their home, jobs and livelihoods. Families were given ten days to dispose of their property and possessions, only allowed to bring what they were able to carry.

My district included two of the sixteen temporary detention centers, located at the Fresno and Merced Fairgrounds. Most of the 5,344 held at the Fresno "Assembly" Detention Center were there for six months before being transferred to concentration camps in Arkansas. Over 4,600 people were held in the Merced "Assembly" Center during the spring and summer of 1942, before eventually being taken by train to a concentration camp in Colorado.

Achieving peace today requires recognizing the dark parts of our history and honoring the memory of those who were affected. Through the hard work of community members, today both the Fresno Fairgrounds and Merced Fairgrounds are home to memorials dedicated to the victims. Both sites feature plaques with the names of those who were imprisoned and stories depicting their harrowing experiences. In Fresno, the Fresno County Historical Museum features a permanent display entitled "Japanese in the San Joaquin Valley", highlighting those who have made significant contributions to our Valley.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in recognizing the 75th anniversary of the evacuation and incarceration of thousands of innocent Japanese-Americans. It is both fitting and appropriate that we mark this solemn day and pay tribute to the thousands of Japanese-Americans that were imprisoned and their families, who today are staples not only in my district, but across the United States.

MAJOR GENERAL WILMOT

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Major General David Wilmot on his retirement from the United States Army, and to thank him for his dedicated service to the United States of America.

During Major General Wilmot's many years of service in the Army, including his most recent assignment as the Deputy Surgeon General for the Army National Guard, Assistant Surgeon General for Quality and Safety, and Deputy Chief of Staff, Quality and Safety, Office of the Surgeon General of the Army, he has proved a top leader in medical readiness, shaping readiness, health care, and personnel issues for the Army National Guard.

In our current time of needed growth and development of the United States Armed

Forces, medical readiness and personal is more necessary than ever, to ensure our warfighters are properly equipped for the job our country sends them to do. Major General Wilmot's experience has truly been a service to this country, and those who fight for its freedom.

Congratulations to Major General Wilmot on his retirement.

HONORING JOHN EVANS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. John Evans upon the occasion of being awarded General Manager of the Year for a large property by the American Hotel and Lodging Association (AHLA). Mr. Evans is the general manager of the Silverado Resort in Napa, California.

Mr. Evans was raised in Marysville, Washington, where his first job was working as a paperboy with two routes. He earned his Bachelor of Applied Science in Organizational Management from Friends University, after which he got his first start in the hospitality business at the age of twenty-four when his mentor, Jerry Smith, guided him in managing a small lodge. Before accepting his current position at the Silverado Resort in 2010, Mr. Evans worked as the interim general manager of the historic Seaview Hotel near Atlantic City, New Jersey and as the general manager of the Ritz-Carlton Resort in Half Moon Bay, California.

The AHLA awards their Stars of the Industry Awards to individuals who perform at the highest level of excellence, demonstrating superior leadership, dedication, and a passion for service. Mr. Evans exemplifies all of these traits. He successfully led his team through and out of the recent recession. Mr. Evans lists family values, integrity, and generosity as characteristics of leaders he strives to emulate. With over thirty-two years of experience leading teams and managing hospitality properties, Mr. Evans has been awarded the Six Sigma green belt and is recognized as first-level sommelier.

Mr. Evans also displayed the same leadership and organizational aptitude in his service on the board of Hands and Hearts for Children, an auxiliary of the Children's Mercy Hospital in Kansas City.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Evans deserves to be recognized as the General Manager of the Year today by virtue of his leadership, commitment, and passion for service. I am proud to have such a man working and living in our community. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor them here today.

RECOGNIZING PRESIDENT TSAI
ING-WEN OF TAIWAN

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 20 marks the one-year anniversary of the inauguration of President Tsai Ing-wen of Taiwan. President Tsai's election was not only historic, in that she is the first woman to be elected to that high office, but as the third peaceful election transferring power from one political party to another. It also demonstrates the maturity of Taiwan's democracy—a system where the will of the people is respected and followed.

The relationship between Taiwan and the United States is one of shared values, and is cemented by the 1979 Taiwan Relations Act, a creation of the Congress, and the Six Assurances of 1982 by President Ronald Reagan. It is supported by countless freedom-loving Americans, many of whom are members of Taiwanese-American communities all over the United States.

While our two countries have much to celebrate on this occasion, old challenges are resurfacing where Taiwan's participation as a constructive member of the global community is concerned. This is most recently manifest in the withholding of the invitation to the World Health Assembly that begins on May 22. Taiwan's 23 million people have much to offer the other peoples of the globe, and in a time of unique challenges, the best minds and talents everywhere in the world should have a part in creating our solutions. We in the Congress, who have been supportive of Taiwan's participation countless times in the past, must make ourselves heard again on this matter.

On this occasion, I wish President Tsai every success as her administration continues to unfold, and I want her—as well as her fellow citizens—to know that we stand with them.

HONORING TY'RIANNE PERRY

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ty'Rianne Perry.

Ty'Rianne has played a big part in community service and helping out her peers. She has participated in the breast cancer awareness walk. Ty'Rianne volunteers at the Boys and Girls Club once a month. She also tutors and mentors young children. She volunteers at the Golden Living Nursing Home where she plays games and reads stories to the patients.

Ty'Rianne's outspoken nature serves her as she advocates for the voiceless children and citizens who cannot speak up for themselves.

Ty'Rianne participates in a Blood Drive twice a year, as she loves helping others in all capacities. Because of her activism and philanthropy, Ty'Rianne was able to attend the Chick-fil-A Leader Academy. She was also selected to attend Camp John Hay; a program

for selected teenagers who volunteered at Boys and Girls Club.

Ty'Rianne has walked in the MLK March many times. She encourages everyone to make a difference in their community and get up and help out.

Mr. Speaker please help us to congratulate Ms. Ty'Rianne Perry for making a difference in her community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes on May 16, 2017 due to travel delays. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: YEA for rollcall vote 258.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE UNITED
STATES MERCHANT MARINERS
AND THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS TO
VICTORY IN WORLD WAR II

HON. MIKE KELLY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the United States Merchant Mariners and their vital contributions to the victory of the Allies in World War II. This year, 72 years after our victory in that war, is a fitting time to recognize the contributions of our merchant mariners to the war effort.

There were more than 250,000 men serving in the Merchant Marine during WWII, all volunteers. They had the distinction of being the only non-segregated service. The Merchant Marine was critical to the mission of our military service members around the world during the war.

Many of the important contributions of the Merchant Marine are not well known, including the fact that they had the highest rate of casualties in the Armed Services. More than 700 merchant ships were sunk and more than 8,000 U.S. merchant mariners were killed during the war. The losses suffered are even more remarkable given that the U.S. Merchant Marine was not considered a military branch and was composed of volunteers classified by the government as civilians. Every invasion during the war involved the Merchant Marine. They suffered tremendous casualties during the Battle of the Atlantic, the Murmansk Run, D-Day, and as an integral part of every island invasion in the Pacific Theater. As we come close to Memorial Day, it is fitting to pause and remember their heroism and sacrifice.

The United States built nearly 6,000 merchant vessels and naval auxiliaries in 16 shipyards with over 650,000 workers. This was an economic and military feat of enormous scale. As part of a government effort to encourage more American participation in the war effort, ships were named after famous American counties and cities. 150 colleges and universities also had victory class merchant ships

named for them. Many of these institutions of higher education supported important military training programs on their campuses. I am proud that 13 of these victory class ships were named for institutions in Pennsylvania, including three in the third district: Allegheny College, Grove City College, and Westminster College.

I am sure all my colleagues join me in taking great pride in the history of the United States Merchant Marine and the special place in our nation's history associated with their ships and the men who sailed them. They have helped preserve our freedom and they deserve our gratitude.

RECOGNIZING PATTY SIMONIAN IN
CELEBRATION OF HER 75TH
BIRTHDAY

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Mrs. Patty Simonian's 75th birthday. Patty is a beloved mother, grandmother, godmother and friend to many.

Patty Simonian was born in Merced, California to John and Mary Costa. She attended Central Union High School, where she met her high school sweetheart, Peter Simonian. They would be married on August 26, 1961.

In 1971, Pete and Patty decided to go into farming for themselves, forming P. Simonian Farms. The third generation family-run farm was passed down from Patty's grandfather. Patty is proud to be one of few female organic growers in California. She was quoted as saying, "... I'm outside working, irrigating and doing everything that's necessary on the ranch, with the help of my children".

Patty is the proud mother of three children Talbert, Nanette and Peter John. She is also blessed with five grandchildren, Matthew, Jerad, Kylie, Cassidy and Caydin.

Patty is a loving and generous mother to her children and was very active in their lives when they were in school. She is now playing a similar role with her beloved grandchildren. Patty's family is the greatest source of love and pride in her life.

Patty and her husband Peter were active members of the Cabrillo Club, a Portuguese civic club that is dedicated to civic progress of Californians of Portuguese descent. Patty currently serves as the President of the Fresno chapter, a position her husband also held from 1997 through 2000.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that Patty's 75th birthday is an especially significant occasion, as Patty is my first cousin. In keeping with the Portuguese Catholic tradition, she is also my godmother.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing Patty Simonian as she celebrates her 75th birthday. I ask that you join me in wishing her and her family continued health and happiness.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF UNITED STATES ARMY SPE-
CIALIST CALEB MICHAEL COL-
LINS

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of United States Army Specialist Caleb Michael Collins, a New Orleans, Louisiana native, who passed away on July 25, 2015, at the tender age of 22.

Specialist Collins was a graduate of St. Augustine High School class of 2011, and a former member of the Marching 100 at the historic all-male Catholic high school in the 7th Ward of New Orleans.

In July 2015, stationed in Honolulu, Hawaii, Specialist Collins distinguished himself by disregarding his personal safety by jumping off of a 25 foot ledge into the ocean to save a fellow soldier who had been swept off the Halona Blowhole ledge by a wave. Through his courageous actions, Specialist Collins made the ultimate sacrifice. His actions are in keeping with the finest traditions of military heroism and reflect distinct credit upon himself, 25th Composite Truck Company, 524th Sustainment Support Battalion, 25th Sustainment Brigade, 25th Infantry Division and the United States Army.

Specialist Collins has been awarded the Soldier's Medal. The Soldier's Medal is awarded to an individual whom while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, is recognized by heroism not concerning direct encounter with an enemy. The Soldier's Medal is the highest military peacetime award for bravery.

Specialist Collins' legacy will forever be a part of the city and his dedication to service embodies the spirit of New Orleans. Specialist Collins' survivors include his parents, Ernest L. and Dawn Moore Collins and sisters Chelsi Marie and Briana Monique Collins.

Mr. Speaker, Specialist Caleb Michael Collins was a tremendously positive young man, always with a word of encouragement for his family and friends. I celebrate the life and legacy of Specialist Collins, and my thoughts and prayers are with his family.

HONORING YAZOO CITY ALUMNAE
CHAPTER OF DELTA SIGMA
THETA SORORITY, INC.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a group of women who has shown what can be done through hard work, dedication and a desire to serve their community, Yazoo City Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. The Yazoo City Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. has served the Yazoo County community and the State of Mississippi through informational meetings, social and civic engagement.

The Yazoo City Alumnae Chapter was granted their 30th chartering in the state of Mississippi on February 2, 1997. Francine Wallace and Edwina Fox, in 1995, had the idea to create a chapter in Yazoo and placed an article in the local newspaper. Other Delta's in the area quickly responded, desiring to continue the mission to which they had pledged themselves in their college years and together they worked with the state leadership, the southern Region Manager and the national Headquarters to achieve this objective. Not being swayed, it took several attempts to acquire the approvals to establish the Yazoo City Alumnae Chapter. The Yazoo City Deltas traveled to the State Cluster to share their desire to focus on the high rate of teenage pregnancies in Yazoo County as it was the highest rate in the state of Mississippi. Relating their dedication to fighting this devastating trend, the Southern Region Manager, on their second attempt approved the chartering of the Yazoo City Alumnae Chapter. On February 2, 1997 at the St. Stephen United Methodist Church 12 members, Mary Ann Brewer, Teresa Bonner, Diane Delaware, Zellee Delaware, Sandra Younger, Tamara Dodd, Edwina Gordon-Fox, Marilyn Hathorne, Gloria Elayne Owens, Francine Wallace, the late Juanita Scott-Washington and Mary Joshua Young stood and committed to carry out the public service mission of their beloved sisterhood throughout Yazoo County. Thus, this was the beginning of the Yazoo City Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Yazoo City Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. for its dedication to serving others and giving back to the community.

HONORING THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN
VINTNERS ASSOCIATION

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Mexican-American Vintners Association (MAVA), whose members include many of the hard-working, entrepreneurial families and individuals who serve as a backbone to the wine community in my district.

The Mexican-American Vintners Association was revived in May 2010 with the mission to recognize Napa and Sonoma Wine produced by Mexican-American Vintners, advocate for quality standards, promote the contributions of Mexican-Americans to the wine community, and to educate and preserve traditions for future vintners. In the words of Member Hugo Maldonado, MAVA "are not just in the vineyards anymore, they're a force to be reckoned with."

Many members of MAVA have traveled to Washington, DC this week, including Ceja Vineyards, Mi Sueño Winery, Maldonado Family Vineyards, and the Robledo Family Winery. They are here, not only to support the mission of the Smithsonian Institution, but also to further educate Congress about their vital con-

tributions to our economy and community. Their stories of immigration, sacrifice and determination are what make America great.

In addition to supporting their current members, the Mexican-American Vintners Association works to support future vintners by providing scholarships to deserving students. By helping those who will follow them, the Vintners are preserving the traditions of making and selling quality wine which they have worked hard to build.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of our Mexican-American Vintners. Their organization preserves and promotes a great tradition of hard work and resilience in our community. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor them here today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 2017, I was not present to vote on H.R. 1616, the Strengthening State and Local Cyber Crime Fighting Act due to a family medical emergency. Had I been present for roll call No. 258, I would have voted YEA.

COL STEVEN OWENS

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Colonel Steven Owens on his retirement from the United States Army, and to thank him for his dedicated service to the United States of America.

Colonel Owens' many years of service include a deployment as the ARNG Medical Advisor for the Multi-National Corps—Iraq Surgeon's Office, Baghdad, Iraq, where he was hand-selected to be 1st Corps Surgeon's Liaison with the Iraqi Ground Forces Command Surgeon and Medical Trainer for COIN.

I have had the pleasure of serving under Colonel Owens, in his assignment as Deputy Director for Reserve Affairs and Sr. ARNG Advisor at the Office of the Surgeon General at the Defense Health Headquarters, and have greatly appreciated his leadership and expertise.

Congratulations to Colonel Owens, to his wife Lonna, on a new chapter, and I thank him for his mentorship and friendship.

RECOGNIZING HAROLD HAGER

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a constituent, Harold Hager, who is celebrating his 100th birthday today.

Mr. Hager has dedicated his life to serving our country and local community. During World War II, he served in the United States Navy as a gunner on the USS *Taconic*. After the war, Mr. Hager returned home and worked for many years as a melding technician and foreman at Corning Glass Works. In 1972, after our area was devastated by Hurricane Agnes, Mr. Hager delivered urgently needed food and supplies to his neighbors in Elmira, New York.

Mr. Hager has served as a volunteer with the Steuben County Retired and Senior Volunteer Program since February 2012. He was previously assigned to the Painted Post Food Pantry and he currently serves at the Habitat for Humanity ReStore in Corning, New York. Mr. Hager has accumulated more than 4,500 lifetime service hours and, in 2016, he averaged 84 hours per month. He is truly an inspiration.

I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating Harold Hager's 100th birthday and recognizing his life-long commitment to service.

HONORING JANA LEIGH CLANTON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, the late Ms. Jana Leigh Clanton. Jana was born January 24, 1996 in Flowood, Mississippi.

Jana confessed Christ at an early age and joined Mt. Able Missionary Baptist Church under the leadership of Rev. Willie A. Travis, Sr., where she was a faithful steward, serving as a clerical volunteer to the church secretarial staff and a member of the Mt. Able Anointed Believers Praise Dance Ministry.

Jana was a Presidential Scholar at Tougaloo College, where she majored in English with an emphasis in Pre-Law and was a student leader, serving as a member of the Student Government Association, a member of Alpha Lambda Delta honor society and member of the Tougaloo Ambassadors for Meritorious Scholars (T.A.M.S.), student recruitment association.

Jana graduated with honors from Madison Central High School in May 2014, most recently became licensed as a Certified Pharmacy Technician, and accepted a position at CVS Pharmacy. Though she loved science, Jana's dream was to become the first African American Female U.S. Supreme Court Justice.

To her family, Jana was affectionately known as "Jana Pooh Pooh". She will always be remembered for her willingness to help others and for her passion for reading. Jana always lived life on her own terms and never met a stranger.

She leaves to mourn her death, her loving and devoted parents, Minister Johnny L. and Vicky L. Clanton, Sr.; her adoring and loving siblings, Waikinya J. S. and Johnny L. Clanton, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Jana Leigh Clanton.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF KEN FUGELSANG

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Mr. Ken Fugelsang. Ken was a world-renowned enologist and professor emeritus of enology at California State University, Fresno. For more than four decades Ken shaped the wine and grape industry by expertly training students in the art of winemaking. His impact on his students and the industry will be felt for generations to come.

Kenneth Claire Fugelsang was born on December 13, 1946 in Fresno, California to Ardith and Paul Fugelsang. He attended Central High School, Fresno City College, and graduated with a degree in Biology from California State University, Fresno in 1969. He would go on to earn his master's degree in 1972.

Ken joined the Fresno State enology faculty in 1971. He and his colleagues were instrumental in the founding of the University's winery in 1997. This was the first winery licensed to produce, bottle and sell wine on a university campus in the United States. Ken trained some of the most skilled wine makers in the nation. He and his students won state, national and international awards in over 600 competitions.

During his tenure, Ken was noted for his research. He was awarded more than 50 grants and published more than 150 technical papers, 18 books and countless academic journal articles.

Ken's legacy will truly be on the impact he had on his students. He was known as a teacher, mentor and friend to many. Ken positively influenced the lives of many students with his commitment to their education and professional development.

Ken is survived by his wife of 45 years Ann, his son Jeffrey, his brother Paul and sister-in-law Cheryl.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the life and service of Ken Fugelsang, whose passion and service to the enology field has left a monumental impact on the lives of those he worked with. I join Fresno State and Ken's family in honoring his life. He will be truly missed.

HONORING THE BAY COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

HON. NEAL P. DUNN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Sheriff Tommy Ford and the Bay County Sheriff's Office for their service and for holding a memorial for those who lost their lives in the line of duty.

The brave men and women of law enforcement put their lives at risk every day. They run into danger so that others can escape it, and

they are willing to make the ultimate sacrifice to protect their communities.

In 2016, our country lost 145 law enforcement officers in the line of duty, and so far this year, 50 law enforcement officers have died on the job. We owe these officers and their families a debt of gratitude we can never fully repay.

Leah and I are eternally grateful to the Bay County Sheriff's Office, and indeed, all who wear the badge, for what they do to keep us safe, and to honor their brothers and sisters who have fallen.

RECOGNIZING THE COLORADO KOREAN CHORUS

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Colorado Korean Chorus' 12th Annual Concert. This year the Colorado Korean Chorus is highlighting "The New Sound of Music" with performances by local and national contemporary artists. The Colorado Korean Chorus celebrates the diversity of our community and brings us together through the uniting force of music.

It is wonderful to watch and listen to the members of the Colorado Korean Chorus who find such obvious joy and spirit in singing and providing entertainment. The moving and beautiful music provides a window into the heart and soul of our Korean community, and further serves to bring the people of Colorado together; connecting the many cultures found across the state through the power of music.

The Colorado Korean Chorus continues to be a proud cultural tradition in the State of Colorado. I want to congratulate the President Eunjo Song, Vice President Soonhee Kolrud, Director Taehyun Kim, and all the members of the Colorado Korean Chorus on 12 wonderful years and wish them success in the years to come.

HONORING THE ROBLEDO FAMILY WINERY

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Robledo Family Winery, owned and operated by Reynaldo Robledo in Sonoma, California. Incredible fortitude and ambition led Reynaldo and his family to the successes they see in their grape harvests and production of their delicately crafted wines.

In 1968, at the age of 16, Reynaldo migrated from Michoacán, Mexico to build a better life. He learned viticulture techniques and good business practices by working hard in the vineyards of Northern California, eventually settling in Sonoma County. Reynaldo and Maria have taught their nine children their same work ethic by raising them to understand the regions, grapes and people which make wine from our community exceptional.

Hard work and sacrifice led Reynaldo and his family to establish two companies, encompassing more than 350 acres in Napa, Sonoma, and Lake Counties. The Winery's focus on perfecting each stage of the winemaking process, "from vine to bottle," ensures that their hard work will result in a quality product. The story of the Robledo Family Winery is uniquely American, and I am proud that their success is possible in our community.

Robledo Family Winery is part of the Mexican-American Vintners Association (MAYA), whose members traveled to Washington, D.C. this week as part of a group of Mexican-American vintners, not only to support the mission of the Smithsonian Institution, but also to further educate Congress about their vital contributions to our economy and community. Their stories of immigration, sacrifice and determination are what make America great.

Mr. Speaker, Robledo Family Winery is a successful business and is producing extraordinary wines. I am proud to have such a business in our community. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor them here today.

HONORING KASPRINA MOTON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable student, Ms. Kasprina Moton.

Ms. Moton attends Xavier University's School of Pharmacy; with a plan to return to Mississippi to provide care and support for the under-served and minorities who cannot afford their medical treatments and medications. She has participated in various activities throughout the state of Mississippi. She is a 2006 graduate of Gentry High School and finished in 10 percent of her class. She graduated from Jackson State University with Bachelors of Science in Chemistry and a 3.7 GPA. She graduated from Ole Miss Medical Center Pharmacy Tech program in the top 5 percent of her class. She placed first in Miss. NOBeChe of Jackson, Mississippi. And, she also won the Leadership scholarship of the Boys and Girls club in Jackson, Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Kasprina Moton for her dedication to serving others and giving back to the community.

CONGRATULATING THE BASKING RIDGE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH ON ITS 300 YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 2017, the Basking Ridge Presbyterian Church will celebrate its 300th Anniversary. I am proud to join the more than 760 members of the congregation, the clergy and church leaders in celebrating this very special occasion.

The Basking Ridge Presbyterian Church was founded in 1717 by a small group of Scotch-Irish farmers. At 1 East Oak Street, the same location where services are still held today, those settlers erected a log house of worship that became the cornerstone of the community in Basking Ridge, New Jersey for generations. Until 1837 the church was the only organization that promoted religious life in the area.

The Basking Ridge Presbyterian Church's theme for its 300th Anniversary year is "Sharing God's Love for 300 years" and the members of this great faith community are certainly living out that mission. Locally, the Church works with organizations like God's Co-op Pantry, Raritan Valley Habitat for Humanity, the Interfaith Hospitality Network and Community in Crisis. Internationally, Basking Ridge Presbyterian supports missionaries in the Ukraine, Haiti and Indonesia as well as relief organizations Hogar de Cristo in Ecuador and Peaceworks in Nicaragua. These charitable efforts are shining examples of the great deal of good that comes from faith based organizations throughout all of the United States.

As the Basking Ridge Presbyterian Church celebrates this important milestone, I congratulate Pastor Reverend Dennis Jones and Associate Pastor Dr. Maureen Paterson for their dedicated efforts.

As the Church continues to carry on the traditions of the Gospels and spread the good news, I wish it the best in celebrating the next 300 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate the Basking Ridge Presbyterian Church in Basking Ridge, New Jersey in celebrating 300 years of service to the community. I am proud to share this important milestone with my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives and with the American people.

IN RECOGNITION OF UNITED STATES COAST GUARD AUXILIARY FLOTILLA 014-02-02

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with the officers, staff and members of United States Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 014-02-02 as they celebrate 75 years of continuous service to the United States Coast Guard (USCG) at USCG Station Sandy Hook in Highlands, New Jersey.

The United States Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 014-02-02, "The Sandy Hook Flotilla," is a unit of the Division 2, First Coast Guard District, Southern Region, serving Sandy Hook as well as the Navesink and Shrewsbury rivers. Authorized to assist and support USCG non-military and non-law enforcement missions, the volunteers of the flotilla provide valuable reinforcement to the USCG. In addition to participating in marine patrols and search and rescue missions, the auxiliary offers boating safety educational programs, performs vessel inspections, provides emergency medical services and assists with special events in the New York Harbor and surrounding areas.

The members of the Sandy Hook Flotilla are trained on USCG standards and live by the motto *Semper Paratus* (Always Ready). Its rapid response and proficient assistance has been recognized over the years with several awards, including Best Flotilla in the USA, Admiral's Operational Award, President's Unit Citation and Secretary's Outstanding Unit Award.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 014-02-02 on its 75 years of continuous service and thanking its members for their service to the United States Coast Guard and the community.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RETIRED FRESNO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ARMANDO RODRIGUEZ

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to the life of Judge Armando Rodriguez. Judge Rodriguez was an influential and honorable servant to the San Joaquin Valley. He was known for being a mentor to many, never hesitating to give his time to others. The San Joaquin Valley will be forever indebted to Judge Rodriguez for his tireless efforts on behalf of the community.

Armando Rodriguez was born on October 31, 1929 to Jorge and Carmen Rodriguez. He was ninth of twelve children. His parents immigrated from Mexico, first settling in Merced, later moving to Fresno. After graduating from Edison High School, Armando married his high school sweetheart Betty Raya in 1950. During the Korean War, Judge Rodriguez served in the United States Air Force as a Morse code radio operator. Following the war, he attended Fresno State and then law school in San Francisco on the GI Bill.

Judge Rodriguez began his law career working with the Alameda County Legal Aid Society and then with the California Rural Legal Assistance in Madera before moving onto a private practice in Fresno. In 1972, he became the first Latino elected onto the Fresno County Board of Supervisors. Then in 1975, Governor Jerry Brown appointed Judge Rodriguez to the Municipal Court, making him the first Hispanic judge to serve on the Fresno Municipal Court. Three years later he was elected as the first Hispanic judge to serve on the Fresno County Superior Court.

As a strong advocate for education and the arts, Judge Rodriguez and his wife Betty, continually worked to make advances in the community. In honor of his wife's passing, he created a memorial scholarship fund to aid local college students. In addition, he and his wife were two of the founders of Arte Americas. To support the cultural arts, he contributed generous donations, engaged in community service, and personally refinanced the building's mortgage.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Judge Armando Rodriguez, whose generosity and unending dedication to the community will be greatly missed.

Judge Rodriguez's memory will live on through the contributions he made to our Valley. It is my honor to join his family and many friends in celebrating his impactful life, which will never be forgotten.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for roll call vote 258 on Tuesday, May 16, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on roll call vote 258.

HONORING JALEXIS EVANS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable student, Ms. Jalexis Evans.

Jalexis is the daughter of the Latoya Lee and Samuel Evans and the granddaughter of Shirley Evans and the late Glenda Nelson. She is a native of Mound Bayou, Mississippi where she attended John F. Kennedy Memorial High School before being accepted into the Mississippi School for Mathematics and Science in Columbus, Mississippi. While attending John F. Kennedy she was class president, the founder of the mentorship program, "Girl Talk", and a cheerleader. In her spare time, she volunteers in her community with organizations such as St. Gabriel's Mercy Center, New Life Church, and local nursing homes.

One of the greatest impacts she believes she has made is with the mentoring program she initiated, Girl Talk. Girl Talk was created solely to help empower, encourage, and equip young girls in the community. Their community activism includes nursing homes visits, Christmas with kindergartners, and hosting a tea party for young ladies in middle school to teach proper etiquette.

Jalexis also spends time playing piano and guitar. During her tenure at John F. Kennedy she played the trumpet in the marching band.

A passion of Jalexis is caring for the youth in her community. Though she believes involvement in the community is crucial, she also believes her education will take her far. She works diligently to ensure that her future goals are within her grasp. Attending the Mississippi School for Mathematics and Science has granted her many more opportunities to do so. At this school, she receives the best education possible for high schoolers in the Magnolia state while enriching her knowledge on cultural diversity. Jalexis aspires to enroll into Tulane University and attend the Tulane Accelerated Physician Training Program and earn her medical degree. She plans to become a pediatric oncologist after attending medical school. She's yearned to be a doctor

since the young age of three. Her love for children pushed her towards the field of pediatrics and her grandmother's fight with cancer led to her interest and passion for oncology. It also instilled within her a strong determination to find a cure for cancer.

She pursues success in her everyday life by continuing to be an example and role model to her sisters SaMaria, Cilyse, and London.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Jalexis Evans for her educational achievements and dedication to other youths.

COL DAMON MATHIS

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Colonel Damon Mathis on his retirement from the United States Army, and to thank him for his dedicated service to the United States of America.

A recipient of the Expert Field Medical Badge, the Parachutist Badge, the Air Assault Badge, the British Parachutist Badge, the Army Staff Badge, and a member of the Order of Military Medical Merit, Colonel Mathis is a proven leader in military health.

I've had the pleasure to serve with Colonel Mathis, in his assignment as Director of Reserve Affairs in the Office of the Surgeon General, and have greatly appreciated his leadership and expertise.

Congratulations to Colonel Mathis, and to his wife Jane, on a new chapter, and thank him for his mentorship and friendship.

RECOGNIZING CITRUS COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Citrus County Sheriff Mike Prendergast and the law enforcement officers who keep Citrus County safe every single day.

This week marks the annual observance of Police Week. Though we set aside one week a year to honor law enforcement, I encourage all Americans to join me not only this week, but every day, in recognizing the honor, courage, and commitment of America's law enforcement.

Our law enforcement are heroes in the community. They keep us safe, and are willing to put their lives on the line every day in the course of their duties. It is impossible to fully express our gratitude or adequately recognize the professionalism of the men and women who voluntarily put their lives on the line for our safety and security. It is with deep respect that we pause today to honor the memory of the heroes who gave the last full measure of devotion and made the ultimate sacrifice.

I want to extend my sincere appreciation to Citrus County Sheriff Mike Prendergast and

the law enforcement officers who bravely and selflessly serve Citrus County. It is an honor to recognize them and all men and women in law enforcement.

HONORING THE CEJA FAMILY

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Ceja family, Pablo, Juanita, Amelia, Pedro, Armando and Dalia who own and operate Ceja Vineyards in Napa, California. Passion and dedication led the Ceja family to the successes they see in their grape harvests and production of premium Carneros wines.

The dream to build Ceja Vineyards began in a small village in Mexico, where Pablo Ceja's family lived while he worked in the Brasero Program in "el norte." While working in California, Pablo came to understand what many people in our community have learned: in the Napa Valley, hard work and sacrifice in a fair system will result in great successes.

Pablo promised his family that he would bring them to a place "surrounded by vineyards growing the finest, sweetest grapes, where hard work is plentiful for those that are strong." In 1967, Pablo, Juanita and their six children left Mexico and settled in St. Helena, where they found work in the growing number of local wineries. In 1983, the Ceja family came together to purchase 15 acres and plant their own grapes. By 1988, the second and third generations of the family were celebrating their first harvest on "Ceja land." The family founded Ceja Vineyards, Inc. in 1999 and today own 113 producing acres.

The Ceja family understands the needs and realities of their workers. They provide a pesticide-free environment and treat their workers like family. Many of Ceja Vineyards workers are loyal to the company and stay on season after season. Their story is remarkable. The Ceja family traveled to Washington, D.C. this week as part of a group of Mexican-American vintners, not only to support the mission of the Smithsonian Institution, but also to further educate Congress about their vital contributions to our economy and community. Their stories of immigration, sacrifice and determination are what make America great.

Mr. Speaker, the Ceja family has built a successful business and are producing extraordinary wines. I am proud to have such a family working and living in our community. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor them here today.

DIPG AWARENESS DAY

HON. STEPHEN KNIGHT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a terrible and almost uniformly fatal form of pediatric cancer, Diffuse Intrinsic Pontine Glioma, or DIPG.

DIPG is a tumor, located in the brain stem, that almost exclusively affects children and for which no treatment exists.

As any parent knows, there is no worse feeling in the world than learning your child has been diagnosed with something fatal and there is nothing they can do about it.

Today, May 17, is a special day for advocates who are working hard around the world to raise awareness for resources and research to combat the disease.

Earlier this year, two research groups, from Northwestern University and the University of Copenhagen in Denmark, published separate studies with groundbreaking insights into the genetic mutation that occurs in 80 percent of DIPG cases. The next set of research will test therapeutic strategies to treat the mutation.

Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER and I introduced H. Res. 69, to formally recognize DIPG Awareness Day in the House of Representatives.

I'd like to thank Congresswoman SPEIER and the 18 other Members who are helping promote DIPG awareness, the researchers who are investigating cures and treatments, and the families and friends of DIPG victims who are working to search for a cure.

HONORING LYNN MAURICE
STINSON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lynn Maurice Stinson, who is a chairman, leader, and educator.

Lynn Maurice Stinson was born in Grenada, MS in 1947 to Minnie Louise Stinson and Sam Metcalf. He was raised by his maternal grandparents, Willie B. and Susie Stinson. His early education was at Grenada Colored School and Willia Wilson Elementary in Grenada. Stinson graduated from Carrie Dotson High School in Grenada, MS in 1966.

Stinson's desire to continue his education led him to enroll in Coahoma Community College in Clarksdale, MS where he earned an Associate of Arts degree. Stinson then attended Jackson State University in Jackson, MS where he earned a Bachelor's of Science degree in Education. Stinson returned back to his home area and began his career in education at Stone Street Elementary in Greenwood, MS. His first position was teaching the integrated study of the Social Sciences and humanities to promote civic competence to 7th and 8th grade students. Stinson's passion was to help each student reach their full potential. He always reminded his students to dream big and work even harder.

A few years later, Stinson transferred to Threadgill Elementary in Greenwood, MS where he taught Social Studies. He later transferred to Greenwood Middle School and eventually retired in 2003 with 30 years of service. Stinson has been a strong supporter of education and those committed to working in the field of education. He is a past president of the Mississippi Association of Educators (MAE) in Greenwood, MS. Stinson also used

his skills to help adults in his hometown, Grenada, by teaching GED night classes for several years.

In Stinson early years, he was a participant in the Civil Rights Movement as the community worked to secure equal rights for all citizens. The reality of past conditions and his firsthand knowledge of the effort to open doors to African Americans has driven Stinson to continue his service to the community after his retirement.

Stinson presently holds the position of Election Commissioner for the City of Grenada. He has served in this position since 2005 with a top priority of assuring that the election process in Grenada is fair to all, and with the highest level of integrity. Stinson also serves on the Board of Trustees for Holmes Community College where he is the chairperson of the Insurance Committee.

Stinson is a proud member of the 100 Black Men of Grenada, Inc., where he serves as the chairman of the Education Committee. Stinson is involved in supporting youth and young adults as they strive to prepare themselves for their future and the workforce.

Stinson is a dedicated member of Belle Flower Missionary Baptist Church in Grenada, MS, and has served many years on the deacon board. He also serves as chairman of finance for the Grenada Baptist District Association Men's Department.

When he is not volunteering and participating in church activities, he enjoys traveling and playing golf.

He has been married to Queen Brooks Stinson for 43 years. They have one daughter, Monica Stinson, who resides in Brandon, MS.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Lynn M. Stinson, a Chairman, Leader and Educator for his dedication to serving others and giving back to the African American community.

HONORING EMILE HADDAD FOR
RECEIVING THE ELLIS ISLAND
MEDAL OF HONOR

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Emile Haddad for receiving the Ellis Island Medal of Honor from the National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations. Recipients of the Ellis Island Medal of Honor are individuals who embody American ideals such as patriotism, diversity, and tolerance. Receiving such an honor is well deserved by a man who embraces American principles while upholding his traditions of ethnic heritage.

Mr. Haddad was born and raised in Beirut, Lebanon prior to the beginning of the civil war. In his early years, Mr. Haddad attended American University in Beirut, where he studied to become a civil engineer. As a young professional in a country of instability, Mr. Haddad made a courageous decision to flee his homeland to start a new life in the United States of America. On March 3, 1986, Mr. Haddad and his now wife Dina, along with other family members, made their way to Ventura, Cali-

fornia to join his younger brother and begin a new life.

Beginning as a construction worker, and after multiple jobs, Mr. Haddad developed a passion for homebuilding and land-development. With an established career and now Chairman and CEO of Five Point Holdings LLC, the largest builder of mixed-used, master-planned communities in California, Mr. Haddad has helped redefine the unique global vision of twenty-first century communities for thousands of Californians.

Mr. Haddad's inspiration for his work stems from his fundamental importance on a strong family unit. Married and a proud father of two now adult children, the communities Mr. Haddad builds reflect his vision for helping people live, work, play, and connect with one another. Additionally, his visions drive his commitment to education, which is why he serves on the advisory and leadership boards of four major institutions of higher learning: The University of California, Irvine, University of California, Berkeley, Claremont Graduate University, and the University of Southern California. To further his impact, Mr. Haddad's charitable giving also reflects his beliefs in giving back to the community. Over the years, he has received multiple personal honors, notably the Father-of-the-Year award from the American Diabetes Association and the Man of Character award from the Boy Scouts of America. Mr. Haddad continues to leave an influential mark as he remembers his journey to America and the path he has taken towards success.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the lifelong achievements of Mr. Haddad. I congratulate Mr. Emile Haddad for this great achievement and ask that you join me in wishing him and his family continued prosperity.

CONGRATULATIONS TO WINTECH

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate WinTech, Inc., on receiving the Missouri impact! Award for Continuous Improvement in Manufacturing Excellence from Missouri Enterprise.

WinTech, located in Monett, Missouri, is an employee owned company founded in 1991. This company specializes in making some of the most cost-effective windows around. As someone who represents this part of Missouri, I couldn't be more proud to have this business in Missouri's 7th Congressional District.

The Missouri impact! Award is an award given to businesses that have gone above and beyond in areas that include manufacturing excellence, innovative technology development, environmental solutions and contributing to Missouri business and community/state economic development.

I am honored to recognize WinTech and its dedication to not only southwest Missouri, but the many communities throughout Missouri. On behalf of Missouri's 7th Congressional District, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in

congratulating WinTech on receiving this award

CELEBRATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF JELLYSTONE PARK

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 25th Anniversary of the Jellystone Park in North Hudson, New York.

Since 1992, Jellystone has provided families from New York and beyond with excellent opportunities for outdoor recreation. Located in the beautiful Adirondack Mountains, the park allows campers to take in some of the most scenic lakes and forests that the North Country has to offer.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to wish Jellystone Park many years of continued success as they celebrate their 25th Anniversary.

**HONORING BRIAN LOUGHMILLER,
MAYOR OF MCKINNEY**

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Brian Loughmiller, Mayor of the City of McKinney, Texas. Brian and his wife, Donna, have lived in McKinney for almost 30 years. In his professional career, Brian is the managing partner at the law firm of Loughmiller Higgins P.C., which is based in McKinney. He holds a bachelor's degree from Illinois State University and graduated from Case Western Reserve University School of Law.

Despite a busy professional career, Brian has been very active in serving the McKinney community. He is a past president of the Collin County Bar Association and has served on the McKinney Board of Adjustment, the McKinney Independent School District Community Redistricting Committee, and the McKinney Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors. Brian has also devoted his time to the Sunrise Rotary Club, Relay for Life, and the American Cancer Society.

Brian was first elected to the McKinney City Council in 2002, and he served as a Council Member for six years. In 2009, Brian was elected Mayor of McKinney, and he was re-elected in 2013. During his tenure, McKinney has been one of the fastest growing cities in the country. Today, it boasts a thriving population of 168,000. Most importantly, McKinney has achieved and managed its growth in a way that has earned the City national recognition for its exceptional quality of life. In 2014, Money Magazine ranked McKinney as the #1 Best Place to Live, and the City has received numerous accolades that recognize it as an outstanding community, including being one of the best places in the nation to start a family and to buy a home. Brian has also overseen

the revitalization of the City's Historic Downtown, which has become a beautiful, thriving center for the community.

Having served on the City Council for 14 years, including eight years as Mayor, Brian will be stepping down in May due to term limits. While this role ends for him, he has positioned McKinney for a bright future.

It has been a pleasure to work with Brian to help make McKinney such a wonderful place to live, and his leadership in this capacity will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Brian for his tireless commitment to public service and his many distinguished accomplishments as Mayor of McKinney. I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in thanking Brian and his wife, Donna, for devoting so much of their time to the McKinney community and in wishing them happiness and continued success in the future

HONORING KEITH M. KING

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a resourceful and ambitious young man, Mr. Keith M. King. He has shown what can be done through hard work, dedication and a desire to live a productive life.

Keith M. King was born April 20, 1959 in New Orleans, LA. He lived there for the first two years of his life, before moving to Las Vegas, Nevada with his grandparents for the next five years. At the age of seven, Mr. King joined his parents in Chicago, IL, but due to the increasing violence, they relocated to Mississippi. Mr. King was then ten years old and stayed in Mississippi with his parents until the age of twelve. He then returned back to Las Vegas, Nevada with his grandparents and resided with them for another four years. At the age of sixteen, Mr. King moved back to Mississippi with his parents because of racial riots at his school in Las Vegas.

Mr. King was halfway through the 10th grade as he continued to live in Mississippi until he graduated from the Jefferson County High School in Fayette, Mississippi. Prior to graduating from high school he joined the Army on the delay entry program on December 16, 1976 and entered the service on August 8, 1977. He completed his basic training in Fort Jackson, SC and completed his advanced individual training in Fort Benning, GA. He was stationed at Scofield Barracks in Honolulu, HI. During Mr. King's tour, he was deployed throughout the Pacific. Some of his tours were: Guam, USA, Korea, The Philippines Islands, Australia, The Big Island of Hawaii, Japan and Samoa.

On August 8, 1980, Mr. King joined the Army Reserves. His first unit was the 386th Transportation Unit in Natchez, MS. Mr. King was still with this unit when they got activated on August 27, 1990 to go to Saudi Arabia to serve in the Desert Shield/ Desert Storm War. They stayed in every state in the United States which included Panama, and overseas

on numerous occasions. In 1999, Mr. King transferred to the 412th Eng. Battalion in Vicksburg, MS and in 2000 he was deployed and made his sixth and final deployment to Korea before his military career ended. In 2001, he transferred from the 412th Eng. Battalion to the 296th Trucking Company in Brookhaven, MS. On August 30, 2002, Mr. King retired from the military with over twenty-five years of military service for his country. He retired with the rank of E-7, Sergeant First Class.

Mr. King has been married to his lovely wife, Sandra Gamble-King for thirty-one years. They have three children. Their oldest daughter has one daughter, the middle son has a set of twins and their baby boy is only sixteen. They have two Godchildren who they love very much.

Mr. King has a total of twenty-three years of law enforcement experience. He started his law enforcement career in Fayette, MS with the Fayette Police Department and at Alcorn State University Police Department both at the same time. Three years later he left the Fayette Police Department and joined the Jefferson County Sheriff's Office. After working with the Sheriff's Office for six years, Mr. King decided to go back to school in 2006 to expand his career and pursue a Criminal Justice Degree, which he obtained in 2010. He graduated with a Bachelor of Art degree having a GPA of 3.5 and he's still with the Alcorn State University Police Department as a Lieutenant.

Mr. King is on the deacon's board at his church, he sings in the choir, and plays the piano for two different churches. He is an author of inspirational writings. His first published book is entitled "Crying, Through GOD'S Eyes". He has completed two more books that have not been published yet and is currently working on another one. He has a weekly column in the Fayette Chronicle, the Glory Journal and the GAD About Magazine in Fayette, MS; along with a column in the Bluff City Post in Natchez, MS.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Keith M. King for his dedication to the U.S. military, the 2nd Congressional District and serving his country and community.

**HONORING ROLANDO AND LORENA
HERRERA**

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rolando and Lorena Herrera, who own and operate Mi Sueño Winery and Vineyards in Napa, California. Love, passion, and dedication to their craft led Rolando and Lorena to the successes they see in their grape harvests and production of Carneros, Russian River Valley, Sonoma Mountain and Napa Valley wines.

The dream to build Mi Sueño Winery began in Mexico, where Rolando's grandparents taught him to tend fruits and vegetables in the mountainous state of Michoacán and where Lorena was born. Both of their families immigrated to the Napa Valley, seeking a better life

and opportunities for their children. Lorena's family taught her about tending vines and growing grapes in the vineyards and Rolando obtained an education and aspired to own his own business. When the couple met, "it seemed like fate."

In 1997, Rolando and Lorena founded Mi Sueño, which is Spanish for "My Dream," the same year that they were married. They believe that crafting truly unique wines requires careful attention to every stage of the winemaking process, from start to finish. From choosing the right plot of earth, to personally planting the vineyards and selecting the most attentive distributors, Rolando and Lorena have created a truly exceptional business and product. The White House recognized the quality of their wines by serving it at state dinners.

Rolando and Lorena traveled to Washington, D.C. this week as part of a group of Mexican-American vintners, not only to support the mission of the Smithsonian Institution, but also to further educate Congress about their vital contributions to our economy and community. Their stories of immigration, sacrifice and determination are what make America great.

Mr. Speaker, Rolando and Lorena Herrera have built a successful business and are producing extraordinary wines. I am proud to have such dedicated business owners living and working in our community. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor them here today.

MAJOR GENERAL WILMOTH

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Major General Margaret Wilmoth on her retirement from the United States Army, and to thank her for her dedicated service to the United States of America.

A true leader and trailblazer in her field, Major General Wilmoth served as the first nurse and female commanding general of a medical brigade with responsibility for wartime readiness of all the U.S. Army Reserve medical assets in the Southeastern United States, including Puerto Rico.

A recipient of the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, the Meritorious Service Medal with four Oak Leaf Clusters, the Expert Field Medical Badge, and the '9A' Proficiency Designator in Medical-Surgical Nursing awarded by The Surgeon General of the U.S. Army, Major General Wilmoth has been a true leader and expert in the U.S. Army Reserves, and in shaping military health care.

Congratulations to Major General Wilmoth on her retirement.

IN CELEBRATION OF PASTOR LAWRENCE BINION SR. AND LADY VALARIE BINION'S 40 YEARS OF SERVICE AS SENIOR PASTOR AT WESTSIDE CHURCH OF GOD

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of Pastor Lawrence Binion Sr. and his wife, Valarie Jean Metoyer Binion, as they celebrate 40 years of service as Senior Pastor and First Lady at West Side Church of God in Fresno, California. Residing in Fresno since 1977, Pastor Binion and Lady Binion have been a blessing to our Valley, and have dedicated their lives to serving others and bettering our community.

Born in Fairfield, Alabama, Pastor Binion eventually moved to Los Angeles, California where he later met his wife, Valarie. He is a graduate of Susan Miller Dorsey High School in Los Angeles, California State University, Los Angeles (UCLA) with a Bachelor's Degree in History, Fuller Theological Seminary with a Master's Degree in Divinity, and was conferred the Doctor of Divinity by the Southern California School of Ministry.

Following his education, Pastor Binion moved to Fresno, California, becoming the Senior Pastor of Westside Church of God. One year later, he married the love of his life, Valarie Jean Metoyer, who continued her education in the Central Valley. Lady Binion is a graduate of Fresno Pacific University with a Bachelor's Degree in Business Management and Organization Development, and served our community as an employee of Fresno Unified School District until retiring in 2013.

Pastor Binion and Lady Binion have dedicated their lives to serving our Valley with a passion for serving the Lord and bettering the community. Pastor Binion is known for being a Pastor of Pastors, advising numerous individuals, ministries, and organizations in our city and throughout the Central Valley. He has been a member of various community organizations dedicated to improving our community, including West Fresno Ministerial Alliance, West Fresno Healthcare Coalition, City of Fresno Police Advisory Council, and the Central California Prison Fellowship, to name a few. He is also the founder and chairman of Southwest Fresno Development Corporation; an organization dedicated to promoting economic development in West Fresno.

Lady Binion has spent the last 38 years serving Westside Church alongside her husband, assisting him in ministry and serving as the Minister of Music and Worship Arts. Like her husband, she has also served with several organizations for the betterment of our community, including Bringing Broken Neighborhoods Back to Life, Feed Fresno Food Giveaways, and the West Fresno Ministerial Alliance, to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Pastor Binion and Lady Binion, whose passion, kind hearts, and selfless service have made an instrumental impact on the lives of those in our Central Valley communities. I join the community in honoring

Pastor Lawrence Binion Sr. and First Lady Valarie Jean Metoyer Binion for their contributions and devotion to our community.

HONORING MRS. LOUISE SMITH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a resourceful and ambitious mother, Mrs. Louise Smith. Mrs. Smith has shown what can be done through hard work, dedication and a desire to live a productive life.

Louise Smith was born on February 21, 1925 in Laurel, Mississippi.

Mrs. Smith married Samuel Smith on March 10, 1946 and together they had 11 children, 5 boys and 6 girls. They moved to Yazoo City, Mississippi in the 1950s. When the youngest child was enrolled in kindergarten, Mrs. Smith enrolled in beauty school and later received her license to become a hairstylist. She and her good friend, Dorothy Casey, co-owned a beauty salon in downtown Yazoo City which opened in early 1970s and remained open for over 30 years. When you stopped by to get your hair done, you not only received a great hair styling, but you also got many words of wisdom with a little gospel to lift up your spirits until the next time you came.

Mrs. Smith was once a member of Chapel Hill Baptist Church on Brickyard Hill in Yazoo City with her husband and children. There she and several other women met and formed a gospel group known as the Gospel Carolettes. Her husband sang with them as well. The Gospel Carolettes not only sang in Church but at various Christian events spreading the news of the gospel. They also sang on the radio station WAZF each Sunday morning.

Mrs. Smith left Chapel Hill Baptist Church with her husband and children to become a member of New Zion Baptist Church where her son, Rev. Willie E. Smith, is the pastor. There she, not only served as a Mother of the church, but also works with the Mission women. Mother Smith taught Sunday School and sang in the choir at New Zion.

Mrs. Smith has been a mother and/or grandmother figure to many in the church and in her neighborhood; always welcoming others into her home, which has always displayed an array of beautiful flowers in the yard and many green plants indoors for comfort, decoration and fresh air. Louise enjoys gardening and preparing dinner with vegetables from her garden on Sundays for her children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren and any other visitors from the community.

Mrs. Smith has pushed to be a role model not only for her children and grandchildren, but to all in her community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Louise Smith for her dedication for change and serving her community.

REMEMBERING THE USS "STARK"
INCIDENT**HON. JOE WILSON**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 30th Anniversary of the tragic attack on the USS *Stark* during the Iran-Iraq War. On May 17, 1987, the USS *Stark* was on patrol in the Arabian Gulf when an Iraqi aircraft fired two missiles at the frigate without warning. The attack and resulting fire killed 37 military personnel and wounded 21 others. The brave crew fought the fire throughout the night and managed to save the ship.

I would like to recognize the heroism of the service members who served on the USS *Stark*, including Mr. Luther James Padgett of Gaston, South Carolina, a member of the HSL-32 Squadron. A proud Navy man, he served his country from 1977 to 1995. I am grateful for his admirable service.

IN HONOR OF NATIONAL NURSING
HOME WEEK 2017**HON. MIKE ROGERS**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention to recognize the National Nursing Home Week, May 14th to 20th, and recognize our Veterans at the Community Living Center (CLC) at the Central Alabama Veterans Health Care System (CAVHCS).

The American Health Care Association established the National Nursing Home Week in 1967 and this year's theme is "The Spirit of America."

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing this special week and thanking all of our Veterans in Alabama.

HONORING THE WASHINGTON IRELAND PROGRAM AND CLAUDIA AND TOM CORCORAN

HON. BRENDAN F. BOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Washington Ireland Program which works every day to support leaders committed to building a future of peace and prosperity for Northern Ireland and Ireland. For over two decades, the Washington Ireland Program has played an important role in post-conflict Ireland by bringing together young leaders from a wide range of communities and backgrounds for an outstanding leadership and skills-development program.

Specifically, I'd like to highlight the work of Claudia and Tom Corcoran who have a deep and steadfast commitment to Ireland and its

young people. They believe in providing opportunities for people to experience life-changing perspectives and opportunities. The Washington Ireland Program's impact today can be attributed to Claudia and Tom's early and effective advocacy. They have been involved in setting up opportunities for young people from the United States to participate in exchange programs to Ireland, in which both countries benefit from these programs to foster transatlantic relations and deeper understanding between our two countries.

Claudia's clear passion for students and background as an educator is evident through her deep involvement and leadership on the Washington Ireland Program Board of Directors. Originally from Ireland, Tom is exemplary of the American Dream. At age 13, Tom emigrated by himself to the United States from County Cavan Ireland, where he was born and his siblings and parents still remain. He is now quite successful as President at Corcoran Enterprises and serves as a Senior Advisor in the Aerospace and Defense Sector at The Carlyle Group where he assists in developing strategy and identifying investments in the aerospace and defense sector.

Tom believes in America as the "land of opportunity." Both Tom and Claudia are focused on paying their successes forward and creating opportunities for others who come behind them, bettering the lives of young people from all parts of Ireland, North, South, East, and West.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 18, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 23

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine worldwide threats.

SD-G50

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

S-116

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Cybersecurity

To hold hearings to examine the cyber posture of the Services; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217, following the open session.

SR-222

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To receive a closed briefing on Navy readiness challenges, emerging threats, and the requirements underpinning the 355 ship force structure objective.

SVC-217

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness

To hold hearings to examine reopening the American frontier, focusing on exploring how the Outer Space Treaty will impact American commerce and settlement in space.

SR-253

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety

To hold hearings to examine making implementation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ground-level ozone attainable, including S. 263, to facilitate efficient State implementation of ground-level ozone standards, and S. 452, to amend the Clean Air Act to delay the enforcement and implementation of the 2015 national ambient air quality standards for ozone.

SD-406

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Border Security and Immigration

To hold hearings to examine building America's trust through border security, focusing on progress on the southern border.

SD-226

MAY 24

Time to be announced

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

TBA

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine industry perspectives on options and considerations for achieving a 355 ship Navy.

SR-232A

10 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine border insecurity, focusing on the rise of MS-13 and other transnational criminal organizations.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Vishal J. Amin, of Michigan, to be Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President, Stephen Elliott Boyd, of Alabama, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, and

Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security. SD-226 10:30 a.m. Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Defense To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Navy and Marine Corps. SD-192 2:30 p.m. Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces To hold hearings to examine Department of Energy atomic energy defense activities and programs. SD-G50 Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security To hold hearings to examine pool safety, focusing on the tenth anniversary of	the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act. SR-253 Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism To hold hearings to examine law enforcement access to data stored across borders, focusing on facilitating cooperation and protecting rights. SD-226 Select Committee on Intelligence To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters. SH-219 MAY 25 9:30 a.m. Committee on Armed Services To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Army in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2018 and the Future Years Defense Program. SD-G50	10 a.m. Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry To hold hearings to examine the Farm Economy, focusing on perspectives on rural America. SR-328A 2 p.m. Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy, and Environmental Policy To hold hearings to examine the United Nations Human Rights Council. SD-419 Select Committee on Intelligence To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters. SH-219

SENATE—Thursday, May 18, 2017

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the source of all our praise, we magnify Your Name. We place our trust in You, for You are our helper throughout life's seasons.

Be mindful of our Senators and bless them. Keep them on the path that leads to life. May Your peace stay with them, guarding their hearts and minds.

Lord, give them the wisdom to practice integrity in all of their conduct. Keep them from stumbling and slipping as You prepare them to stand before Your presence with great joy.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the cloture vote on the Branstad nomination, the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 56 and 57.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that, if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE INTERNET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I don't have to tell colleagues how im-

portant the internet and other wireless technologies have been in our modern society. From the way students learn to the way we do business and even the way we as Senators keep in touch with our constituents, these advancements have in many ways fundamentally changed how we operate. It is important to remember that these groundbreaking technological advances didn't just come about because of government mandates or heavy-handed bureaucracy; they grew out of an environment that allowed for, and actually encouraged, innovation.

From the Clinton years onward, there was a bipartisan consensus that we should maintain the kind of light regulatory touch that allows this innovation to thrive in the first place in order to open the door to further advancements.

Unfortunately, that changed under the Obama administration, which used the FCC to force through antiquated regulations designed for an age of rotary phones and switchboards. Today, however, we finally have an FCC chairman who recognizes that we live in an entirely new era—an era of smartphones and laptops and other mobile devices. We have a chairman who believes that innovation, ingenuity, growth, and job creation aren't dirty words to be stifled with unnecessary redtape.

Today, it is expected that Chairman Pai and Commissioner O'Rielly will take the first necessary step to address a deeply flawed Obama-era diktat that empowered bureaucrats with vast new powers to control the internet through archaic rotary telephone regulations from nearly a century ago. No matter how well intended, this overreach threatened the very innovation that brought us the internet and other technological advancements in the first place.

I want to commend Chairman Pai for taking this preliminary step to address the issue, which will also open the door for bipartisan congressional action to keep the internet open for consumers permanently. Later today, Senator THUNE and others will come to the floor to talk more about this issue. I look forward to hearing what they have to say and thank them for continuing this important conversation.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, too many Americans woke up this morning worried about the rising costs and limited options they are experiencing under

ObamaCare. As they went to work, too many struggled with the reality that their ObamaCare premiums could take an even larger bite out of their paycheck next year.

This afternoon, as they pick up their kids, too many will worry that they may have a hard time finding an ObamaCare plan at all for next year, with many counties having only one option left on the exchanges. Unfortunately, these are the realities for far too many Americans under ObamaCare, and they are miles away from what Democrats promised.

In my home State, we endured large premium hikes this year of up to 47 percent. For many working families, a spike in premiums like that can make it nearly impossible to afford health insurance at all. To make matters worse, under ObamaCare, many Kentuckians don't have the option to select the best provider for themselves and their families.

Let's take a look at the chart behind me. In Kentucky, under ObamaCare, 49 percent of our counties—49 percent—have one insurer, one. For Kentuckians in half of our counties, half have one choice. Really, when you have one choice, you have no choice at all.

It is not as though this situation is unique to my State either. This year, there are 26 States with at least one county where residents have only a single insurance option under ObamaCare. That means millions of Americans living in more than 1,000 counties across the country really have no choice at all—no choice at all—when it comes to ObamaCare.

Those families didn't get the increased choices they were promised under that law. They have been left to shoulder the burden nonetheless, and things have only gotten worse over time.

In fact, just this week, people on the ObamaCare exchanges in three more States—Vermont, Virginia, and Oregon—learned they could face double-digit premium increases as high as 20 percent next year. I would ask our Democratic friends, are they really OK—are you really OK with ObamaCare's continuing attacks on the middle class?

One constituent from Lexington in my State wrote me about her frustration with the status quo under ObamaCare. Here is what she had to say:

My insurance is way more than what I can afford. I can't imagine many others who can pay more for health insurance than their mortgage.

She and her husband had shopped on the exchanges for healthcare, but the

lowest premium options were around \$1,000 a month—listen to this—\$1,000 a month, and that got them a \$10,000 deductible; \$1,000 a month would only get a policy with a \$10,000 deductible. So they decided to go uninsured and pay the penalty. She said:

The cost will be minor compared to the useless premium cost.

The last part of this Kentucky woman's message is something I think we should all remember throughout this debate. She said:

Please remember that there are many people depending on Congress to set this . . . right.

Americans like her are counting on all of us to leave ObamaCare's failures where they belong—in the past. For years, they have suffered under a collapsing system. Yet our friends across the aisle continued to defend the broken law regardless of its significant problems—problems that even many of them have, by the way, started to acknowledge.

Last week, Senate Democrats sent me a letter effectively admitting that the ObamaCare status quo is unsustainable. I hope that means they are prepared to join us in moving beyond their failed law. Otherwise, Senate Democrats are essentially telling the American people that they are OK with the status quo and that ObamaCare's collapsing markets, double-digit premium increases, and counties with only one insurer represent the new normal for healthcare in our country. Surely, they are not comfortable with that.

My constituents refuse to accept the status quo. The only question that really remains is this: Will Senate Democrats work with us to move beyond the status quo?

The entire Senate Republican Conference has been at work debating ideas and making progress. We are pursuing smarter healthcare policies for Kentuckians like the couple in Lexington and the millions more like them across the Nation who know that ObamaCare just isn't working. I hope our friends on the other side of the aisle will agree to join us in bringing some relief to all of these families who desperately need it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, last night, Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein appointed former FBI Director Robert Mueller as a special counsel to oversee the investigation into Russia's interference in the 2016 elections.

This was a very good first step. Mr. Rosenstein has done the right thing. I applaud his decision for both its correctness and its courage. A special counsel was much called for in this situation. Former Director Mueller is the right kind of individual for the job. I now have significantly greater confidence that the investigation will follow the facts wherever they lead. Additionally, as special counsel, Mr. Mueller must have broad latitude to pursue the Russia investigation. In the appointment order, it stipulates that the special counsel is authorized to investigate "any matters that arose or may arise directly from this investigation." That is a really important power, given recent reports about an active FBI investigation into General Flynn.

I am heartened by the news of Mr. Mueller's appointment, but it in no way diminishes the need for Congress to play an active role in helping to get to the bottom of recent events. Intelligence Committee Chairman BURR and Ranking Member WARNER should still pursue the congressional investigation into these matters with just as much vigor. That investigation has been proceeding in a bipartisan way, and it absolutely should continue as such.

We should still seek testimony from Mr. Comey in both the Judiciary and Intelligence Committees to discuss the events surrounding his dismissal and be given access to memos and transcripts or tapes of his conversations with President Trump. Mr. Comey was central to the events of the past few weeks. We still need to hear from him. I thank the bipartisan leadership of both the Intelligence and Judiciary Committees for requesting both the records and public testimony of Director Comey.

Congress, specifically the Judiciary and Intelligence Committees, should still be given access to any transcripts or related summaries of the President's meeting with the Russian Foreign Minister and Ambassador, during which reports have alleged he may have divulged highly sensitive intelligence.

Finally, there is still a great need as before for the next FBI Director to be someone who is nonpartisan, independent, fearless, and of unimpeachable integrity. A career politician of either party or anyone who suggests a lack of impartiality, should not be considered. The appointment of Mr. Mueller is a great first step toward getting the Russia investigation back on solid ground, but these other things also need to happen: Mr. Comey testi-

fying; the White House turning over to Congress the relevant tapes and transcripts, if they exist; and the selection of an independent, impartial FBI Director.

Later this afternoon, the Deputy Attorney General, Rod Rosenstein, will brief all 100 Senators at the request of the two leaders, the majority leader and myself. He can brief us on a great many things, including the events of Mr. Comey's dismissal and the status of the Russia investigation.

While the briefing itself will not take place in a public setting, I hope that much of what we learn today can be shared with the American public.

So in the interest of getting all the facts, we in Congress look forward to hearing from Mr. Rosenstein this afternoon. It is a sign that while we wholeheartedly applaud the appointment of a special counsel, we in Congress must continue to do our jobs as well.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, on another matter, Mr. President, criminal justice reform. Last week, Attorney General Jeff Sessions ordered Federal prosecutors to "charge and pursue the most serious readily provable offense," even for low-level drug crimes. Functionally, this means Federal prosecutors will seek the harshest possible penalty even for nonviolent, low-level drug crimes.

This is a significant reversal from the Obama-era Smart on Crime Initiative, in which Federal prosecutors were instructed to focus on more dangerous drug traffickers and avoid charging less-serious offenders with crimes that required long, mandatory minimum sentences. As a result of the Obama policies, Federal drug cases dropped by more than 19 percent between 2012 and 2016, according to the U.S. Sentencing Commission. Cases with charges carrying longer, mandatory minimum sentences fell precipitously, from nearly 60 percent in 2012 to 45 percent last year. Thanks in part to this initiative, President Obama became the first President since Carter to leave the White House with a smaller Federal prison population than when he took office.

Meanwhile, prosecutions of the more serious crimes—the evil drug dealers, those who run the drugs, often from out of this country to here, they are the ones we can really go after and need to go after—increased by 17 percent and 14 percent, which makes it the way we can stop these evil drugs from coming into this country.

So that policy was tough on crime and smart on crime. Our law enforcement agencies have finite resources. They should be focused on combating violent crimes. When a prosecutor is spending hours in court, days, for a low-level possession charge and not

having the resources to go after the drug runners, the drug dealers who poison our kids, that is misplaced priorities.

What Attorney General Sessions has just ordered is the exact opposite approach of what we need. Instead of giving judges and juries the discretion to use their judgment in sentencing, it compels prosecutors to seek as much jail time as they can get for every single offense, treating low level and high level the same. It is a blunt instrument that will result in more unnecessary, punitive sentences, overcrowding of our prisons, and will be less effective in our fight on crime. It runs completely counter to a bipartisan consensus here in Congress.

Many Members of this body, Democrats and Republicans, agree that mandatory minimum sentences have led to bloated, costly prisons, and disproportionately ravaged minority communities.

In the last Congress, a bipartisan group of Senators sought to make meaningful progress with a sentencing reform proposal that had, among its cosponsors, a diverse group of Senators, ranging from Senators DURBIN and BOOKER on the Democratic side to Senators LEE and PAUL on the conservative side. Unfortunately, those efforts to strike a compromise to bring much needed reform to our Nation's criminal justice system were derailed by the obstruction of, guess who—then-Senator Sessions, with the cooperation of the Republican leadership. Now, after making progress under President Obama and Attorney General Holder, Attorney General Sessions has chosen to simply revert back to the one-size-fits-all approach that criminologists, police leaders, and bipartisan lawmakers have determined is not the right answer.

In order to truly be tough on crime, we must be smart on crime. This approach is dumb on crime. Congress, of course, still has the power to legislate this issue. We have the power to override the Attorney General's decision. So I hope this misguided change in the Department of Justice's policy revives a bipartisan desire to pursue sentencing reform. When we look for areas where there can be significant bipartisan cooperation, this is one of them. I hope Leader MCCONNELL will choose to pursue it.

Thank you, Mr. President.
I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Brand nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Rachel L. Brand, of Iowa, to be Associate Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Connecticut.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

MR. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am on the floor to talk about the status of America's healthcare system. As we speak though, the country is obsessed with the question of the firing of FBI Director Comey and the appointment last night of a special counsel who is going to seek to get to the bottom of this question as to whether there was coordination between the Trump campaign and the Russian Government and their attempts to influence an American election.

There have been secret meetings happening in the Senate among Republicans—reportedly 13 Republicans, to be specific—attempting to craft a new version of legislation that passed the House of Representatives, now, I guess, 2 weeks ago, that would rob healthcare from 24 million Americans. According to the Congressional Budget Office, it would drive up costs for everyone immediately by about 15 percent to 20 percent and jeopardize the protections that are built into the law for people with preexisting conditions.

There is no CBO score on the latest House proposal because Republicans decided to ram the bill through without the ability of anyone to read the legislation. No one read that bill. Let's be honest. It was filed hours before it was voted on, and no one knows the cost of that bill because they didn't wait for a CBO score.

It is simply unbelievable that the House of Representatives decided to reorder one-fifth of the American economy without reading the proposal or without understanding its cost, but Republicans in the Senate are attempting to pass their own version of a repeal-and-replace bill. We await the results of these secret partisan meetings.

I think Democrats have been pretty clear that we would like to be in this conversation. We want to preserve what works in the Affordable Care Act, and there is a lot that works. A new report out just a couple of weeks ago shows an astonishing decrease in the number of people who face personal bankruptcy in this country. Why? Because half of personal bankruptcies in the United States of America, prior to

the Affordable Care Act being passed, were due to medical debt. So the reason that less people than ever before are having to declare personal bankruptcy is because medical bills don't bankrupt them anymore because of the Affordable Care Act. Let me guarantee you, that number will spike back up if anything approximating the House bill passes.

We think there are good things in the Affordable Care Act. Our constituents agree. Polling now routinely tells you the majority of Americans want to keep the Affordable Care Act, not replace it, but we want to be part of a conversation in which we talk about keeping the things that work and addressing the parts of the healthcare system that don't work. Costs are still way too high. We would like more competition on these exchanges. So let's have a conversation about that.

As of today, Democrats are being shut out of the process. If you are represented by Democrats in the U.S. Senate, you have no voice in this process because Republicans have chosen to do it just amongst their own party. I think that is a shame. I understand in the end, Democrats passed a product in 2010 with Democratic votes, but anybody who was here remembers that there was a long process by which President Obama and Democrats in Congress tried to work with Republicans and brought the bill through the committee process. The HELP Committee and the Finance Committee had exhaustive meetings, hearings, and markups. In the end in the HELP Committee, upon which I sit today, there were over 100 Republican amendments that were accepted and included in the piece of legislation that eventually passed on the floor of the Senate.

As far as we know, this secret process happening behind closed doors will include no Democrats now and will not go through a committee process. If they ever come up with something that can come up with 50 votes, it will be rushed to the Senate floor. That is outrageous. We want to be part of this process.

I am on the floor not to talk about what will happen if a bill robbing healthcare from millions of Americans, jeopardizing protections for people with preexisting conditions, comes to the floor of the Senate, I want to talk about what is happening right now because President Trump made it very clear, just a few days after he was sworn in, that his desire was to kill the aspects of the American healthcare system that are affected by the Affordable Care Act. By the way, that is almost the entirety of the American healthcare system because that bill did—in addition to extending coverage to 20 million Americans—grant protections from insurance abuse to hundreds of millions more.

A January 20 Executive order issued by the President said that "it is the

policy of my Administration to seek the prompt repeal" of the law. It said:

To the maximum extent permitted by law, the Secretary of HHS and the heads of all other executive departments . . . shall exercise all authority available to them to waive, defer, grant exemptions from, or delay the implementation of any provision or requirement in the Act that would impose a fiscal burden on any State or a cost, fee, tax, penalty, or regulatory burden on individuals, families, healthcare providers.

President Trump made it clear that his motive from the start was to destroy the Affordable Care Act. My colleagues, he has consistently kept up that attack. I am often bringing President Trump's tweets to the floor because, well, they continue to exist on social media. It is nice to be reminded of the fact that, over the course of the first 100 days in office, President Trump has been routinely—routinely—attacking the American health care system, saying: *ObamaCare will fall of its own weight; be careful—i.e., if you are thinking of signing up, be careful—discouraging people from signing up for these exchanges.*

Once again, *ObamaCare is dead*, says the President of the United States, despite the fact that 19 million people rely on the exchanges for their healthcare coverage. Here is another one: *ObamaCare will explode. Do not worry; he has it taken care of*, he says. Finally, *ObamaCare is in a death spiral.*

So these are the routine, almost daily attacks, rhetorically, that this administration has waged against the Affordable Care Act. He has commanded his agencies to pick it apart in any way that they can. So, to the extent there is any diminution in the health of these exchanges, to the extent that insurers are thinking about not participating or are pushing up their rates, there is only one reason for it. It is the active sabotage campaign that the Trump administration is engaged in to try to destroy the Affordable Care Act.

This is purposeful. This is intentional. This is planned. That Executive order, unlike some other Executive orders, was not just an exercise in political and public relations, because the next month, in February, the IRS announced that it would not reject tax forms from people who failed to answer the question of whether they had health insurance. So the IRS took a definitive step to undermine the Affordable Care Act by telling consumers they were not going to enforce the individual mandate.

Now, here is a news flash: Republicans think the individual mandate is a good idea. After attacking it for the last 6 years, the House bill they passed includes an individual mandate. It does. It is in a slightly different place. Instead of the penalty applying when you lose healthcare, in the House, all they did was just shift the penalty to

when you sign up for healthcare again. All they did was move the mandate from when you lose healthcare to when you repurchase healthcare. But it is still there.

The administration is seeking to undermine the existing mandate. Insurance companies have noticed. Senator MCCONNELL came to the floor a week or so ago to take note of the pretty serious premium increases that were requested in Maryland, in part, by Blue Cross Blue Shield. But the head of Blue Cross Blue Shield in Maryland was very clear about why they were increasing rates.

He said the uncertainty around the individual mandate plays a significant role in the company's rate filing because failure to enforce the mandate makes it far more likely that healthier, younger individuals will drop coverage and drive up the costs for everyone else.

Insurance companies are noticing that the administration is picking apart the protections that can keep rates down in the exchanges and, thus, they are filing higher rates. But with less people in the exchanges than anticipated, insurance companies are also rethinking participation. This is intentional as well. Shortly after taking office, the HHS Secretary pulled the advertising for the Affordable Care Act in the last week of open enrollment. We know exactly what happened here because we have the data on who was signing up before Trump took office and after Trump took office.

Before Trump took office, open enrollment was exceeding open enrollment for the prior year. After that decision was made to pull funding for advertising, open enrollment cratered. The former marketing chief for healthcare.gov estimates that 480,000 people did not sign up for coverage in the last week because the ads were pulled and because the President of the United States was out there actively telling people that they should "be careful" before signing up for the exchanges because he was going to kill it.

So almost half a million Americans did not sign up for these exchanges. A half million Americans don't have health care today, potentially, because the Trump administration stopped advertising the exchanges and because the President of the United States told people, essentially, not to sign up.

Finally, let me talk about what is happening right now with respect to something called cost-sharing reduction payments. A big part of the Affordable Care Act—and really the foundation of the Affordable Care Act—is subsidies that are given to individuals, often passed straight through to insurance companies, in order to help folks who are lower income buy insurance.

Guess what. Republicans think this is a good idea too. I know that because we stole the idea from Republicans.

This was initially a Heritage Foundation plan that was adopted by Mitt Romney in Massachusetts. It was the Republican alternative to the Clinton healthcare bill in 1993. So this idea of individuals getting subsidies is a Republican idea that Democrats stole.

Republicans included it in the House bill. The subsidies are lower, but they are still there. The subsidies come in two forms. One, there is a tax credit to individuals based upon their income, and, two, for lower income individuals there is a payment that goes to the insurance companies that mitigates the amount of money that you have to pay out of pocket—just two different kinds of subsidies.

These subsidies are relied upon by the insurance companies to continue to offer these products. The Trump administration is paying the subsidies but is trickling them out 1 month at a time, constantly making public pronouncements that question whether they will continue to make those payments.

Here is what OMB Director Mick Mulvaney told reporters. He said the administration could pull the plug on subsidies at any time. He said: *We haven't made any decisions. The payments are due, I believe, the 20th or the 21st of every single month. We have not made any decisions at all on whether we will pay in May.*

Think about if you are an insurance company executive deciding, A, whether to put a plan on an exchange or, B, if you put a plan on an exchange, how much to charge, and the White House is telling you: *You may not get the subsidies that are called for under the law, and we may give you no warning in pulling those subsidies. We are going to pay them for May. We might not pay them for June. Maybe we will pay them for July and August. Maybe we will pull them for September.*

How would you make a decision on how much to charge consumers? Why would you enter into a contract with a State or Federal-based exchange? So whether it is the attack on the individual mandate, whether it is the decision to pull advertising, or whether it is the games being played with cost-sharing reduction payments, there is a coordinated effort inside the White House today to destroy the American healthcare system to the extent that much of the system has the Affordable Care Act at its foundation.

President Trump was pretty clear about this the day of the failure of the first healthcare bill in the House of Representatives. He essentially telegraphed that he was going to try to undermine the Affordable Care Act as punishment to Democrats, and that if he hurt enough people, eventually Democrats would come to the table and negotiate with him. Well, I have a message for the President of the United States: That is not how it is going to

work. You are not going to blackmail Democrats by hurting our constituents by undermining the Affordable Care Act.

We want to be part of this discussion about improving the healthcare system. We do. We want to work with Republicans. It will be a much smaller and likely less revolutionary bill than Republicans are considering today, but it will have both party's fingerprints on it. We are not going to be part of a bill that strips healthcare away from tens of millions of Americans, and we cannot support this administration while it seeks to undermine the Affordable Care Act on a daily basis.

If these exchanges fail—I don't think they will, but if the exchanges fail—or if rates go up, there is only one place to put the blame—on an administration that is actively, regularly, and on a daily basis trying to sabotage the Affordable Care Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are not. We are on the Brand nomination.

THE INTERNET

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I rise today to point out that the Federal Communications Commission is voting today, perhaps this morning, to begin the process to roll back a regulatory framework that should never have been imposed on broadband service providers in the first place. Like many of my colleagues, I am glad the FCC is working to restore the "light touch" regulatory framework that has allowed the internet to thrive since its creation.

This action sets the stage for Congress to then put a legislative solution in place that strikes the right balance between providing regulatory oversight on the one hand and giving the broadband industry the flexibility it needs to innovate and expand on the other hand.

We should not rely on a classification that was devised during the depression era. There should be 21st-century rules for 21st-century technology. As chairman of the Senate subcommittee that oversees internet issues, I look forward to the task ahead. Keeping the internet free and open is a goal shared by most of us and by many of my friends on the other side of the aisle. A bipartisan solution can help provide long-term certainty for both consumers and broadband providers.

This certainty will be essential to our efforts to close the digital divide and remove barriers to internet connectivity that exist in Mississippi and around the United States. The online experience we enjoy today and the revolutionary advances of the internet over the past quarter century did not happen because of the heavy hand of the Federal Government.

These advances happened because the Federal Government stayed out of the way, supporting a "light touch" regulatory framework where innovation, competition, and investment could truly survive and thrive.

This was the framework that existed under both Republican and Democratic administrations until 2015, when politics got in the way. With a party-line vote, the FCC that year decided to adopt a utility-style framework, as I said, resulting from legislation devised during the depression. It classified broadband service as a common carrier under title II of the Communications Act of 1934.

A utility-style framework for telephones may have worked during the Bell telephone monopoly of the depression era, but that does not mean it is a right fit now. Nor does it mean we should adopt a completely hands off regulatory approach, which I would also oppose. The goal of net neutrality, which is designed to prevent internet providers from prioritizing some legal content over others has not gone away. But we know that handing over broad control of the internet to Washington is also not the answer.

FCC Chairman Ajit Pai has outlined some of the reasons for this, including the impact of title II regulations on big and small internet service providers. If we do not give providers the confidence to invest in better services and better infrastructure, it could limit consumers' options and services. This could also affect our efforts to close the digital divide, to bring the digital world to our rural communities in Alabama and Mississippi. Underserved communities could remain underserved.

Without broadband access, these communities could lose out on critical jobs, economic development, and many other opportunities borne out of the thriving internet economy.

At the end of the day, we need to be asking: What do Americans want and what do Americans need? They need broadband that is accessible, affordable, fast, and reliable. They want to be able to choose the services and content that best meets their needs.

These are the priorities that need to be kept in mind as the FCC works today and as lawmakers work to strike a balance between regulatory oversight and free market productivity.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL CARSON

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, every week I have been coming to the Senate

floor to talk about someone in my great State of Alaska who makes Alaska a better place for all of us—for the community, for everybody living there. I call this person our Alaskan of the Week. To be honest, it is one of the most fulfilling things I get to do as a Senator, recognizing back home and across the country special people in my State.

There is no doubt that many here in the Chamber and the people who are watching from home have seen pictures and television shows about Alaska. We are a little biased—I know one of our pages is an Alaskan—that we have the most beautiful State, not only in the country but in the world. So we want to encourage everybody watching to come visit Alaska. It will be the trip of a lifetime, absolutely guaranteed. It is truly the people of Alaska who make our State so special, people with big hearts who band together to solve challenges. Like all places, we have challenges.

This week I would like to recognize Michael Carson for his work to help people in Alaska who are struggling with addiction. We know this is a problem that is impacting every single State in our great Nation. Michael lives in Palmer, AK, a picturesque town about 45 miles from Anchorage in Alaska's vast Matanuska-Susitna Valley—what we just call the Valley or the Mat-Su. It is about the size of West Virginia, so don't get me going on the size of Alaska. It will embarrass most of my—actually all of my colleagues here, unfortunately for them. Palmer is flanked by the rolling Talkeetna Mountains to the north and the sawtoothed Chugach Mountains to the south. It is a close-knit community where most people know each other.

Many people in Palmer and the Mat-Su across the State know Michael Carson's name. Like many Alaskans, Michael's story is one full of adventure. Originally from California, he received his undergraduate in early childhood development from the University of Texas. After hitchhiking through Africa and spending a summer in Mexico, he took a job teaching in Nome, AK, in 1974. A few years later, he moved to the Mat-Su to teach and taught our students for many years.

He retired from teaching, but his yearning to help people, particularly our youth, did not leave him. He got a job at Covenant House in Anchorage, which is a homeless youth shelter. It is a wonderful place, by the way. I am a little biased on this one; my wife Julie happens to work at Covenant House. Michael's shift started at 8 p.m. and ended at 8 a.m. That is what he was doing at Covenant House. He spent those hours walking through the city, reaching out to kids on the streets, sharing his own story, and inspiring our youth because his story also involves recovery. It is a privilege to say

here on the Senate floor that Mike has been sober for 29 years.

Eventually realizing that kids in the Mat-Su Valley also needed a place to go when they were in trouble and needed help, Michael and another incredible constituent of mine, Michelle Overstreet, founded MYHouse in Palmer, a place that provides services like job assistance, access to healthcare, clothing, food, and showers for homeless youth. Michael still sits on the board, still remains a champion for all youth, particularly those in recovery and the homeless or disadvantaged. He leads recovery groups on-site weekly, as well as meetings with clients who are struggling. He has also volunteered to host recovery groups at the Mat-Su youth detention facility for the past 13 years. Michael has helped many young people get sober and stay sober.

In Michelle Overstreet's words, it is not uncommon for youth to come into the drop-in center, homeless and just out of juvenile detention, and ask specifically for Michael, to come in and say that he helped them somewhere along their journey through life to sobriety, just to come in and say: Thank you, Michael.

Most of us know that our country is in the midst of an opioid crisis, one that has become an epidemic in many places across the country. In 2015, more people in America died from overdoses—over 52,000, and most were linked to opioids and heroin—than car crashes or gun violence.

On Wednesday morning, Alaskans awoke to a disturbing headline in the Alaska Dispatch News: "Anchorage is seeing a dramatic surge in heroin overdoses." Anchorage is the largest city in Alaska. It is my hometown. The article said that since May 1, there have been more than 2 overdoses a day in Anchorage—34 overdoses in just a little more than 2 weeks.

Like almost every State in this great Nation of ours, Alaska is being hit hard by the opioid crisis, and we are trying to focus as much attention as we can in a bipartisan fashion on addressing this crisis, whether in Alaska, Kentucky, New Hampshire, Indiana, or Vermont.

We need people like Michael. Every State does. He started the only grass-roots opioid task force in the State of Alaska and continues to chair that effort to this day. He knows too well how the abuse of opioids, other drugs, and alcohol robs our citizens—but particularly our youth—of their lives, promise, and future. He also understands how very important it is to have resources for those who need the support and recovery. Those resources come in many forms. We have been trying in the Congress in the last year, year and a half, to bring significant resources to our State and local communities. We are doing that.

State support is also important across the country. Perhaps most im-

portant is the community support and having people like Michael on the frontlines who understand that addiction is not a moral failure and that people who are suffering need help. They need help, not moral judgments from us.

Because of Michael's involvement and the involvement of so many others in Alaska and particularly in the Mat-Su, there are places for people who are suffering to call and get help. There are places to go and heal and places where our youth can have leaders who listen to them, like Michael.

Michael says it is vital for his own recovery to continue to help people who are suffering from addiction. He calls it "survivor obligation." I call it the work of angels.

Michael, thanks for all you do, and congratulations on being our Alaskan of the week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULIVAN). The Senator from South Dakota.

THE INTERNET

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the internet worked great in 2014 when there were no Federal net neutrality rules. Truth be told, even after the Obama-era Federal Communications Commission applied depression-era phone monopoly regulations to broadband in 2015, most Americans saw little or no difference in their internet experience. The internet still creates jobs, expands educational opportunities, keeps us in touch with loved ones, and, as a bonus, it is often entertaining.

This internet that we know and love isn't going to fall apart anytime soon, no matter what the FCC decides. But there are important policy questions that need to be answered about how the internet will grow and develop into the future. Let's put the apocalyptic rhetoric and fearmongering aside.

The internet doesn't belong just to Republicans, Democrats, big Silicon Valley tech companies, internet service providers, small Silicon Prairie startups, or the Federal Government. It belongs to everyone. It is global. It is best when it is free and open.

Today, as the FCC reconsiders the flawed broadband regulations it issued only 2 years ago, Congress should look back at the path that we could have taken but didn't. In November of 2014, I offered former FCC Chairman Tom Wheeler an opportunity for Democrats and Republicans to come together to craft a permanent legislative solution banning controversial practices known as blocking, throttling, and paid prioritization of internet traffic. With colleagues in the House of Representatives, I even put forward a draft bill doing exactly that. It wasn't a final offer but, rather, an outreach to get the conversation started. I thought the time and opportunity to protect the open internet on a bipartisan basis had

arrived. Through bipartisan legislation, I believed Congress should put into statute widely accepted principles of network management, commonly referred to as "net neutrality."

Our idea for legislation was straightforward: Combine protections ensuring that owners of broadband infrastructure can't use their role to manipulate the user experience with those guaranteeing a continuation of the light-touch regulatory policies that helped the internet thrive for two decades.

But Chairman Wheeler rejected our idea for bipartisan legislation. Instead, he and his staff lobbied to block such discussions from even happening in Congress. He then, with only partisan support, issued an order that gave the FCC authority to regulate the internet under old laws designed for phone monopolies and eliminated all the authority the Federal Trade Commission had to police broadband providers.

I represent South Dakota, a rural State that is home to small but still very innovative technology businesses. In other parts of the State, communities lack access to high-speed broadband. In the debate over the FCC regulating broadband with rules designed for phone monopolies, there were many concerns that Chairman Wheeler's approach would create uncertainty that chills investment.

"Chilling investment" is a term that one often hears among the business community. To me, what it really means is that many Americans in rural communities will have to wait longer before they have an opportunity to select high-speed internet service. Today there are 34 million Americans who lack access to broadband services at home.

As innovation on the internet thrives, demand for data rises, and the stock market hits all-time highs, one would have suspected that broadband investment would continue growing as it had for two decades. But according to one analysis, annual investment actually went down 5.5 percent in 2016 compared to 2014. This is a troubling sign that private investment may have second thoughts about the ability to turn capital expenditures into future profits under an excessive regulatory regime.

Chairman Wheeler assured the public that his FCC would not use new authority over the internet to aggressively restrict many regular online practices, but he could not offer assurances that, as years pass and administrations change, such regulatory restraint would remain. His order gives wide legal latitude for any future FCC not bound by his commitments to touch any and every corner of the internet. After all, unless grounded in legislation, partisan policy changes through administrative action can be fleeting.

Today's action at the FCC aptly underscores the concern that the FCC's

partisan approach to internet policy in 2015 did not put the internet on a solid foundation. I know there are many upset about what the FCC is doing. I felt much the same way 2 years ago when the FCC voted to proceed after my bipartisan outreach had been rejected.

We should not, however, view the FCC's action today as a final outcome. While I commend Chairman Ajit Pai and Commissioner Michael O'Rielly for taking this necessary step, I fully recognize that today's action alone does not create ideal certainty for the internet. There is more work yet to do.

In politics, it is rare to get a second chance at bipartisan compromise, yet right now we have an opportunity to accomplish what eluded us 2 years ago—clear and certain rules in statute to protect the open internet. We have another chance to sit down, to discuss every stakeholder's concerns, and to work toward the common goal of protecting the internet.

While the FCC's 2015 order may soon be consigned to the dustbin of history, the last few months have shown that political winds can and often do shift suddenly.

To my colleagues in both the majority and minority: The only way to truly provide legal and political certainty for open internet protections is for Congress to pass bipartisan legislation. We need a statute offering clear and enduring rules that balance innovation and investment throughout the entire internet ecosystem.

In crafting rules, we need to listen to the concerns of all Americans who support an open internet but who may have differing opinions about the greatest threats to online freedom. For some Americans, the greatest concern is meddling by internet service providers, and for others it is unelected bureaucrats attempting to overprotect Americans from products and services that they actually like.

Online innovation is a virtuous circle. Online companies need robust and widely available broadband networks to reach their customers, and ISPs need the online experience to be compelling enough to drive subscriber demand.

We need to work together collaboratively to find the right policies for the internet. I firmly believe we can find common ground to protect the internet, so long as we don't fixate on the misguided notion that monopoly regulation is the only way to preserve it. While some may wish to wait until the activities at the FCC and in the courts have completely run their course, my preference would be to begin bipartisan work on such legislation without any further delay. Innovation and job creation should no longer take a backseat to partisan point scoring.

It is time for Congress to finally settle this matter. I am happy to meet at

any time with any of my colleagues who are serious about discussing a path forward. I would also welcome discussing any new open internet proposals from my colleagues that balance the need for both innovation and investment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, after reviewing Rachel Brand's record and testimony during her confirmation hearing, I cannot support her nomination to become Associate Attorney General.

Ms. Brand is a fierce supporter of the so-called Patriot Act and the bulk collection of millions of Americans' data. Americans deserve an Associate Attorney General who can properly balance their Constitutionally protected right to privacy against national security interests. Ms. Brand has demonstrated her willingness to abridge those rights.

I am particularly disturbed by Ms. Brand's tenure as the Assistant Attorney General for the Department of Justice's Office of Legal Policy from 2005 to 2007. Ms. Brand worked at the Department at the time when Bradley Schlozman, a high-ranking official within the Department of Civil Rights, was accused of inappropriately politicizing the Department. Ms. Brand's emails during her time at the Department indicate that she may have been aware of and, indeed, a willing participant in this inappropriate activity. Conservative groups are now urging Attorney General Sessions to "wash out the progressive liberal activism that infects the agency from top to bottom." This Justice Department under Attorney General Sessions is already facing its own ethics crisis. When President Trump flouts protocols and procedures with impunity, I cannot in good conscience vote to allow Ms. Brand to return to the Department of Justice and continue where she left off.

Mr. THUNE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, we are still dealing with some of the same issues we have dealt with before. It is interesting to me the number of people who have asked: Is Congress obsessed right now with all of the press reports and all of the things that are happening around the Presidency and everything else? I have said to them that is one of the things on our list, but that is not what we are talking about the most. We are working on issues like tax reform and healthcare issues and regulatory issues.

I just had three bills that went through the markup process just yesterday that deal with small business regulation and how we are going to be able to manage getting things back in order. We spent all day at lunch on Tuesday and we spent all day at lunch on Wednesday with our entire conference in a working lunch together and talked about healthcare policies. We are still working on trying to finish these issues that absolutely need to get done.

Healthcare is one of those issues that has been one of the prime conversations now for years, and we are in the final stretch of actually working through an actual repeal and replace of multiple sections of the Affordable Care Act that have caused the greatest amount of damage, but I still have people who will catch me and ask: Well, there are beneficial parts. What are you going to keep, and what is going to go, and why do we need to replace it?

I will typically smile at folks and say: Let me give you a quick recap as to why we need to replace this and what is really happening. It may be different in your State than it is in mine, but let me lay it out as to where we are and what has been said.

Remember, back in the earliest days, the Affordable Care Act being passed, it was all about premiums decreasing. In my State, premiums went up just last year—in 1 year—76 percent in the individual market. It was a 1-year increase of 76 percent. The year before, under the Affordable Care Act, they went up 35 percent in 1 year. Premiums not only have not stabilized, but they have accelerated out of control.

It was all about deductibles decreasing. Deductibles have also skyrocketed. It was about, if you like your doctor or if you like your healthcare, you can keep it. Doctors have moved to other hospitals. Doctors' offices have stopped being independent. They have to be able to work with other facilities so as to maintain the compliance requirements there. Most of the independent doctors in Oklahoma are no longer independent doctors. They now work under a corporate structure or they cannot survive.

As to this whole thing about competition on the open market, we used to have multiple companies in Oklahoma that provided insurance. We now have one. Every other company has left. There is one company left. There is no competition driving down prices. It is a monopoly. It is the same thing that is happening all over the country. Just this year, there are one-third of the counties in America that now only have one insurance provider. In my State, all 77 counties only have one insurance provider.

To tell you where things are really headed in this area of competition, United, which is one of the largest providers of healthcare, dropped out of all

of the exchanges nationwide—everything. It is doing none. In the past couple of days, Aetna announced it will no longer do competition in any State anywhere in the country. The number of companies even willing to try to live up to these regulations continues to drop off. That is what is really happening in our States.

If you want to know what that actually means to real families, let me give you a taste as to what comes into my office regularly because I have many people who call my office and say: Protect this. Protect this. Protect whatever it may be in the healthcare coverage. You have to make sure you guard it.

I will typically say to them: Let me introduce you to some other people who are also calling in and who are also writing in.

I will leave their names out, but let me give you just some of the situations:

A single mom, who has children and is from Norman, OK, contacted us and said her family has seen its premiums triple over the last 2 years. Currently, its premiums are \$1,500 a month, with a deductible for the family of \$24,000.

Another family contacted me who has a disabled child. The federally mandated health insurance under ObamaCare for 2016 was \$895. For 2017, it is \$1,553 a month for this family with a disabled child.

A husband and wife in Tulsa, OK, wrote me. Their current monthly expense for just insurance is \$1,500—twice the amount of their house payment. They have a relative who is working three part-time jobs and cannot get a full-time job because, under ObamaCare, a full-time job also requires all of the benefits. No one is hiring in that full-time area because of the additional requirements for ObamaCare. He is working three part-time jobs, and because he is working three part-time jobs and has no health insurance, he is also paying the penalty—fine—on his taxes for not having insurance. Not only can he not get a full-time job because of the ObamaCare requirements, but he is paying a penalty because of it as well.

A husband and wife from Newkirk, OK, wrote me. For their insurance alone, not including out-of-pocket medical expenses, the husband and wife will spend \$21,965 this year on healthcare coverage.

Another family wrote me from Stillwater, OK. Their healthcare coverage used to be 5 percent of their family income. Now their healthcare coverage is 22 percent of their family healthcare income.

I have another family who wrote to me, and it is very interesting. They are from Oklahoma City, and they wrote me and just gave me a breakout—a chart—that they had created. In 2015, their monthly premium had sky-

rocketed to \$1,400. In 2016, it was \$1,500. Now, in 2017, it is \$2,042 a month. Let that soak in for a moment.

Then they made the statement that there are financially strapped families who will not go to the doctor due to this out-of-pocket expense. That is the additional deductible that is on top of their \$2,000 premium. Individuals buying private insurance have no recourse because we have no other option that we are allowed to go to. There is only one insurance provider available to us. We need competition in this State in order to take away the financial burden on our families.

All they want are options. Yet right now what the Federal Government has told them is: No. We have a policy, and you have to buy that policy. If you do not buy the policy we pick for you, we will fine you on your taxes.

They are stuck. Thousands of Oklahomans are stuck.

Why is it such a big issue? Because of how it affects individuals. Why is it such a big issue? Because of what is still coming.

There is this false belief that the Affordable Care Act is fully implemented. That is not true. Many of the aspects of the most onerous parts of the Affordable Care Act did not go into implementation until after President Obama left office. Let me give you some examples of some things they had back-loaded that would not start until after he had left office:

There is the Cadillac tax. Every union family across the country will start to face much higher costs on their insurance because their insurance is considered too good under the Affordable Care Act. So all of those great union families who have great healthcare insurance across the country are about to start facing additional taxes and fees for their insurance being better than their next-door neighbors' insurance as the Affordable Care Act tried to push down healthcare insurance to be the same for everyone.

There are increased penalties that are still coming because the full penalties have not been rolled out yet on all of the taxes. They have gone up a little bit each year, but they will accelerate now over the next several years.

There are increased taxes. The medical device tax, which has been sitting out there, has been delayed, but it now will go into full implementation. There is also a tax, which is a health insurer tax, that adds an additional tax to every insurance company that of course they will then pass on to every single premium.

There are still all of the costs that are associated with the expansion of Medicaid. Now, there has been a lot of conversation about the expansion of Medicaid. As many people know, this was an expansion of Medicaid for people from 100 percent of poverty to 138 percent of poverty. It is just in that

small bracket that there had been an expansion of Medicaid. Initially, the Federal Government covered all of the costs of that expansion. Then, starting this year, the States pick up the additional cost. My State, like several others, chose not to do the expansion, and my State legislature and my Governor have taken a lot of heat for that. Yet what they said several years ago is, once the State has to pick up the additional bill, we will not be able to afford that expansion. We cannot do that.

Let me tell you what that would mean to my State. Because we did not expand, we do not have an additional cost this year, but let me give you a parallel. The State of Oregon is almost exactly the same size as the population in the State of Oklahoma. It will now start taking on an additional \$257 million a year in its State budget because of the expansion of Medicaid it took on.

Now, that may not seem like a big deal to some people in this Chamber, but in my State right now, our State legislature and our Governor are struggling to balance a budget, and we are going through all kinds of issues because, right now, our State is about \$800 million behind budget, and this is after being \$800 million behind budget last year. If the people in my State will imagine what is going on right now in the State capitol, if we had an additional \$257 million added to that hole, then that is what it would mean for our State.

There are real effects that are out there, and I understand healthcare is extremely personal. That is why it has always been something that has been decided by individual families, not by the Federal Government and, in my State, by someone 1,000 miles away who is trying to make healthcare decisions for them.

What we are really trying to do with this is to deal with the issues I just laid out. This is not about partisan politics. This is about people and families who have been hurt by what is happening in the Affordable Care Act—by someone 1,000 miles away who is trying to tell them what policies they can and cannot buy, by the skyrocketing costs, by the actual effect that has happened. While I have some people who say that is not real, I could line up the families in my State who used to have coverage but who no longer have coverage because they cannot afford it anymore.

Then there are the simplistic answers to, Why don't we just cover everybody in the country? Why don't we just do a single-payer system? People do not understand. They know how bad it has become now and how hard it has become now. You would accelerate that multi-fold if you were to just slip into a single-payer system.

What do we need to do? Let me give you a couple of quick thoughts. We are

going to need transition time. Whatever you hear about all of the conversation we have about the Affordable Care Act or replacing the Affordable Care Act, please know that all of the conversations for us begin with how do we do a good transition from where we are now to where we need to be.

I have folks who say: Well, next week, this ends. Well, next year, this suddenly goes away.

No, there will have to be a transition process, and it will be over several years.

We are also still looking at some of the most basic elements. For instance, I have had folks say: I want to be able to keep my kids on my insurance until 26. That has been assumed, quite frankly, by the House and by the Senate, but the House bill that has been passed already keeps that. There has been a lot of conversation about preexisting conditions. Most of the conversation we have had as Senators, behind closed doors, is about taking care of people with preexisting conditions.

Those are very real issues.

We understand the dynamic of what happens back and forth with insurance companies and families and the struggles families have, whether they are cancer patients, diabetic, have rare blood diseases or Alzheimer's. There are so many struggles that are out there. We understand that. That is in our conversation as well. Yet we have to be able to find practical ways to start leveling out the cost of insurance. We cannot survive with rates skyrocketing like they are, and people need to know the safety net is going to actually be there.

We have to resolve these issues. We have to work for the benefit of our States, which cannot afford these overwhelming cost increases. We have to work for the benefit of families who are facing the issue and, quite frankly, for the Federal taxpayer as well.

While my State struggles with an \$800 million hole that it is facing right in the budget, by the end of our session, it will have had that resolved. It is constitutionally required to have that resolved. The Federal Government is facing a \$20 trillion budget hole right now—\$20 trillion. For all the folks who say: Just add more to it, it will be fine, may I remind you, there is a day all of that has to be paid. We have to be able to be responsible with our Federal budget at the same time we are helping our States to be able to manage theirs and at the same time we are helping our families to do the same.

No, this is not simple, but it has to be done. We have to be able to find a way to restore it. This is not about returning healthcare back to where we were years ago. That, quite frankly, is gone. As I mentioned before, all of those private doctors that used to function in my State, they don't function in my State anymore. They are all

under corporate structures. The insurance companies have left or have merged. Hospitals in my State have merged because they couldn't survive the last few years of ObamaCare. Even if we wanted to go back to how healthcare was—and we don't—but even if we wanted to, we can't because there has been so much change in the last few years. We have to be able to actually fix where we are.

So I would encourage continued communication. Lots of folks have contacted my office on every side of this issue. Keep doing that. Lots of folks in this Chamber have had dialogue, and though it looks like a partisan exercise, it is actually a pretty open conversation among our conference to try to figure out how we are going to actually help families, help our States, help our Federal budget, and help us to be sustainable on these critical issues.

I have gotten lots of other letters I can bring. There are lots of other stories out there. I think we know enough now to be able to know this is something that needs to be done. So while the Nation is distracted, we cannot be distracted. Let's finish the healthcare conversation. Lots of families are counting on us.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, last night, Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein appointed Robert Mueller as special counsel to oversee the investigation into Russia's alleged meddling in the election last fall and any related misconduct. Robert Mueller is perhaps the single-most qualified individual to lead such an investigation, in my view, and he is certainly independent.

As a former FBI Director—the longest serving FBI Director since J. Edgar Hoover—he, by any measure, has the experience and the credibility and the credentials to conduct a nonpartisan investigation and come to a conclusion based on the facts alone. We could use some conclusions based on facts here in Washington, with the relentless torrent of rumor, gossip, and suspicion but very few facts. It is clear to me that Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein felt this was in the best interests of the Department of Justice and the country, and I trust his judgment on the matter.

I do think there is a related concern now that a special counsel has been chosen; that is, the proliferation of hearings and contact with witnesses and the principals over this Russia

matter that while certainly legitimate in terms of doing oversight, which is our responsibility as the legislative branch, we can't—and shouldn't—intrude or perhaps undermine inadvertently the investigation being conducted by the executive branch and the special counsel. I think this is something we should talk about as a Senate because I know each committee that has some jurisdictional hook on this issue wants, of course, to do its job, but I think, if we don't deconflict between committees, as well as between the role of the Justice Department and the special counsel, we could risk inadvertently harming the investigation. I trust no one would want to do that intentionally.

Sometimes, having served myself—as has the distinguished Presiding Officer as the former attorney general of Alaska—it is interesting, this is my first legislative role in government. I have been here for a while now, and I am starting to get the hang of things, but the fact is, sometimes I think legislators are confused about their role when it comes to investigations. They are not the FBI. Legislators are not the Department of Justice. They can't investigate a counterintelligence matter or a criminal matter. That is simply within the exclusive purview of the executive branch.

What we can do and what we must do, in my view, is to continue to conduct a bipartisan oversight investigation into these matters for our own purposes, which are legislative purposes, not executive branch or prosecutorial purposes. Now that Director Mueller has been appointed as special counsel and will be doing that on behalf of the Department of Justice and the executive branch, I think it is really important for us to again consider whether this proliferation of hearings and running down every rabbit trail that happens to pop up is really in the best interests of getting to the bottom of this matter.

I believe it is our duty—and this would be the case no matter who was in the White House—to get the facts and to conduct our legitimate oversight investigation here but in a way that cooperates with or certainly at least coordinates and deconflicts with the Department of Justice's investigation under the auspices of Director Mueller. In the meantime, I will continue to work with my colleagues on the Senate Intelligence Committee on a broad bipartisan basis to conduct the kind of investigation that is entirely appropriate so we can get to the bottom of this matter. The American people, of course, deserve nothing less.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, on another matter, the Senate continues to work toward repealing and replacing ObamaCare, unfortunately, without any help whatsoever from our Democratic colleagues,

even though they know ObamaCare is failing the millions of people who buy their insurance in the individual market. Premiums are skyrocketing because of adverse selection and deductibles are so high they are effectively denied the benefit of having insurance in the first place. One would think an elected Senator representing those constituents would care enough about it to try to do something about it, but our Democratic colleagues, because they are so tied to ObamaCare and they feel like they have to defend it at all costs, I think it has blinded them to the failings of ObamaCare, certainly in the individual market. There ought to be some basis for us to work together in the best interests of all our constituents and the entire country.

Some of our colleagues have said: Well, we would be revisiting ObamaCare even if Hillary Clinton had been elected, and that is absolutely true because ObamaCare is failing millions of Americans, and it is our responsibility, on a bipartisan basis, to do something about it. So far, the politics of the day seem to be carrying our Democratic colleagues along with it. I hope at some time the fever breaks and they will see fit to do their duty, as we are attempting to do our duty, which is to replace ObamaCare with affordable healthcare that preserves individual choices and doesn't continue to exacerbate and aggravate the national debt and our financial status in the country.

ObamaCare, we now know, was oversold. At the time, the President said: If you like your policy, you can keep your policy; if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor; and, oh, by the way, a family of four will see a reduction in their premiums of \$2,500 a year. None of those claims proved to be true.

Again, the Presiding Officer was a former attorney general, as I was in my State, and we had a Consumer Protection Division. When people misrepresented the services or product they sold, we sued them. We went after them for consumer fraud. ObamaCare, to me, is one of the largest cases of consumer fraud I have ever seen, and people deserve better.

It is time to do away with this government-mandated, top-down approach that doesn't work. It is time to provide the American people with more affordable options. That is what we are trying to do. One would think that would be something all of us would want to do.

ObamaCare has taken a heavy toll on folks in my State. It is estimated that more than one-third of our counties are down to just one health insurance provider this year, and the ones that are there are saying that unless something changes, they are going to see double-digit increases in premiums for 2018. They are down to one provider because everybody else has decided they have

lost enough money and they want to get out while they can. To have one provider is not about more options and choices and better coverage, it is an unworkable path forward for our Nation's healthcare needs.

Fortunately, every member of the Republican conference is now working together to do away with this unworkable healthcare plan and replace it with healthcare that helps American families get the coverage they need at a price they can afford. Why wouldn't we all be interested in providing the healthcare they need at a price they can afford?

The House has taken the first critical step, and I know my colleagues and I are eager to do our part. Since the Democrats refuse to lift a finger, we are going to have to do this with 52 Republicans, and it is not easy, but just because it is hard is no excuse for not succeeding. We must succeed in the best interests of our constituents.

This isn't just a matter of taking something that is OK and making it better; this is taking something that is failing and, if we fail to act, will continue to drag Americans by the millions down with it.

It is important to understand the trials that Americans have faced under ObamaCare so we can move forward in a direction that supports families across the country. One of my constituents wrote me recently and told me that his premiums were going up by about 50 percent. To make matters worse, his doctors wouldn't accept patients on ObamaCare plans. That is a theme we have seen across the country: healthcare options dwindling while prices keep getting higher. The cost of his healthcare keeps going up, and his salary isn't going up at the same rate. He is losing disposable income, even though he has a job. So he is literally poorer as a result of ObamaCare. This isn't helping him, this is hurting him, and all because his monthly payment for health insurance is climbing. So he is living from paycheck to paycheck, and of course he is worried about the future, which is the reason he contacted me.

Unfortunately, this gentleman is representative of the unintended consequences brought about by ObamaCare. All of our offices get a lot of calls, a lot of emails and letters just like his. He is not on the exchanges because he wants to keep his doctors, and he is employed with employer-provided health insurance. To many in America, this would be a huge blessing, but unfortunately ObamaCare did nothing to help people like him. His premiums are going up so high, he is concerned about being able to put food on the table for his family. What a tragedy. What a disaster. This is truly a manmade disaster, and it is a crystal clear example of just how flawed ObamaCare really is.

This constituent of mine ended his letter to me by calling on Congress to

fully repeal ObamaCare, and that is exactly what we will do. He is not alone in calling for change. Many Texans have been writing and calling in, and have been for some time, to tell me their ObamaCare story. It is making their lives harder, as I mentioned, with skyrocketing premiums, higher deductibles, and fewer choices of doctors and healthcare providers. These are the folks I was sent here to represent and whom I am fighting for, and each of us, I know, is doing their part—at least on this side of the aisle—to fight for our constituents who are being hurt by the status quo.

The status quo is not acceptable. I know it is not acceptable to our colleagues across the aisle, but they are so frozen in place by their own politics that they can't even step across the aisle and work with us in areas where we might agree. I hope this happens at some point, but it is not happening right now.

So we are going to repeal and replace ObamaCare and come up with the very best healthcare plan that we can—again, one that preserves choices, brings premiums down, and makes it more affordable.

Here is the final reason why we need to do this: We promised. We promised. In the last elections, we promised. There is a reason why, when ObamaCare passed, there were 60 Democrats and today there are 48. It is because in every intervening election we have made the perils of ObamaCare an issue, and in every election our friends across the aisle have lost Senators because they simply can't defend the status quo.

But beyond elections, I believe there is a time to engage in electioneering and there is a time to govern, and now is the time for us to govern responsibly. But it does have political benefits, too, because if people think you are doing a good job and if people think you care about them, then, they are likely to reward you politically. But that is not the main reason we should do it. We should do it because it is the right thing to do and because people are hurting and people are anxious and concerned about their future, living paycheck to paycheck, with ObamaCare taking a bigger and bigger bite out of their ability to provide for their family.

So we are going to get this done. Just because it is not easy isn't an excuse for not doing it. We can't complain that it is too hard because that is what we asked our constituents to send us here to do—to do the hard stuff, not the easy stuff—to do the hard stuff. This is hard, but it is not impossible. It is imminently doable. But it takes political will and commitment not just to keep our promise but, then, to do the dead-level best of our abilities to come up with a plan that actually believes not in more government control but in

more individual control over your healthcare choices and to bring competition back into the marketplace, to let the market set rates and quality rather than the government determining this from Washington, DC.

One thing I truly believe is that competition makes things better for consumers. It brings down prices and it improves service because in a competitive environment where people have choices, they are going to go to the choice which serves their interests the best. They are going to reward the people who are doing the best job of delivering what they need and what they want at the price they can afford. It has a way of regulating the insurance market better than anything Washington, DC, could do—particularly by command and control of programs like ObamaCare.

So we are going to get it done, and we are all working together. We would continue to invite our colleagues across the aisle not to sit on their hands, not to do nothing but to do what they can, working with us in a nonpartisan or bipartisan way to help save the people who are currently being damaged and hurt by the failures of ObamaCare but then to help us build something better, something more durable than what we have seen with ObamaCare.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Brand nomination?

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 131 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Capito	Cornyn
Barrasso	Cassidy	Cotton
Blunt	Cochran	Crapo
Boozman	Collins	Cruz
Burr	Corker	Daines

Enzi	Kennedy	Rubio
Ernst	Lankford	Sasse
Fischer	Lee	Scott
Flake	McCain	Shelby
Gardner	McConnell	Strange
Graham	Moran	Sullivan
Grassley	Murkowski	Thune
Hatch	Paul	Tillis
Heller	Perdue	Toomey
Hoeben	Portman	Wicker
Inhofe	Risch	Young
Isakson	Roberts	
Johnson	Rounds	

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Harris	Reed
Blumenthal	Hassan	Sanders
Booker	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Heitkamp	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Manchin	Udall
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Duckworth	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	
Franken	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—2

Hirono Kaine

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Terry Branstad, of Iowa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of China.

Mitch McConnell, Jeff Flake, Bob Corker, Roger F. Wicker, Cory Gardner, Marco Rubio, John Boozman, Pat Roberts, Joni Ernst, Mike Rounds, Todd Young, Rob Portman, John Thune, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, James M. Inhofe, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Terry Branstad, of Iowa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of China shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and

the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 86, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 132 Ex.]

YEAS—86

Alexander	Franken	Murray
Barrasso	Gardner	Nelson
Bennet	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Perdue
Boozman	Hassan	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Reed
Cantwell	Heinrich	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cardin	Heller	Rounds
Carper	Hoeben	Rubio
Casey	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Schatz
Cochran	Johnson	Scott
Collins	Kennedy	Shaheen
Coons	King	Shelby
Corker	Klobuchar	Strange
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Tester
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	Markey	Toomey
Daines	McCain	Udall
Donnelly	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Durbin	McConnell	Warner
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Ernst	Merkley	Wicker
Feinstein	Moran	Wyden
Fischer	Murkowski	Young
Flake	Murphy	

NAYS—12

Baldwin	Duckworth	Sanders
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Schumer
Booker	Harris	Stabenow
Brown	Peters	Warren

NOT VOTING—2

Hirono Kaine

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 86, the nays are 12.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Terry Branstad, of Iowa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of China.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following nominations en bloc, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Todd Philip Haskell, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo and Tulinabo Salama Mushingi, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the

Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guinea-Bissau.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Haskell and Mushingi nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made laid upon the table en bloc and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1185 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Thank you, Mr. President.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN

I rise today to once again speak out against the administration's proposal to revive Yucca Mountain. I know I have said it before, and I will say it again: Yucca Mountain is dead. Nevada will not be our Nation's nuclear waste dump.

I conveyed that message in my meeting with Secretary Perry during his confirmation and reiterated it ahead of his visit to Yucca in March. My former colleague, Senator Harry Reid, was a powerful and outspoken opponent of Yucca and worked hard to make sure the project did not see the light of day. Now I am standing between this administration and Yucca. I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that I will be leading this fight.

This is a reckless proposal. Over the last 30 years, the Federal Government wasted billions of taxpayer dollars to design and permit Yucca Mountain, all without any signal that Nevada would consent to it. A State without a single nuclear power plant should not have to shoulder the entire Nation's nuclear waste burden. We will not be run over by the desires of other States that want to move the nuclear waste that they produce, that they create out of their own backyards and then put it into ours.

I will say it again: Nevada will not be our Nation's nuclear waste dump.

Last week's accident at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington State serves as a chilling reminder of what Nevada could have to deal with at Yucca Mountain. I was relieved that no one was harmed after the tunnel collapsed but believe it serves as a wake-up call to my colleagues.

We need to find a viable solution to our Nation's nuclear waste problem. In addition to the potential tragic loss of life, radiation exposure resulting from a similar event at Yucca Mountain could shatter Nevada's economy. This is not to mention the threat of transportation accidents along the proposed waste transportation routes.

What this means is that under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, we are looking at shipping 9,495 rail casks in 2,800 trains, and 2,650 trucks hauling one case each to Yucca Mountain over the next 50 years. If the capacity limit at Yucca is more than doubled as has been discussed with the Department of Energy, we would shift 21,909 rail casks in about 6,700 trains and 5,025 truck casks to Yucca Mountain.

So I ask my colleagues: Do you really believe that over the span of the next 50 years there will not be a single transportation accident with an ensuing radiological release?

Under the DOE's proposal, these shipments would use 22,000 miles of railways, 7,000 miles of highways crossing over 44 States and the Tribal lands of at least 30 Native American Tribes, the District of Columbia, and 960 counties with a population of about 175 million people.

Between 10 and 12 million people live within the radiological region of influence for route shipments; that is, within one-half mile of these rail and highway routes. In effect, these rail and highway routes would impact most of the Nation's congressional districts, estimated at 330 districts.

For those who are not familiar with the West or Nevada, access to rail corridors or highways is often difficult because they are in such remote locations. If there were a spill or an accident, questions remain within the Department of Energy regarding their response time for emergency radiological exposure. This is not to mention the issue of private ownership of rail rights-of-way, making it uncertain who would even control accident sites.

What we do know is that the local communities would be the ones forced to suffer any type of long-term effects of radiation exposure. This is in a State that was home to our Nation's nuclear test site and the surrounding communities, which have suffered for years from resulting exposure.

I ask my colleagues: Should Nevada be forced to once more to shoulder this burden?

Secretary Perry, in response to last week's accident, acknowledged our Nation's problem with nuclear waste, saying that the nation could no longer kick the can down the road.

I do not believe that our Nation should continue to kick the can—or in this case the cask—down the road. We must find a long-term viable solution to our Nation's nuclear waste problem, one that is rooted in a consent-based siting.

I stand ready to work with my colleagues to make sure States have a voice in this process. Failure to do so will serve only to make this problem worse, risking future accidents similar to what we saw last week.

We can no longer afford to look backward at the failed proposals of the past and waste even more taxpayer dollars. Instead, we need to move forward on a real solution to a very real problem.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, the most important words in our Constitution are the first three words "We the People," written in beautiful script and written many times larger than the rest of the document so that even if you are across the room, you know what this Constitution stands for—not a government by and for the powerful, not a government by and for the privileged, but as President Lincoln so eloquently said in his Gettysburg Address, a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

As a "we the people" nation, we adhere to a core set of principles that have guided us through good times as well as in dark moments. One of those key principles is the rule of law, that we are a nation in which not only is there the rule of law but in which no one is above the law.

If we walked out of this Chamber right now, proceeded through the double doorways, and down the steps of the Capitol, we would be staring at the beautiful building of the Supreme Court. The entire building symbolizes the role of justice in our society. As you look at that magnificent Supreme Court—the broad, marble steps leading up to the door—you see these simple words inscribed above: "Equal justice under the law." It is right there. You can almost see it from where I am standing now: "Equal justice under the law." That is the principle that is part of the ethic of every courthouse in America—from the smallest, most rural courthouse to the big city courthouse square. We see those same principles personified as Lady Justice. There she is, holding the scales, blindfolded so as to make sure everyone is treated equally.

Yet, over the past few months, we have been in a period in which we have been staring into the abyss of a constitutional crisis because this very core principle of "no one is above the law" and "equal justice under the law" has been under assault.

We have a President whose campaign team is under investigation because of substantial information that suggests the possibility of coordination and collaboration with Russia to change the outcome of the Presidential election—an assault on one of the most fundamental premises of a free society; that of free and equal elections.

We have a President who gave code-word classified information to an adversary—Russia—just a few days ago. We have confidential information, we have secret information, we have top secret information, and we have code-word information at the very top. These are the most sensitive secrets of the American Government, and our President gave that information to Russia. If anyone else did that, he would be facing criminal charges.

We have a President who sought to shut down an investigation into one of his former team members—retired LTG Michael Flynn. We know Lieutenant General Flynn was in contact with Russian officials, and he was fired for lying about it. President Trump fired the head of the FBI because he would not drop the investigation into General Flynn's Russian connections and conduct.

We have a President, President Trump, who asked his Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General to develop a cover story to tell the American people the reason he fired the Director of the FBI, which is that he was upset about the Director of the FBI's treatment of his former Presidential opponent, Hillary Clinton.

If anyone believes the President woke up in the middle of the night and decided to fire the Director of the FBI because he was concerned about the way Hillary Clinton was treated, then you have not been paying attention this last year and a half.

Now, if in the course of an investigation it is found that members of the Trump campaign coordinated or collaborated with the Russians to undermine the integrity of our elections, then that is treasonous conduct. If the President asked for, encouraged, or knew about such activity, then he would be party to such treasonous conduct. If the President used his office to attempt to shut down either the investigation of Michael Flynn or the investigation into the collaboration between the Trump campaign and the Russians, then that obstruction is potentially a serious crime of obstruction of justice, and it has to be fully pursued. If the President fired his former FBI Director in order to slow down or shut down these investigations, then that compiles the evidence of obstruction of justice.

These sets of facts point to serious misconduct. We have to fully investigate whether there was, in fact, such misconduct. That is why, for more than 3 months—going back to Feb-

ruary 15 and Michael Flynn's resignation—I have been calling for a special prosecutor to conduct a thorough, impartial investigation into these matters. Over these 3 months, the case for why we need an independent special prosecutor has only grown stronger with each new event, each new story, each new piece of evidence.

If there were any lingering doubt about the need for a special prosecutor, that doubt was washed away last week when President Trump fired Director Comey for pursuing the investigation into the ties between the Trump campaign and Russia. That is why many of my colleagues and countless Americans all across the country stood up and demanded that no nominee fill Director Comey's shoes unless a special prosecutor had been appointed. So I was very pleased when last night Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein appointed such a special prosecutor.

Now, he will be coming to this Chamber to speak with us in a short period of time, later this afternoon. But whatever else transpired, stepping up and appointing that special prosecutor was the right thing to do. He announced the appointment of former FBI Director Robert Mueller as special counsel—the words “special counsel” and “special prosecutor” are largely interchangeable—with wide-ranging authority to conduct a thorough and independent investigation into “any links and/or coordination between the Russian government and individuals associated with the campaign of President Donald Trump; and, any matters that arose or may arise from the investigation; and, any other matters within the scope of the investigation.”

Last night's announcement was a tremendous victory for justice—the principle of justice. It was a tremendous victory for a country with the rule of law. It was a tremendous victory for the principle that no individual is above the law in the United States of America.

We need to have confidence that there will be a robust investigation to get to the truth, no matter where that leads us. Certainly, our confidence has been improved by the appointment of the special prosecutor last night—and not just any individual, but an individual qualified and respected to lead such an investigation.

For 12 years, from just before the September 11, 2001, attacks and right through 2013, this man, Robert Mueller, led the FBI. He led it for the second longest period in U.S. history. He led it for 2 years more than the standard term for the head of the FBI. He is known as a thorough, by-the-book prosecutor who can't be influenced or intimidated, and I have every faith that he will conduct a professional, robust, and thorough investigation and give the American people the answers to all of these issues.

But as we applaud this strong movement toward justice, to truth, and to accountability, this strong stride in support of our “we the people” democratic Republic, we cannot rest. We need to make sure that Mr. Mueller, as a special prosecutor, gets every resource he needs to aggressively pursue justice and the complete independence he needs to undertake this incredibly important task.

At the same time, we have to keep pressing here in the Senate, encouraging our Intelligence Committee, as well as the House Intelligence Committee, to aggressively pursue information. We cannot cede our obligation to represent and fight for the best interests of the American people or for our “we the people” Nation, and that includes speaking truth to power and holding our leaders accountable for their actions.

Mr. Mueller will have, as I noted, wide-ranging authority to conduct his investigation. His investigation and the investigation here in the Senate by the Senate Intelligence Committee will be looking at a number of connections that have occurred over the course of this last year and a half.

Now, we know a lot about what the Russians did to hack the American Presidential election. The intelligence community told us in a report this past January that, with “high confidence” Russian President Vladimir Putin “ordered and influenced the campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. presidential election” and that he did so in order to “undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process, denigrate [Hillary] Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency.”

The report goes on to say that the Russian Government “aspired to help President-elect Trump's election chances when possible by discrediting Secretary Clinton and publicly contrasting her unfavorably to him.”

We know many of the elements of this aggressive Russian campaign. They used the resource “Russia Today” to spread fake news stories, to develop those stories, and to publicize those stories. They hired thousands of internet trolls to comment in social media on the affairs in America, as if they were Americans weighing in. They proceeded to hack the DNC, or the Democratic National Committee, files and the Clinton campaign files, and they released damaging documents from those hacks. They used bots; that is, remote computers instructed by code that was placed onto those computers to weigh in on social media as if they were people weighing in. So we had thousands of machines weighing in with comments as if they were individuals weighing in. Why did they do that? To take the fake news story and proceed to amplify it with comments from thousands of trolls and, probably, tens of thousands of bots, in order to

get those issues trending so they would appear in the everyday news that Americans see. We are talking about a massive campaign of interference in the Presidential election.

What we need to know is whether anyone on the Trump campaign was connected, in any possible way, to these activities. To find that out, we have to investigate the growing web of connections between members of the Trump campaign and Russia.

Just consider some of the connections that have been explored already in the press. One individual is Carter Page, who served as President Trump's foreign policy adviser on the campaign trail. Mr. Page lived in Russia for 3 years while working for Merrill Lynch. He participated in several deals during his time there with Gazprom, the Kremlin-owned energy giant whose chairman was Vladimir Putin's deputy while Prime Minister.

He became friendly and emailed back and forth for months with Victor Podobnyy, a Russian spy who was recorded on tape saying he was trying to recruit Page.

Last year, while employed as a member of the Trump campaign, Mr. Page traveled to Moscow to deliver a speech bashing U.S. policy toward Russia, saying: "Washington and other Western powers have impeded potential progress through their often hypocritical focus on ideas such as democratization, inequality, corruption and regime change."

Then there is Paul Manafort, the former chairman of the President's campaign. He was hired to manage the Republican Convention and to wrangle delegates, but he was promoted to campaign chairman and chief strategist, until he resigned because of his questionable foreign dealings.

From 2004 until 2014, Manafort worked as an adviser to the Ukrainian President, Viktor Yanukovich, a pro-Russian strongman who, over the years, adopted policies that moved his country away from the European Union and closer to Russia. Manafort is regularly credited with helping Yanukovich win the Presidency in 2010.

In 2014, a revolution rose up against Yanukovich, and he was ousted from power. He now lives in exile in Russia. But Mr. Manafort continued working in Ukraine, helping rebrand the former President's Party of Regions as an opposition party, mostly from eastern Ukraine, which advocates for stronger relations with Russia.

Then, we have Roger Stone, President Trump's longtime ally, friend, and adviser since they first met back in 1979. That is three-plus decades. Ironically, it was Mr. Stone who introduced Donald Trump to former President Richard Nixon back in the 1980s, and there are stories in the media that Mr. Stone pressured the President to fire Director Comey.

Over the years, Mr. Stone has appeared many times in *Russia Today*, the Kremlin's English language news network that developed and publicized fake news stories during last year's Presidential election.

In his appearances, Mr. Stone regularly criticized the U.S. intelligence community, he attacked our media, he attacked our free press, he praised Russia and its policies, and he even praised WikiLeaks—the organization responsible for releasing massive amounts of confidential and damaging documents about our Nation's intelligence services and capabilities.

More than that, Mr. Stone has bragged about his communications with hackers—hackers like Guccifer 2.0. And who is Guccifer 2.0? The individual responsible for hacking the DNC and releasing emails during the campaign.

Another person whose connections to both the Trump campaign and Russia will be looked at is our former colleague and now our Attorney General. During the course of his confirmation hearings, Mr. Sessions misled fellow Senators about his interactions with Russian officials. When asked what he would do as Attorney General if he learned that anyone connected with the Trump campaign had communicated with the Russian Government, he said:

I'm not aware of any of those activities . . . I have been called a surrogate at a time or two in that campaign and I did not have communications with the Russians.

But he did have communications, meeting with Russian Ambassador Kislyak on two separate occasions last year.

Then, we have Michael Flynn, a very major part of the connections between the Trump campaign and Russia—a retired lieutenant general and appointed to be National Security Advisor by President Trump. He was intimately involved in the series of events that led us to yesterday, with the appointment of a special prosecutor.

Beginning in February 2016, General Flynn served as an adviser to the Trump campaign, and he was even considered as a potential running mate for President Trump. As we know, he followed President Trump into the White House as National Security Advisor. But as I noted before, that role was short-lived, as his Russian connections came to light.

Back in 2015, he was paid to attend a 10th anniversary gala for Russian TV and sat at a table with Mr. Putin. He didn't disclose this on his security forms.

During the Trump administration's transition, he talked with Ambassador Kislyak by phone, including one call on the very day that President Obama ordered sanctions against Russia as punishment. Punishment for what? Punishment for interfering with the American election.

When that information was discovered, the White House contended that General Flynn's conversations with the Russian Ambassador were nothing more than ironing out logistics for an eventual call between the President and Vladimir Putin.

Even Vice President PENCE went on the record defending Flynn, telling CBS News that the two "did not discuss anything having to do with the United States' decision to expel diplomats or impose censure against Russia."

But General Flynn's conversation with the Ambassador was picked up during routine surveillance of the Russian Ambassador. And what were they discussing? They were discussing the sanctions President Obama was placing on Russia. Why did he place those sanctions? Because of Russian interference in the election.

Acting Attorney General Sally Yates made it known that she warned the White House that Flynn was lying to the Vice President and that he was compromised. She met twice with Dan McGahn, the White House Counsel, to warn him about Flynn. But in exchange for making sure the White House knew about the fact that the National Security Advisor was compromised and then lied to the Vice President, she was fired—fired by the President.

Eighteen days after Sally Yates' warning, Michael Flynn resigned, after the Washington Post revealed that he had, in fact, discussed sanctions with Ambassador Kislyak.

Now, according to his lawyer, "General Flynn certainly has a story to tell, and he very much wants to tell it."

Well, I hope, as the Senate Intelligence Committee and as the special prosecutor pursue the investigations, that he will have every chance to tell it and will tell it with a fullness and an accuracy that will be complete.

That is the web of visible connections we already know about, and they suggest the possibility of coordination, consultation, and collaboration with the Russians to influence the American elections. We have to get to the bottom of whether, in fact, that is the case. Did it go beyond a series of conversations to actual coordination, consultation, and collaboration? This is what we need to know.

Now, the President says that there is no "there," there. That is why we need an investigation, in order to find out. The President has called this a witch hunt. An investigation, I would convey to President Trump, is not a witch hunt. An investigation is pursuit of the truth. An investigation is in the highest tradition of equal justice for all.

A very large development, as we all now know, occurred last week with the firing of FBI Director James Comey, who was leading the Bureau's investigation into these matters. Director

Comey confirmed while testifying in the House on March 20 that the FBI was, in fact, conducting an investigation into Trump's campaign—something we now know really bothered the President. But at the outset, the President's White House claimed that Comey's firing was about the Director's handling of the Clinton email investigations, not because of the Russia investigation. That story on its face caused eyebrows to raise across the country. Did people really believe the President woke up and was determined to right a wrong because the FBI Director had unfairly treated Hillary Clinton? Yet he asked his team to develop this story to share it with the American people. He asked his team—his Attorney General and his Deputy Attorney General—to essentially put out a story to mislead the American people. That in itself deeply damages the integrity of the White House.

This cover story also claimed that Comey was fired because he lost the trust of the rank-and-file FBI agents. Acting FBI Director Andrew McCabe came to the Hill to testify before the Intelligence Committee last week, and he conveyed that this is simply not true.

The cover story also involved Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein being the instigator of the firing by preparing this memo on his own and recommending it to the President. That also turned out to be a part of the deception, and the President himself made that clear, taking responsibility that it was his decision to fire, not a decision based on a recommendation that came from Rosenstein.

In an NBC News interview with Lester Holt, President Trump admitted that he "was going to fire regardless of recommendation" and that he was thinking of "this Russia thing," as he called it—"this Russia thing"—when he finally decided to fire the Director. He also told Lester Holt that he had asked Director Comey three times whether he himself was under investigation. The President admitted on camera to the American people that he fired the man in charge of the investigation against his campaign because he was frustrated that the investigation was still going on.

The American people received reports subsequently that the President had asked Director Comey to pledge his loyalty to the President. This is news report of the memo that Director Comey wrote after meeting with the President. We find that the FBI Director is not going to be loyal to anyone but Lady Justice.

The President had the audacity to publicly threaten Director Comey after firing him. "James Comey," said the President, "better hope there are no 'tapes' of our conversations before he starts leaking to the press!"

Attempting to intimidate future statements and possible statements in

an investigation after a person has been fired is another factor that is totally inappropriate. Everyone with any shred of common sense knows such intimidation is inappropriate, but in the context of a criminal investigation, it may be more than inappropriate.

We don't know if there actually were tapes. Our Intelligence Committee has requested the memos Director Comey wrote on his various conversations with the President. Remember, this is an experienced, seasoned FBI agent-turned-Director who has spent his life documenting conversations. It is considered to be a high level of integrity when such information is recorded in this fashion. Those memos carry a lot of weight. Some are classified, some are unclassified. They need to be provided immediately to the Senate Intelligence Committee, and if they aren't provided, then the Intelligence Committee needs to subpoena them and needs to subpoena the tapes. If they exist, they need to be delivered. If they are not tapes but they are transcripts, they need to be delivered. If they are not tapes but a thumb drive or they exist on a piece of hardware, they need to be delivered, and our special prosecutor, Mr. Mueller, needs to have them as well.

I think that as one steps back from this incredible amount of information—the information about how Russia hacked the campaign, not just hacking into the DNC and Hillary Clinton's campaign but then releasing that information in strategic moments; hiring a thousand individuals to comment in social media as if they were American citizens; establishing a botnet of computers to weigh in as if they were people to amplify this false social media, to get it trending and to get it into the mainstream news—when we consider all of this, we know how terribly wrong it was, and we have to learn every piece about what went on in order to make sure we are in the best prepared way to stop it from ever happening again.

We need to make sure we are in the best possible place to ensure that we can assist other democratic republics in making sure they are not victims of the Russians. We need to make sure that if any American, no matter who he or she is, collaborated or coordinated with the Russians in this effort to hack our campaigns, that they are prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, our law enforcement officers and the families who support them give so much in service to our communities. As we were tragically reminded again last week—and this happens in far too many places, in far too many States—some make the ultimate sacrifice to keep us safe.

Last Friday in Kirkersville, OH, Police Chief Steve DiSario responded to a report of a man with a gun at a nursing home. Chief DiSario did what so many first responders do when most of us in the public run away from danger: He ran toward it. He arrived at the Pine Kirk Care Center to protect his community and was killed in the line of duty by a gunman who also took the lives of two nursing home employees. Chief DiSario was 36. He had six children and a seventh on the way.

Our thoughts and our prayers are with Chief DiSario's family and the families of all of our first responders, who worry each day that their loved ones may not return home. Think about that. For soldiers, marines, sailors, police officers, and firefighters, so often when they kiss their spouse goodbye and go to work, there is always the anxiety at home. It is not just the sacrifice that our soldiers and our military personnel and our police officers make; it is the sacrifice their families make too.

Sadly, Police Chief DiSario wasn't the only Ohio officer to lay down his life this year. In January, Officer David J. Fahey of the Cleveland Police Department was working the scene of an accident on I-90 and was struck and killed in a despicable act of hit-and-run.

This week in Washington, we honor the five Ohio officers killed in the line of duty last year. Aaron Christian of the Chesapeake Police Department was killed in a car accident while on patrol. While conducting traffic, Trooper Kenneth Velez of Elyria was killed by a driver under the influence of drugs. Officer Sean Johnson was the first officer to be killed in the line of duty in the town of Hilliard when he succumbed to injuries from a motorcycle accident during a training exercise. Officer Steven Smith was shot and killed during a SWAT standoff in Columbus. Officer Thomas Cottrell, Jr., of Danville was killed in a heinous and cowardly ambush. Each of these losses is a tragedy for a family, for a community, and for fellow police officers.

As we honor the work and sacrifices made by law enforcement throughout Police Week, we need to offer more than kind words; we need action to support law enforcement as they work to keep our communities safe.

Yesterday, I was talking to Police Chief Richard Biehl of Dayton and Youngstown Police Chief Robert Lees about what more we should do to support officers and their families. This week, we have unanimously passed several pieces of bipartisan legislation that will provide new support to the officers who protect us and the families who sacrifice alongside them.

The Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvement Act, which Senator GRASSLEY introduced, will put pressure on the Bureau of Justice Assistance at

the DOJ to speed up claims processing so families of disabled officers or fallen officers get their benefits more quickly.

We passed the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act, introduced by Indiana Senators DONNELLY and YOUNG, to help law enforcement agencies establish or enhance mental health services, like peer monitoring pilot programs and crisis hotlines, for their officers. I learned about this bill from my friend Jay McDonald from Marion, OH, whose advocacy for police officers and their families makes a huge difference for Ohio's law enforcement communities. He has been the president of the Ohio Fraternal Order of Police for some time.

We approved Senator CORNYN's American Law Enforcement Heroes Act of 2017, which would allow local police departments to use Federal grant money to hire veterans as law enforcement officers. It is a bipartisan, commonsense idea that would open new doors for those who served our communities and our Nation in the military and who have accrued and developed skills that will serve well their communities in police work.

We have a solemn obligation to the children of fallen officers whose lives are forever changed because of the heroism of their mother or father. The bipartisan Children of Fallen Heroes Scholarship Act—which I have introduced with Senators CASEY and DONNELLY, two Democrats, as well as two Republican Senators, TOOMEY and COLLINS—would increase access to Pell grants for the surviving children of law enforcement who lay down their lives for their communities. It would ensure that all children of fallen officers are eligible for the maximum Federal Pell grant. Of course, we can't repay the debt we owe these families, but we can ease the burden on their children as they prepare for their future.

We need to do everything we can to ensure that officers and family members get the benefits and help they deserve. We also need to do more to give officers the tools they need to protect themselves. This week, I joined a group of Senators calling for full funding of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership.

I have written to the Department of Justice thanking them for their work so far and urging them to speed up distributing funding we passed as part of the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. The bipartisan bill created the Comprehensive Opioid Abuse Grant Program to provide funding to police departments to train first responders as they deal with opioid-related incidents.

More and more officers are being exposed to fentanyl out in the field. Just this week in Eastern Ohio, an officer in East Liverpool was the victim of an accidental fentanyl overdose. He survived, but the situation was perilous.

We need to make sure officers have the equipment they need to handle this deadly opioid look-alike—only more toxic—safely.

Our law enforcement officers put their lives on the line each day to protect us. This Police Week, we owe them more than gratitude; we must show support to the selfless men and women who serve our communities and country every single day, and we must support their actions, their lives, and their families.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to talk about the Russia questions that are on the minds of so many Americans. We had—I think, in the midst of all of the debate and controversy and genuine concern across the country—some good news yesterday when it was announced that Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein had made the decision to appoint a special counsel and, in this case, former FBI Director Mueller. That was good news because, No. 1, there was a special counsel who would undertake a review of these questions and in an independent fashion. I think people across not just Washington but even across the country were heartened by the fact that it was someone of the caliber, the experience, and the dedicated law enforcement commitment that Director Mueller demonstrated in his years with the FBI as Director, as a prosecutor. That was good news.

We are grateful for that. I know we will have a chance in a little while to talk to the Deputy Attorney General about these issues. I think we have to examine a couple more questions that arise.

So to review, on January 26, Acting Attorney General Sally Yates informed the Trump administration that General Flynn had apparently lied about having conversations with the Russian Ambassador, warning that it could open him up to blackmail. On May 8, Yates testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee and stated, contrary to claims by White House officials, that Flynn had discussed Russian sanctions in his those conversations with the Russian Ambassador.

On January 27, President Trump hosted Director Comey at the White

House, where the New York Times reported he asked Director Comey to pledge his loyalty. Director Comey reportedly promised only honesty.

On January 30, President Trump fired Acting Attorney General Yates, claiming her dismissal was over a matter unrelated to Russia.

On February 13, fully 18 days after the White House was originally informed by Yates of General Flynn's misconduct, General Flynn was relieved of his job after it became public that he lied about his conversations with the Russian Ambassador.

The day after General Flynn was pushed out, the President reportedly summoned Director Comey to a private meeting in which he took the extraordinary step of asking him to drop the FBI investigation into Flynn.

In March and again in May, Director Comey publicly confirmed that Trump associates were under investigation for possible coordination with Russia to interfere in the election. On May 9, President Trump fired Director Comey. His administration initially said it was based on a recommendation from Attorney General Sessions, who was supposed to be recused from anything to do with the Russia investigation, and Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein, who reportedly had been asked by Director Comey just days earlier for additional funding for the Russia investigation. But then the President himself revealed he fired Director Comey explicitly because of the Russia investigation.

The day after, the President tweeted a veiled threat that Director Comey "better hope that there are no 'tapes'" of their conversation, raising the question of whether the President was surreptitiously recording his Oval Office meetings and whether tapes exist.

While it may be unrelated, it also bears mentioning that, this week, it was also reported that President Trump revealed highly classified information to Russian officials in a private Oval Office meeting—information that could jeopardize critical intelligence assets and risk undermining relationships with allies.

I think there are some serious questions, even with the special counsel who has been named, even with two Intelligence Committees reviewing these matters. I would hope that, in addition to those reviews that are being undertaken—those investigations—that we also have an independent commission to get all of the answers we need so that we can ensure the American people that this will never happen again—that no foreign government, in this case, a foreign adversary, can interfere in an election at any time in our future.

That guarantee will not be ironclad unless we know exactly what happened and why it happened, and then we take a series of steps to prevent it from happening. We should be very clear with

the Russian Federation that if they do this again, they will be sanctioned, and there will be a consequence in response to their actions. We won't be able to do any of that unless we find the answers.

Here are a couple of basic questions I hope would be a part of the deliberations, not just of the two committees or other committees that might review this but also the deliberations and work of the special counsel and his team.

The first question is, Why does the President believe that the Russian election interference investigation is baseless, which is contrary to the unanimous finding of 17 U.S. intelligence agencies? These agencies issued a "high confidence" assessment of the determination they made. That is a technical term in the intelligence circles that they don't use lightly.

Based upon the findings of those intelligence agencies and that finding being of high confidence, why does the President continue to question or even undermine that determination?

Question No. 2 is, Why did Attorney General Sessions, who had to recuse himself from the Russian investigation, weigh in on the firing of the FBI Director responsible for that very investigation? That is a question, I think, a number of people are asking.

Question No. 3 is, Can the Justice Department's political leaders—individuals who have just come in with this administration and officials in the Justice Department—be trusted not to interfere in the ongoing FBI investigation? That is a question.

Question No. 4 is, Why, immediately after firing Director Comey and amid the uproar about interference in the Russian investigation that it created, did the President convene a private meeting with the Russian Foreign Minister and the Russian Ambassador in the Oval Office and allow the Russian state media—the Soviet-era state media entity—to cover that meeting while keeping out the U.S. media? I think that is a question that a lot of people have.

Question No. 5 is, Why did the President reveal highly classified information to the Russian Federation, according to the reporting by the Washington Post and others, during this meeting with the Russian Foreign Minister and the Russian Ambassador, and what are the implications of that disclosure? That is something that we need to have answers to.

At least these five questions—you could add many more—are critically important questions. In some respects, there are even more urgent questions in front of us, and I will focus a little bit on those today—basically, three, I guess.

No. 1, did the President intentionally interfere with the ongoing FBI investigation into his associates, people that were on his campaign or on the

campaign or working in the government now? The interference question seems more likely than not based upon the reporting, but we have to know for sure, one way or the other: Did the President intentionally interfere with an ongoing FBI investigation?

No. 2, are any such efforts to interfere ongoing?

If the answer to the first question is yes—and we don't know for certain if it is question yes, but if it is yes—if there was intentional interference with the investigation by the President, the second question would be, Are there any such efforts to interfere that are ongoing?

No. 3, do they extend—meaning this potential alleged interference—past the FBI inquiry, to the investigations in the Senate and the House of Representatives? I think that is a question that is rather urgent as well.

Will this attempt to interfere, or alleged attempt to interfere, carry over into other investigations?

In essence now, we have three inquiries. One is the House Intelligence Committee, the other is the Senate Intelligence Committee, and the third would be Special Counsel Mueller's investigation. They are all critically important.

I would hope that we could add a fourth to that, which would be an independent commission, like the 9/11 Commission, where we came to definitive conclusions with regard to what happened on 9/11. Then, added to those conclusions, there were a series of recommendations so that we could prevent another 9/11. The same could be said here—that we want to make sure we get answers to these questions, have conclusions made, have accountability with regard to those conclusions, but then have a series of recommendations about how to prevent Russian interference or the interference of any foreign adversary in our election ever again.

Director Comey himself warned about the danger of undue influence on FBI investigations in an exchange during a May 3 Senate Judiciary Committee hearing. In this case, it was Senator HIRONO, a Democratic Senator from Hawaii, who asked if the Attorney General or senior Justice Department officials had ever ordered the FBI to halt an investigation.

Interestingly, here is what Director Comey replied to that question: "Not in my experience," meaning not in his experience does he know of an instance where the Justice Department officials interfered with an FBI investigation.

I will read it again.

Not in my experience. Because it would be a big deal to tell the FBI to stop doing something.

Then, he continues on, and it picks up with this:

[W]ithout an appropriate purpose. . . . a situation where we were told to stop some-

thing for a political reason, that would be a very big deal. It's not happened in my experience.

That is the now former FBI Director saying that there is no precedence for the idea that the Justice Department would ask the FBI to take an action, which would be interference.

Director Comey was talking about the Department of Justice in this case—actions by the Department of Justice to interfere with an FBI investigation. In retrospect, perhaps a better question would have been whether the political interference he thought would be a "very big deal" might have been coming directly from the Oval Office. It is essential that we get to the bottom of this—a number of these questions.

An issue of this importance requires that the full investigative power of the Federal Government be brought to bear. The House and Senate Intel Committees are doing their investigation, as I said. The FBI investigation continues as well, despite concerns about independence in the wake of Director Comey's firing.

I hope, and I expect, that the next FBI Director will be someone who will be as independent, as capable, and as committed as Director Mueller is as the new special counsel.

We know there are dedicated professionals running these investigations. It has long been my belief that these extraordinary circumstances demand even more. I have been repeating for some time that we need a greater level of independence to insulate this critically important investigation from any suspicion of partisan interference. That is why I have been calling—for many weeks now, since early March—for a special counsel. I am glad the Justice Department now agrees with me.

Suffice it to say that we have a lot more work to do. Ultimately, this will be the work of everyone here, even if you are not a member of the Intel Committee or any other committee that is doing work that is directly relevant to this because, ultimately, the Congress has to take actions to get to the bottom of these questions but also be part of the process, at least, of imposing accountability and, also, especially the Congress is going to have to play a major role—the leading role—in making sure we put in place policies and procedures and laws that prevent this from ever happening again.

I hope the administration will join us in taking every step necessary to get to the bottom of these questions and to insist and to ensure that this never happens again to any American election. That is not just a goal, that has to be a guarantee as a result of this process. If the administration is not committed to that, I am not sure what they are committed to.

To take lightly or to ignore a problem that is this great and this serious,

to undermine our democracy is, I think, to put at risk the very foundation of our Nation as a nation of laws and not of men, a nation that is committed to the rule of law.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the nomination of John Sullivan to be Deputy Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

Mitch McConnell, Cory Gardner, Tom Cotton, Roy Blunt, Jeff Flake, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Ron Johnson, James E. Risch, Joni Ernst, John Thune, Mike Rounds, Orrin G. Hatch, Bob Corker, David Perdue, John Hoeven, James M. Inhofe.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of the Branstad nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, for purposes of today's votes, I want to announce that had I voted on Thursday, May 18, 2017, I would have voted no on confirmation of Rachel Brand to be Associate Attorney General, and I would have voted yea on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 55, the nomination of Terry Branstad, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to China. •

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, during this week, National Police Week, I honor all those who serve to keep us safe. I honor three Maryland officers who lost their lives in the line of duty in 2016. Corporal Jack Colson of Prince George's County Police Department, Senior Deputy Patrick Dailey, and Deputy First Class Mark Logsdon, both of Harford County Sheriff's office, all dedicated their lives to making Maryland safe. We thank them for their sacrifice, and we thank their families, friends, and fellow officers. They will never be forgotten, and they deserve to be honored not just this week, but every day.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

IDAHO ANNE FRANK HUMAN RIGHTS MEMORIAL

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today I wish to commend Idahoans and specifically the Boise community for coming together so quickly to fight hate speech and related vandalism.

Kindness, support, and respect run deep in Idaho. The response to the recent vandalism of the Idaho Anne Frank Human Rights Memorial in Boise, ID, is the most recent example of the depth of compassion in Idahoans. Since the recent vandalism, considerable resources have poured in to repair and enhance the memorial. Rather than responding with anger and hate, Idaho is moving forward with a positive spirit of renewal and inclusiveness. Dan Prinzing, executive director of the Wassmuth Center for Human Rights that built the memorial with support from the Carr Foundation and others and now partners with Boise Parks and Recreation to maintain the memorial, said, "An act of hate by an individual is not us, the community's response to the act is what defines who we are and the values we share. Now what does

that do for us? It emboldens the message of the Memorial and reinforces that our work is not done."

The Anne Frank Human Rights Memorial was dedicated to the public 15 years ago to offer a place for visitors to consider and reflect on human rights and inspire engagement with others about the issue. The memorial is a beautiful and thought-provoking resource, which includes a statue of Anne Frank, quotes and excerpts of her writings, as well as a wall of inspiring quotes. The love and care, including the support of Idaho students and their families, that went into this memorial's creation is prevailing upon its restoration and contributing to ongoing human rights discussions. Among the many quotes highlighted at the memorial is the following from Mother Teresa, "Kind words can be short and easy to speak, but their echoes are truly endless."

I commend all those who are coming together to counter the acts of hateful vandalism with kindness that will continue to echo through our communities and Nation. •

TRIBUTE TO PAMELA ROSSETTI

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, today I wish to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and congratulating Ms. Pamela Rossetti on her 35 years of remarkable service as a fifth and sixth-grade teacher at Lincoln Street School in the Exeter, NH, School District. Throughout her career, Ms. Rossetti has gone above and beyond to meet the needs of her students, as well as her larger school community, by serving as an adviser on a number of committees and taking a leadership role in special projects throughout her tenure. The State of New Hampshire owes her a debt of gratitude for her service.

Ms. Rossetti graduated with her B.A. from Notre Dame College in Manchester, NH, in 1981. She later received her masters of education from Leslie College in Cambridge, MA, with a concentration in integrated teaching through the arts. She was hired by the Exeter School District in 1982 as a sixth-grade teacher. After 2 years, she began teaching in the fifth grade, where she has taught for 33 years.

Throughout her career, Ms. Rossetti has received accolades for her service. In 1983, she received a commendation from New Hampshire's Governor John H. Sununu in recognition of her work with a colleague to create an American citizenship course. She has been a member of both the science and social studies committees for the Exeter School District and served on a number of Lincoln Street School committees, including the arts and health committees. She has also been a mentor teacher and a trainer for the school district's Intel Teach to the Future Program, which focuses on integrating technology into curriculum.

Ms. Rossetti has touched many lives in the Exeter School District, including my son Ben's. Ben experiences disabilities that leave him unable to communicate verbally. Ms. Rossetti was Ben's fifth-grade classroom teacher, and, shortly after the school year, she called me to tell me how smart Ben was. While my family had always thought that Ben was smart and funny, it was incredibly reassuring to know that an objective—and caring—educator thought so as well. She went on to tell me how she had assessed Ben's understanding of sophisticated content material.

Ms. Rossetti's observation impressed me because, in a classroom of students where Ben received support from a special education team, Ms. Rossetti still took the time to get to know him and every one of her students as individuals. Because of her ability to do this, Ms. Rossetti has been able to customize her approach to her students and foster their growth and development. Many of Ms. Rossetti's students have been impacted by this level of support and have stayed in contact with her through the years.

The Exeter School District and all of New Hampshire have benefitted greatly from Ms. Rossetti's devotion and service. On behalf of my colleagues and the U.S. Congress, I thank Ms. Pamela Rossetti for her unrelenting commitment to support every one of her students, as well as the entire school community, through her 35 years as a teacher, and I wish her the very best in her retirement.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 419. An act to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program, and for other purposes.

S. 583. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to

hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

At 11:46 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it request the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 194. An act to ensure the effective processing of mail by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 195. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 653. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to protect unpaid interns in the Federal Government from workplace harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes.

H.R. 672. An act to require continued and enhanced annual reporting to Congress in the Annual Report on International Religious Freedom on anti-Semitic incidents in Europe, the safety and security of European Jewish communities, and the efforts of the United States to partner with European governments, the European Union, and civil society groups, to combat anti-Semitism, and for other purposes.

H.R. 984. An act to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

H.R. 1177. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States the condition that certain lands conveyed to the City of Old Town, Maine, be used for a municipal airport, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1677. An act to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, encourage a negotiated political settlement, and hold Syrian human rights abusers accountable for their crimes.

H.R. 2154. An act to rename the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, as the Edward T. Schafer Agricultural Research Center.

H.R. 2169. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance information sharing in the Department of Homeland Security State, Local, and Regional Fusion Center Initiative, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2227. An act to modernize Government information technology, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2266. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes.

H.R. 2281. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reauthorize the Border Enforcement Security Task Force program within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 194. An act to ensure the effective processing of mail by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 195. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 653. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to protect unpaid interns in the Federal Government from workplace harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 672. An act to require continued and enhanced annual reporting to Congress in the Annual Report on International Religious Freedom on anti-Semitic incidents in Europe, the safety and security of European Jewish communities, and the efforts of the United States to partner with European governments, the European Union, and civil society groups, to combat anti-Semitism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 984. An act to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 1177. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States the condition that certain lands conveyed to the City of Old Town, Maine, be used for a municipal airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 1677. An act to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, encourage a negotiated political settlement, and hold Syrian human rights abusers accountable for their crimes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2154. An act to rename the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, as the Edward T. Schafer Agricultural Research Center; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 2169. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance information sharing in the Department of Homeland Security State, Local, and Regional Fusion Center Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2227. An act to modernize Government information technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2266. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2281. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reauthorize the Border Enforcement Security Task Force program within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 582. A bill to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-74).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF
COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amul R. Thapar, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND
JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 1171. A bill to keep girls in school around the world, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1172. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 1173. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 1174. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a deduction equal to fair market value shall be allowed for charitable contributions of literary, musical, artistic, or scholarly compositions created by the donor; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1175. A bill to protect Federal, State, and local public safety officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1176. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a simplified income-driven repayment plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUNT:

S. 1177. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to require the annual human rights reports to include information on the institutionalization of children and the subjection of children to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment, unnecessary detention, and denial of the right to life, liberty, and the security of persons; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BURR, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COTTON, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KING, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1178. A bill to realign structures and reallocate resources in the Federal Govern-

ment in keeping with the core belief that families are the best protection for children and the bedrock of any society to bolster United States diplomacy targeted at ensuring that every child can grow up in a permanent, safe, nurturing, and loving family, and to ensure that intercountry adoption to the United States becomes a viable and fully developed option for providing families for children in need, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1179. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to inter in national cemeteries individuals who supported the United States in Laos during the Vietnam War era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 1180. A bill to advance the integration of clean distributed energy into electric grids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1181. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. TESTER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KING, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. WARREN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1182. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1183. A bill to establish a third-party quality system assessment program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1184. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require individuals nominated or appointed to Senate-confirmed positions or to positions of a confidential or policymaking character to disclose certain types of contributions made or solicited by, or on behalf of, the individuals; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1185. A bill to increase public safety by punishing and deterring firearms trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1186. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to designate certain entities as centers of excellence for domestic maritime workforce training and education, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1187. A bill to designate the area between the intersections of International Drive, Northwest and Van Ness Street, Northwest and International Drive, Northwest and International Place, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as "Liu Xiaobo Plaza", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1188. A bill to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1189. A bill to provide greater controls and restrictions on revolving door lobbying; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND
SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BURR, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 172. A resolution designating May 2017 as "Older Americans Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WICKER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. CARPER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HATCH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. KING, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COONS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BURR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. TOOMEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CORKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. HELLER):

S. Res. 173. A resolution designating the week of May 15 through May 21, 2017, as "National Police Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ENZI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PAUL, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 174. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International and celebrating the Lions Clubs International for a long history of humanitarian service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. COTTON):

S. Con. Res. 15. A concurrent resolution expressing support for the designation of October 28, 2017, as "Honoring the Nation's First Responders Day"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Con. Res. 16. A concurrent resolution expressing support for strengthening engagement between the United States and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 170

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to provide for non-preemption of measures by State and local governments to divest from entities that engage in commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activities targeting Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 292

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 292, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to condition assistance to the West Bank and Gaza on steps by the Palestinian Authority to end violence and terrorism against Israeli citizens.

S. 568

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 568, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 569

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 591

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cospon-

sor of S. 591, a bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes.

S. 597

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 597, a bill to increase Federal Pell Grants for the children of fallen public safety officers, and for other purposes.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 623, a bill to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of assistance provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to promote quality basic education in developing countries, to better enable such countries to achieve universal access to quality basic education and improved learning outcomes, to eliminate duplication and waste, and for other purposes.

S. 652

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 652, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

S. 765

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 765, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for penalties for the sale of any Purple Heart awarded to a member of the Armed Forces.

S. 976

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 976, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1002, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1085

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) and the Senator from South

Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1085, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide enhanced penalties for convicted murderers who kill or target America's public safety officers.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1094, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1114

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1114, a bill to nullify the effect of the recent Executive order laying a foundation for discrimination against LGBTQ individuals, women, religious minorities, and others under the pretext of religious freedom.

S. 1135

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1135, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the Federal Pell Grant duration limits of borrowers who attend an institution of higher education that closes or commits fraud or other misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 1155

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1155, a bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to increase the amount of financial support available for working students.

S. 1163

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1163, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure compliance of medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs with requirements relating to the scheduling of appointments, to require appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate of certain health care officials of the Department, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 1174. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a deduction equal to fair market value shall be allowed for charitable contributions of literary, musical, artistic, or scholarly compositions created by the donor; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in celebration of Museum Day on May 18, we

reinroduce the “Artist-Museum Partnership Act.” This legislation would enable our country to keep cherished art works in the United States and to preserve them in our public institutions. At the same time, this legislation will erase an inequity in our Tax Code that currently serves as a disincentive for artists to donate their works to museums and libraries. Since 2000 I have introduced this same bill in each Congress. It was also included in the Senate-passed version of the 2001 tax reconciliation bill, the Senate-passed version of the 2003 Charity Aid, Recovery, and Empowerment, CARE, Act, and the Senate-passed version of the 2005 tax reconciliation bill.

This legislation would preserve cherished art works for the public by allowing artists to take a fair market deduction for works they donate to museums, libraries, colleges and other public institutions. Under current law, artists who donate their created work may only deduct the cost of supplies, while a collector of the same work who donates it to qualified charitable institutions is allowed to take a tax deduction equal to the fair market value of the donated work.

In my State of Vermont, we are incredibly proud of the great works produced by hundreds of local artists who choose to live and work in the Green Mountain State. Displaying their creations in museums and libraries helps develop a sense of pride among Vermonters and strengthens a bond with Vermont, its landscape, its beauty, and its cultural heritage. Anyone who has contemplated a painting in a museum or examined an original manuscript or composition and has gained a greater understanding of both the artist and the subject as a result, knows the tremendous value of these works. I would like to see more of them, not fewer, preserved in Vermont and across the country.

Prior to 1969, artists and collectors alike were able to take a deduction equivalent to the fair market value of a work. Congress changed the law for artists in response to the perception that some taxpayers were taking advantage of the law by inflating the market value of self-created works. Much has changed in the United States since 1969 when the tax law was amended. There has been an explosion of artistic and literary creativity in the country that is valued throughout the world. Yet, since the law was changed, artists now give far less frequently than before, harming the public by denying it the opportunity to see museum-quality contemporary art. The current tax law discriminates against those who choose to make their living as artists and writers. It also undermines the ability of public and cultural institutions, especially those in small and midsized cities and towns, to collect and preserve our Nation’s cultural

patrimony. With no or meager acquisition budgets, it is impossible for them to compete in the global art market.

A letter from the distinguished Librarian of Congress Emeritus James Billington stated that “restoration of this tax deduction would vastly benefit their institution’s manuscript and music holdings, and remove the single major impediment to developing the Library’s graphic arts holdings. The Artist-Museum Partnership Act would once again allow artists who donate their own paintings, manuscripts, compositions, or scholarly compositions to be subject to the same new rules that all taxpayers or collectors who donate such works follow.”

This legislation is vital because it reminds us that artists have an important role in the process of engaging communities, and artists are a cultural necessity in the fabric of any community in Vermont or around the world.

The Artist-Museum Partnership Act is supported by such organizations as the Vermont Arts Council, Shelburne Museum, Association of Art Museum Directors, American Alliance of Museums, Americans for the Arts, Dance/USA, League of American Orchestras, National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, National Council for the Traditional Arts, OPERA America, Theatre Communications Group, Local Learning, Artists Rights Society, National Humanities Alliance, College Art Association, and Fractured Atlas.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1185. A bill to increase public safety by punishing and deterring firearms trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, for too long, criminals have exploited loopholes in our gun laws. Congress’s failure to properly address this issue has had devastating consequences for families and communities across the country. We have allowed criminals to readily obtain firearms through straw purchasers, trafficking networks, and unregulated gun markets. It is past time for this body to take action.

Today, I am reintroducing bipartisan legislation to close loopholes that allow criminals to obtain firearms through straw purchases and illegal trafficking. I am proud to be joined once again by Senators COLLINS and DURBIN. The Stop Illegal Trafficking in Firearms Act would make it a Federal crime to act as a straw purchaser of firearms or to illegally traffic in firearms. It sets forth tough penalties for anyone who transfers a firearm with reasonable cause to believe that the gun will be used in a drug crime, crime of violence, or act of terrorism, or for anyone who smuggles firearms out of the United States. This legislation would help keep guns out of the hands of those who seek to do us harm.

As the opioid crisis reached epidemic levels throughout the United States—and in Northeastern states like Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine in particular—gun traffickers stood ready to profit. Dealers who cannot pass background checks take advantage of addicts by forcing them to make straw purchases. Passing this gun trafficking bill and closing these loopholes will be a key piece of our response to the opioid crisis in so many of our communities.

This legislation will also be an important tool in preventing terrorist attacks on American soil. Terrorists have increasingly turned to guns to carry out domestic attacks, as they did in San Bernardino, Orlando, and Charleston. In the case of San Bernardino, the shooters relied on straw purchasing to acquire their deadly weapons. But because straw purchasing is not a Federal crime, prosecutors only charged the straw purchaser with making a false statement—a so called “paperwork” offense. I have often heard from law enforcement that current law does not do enough to deter gun traffickers. This legislation answers that call.

I also want to take note of National Police Week. This is a time when we pause to thank our Nation’s law enforcement officers for their important work and many sacrifices. Earlier this week, thousands of officers gathered for a candlelight memorial. The names of 143 officers killed in the line of duty during 2016 were added to the walls of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. It is not enough to merely pay tribute to these men and women. They deserve action. A year ago during Police Week, President Obama signed into law my legislation reauthorizing the life-saving Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program. That law will ensure that more than 200,000 officers receive protective vests over the next five years.

The legislation that Senator COLLINS and I introduce today will also help keep our officers and our neighborhoods safe. We must not wait for another national tragedy to address this problem. Only Congress can close these loopholes. I recognize that one piece of legislation cannot prevent all gun violence, but this bill would provide a critical tool to investigate and deter straw purchasers and gun traffickers. That is why it has strong support from groups representing law enforcement officers and prosecutors around the nation, including the Fraternal Order of Police, Major Cities Chiefs Association, Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, National Tactical Officers Association, and National District Attorneys Association.

Like so many Vermonters, I am proud to be a responsible gun owner; and I know that Senator COLLINS shares my commitment to protecting

our Second Amendment rights. But we also share a desire to keep guns out of the hands of violent criminals, drug traffickers, and terrorists. There is broad agreement in Congress that our existing gun laws do too little to prevent gun violence in our communities. The legislation we introduce today is an important part of the solution, and I call on all Senators to support this bill and make our communities safer.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, each May we recognize National Police Week to honor the service and sacrifice of U.S. law enforcement officers and to pay tribute to those who have lost their lives in the line of duty. One meaningful way for us to honor our police officers and other law enforcement officials this week is to give them the tools they need to stop the illegal firearms traffickers who threaten their lives and the lives of those they protect.

Today, I rise to join Senator LEAHY in introducing the Stop Illegal Trafficking and Firearms Act. Our bill would strengthen Federal law by making it easier for prosecutors to go after gun traffickers, while fully protecting the rights of the vast majority of gun owners who are law-abiding citizens.

Straw purchasing is intended to achieve only one result, and that is to put a gun in the hands of a criminal who cannot legally obtain one. Today, traffickers exploit weaknesses in our laws by targeting individuals who can lawfully purchase guns, which are then used to commit crimes once they are transferred to the criminal, who would be unable to pass the background check. Right now, a straw purchaser can only be prosecuted for lying on a Federal form, and that is treated as a paperwork violation. Our bill would create new criminal offenses for straw purchasing, which would help our law enforcement officials take down these criminal enterprises.

The illegal guns that we are targeting in our bill are frequently sold, resold, and trafficked across State lines, resulting in the proliferation of the illegal firearms in our communities. This practice has fueled the violence across our southern border associated with the Mexican drug cartels, as well as gang violence in our cities and, tragically, the heroin crisis that is ravaging so many families and communities and undermining public health and safety in States like Maine.

Police officers tell me they have seen a major influx of drug dealers coming from out of State, straight up I-95's iron pipeline and other interstate highways, with direct ties to gangs in major cities. They are ready to sell or trade prescription opioids and heroin for illegal guns.

Heroin flooding into our communities is reaching crisis levels. In 2016, there were 376 drug-induced overdose deaths in my State, the State of Maine.

That is more than car crashes and suicides put together. It is 104 more deaths than the year before. So this crisis with opioids and heroin is getting worse, not better. The vast majority of these overdoses were caused by at least one opioid, whether pharmaceutical or illicit.

Often, drug dealers and gang members follow a similar pattern: They target addicts who have no criminal records, and then they trade or sell them drugs in exchange for guns. These gang members with criminal records cross into Maine and link up with drug addicts to be their straw buyers. These addicts are people with clean records who may legally purchase firearms. The addict then exchanges the gun for heroin to support his or her drug dependency, and the cycle is repeated time and again.

Last year I had a deeply disturbing briefing from Federal law enforcement officials about a case in Maine that fit this exact pattern. Gang members trafficked crack cocaine and heroin between New Haven, CT, and Bangor, ME. They committed acts of violence, including assaults, armed robberies, attempted murder, and murder. They traded narcotics for firearms and then distributed them to other gang members back in Connecticut. This is exactly the type of criminal activity our bill aims to prevent, and it complements existing laws that target criminals who are profiting from firearms and drug trafficking.

Current Federal law makes preventing and prosecuting straw purchasing offenses very difficult for law enforcement officials, since a straw purchaser can be prosecuted only for lying on a Federal form, a relatively minor offense.

The Stop Illegal Trafficking in Firearms Act would create new, specific criminal offenses for straw purchasing and trafficking in firearms. Instead of a slap on the wrist, these crimes would be punishable by up to 15 years in prison. For those straw purchasers who knew or have reasonable cause to believe that the firearm would be used to commit a crime of violence, that crime would be punishable by up to 25 years in prison.

Our bill would also strengthen existing laws that prohibit gun smuggling. Right now, it is illegal for someone to smuggle a firearm into the United States with the intent to engage in drug trafficking or violent crime. To combat the drug cartels operating on our southern border, however, we must also prohibit firearms and ammunition from being trafficked out of the United States for those illegal purposes. In so doing, our bill would provide an important tool to combat trafficking organizations that are exporting firearms and ammunition from the United States and into Mexico where they are used by the drug cartels that are in turn fueling the heroin crisis here at home.

In a recent investigation along our southern border, ATF agents seized nearly 40,000 rounds of illegal ammunition from suspects who were attempting to smuggle both firearms and ammunition across the border and into Mexico. Similarly, a large percentage of the guns used in crimes in our largest cities were trafficked across State lines.

I want to emphasize that our bill fully protects the Second Amendment rights of our law-abiding citizens. It protects legitimate private gun sales and is drafted to avoid sweeping in innocent transactions and placing unnecessary burdens on lawful private sales. It expressly exempts certain transactions that are permitted under current laws, such as gifts, raffles, and auctions. Furthermore, the bill expressly prohibits any authority provided by this act from being used to establish a Federal firearms registry—something I am strongly opposed to.

I started my remarks by reminding us all that this is National Police Week. Let's honor our police officers and other law enforcement by giving them this much needed tool to crack down on illegal firearm traffickers who are exploiting our addicts in so many ways in order to obtain guns that they are not legally able to purchase. I urge my colleagues to support this much needed legislation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 172—DESIGNATING MAY 2017 AS “OLDER AMERICANS MONTH”

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BURR, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 172

Whereas President John F. Kennedy first designated May as “Senior Citizens Month” in 1963;

Whereas, in 1963, only approximately 17,000,000 individuals living in the United States were age 65 or older, approximately 1/3 of those individuals lived in poverty, and few programs existed to meet the needs of older individuals in the United States;

Whereas, in 2017, there are more than 47,800,000 individuals age 65 or older in the United States, and those individuals account for 14.9 percent of the total population of the United States;

Whereas approximately 10,000 individuals in the United States turn age 65 each day;

Whereas, in 2015, more than 9,300,000 veterans of the Armed Forces were age 65 or older;

Whereas older individuals in the United States rely on Federal programs, such as programs under the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) (including the Medicare

program under title XVIII of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) and the Medicaid program under title XIX of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), for financial security and high-quality affordable health care;

Whereas the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) provides supportive services to help individuals of the United States who are age 60 or older maintain maximum independence in the homes and communities of those individuals;

Whereas that Act provides funding for programs, including nutrition services, transportation, and care management, to assist more than 11,000,000 older individuals in the United States each year;

Whereas compared to older individuals in the United States in past generations, older individuals in the United States in 2017 are working longer, living longer, and enjoying healthier, more active, and more independent lifestyles;

Whereas more than 5,300,000 individuals in the United States age 65 or older continue to work as full-time, year-round employees;

Whereas older individuals in the United States play an important role in society by continuing to contribute their experience, knowledge, wisdom, and accomplishments;

Whereas older individuals in the United States play vital roles in their communities and remain involved in volunteer work, mentoring activities, the arts, cultural activities, and civic engagement; and

Whereas a society that recognizes the success of older individuals and continues to enhance their access to quality and affordable health care will encourage the ongoing participation and heightened independence of those individuals and will ensure the continued safety and well-being of those individuals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 2017 as “Older Americans Month”; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to provide opportunities for older individuals to continue to flourish by—

(A) emphasizing the importance and leadership of older individuals through public recognition of the ongoing achievements of the older individuals;

(B) presenting opportunities for older individuals to share their wisdom, experience, and skills with younger generations; and

(C) recognizing older individuals as valuable assets in strengthening communities across the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 173—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 15 THROUGH MAY 21, 2017, AS “NATIONAL POLICE WEEK”

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WICKER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. CARPER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HATCH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. KING, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COONS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BURR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr.

YOUNG, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. TOOMEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CORKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. HELLER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 173

Whereas, in 1962, John Fitzgerald Kennedy signed the Joint Resolution entitled “Joint Resolution to authorize the President to proclaim May 15 of each year as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the calendar week of each year during which such May 15 occurs as Police Week” (36 U.S.C. 136);

Whereas the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, dedicated on October 15, 1991, is the national monument to honor law enforcement officers who have died in the line of duty;

Whereas Federal, State, local, and tribal police officers, sheriffs, and other law enforcement officers across the United States serve with valor, dignity and integrity;

Whereas law enforcement officers are charged with pursuing justice for all individuals and performing their duties with fidelity to the constitutional and civil rights of the individuals that the law enforcement officers serve;

Whereas the resolve of law enforcement officers in the service of their communities is unyielding, despite inherent dangers in the performance of their duties;

Whereas the vigilance, compassion, and decency of law enforcement officers are the best defense of society against individuals who seek to do harm;

Whereas Peace Officers Memorial Day, 2017, honors the 143 law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty during 2016, including Amir Abdul-Khalik, Lorne Bradley Aherns, Sean Lewis Allred, Manuel Alejandro Alvarez, Scott Alfred Ballantyne, Robert Aaron Barker, Gregory Eugene Barney, Douglas Scott Barney, II, Jose Daniel Barraza, Scott Leslie Bashoum, Stacey Allen Baumgartner, Brian Pecson Beliso, Anthony David Bemino, Kenneth Levella Bettis, Timothy James Brackeen, Allen David Brandt, James Irwin Brockmeyer, Cody James Brotherson, Shannon Matthew Brown, Patrick Thomas Carothers, Nathaniel Alan Carrigan, Jose Ismael Chavez, Aaron Jackson Christian, Thomas L. Clardy, Paul Allen Clark, Brandon Scott Collins, Jacai David Colson, Adam Scott Conrad, William Pressley Cooper, Clint E. Corvinus, Thomas Wayne Cottrell, Jr., Sean Eamonn Cullen, Patrick Bryan Dailey, Jonathan Matias DeGuzman, Chad Phillip Dermeyer, Cody James Donahue, Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya, David Kyle Elahi, Eric Dale Ellsworth, Susan Louise Farrell, William George Fearon, Scot Fitzgerald, Leander Frank, De'Greun Reshun Frazier, Anthony Joseph Freeman, Jason Gallero, Bradford Allen Garafola, Sr., Derek Mace Geer, Matthew Lane Gerald, David Van Glasser, Dan Thomas Glaze, Jr., David Gomez, Jason Michael Goodding, Ashley Marie Guindon, R. Jake Gutierrez, Adam John Hartwig, David Stefan Hofer, Jack Lanceson Hopkins, Natasha Maria Hunter, John Thomas Isenhour, Montrell Lyle Jackson, Allen Lee Jacobs, Myron Anthony Jarrett, Mari Ann Johnson, Sean Richard Johnson, Michael Jason Katherman, Ronald Eugene Kienzle, Carl Allen Koontz, John Robert Kotfila, Jr., Mi-

chael Leslie Krol, Brad D. Lancaster, Zachary Tyler Larnerd, Jude Williams Lewis, Mark Franklin Logsdon, Alfonso Lopez, Rod Barron Lucas, Kenneth Hubert Maltby, Benjamin Edward Marconi, Justin Scott Martin, Lisa Anne Mauldin, Henry Malcolm McAleenan, Jr., Calvin Marcus McCullers, Jr., J. Scott McGuire, Luis A. Melendez-Maldonado, Robert David Melton, David Francis Michel, Jr., Kevin Dwayne Miller, Shawn Glenn Miller, Derrick Morial Mingo, Kenneth Ray Moats, Jason David Moszer, Kristopher David Moules, Jeffrey Don Nichols, Eric James Oliver, David Ortiz, Steven C. Owen, Edwin R. Pabon-Robles, Joseph George Portaro, Timothy P. Pratt, Carlos Bernabe Puente-Morales, Jorge Ramos, Robert Eugene Ransom, Darrin Lee Reed, Waldemar Rivera-Santiago, Victor M. Rosado-Rosa, Collin James Rose, Jorge Sanchez, Justin Ryan Scherlen, Nikeelan D. Semmon, Daryl Wayne Smallwood, Nicholas Ryan Smarr, Jody Carl Smith, Michael Joseph Smith, Steven Michael Smith, Timothy Kevin Smith, Verdell Smith, Sr., Harvey Snook, III, Blake Curtis Snyder, Patrick Michael Sondron, Kenneth Joseph Starrs, Kenneth Melvin Steil, Paul R. Stuewer, Martin Tase Sturgill, II, Ronald Tarentino, Jr., James Lee Tartt, Nathan Daniel Taylor, Ryan Sean Thomas, Brent Alan Thompson, Paul J. Tuozzolo, Jose Gilbert Vega, Kenneth V. Velez, Michael Josua Ventura, Dennis Randall Wallace, Landon Eugene Weaver, Justin Scott White, Frankie Lamar Williams, Michael Scott Williams, Michael Arthur Winter, Kerry Joseph Winters, Sr., Patricio Enrique Zamarripa, Joseph Peter Zangaro, Marco Antonio Zarate, and Lesley Marie Zerebny; and

Whereas, during the first 4 months of 2017, 42 law enforcement officers across the United States have made the ultimate sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 15 through May 21, 2017, as “National Police Week”;

(2) expresses strong support for law enforcement officers across the United States for their efforts to build safer and more secure communities;

(3) recognizes the need to ensure that law enforcement officers have the equipment, training, and resources necessary to protect their health and safety while the law enforcement officers are protecting the public;

(4) recognizes the members of the law enforcement community for their selfless acts of bravery;

(5) acknowledges that police officers and other law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice should be remembered and honored;

(6) expresses condolences to the loved ones of each law enforcement officer who has made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty; and

(7) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Police Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the vital role of law enforcement officers in building safer and more secure communities across the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 174—RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF LIONS CLUBS INTERNATIONAL AND CELEBRATING THE LIONS CLUBS INTERNATIONAL FOR A LONG HISTORY OF HUMANITARIAN SERVICE

Mr. MORAN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ENZI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PAUL, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 174

Whereas, on June 7, 1917, Chicago business leader Melvin Jones founded Lions Clubs International in Chicago, Illinois, based on the principle that “[y]ou can’t get very far until you start doing something for somebody else”;

Whereas the motto of Lions Clubs International, “We Serve”—

(1) was selected in 1954 after having been submitted by Lion D.A. Stevenson of Font Hill, Ontario, in an international contest; and

(2) applies to the charitable and humanitarian priorities of Lions Clubs International, including—

- (A) eyesight preservation and blindness prevention;
- (B) services for individuals with disabilities;
- (C) hearing and speech conservation;
- (D) diabetes awareness;
- (E) youth outreach;
- (F) services for older individuals;
- (G) activities that promote international goodwill;
- (H) disaster relief; and
- (I) environmental protection;

Whereas, with over 46,000 clubs and 1,400,000 members in over 200 countries and geographical areas around the globe, Lions Clubs International is the largest service organization in the world;

Whereas the purposes of Lions Clubs International include—

- (1) to create and foster a spirit of understanding among people around the world;
- (2) to promote the principles of good government and good citizenship;
- (3) to take an active interest in the civic, cultural, social, and moral welfare of the community;
- (4) to provide a forum for the open discussion of all matters of public interest, except that members of Lions Clubs International may not debate partisan politics and sectarian religion;
- (5) to encourage service-minded individuals to serve their communities without personal financial reward; and
- (6) to encourage efficiency and promote high ethical standards in commerce, industry, public works, and professional and private endeavors;

Whereas, on March 12, 1920, a Lions Club was chartered in Windsor, Ontario, Canada, and Lions Clubs became an international organization;

Whereas, in 1925, at the Lions Club in Cedar Point, Ohio, Helen Keller charged members of Lions Clubs International with becoming “knights of the blind in the crusade against darkness”;

Whereas, in 1926, polar explorer and member of the District of Columbia Lions Club, Admiral Richard E. Byrd, Jr., flew over the North Pole carrying the flag of Lions Clubs International;

Whereas, in 1930, after witnessing an individual with a vision impairment having dif-

ficulty crossing a street, Lion George Bonham painted a cane white with a red band for use by visually impaired individuals;

Whereas, in 1931—

(1) the first Lions Club was established south of the United States in Nuevo Laredo, Mexico; and

(2) the first Lions Clubs International convention was held in Toronto, Ontario;

Whereas, in 1935, during the Lions Clubs International convention in Mexico City, Amelia Earhart, who was an honorary member of the New York City Lions Club, completed a record-breaking nonstop flight from Los Angeles, California, to Mexico;

Whereas, in 1939, the members of the Detroit Uptown Lions Club converted an old farmhouse in the State of Michigan into a school to train dog guides for visually impaired individuals, helping to popularize dog guides worldwide;

Whereas, on June 6, 1939, the first Little League baseball game was played at Park Point in Williamsport, Pennsylvania, after Lion Carl Edwin Stotz appealed to Lions Clubs International, the Young Men’s Christian Association, and other community partners for support to provide an organized baseball program for children;

Whereas, in 1944, the first eye bank in the world was established in New York City, and as of March 2017, most eye banks are sponsored by Lions Clubs International;

Whereas, in 1945, Lions Clubs International assisted in drafting the Charter of the United Nations, which began a lasting relationship between Lions Clubs International and the United Nations that includes Lions Clubs International aid and volunteers for—

- (1) the United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund;
- (2) the World Health Organization;
- (3) the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; and
- (4) other humanitarian projects;

Whereas, in 1957, the Leo Clubs youth program of Lions Clubs International was established to provide young people with the opportunity for personal development through volunteer work;

Whereas, as of March 2017, there are approximately 157,000 Leos and 600 Leo Clubs in over 200 countries and geographical areas worldwide;

Whereas, in 1968, the Lions Clubs International Foundation (referred to in this preamble as “LCIF”) was established to assist Lions Clubs International with global and large-scale local humanitarian projects;

Whereas LCIF has given more than \$826,000,000 in grants to support the humanitarian work of Lions Clubs International;

Whereas, in 1972, LCIF awarded its first grant, in the amount of \$5,000, to assist flood victims in South Dakota;

Whereas, in 1977, Lion Jimmy Carter became the 39th President of the United States;

Whereas, in 1985, LCIF awarded its first Major Catastrophe Grant, in the amount of \$50,000, for earthquake relief in Mexico;

Whereas, in 1986, Mother Teresa accepted a Lions Humanitarian Award;

Whereas, in 1987, Lions Clubs International amended its bylaws and invited women to become members, and women are now the fastest growing group of new members in Lions Clubs International;

Whereas, in 1990, LCIF launched SightFirst, an initiative that—

- (1) assists Lions Clubs International in activities to restore eyesight and prevent blindness on a global scale; and

(2) eventually raised more than \$415,000,000 to target low vision, trachoma, river blindness, childhood blindness, diabetic retinopathy, and glaucoma;

Whereas, in 1995, LCIF began a partnership with the Carter Center, led by former President and Lion Jimmy Carter, to combat river blindness in Africa and Latin America, and by 2003, LCIF and the Carter Center had provided 50,000,000 river blindness treatments;

Whereas, in 2001, LCIF partnered with the Special Olympics on Opening Eyes, an initiative to provide vision screening for Special Olympics athletes;

Whereas, in 2002, Lions Clubs International chartered a club in China, which became the first voluntary membership group in China;

Whereas, in 2007, the Financial Times ranked LCIF as the best nongovernmental organization worldwide with which to establish a partnership;

Whereas, in 2010, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation contributed \$5,000,000 to the One Shot, One Life measles initiative, and Lions raised more than \$10,000,000 to support measles prevention efforts during the subsequent 2 years;

Whereas, in 2011, LCIF awarded its 10,000th grant, bringing the total amount awarded to grant recipients by LCIF to \$708,000,000;

Whereas, in 2013, LCIF partnered with the GAVI Alliance to protect millions of children from measles and rubella in 2013;

Whereas LCIF committed \$30,000,000 for immunizations, an amount matched by the United Kingdom and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation;

Whereas, in 2013, with the support of Lions Clubs International and the Carter Center, river blindness was eliminated in Colombia; and

Whereas, in 2014, Lions Clubs International launched the Centennial Service Challenge, a global initiative to serve 100,000,000 people around the world; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates Lions Clubs International on its 100th anniversary on June 7, 2017;

(2) recognizes Lions Clubs International for 100 years of promoting community service and humanitarian assistance;

(3) encourages Lions Clubs International to continue to emphasize the values of community service and improving the community for all individuals; and

(4) applauds Lions Clubs International for instilling in young people the value of community service.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 15—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF OCTOBER 28, 2017, AS “HONORING THE NATION’S FIRST RESPONDERS DAY”

Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. COTTON) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 15

Whereas first responders include professional and volunteer fire, police, emergency medical technician, and paramedic workers in the United States;

Whereas there are more than 25,300,000 first responders in the United States working to keep communities safe;

Whereas first responders deserve to be recognized for their commitment to safety, defense, and honor; and

Whereas October 28, 2017, would be an appropriate day to establish as “Honoring the Nation’s First Responders Day”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of October 28, 2017, as “Honoring the Nation’s First Responders Day”;

(2) honors and recognizes the contributions of first responders; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe Honoring the Nation’s First Responders Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the contributions of first responders in the United States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR STRENGTHENING ENGAGEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE ASIA-PACIFIC ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 16

Whereas the United States and the other members of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (in this preamble referred to as “APEC”) have, since 1989, worked collaboratively to advance commercial and trade interests in the Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas the Asia-Pacific region accounts for 41 percent of the world’s population, 54 percent of the world’s gross domestic product, and 44 percent of the world’s trade;

Whereas expanding trade and investment between the United States and the Asia-Pacific region has created new commercial opportunities and jobs in the United States;

Whereas United States businesses in the Asia-Pacific region face obstacles to doing business in the region as a result of tariff and nontariff barriers, including discriminatory policies and regulations;

Whereas strengthening trade and investment between the United States and other APEC members and addressing tariff and nontariff barriers to United States exports has the potential to benefit United States businesses, manufacturers, farmers, ranchers, workers, and consumers;

Whereas APEC was established as a regional economic forum to leverage the growing interdependence of the Asia-Pacific region to create greater prosperity for the people of the region and serves as a forum for the United States to address business concerns, promote high standards, and facilitate economic growth in the region;

Whereas APEC contributes to United States economic policies that promote fairness, due process, and the rule of law by supporting trade rules embodied in the World Trade Organization (in this preamble referred to as the “WTO”) and the establishment of new WTO commitments, developing model measures for high quality trade agreements in the Asia-Pacific region, encouraging coherence in regulations and standards in the region, and encouraging policies to promote development of the digital economy; and

Whereas the APEC Leaders’ Meeting in November 2017 in Da Nang, Vietnam, and preparatory meetings at the ministerial level, including the meeting in May 2017 of the

APEC Ministers Responsible for Trade, provide important opportunities to demonstrate to the world the commitment of the United States to increasing prosperity and security in the Asia-Pacific region: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the continuing success of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (in this resolution referred to as “APEC”) is in the national economic interest of the United States;

(2) APEC should be a part of the diplomatic and economic strategy of the United States for the Asia-Pacific region; and

(3) the United States should continue to engage APEC in promoting economic growth through the adoption of rules-based policies to strengthen trade and investment between the United States and other APEC members.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the majority and minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 18, 2017, at 9:30 a.m. in open session to consider nominations.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 18, 2017 at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Domestic and International Policy Update.”

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold an Executive Session during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 18, 2017, at 10 a.m. in Room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate in order to hold a hearing on Thursday, May 18, 2017, at 10:15 a.m. in Room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC. The purpose of the hearing is to consider the nomination of Mr. David Bernhardt, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 18, 2017, at 10:30 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to consider favorably reporting the Creating High-Quality Results

and Outcomes Necessary to Improve Chronic (CHRONIC) Care Act of 2017.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 18, 2017 at 9:30 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled “Nominations.”

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on May 18, 2017, at 10 a.m., in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 172, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 172) designating May 2017 as “Older Americans Month.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 172) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 173, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 173) designating the week of May 15 through May 21, 2017, as “National Police Week.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 173) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Foreign Service; that the nominations be confirmed, that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

PN116 FOREIGN SERVICE nomination of Alexander Dickie, IV, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 21, 2017.

PN353 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (201) beginning Joel Justin Agaloff, and ending Iva Ziza, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2017.

PN354-1 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (96) beginning Edward Francis Acevedo, and ending Benjamin D. Zinner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2017.

PN355-1 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (19) beginning Jim Nelson Barnhart, Jr., and ending Anne N. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2017.

PN356 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (9) beginning Jeanne F. Bailey, and ending Robert Henry Hanson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2017.

PN357-1 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (20) beginning Jeffery S. Austin, and ending Jeffrey G. Willnow, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2017.

PN358-1 FOREIGN SERVICE nomination of Scott S. Sindelar, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2017.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 22, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, May 22;

further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Branstad nomination; further, that the time until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the postcloture time on the Branstad nomination expire at 5:30 p.m. Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 22, 2017, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:24 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 22, 2017, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

DAVID J. REDL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION, VICE LAWRENCE E. STRICKLING.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

CLAIRE M. GRADY, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE RUSSELL C. DEYO.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

NEOMI RAO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, VICE HOWARD A. SHELANSKI.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN P. LAWLOR, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. DION B. MOTEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. BOWLMAN T. BOWLES III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL R. FENZEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

WILLIAM F. MCCLINTOCK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO

THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

DAVID S. ALLEN
MARCUS A. BUSSELL
ALLEN R. HORNER
KENNETH P. HUTNICK
BRAD G. JOHNSON
ALEXANDER V. MCLEMORE
JOE H. MILLER II
JUDE B. MULVEY
BARRY K. VINCENT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JEFFREY L. WASHINGTON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be lieutenant commander

KENNETH M. KING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

GARRY P. CLOSAS

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 6222:

To be colonel

JASON K. FETTING

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 18, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RACHEL L. BRAND, OF IOWA, TO BE ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

TODD PHILIP HASKELL, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO.

TULINABO SALAMA MUSHINGI, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUINEA-BISSAU.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATION OF ALEXANDER DICKIE IV.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOEL JUSTIN AGALSOFF AND ENDING WITH IVA ZIZA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2017.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EDWARD FRANCIS ACEVEDO AND ENDING WITH BENJAMIN D. ZINNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2017.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JIM NELSON BARNHART, JR. AND ENDING WITH ANNE N. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2017.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEANNE F. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH ROBERT HENRY HANSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2017.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFERY S. AUSTIN AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY G. WILLNOW, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2017.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATION OF SCOTT S. SINDELAR.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 18, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 18, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROGER W. MARSHALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

END HUNGER NOW—DC CENTRAL KITCHEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this week I joined my colleague Representative G.T. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania on a visit to DC Central Kitchen.

G.T. serves as the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee's Nutrition Subcommittee, and I serve as the ranking Democratic member. Our committee oversees Federal nutrition and antihunger programs, including SNAP, our Nation's first line of defense against hunger in communities all across this country. I have been fortunate enough to work with the incredible staff, students, and volunteers of DC Central Kitchen, so I am so pleased G.T. was able to join us this week to experience firsthand the impact that this organization has on the D.C. community. I very much appreciate his commitment to nutrition and his support for antihunger initiatives.

During our visit this week, we heard from the Kitchen's CEO, Michael Curtin. I continue to be inspired by

Mike's commitment to and passion for alleviating hunger and offering some of the most vulnerable adults in this community the opportunity for a second chance.

What makes DC Central Kitchen so special is its mission. Not only does the organization work to address the immediate nutritional needs of local residents, but it works to train and empower adults with high barriers to employment to a successful job-training program.

This preeminent job-training program prepares vulnerable adults, those with difficult histories of incarceration, addiction, homelessness, trauma, and chronic unemployment, for careers in the culinary industry.

Importantly, students of the program also receive career-readiness training and self-empowerment counseling. As Mike pointed out during our visit, these important components of the program are a big part of why students are able to find and keep jobs after graduating.

The program works. After graduating, almost 90 percent of the program's participants find jobs in restaurants, hotels, cafeterias, schools, and other parts of the culinary industry.

So not only does the program offer participants the training they need to enter the workforce, it also helps local businessowners staff their companies with motivated, trained individuals. It is a successful model that should be replicated.

A core aspect of DC Central Kitchen's mission is feeding hungry children, seniors, and other vulnerable adults. Each day the Kitchen uses 3,000 pounds of donated and recovered foods to make 5,000 healthy meals. In the past year alone, the Kitchen has delivered 1.8 million meals to 80 partner agencies.

A majority of the meals are delivered to at-risk children in afterschool programs, emergency shelters, adult education and services providers, child and youth services providers, and homeless shelters, but also to transitional housing, rehabilitation, drug treatment, and domestic violence shelters. They also receive food from the Kitchen as well.

I am particularly impressed by the reach of DC Central Kitchen's school food program, which provides healthy meals to kids in 15 local schools. Last year alone, the Kitchen prepared a million meals and snacks, and at least 50 percent of every plate was made of locally sourced produce. The program is supporting local farmers as well.

DC Central Kitchen is also working to expand its reach across the country by engaging high schools and college students with its successful campus kitchens project. On 53 high school and college campuses, students work to fight hunger and food waste by turning surplus food into healthy meals for those in need.

On top of all of this, DC Central Kitchen also has a successful catering arm that uses locally sourced produce to create healthy and delicious meals for special events. The catering coupled with private donations help to fund the Kitchen's programs and invest in these incredible students.

So during our visit earlier this week, we saw firsthand the positive impact the DC Central Kitchen is having on our community. We were able to meet some of the Kitchen's students, volunteers, and graduates who are now working at the Kitchen. They are inspirational.

But during our visit, we were also reminded that charities like DC Central Kitchen can't do it alone. They are only one piece of the puzzle when it comes to alleviating hunger and helping our most vulnerable neighbors get back to work.

In Congress, we need to support our Federal antihunger safety net and commit to long-term investments in areas like job training, housing, addiction recovery, and education, just to name a few.

At a time when progress in Washington is stalled, it was refreshing to join my colleague G.T., his staff, and a bipartisan group from the House Agriculture Committee in accomplishing something.

We all need to do more to help those who are having trouble putting food on the table, so it was great to chop peppers and carrots and radishes to help make nutritious salads for those in need. It was a great reminder that, working together, we can end hunger now.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, every day law enforcement officers around this country protect our families from harm and keep peace and promote the cause of justice. As a former first responder myself, I am proud to support these heroes, especially those who have

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

paid the ultimate price to keep our families safe.

National Police Week is a good reminder that we need to show support and appreciation to those who serve and protect us. We set aside this week each year to honor the call to service and profound commitment to duty embodied in our law enforcement officers—both in southern Illinois and across this Nation.

I join with the grateful communities around the Nation to thank our officers and honor those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty. We pray for them and we pray for their families as they watch over us.

“I AM JAZZ”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor for the second year in a row to read the book “I Am Jazz,” a children’s book about transgender youth cowritten by Jazz Jennings, pictured here, and Jessica Herthel.

After an LGBT hate group forced a school to cancel a reading of this book 2 years ago, a movement was launched. Every year since, readings have been held across the country to increase understanding and to show young people that they are welcomed and loved.

Last year I read this book from the House floor, and today I am proud to join this movement to read it again.

“I Am Jazz.”

For as long as I can remember, my favorite color has been pink. My second favorite color is silver, and my third favorite color is green.

Here are some of the many other things I like to do: dancing, singing, backflips, drawing, soccer, swimming, makeup, and pretending I am a pop star.

Most of all, I love mermaids. Sometimes I even wear a mermaid tail in the pool.

My best friends are Samantha and Casey. We always have fun together. We like high heels and princess gowns or cartwheels and trampolines.

But I am not exactly like Samantha and Casey. I have a girl brain but a boy body. This is called transgender. I was born this way.

When I was very little and my mom would say, “You are such a good boy,” I would say, “No, Mama. Good girl.”

At first my family was confused. They had always thought of me as a boy. As I got a little older, I hardly ever played with trucks or tools or superheroes, only princesses and mermaid costumes. My brothers told me this was girl stuff. I kept right on playing.

My sister says I am always talking to her about my girl thoughts and my girl dreams and how one day I would be a beautiful lady. She would giggle and say, “You are a funny kid.”

Sometimes my parents let me wear my sister’s dresses around the house, but whenever we went out, I had to put on my boy clothes again. That made me mad. Still, I never gave up trying to convince them. Pretending I was a boy felt like telling a lie.

Then one amazing day, everything changed. Mom and Dad took me to meet a

new doctor who asked me lots and lots of questions. Afterward, the doctor spoke to my parents, and I heard the word “transgender” for the very first time. That night at bedtime, my parents both hugged me and said, “We understand now. Be who you are. We love you no matter what.”

This made me smile and smile and smile. Mom and Dad told me I could start wearing girl clothes to school and growing my hair long. Then they even let me change my name to Jazz. Being Jazz felt much more like being me. Mom said that being Jazz would make me different from the other kids at school, but that being different is okay. “What is important,” she said, “is that I am happy with who I am.”

Being Jazz caused some of the people to be confused, too, like the teachers at school. At the beginning of the year, they wanted me to use the boys bathroom and play on the boys team in gym class, but that didn’t feel normal to me at all. I was so happy when the teachers changed their minds. I can’t imagine not playing on the same team as Casey and Samantha.

Even today, there are kids who tease me or call me by a boy name or ignore me altogether. This makes me feel crummy. Then I remember that the kids who get to know me usually want to be my friend. They say I am one of the nicest girls at school.

I don’t mind being different. Different is special. I think what matters most is what a person is like inside, and inside I am happy. I am having fun. I am proud. I am Jazz.

A TRULY OUTSTANDING AGENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Stearns County Corrections Agent Jeremy Gallagher. Mr. Gallagher recently received the Outstanding Agent Award from the Minnesota Association of Community Corrections Act Counties. Jeremy received this award because of his work with victims of domestic violence.

Jeremy has served as a corrections agent in Stearns County for 11 years, 4 of which have been spent as an agent in the county’s Domestic Violence Court.

Being a corrections agent in domestic violence cases can be overwhelming, but not for Jeremy. He has embraced his role to aid and protect Minnesota families. Through his assignment, he has even discovered a passion for helping children overcome the trauma that domestic violence can bring.

Jeremy Gallagher has gone above and beyond his role as a corrections agent. He is so deserving of this award, and he is the first Stearns County agent to receive it.

I applaud Jeremy for his dedication to Minnesota families, and especially for his dedication to our children.

A VICTORIOUS WEEKEND

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate an outstanding college student in my district.

Megan Hedstrom is currently in her senior year at St. Cloud State University. Megan has excelled in college as a

student and as an athlete. She has a bright future.

Recently, Megan won a Crystal Pillar Award from the Upper Midwest Emmy Chapter of the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences. She received the award for a piece called “True Grit” that Megan wrote, edited, and produced for the university’s television station.

As if her Crystal Pillar Award was not enough, Megan also pitched a perfect game this spring, leading the St. Cloud Husky softball team to victory over the University of Mary.

Megan excels in the classroom as well. Just this week she was named to the Northern Sun Intercollegiate Spring All-Academic team, which requires a minimum 3.2 GPA or higher.

Megan’s academic success, her success on the softball field, and her chosen career path, deserve recognition and celebration.

Congratulations, Megan. We are proud to have students like you at St. Cloud State University.

A NORMANDY SCHOLAR

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Evan DuFresne and his teacher, Christopher Stewart, of the North Lakes Academy Charter School. Evan has recently been named a Normandy Scholar, and with this, Evan and Mr. Stewart have been chosen to attend the Normandy: Sacrifice for Freedom Albert H. Small Student and Teacher Institute. They will participate in this prominent program alongside 14 other student and teacher teams from across the United States.

After coming up shy in last year’s application, Evan doubled down on his commitment to this project. He resigned from the Civil Air Patrol Cadet Program after 5 dedicated years and even chose to delay his plans to join the Army National Guard. Thankfully, Evan’s perseverance and dedication appealed to this year’s judges.

The Normandy Scholar Program allows student to learn about World War II at an in-depth level by researching and telling the story of a fallen soldier from their hometown.

□ 1015

The program also gives them the chance to pay their respects to this hero at the Normandy American Cemetery in Normandy, France.

Congratulations to both Evan and Mr. Stewart for being chosen to participate, and thank you for telling the story of an American hero from the Greatest Generation who paid the ultimate sacrifice. We look forward to hearing more about your educational journey in the months to come.

STILLWATER’S LAST MAN

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand in support of a local veteran who is now the last surviving member of his World War II veterans club.

Jean L. DeCurtins became the last member of his club when his lifelong friend Robert Kunshier passed away. Both were among the 180 men from the Stillwater area in Washington County, Minnesota, who joined the Minnesota National Guard's 34th Infantry right before World War II.

After the attacks on Pearl Harbor shook the Nation, DeCurtins and the rest of his unit deployed to Europe where they helped defend this Nation and the world. Jean was injured twice during the war and bravely returned to fight each time after recovery.

He returned to Stillwater, Minnesota, in 1944. Many of his friends did not return. The survivors in the area formed the A&D Last Man's Club, which was named after both companies the men belonged to during the war.

Mr. Speaker, men like Jean DeCurtins, and those in the Last Man's Club, bravely fought during World War II. They did so unselfishly and without reservation. We will never forget the courage and sacrifice they displayed during our Nation's and the world's darkest hour, and the world will always be thankful for them.

WELCOMING A STRANGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I received a letter from a third grade student at the Brooklyn Friends School and the Kane Street Synagogue Hebrew School named Elijah.

Elijah wrote: At our synagogue, we learned that welcoming a stranger is an important mitzvah, and I know that my people were immigrants and sometimes refugees trying to find a new home in the USA. So it is important to me that we extend our welcome to refugees from Haiti.

Elijah is right. The people of Haiti have suffered through numerous tragedies over the past few years alone. They have experienced a devastating and catastrophic earthquake, tragic cholera epidemic, ongoing food scarcity crisis, deadly hurricanes, and continued flooding.

For these reasons, the Obama administration designated Haiti for temporary protected status in 2010, and redesignated it four times thereafter. However, Haiti's TPS designation will expire in July if the administration does not act immediately.

That is why I organized with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus and called for DHS Secretary John Kelly to redesignate Haiti for an additional 18 months of TPS.

We also asked DHS to issue a new TPS designation that would include the tens of thousands of Haitians who are in the United States but are not covered by the existing TPS designation.

The continuing humanitarian crisis on the ground in Haiti should make this an easy call. But news reports indicate that the acting head of USCIS, James McCament, is looking for evidence of crimes committed by Haitians to use as a pretext for ending Haiti's TPS designation. Such actions are part of the Trump administration's attempt to depict immigrants as criminals. They are also part of a flagrant effort to obscure the fact that TPS is based on the conditions on the ground in Haiti rather than the actions of some TPS beneficiaries here in the United States.

I call on Director Kelly to ignore these misguided voices and instead listen to people like Elijah. Human decency demands that the Department of Homeland Security extend temporary protected status to all Haitians present in the United States prior to November 4, 2016, as the country continues to rebuild.

CONDEMNING HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN CHECHNYA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned by the rapidly deteriorating human rights situation in Chechnya where hundreds of gay or perceived-to-be gay men have been harassed, have been tortured, and have been killed by Chechen authorities.

On April 1, a Russian independent newspaper first reported on this detention and disappearance of gay men, which the Chechen leader has continuously denied.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the leader Ramzan refuses to acknowledge that gay men exist in Chechnya, but we know from many credible reports that the Chechen Government has allegedly put these men into camps, and it plans to eliminate its entire gay population by Ramadan, which is May 26.

This is disheartening, to say the least, in an era where the world is moving toward tolerance and equality for all people. To hear about these atrocities being committed is very tragic. The United States should not and must not turn a blind eye to this unwarranted persecution. All individuals, no matter their sexual orientation, their gender identity, their religion, their race, or any other basis deserve the full enjoyment of their God-given rights. These are universal and are for all people to enjoy.

In the wake of these events, I joined several of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in sending a letter to Secretary of State Rex Tillerson to take swift action and condemn these atrocities which run counter to American values of promoting human rights and freedom and that should guide

strategic decisions that we make on U.S. foreign policy.

I was glad to see that the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the Department of State spoke out against the practice of the Chechen authorities and called for the immediate release of the hundreds of detained men being held at these camps.

U.N. Ambassador Nikki Haley must be congratulated, also. She condemned these abuses and raised the issue at the first U.N. Security Council meeting. I look forward to the continued collaboration of these agencies and with my colleagues because we must send a united and clear message that we are against all forms of discrimination and all forms of violence.

Mr. Speaker, we must not forget that Putin has significant influence over what goes on in Chechnya, and, to date, Putin has done nothing to help. This is simply outrageous.

From restrictions on political participation, to the suppression of civil society, to the silencing of religious minorities, to the prohibition of freedom of expression, Russia has a deplorable human rights record. Just over the last few years, the Russian Government has adopted laws that restrict free speech, that restrict free association of LGBT individuals, and Russian agencies threaten the removal of children from their rightful loving homes.

Chechnya's crackdown on the LGBT community, directed by government officials, it is very clear to see that these are not haphazard events. These are state-sponsored violent activities. It is time for Putin to talk to his crony Ramzan and put an end to this barbaric gay purge. No government ought to be able to dictate how each person expresses their individuality, and no government ought to be able to use children as pawns to punish and intimidate others.

I am committed to supporting LGBT individuals under siege in Chechnya, and through the combined efforts of wonderful organizations like the Council for Global Equality, Human Rights First, Human Rights Campaign, Freedom House, and so many NGOs in Russia, we will continue to raise the alarm about Chechnya and Russia's declining human rights record and help find a safe haven to those facing persecution.

Living in a free society and a truly blessed nation like ours, it reaffirms our moral obligation and our unique responsibility to speak for those who find themselves under the shadow of oppression and tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, I am against any actions that undermine the human rights of any person, and, in the coming days, I will introduce a resolution that condemns these reports of violence and persecution in Chechnya. It calls on its officials to immediately stop the abduction, the detention, and the torture of individuals based on their sexual orientation. It is just unbelievable.

It urges further our U.S. leadership to continue to condemn Chechnya's ongoing human rights violations and demand the release of individuals wrongfully detained. We remain steadfast in our commitment to protect and promote the human rights and dignity of all people.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that our colleagues would join me in this worthy endeavor.

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to act together in a bipartisan fashion to improve the state of our Nation's infrastructure. It is long overdue.

This week is National Infrastructure Week where we recognize the challenges we face in addressing America's transportation systems, its water systems, its ports, its harbors. Sadly, what we have to recognize isn't particularly positive.

This year, the infrastructure grade that we received from America's Society of Civil Engineers, a national organization that is made up of some of the best and the brightest engineers in our country, gave our Nation a D-plus. That is not a good grade. Never has been.

As a matter of fact, this same organization has estimated that, to rectify our Nation's infrastructure, we need to invest over \$1 trillion, \$1 trillion of new investments, to provide the sort of transportation, water and ports and harbors, that our Nation needs and deserves.

So we must do better than a D-plus. Literally, we are living off the investments that our parents and our grandparents made a generation and two ago, and it is an aging infrastructure.

We know from our country's history that the infrastructure projects that move forward most effectively are those combined with local, State, and Federal funding; all the governments doing their part with private participation.

We, in California, are no strangers to infrastructure problems caused by a lack of investment, but we are stepping up to the plate to make the necessary crucial improvements.

In my own district, the counties that I represent, Merced, Madera, and Fresno Counties, have all increased their local sales tax in order to pay for crucial road repairs, new road projects, highways, and other essential transportation needs.

Last month, the California legislature enacted legislation that Governor Brown signed into law to increase the State's gas tax and vehicle fee to pay for roads, bridges, and other transportation improvement projects.

Clearly, these are tough decisions, and they come with policy implications and political risks. I mean, let's face it, it is never popular, whether it is your local, State, or Federal level, to raise taxes to pay for these much-needed improvements, but it must be done. The last time we increased the gas tax nationally was 1994.

In California, Governor Brown's decision to pursue high-speed rail, among other efforts, is a long-term commitment in the 21st century to do what is necessary to create the inner city rail and auto and air transportation, the interconnectivity that comes with that.

There is a reason why we must do this. California has 40 million people today. By the year 2030, it will have 50 million people; the sixth or seventh largest economy in the world.

So why are we not doing this on a national level? It is simple. What is lacking is the political will—the political will to come together on a bipartisan basis. Now is the time for the Federal Government to face this challenge head-on in a bipartisan fashion. And we know we can do this.

□ 1030

Not only has the process begun in California, but many other States across the Nation have stepped up to the plate to put in resources to rebuild their infrastructure, and we must get serious about that. President Trump has made a proposal for infrastructure, and I think we need to ensure that that infrastructure proposal also includes water.

Water is critical not just in California but in Western States and throughout the country. We need to significantly improve our water storage or water delivery and our drinking water systems. We have taken initial steps to meet these challenges by acting at the State and Federal level.

In 2014, California passed Proposition 1, which authorized \$7.12 billion for water infrastructure projects. Late last year, after hard work by many of my colleagues in a bipartisan fashion, the California delegation passed the Water Infrastructure Improvement Act, or the WIIN Act, that was signed by President Obama last December. This law authorized vital new water projects across the State, including, in the valley, additional storage at the New Exchequer Dam, and San Luis Reservoir in Merced County, as well as funding for water recycling projects like the North Valley Regional Recycled Water Program, and it will provide 50,000 acre-feet of additional water for both Merced and Stanislaus Counties.

Although we have made some significant efforts to improve California's water infrastructure, this first good step indicates that we must build upon that and do more at all levels of government. That is what we must do on a

bipartisan level. Let's take President Trump's suggestion and make this a bipartisan effort. This is an opportunity to invest.

DC CENTRAL KITCHEN HELPS THE UNDERSERVED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I had the privilege of visiting the DC Central Kitchen, which is a nonprofit that fights hunger and poverty here in the Nation's Capital. But it fights hunger differently. Yes, DC Central Kitchen feeds people who are hungry. It also offers the training, empowerment, and career opportunities that allow people to finally be free from hunger and poverty.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Nutrition of the Committee on Agriculture, this visit was especially important to me, and I am grateful that I could volunteer and tour the site with my colleague and subcommittee ranking member, Congressman JIM McGOVERN.

DC Central Kitchen is located in the basement of one of the Nation's largest homeless shelters. It focuses its services on addressing the deeper issues that have plagued generations: hunger, homelessness, incarceration, and, ultimately, poverty.

CEO Michael Curtin made it very clear that DC Central Kitchen isn't merely offering handouts to those in need. He said, "You can't feed your way out of poverty," and I wholeheartedly agree with him. DC Central Kitchen puts as much emphasis on training those who come through its doors to prepare them to earn living wages as it does to provide meals to Washington's marginalized citizens.

People who receive services there truly do have a chance to escape poverty. They find employment right at DC Central Kitchen or in Washington's hospitality industry. DC Central Kitchen is helping people find jobs that pay living wages and obtain lasting careers.

In 1989, a nightclub manager named Robert Egger founded DC Central Kitchen. He was frustrated with his volunteer experiences at traditional charitable responses to help end hunger and homelessness. His idea was to create a "central kitchen" where wasted food could be turned into balanced meals for shelters and nonprofits and jobless adults could be trained in the culinary arts.

Of course, the critics said it couldn't be done. It was unwise. It was unsustainable. The concept was just not possible, they said. Well, they were wrong. And Robert was ahead of the curve and ahead of his time.

DC Central Kitchen's successes have been celebrated nationally. Its story

has been featured in outlets ranging from National Geographic to The Washington Post to The Chronicle of Philanthropy and many more places. It works every day to transform food that would otherwise be wasted into nutritious meals for homeless shelters and nonprofits. It serves farm-to-school menus to low-income schoolchildren, all while creating job opportunities for unemployed adults who have completed its culinary job training program.

The numbers are clear. Last year, 91 individuals graduated from the program; 88 percent of them found good-paying jobs. Fifty percent of last year's graduates received a wage increase within 12 months of being on that job.

DC Central Kitchen has also expanded access to healthy foods by making them available at corner stores in D.C.'s food deserts. Last year alone, it supported store owners in selling more than 207,000 units of affordable, healthy snacks and produce.

Mr. Speaker, DC Central Kitchen is a shining example of what can be done to truly help the underserved in our communities all across this Nation. By giving individuals career training and job skills, it allows them to break the back of intergenerational poverty that has hindered the lives of so many.

No one in America should go hungry. Everyone deserves a shot at living a full, healthy, and productive life. DC Central Kitchen shows us this is possible.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations to the staff, to the volunteers, to the students, and to all those who had this vision with DC Central Kitchen.

THANK YOU, LAW ENFORCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to praise law enforcement across the Nation and the State of Missouri for their dedication, courage, and sacrifice in serving our communities.

This week is National Police Week. We should thank police every week, but this time of year provides a special opportunity to give honor where honor is due. Law enforcement officers deserve our deep appreciation and respect.

Police officers do an excellent job protecting the residents of my district, from Columbia to Waynesville, to Warrensburg and throughout Missouri. They stand ready to help wherever needed. That is why, today, I am introducing the Police Officers Protecting Children Act. This bill would allow schools that want to allow retired or off-duty law enforcement officers to be armed as a security measure to protect children in our schools. If a school

wants to allow off-duty or retired police to protect their students, the Federal Government shouldn't stop them.

The Police Officers Protecting Children Act is even more important for schools in our rural communities where law enforcement may take a significant amount of time to respond to an emergency. A well-placed retired or off-duty officer could save lives.

Law enforcement in my district have shown their support for this bill because they know firsthand that police officers have the training and experience to protect our children when it counts. They have the trust of our communities and have years of experience carrying a weapon. I thank them for their service and their willingness to protect our children while they are at school.

Law enforcement officers live out the honorable duo of bravery and service. They put their lives on the line every day to protect our communities, often without the thanks they deserve. They work day in and day out patrolling our neighborhoods, getting drugs off the streets, and protecting us from criminals who seek to do us harm.

In Missouri, we honor the brave men and women who carry the badge as police officers. This National Police Week, I am glad to recognize those officers and their bravery and service protecting the people of Missouri.

So to the police around the Nation and in my home State of Missouri, I say to you: Thank you for your service. You make a difference every day, and we are so grateful for you.

GROWING UP IN A LAW ENFORCEMENT FAMILY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give a very personal thanks to our men and women in uniform during this National Police Week.

I was raised the son of the chief of police and the head of the fire department of El Dorado, Kansas, for some 25 years. In that time, he taught me discipline and values. He taught me there was right and there was wrong, that some things are black and white in the world, and my father represented what the law was in my community.

Today, I celebrate this week with him and the men and women who served with him who gave me a deep respect for the rule of law and those who serve daily to uphold it. Certainly, I am the person I am today because of what my parents taught me, my family, and the community, and they still do to this day.

I can remember growing up and the first day my dad brought home Rene, our trained police dog, and how that dog became part of our family, a very

gentle dog until one morning, we were playing football in the backyard, and one of my friends tackled me. We watched that police dog climb a 6-foot-high fence to come to my rescue.

I remember my dad pulling people from fires. I remember riding in the back of an old Jeep that was overhauled from an Army Reserve to fight prairie fires and grass fires, something I am sure that kids wouldn't be allowed to do today. My dad took me to the firing range time and time again, and I would watch my dad shoot 25 rounds into a small circle the size of a quarter week after week, training to do his job right. I remember him getting called out to domestic disturbances and crime scenes. I remember him disarming people with weapons time and time again, putting his life on the line.

But it is just not my family, Mr. Speaker. Families across the country have loved ones who serve our communities, States, and country.

Earlier this week, President Trump gave a great message: "No one asked these selfless men and women to enlist in this righteous cause or to enroll as foot soldiers in the eternal struggle against crime and violence. They joined the cause because their hearts were big and full of amazing courage."

Mr. Speaker, I salute the men and women in uniform and thank them for their service.

MY RECENT TRAVEL TO AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a report on my recent travels to Afghanistan, where our Armed Forces remain engaged at a critical front of the global war on terrorism.

I have been a part of several congressional delegations to Afghanistan to survey conditions there, particularly as it concerns the progress being made by Afghan women and girls to attain equal rights. I was honored once again to lead a delegation of my colleagues to the region to conduct oversight of American operations and better inform our efforts here in Congress to fulfill our constitutional responsibility to fund and support our military.

Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 15 years since American and allied forces invaded Afghanistan to topple the Taliban regime and stamp out the terrorist breeding ground it harbored. Many brave Americans have given their lives in the struggle to defeat the al-Qaida terrorist threat and protect our homeland. It is incumbent on us as a nation to honor their sacrifice by never allowing it to be in vain.

So much has been given and, because of that, so much has been gained. There is no question in my mind that our country is safer and the world is

freer because of the work our military has done and continues to do in Afghanistan. That is an important truth I am reminded of in a powerful way each time I visit Afghanistan, and I am compelled to share it with my colleagues here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have said for years that the test for our success in Afghanistan going forward is the preservation of the gains made by women and girls. Having observed the treatment of women and girls in Afghanistan over many years now, I can tell you that the progress today is as fragile as ever.

There is good news. New laws criminalize violence toward women and offer them unprecedented legal protections. Girls are attending school and going to college. Women are working in government, serving in the military, in the police force, and even running for office. There is an Afghan Women's Chamber of Commerce that specifically works to see that women are incorporated into the nation's economic future.

For American women like me who grew up with parents telling me I could achieve anything I wanted to, those kinds of things are commonplace. For Afghan women who grew up in a culture that has subjugated them to second-class citizenship or worse, these activities are nothing short of extraordinary. Centuries of repression are being reversed, and a new generation of women that expects and demands basic rights is taking hold.

During our visit, our delegation was honored to meet with the Afghan First Lady, Mrs. Ghani, and many other women leaders. We discussed the opportunities now available to Afghan women that weren't conceivable 50 years ago under the Taliban, and most importantly they explained just how critical these gains are to the overall stability of Afghanistan.

□ 1045

While it is certainly encouraging to listen to these remarkable stories of hope and progress, there exists a deep concern among Afghan women about seeing these important gains backslide and their rights erode. In fact, in some areas of the country, this is already happening. The Taliban's resurgence amid the drawdown of coalition forces presents a major threat that we must acknowledge.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow this to happen. We cannot allow the gains we have made in Afghanistan to fall by the wayside.

We know all too well what can happen when radical oppressive ideologies are allowed to fester in hostile nations. Make no mistake: because freedom and fairness for Afghan women is essential to the security of our Nation, it is also crucial to our own.

That is why I am pleased that President Trump is reviewing our strategy

in Afghanistan, including a reevaluation of troop levels and our rules of engagement.

Simply put, if we are going to be in Afghanistan, we need to be willing to do what it takes to succeed. Of course, the Afghan people must take the reins of their country's future, but the United States will play a key role in ensuring a lasting peace.

Right now I fear we have tied the hands of our military through reduced force strength and limited rules of engagement. We should never send our military men and women into harm's way without the tools and resources they need to get the job done. Reevaluating our force strength and rules of engagement is the right decision, and I look forward to hearing from President Trump and Secretary Mattis as the NATO summit approaches.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased that Congress was able to deliver a comprehensive appropriations bill that properly funds our military. Funding the government by short-term extensions takes away the Pentagon's ability to plan for the future. With everything going on in the world right now, including the situation in Afghanistan, we cannot hinder our commanders with financial uncertainties.

One of the reasons I was so eager to serve on defense appropriations was having the opportunity to reverse military cuts that made no sense. For the last several years, we have been in constant tension with the Obama administration, whose sequestration policy threatened to hollow out our military. But not anymore.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues who joined me on the delegation.

FLEXIBLE FLOW MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the House's attention today to the ongoing negotiations between New York City and the States of New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania, regarding the Flexible Flow Management Program.

The current Flexible Flow Management Program, which governs New York City reservoir releases into the Delaware River Basin, expires at the end of this month on May 31. This interstate agreement is a critically important water management tool that helps mitigate downstream impacts of New York City's reservoirs.

In addition to supporting the water allocation goals, the Flexible Flow Management Plan helps control the flow of water downstream, decreasing the likelihood of catastrophic flooding events. The FFMP also provides critical support to the Delaware River

freshwater trout fishery, which is an important part of the Catskill's regional economy.

Unfortunately, if the Flexible Flow Management Plan is allowed to expire, we jeopardize the safety and well-being of constituents along the entire length of the Delaware River. The progress that has been made towards finalizing the FFMP agreement cannot be lost due to a breakdown in communications among decree party members.

I encourage all parties to return to the table from their respective States and agree to at least a 1-year extension to allow the negotiation process to continue.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to this important issue because it greatly affects the lives and livelihoods of tens of thousands, indeed millions, of people in the entire Delaware River Valley and the Delaware River estuary, which covers New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the State of Delaware.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter I sent to the four States on May 11, 2017, on this important matter.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2017.

Secretary SHAWN GARVIN,
Delaware Department of Natural Resources and
Environmental Control, Dover, DE.

Commissioner BOB MARTIN,
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Trenton, NJ.

Secretary PATRICK McDONNELL,
Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, Harrisburg, PA.

Commissioner BASIL SEGGOS,
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Albany, NY.

Acting Commissioner VINCENT SAPIENZA,
New York City Department of Environmental Protection, Flushing, NY.

DEAR MEMBERS: As Decree Party Members, I want to thank you all for being willing and active participants during Flexible Flow Management Plan (FFMP) negotiations over the last number of years. Your past willingness to engage with all stakeholders is admirable.

Unfortunately, I am disheartened to hear that a finalized FFMP has yet to be established. Despite the recent breakdown in the conversation, I believe that it is not too late to continue collaborative negotiations toward a final agreement. With the deadline fast approaching, it is vitally important that all Decree Party Members return to the table to continue the dialogue. Incredible reforms and relationships have been established over the last decade; we cannot let these efforts go to waste.

I understand that several proposals to improve basin management and releases have been suggested up to this point, and I urge all Decree Party Members to consider positive reforms, including:

Thermal mitigation banks to provide support to cold-water fisheries during times of thermal stress in the Pepacton, Neversink, and Cannonsville ecosystems;

Flood mitigation improvements that will decrease the risk of disastrous flooding events both above and below the dams;

Continued evaluation of the impacts of fully utilizing the F.E. Walter Dam and reservoir.

Regardless of the final changes to the FFMP, it is imperative that we not sacrifice

the progress which has been made over the last number of years. All parties' specific concerns and opinions have value, but we must accept that if we are not willing to negotiate and compromise we jeopardize the safety, well-being, and economic viability of all communities within the Delaware River Basin.

I eagerly anticipate a finalized FFMP before the May 31 deadline. If a new FFMP cannot be negotiated within that time, a one-year extension should be agreed upon. Reverting back to the 1980s reservoir management approach is unacceptable.

I am more than willing to provide support as needed.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. FASO,
Member of Congress,
19th Congressional District of New York.

WESTERN WALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, President Trump will embark on his first international trip as our Commander in Chief. I am very pleased to see that one of the first countries our President will visit is Israel, a nation that is a cherished American ally and a beacon of freedom in a troubled region.

This visit comes at an important time, as recent comments by an administration official created uncertainty as to whether the U.S. Government considers the Western Wall to be within Israeli territory. Located in the heart of Jerusalem's Old City, the Western Wall is one of the holiest sites in the world and a place where millions have gathered to pray and seek the presence of God.

Jewish tradition teaches that the Western Wall was an integral part of the Temple Mount and has been an important site in Judaism for more than 2,000 years.

It is vital that the United States Government recognize the Western Wall as part of Israel and that the President should affirm that position during his upcoming trip. I am hopeful that recognizing the Western Wall will be part of a process to formally recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

REPEALING THE DURBIN AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, right now we are having a fierce debate in the Republican Conference over the Durbin amendment, which is a price control on debit swipe fees. Retailers have claimed that the Durbin amendment is about competition. They have claimed that it is about restoring a broken market. They have claimed that Visa, MasterCard, and issuing banks are engaged in price-fixing on swipe fees.

This is a key element of this debate. A vote to keep the Durbin amendment is a vote that rests on the idea that Members are sure that there is price-fixing in the debit card market. There is \$6 billion to \$8 billion per year at play here, and the violation of a core free-market principle, which is the notion that government should not be telling people what they can or can't charge.

My point would be that, if you do that, if you support that degree of command and control in the economy, you have got to be sure.

And should we be sure?

I go back to the Sherman Antitrust Act, which outlaws price-fixing. This is a criminal law. Hundreds of people have been put in jail for it. You can go to jail for up to 10 years for violating it, and the law has stood for more than 100 years.

Payment networks and retailers have been fighting over whether or not Visa, MasterCard, and issuing banks are violators of the Sherman Antitrust Act for 30 years. And one of the earlier rulings goes back to 1986.

There is ongoing litigation now. In fact, there are more than 15 different cases out there on this. Litigation, I would add, that the retailers have never won when cases went to trial. In the major cases that we have managed to find, they are 0-3.

They are actually in the middle of another big case right now. There was a settlement, and later a higher court set it aside. A sentence of that ruling reads:

"Discovery included more than 400 depositions, 17 expert reports, 32 days of expert deposition testimony, and the production of over 80 million pages of documents."

Eighty million pages. I have studied this issue for months, and I have not read 80 million pages. I am a retailer, and I have paid thousands of dollars in swipe fees, so I know the difference between point of sale and Square mobile payments. I have used these systems, but I still don't know.

That is why I oppose the Durbin amendment: because I am not sure that this price control is necessary. Therefore, I put the Federal Government in the role of judge, jury, and executioner for the payment industry. For me to do that, I would have to be sure.

I know that the government wasn't sure when they came up with the regulation. They originally came up with 12 cents per transaction. Then the final rule finally came in at 24 cents.

Were they right the first time?

Were they wrong the second time?

There is no way to know for sure.

I guarantee you that when we walk down to this floor and we vote on this issue and choose to uphold a policy which many free-market think tanks have said harms consumers, Members will not have read 80 million pages. If

we are honest with ourselves, most will not have read 80 pages. There is no way we could, given everything that is in front of the Federal Government, even if we wanted to.

Economist F.A. Hayek got at this in his criticism of the planned economy. He said that socialism doesn't work because of what he called "the unavoidable imperfection of man's knowledge."

Hayek was referring to human beings at large. I would offer that the knowledge of politicians—speaking for myself, in particular—must be that much more imperfect.

You don't have to believe that the banks are angels, and you don't have to disbelieve the retailers to oppose the Durbin amendment. You just have to feel a bit of doubt either way.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Pastor Glen Berteau, The House Modesto, Modesto, California, offered the following prayer:

God, Your Word says that unity and light extinguish darkness and chaos. We debate opinions while not recognizing that You are the answer. Behind me the words "In God We Trust" are not a suggestion.

God, we have told You to leave, but come back to our schools, our businesses, our streets, our families, our government. I ask You to fill the political seats in America with God-fearing, God-following leaders. I pray for our Nation to stop rising up in division against one another and instead kneel down and pray for one another.

Instead of petitioning opinions and protest, we petition You in prayer. I pray for hate to dissipate from the heart of our society. Lord, You are our protection, our sustaining power.

Protect our first responders. Protect our powerful military. Protect the citizens of this great Nation, and let us not forget that You are our national security.

In Jesus' name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LAWSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING PASTOR GLEN BERTEAU

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor today to introduce to the House our guest chaplain, Glen Berteau of Modesto, California.

Glen is the senior pastor of The House in Modesto, a church of more than 8,000.

Supporting his community is a priority, and, under Glen's leadership, The House Modesto has established programs to fight against human trafficking, provided groceries on a weekly basis to those in need, repaired bicycles for the homeless, and developed mobile medical and dental clinics that provide services free of charge.

The House was also recently recognized by the city of Modesto for their annual event, Unity Matters, which honors law enforcement and first responders.

Glen is originally from Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and has called California his home for over 24 years. He and his wife, Deborah, have been in ministry for over 40 years, have been married for 42 years, and they have 3 children, 5 grandchildren.

Glen is a gifted speaker, teacher, and evangelist and has ministered at conferences, churches, and conventions all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Pastor Glen Berteau. We thank him for offering today's opening prayer in the United States House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IRAN-NORTH KOREA LINK

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, The Post and Courier of Charleston, on May 6, explained the Iran-North Korea link in an editorial:

"President Trump is looking for ways to put a squeeze on North Korea that will persuade it to give up nuclear weapons and the missiles to carry them . . . there is another collaborator with North Korea that appears to be helping it survive: Iran."

"According to Jeffrey Lewis of the Middlebury Institute of International Studies in Monterey, California, the evidence of collaboration between North Korea and Iran is ample and of long standing. 'The very first missiles we saw in Iran were simply copies of North Korean missiles. Over the years, we have seen photographs of North Korean and Iranian officials in each other's countries, and we have seen all kinds of common hardware.'"

" . . . President Obama got Tehran to agree to reduce its stock of enriched uranium. . . . But the agreement is a weak one if Tehran is simply paying Pyongyang to do the design work for missiles and warheads. . . ."

"And if Iran is paying North Korea for help, then the sanctions . . . are also being fatally undermined."

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT SHOULD INVESTIGATE HEALTHCARE COMPANIES

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was reported in The New York Times on Monday that UnitedHealthcare and four of the Nation's largest health insurance companies concocted a scheme to defraud the Medicare program and the American people out of tens of billions of dollars each year over the past decade.

The United States Department of Justice yesterday joined the lawsuit and is investigating these serious charges against UnitedHealthcare and the others. The Justice Department should conduct an investigation aggressively and thoroughly to get to the truth and to exact justice.

If these allegations are true, these actions would represent among the most egregious schemes of fraud perpetrated against the American people.

Shockingly, the House Republican health bill gave a \$78 million tax cut to the executives of the very companies that are under investigation, including a \$15.5 million tax cut to UnitedHealthcare and their chief executive officer.

This information can easily be found on page 67 in 3 lines of the Republican healthcare bill.

This is, Mr. Speaker, a blatant violation of the public trust that this Congress took an oath to protect and to uphold.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Police Week. I rise today to honor the brave men and women in blue who sacrifice their safety every day to keep our families and communities safe.

Each day these Americans go to work willing to put their lives on the line for the security of their fellow Americans.

We often hear the remarkable stories of our law enforcement officers. These men and women work long hours and late shifts, often being called into work and called away from their families. These are the people who risk their lives to protect our very neighborhoods, schools, communities, while asking nothing in return.

These professionals exhibit the greatest love of all, and that is to offer their lives to protect another.

I pray for those who have lost their lives, like Sergeant Greg Meagher, a 33-year veteran of the Richmond County Sheriff's Office who lost his life earlier this year in the line of duty. We will never forget his ultimate sacrifice.

Our safety depends on these amazing people, and I am proud to honor them here today.

INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK

(Mr. LAWSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week is infrastructure week, and today I rise to highlight the need to update our country's aging infrastructure system. This is a topic that is important in both the rural and urban areas of our country.

From the highway system in Lake City, Florida, to the port needs of Jacksonville, we must put forth the necessary resources to update our transit needs.

Each year, millions of tons of freight traffic, seaport cargo, and rail cargo pass through Jacksonville as they are transported to communities throughout our country.

The Jacksonville Transportation Authority is building a 57-mile bus rapid transit system, which is cost-effective and will support hundreds, and potentially thousands, of new jobs.

They are also overseeing the development of the Jacksonville Regional

Transportation Center, a transportation hub that will consolidate major modes of public transportation, making transit more accessible and convenient.

While that is all good news, there is still much work to be done to improve our infrastructure in north Florida.

REMEMBERING ROXCY O'NEAL BOLTON

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to recognize the beloved memory of a dear friend, Roxcy O'Neal Bolton, who passed away the morning of May 17.

Roxcy was born in Mississippi and later moved to Coral Gables, Florida, in my congressional district, where she spent the last 53 years of her rich and accomplished life.

Roxcy became a champion for women everywhere. She was on the front lines fighting on behalf of abused women and created the first women's rescue shelter and the first crime watch in Florida to help curb crime against women. Roxcy also established the first rape treatment center in the country located at Jackson Memorial Hospital in Miami, which serves as the model for the creation of many other such centers across our Nation.

It was Roxcy's vision that helped establish The Women's Park of Miami-Dade County, which was later renamed after Roxcy.

The passing of Roxcy O'Neal Bolton is a huge loss for those of us in south Florida; and, Mr. Speaker, it is a huge loss for women everywhere. We are comforted by her outstanding legacy, which will live forever.

My prayers go out to her children, David, Bonnie, and Buddy, and to all of her loved ones during this most difficult time.

Way to go, Roxcy. We are going to miss you forever, my friend.

PROTECTING PERSONAL PRIVACY

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, for years now the NSA has been collecting phone and online communications from everyday Americans from all across the country, defying the rights and liberties granted to us under the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution.

The 2008 FISA amendments, specifically section 702, has led to massive government-led exploitation of personal privacy through the collection of American citizens' emails. We need serious reforms that balance the protections of our civil liberties and rights through our Constitution and also keep the American people safe.

The NSA recently announced that they would stop collecting our emails and electronic communications under section 702, but what is to say it wouldn't start up again?

That is why I am introducing legislation today to keep our country from backtracking on this progress. My bill will permanently codify this policy change and ban this privacy-evading collection from taking place again.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation and defending our civil liberties.

DROWNING PREVENTION MONTH

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of the two children who die every single day in the United States as a result of drowning.

I want to recognize the Young Men's Christian Association, the YMCA, for their efforts to empower youth with the imperative skills and knowledge to prevent these tragic accidents.

Drowning is the number two cause of death for children ages 1 to 4, second only to birth defects. In Texas alone, 107 children lost their lives due to drowning last year. In 2017, we have already lost 14.

Mr. Speaker, these statistics are absolutely unacceptable. Both in Texas and across the Nation, there is an opportunity and a need to save these young individuals.

The YMCA is example of an organization that is changing the statistics for kids across the country. It is bringing swimming safety and drowning prevention to communities that historically could not obtain them before. It partners with local schools to transport kids to the Y for year-round swimming lessons.

I am proud to say that the YMCA of Austin is one of many across the country implementing the Safety Around Water program. The program strives to reduce these incidences by going into overlooked communities to provide the necessary resources for kids who otherwise would not have access to these lifesaving skills.

I applaud the Austin YMCA on its tireless efforts to save the lives of our children.

In God we trust.

PROTECT OUR DEMOCRACY

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise yet again to challenge you to put country before political party. For too long, candidate and now President Trump has been playing a game of dangerous liaisons with Vladimir Putin and his Russian regime.

He called on Russian spies—that is right, the KGB—to hack his opponent. He fired the Acting Attorney General who warned him. He fired the FBI Director investigating him. And he has shared highly classified intelligence with Russia, posing a direct threat to our brave assets on the ground.

When is enough enough?

Mr. Speaker, how much longer before you do your job and bring up the bipartisan Protecting Our Democracy Act that is cosponsored by 199 Members of this House?

Show us that you have the courage to put country before political party. Show us that you meant it when you said "against all enemies, foreign and domestic." Show us that you will do what is right by our country and stand up to this President.

□ 1215

CLINTON HIGH SCHOOL HONORED AS A LEADER IN SOUTH CAROLINA

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to congratulate Clinton High School in my home county of Laurens, South Carolina, for being named one of the Best High Schools by U.S. News & World Report's school rankings.

Congratulations to my friend Maureen Tiller, the teachers, the students, and the parents. This really is an honor that goes to all of you for all of your hard work that you put forth in educating the next generation of leaders in South Carolina.

U.S. News compiled and analyzed data from over 22,000 public high schools, and Clinton High was recognized as a leader in South Carolina.

I want you to know how proud I am of you for all that you have accomplished and wish you the best as you continue to work to educate our children.

So congratulations, Principal Tiller, on getting this great recognition.

Now, as a side note, both of my sons, Graham and John Philip, have graduated from Clinton High. My third son is currently a sophomore at Clinton High. He is also all-region and all-State for the Red Devils boys soccer team.

Congratulations to Parker and Clinton High.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LABORATORIES

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate and recognize our Department of Defense laboratories. I am

pleased to introduce a bipartisan resolution to designate May 18 as Department of Defense Laboratory Day 2017.

Mr. Speaker, Defense labs have played a unique role in countless innovations that have enhanced and strengthened our national security. Defense-supported research and development has yielded many game-changing state-of-the-art weapons systems and technologies, ensuring that we never send our men and women in uniform into a fair fight.

Our Defense labs also contribute to American economic growth by spurring the creation of new industries, companies, and jobs across the country, guaranteeing that America leads the way in cutting-edge science and technology.

Mr. Speaker, in celebration of all the work and accomplishments of our national network of Defense laboratories, and most especially the incredibly talented scientists, researchers, and support staff who support them and staff them, please join me in honoring their contributions to our security.

CHANCE FOR PEACE

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's most famous speech was his farewell address in which he criticized the military industrial complex.

However, 7 years earlier, in April of 1953, he gave a speech, entitled, "The Chance for Peace," with these words: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed."

"The cost of one modern heavy bomber," Eisenhower added, "is this: a modern brick school in more than 30 cities. It is two electric power plants, each serving a town of 60,000 population. . . . We pay for a single fighter with a half-million bushels of wheat. We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people. . . ."

Eisenhower concluded: "This is not a way of life at all, in any true sense . . . it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron."

President Eisenhower loved the military, but he hated war. He would never have gone along with a 16-year war in a place like Afghanistan, especially since it is one mainly done for personal glory for generals and more money for defense contractors.

TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I proudly represent North Carolina's 12th Congressional District, leader in transportation and infrastructure.

We have Norfolk Southern's state-of-the-art intermodal yard connecting trucking, rail, and air to East Coast seaports. We are home to the Charlotte Douglas International Airport, eleventh busiest in the Nation, nearly 700 American Airlines flights departing daily.

I-85, I-77, Route 21, and Highway 115 move our 800,000 residents and products from businesses like International Paper and Coca-Cola Consolidated. Our LYNX and rapid bus transit lines are making our cities greener. And as we say in Charlotte, we've got a lot.

I am committed to ensuring we remain a national leader. I am hosting a regional transportation summit to help promote Route 21 and Highway 115 projects, continue developing our rapid transit systems, move our Red Line project forward, and to ensure that our airport can complete its new terminal and runway projects.

We are "One Meck." Transportation has made us an economic powerhouse and southern hub of cultural diversity. During National Infrastructure Week, I urge my colleagues to work to make greater investments in our Nation's infrastructure.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as we have heard, this week is National Police Week. It is a time for us to honor the service of those officers who have fallen in the line of duty and to recognize those who serve and protect our communities day in and day out.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sergeant Paul Arnold of the Franklin, Tennessee, Police Department. Sergeant Arnold is a 26-year Franklin Police veteran. In July of last year, for the third time, he faced a cancer diagnosis. Through each of these diagnoses, treatment, rehab, he has maintained one demand, and that is that it not affect the work that he is doing in the line of duty with the Franklin Police Department.

Today, the police department is standing together as he is receiving the Theodore Roosevelt Association Police Award, which is given to an officer who has rendered outstanding and praiseworthy service to the department and the community despite a serious handicap, illness, or injury.

His dedication to service is noted. It is appreciated. We honor him and congratulate him on a well-deserved honor and say thank you to all of the law enforcement community that chooses to protect and defend.

CALLING FOR SPECIAL COUNSEL

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, on April 4 of this year, I, along with my colleagues TED LIEU and KATHLEEN RICE, sent a letter to the Department of Justice asking that they appoint a special counsel to investigate any Trump campaign collusions with Russia.

Yesterday, the Department of Justice took a step in the right direction by appointing former FBI Director Robert Mueller as the special counsel to oversee the Federal investigation into possible Russian interference in the 2016 election, including potential collusion between Trump campaign associates and Russian officials.

I have worked with Mr. Mueller at Justice and recognize his past accomplishments. His appointment speaks to the urgency of bringing some stability to this process so that Congress can get back to the business of working on what our constituents need most: issues affecting Virgin Islanders and the United States of America and the world; issues of jobs, infrastructure, education.

Last week I introduced H.R. 2404, the Improving the Treatment of the U.S. Territories Under the Federal Health Programs Act of 2017, a bill to remove the existing inequities and disparities that territories face under Medicaid and Medicare, and also to provide us with a fair share of funding for our hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, these are the types of issues Congress must begin to work on for the American people, and I ask my colleagues to continue to put people over politics.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK 2017

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Police Week. It is a privilege to take the time this week to reflect, remember, and honor our Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who courageously defend American citizens and protect our communities. They selflessly put their lives on the line to ensure that this Nation is one of safety and order.

On November 18, 2016, the reality of that danger hit home in Georgia's First Congressional District. Deputy Commander Patrick Carothers, a 26-year veteran of the U.S. Marshals Service and a resident of Long County, lost his life in the line of duty while serving a routine warrant. He left behind a loving wife and five children.

This week the House will vote on H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act. With

this bill, we can put a safeguard in place that works to protect our officers and their families from experiencing the same tragedy that took Commander Carothers' life.

Thank you to the hardworking men and women of law enforcement that work each day to keep us safe, and thank you to the family of Commander Carothers, who sacrificed his life in the name of public good. You are in our thoughts and prayers.

WE NEED TO FIX OUR FAILING INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, you know, if there is an issue that has the opportunity to pull Congress together, it is the need to fix our failing infrastructure. You all know the statistics, but suffice it to say, if your child had the grade of our infrastructure, they would be going to summer school this summer.

In my district in Colorado, it is the upgrades for Interstate 25 between Denver and Fort Collins for the tens of thousands of commuters each day; it is the backup from skier traffic returning from the mountains on Interstate 70, or our Northwest line commuter rail that is 35 years behind schedule.

Of course, there are people who came within a hair's breadth of missing their flight because of interstate traffic. What is happening to my district and my State is happening across the country.

But it is not just roads and bridges we need to fix. To connect and improve our communities, the true definition of infrastructure includes investments in broadband, 21st century infrastructure, clean water systems, schools, public rail, pedestrian and bike paths, airports, energy efficiency, storage, and transmission to make our country stronger and reduce costs.

Now is the time to act on an infrastructure package that has true investment. It can't just be toll roads or a giveaway to Wall Street. A fully paid-for infrastructure package will be a boon for the country, for our cities, for our towns, for our rural areas, and for the middle class.

Infrastructure is a today problem that we can come together and solve. We need to act now and make infrastructure a priority.

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, May is National Foster Care Month and a time to recognize the

more than 400,000 foster youth in America. During this month, we renew our commitment to ensuring that every child has a safe, loving family.

I am a member of the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth and continue to this day to have a foster brother that I grew up with. I know firsthand how a loving, supportive home can make all the difference in a young person's life.

Mr. Speaker, if we were able to bring together all these children into one city, this city would be the 43rd or the 44th largest city in the country. More than 200,000 children enter the foster care system every year, which translates to a child entering care every 2 minutes. Approximately 254,000 will leave foster care this year; nearly 128,000 will be reunified with their families; another 52,000 will find new loving families through adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I thank every foster parent, volunteer, and mentor who works to make sure the needs of our children are not only being met, but they have the opportunity to thrive in a loving home.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1039, PROBATION OFFICER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 324 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 324

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1039) to amend section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, to grant probation officers authority to arrest hostile third parties who obstruct or impede a probation officer in the performance of official duties. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; (2) the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I

yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Resolution 324, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Committee on Rules today. The rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 1039, the Probation Officer Protection Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule also provides for a motion to recommit and makes in order an amendment by Congresswoman JACKSON LEE of Texas.

On Tuesday, the Committee on Rules had the opportunity to hear from my fellow Committee on the Judiciary members: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1039 was marked up by the Committee on the Judiciary on May 3 and favorably reported by the committee without amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we debate this rule and the underlying bill this week during National Police Week. As the son of a Georgia State Trooper, it is an honor to come before this House to help advance legislation that protects the men and women of law enforcement. The dangers our law enforcement officers face are real, and I know too well the fear that a loved one might not come home after leaving for a routine shift. This week we had the opportunity to recognize those who make our communities safer, and we are humbled to advance the policies that support their efforts, and we honor their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to point out that the sponsor of the underlying bill we are discussing, the Probation Officer Protection Act, is a former law enforcement officer himself. My friend DAVE REICHERT from Washington State is Sheriff REICHERT also, who led the task force responsible for solving the case of the infamous Green River serial killer. Along with him, I serve on the Policing Strategies Working Group, and I commend him for his work on the underlying legislation and his tireless advocacy on behalf of the heroes who wear the badge.

The Probation Officer Protection Act is a commonsense, yet modest, expansion of the Federal probation officers'

existing arrest authority. Under current law, 18 U.S. Code section 111, it is a crime for a person to forcibly assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with any Federal official in the performance of his or her official duties. While the Federal officials described by this statute include probation officers, probation officers are limited in their ability to take affirmative actions in order to protect themselves when they face these threats not from the offender but from third parties.

Mr. Speaker, while probation officers can make arrests of those under their supervision, the first party, such as a parolee or individual serving a term of probation or supervised release, the law does not allow probation officers to take action to protect themselves should a third party impede or assault them.

In fact, if a third party, such as a family member or friend of a parolee, threatens or attacks a probation officer, that officer's only recourse is to retreat and call for local law enforcement.

Think about that, Mr. Speaker. I want to read that again.

If a third party, such as a family member or friend of a parolee, threatens or attacks a probation officer, that officer's only recourse is to retreat and call for local law enforcement.

Because the law has failed to equip probation officers with the authority to arrest an aggressive third party, probation officers have limited recourse when their safety is uncertain. Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable and even defies reason. When probation officers find themselves in a dangerous situation involving third parties, they are at the mercy of happenstance. Perhaps, in urban areas, other law enforcement agents may be in proximity and able to respond. Perhaps, at times, the brave men and women who oversee offenders on release may have access to the backup they need once a third party threat has been established. But I will tell you this, in these certain areas that may happen. But it is possible, though, that without the authority to deescalate or manage a dangerous situation without the necessary authority to arrest threatening third parties, probation officers will remain unnecessarily vulnerable to attacks, violence, or even death.

In rural areas, like my district in northeast Georgia, a probation officer's restricted authority to arrest could pose an even greater risk to their well-being. Local law enforcement agencies in rural areas are often smaller and more separated from backup by distance. This means that probation officers who call for help could be subject to longer response times in the very moment they need the assistance the most.

Considering these facts, Mr. Speaker, it is reasonable to make a narrow, yet

important, adjustment to current law in order to ensure that the probation officers have third-party arrest authority when they are forcibly threatened by that third party. Simply put, probation officers enter dangerous situations for the benefit of our communities and should be able to effectively protect themselves and others.

The Probation Officer Protection Act would address this flaw in current law by providing necessary recourse for probation officers. Under the terms of the bill, probation officers would have the authority to arrest hostile third parties who forcibly assault, resist, or otherwise impede a probation officer as they are carrying out their sworn duties.

We have heard examples of probation officers making visits to those under supervision, only to be greeted by third parties who are wielding knives or baseball bats or yelling obscenities at the officers as they attempt to serve the larger community. In these events, probation officers should not be handicapped in their ability to perform their jobs while protecting their own safety. As we know all too well, situations with agitated third parties can escalate in an instant. Officers on site need to be equipped to deescalate dangerous situations for the good of the supervisee, the probation officer, and any bystanders.

This legislation does not represent an unprecedented or large-scale expansion of authority for probation officers. Probation officers already have limited arrest authority for first-party offenders. They are also bound by formal search and seizure policy and arrest procedures. Probation officers receive training that instructs them in properly detaining offenders so that they will be equipped with the necessary skills to manage dangerous individuals in circumstances that might warrant it.

Mr. Speaker, the intent behind the underlying bill is but one example of a larger effort behind much of the legislation we have seen on the floor this week. Every day, law enforcement officers put their lives on the line to protect us. Every day, they face dangerous situations for the sake of their neighbors. Law enforcement officers across the country bravely walk into uncertain situations prepared to protect and defend you and me and the people that we love.

I believe that our Nation's law enforcement—be they local, county, State, or Federal agents—overwhelmingly abide by their oath to protect and serve. In turn, we should remember their bravery and sacrifices each day and thank those who risk their lives to protect us. We must also thank the families who kiss their loved ones good-bye each morning, fully aware of the risk that their service entails.

Our men and women in blue should experience our gratitude every day, but

this week, during Police Week, it is right for us to take the extra care to commemorate those who have fallen and to honor those who are serving.

As thousands of law enforcement professionals visit our Nation's Capital this week, I encourage all of my colleagues to thank them for their service. Also, I ask that all of my colleagues in this body look at this commonsense piece of legislation and show their support by voting "yes."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 1039, but first and foremost, I want to make sure that we recognize and honor the work and sacrifice that our police and first responders do each and every day.

This week is National Police Week and, frankly, it is an opportunity to honor every week, but in particular this week, those who run toward the gunfire, those who run toward the building on fire every day.

In my own district in Colorado, I hear so many countless stories of heroic acts and going above and beyond the call of duty by those on the front lines of keeping us safe. In one example in Colorado, Officer Ross Maynard responded to a domestic violence situation. The victim's former boyfriend had broken a living room window in the middle of January, leaving the victim and her young daughter exposed to our record cold temperatures. Maynard went above and beyond his duty and covered the window to keep out the elements. He vacuumed the shattered glass from the floor when he found out the victim didn't have a vacuum so that the child didn't receive cuts from the glass.

In example of heroism, dispatcher Sara Demgen calmly helped a man deliver his son when his wife went into labor and they realized they wouldn't be able to make it to the hospital.

It is individuals like these who we should celebrate and support through our work here in Congress. Unfortunately, the legislation we are considering today doesn't make anyone safer, and if we passed it, it would bring about a constitutionally dubious process that could interfere with the important work of law enforcement professionals.

Part of the reason this is problematic legislation is because the process this legislation followed—like a lot of stuff that we have to vote on—was not transparent and was not regular order. There was no hearing on this bill. Even if we look back at last year's version of the bill, there was no hearing on that one, either.

Then we look at the rule that we are debating now. Mr. Speaker, a rule

means what is the process for amending this bill. What we have here is a shutting down of that process, where they didn't provide an open rule. They allowed only one amendment as part of this bill that had been offered. There was no opportunity on the floor, through what is called an open rule, for Democrats or Republicans to offer good ideas to improve this legislation.

Of the six amendments that were submitted that the Committee on Rules considered yesterday, five of them were killed by the Committee on Rules and not even allowed to be voted on or debated by the House of Representatives. Now, the number of times I have had to come to this floor and argue against a closed rule or a structured rule is exhausting, and it is contrary to Speaker RYAN's promise that he made for the world to hear that he would bring us back to regular order and give everybody input on legislation that we consider in what is supposed to be the people's House.

This rule, yet again, is not open. It rules five of the six amendments out of order. The confidence and the trust in the House of Representatives, it is hard to imagine how it could even sink much lower, but it is restrictive processes and rules like this where neither Republicans or Democrats are allowed to even offer amendments or debate amendments to improve the legislation that have led to the record level of distrust in this body.

In a moment, I will look forward to discussing the bill itself, but I just wanted to take this occasion in particular to celebrate our law enforcement professionals on National Police Week and every week.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, again, I appreciate my colleague pointing out certain things. Again, I think pointing out the complete story there would also be helpful, and that is that the amendments spoken of that were not made in order, following the rules of the House, the Jefferson's Manual, and all were not germane. The one amendment that was offered was made in order for this bill. The others were not germane. If they want to be brought up in a separate bill or separate order or find a bill that is actually germane to it, then that is a different issue, but not in this one.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it seems that with each passing day, we learn more about the tangled web of conflicts of interest and secret meetings with Russians in and around the Trump campaign and Trump administration. Last week, President Trump fired FBI Director James Comey while he was overseeing the FBI's investigation into possible collusion between Trump campaign officials and the Russian Govern-

ment, after reportedly asking Director Comey personally to drop the investigation into former National Security Advisor Flynn's ties to Russia. This week, we also learned that President Trump revealed highly classified information provided by an ally to Russian officials.

Without President Trump's tax returns, we have no way of knowing if he himself has financial ties or is financially beholden to Russia or Russian interests, as news reports have suggested. The American people deserve to know whether or not President Trump has conflicts of interest, financial interests, or business dealings with Russia or other foreign governments. It is imperative that we, as the people's representatives, hold the executive branch fully accountable.

Mr. Speaker, when we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative ESHOO's bill, H.R. 305, which would require Presidents and major party nominees for the Presidency to release their tax returns.

If the President truly has nothing to hide, including business dealings or being economically beholden to Russia, he should freely release his tax returns to reassure the American people that they can have confidence that he is not acting out of conflict of interest but, rather, in our interest as a nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our important proposal, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that the House can vote on my bipartisan legislation, the Presidential Tax Transparency Act.

Mr. Speaker, in the last week, the President fired the FBI Director who was investigating him. We then learned that the President also pressured the Director to end his investigation of Michael Flynn's Russia entanglements. These revelations, added to so many others, make it abundantly clear that we must have disclosure of the President's tax returns in order to fully understand his connections to Russia. The Presidential Tax Transparency Act would require this disclosure for the current President, all future Presidents, and Presidential nominees.

□ 1245

This practice has never been required by law. But if there were ever a time

for Congress to codify this bipartisan disclosure tradition, now is the time.

The President's behavior has raised questions since before the election about what connections or exposure he may have to Russian officials. After the FBI, the CIA, and the NSA concluded that Russia did, in fact, interfere in our national elections; after several of the President's associates and staff lied about meetings with Russian officials during the campaign and transition; and after the FBI opened an investigation into these Russia contacts, the President still welcomed top Russian diplomats into the Oval Office for a closed-door meeting last week.

Holding the meeting itself raised many questions. But in the meeting, the President revealed highly classified, code-word information to the Russians. I believe that this is unprecedented. No President in the history of our country has ever done such a thing.

And on May 16, The New York Times reported that the President pressed the former FBI Director Jim Comey to end his investigation of Michael Flynn's ties to Russia before he fired him. This all begs the question: Why is the President so eager to please the Russians?

The appointment of former FBI Director Mueller, a highly distinguished public servant, as special counsel is most welcome. But I believe that Congress can act today to provide public disclosure of the President's tax returns, which would provide an immediate and important window into the President's potential Russian entanglements, and answer the critical questions of: To whom does he owe money? And who is the President doing business with? What are those entities?

We know there are 564 of them. The American people deserve to know. Only with full disclosure will we know the true sources of the President's income, the holders of his debt, and the extent of any business ties to Russia and other foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a highly serious, bipartisan—I want to stress that—bipartisan effort to exercise Congress' constitutional duty to serve as a check and balance on the executive branch as a coequal branch of government.

As the former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper said on May 14:

Our institutions are under attack, both externally . . . and internally.

I want to thank all of the cosponsors of this bill and, most especially, the Republicans who have had the courage to do so. It takes courage to have courage. Now is the time to stand up and demonstrate courage so that the American people will have confidence—confidence in what takes place here and to answer the questions that are left unanswered.

So by defeating the previous question today and voting to approve the Presidential Tax Transparency Act, Congress can create a pathway to the

facts, and then the truth, that the American people have a right to know.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS), the former Orlando police chief, and my good friend.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have taken three oaths in my lifetime. The first oath I took was in 1984, as a police officer, when I was sworn in at the Orlando Police Department. The second oath I took when I was sworn in as the chief of police. And the third when I became a Member of the 115th Congress.

Although different positions, each oath stated that I would protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that I have taken each oath very seriously.

I know former FBI Director James Comey understood the enormity of the oath he took to uphold the Constitution to seek the truth, regardless of outside influences or political circumstances. His loyalty is to the United States Constitution.

The American people should have faith that no one—that includes the President, the U.S. Attorney General, and the Deputy U.S. Attorney General—should be able to interfere with the proper functioning of the FBI or its work with local and State law enforcement agencies. It is the responsibility of Congress to ensure that all our law enforcement and intelligence agencies are able to fulfill their mission: to protect and defend the United States and enforce criminal laws as appropriate.

I filed an amendment with the Rules Committee that would prohibit the removal of the FBI Director, except for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment would insulate the FBI's mission from political influences and agendas. Unfortunately, it appears that the Republican leadership doesn't think that this is a good idea, or simply does not want to have this debate.

The rule reported from the Rules Committee prevents me from offering this important amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, if the FBI Director is abiding by the oath he took, then he should not be removed.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind everyone, as we have discussed here and we hear impassioned arguments for amendments that were not germane, find proper places to put amendments, and find bills that you want to write. That is all fair. That is in our rule book. But remember, the only germane amendment was made in order. I re-

peat, the only germane amendment was made in order.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the gentleman knows, we grant necessary waivers for amendments all the time. It is a very routine thing. So to argue it is not germane, the Rules Committee can grant the necessary waivers for any of these amendments. And, frankly, these amendments are more germane to what the American people care about than the underlying bill.

Mrs. DEMINGS' amendment that states that the Director of the FBI may only be removed for inefficiency or neglect of duty or misuse of office, what could be more germane to the concerns of the American people than that? All it would have taken was granting necessary waivers, as the Rules Committee does regularly on a number of bills when it suits their interests.

Another amendment from Representative KENNEDY was rejected to reinstate the authority to appoint independent counsel for purposes of an independent investigation.

One from Representative LAWRENCE was rejected to reinstate the authority for independent counsel.

Representative LIEU had an amendment to reinstate the authority for independent counsel to investigate and was not allowed.

Representative MOULTON had one.

So all of those amendments, even though they are more germane than any of the other items of what the American people care about, were, nevertheless, not granted the necessary waivers to be included in this bill.

The bill we are considering under this bill is highly problematic. It, frankly, serves to hurt the very people it purports to protect.

I know we all value the safety of our first responders and the safety of our communities. This bill would hurt the relationship police have with communities without any need. It is truly a solution in search of a problem.

This legislation would give Federal probation officers authority to arrest third parties, not the person that they are working with on probation, the ability to arrest them without a warrant.

When referring to third parties, that means people who are not under the authority of the police officer. It could mean a mother of someone on probation, a roommate, somebody who shares a house, and somebody doesn't want the probation officer to come into their room because the probation officer doesn't have a warrant, even if the parolee is in a different room.

We need to remember that an individual, of course, gives up some of their rights, including their Fourth Amend-

ment rights, as a condition of probation. But not everybody who comes into contact with that person also should be required to give up their Fourth Amendment rights. The mother in this example has not given up those constitutional rights, which read: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause. . . ."

And simply being a roommate or a family member of somebody who is on probation should not mean you lose your constitutional rights as an American citizen.

If in this example the mother doesn't want the probation officer to enter her room, she has that right, unlike the parolee. But this bill would change the dynamics and allow the probation officer to say she was interfering and arrest her, something that likely violates her Fourth Amendment protections and would be overturned by the courts.

This would make family and friends of individuals entering probation from prison scared of allowing the person on probation to live in their homes. This could lead to increased recidivism and increased crime. It will create a huge hindrance to the probation system and the goal of successfully encouraging people to reenter society and avoid breaking the law.

If people don't have a family member or friend to live with, successful reentry becomes harder and almost impossible. We need to remember that probation officers are part of the judicial branch, but police are members of the executive branch. Not only does this legislation complicate that, but it is a violation of separation of powers.

When an individual is granted probation, as a condition of that probation they give up certain rights, and that is understandable, and under the authority and supervision of the judicial branch in doing so. Third parties have not made that agreement with the judicial branch. They are not their jurisdiction. They are not adjudicated by the judicial branch. And probation officers should not have the authority to arrest them without a warrant provided by an officer of the peace.

However, even if we don't care about the constitutional rights of citizens, which I certainly hope we care about, we should care about the fact that this bill would reduce the safety of our probation officers. This legislation creates a very unsafe situation for our probation officers who are not trained in law enforcement.

On average, a Federal probation officer completes six weeks of training. That is compared to 21 weeks of training and 3 weeks of field for a police officer. That is simply not the same level of training.

With the disparity, doesn't it make sense for probation officers to use the

assistance of police when they actually do need to arrest an uncooperative third party or serve a warrant based on probable cause?

With additional police powers come more likelihood people could be put in harm's way, and that is the opposite of what we want for someone who doesn't have the proper training.

I also want to talk about why the bill is so bad. In many ways, I asked myself the question: What problem are we trying to solve? Even if we look at the associations that are pushing for this legislation, the data just doesn't show that there is a need or that this would be a productive step towards either keeping our communities safer—and this bill would also put the lives of our probation officers at risk.

In a letter earlier this year, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association stated that "formal arrests by probation officers are rare." And 2015 data shows that, of the 987 searches conducted, only 30 uncooperative third parties, and even less arrests.

With so few incidents, it is, frankly, better for probation officers to call or use the assistance of well-trained police officers, if needed. That is the answer.

The proponents of this bill claim they have brought the bill forward at the request of our first responders. But the request was not even close to unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by officers, chiefs of police, probation officers, and other first responders in opposition to the bill.

MAY 16, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: We are current or retired law enforcement officers concerned about public safety, constitutional policing practices, and building trust between law enforcement and the communities we serve. In light of Police Week, some Members of Congress have sponsored bills that would increase incarceration rates, enhance penalties for certain crimes, and, ultimately, weaken relationships between communities and police departments.

The idea that "law and order" has declined in the previous decade does a disservice to the law enforcement officers who have taken oaths to protect and serve their local communities. Those officers deserve programs and policies that fund critical training, enhance important policing skills that improve officer and public safety, and offer technical assistance and operational support. We are deeply troubled by recent legislative and executive actions that support this divisive "law and order" rhetoric and that chip away at our hard-fought efforts to sustain long-term trust between our communities and law enforcement agencies.

As officers who have handled high-profile incidents and routine investigations, we know that keys to success are strong leadership and morale, officer training and accountability, and community trust and engagement. Below, we offer several recommendations based upon these principles.

Programs that support mental health services for officers. A number of law enforcement agencies are increasingly recognizing the importance of regular mental health

checks, crisis hotlines, peer mentoring programs, and other mental health services to alleviate the stress and trauma that officers face.

Policies and programs for de-escalation and crisis intervention training. As a result of such training, law enforcement agencies learn to apply strategies that reduce the likelihood of force-related incidents. De-escalation training is essential to reducing the number of violent confrontations between law enforcement and communities, as well as increasing methods for age appropriate responses when interacting with youth to improve their safety and well-being in communities. These trainings promote best practices and, as a result, reduce the risk of injury to police officers and members of the community.

Policies that promote crisis intervention training incorporating the services of mental health professionals. Such professionals can assist officers in identifying and responding to a person impacted by mental illness, an intoxicating substance, or emotional distress. The public safety benefits resulting from this training are well-documented and broadly supported by policing and public safety experts.

Programs that assist officers with understanding the effects of systemic trauma and better deal with the aftermath of trauma. Trauma sensitivity or trauma informed training can help officers identify individuals showing signs of trauma related behaviors, which may include: aggression; difficulty processing information; impulsiveness; heightened fight, flight, or freeze response; and hypersensitivity to noise or physical contact. Training can help law enforcement avoid interpreting such behaviors as requiring more aggression or use of force and, instead, guide officers to respond in a more informed and appropriate manner.

Policies and programs that incorporate implicit bias training into police training at all levels. Implicit bias training helps police officers mitigate racial bias during community interactions, encourage respectful encounters, and promote constitutional policing with the goal of building trust with communities.

Programs that collect data on deaths and use-of-force incidents by law enforcement. Specifically, we encourage you to support the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Use-of-Force Data Collection Program, which expands the Uniform Crime Report Program to include use of force incidents by law enforcement resulting in serious bodily injury. The Death in Custody Reporting Act, which was signed into law in 2014, must also be properly implemented.

Support the Collaborative Reform Initiative of the U.S. Department of Justice's (DOJ) Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. The Collaborative Reform Initiative is a valuable program that offers technical assistance and operational support to local police departments to improve policing practices, transparency, professionalism, accountability, community inclusion, and procedural fairness. The Collaborative Reform Initiative enables police departments—which participate on a voluntary basis—to sustain longterm, significant reforms in a manner that improves trust between police and communities and meets the public safety goals of residents. The work of DOJ's Civil Rights Division around policing must also be supported and sustained.

During Police Week, we urge you to prioritize federal programs, funding, and legislation that support the above polices, rather

than legislation that would undercut partnerships with our local communities. We invite you to reach out to us about the above priorities and ask that you support legislation and funding that champion these important issues.

Sincerely,

Hassan Aden, Police Chief (Ret.), Greenville (NC) Police Department; Chief James Abbott, West Orange (NJ) Police Department; Officer Nick Bucci (Ret.), New Jersey State Police; Sheriff Jerry L. Clayton, Washtenaw County (MI) Sheriff's Office; Captain James Davidsaver (Ret.), Lincoln (NE) Police Department; Deputy Chief Stephen Downing (Ret.), Los Angeles Police Department; Former Probation/Parole Officer and Corrections Counselor Shelley Fox-Loken, Oregon; Major Neill Franklin (Ret.), Baltimore and Maryland State Police Department; Officer Brian Gaughan (Ret.), Davenport, Iowa and Chicago; Lieutenant Commander Diane Goldstein (Ret.), Redondo Beach Police Department.

Ron Hampton, Community Relations Officer, D.C. Metropolitan Police Department (Ret.); Blacks in Law Enforcement of America; Officer Karen Hawke (Ret.), Massachusetts State Police; Former Federal Corrections Officer Regina Hufnagel, Boston, Massachusetts; Commissioner Terence Inch (Ret.), Hellam Township (PA) Police Department; Senior Patrol Officer Tim Johnson (Ret.), Madison (OH) Township Police Department; Commissioner George Kain, Ph.D., Ridgefield (CT) Board of Police Commissioners; Analyst Richard Kennedy (Ret.), Central Intelligence Agency; Chief Larry Kirk (Ret.), Old Monroe (MO) Police Department; Former Special Agent David Long, U.S. Department of Labor; Former Detective and Deputy Sheriff Nick Morrow, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

Lieutenant Joanne Naughton (Ret.), New York Police Department; Chief Norm Stampfer (Ret.), Seattle (WA) Police Department; Special Agent Ray Strack (Ret.), Department of Homeland Security, Fort Lauderdale, Florida; Former Police Officer Silvestre Tanenbaum, Carrollton (TX) Police Department; Sergeant Carl Tennenbaum (Ret.), San Francisco Police Department; Former Detention Officer and Deputy Marshal Jason Thomas, Prowers County, Colorado; Detective James Trainum (Ret.), Washington Metropolitan Police Department; Deputy Sheriff Darren Ullmann, Cowlitz County (OR) Sheriff's Office; Federal Probation Officer LeRoy Washington (Ret.), Hawaii; Officer Jack Wilborn (Ret.), Glendale (AZ) Police Department; Detective Howard Wooldridge (Ret.), Michigan.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, as they state, in part, in the letter: "We are deeply troubled by recent legislative and executive actions that support this divisive 'law and order' rhetoric and that chip away at our hard-fought efforts to sustain long-term trust between our communities and law enforcement agencies."

This letter is signed by many current and former police chiefs, sheriffs, and other law enforcement officials.

In the letter that I included in the RECORD, which will now appear for the world to see, law enforcement professionals say that instead of pushing forward with this bill that we are being asked to consider under a closed and restrictive rule, we should focus on mental health and trauma services for

officers to support them, programs and policies for de-escalation and crises intervention training, better staffing for our police agencies and probation officers, programs and policies that incorporate implicit bias training into police training and probation office training, and community-oriented policing. These are the types of policies that Democrats, and myself, would love to put forward during National Police Week to support our law enforcement professionals and to keep our communities safe.

Why aren't we focusing on those kinds of ideas, rather than a solution in search of a problem?

It is National Police Week, and we should be supporting legislation that protects and supports our police, not create a greater schism between our community and police through an unconstitutional bill that puts the lives of our probation officers at risk, and will likely increase recidivism among those on probation.

□ 1300

We can do better. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and to vote "no" on the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time, and I appreciate the debate today. Also, I feel, in just a little bit of ways, I am sort of Alice in Wonderland here; what is up is down and what is down is up. I am not sure how you take this bill to, number one, say that probation officers would be any more in danger.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to include in the RECORD another letter that is from the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association in support of what is going on here.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT
OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Cabin John, MD, May 17, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
*Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND LEADER PELOSI: I am writing on behalf of the nearly 27,000 members of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association to advise you of our strong support for H.R. 1039, the "Probation Officer Protection Act," and to express our appreciation for the Congress's consideration of this important officer safety measure during National Police Week. FLEOA opposes the amendment that will be offered on the floor to sunset the authority provided by the bill, as you cannot put a stopwatch on critical law enforcement officer protection measures such as H.R. 1039.

The "Probation Officer Protection Act" is a critical officer safety measure. At a time when U.S. Probation Officers have seen their workloads increase due to changes in sentencing policy and are being asked to "do

more with the same," ensuring that they have the means to protect themselves when placed in harm's way is paramount. H.R. 1039 will fully authorize a U.S. Probation Officer to arrest any third party who violates 18 USC 111. This statute has been on the books since the 1940s and makes it a crime for any person to forcibly assault, resist, intimidate, or interfere with any federal officer in the performance of their official duties. Current law, however, only allows Probation Officers to make arrests of individuals on probation or under supervised release who violate 18 USC 111. This authority does not extend to "third parties," which could include a former associate of the offender or an unidentified member of the community. In many instances third parties are well aware that a federal officer's authority is limited to individuals on supervision, and when a third party does impede or assault a U.S. Probation Officer, the Officer's only recourse is to retreat and call for local law enforcement. While in major cities local law enforcement may respond depending on availability, the same is not true for U.S. Probation Officers who work in rural communities where response by local law enforcement may be a single officer or none. This places Probation Officers at even greater risk, particularly in those situations where retreat is not even a reasonably safe alternative.

During the forthcoming debate on this bill, there will undoubtedly be those who go to great lengths to demean U.S. Probation Officers as something less than "real" law enforcement officers or to diminish the hazards that they face. Some may also raise inchoate objections about the constitutionality of H.R. 1039. For example, you will hear that Congress cannot extend Executive Branch police powers to the Judicial Branch, despite the fact that it was Congress that established the U.S. Supreme Court Police that resides directly across the street from the U.S. Capitol. Not only are such statements factually inaccurate, they display a basic lack of understanding about those who serve our nation as U.S. Probation Officers and the purposes behind the "Probation Officer Protection Act."

Make no mistake: U.S. Probation Officers are fully trained federal law enforcement officers. They attend basic training at the National Training Academy at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Charleston, SC, and receive ongoing in-service training throughout the year. Their training covers everything from firearms regulation and safety and defensive tactics to handcuffing, the use of force, de-escalation training, and reality-based scenario training. It may be difficult for some to acknowledge, but there is an inherent risk to the work U.S. Probation Officers do—a risk that often outweighs that of traditional law enforcement. They do not enter into sterile offices, but often into environments that are uncertain. They are required to have frequent and regular contacts in the home and community and knowingly come into daily contact with individuals who have a history of violence, mental health issues, problems with authority, and troubles with substance abuse. U.S. Probation Officers are not able to anticipate what is going to occur during all contacts. There are and have been occasions when U.S. Probation Officers are threatened and/or attacked by third parties and they need the ability to take an affirmative step to protect themselves.

U.S. Probation Officers are a unique profession. They have a knowledge base in law and human behavior, and a mix of skills in

investigation, communication, and analysis. They strive to make our communities safer, to make a positive difference in the lives of those they serve, and promote fairness in process and excellence in service. But as the volume of approved searches they must conduct has markedly increased over the past year due to changes in sentencing policy, the absence of any authority to restrain or direct the movements of third parties places U.S. Probation Officers at a greater and unnecessary risk of physical harm. H.R. 1039 provides a modest expansion of U.S. Probation Officers' existing arrest authority to cover only violations of 18 USC 111. It does not in any way provide them "peace officer" status or grant them the same general arrest authority that state-level probation officers enjoy in many jurisdictions. Granting U.S. Probation Officers the authority to arrest third parties would not change who they are and what they are seeking. Nor will it interfere with or otherwise diminish U.S. Probation Officers' use of the de-escalation techniques that are the hallmark of their profession. It would simply afford them another tool, another avenue, if ever needed.

In the end, this legislation will enhance officer safety while also protecting probationers and third parties by preventing obstruction from escalating to actual violence. Thank you in advance for your consideration of this legislation and for helping U.S. Probation Officers do their job more safely by passing H.R. 1039, the "Probation Officer Protection Act."

Sincerely,

NATHAN R. CATURA,
National President.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I think what is interesting here is I can't really, frankly, understand sort of the shade, I guess, or the dismissiveness that is being thrown on probation officers and their lack of training, which is 6 weeks plus 40 hours additional, which is subject to their job.

The evidence that was presented here, the example of the person not wanting a search, many times a probation officer will come with a search warrant that will allow them to search anywhere. But even in the case of the lady who did not want her room searched, the bill specifically says forcible impeding, which is already discussed and talked about in law.

Also, any officer who witnesses a crime or is being attacked does not have to have a warrant to make an arrest. So, I mean, it is really interesting to me why we are discussing a bill and doing so in such a way for which there are actual instances where this takes place.

My friend said, well, it only happens a very few times. My question for this, as a son of a State trooper, if his name was Leonard Collins and he was actually going to do this, I would say that one matters, even if it is the only one—lives of these probation officers, one.

So why we are doing this, I am not really sure. Why we would oppose this, I am not really sure.

You can make stretched arguments here, but when a probation officer goes in and, in the words of the bill, is forcibly intimidated, impeded, attacked,

they can arrest the person there who they have already had training in how to arrest. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, how you can make a good argument about that. You can try.

There will be debate here in just a few minutes, which this rule gives, because I would encourage voting “no” on the previous question and voting “yes” on this rule.

But there is also another issue that I do want to address. In this majority, since this majority has been in control, there has never been a waiver for germaneness on a floor amendment. Germaneness matters. So, again, find the proper place.

As we go forward, as we look, at least in my time here, this is one of the simple, straightforward issues. You are protecting and giving a chance for those probation officers who encounter something that most in this body now, in our current jobs, maybe in previous, have not had to face.

So the question for me today is simply this. It makes sense as a common-sense update. Support it. It enables them to carry out their job, protecting themselves.

The underlying bill simply provides additional resources for probation officers to protect themselves while, at the same time, freeing up the demands of other law enforcement officers in the area. When we understand the commitment that they make, I do not understand making legal sidestep arguments of hypotheticals that may or may not exist to say we should not give them another tool in their toolbox.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 324 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 305) to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Ways and Means and Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no reso-

lution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 305.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 2:15 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1415

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 324; and

Adopting House Resolution 324, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1039, PROBATION OFFICER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 324) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1039) to amend section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, to grant probation officers authority to arrest hostile third parties who obstruct or impede a probation officer in the performance of official duties, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 188, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

YEAS—226

Abraham	Gohmert	Nunes
Aderholt	Goodlatte	Olson
Allen	Gosar	Palazzo
Amash	Gowdy	Palmer
Amodei	Granger	Paulsen
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Pearce
Babin	Graves (LA)	Perry
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)
Banks (IN)	Griffith	Poliquin
Barletta	Grothman	Posey
Barr	Guthrie	Ratcliffe
Barton	Harper	Reed
Bergman	Harris	Reichert
Biggs	Hartzler	Renacci
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Roe (TN)
Black	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Blackburn	Hill	Rogers (KY)
Blum	Holding	Rohrabacher
Bost	Hollingsworth	Rooney, Francis
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Ros-Lehtinen
Brat	Huizenga	Roskam
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Ross
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rothfus
Brooks (IN)	Hurd	Rouzer
Buchanan	Issa	Royce (CA)
Buck	Jenkins (KS)	Russell
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Rutherford
Budd	Johnson (LA)	Sanford
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Byrne	Jordan	Schweikert
Calvert	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Carter (GA)	Katko	Sensenbrenner
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Shimkus
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Shuster
Cheney	King (IA)	Simpson
Coffman	King (NY)	Smith (MO)
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger	Smith (NE)
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NJ)
Comer	Labrador	Smith (TX)
Comstock	LaHood	Smucker
Conaway	LaMalfa	Stefanik
Cook	Lamborn	Stewart
Costello (PA)	Lance	Stivers
Cramer	Latta	Taylor
Culberson	Lewis (MN)	Tenney
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Thompson (PA)
Davidson	Long	Thornberry
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Tiberi
Denham	Love	Tipton
Dent	Lucas	Trott
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Turner
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Upton
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Valadao
Donovan	Marino	Wagner
Duffy	Marshall	Walberg
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Walden
Duncan (TN)	Mast	Walker
Dunn	McCarthy	Walorski
Emmer	McCaul	Walters, Mimi
Estes (KS)	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Farenthold	McHenry	Webster (FL)
Faso	McKinley	Wenstrup
Ferguson	McMorris	Westerman
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Williams
Fleischmann	McSally	Wilson (SC)
Flores	Meadows	Wittman
Fortenberry	Meehan	Womack
Fox	Messer	Woodall
Franks (AZ)	Mitchell	Yoder
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Yoho
Gaetz	Mooney (WV)	Young (AK)
Gallagher	Mullin	Young (IA)
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Zeldin
Gibbs	Noem	

NAYS—188

Adams	Beatty	Blumenauer
Aguilar	Bera	Blunt Rochester
Barragán	Beyer	Bonamici
Bass	Bishop (GA)	

Boyle, Brendan F.	Green, Gene	Pallone
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	Panetta
Brown (MD)	Hanabusa	Pascarell
Brownley (CA)	Hastings	Payne
Bustos	Heck	Pelosi
Butterfield	Higgins (NY)	Perlmutter
Capuano	Himes	Peters
Carbajal	Hoyer	Peterson
Cárdenas	Huffman	Pingree
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Cartwright	Jayapal	Polis
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Raskin
Cicilline	Jones	Rice (NY)
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Richmond
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Rosen
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Cleaver	Kennedy	Ruiz
Clyburn	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Cohen	Kihuen	Rush
Connolly	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Conyers	Kilmer	Sanchez
Cooper	Kind	Sarbanes
Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Costa	Kuster (NH)	Schiff
Courtney	Langevin	Schneider
Crist	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Cuellar	Lawrence	Scott, David
Cummings	Lawson (FL)	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Lee	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny	Levin	Shea-Porter
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Sinema
Delaney	Lipinski	Sires
DeLauro	Loeb sack	Slaughter
DeBene	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Demings	Lowenthal	Soto
DeSaulnier	Lowe	Suozzi
Deutsch	Lujan Grisham, M.	Takano
Dingell	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Titus
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Engel	Matsui	Torres
Eshoo	McCollum	Tsongas
Espallat	McGovern	Vargas
Esty (CT)	McNerney	Veasey
Evans	Meng	Vela
Foster	Moore	Velázquez
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Visclosky
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Walz
Gabbard	Nadler	Wasserman
Gallego	Neal	Schultz
Garamendi	Nolan	Waters, Maxine
Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross	Watson Coleman
Gottheimer	O'Halleran	Welch
Green, Al	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)
		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Chaffetz	McEachin	Rooney, Thomas
Cole	Meeks	J.
Crawford	Napolitano	Sessions
Gutiérrez	Newhouse	Speier
Johnson, Sam	Pittenger	Swalwell (CA)
Knight	Rokita	

□ 1438

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 184, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 264]

AYES—230

Abraham	Gosar	O'Halleran
Aderholt	Gottheimer	Olson
Allen	Gowdy	Palazzo
Amash	Granger	Palmer
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Pascarell
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Paulsen
Babin	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Bacon	Griffith	Perry
Banks (IN)	Grothman	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Guthrie	Poliquin
Barr	Harper	Posey
Barton	Harris	Ratcliffe
Bergman	Hartzler	Reed
Biggs	Hensarling	Reichert
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Higgins (LA)	Roby
Black	Hill	Roe (TN)
Blackburn	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)
Blum	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Bost	Huizenga	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rokita
Brat	Hunter	Rooney, Francis
Bridenstine	Hurd	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (AL)	Issa	Roskam
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Rothfus
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Royce (CA)
Budd	Jones	Russell
Burgess	Jordan	Rutherford
Byrne	Joyce (OH)	Sanford
Calvert	Katko	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Carter (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Chabot	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Cheney	King (NY)	Shimkus
Coffman	Kinzinger	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Smith (MO)
Comer	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Comstock	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Cook	Lance	Smucker
Costello (PA)	Latta	Stefanik
Cramer	Lewis (MN)	Stewart
Culberson	LoBiondo	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Long	Taylor
Davidson	Loudermilk	Tenney
Davis, Rodney	Love	Thompson (PA)
Denham	Lucas	Thornberry
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Tiberi
DeSantis	MacArthur	Tipton
DesJarlais	Marchant	Trott
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Turner
Donovan	Marshall	Upton
Duffy	Massie	Valadao
Duncan (SC)	Mast	Walberg
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy	Walden
Dunn	McCaul	Walker
Emmer	McClintock	Walorski
Estes (KS)	McHenry	Walters, Mimi
Farenthold	McKinley	Weber (TX)
Faso	McMorris	Webster (FL)
Ferguson	Rodgers	Webster (FL)
Fitzpatrick	McSally	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	Meadows	Westerman
Flores	Meehan	Williams
Fortenberry	Messer	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Mitchell	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Womack
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Gaetz	Mullin	Yoder
Gallagher	Murphy (PA)	Yoho
Garrett	Noem	Young (AK)
Gibbs	Nunes	Young (IA)
		Zeldin

NOES—184

Adams	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)
Aguilar	Bustos	Clay
Barragán	Butterfield	Cleaver
Bass	Capuano	Clyburn
Beatty	Carbajal	Cohen
Bera	Cárdenas	Connolly
Beyer	Carson (IN)	Conyers
Bishop (GA)	Cartwright	Cooper
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Correa
Blunt Rochester	Castro (TX)	Costa
Bonamici	Chu, Jody	Courtney
Brady (PA)	Cicilline	Crist
Brown (MD)	Clark (MA)	Crowley

Cuellar	Kildee	Price (NC)
Cummings	Kilmer	Quigley
Davis (CA)	Kind	Raskin
Davis, Danny	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
DeFazio	Kuster (NH)	Richmond
DeGette	Langevin	Rosen
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
DelBene	Lawrence	Ruppersberger
Demings	Lawson (FL)	Rush
DeSaulnier	Lee	Ryan (OH)
Deutch	Levin	Sánchez
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
Doyle, Michael	Lipinski	Schiff
F.	Loebach	Schneider
Ellison	Lofgren	Schrader
Engel	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)
Eshoo	Lowey	Scott, David
Espallat	Lujan Grisham,	Serrano
Esty (CT)	M.	Sewell (AL)
Evans	Luján, Ben Ray	Shea-Porter
Foster	Lynch	Sherman
Frankel (FL)	Maloney,	Sinema
Fudge	Carolyn B.	Sires
Gabbard	Maloney, Sean	Slaughter
Galleo	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Garamendi	McCollum	Soto
Gonzalez (TX)	McGovern	Suozzi
Green, Al	McNerney	Takano
Green, Gene	Meeks	Thompson (CA)
Grijalva	Meng	Thompson (MS)
Hanabusa	Moore	Titus
Hastings	Moulton	Tonko
Heck	Murphy (FL)	Torres
Higgins (NY)	Nadler	Tsongas
Himes	Neal	Vargas
Hoyer	Nolan	Veasey
Huffman	Norcross	Vela
Jackson Lee	O'Rourke	Velázquez
Jayapal	Pallone	Visclosky
Jeffries	Panetta	Walz
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Wasserman
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Schultz
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Peters
Keating	Peters	Watson Coleman
Kelly (IL)	Peterson	Welch
Kennedy	Pingree	Wilson (FL)
Khanna	Pocan	Yarmuth
Kihuen	Polis	

NOT VOTING—16

Boyle, Brendan	Gutiérrez	Pittenger
F.	Holding	Rooney, Thomas
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	J.
Cole	McEachin	Sessions
Crawford	Napolitano	Speier
Franks (AZ)	Newhouse	Swalwell (CA)

□ 1447

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable conflict, I missed the following votes on May 18. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 263 and "nay" on rollcall No. 264.

THIN BLUE LINE ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 115.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 323, I call up the bill (H.R. 115) to amend title 18,

United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 323, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-17 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 115

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Thin Blue Line Act".

SEC. 2. AGGRAVATING FACTORS FOR DEATH PENALTY.

Section 3592(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (16) the following:

"(17) KILLING OR TARGETING OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—

"(A) The defendant killed or attempted to kill, in the circumstance described in subparagraph (B), a person who is authorized by law—

"(i) to engage in or supervise the prevention, detention, investigation, or prosecution, or the incarceration of any person for any criminal violation of law;

"(ii) to apprehend, arrest, or prosecute an individual for any criminal violation of law; or

"(iii) to be a firefighter or other first responder.

"(B) The circumstance referred to in subparagraph (A) is that the person was killed or targeted—

"(i) while he or she was engaged in the performance of his or her official duties;

"(ii) because of the performance of his or her official duties; or

"(iii) because of his or her status as a public official or employee."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Federal law provides a list of 16 aggravating factors a jury is required to consider when deciding whether a death sentence is warranted in a Federal capital case. These factors include whether the defendant acted in an especially heinous, cruel, or depraved manner; whether the defendant engaged in substantial planning and premeditation; whether the victim was particularly vulnerable; and whether the victim was a high public official.

High public official, as defined in the statute, includes a litany of high-ranking public persons from the President, to a foreign head of state, to a judge or law enforcement officer. Currently, however, the law only contains specific protections for Federal officers, not State and local officers.

H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act, introduced by my colleague, Mr. BUCHANAN, amends Federal law to add the killing of a State or local law enforcement officer as an aggravating factor for a jury to determine during the sentencing phase of a trial, when the jury is considering whether a sentence of death is justified.

This legislation enjoys widespread support in the law enforcement community. And, Mr. Speaker, we can all understand why. In recent years, police officers across our Nation have laid down their lives in the service of their communities, often with little recognition or support.

According to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, 17 police officers have already died as a result of gunfire this year. Most recently, 2 days ago, Deputy Sheriff Mason Moore of the Broadwater County, Montana, Sheriff's Office was shot and killed during a routine traffic stop. We honor Deputy Moore's sacrifice, which is a stark reminder of how a routine event can quickly turn fatal for an officer of the law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is true that the scenarios where the provision in H.R. 115 applies may be limited. It is true that the vast majority of homicide cases are prosecuted in State courts. It is also true that the circumstances where a defendant killed a State or local law enforcement officer during the commission of a Federal capital offense are probably limited.

But H.R. 115 is, nevertheless, vitally important in the scenarios where it will apply—for example, in many terrorism cases. My colleagues may not remember that the terrorist who bombed the Boston Marathon also murdered an MIT police officer during their flight from the law. H.R. 115 would also apply to situations where a State or local officer is killed serving as a member of a Federal task force. And it would cover volunteer first responders, who are, of course, authorized by law to carry out their duties.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation sends a simple message: The stalking and killing of law enforcement officers will not be tolerated.

H.R. 115 is straightforward, common-sense legislation that will provide all the men and women of law enforcement, who serve and protect our communities every day, with the support they deserve.

As we conclude the 2017 National Police Week, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in support of the bill.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
POLICE ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,
Alexandria, VA, January 5, 2017.

Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUCHANAN: On behalf of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), I am writing to you to express our strong support for the Thin Blue Line Act.

NAPO is a coalition of police units and associations from across the United States that serves to advance the interests of America's law enforcement through legislative and legal advocacy, political action, and education. Founded in 1978, NAPO now represents more than 1,000 police units and associations, including the Florida Police Benevolent Association, 241,000 sworn law enforcement officers, and more than 100,000 citizens who share a common dedication to fair and effective crime control and law enforcement.

The Thin Blue Line Act increases penalties on those who harm or target for harm public safety officers by making the murder or attempted murder of a local police officer, firefighter, or first responder an aggravating factor in death penalty determinations.

This bill is critical, as law enforcement officer assaults, injuries, and deaths have increased sharply in recent years. In 2016 alone, ambush-style killings of law enforcement officers increased by 167 percent. Establishing stricter penalties for those who harm or target for harm law enforcement officers will deter crime. Any persons contemplating harming an officer must know that they will face serious punishments. NAPO strongly believes that increased penalties make important differences in the attitudes of criminals toward public safety officers, and ensure protection for the community.

We thank you for your continued support of the law enforcement community and we look forward to working with you to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. JOHNSON, ESQ., CAE,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL
ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, 9 January 2017.

Hon. VERNON G. BUCHANAN,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BUCHANAN: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our strong support for H.R. 115, the "Thin Blue Line Act."

The "Thin Blue Line Act" increases the penalty for an individual who targets, kills, or attempts to kill a person who is a law enforcement officer, firefighter or any other public safety officer, while he or she was engaged in the performance of his or her official duties, because of the performance of his or her official duties, or because of his or her status as a public official or employee.

Law enforcement officers have always faced threats while on duty but within the past few years, officers have become a target for violence solely because of the uniform they wear. As you know, the FOP has called upon Congress to expand the current Federal hate crimes law to include law enforcement officers for this very reason.

Of the 63 deaths by gunfire suffered by law enforcement in 2016, 21 of them—that's 33%—were ambush killings. These were deliberate and sadly successful efforts by individuals who set out to kill a police officer:

The ambush attack against the Dallas Police Department; the deadliest day for law enforcement since 9/11 that saw 5 officers killed from gunfire;

The ambush attack against members of the Baton Rouge Police Department that saw 3 officers killed from gunfire;

The ambush attack against 2 Iowa police officers, Scott Martin and Anthony Beminio who were killed as they sat in their respective patrol cars;

Officer Thomas Cottrell of the Danville Police Department (OH) was killed by ambush.

All of these officers died because of the uniforms they were wearing. Those in our profession have always been in harm's way. It is our job to protect others but it should not be "part of the job" to be a target of someone who is looking simply to kill a cop. We do not accept that our uniforms alone make us targets because someone was driven to rage over a perceived injustice or desires to strike a blow against our civil government.

On behalf of more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I want to thank you for introducing this legislation and amendment. If I can be of any further help, please do not hesitate to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

SERGEANTS BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION,
POLICE DEPARTMENT, CITY
OF NEW YORK,
January 17, 2017.

Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BUCHANAN: I am writing on behalf of the more than 13,000 members of the Sergeants Benevolent Association of the New York City Police Department to advise you of our strong support for H.R. 115, the "Thin Blue Line Act."

For too long, members of the NYPD, along with law enforcement officers across this nation, have been targets. There has been a proliferation of groups and pundits impugning the motives and mission of law enforcement. They do so with no regard for the impact it has on our ability to protect life, property, and the freedoms we all hold dear. These constant attacks and the excessive, exaggerated rhetoric of anti-police elements have led some to declare an open season on police officers, and to welcome with cheers and praise the cowardly criminals who target law enforcement officers with acts of violence. We saw this first hand in New York City in December 2014, when Officers Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos were ambushed and senselessly murdered as they sat in their radio car on a Brooklyn street corner. Unfortunately, they are not alone. According to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, in 2016 there were 21 police officers killed in ambush-style attacks. Shockingly, 20 of these officers were killed in eight multiple-shooting death incidents—such as those that claimed the lives of 8 officers in Baton Rouge, LA and Dallas, TX—the highest total of any year since 1932.

It is for these reasons and many others that the legislation you have introduced is so important. The "Thin Blue Line Act" would make the murder or attempted murder of police officers, prosecutors, firefighters, and other first responders at any level of government an aggravating factor in federal death penalty determinations. The

bill applies to things like the interstate homicide of an officer, and is applicable whether the officer is murdered on duty, because of the performance of their duty, or because of their status as a public official. While we know that law enforcement officers will continue to be targets, regardless of their uniform and whether they are on duty or off, active or retired, this legislation sends the message that any action to target law enforcement officers for murder or violence will be met with the harshest of penalties. And that is a message that is long overdue.

On behalf of the membership of our organization, thank you for your leadership on this important issue. We look forward to working with you to see it swiftly enacted into law.

Sincerely,

ED MULLINS,
President.

MAJOR COUNTY SHERIFFS
OF AMERICA,
April 25, 2017.

Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUCHANAN: I write to you today on a matter of significant importance to the Major County Sheriffs of America (MCSA) and all of America's law enforcement professionals. MCSA is an association of elected Sheriffs representing the Nation's largest counties with populations of 500,000 or more. Collectively, we represent more than 100 million Americans.

As Vice President in charge of Government Affairs for the MCSA, I am pleased to express our association's support of your legislation, the Thin Blue Line Act. This legislation would make the murder of law enforcement officers, firefighters and other first responders an aggravating factor in capital punishment determinations.

In 2016, one hundred forty-four officers died in the line of duty and to date, line of duty deaths are up 10 percent. The targeting of law enforcement officers is unconscionable and those who commit such heinous acts should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. Law enforcement officers and other first responders have the right to go home to their families at the end of their shifts.

The Thin Blue Line Act is a step in the right direction and your work on this legislation is sincerely appreciated. We value your support and look forward to working with you in the future.

MICHAEL J. BOUCHARD,
*Sheriff, Oakland County (MI),
Vice President—Government Affairs.*

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, though troubled and saddened by the recent attacks on law enforcement officials, I believe that H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act, is counterproductive to ensuring public safety and only serves to exacerbate concerns with the unfair and unjust death penalty.

H.R. 115 expands the list of statutory aggravating factors in Federal death penalty cases to also include killing or targeting a law enforcement officer, firefighter, or other first responder.

Aggravating factors are specific factors that judges and juries consider in determining whether a sentence of

death is justified for the underlying offense. Passage of this bill would add a 17th statutory aggravating factor for Federal death penalty eligible offenses.

H.R. 115 has been rushed to the House floor, without a single hearing and without the opportunity to consider amendments directly relevant to whether our system of imposing the death penalty is fair, just, and reliable. Like most of my colleagues, I support measures that would actually protect our first responders, brave men and women who risk their lives every day to protect us.

Unfortunately, H.R. 115 not only fails to do this but would also exacerbate problems with the Federal death penalty.

First, H.R. 115 duplicates Federal and State laws that enhance sentences of persons convicted of crimes of violence against law enforcement. The very law the bill seeks to amend, 18 U.S.C. section 3592, already states that a crime against a high public official, including a judge, a law enforcement officer, or an employee of a United States penal or correctional institution, is an aggravating factor that may be considered in determining whether a death sentence should be imposed.

Other Federal laws also impose a life sentence or death on persons convicted of killing State and local law enforcement officers, or other employees assisting with Federal investigations, as well as officers of the United States courts.

Secondly, H.R. 115 does not address documented and systemic unfairness and racial unfairness in the disposition of the death penalty. Any legislation dealing with the Federal death penalty must also address numerous concerns related to racial disparity in application of capital punishment, the lack of qualified counsel and sufficient resources to represent those facing the death penalty, and faulty forensic "science" testimony ordered in support of convictions in death penalty cases.

The Federal death penalty, in particular, is rife with troubling evidence of racial disparity. For example, 36 of the 61 people currently on Federal death row are African American, Latino, Asian, or Native American.

If you break this down by Federal circuit, the results are even more disturbing. For example, 15 of 18 men who have received a Federal death sentence in the Fifth Circuit—Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi—in the modern era have been people of color.

Third, civil rights and civil liberties organizations oppose H.R. 115. Organizations committed to the protection of civil rights and civil liberties, including the NAACP, ACLU, and the LCCR, have noted that the Thin Blue Line Act "is an unnecessary and misguided attempt to politicize the unfortunate deaths of law enforcement officers and could ultimately exacerbate existing

tension between law enforcement and the communities they served."

□ 1500

And finally, H.R. 115 will not deter violence against police officers. By adding a 17th aggravating factor to the Federal death penalty statute, this legislation ignores scientific research regarding the ineffectiveness of capital punishment as a deterrent to crime.

It is important to note that the National Research Council of the National Academies has concluded that the studies claiming that the death penalty has a deterrent effect on murder rates are "fundamentally flawed" and should not be the basis of sound public policy.

Accordingly, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN), the chief sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding and for his incredible support for our Nation's law enforcement officers.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Thin Blue Line Act, legislation I have introduced to support our Nation's brave police officers, firefighters, and first responders.

This week, we recognize National Police Week, a time to reflect on the very professional service of our law enforcement officers and their families. It is also a time to honor the lives of those brave officers who were killed in the line of duty and made the ultimate sacrifice.

It is really a sad reality that attacks against law enforcement officers have skyrocketed in recent years. Their entire community endured an especially difficult and heartbreaking 2016. In fact, in the last year alone, police officer deaths from shootings have increased 56 percent, and ambush-style killings of law enforcement officers have increased a staggering 167 percent, nationally.

We need to send a very clear message: The intentional targeting and killing of our first responders will not be tolerated.

My bill, the Thin Blue Line Act, would make murder or attempted murder of a police officer, firefighter, or other first responder an aggravating factor in death penalty determinations. This bill will serve as a strong deterrent to anyone planning an attack against our brave men and women in uniform who protect and serve our communities.

We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to police officers and first responders across the country. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to help our American heroes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation which would expand the death penalty by adding a 17th aggravating factor—killing or targeting a police officer, probation officer, or firefighter—to the list of 16 aggravating factors already on the books.

Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for our Nation's public servants, our police, our firefighters, the men and women of the Armed Forces, our teachers, and our other government employees. They serve our Nation out of a sense of duty to our country and for the honor and privilege of helping others.

But I cannot, in good conscience, support the bill we have before us simply because its purported goal, though certainly not its result, is to protect our public safety officers. The legislation is unnecessary and duplicative since there are already extensive penalties at both the State and local level for the murder of law enforcement officers.

As we know, numerous studies have demonstrated that the death penalty is not an effective deterrent to crime in any event. Numerous studies have shown that what enhances the deterrent is certainty and swiftness of punishment, not severity of punishment. Therefore, adding the death penalty as a punishment is unlikely to prevent future violence against our police and our firefighters.

In addition, I believe the bill is counterproductive to our goal of improving law enforcement and community relations.

If you oppose the death penalty, as I do, because, in many cases, there is no appropriate access to counsel, which we know; because the death penalty has racial disparities in its application, which we know; and because, as we have seen over the past many years, there is a strong possibility of a wrongful conviction leading to the untenable situation of putting an innocent person to death, and we know that this has been done in my State and others, then you should oppose this bill and any bill expanding application of the death penalty which will result in innocent men and women being executed. This bill does nothing to correct any of these issues.

If you oppose the death penalty on moral and religious grounds, perhaps because you believe that all life is sacred and that the State should not sanction death as a punishment, then you should oppose this bill as well.

There is another fundamental objection to this bill. It is one thing to impose a death penalty for murder, bad as that is, or for any crime; it is another thing to impose a death penalty for attempted murder. This bill imposes the

death penalty for attempted murder of police, firefighters, and probation officers.

I am not aware that we have in the law, anywhere, a death penalty for an attempted crime; and here, we are establishing a death penalty for an attempt, an unsuccessful attempt. The bill imposes the death penalty on persons who "killed or attempted to kill."

So under this bill, if you aimed the gun, even if you did not hit the person or injure him in any way, the death penalty would be imposed. This is a fundamental change in the law for which we are given no reason at all.

The law has always recognized a distinction between a terrible act and an attempted terrible act. The attempted terrible act certainly should be punished, but not as severely as the accomplishment of the terrible act. Here, we are establishing a death penalty for an unsuccessful attempt to commit the crime, and no reason is given for this fundamental break with our legal traditions.

So, for all these reasons—this bill is unnecessary, duplicative, ineffective, counterproductive, and where it is new, excessive—I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) will control the time of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I would just briefly remind my colleague on the other side that this does not establish the death penalty for an attempted murder, as was just stated. There must be an underlying capital crime for which the defendant is convicted. That is what this bill does, and nothing more.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on July 7, 2016, while a demonstration was taking place in Dallas, Texas, and police officers were protecting the demonstrators, a sniper rang out shots. After the smoke cleared, five Dallas police officers were murdered, seven others were wounded, and civilians were wounded. The culprit was finally apprehended, and, because he would not give up without shooting, he was killed by the Dallas Police Department.

Ambush on police officers by citizens increased, for some reason, last year. Locally, in Houston, Texas, Chief Deputy Constable Clint Greenwood, a friend of mine, was walking into the courthouse at 7 a.m.; and as he is walking into the courthouse, a person comes up behind him and assassinates him, and he is killed. And that criminal was captured.

Attacks on law enforcement and all of the people that I mentioned were local or State police officers. They were not Federal officers.

Now, we talk about discrimination. Why does Federal law discriminate in punishment of outlaws in these type of death penalty situations by not allowing the same punishment if the person is a local or State police officer instead of a Federal police officer? I think that is wrong.

As stated by the other side, most cases are made by State or local officers, especially crimes of violence. What this bill does is not discriminate against police officers who are local or State because of their status in a death penalty case where an outlaw is charged with a capital offense, but it allows the outlaw to get the same punishment that an outlaw would get if they killed a Federal officer, which is the death penalty.

As a former judge for 22 years in criminal courts and a prosecutor, I believe in the death penalty, and here is the reason why: Some people deserve it. They deserve it for what they did, and that is why society should have the death penalty.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I hadn't planned to speak again, but a gentleman on the other side was just completely incorrect in what he said, and I have the bill here.

The bill does establish the death penalty for attempted killing, and here is the language. The bill is very short. It says:

The law is amended by inserting after paragraph 16 the following:

Paragraph 17, killing or targeting of law enforcement officer.

A. The defendant killed or attempted to kill, in the circumstance described in subparagraph B, a police officer, etc.

And B says:

The circumstance referred to in subparagraph A is that the person was killed or targeted while he was engaged in performance of his duties, basically.

So this implies the death penalty lists, as an additional aggravating factor for the death penalty, someone who killed or attempted to kill a police officer, a probation officer, a firefighter while they were engaged in their duties—killed or attempted to kill. That is what it means when it says killing or targeting. Targeting means attempting to kill.

It is very clear. You cannot misread this. Maybe the drafter made a mistake, but it is very clear. This applies the death penalty to someone who kills or attempts to kill. It is the first instance I know of in the entire corpus of American law where an attempted murder, attempted killing, an attempted anything is given the death penalty.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I would just rise, once again, to correct my colleague. It is an aggra-

vating factor that is to be considered by a jury as one of many factors postconviction.

So what you are saying is not 100 percent accurate. We can engage in semantics, but we will agree to disagree on that point.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the House, this week, is taking action to support our law enforcement officers and their families as we mark National Police Week.

We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to law enforcement officers at all levels: State and local police officers, sheriffs, firefighters, first responders, and our Federal agents. They all put their lives on the line to keep this country and our communities safe.

Congress must always ensure that our law enforcement agencies have the proper tools and resources to get the job done, and I am honored to play a role in this important work through my service on the Judiciary Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittee for Commerce, Justice, and Science.

But, Mr. Speaker, law enforcement officers need more than equipment and funding. They need our support. They need our support because they are under attack. The last few years have seen a disturbing uptick in the instances of police being targeted by violent criminals just because they are wearing a badge.

According to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, at least 64 police officers were shot and killed in the line of duty last year, 21 of which were ambush-style killings. Attacks in Dallas, Baton Rouge, Chicago, and other places were chilling reminders of the dangers these brave individuals face when they go to work.

It is time to send a clear, strong message: If you kill a law enforcement officer, you will be brought to justice and punished to the full extent of the law. That is why I am proud to support H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act.

Under current law, killing a Federal law enforcement officer is an aggravating factor when considering a death sentence for the offender, just as it should be. However, the same deterrent and prosecution is not extended to State and local police officers, firefighters, or first responders. The Thin Blue Line Act would change this by making the murder of local law enforcement an aggravating factor when considering a death sentence.

Mr. Speaker, had this provision been in place just 4 years ago, it would have applied to the Boston bombing case when the bombers killed a local campus officer. It would also apply when State and local officers serve on joint law enforcement task forces.

States all over the country are taking action to support law enforcement

through stronger protection for officers and stricter penalties for criminals, and I believe Congress should do the same.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

□ 1515

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I must again correct the gentleman on the other side. The underlying title 18 is the criminal code. It lists a series of crimes and a series of penalties, and then you have a list of aggravating factors, which make the death penalty mandatory if any of them are present. There are 16 aggravating factors. This is number 17 and adds an aggravating factor; and when this aggravating factor is present, the death penalty is mandatory.

Among the things this aggravating factor says, is "attempt." So it is the first death penalty—for that matter, it is the first death penalty, mandatory or not, for an attempt, as opposed to an actual killing. Even if it weren't mandatory, we should not have a death penalty for an attempt. You should have a severe penalty, but a death penalty should be reserved for actual murder and such crimes, not for an attempt. Attempt is always punished more leniently than the actual accomplishment of the heinous act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to correct my colleague. I guess we can do this all day, but I do actually have a copy of the criminal code in front of me, and I would refer him to 18 U.S.C. section 3591(b)(2), where it lists very specifically and expressly that attempts to kill are listed in the sentence of death.

I refer you to that provision, and it is not mandatory. The jury can determine whether the aggravating factors outweigh the mitigating factors, or in the absence of any mitigating factors, whether the aggravating factors alone justify a death sentence.

So I feel that we are engaging in an exercise of semantics, but it is important that we don't misportray what this bill would accomplish and what it would do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the men and women of law enforcement whose selfless service to a noble cause fills me with humble gratitude.

Being a law enforcement officer requires more than training. It requires sacrifice, devotion, integrity, and honor. Most importantly, it requires an unshakeable faith in the value and importance in the rule of law.

What keeps our civil society from a descent into lawlessness and chaos? What separates civilization from savagery?

It is a thin blue line—these men and women of law enforcement, who give their blood, sweat, tears, and sometimes their lives in order to protect and serve communities; who make the country a safer place, one street, one neighborhood, and one community at a time.

As a society, our laws enshrine freedom, our security, and our liberty. They uphold America's promise of innate fairness. But for their service and devotion to our great Nation, our law enforcement officers are often criticized and scorned by some they serve. Yet, through it all, they continue to serve and protect.

Too often these brave men and women are targets of violence, which is why I support the Thin Blue Line Act. An attack on law enforcement is an attack on the freedom of the United States of America, and it cannot be tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, some have spoken out in opposition to the death penalty in this discussion, and they would say only God can judge. And while that is true, certainly the United States Government can do a better job setting up the meeting.

So today I rise in support of heroes, and I hope my colleagues will do the same.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Michigan for his yielding and for his leadership and for the pleasure that I have in working on the Judiciary Committee. Let me thank the chairman and Members as well, particularly working on the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee, of which this underlying bill comes to the floor on.

This is a very important week, Mr. Speaker. It is National Police Week. A number of our constituents have been here, and we have had the opportunity to hear from a number of outstanding leaders: a sheriff from Los Angeles County; the sheriff from South Carolina; the police department leader from Houston, Texas; and the head of the FOP.

So I think that we have had a good week in terms of hearings in the Judiciary Committee, and certainly this past Monday we honored those who tragically ascended to the memorial wall where we honor police from across the Nation.

So I think it is important to put on the record that none of us, I would hope—I certainly don't—take a back seat to the respect, admiration, and the work that we do to keep our law enforcement and first responders safe. We commend them for their service as we continue to work on police and community working together.

We also are grateful for those who are engaged in enhanced community

relations as well as working with diverse communities.

So let me acknowledge individuals from Houston that we have lost: Assistant Deputy Chief Clint Greenwood; Officer Richard K. Martin; Harris County Sheriff's Deputy Darren Goforth.

We lost Jerry Ronald Walker of Little Elm Police Department.

Then officers who died in Dallas: Officer Brent Thompson, Sergeant Michael Smith, Senior Corporal Lorne Ahrens, Officer Patricio Zamarripa, and Officer Michael Krol.

I have had the chance to work with a number of chiefs of police, including Chief Lee P. Brown, one of the first police chiefs in Houston that I was able to work with as I began to engage publicly; Chief McClelland; now Chief Acevedo; and chiefs in-between.

I particularly thank them for working with the community during stressful times, during times when violence was evidenced out in the community; not against police, but against communities—keeping the peace, if you will, as we tried to work together.

So I support policies that are necessary, and I certainly support the idea of protecting our law enforcement. Of course, the underlying bill has that provision and indicates a protection of law enforcement officers. In actuality, it provides the opportunity for the protection as well as the utilization of the death penalty.

This particular legislation continues to want to add aggravating factors, making it 17. If we had a hearing and if we were able to determine that this would actually have an impact, there would be reason to at least have a vigorous debate over whether there is an impact or not.

But H.R. 115 is a duplicative bill and unnecessary because under 18 U.S.C. 3592(c), there already exists mechanisms that achieve the goal of punishing by death a defendant who kills a law enforcement officer or first responder.

First of all, it should be stated that the bill is based upon underlying offenses, drug offenses. There is a whole myriad of actual laws that are Federal criminal offenses, and if a death occurs under that Federal criminal offense, then you are eligible for the death penalty.

Let me cite as an example the Boston Marathon terrorists act and the killing of the MIT officer who was killed. The Federal prosecutor was able to take that case to the Federal court and to pursue a death penalty because it was pursuant to a terrorist act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The most heinous tragedy of those who were lost in

9/11, the mourning of firefighters, first responders, and law enforcement who lost their lives, certainly there is no doubt that that was a heinous terrorist act. If those terrorists had lived—there would have been firefighters and first responders included, and their deaths would have been, in essence, tried under the Federal death penalty; and those heinous perpetrators would have been tried, given capital punishment, if the jury had convicted them—there probably was no doubt—and ultimately might have seen their end through the exercise of the death penalty.

That is, I think, clearing up that we are standing here adding any measure of difference to this particular legislation. If the act falls under Federal criminal laws, you can be, or the murderer of you can be, in fact, charged with a Federal death penalty.

On the other hand, if you go into a burning building and, unfortunately, the owner of the building—or there is some unfortunate incident and you are shot as a firefighter, you do not fall under this statute. That is not a Federal offense, but you can fall under your State death penalty cases.

Why would we be concerned about this idea of additional death penalties?

Let me cite for you the case of *Buck v. Davis*, where the death penalty verdict was based merely on whether the defendant is likely to commit acts of violence in the future, and a psychologist opined that being Black did increase the probability. The trial court reasoned that: “introduction of any mention of race was *de minimis*.” In other words, insignificant, completely ignoring that the largest number of individuals that go to their death are African Americans. Thank goodness for the Supreme Court and the reasoning of Chief Justice Roberts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Justice Roberts stated for the court in reversing the lower court: “Some toxins can be deadly in small doses.”

Likewise, in the *Gregg v. Georgia* case, decided after *Furman*, the court held that if death penalty is mandatory, such that no permission for mercy is granted, and where capital punishment is based on characteristics of the offender, then it is unconstitutional and “arbitrary and capricious.”

The underlying bill has mandatory death penalties. It will cover first responders if they are killed pursuant to Federal crimes. We are standing here, not adding anything to the underlying bill. First responders are protected. Law enforcement are protected.

I would hate to see any of them lose their life, but under a Federal crime, their case will be tried as a death penalty case. In other instances, it will be

tried by State law. We respect these heroes and heroines. It is shameful if we use that to add another aggravating element to the death penalty, and continue to discriminate based on race.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to first acknowledge and commend the law enforcement community throughout our country that work tirelessly to help protect and serve our communities.

I especially want to thank Chief Acevedo for his leadership, commitment to Houston, and for his vision on unifying communities through police relations with the people they take an oath to serve and protect.

As we celebrate police week, I would like to take a moment to thank and honor all the officers that served selflessly and died in the line of duty.

Especially, Assistant Deputy Chief Clinton Greenwood of Harris County Constable's Office-Precinct 3, TX, died on 4/3/17;

Officer Richard K. Martin of Houston Police Dept., died on 5/18/15;

Deputy Sheriff of Harris County Sheriff office, Darren Goforth, 8/28/15;

And Detective Jerry Ronald Walker of Little Elm Police Dept., TX, died 1/17/17 and the five officers killed in Dallas, TX on 7/7/16—Brent Thompson, Sgt. Michael Smith, Sr. Corporal Lorne Ahrens, Officer Patrick Zamarripa, and Officer Michael Krol.

Additionally, I would like to acknowledge Houston's former Chief, Lee P. Brown who laid the strong foundation for HPD's strong community liaison practices with all communities; Harris County Sheriff Ed Gonzalez; Alan Rosen, Harris County Constable, Precinct 1 and all of our other men and women in uniform.

I know personally the level of stress and challenges posed, because I have many friends that have and are currently serving my Congressional district in Houston and our country very well and with great distinction.

I support our policies that are necessary, so long as we are doing so with fairness, in accordance with our Constitution, and in a manner that is not duplicative of statutory measures already in place.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 115 imposes the death penalty for the killing or targeting of law enforcement officers, firefighters, and first responders as a 17th aggravated factor for homicide.

Although this bill is presented as a proposal to protect police officers and first responders, it does much more.

H.R. 115 is duplicative and unnecessary because under 18 U.S.C. 3592(c), there already exists mechanisms that achieve the goal of punishing by death, a defendant who kills a law enforcement officer or first responders.

Prosecutors are already armed with prosecutorial discretion to seek capital punishment in death penalty cases as demonstrated in the cases below:

U.S. v. Ronell Wilson—2 NY City detectives were killed during a gun sting operation. Defendant was sentenced to death.

U.S. v. Donzell McCauley—a Washington, DC police officer was killed and defendant received a sentence of life without parole.

U.S. v. Kenneth Wilk—a deputy sheriff was killed while attempting to serve a search war-

rant; defendant was sentenced to life without parole.

U.S. v. Kenneth Barrett—a state law enforcement officer was killed during a drug raid, defendant was sentenced to death.

LaShawn Casey, an undercover police officer was killed in a carjacking related to a drug transaction; a capital jury sentenced the defendant to life without the possibility of parole.

These cases illustrate that prosecutors have the discretion under the current law to seek the death penalty. By adding a 17th aggravated factor under the vague, arbitrary and capricious language of H.R. 115, we are heading down a dangerous path.

Please take note that the death toll of firefighters/first responders reported by the National Fire Protection Association illustrates a drastic decline in deaths overall, most of which were fire and accident related.

The statistics available do not support the need for this duplicative measure in H.R. 115.

This bill does nothing to protect our law enforcement or to ensure public safety; instead, it raises constitutional questions as to its validity because “targeting law enforcement” is substantially vague language that will subject many innocent lives to death, based purely on their desire to exercise their First Amendment rights about the well-documented racial disparity in treatment throughout our communities.

We must ensure that we do not create legislation of broad scope and vagueness that will have a chilling effect on an insular group.

H.R. 115 is laced with a discriminatory effect that will trigger strict scrutiny under the 14th Amendment, and open the gateway for draconian habeas laws.

This bill will create a slippery slope, further adding to recent turbulence caused by Attorney General Jeff Session's memo and destroying whatever trust remains between law enforcement and communities.

This bill sends troubling messages around the world about how we view and measure life in America in this 21st century.

It is time to get serious about this epidemic and not hide behind vague language because ‘all’ lives matter, blue, black, brown, white.

Mr. Speaker, while some may say that any adverse effects of the bill before us are *de minimis*, and thus, will not severely impact the racial disparity found in the use of the death penalty, it is neither the amount of words in this bill nor the amount of time used to utter them that is significant; rather, it is the discriminatory effect that will result in communities disproportionately impacted by the death penalty.

Let us take for example, the case of *Buck v. Davis*, 580 U.S. ____ (2017) where the death penalty verdict was based merely on ‘whether defendant is likely to commit acts of violence in the future’ and a psychologist opined that being black did increase the probability. The trial court reasoned that “introduction of any mention of race was *de minimis*,” in other words, insignificant.

As Chief Justice John Roberts stated for the Court in reversing the lower court: “Some toxins can be deadly in small doses.”

Likewise, in *Gregg v. GA*, which was decided after *Furman* (invalidated death penalty across the country), the court held if death

penalty is mandatory, such that no permission for mercy is granted, and where capital punishment is based on characteristics of the offender, then it is unconstitutional and "arbitrary and capricious."

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 115 is extremely deadly because it is arbitrary and capricious, imposing the death penalty based solely on the status of the victim.

The death penalty is already available both at the state and federal level and is reserved for matters of extraordinary circumstances.

While we want to ensure that law enforcement officers, firefighters and first responders received protection as they protect our communities, we cannot and should not attempt to do so by weighing the worth of lives and arbitrarily impose the death penalty based on our measuring sticks of who should live and who should die.

H.R. 115 will undoubtedly contribute to the continuation of well-documented and pervasive racial disparities in the imposition of the death penalty.

Since 1976 only 20 white prisoners have been executed for the murder of an African American victim, while an alarming 286 African American prisoners have been executed for the death of white victims, and 42% of African Americans currently remain on death row.

Death penalty generally, has been criticized over the years by legal scholars and by Supreme Court Justices who have opined in several instances, that 'the death penalty violates the Eighth Amendment, which prohibits cruel and unusual punishment.'

Even in 1958, when the Court first explicitly spoke about the death penalty as having constitutional challenges, it said in *Trop v. Dulles*, "the Eighth Amendment's Cruel and Unusual Punishment clause must draw its meaning from the 'evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society' rather than from its original meaning."

Mr. Speaker, there is no argument that we have evolved and matured significantly since we first implemented the death penalty in the 1600s and thus, we must evaluate cautiously, laws that seek to further advance this flawed, astronomically costly and unjust practice.

Tax payers currently spend \$740,000 for cases without the death penalty, while cases where the death penalty is sought cost \$1.26 million. Maintaining each death row prisoner costs taxpayers \$90,000 more per year than a prisoner in general population.

Capital punishment does not work; it is discriminatory and is used disproportionately against the poor, minorities and members of racial, ethnic and religious communities.

Since the U.S. Supreme Court reinstated the death penalty in 1976, 82% of all executions have occurred in the South (37% in Texas alone), which contributed to the United States status as one of five countries in the world to account for the most executions in 2012.

FBI data has shown that the death penalty is not a deterrent and in fact, 14 states without capital punishment in 2008, had homicide rates at or below the national rate.

Taking another life does not stop violence.

Like mandatory minimums, public opinion for the death penalty is currently at its lowest with a 42% opposition, evidenced in a 2016

Pew Research report, which found that the U.S. now dropped to number seven worldwide in countries accountable for the most executions.

Mr. Speaker, over two-thirds of the world's countries have abolished the death penalty either in law or practice, and the U.S. is the only Western country that still uses the death penalty.

Even family members of murder victims and other individuals who have witnessed live executions of death row inmates, particularly, in the recent botched and questionable executions, have called for a repeal of this practice and ask instead for alternative sentencing.

In fact the death penalty solves nothing, and may even perpetuate the suffering of the parents, children, or siblings left behind.

We do not need to expand the use of the death penalty where public opinion is at its lowest, but instead, implement sound and practical legislation that will save lives of our officers and the people they serve.

This measure is what public opinion suggests.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There are two important very brief points for correction. I respect the gentlewoman from Texas, but she just suggested to us that this would be a duplicative law; thus, unnecessary because, as she cited the Federal criminal code, she says that law enforcement officers are already covered by the law.

However, I would refer her attention to 18 U.S.C. Section 3592(c)(14), and then subsection (d), where it clearly says in a capital letter, "a Federal law enforcement officer."

So it is important to note that the existing Federal law does not cover State and local officers, which this bill would and, thereby, is one of the things that necessitates this action.

Also, I want to point out, respectfully, that that same criminal code—just one-page later in section 3593, also in title 18, subsection (f)—says: "Special Precaution to Ensure Against Discrimination."

We know that Federal law already provides that a jury must specifically find that a defendant's race, color, sex, religion, national origin, or that of the victim, is not a factor in their decision.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last November, Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, Police Officer Scott Bashioum was shot and killed as he and his partner responded to a domestic disturbance call. They were ambushed as they approached the home. Officer Bashioum was also a United States Air Force veteran. He retired as a senior master sergeant with 29 years of service.

He will be remembered for his service both in the Canonsburg community as a police officer, and to the country as a veteran.

Mr. Speaker, when our brothers and sisters are killed in the line of duty, we can memorialize them by building monuments. We can remember them by renaming buildings. We can support them by raising funds to help their widows and their orphaned children.

□ 1530

But most importantly, we can make sure we do all we can so that they return home at the end of their watch and that we protect their right to raise their children and their children's right to be raised by them. The community needs to know that we do all we can to make sure that thin blue line does not break and that thin blue line does not bend. We need to work together as a nation to protect those who protect the safety of all of us.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, every day, courageous men and women in America's law enforcement leave the safety of their homes to go into volatile situations, not knowing whether or not they will even return home safely. These brave police officers and first responders have dedicated their lives to ensuring our safety, as well as the safety of our neighborhoods and communities. I honor these fearless men and women and recognize the sacrifice they and their families make.

But merely saying thank you is not enough. The Thin Blue Line Act will protect law enforcement officials by giving harsher penalties to criminals targeting the police and first responders who put their lives on the line daily to protect and defend us.

It is my duty and privilege to support efforts that give our dedicated law enforcement officials the best possible chance of coming home safely every day. Mr. Speaker, this is how I can show my gratitude. Each House Member should join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Louisiana has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear that we are all in support of the protection of our officers. I think that there is no competition on sympathy or wanting to appropriately assure that those who go up against our officers in a vile and violent manner would be brought to justice.

I think the point on race disparity as relates to the death penalty is relevant. It is about life. But I want to make it very clear: Under this underlying bill, our officers who are State

police officers are protected already, including the example that I used about the MIT officer in the Boston Marathon terrorist act. It is if you are in the furtherance of a Federal crime. The bill itself is all Federal. You have to be engaged in an act that is a Federal crime.

Clearly, if the terrorists on 9/11 had lived, the cases of the firefighters who lost their lives certainly would have been tried—those cases of the tragic, heinous deaths of firefighters who are our friends, and certainly are my friends—under the Federal death penalty law.

In the case of *U.S. v. Kenneth Barrett*, a State law enforcement officer was killed during a drug raid. That is one of the underlying offenses. The defendant was sentenced to death.

In the case of Lashaun Casey, an undercover police officer was killed in a carjacking related to a drug transaction. A capital jury decided to sentence the defendant to life without the possibility of parole, but it was a capital jury.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. And so I want to honor them, too, but I also want to show the disparities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the very valuable point that Chief Justice Roberts made in the particular case of *Buck v. Davis* and the statistical documentation of the disparities in the death penalty cases. We cannot ignore it.

Chief Justice Roberts stated before the Court, in reversing the lower court, “some toxins can be deadly in small doses,” when the district court wanted to ignore or diminish the fact that race was involved in this case.

A psychologist had the audacity to say that being Black did increase the probability that you would commit an act of violence prospectively. How sad is that?

We are saddened by the death of our officers, but we are already protecting them and the first responders. Pursuant to a Federal criminal act, the prosecutor, at their discretion, can charge the defendant with a death penalty case.

I just hope my colleagues will recognize that we are not divided in our love, affection, and respect for the men and women that serve as first responders and law enforcement throughout this Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to speak on the floor today not only in support of H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act, but also in honor of all of our brave men and women who put their lives on the line every single day to keep our communities safe.

I am the son of a first responder myself. My father was critically injured and permanently disabled in the line of duty. I know these sacrifices very well.

This country owes our law enforcement officers an extraordinary debt of gratitude for the many services they provide. Our Nation simply would not be what it is today were it not for the sacrifices of all those who take the oath to protect and to serve us.

The Thin Blue Line Act is simple: It seeks to expand on certain penalties to also include the murder or targeting of a State or local law enforcement officer.

Virtually every American—anyone of good conscience—is shocked and disgusted by the recent trend of our local law enforcement heroes being targeted for violent acts.

I am sad to report that, in my home State of Louisiana, we have been named the most dangerous State in America for law enforcement officers. It is shocking. It is true. It saddens all of us. The Thin Blue Line Act is a commonsense response to this epidemic that we are seeing across the culture.

We thank and we stand with our first responders back home in Louisiana and all across our Nation. Those dedicated public servants never question and never hesitate in the face of danger. As many people have analogized this, we consider them our sheepdogs. They protect our communities from the wolves of our society who prey upon the innocent.

To honor those sacrifices, I am proud, today, to support this legislation on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter addressed to Mr. GOODLATTE and myself, and I want to read the first paragraph of it.

“Dear Chairman Goodlatte and Ranking Member Conyers:

“We are current and former law enforcement leaders and officers from jurisdictions across the country. We ask you to oppose H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act. We do so because we believe this bill will do little to protect the lives of police and first responders and will drive away resources proven to be effective at protecting law enforcement and preventing and solving crime.”

APRIL 26, 2017.

Re Law Enforcement Opposition to H.R. 115.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, JR.,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE AND RANKING MEMBER CONYERS: We are current and former law enforcement leaders and officers from jurisdictions across the country. We ask you to oppose H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act. We do so because we believe this bill will do lit-

tle to protect the lives of police and first responders and will drive away resources proven to be effective at protecting law enforcement and preventing and solving crime.

We are all too familiar with the risks that local, state, and federal law enforcement and first responders take each day to prevent, investigate, and prosecute crime. In fact, some of us have served alongside colleagues who were killed in the line of duty. We understand the impulse to threaten those who have murdered our fellow officers with the death penalty, and some of us have experienced that desire directly.

But we also know that the death penalty, as it currently operates, is poor public policy. It is ineffective, expensive, and can make irrevocable mistakes. It is also used disparately and often on vulnerable populations, which undermines our ability to create effective and trusted relationships with those in the community on whose support our success depends. That is why, while some of us may philosophically support the death penalty, we all oppose its expansion in practice—even under the auspices of supporting law enforcement.

Each of us understands that it takes many and varied resources to keep our communities safe. We need strong partnerships with local government and the communities we serve. We need well-functioning and modern systems to collect, store and process police activities, crime data, and evidence. We need equipment to protect and assist officers as they perform their duties. One tool virtually never seen on our list of needs is the death penalty.

In short, we believe H.R. 115 is an unnecessary expansion of an already flawed and ineffective policy. We encourage you to oppose this bill and instead support measures that promote the overall health, safety, and welfare of law enforcement and the communities we have been sworn to protect.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

James Abbott, Chief, West Orange (NJ) Police Department (1997–Present).

John Breckenridge, Officer, Manchester (NH) Police Department (ret.).

James Davidsaver, Emergency Management Director, Lancaster County, Nebraska; former captain, Lincoln (NE) Police Department.

Neill Franklin, Baltimore Police Department (2000–2010); Maryland State Police (1976–1999).

Gerald Galloway, Chief, Southern Pines (NC) Police Department (1988–2005); Past President, North Carolina Chiefs of Police Association; former Executive Committee member, IACP.

Terence Inch, Professor of Criminal Justice, York College of Pennsylvania; Former Commissioner of Police, Hellam Township (PA); Former Detective Chief Inspector, New Scotland Yard, London.

George Kain, Ph.D., Police commissioner, Ridgefield, CT; Division of Justice and Law Administration at Western Connecticut State University.

Douglas Orr, Ph.D., Adjunct Professor, Champlain College (2009–present); Adjunct Professor, Gonzaga University (2006–present); Detective, Spokane (WA) Police Department (1996–present); Corporal, Idaho State Police (1992–1996); Patrol Officer, Greenville (SC) Police Department (1987–1992).

Norman Stamper, Chief, Seattle Police Department (1994–2000); San Diego Police Department (1966–1994).

James Trainum, Detective, Washington Metropolitan Police Department (1983–2010).

David Walchak, Deputy Assistant Director (Ret.) FBI (2000–2004), Sr. Advisor FBI (1999–2000), Sr. Policy Advisor USDOJ COPS Office (1997–1999), Chief of Police (Ret.) Concord, NH (1975–1997), President, International Association of Chiefs of Police (1995–1996).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like all of my colleagues to recognize that, during our observation of National Police Week, we are reminded again of the importance of ensuring that law enforcement officers are safe so they can carry out their duties effectively.

These kinds of “enhancement” bills like H.R. 115 do nothing to invest in officer wellness or to address the everyday challenges faced by police officers or first responders. Moreover, they are redundant, especially because there are laws that protect police officers and first responders from violence in all 50 States.

Rather than advancing a bill that amounts to an empty gesture, that is damaging, at best, this Congress should focus on real reform measures that will protect law enforcement, first responders, and their communities. Providing duplicative protections to law enforcement simply cannot counterbalance the impact of fundamentally flawed death penalty legislation.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard many arguments from the other side of the aisle in opposition to this legislation. Of course, they began by saying how much they support the men and women of law enforcement. But let’s consider these arguments and decide for ourselves in closing here.

First, we heard that the legislation is duplicative. It is not. In fact, it closes a loophole that currently exists in Federal law. There is currently no provision in our Federal law stating that the killing of a State or local law enforcement officer shall be an aggravating factor for capital punishment.

Next, we heard that this legislation is unnecessary. It is not, unless you believe that State and local law enforcement officers are not somehow entitled to the same legal protections currently enjoyed by Federal officers. That is what this legislation would correct.

A third argument we heard is that this is a messaging bill. It is clearly not that. Though it may be true that this provision would apply in a limited number of cases because the vast majority of capital cases are prosecuted at the State level, this bill inserts a provision in Federal law that will be vitally important in the cases where it would be applicable, such as in the Boston bombing.

On that point, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have noted that Federal law al-

ready contains provisions to ensure criminals who carry out heinous acts such as the Boston terrorism attacks are dealt with appropriately. That is, of course, true, but saying that ignores the suffering of families of fallen police officers who have lost their lives rushing to aid after such an attack.

It also ignores the sacrifice of law enforcement officers themselves, for example. Officer Sean Collier of the MIT Police Department is one example. He was murdered by the Tsarnaev brothers during their flight following their horrific act.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, what these arguments reveal is simply that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle oppose this bill because it amends a Federal death penalty statute.

We would point out, in response to the letter that was just entered into the RECORD, that we have received support letters that are already in the RECORD from numerous law enforcement organizations, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the Major County Sheriffs of America, the National Association of Police Organizations, and the Sergeants Benevolent Association of the NYPD, among many, many others across the country who believe that this is an appropriate step for us to take today.

In light of all that, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject the arguments of the other side, to support the men and women who comprise the thin blue line between order and chaos in our society, and to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act. This bill unnecessarily expands the federal death penalty, and does not further the laudable goal of bringing justice to the law enforcement officers who make the ultimate sacrifice for our safety and security.

The United States is in the minority of countries that still use the death penalty, and Americans’ opposition to it has increased in recent decades, particularly as social scientists better understand the disparate effects of the death penalty on minority populations. A sentence of death is disproportionately used in cases involving defendants of color. According to U.S. Department of Justice, in 2011, 41.7 percent of all death row inmates were African American, despite only making up 13.1 percent of the population. Furthermore, since 1973, 159 people who were sentenced to death were later exonerated. There is no doubt that innocent individuals have been put to death in the United States—a fact that must not be ignored in a country that values justice under the law.

I greatly respect and appreciate our law enforcement community. Local police, firefighters, and first responders put their lives on the line every single day to protect people in Oregon and across the country. Those criminals who target and murder police officers have no place in our society. Nothing in cur-

rent law prevents those individuals from being prosecuted to the highest extent of the law, and to receive a sentence of death. Under current law, there are 16 aggravating factors that can be considered during criminal sentencing, and the federal government can allege the targeting or killing of a law enforcement officer—federal, state, or local—as an aggravating factor when considering the death penalty. This bill creates a 17th aggravating factor that is duplicative of existing law.

I will continue to do all I can to support our law enforcement officers, particularly the admirable men and women who serve our communities in northwest Oregon. This bill, however, is an unnecessary expansion of the death penalty, and I therefore cannot support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 323, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 3 o’clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1556

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HILL) at 3 o’clock and 56 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 115; and

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1892.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

THIN BLUE LINE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 115) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 271, nays 143, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

YEAS—271

Abraham	Emmer	Latta
Aderholt	Estes (KS)	Lawson (FL)
Aguilar	Farenthold	Lewis (MN)
Allen	Faso	Lipinski
Amodel	Ferguson	LoBiondo
Arrington	Fitzpatrick	Long
Babin	Fleischmann	Loudermilk
Bacon	Flores	Love
Banks (IN)	Fortenberry	Lucas
Barletta	Fox	Luetkemeyer
Barr	Franks (AZ)	Lynch
Barton	Frelinghuysen	MacArthur
Bera	Gaetz	Maloney, Sean
Bergman	Gallagher	Marchant
Biggs	Garamendi	Marino
Bilirakis	Garrett	Marshall
Bishop (GA)	Gibbs	Mast
Bishop (MI)	Gonzalez (TX)	McCarthy
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	McCaul
Black	Gosar	McClintock
Blackburn	Gottheimer	McHenry
Blum	Gowdy	McKinley
Bost	Granger	McMorris
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	Rodgers
Brat	Graves (LA)	McSally
Bridenstine	Graves (MO)	Meadows
Brooks (AL)	Green, Gene	Meehan
Brooks (IN)	Griffith	Meng
Buchanan	Grothman	Messer
Buck	Guthrie	Moolenaar
Bucshon	Harper	Mooney (WV)
Budd	Harris	Mullin
Burgess	Hartzler	Murphy (FL)
Bustos	Heck	Murphy (PA)
Byrne	Hensarling	Noem
Calvert	Herrera Beutler	Norcross
Carbajal	Hice, Jody B.	Nunes
Carter (GA)	Higgins (LA)	O'Halleran
Carter (TX)	Higgins (NY)	O'Rourke
Cartwright	Hill	Olson
Castor (FL)	Holding	Palazzo
Chabot	Hollingsworth	Palmer
Cheney	Hudson	Panetta
Coffman	Huizenga	Pascarell
Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Paulsen
Collins (NY)	Hunter	Pearce
Comer	Hurd	Perlmutter
Comstock	Issa	Perry
Conaway	Jenkins (KS)	Peters
Cook	Jenkins (WV)	Peterson
Correa	Johnson (LA)	Pittenger
Costa	Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)
Costello (PA)	Jones	Poliquin
Cramer	Jordan	Posey
Crist	Joyce (OH)	Quigley
Cuellar	Katko	Ratcliffe
Culberson	Kelly (MS)	Reed
Davidson	Kelly (PA)	Reichert
Davis, Rodney	Kilmer	Renacci
Demings	Kind	Rice (SC)
Denham	King (IA)	Roby
Dent	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
DeSantis	Kinzing	Rogers (AL)
DesJarlais	Knight	Rogers (KY)
Deutch	Krishnamoorthi	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff (TN)	Rokita
Donovan	Labrador	Rooney, Francis
Duffy	LaHood	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Rosen
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Roskam
Dunn	Lance	Ross

Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)

Smucker
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner

Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—143

Adams
Amash
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cardenas
Carson (IN)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)

Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Hastings
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Mitchell

Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Chaffetz
Cole
Crawford
Curbelo (FL)
Gohmert
Gutiérrez
Johnson, Sam
McEachin
Napolitano
Newhouse
Rooney, Thomas
J.

Russell
Sessions
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Wilson (FL)

□ 1620

Ms. PINGREE and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. HIGGINS of New York, TIP-TON, and CARBAJAL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 265.

Stated against:

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 265.

HONORING HOMETOWN HEROES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1892) to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 266]

YEAS—411

Abraham	Cárdenas	Deutch
Adams	Carson (IN)	Diaz-Balart
Aderholt	Carter (GA)	Dingell
Aguilar	Carter (TX)	Doggett
Allen	Cartwright	Donovan
Amash	Castor (FL)	Doyle, Michael
Amodel	Castro (TX)	F.
Arrington	Chabot	Duffy
Babin	Cheney	Duncan (SC)
Bacon	Chu, Judy	Duncan (TN)
Banks (IN)	Cicilline	Dunn
Barletta	Clark (MA)	Ellison
Barr	Clarke (NY)	Emmer
Barragan	Clay	Engel
Barton	Cleaver	Eshoo
Bass	Clyburn	Español
Beatty	Coffman	Estes (KS)
Bera	Cohen	Esty (CT)
Bergman	Collins (GA)	Evans
Beyer	Collins (NY)	Farenthold
Biggs	Comer	Faso
Bilirakis	Comstock	Ferguson
Bishop (GA)	Conaway	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (MI)	Connolly	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Conyers	Flores
Black	Cook	Fortenberry
Blackburn	Cooper	Foster
Blum	Correa	Fox
Blumenauer	Costa	Frankel (FL)
Blunt Rochester	Costello (PA)	Franks (AZ)
Bonamici	Courtney	Frelinghuysen
Bost	Cramer	Fudge
Boyle, Brendan	Crist	Gabbard
F.	Crowley	Gaetz
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Gallagher
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Gallego
Brat	Cummings	Garamendi
Bridenstine	Davidson	Garrett
Brooks (AL)	Davis (CA)	Gibbs
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Danny	Gonzalez (TX)
Brown (MD)	Davis, Rodney	Goodlatte
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Gosar
Buchanan	DeGette	Gottheimer
Bucshon	Delaney	Gowdy
Budd	DeLauro	Granger
Burgess	DeBene	Graves (GA)
Bustos	Demings	Graves (LA)
Butterfield	Denham	Graves (MO)
Byrne	Dent	Green, Al
Calvert	DeSantis	Green, Gene
Capuano	DeSaulnier	Griffith
Carbajal	DesJarlais	Grothman

Guthrie	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)	Grijalva	Newhouse	Sessions
Hanabusa	Marchant	Sánchez	Gutiérrez	Noem	Swalwell (CA)
Harper	Marino	Sanford	Johnson, Sam	Rooney, Thomas	Walker
Harris	Marshall	Sarbanes	McEachin	J.	
Hartzler	Massie	Scalise	Napolitano	Russell	
Heck	Mast	Schakowsky			
Hensarling	Matsui	Schiff			
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy	Schneider			
Hice, Jody B.	McCaul	Schrader			
Higgins (LA)	McClintock	Schweikert			
Higgins (NY)	McCollum	Scott (VA)			
Hill	McGovern	Scott, Austin			
Himes	McHenry	Scott, David			
Holding	McKinley	Sensenbrenner			
Hollingsworth	McMorris	Serrano			
Hoyer	Rodgers	Sewell (AL)			
Hudson	McNerney	Shea-Porter			
Huffman	McSally	Sherman			
Huizenga	Meadows	Shimkus			
Hultgren	Meehan	Shuster			
Hunter	Meeks	Simpson			
Hurd	Meng	Sinema			
Issa	Messer	Sires			
Jackson Lee	Mitchell	Slaughter			
Jayapal	Moolenaar	Smith (MO)			
Jeffries	Mooney (WV)	Smith (NE)			
Jenkins (KS)	Moore	Smith (NJ)			
Jenkins (WV)	Moulton	Smith (TX)			
Johnson (GA)	Mullin	Smith (WA)			
Johnson (LA)	Murphy (FL)	Smucker			
Johnson (OH)	Murphy (PA)	Soto			
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Speier			
Jones	Neal	Stefanik			
Jordan	Nolan	Stewart			
Joyce (OH)	Norcross	Stivers			
Kaptur	Nunes	Suozi			
Katko	O'Halleran	Takano			
Keating	O'Rourke	Taylor			
Kelly (IL)	Olson	Tenney			
Kelly (MS)	Palazzo	Thompson (CA)			
Kelly (PA)	Pallone	Thompson (MS)			
Kennedy	Palmer	Thompson (PA)			
Khanna	Panetta	Thornberry			
Kihuen	Pascrell	Tiberi			
Kildoe	Paulsen	Tipton			
Kilmer	Payne	Titus			
Kind	Pearce	Tonko			
King (IA)	Pelosi	Torres			
King (NY)	Perlmutter	Trott			
Kinziger	Perry	Tsongas			
Knight	Peters	Turner			
Krishnamoorthi	Peterson	Upton			
Kuster (NH)	Pingree	Valadao			
Kustoff (TN)	Pittenger	Vargas			
Labrador	Pocan	Veasey			
LaHood	Poe (TX)	Vela			
LaMalfa	Poliquin	Velázquez			
Lamborn	Polis	Visclosky			
Lance	Posey	Wagner			
Langevin	Price (NC)	Walberg			
Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Walden			
Larson (CT)	Raskin	Walorski			
Latta	Ratcliffe	Walters, Mimi			
Lawrence	Reed	Walz			
Lawson (FL)	Reichert	Wasserman			
Lee	Renacci	Schultz			
Levin	Rice (NY)	Waters, Maxine			
Lewis (GA)	Rice (SC)	Watson Coleman			
Lewis (MN)	Richmond	Weber (TX)			
Lieu, Ted	Roby	Webster (FL)			
Lipinski	Roe (TN)	Welch			
LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)	Wenstrup			
Loeback	Rogers (KY)	Westerman			
Lofgren	Rohrabacher	Williams			
Long	Rokita	Wilson (FL)			
Loudermilk	Rooney, Francis	Wilson (SC)			
Love	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman			
Lowenthal	Rosen	Womack			
Lowey	Roskam	Woodall			
Lucas	Ross	Yarmuth			
Luetkemeyer	Rothfus	Yoder			
Lujan Grisham,	Rouzer	Yoho			
M.	Roybal-Allard	Young (AK)			
Luján, Ben Ray	Royce (CA)	Young (IA)			
Lynch	Ruiz	Zeldin			
MacArthur	Ruppersberger				
Maloney,	Rush				
Carolyn B.	Rutherford				

NAYS—1

Hastings

NOT VOTING—18

Buck	Cole	Curbelo (FL)
Chaffetz	Crawford	Gohmert

Grijalva	Newhouse	Sessions
Gutiérrez	Noem	Swalwell (CA)
Johnson, Sam	Rooney, Thomas	Walker
McEachin	J.	
Napolitano	Russell	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1627

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Vote No. 263, I would have voted "nay" on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 324, providing for consideration of H.R. 1039. On rollcall Vote No. 264, I would have voted "no" on agreeing to H. Res. 324, providing for consideration of H.R. 1039. On rollcall Vote No. 265, I would have voted "nay" on passage of H.R. 115, Thin Blue Line Act. On rollcall Vote No. 266, I would have voted "yea" on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1892, Honoring Hometown Heroes Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall vote Nos. 265 and 266. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 265, and "yea" on rollcall No. 266.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, circumstances have arisen which caused me to return home to Oklahoma early. However, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 263, "yea" on rollcall No. 264, "yea" on rollcall No. 265, and "yea" on rollcall No. 266.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on account of family obligations in the district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 265, and "yea" on rollcall No. 266.

□ 1630

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 953, REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2017; H.R. 1761, PROTECTING AGAINST CHILD EXPLOITATION ACT OF 2017; AND H.R. 1973, PROTECTING YOUNG VICTIMS FROM SEXUAL ABUSE ACT OF 2017

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has issued announcements outlining the amendment process for three measures that will likely be before the Committee on Rules next week. The amendment deadline has been set for Monday, May 22 at 10 a.m. for H.R. 953, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017; for Monday, May 22 at 3 p.m. for H.R. 1761, the Protecting Against Child Exploitation Act

of 2017; and Tuesday, May 23 at 10 a.m. for H.R. 1973, the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act of 2017.

The text of these measures, Mr. Speaker, is available on the Committee on Rules website at this time, and Members can feel free to contact the Committee on Rules with any questions regarding the amendment process.

CITIZENSHIP FOR SURVIVORS OF FALLEN FIRST RESPONDERS

(Mr. BACON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 1970, the Kerrie Orozco Act. This coming Saturday is the 2-year anniversary of the death of the Omaha Police Officer Kerrie Orozco, who was killed while serving a warrant to a convicted felon and known gang member. May 20, 2015, will forever be a somber day in the Omaha metro area.

Every day all across the country, first responders put their lives on the line to protect citizens. When Officer Orozco was killed, her husband, Hector, was going through the process to gain U.S. citizenship, and her death put a halt to it. He has an enormous responsibility as a single parent, and we owe it to Kerrie to ensure that her family is provided the same protections they would have had if this unfortunate situation had not occurred.

H.R. 1970 would give many of our first responders peace of mind to know that, even in death, their surviving loved ones can continue the immigration process. This legislation would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow for the surviving family members of a fallen U.S. citizen first responder to be naturalized upon compliance with all requirements.

Current law allows for surviving family members of the U.S. military killed in service of our Nation to continue with their citizenship application. H.R. 1970 will simply extend that privilege to first responders. We owe it to Officer Orozco and other fallen first responders to honor their memory by passing H.R. 1970.

I look forward to working with both Democrats and Republicans in Congress to give our first responders the peace of mind they deserve as they head out the door each day to serve our communities.

STROKE AWARENESS MONTH

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of May as Stroke Awareness Month. As a stroke survivor, I understand the magnitude of

this disease and the hundreds of thousands of lives it touches in American families each year.

We know that the risk of stroke increases each year, but strokes can and do occur at any age. In fact, every 40 seconds, someone in the United States suffers a stroke; and every 4 minutes, someone dies from a stroke. Stroke is the fifth leading cause of death in the United States, killing nearly 130,000 Americans per year.

To help raise awareness on how stroke affects Americans across all ages, races, and demographics, today I am reintroducing my resolution recognizing May as Stroke Awareness Month. The resolution aims to enhance public awareness by urging and continuing the coordination and cooperation among researchers, families, and advocates for improving treatment for individuals who suffer stroke. Together, we can combat this illness and work together toward long-term solutions to prevent, treat, and improve the lives of those suffering from stroke.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) for joining me as an original cosponsor of this bipartisan effort. Mr. Speaker, I ask others to please sign on.

WE NEED A BORDER WALL

(Mr. BIGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, last week I again visited the Arizona-Mexico border. I examined border fencing in the city of Nogales, on the Tohono O'odham Indian Reservation, and a working cattle ranch. As an Arizona native, I have visited the border many times, and each time I am disheartened by what I see.

Much of the fencing I saw last week would do little to keep illegal aliens from crossing the border. In failing to construct a wall, we are allowing anyone to enter the United States.

Border Patrol agents are outnumbered by illegal aliens, drug cartel scouts, and human smugglers. The technology in place is woefully inadequate. There is no question that our citizens along the border are in danger and our national security is in peril due to the unknown identities of those crossing our border.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump won by promising to build a border wall. I unequivocally stand with him, but building the wall is only the first step to securing our border. We must also increase the number of Border Patrol agents, invest in cutting-edge technology, and fully enforce our immigration laws. These expenditures and efforts are necessary and worth the cost. It is time to do what we said we would do.

REMEMBERING AL KARNIG

(Mr. AGUILAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Al Karnig, a dedicated and passionate member of the San Bernardino community who served as president for California State University, San Bernardino, for 15 years.

Dr. Karnig was a fierce advocate for our students, overseeing record numbers of enrollment, diversity, and faculty, as well as raising tens of millions of dollars for the university.

When Al wasn't working on improving access to higher education in our community, he was investing his personal time to make the inland empire a better place to live and raise a family. He served on the board for KVCR Educational Foundation, Inland Empire Economic Partnership, and the Community Hospital of San Bernardino.

Just last month, Al was in my office touting his latest philanthropic venture to help children, the Infant-Toddler Success program, working with parents and caregivers of children from birth to 36 months to help them to be ready for school and life.

I thank Dr. Karnig for his tireless efforts to make our region home to a world-class institution through Cal State, San Bernardino, as well as his advocacy on behalf of San Bernardino County families. As we mourn his loss, we give thanks for his contributions to our community, which will live on in his family, colleagues, graduates, students, children, and parents he helped through so many years of service.

HONORING FALLEN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate National Police Week and to applaud the 900,000 law enforcement officers nationwide.

Last year, Arizona lost some of our finest, those who paid the ultimate sacrifice to keep our communities safe: Officer David Glasser of Phoenix PD was killed in the line of duty last May, leaving behind his wife and two children; Senior Officer Leander Frank of Navajo Nation PD was killed while responding to a call last August, and he is survived by his wife and children; Officer Darrin Lee Reed of Show Low PD was shot in the line of duty this past November, just weeks away from his retirement, leaving behind his wife, his son, and his daughter. We can never fully express our gratitude or repay the debt for their service.

I would also like to honor those who serve in law enforcement along our border. While not every community in America has the proximity to the bor-

der that my district does, we all benefit from the courage of CBP officers and Border Patrol agents. Last August, we lost Border Patrol Agent Manuel Alvarez, who is survived by his wife and four children. Just over a week ago, we lost CBP Officer Edgard Garcia, who was well loved by our Tucson community.

We owe these men and their families for their ultimate sacrifice, and we owe a debt of gratitude to those who serve us today and every day in uniform.

WE NEED INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today about the need for investment in our infrastructure. As we know, this week is National Infrastructure Week. In my district on the central coast of California, we need infrastructure investment, not just for our roads, for our water systems, and our rural broadband but for something I used growing up, the transit systems.

The bus systems where I am from played an important role not just in my life but in many of my constituents' daily lives. Parents use the system to bring their children to their doctors, students use the transit system to attend the many schools and colleges in my area, and our employees use this form of transportation when they travel to their high-tech jobs in Silicon Valley, to their hospitality jobs on the Monterey Peninsula, and to their agriculture jobs in the Salinas and Pajaro Valleys.

The transit system makes our businesses more accessible to their employees, to their customers, and everybody who helps the regional economy, but the benefits don't end with our riders. With transit, our roads experience less wear and tear, and our environment is protected.

I know that my district isn't unique when it comes to the need for infrastructure investment. Our entire country needs it. So let's continue to do our jobs here in the Congress. Let's invest in our transit systems, in our infrastructure, so that our government can do something for our constituents, our local businesses, our home, and our families.

HONORING BUDDY LAROSA

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Buddy LaRosa for his countless years of service to the city of Cincinnati, having touched the lives of so many. Recently, West Elder Street near Findlay Market in Cincinnati was renamed Buddy LaRosa Way.

The exact spot was picked because, according to Buddy, that is the exact spot where he sold shopping bags for 3 cents when he was 10 years old. This was the beginning of his successful pizza empire, LaRosa's Pizza, a Cincinnati favorite. But great pizza isn't Buddy's only contribution to the Cincinnati area, not by a long shot.

Buddy is one of the most generous people I have had the pleasure of knowing through my life. He has dedicated his time and energy, making many contributions supporting the people of our community and changing their lives. Naming Buddy LaRosa Way is a reminder of how the city of Cincinnati has been forever positively changed by Buddy LaRosa's heart and soul. Thank you, Buddy.

PLEASE READ THE NEW HEALTHCARE BILL

(Mr. CÁRDENAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged and honored to be a Member of this House, and it is very frustrating for us to come here week after week and to not do the business of the people of the United States of America. One of those impediments is that we have a President of the United States who is trying to force and push this Congress, and many others in his administration, to do things that are not right for the people and this country.

I think it is important for us to understand that when and if you get an opportunity to read the legislation called TrumpCare, you will realize that really what it is about is Trump doesn't care about your healthcare. Please, just read it. I apologize for talking about the 24 million-plus Americans who will lose their healthcare if this bill were to become law. I apologize because I need to remind each individual that they will likely lose the ability to see a doctor if this bill becomes law. Please, please, help us. Please, focus on what is going on here in Washington and what is not going on here in Washington for everyone's sake.

SYRIAN ATROCITIES

(Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, recent State Department revelations show that Syrian President Bashar al-Assad continues inflicting atrocities on his own people. The discovery of a crematorium at Saydnaya military prison will only make it more difficult to account for the thousands detained and executed by Assad.

According to numerous nongovernmental organizations, the Assad re-

gime has abducted and detained between 65,000 and 117,000 people between 2011 and 2015. Credible reports have the regime executing up to 50 people daily. Assad uses the excuse of fighting terrorism to justify this gross campaign of inhumanity against innocent civilians. We know he has used mass graves and crematoriums to dispose of the corpses of the murdered. The savagery must stop.

I am proud to represent many Syrian Americans in Charleston, West Virginia. I urge my colleagues to join me in publicly condemning the atrocities committed by the Syrian regime of President Assad. Syrians deserve to be safe and free.

□ 1645

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF DR. ABRAHAM FISCHLER

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Dr. Abraham Fischler, president emeritus of Nova Southeastern University.

Dr. Fischler was one of south Florida's education pioneers and served as NSU's second president for 22 years, as well as a member of the Broward County School Board.

Dr. Fischler was an inspiration to all those who knew him, myself included. He served as NSU president when I was a member of the staff, often providing wise counsel and guidance.

He understood that in order to invest in our students, we need to invest in our teachers. He was truly an educator's educator. There are more than 10,000 students currently enrolled in the Abraham S. Fischler College of Education.

He has shaped countless lives and will always be remembered for his determination to ensure our students succeed. Thanks to Dr. Fischler, our young adults face their future prepared and ready to take on all that life has to offer.

My thoughts are not only with his wife, Shirley, and the entire Fischler family, but with the students, faculty, and staff.

HONORING WILLIAM T. COLEMAN, JR.

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of one of our Nation's greatest leaders and, for me, in my young career, a mentor and good friend, William Coleman, Jr., who passed away earlier this year at the age of 96.

Throughout his long career, Bill helped shape the future of our country in a past full of racial tension.

In 1948, Bill became the first African American to serve as a law clerk on the United States Supreme Court, and helped draft the legal brief for the landmark 1954 case, *Brown v. Board of Education*.

Bill later became our Nation's second African-American Cabinet official, serving as Transportation Secretary for Gerald Ford.

I extend my respect, affection, and prayers to his family, his loved ones, his former law partners, and his staff.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT WEEK

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, it is a privilege to honor the men and women of law enforcement who put their lives on the line every single day to keep us safe.

In my hometown of Philadelphia and across the Nation, police officers serve our communities with immeasurable courage. Every police officer goes to work knowing that any day could be their last. In Philadelphia alone, more than 260 police officers throughout our city's history have lost their lives.

One thing in Congress that we could do to show just how much we honor their sacrifice is to enact the legislation that myself, along with Congressman FITZPATRICK, Senators CASEY and TOOMEY, have introduced. It would provide a boost of education aid, up to the maximum Pell grant award, for the children of fallen law enforcement and first responders who have died in the line of duty. The bipartisan Children of Fallen Heroes Scholarship Act is widely supported by the law enforcement community.

Although we can never fully repay our debt to those families who have made the ultimate sacrifice, I believe this would be an important step in the right direction.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT WEEK

(Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the great men and women of law enforcement. As you know, it is National Law Enforcement Week, first established by President Kennedy in 1962.

Imagine waking up every morning, rolling out of your bed, rubbing your eyes, getting dressed for work, kissing a loved one good-bye for what may be the very last time. You walk out your door not even thinking about the potential danger that awaits you, not

even questioning who the person is asking for help, and not hesitating to step in the line of fire should you be required to.

Notice that I said “you.” You, a Republican. You, a Democrat. Black, White, Brown, gay, or straight, for all types don the uniform every day.

Men and women of law enforcement are a special breed amongst us. Theirs is a higher calling for service. They are part of the very fabric of our society. Without them, we would not have order, and our laws would be worthless.

For those men and women of law enforcement in Virginia’s Second District, and those around the Nation, we thank you. Your willingness to put the safety of others above your own demands respect, recognition, and, for some, remembrance.

TRUMP-RUSSIA TIES

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, on May 9, President Trump abruptly fired FBI Director Comey, who was leading the investigation into ties between his administration and Russia.

On May 10, the President met with the Russian Ambassador in the Oval Office, and the White House changed their reasoning for firing Comey.

On May 11, in an interview with Lester Holt, President Trump admitted that the Russia investigation was a factor in firing Comey.

On May 12, he appeared to threaten Comey, saying he had “better hope that there are no ‘tapes’” of their conversations.

On May 15, we learned Trump shared code word classified intelligence with the Russian Ambassador.

On May 16, Comey’s memo of his conversation with President Trump quoted him saying: “I hope you can see your way clear to letting this go.”

Every day brings a new scandal.

The appointment of Director Mueller as special prosecutor is a good first step, but it shouldn’t be our last. We need an independent commission, free of meddling from the Trump administration. Our democracy depends on it.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM “DOC” LONG

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor William “Doc” Long of Oak Ridge, North Carolina.

Doc is a veteran who served under the command of General Patton in World War II. For his service, the United States awarded him two Purple Hearts, two Bronze Stars, the Good Conduct Medal, the American Campaign Medal, and the Combat Infantry Badge.

Doc has worked tirelessly to help his fellow citizens understand the meaning of freedom and to ensure the sacrifices made on behalf of our Nation are not forgotten.

In 2014, the Carolina Field of Honor opened at Triad Park in Kernersville, North Carolina, to honor all who serve or have served in the Armed Forces of the United States of America. As one of its biggest supporters, Doc personally sponsored two of its military service monuments: the U.S. Army Monument and the U.S. Navy Monument.

On Saturday, May 27, family and friends will gather to celebrate this remarkable man’s 93rd birthday. North Carolina is fortunate to call Doc one of its own.

WHERE ARE THE WOMEN ON THE AHCA COMMITTEE?

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is a picture of the committee our Republican colleagues in the Senate have put together and tasked with crafting a healthcare bill that will affect the healthcare of tens of millions of American women.

And just a quick glance at his poster tells you that there is not one person on this committee who will ever bear a child or need maternity care. There is no one on this committee that will ever need a mammogram. No one on this committee will ever have to worry about having their access to affordable contraceptives or prenatal care taken away from them.

Yet, the House bill that was delivered to the Senate callously would make healthcare services and insurance coverage either unaffordable or unavailable to millions of struggling hard-working women.

So, once again, we find that our Republican colleagues are making life-altering decisions without a single woman at the table, ignoring the very real, very cruel effects of the House-passed bill on American women and families.

So, once again, Mr. Speaker, we ask: Where are the women?

TAX REFORM FOR HARDWORKING MICHIGAN RESIDENTS

(Mr. MOOLENAAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, tax reform is a key concern for small-business owners and hardworking residents in my district.

My predecessor, former Ways and Means chairman, Dave Camp, worked diligently on this issue in hopes of reforming our Nation’s burdensome Tax Code.

Today, the Ways and Means Committee took up this work again because our Tax Code needs to be simpler, fairer, and flatter for Michigan families.

Tax reform done right will benefit Michigan residents of all income levels by making it easier for them to calculate and file their tax returns while lowering their tax burden.

The first bill I introduced as Michigan’s Fourth District Representative was legislation that would make it easier for Michigan families to pay for child care. It is my hope that this will become part of this tax reform package.

Our Tax Code was last updated in 1986. It is time for a change. I hope this Congress will pass tax reform for the 21st century.

HONORING PATRICIA BROUGHTON

(Ms. BARRAGÁN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Patricia Broughton, my caseworker in San Pedro, California, who is retiring after her distinguished career in public service.

Patricia has served for 32 years, and has served five Members of Congress, including me. She also served former Representatives Janice Hahn, Jane Harman, the late Steve Horn, the late Glenn Anderson, and then myself.

Patricia isn’t just a caseworker, she is a miracle worker. She has handled virtually every type of case that is referred to a congressional office.

Patricia has resolved Social Security and Medicare claims for seniors, helped disabled veterans who weren’t receiving their veterans’ disability checks, and assisted those who had trouble with the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the IRS.

Patricia has been an advocate for the frustrated, and a source of comfort for those tangled up in the Federal Government’s bureaucracy.

I wish Patricia the best in her well-deserved retirement from public service.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise during National Police Week to honor the men and women who every morning put on their badge and selflessly protect and serve our communities. Many heroically go above and beyond their duty.

It was a privilege of mine to invite and sit next to Kendall County Sheriff’s Deputy Tyler Johnson at last year’s State of the Union Address. On New Year’s night, he jumped into a

freezing pond to rescue a motorist in a sinking car.

These acts of heroism deserve our recognition. Yet, rarely do our officers receive recognition and thanks for their day-to-day work serving people.

A police officer is the person that helps you when you are stranded on the side of the road. A police officer scours the neighborhood with your kids looking for a lost dog.

They are the Illinois police departments that tomorrow are taking part in Cops on a Rooftop with Dunkin' Donuts to help raise money for the Illinois Special Olympics.

To police officers everywhere: Thank you.

COMMEMORATING THE DEDICATION OF THE WASHINGTON SPY TRAIL

(Mr. SUOZZI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the dedication of the Washington Spy Ring along Route 25A of Long Island's North Shore, in my and Congressman ZELDIN's district.

This group of American heroes is often overlooked because knowledge that George Washington's Culper Spy Ring existed was not disclosed until 1930.

Nathan Hale of the often noted "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country" is claimed by Huntington to have been captured there and gave rise to the spy ring.

One of Culper's top spies was Robert Townsend of Raynham Hall, Oyster Bay, also known as Culper, Jr.

Townsend posed as a Tory merchant in New York City. He relayed intelligence concerning troop movements, supplies, and British plots, using an expensive spy ring, coded messages, invisible ink, and elaborate signal system using everything from drying laundry to buttons on clothing.

Their efforts turned the tide of the war by assisting Washington to outfox the British, even saving him from capture.

As Washington said, and as is recounted to members of today's CIA:

"There is nothing more necessary than good intelligence to frustrate a designing enemy, and nothing requires greater pains to obtain."

I would like to thank the North Shore Promotional Alliance, Raynham Hall, the Ward Melville Heritage Organization, and the producers of the AMC television show "Turn" for promoting the legacy of these unsung American patriots.

□ 1700

GIVING CONSUMERS A FINANCIAL CHOICE

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, in 2010, the Democratic majority passed the Dodd-Frank Act, a 2,300-page rewrite of America's financial laws. This sweeping law imposed significant costs on the economy, financial institutions, investors, small businesses, and American consumers.

Dodd-Frank was supposed to help lift up our economy; instead, what we got was the slowest, weakest recovery in 70 years. It was supposed to end taxpayer-funded bailouts; instead, it enshrined, permanently, Wall Street bailouts into law. It was supposed to make the financial system safer; instead, big banks got even bigger, and we have one less community bank or credit union every day. It was supposed to protect consumers; instead, higher bank fees, more expensive mortgages, fewer choices, and the most unaccountable government agency in the history of the Republic, the CFPB.

The Financial CHOICE Act moving through committee and to this floor soon will give consumers the protections they need and the opportunity for investment that has been so bottled up for many, many months—even years—in this country. The Financial CHOICE Act will be very helpful toward restarting our economy and bringing back, once again, consumer choice.

Let's move this bill through.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BANKS of Indiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here with my partner, Congresswoman JAYAPAL from the State of Washington, and we are running the Progressive Caucus Special Order hour.

We are delighted to kick off this session, which is about the extraordinary revelations this week and some breath-taking developments in Washington, with a statement by our distinguished colleague from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland and the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington. Just by coincidence, Mr. Speaker, all three of us are members of the Judiciary Committee and had a very vigorous constitutional discussion this morning in a hearing on the responsibilities of the Judiciary Committee and, as well, the responsibilities of this Congress to the American people.

I think many of us offered our comments in the context that we did not

speak as a Democrat or a Republican, though we are here on this floor as members of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. We really spoke to our views and commitment as Americans.

Having served in this House for a period of time where I have seen the Judiciary Committee engage vigorously in impeachment proceedings for judges and Presidents, I know that the role of the Judiciary Committee is to be assured that the government—the executive, the legislature, the judiciary—works within the context of the Constitution.

So that is the spirit and the position in which I rise this evening: to share a few thoughts and to recount for our Members why this is a week that requires further oversight and insight and further assessment of whether the actions of the Oval Office, the executive—in this instance, the White House—have really complied with the Constitution of the United States.

I would, first of all, indicate that much of what I will say I will qualify and say that the President, or a President, or any President, would have the authority to do. So although, for example, the FBI Director is given a 10-year term, the individual serves at the will of the President of the United States of America. That means that President Trump, President Obama, President Bush, President Clinton, and others would have the authority to fire this particular individual as they would have the right to fire Cabinet officers and others. They have the right to fire the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General, which may be one of the concerns we now have as we proceed to try to get to the facts of just a whole litany of issues.

Let me recount for you, as I discuss the firing of Director Comey, that in the last couple of days we have discerned that the Trump campaign operatives spoke to Russian operatives, Russian Government officials, 18 times in the last 7 months of the campaign.

We are well aware that the former NSA Director, something I think we, as Members of Congress—I will speak for myself—have never heard of in the tenure that I have been privileged to serve in the United States Congress, that an individual who was advising the President of the United States not in the form of a lobbyist, but in the form of an adviser in national security issues, was being paid by a foreign country.

So the advice that was given, two different recommendations: one, to drag out and throw to an unknowing future a Turkish citizen who is here, who has been involved in a number of schools and good charitable work, who lives in Pennsylvania; one of his recommendations was to throw this individual who is statused, not undocumented, out into the hands of the present President of Turkey, who has been known over the years, recently, to deny political

and religious rights and human rights. That was one recommendation.

The second recommendation, whether you liked it or disliked it, was to not arm the Kurds to help with the fight in Syria. That advice was given, both of those proposals as advice were given while General Flynn was on the payroll of a foreign government.

So you would have to wonder in the series of incidents how we have come to the point where the FBI Director, who was actively engaged in investigating—or the FBI, investigating General Flynn, as were congressional committees—General Flynn is now under a subpoena by, I believe, the Senate Intelligence Committee. All of that, all of those elements certainly respond that the Congress and the FBI were engaged in active investigations. I think the American people understand that.

The American people understand that if their chief of police was engaged in an active investigation of murder, one that the whole community was just outraged about, as any murder, as all the homicides that take place in a community that you desire to be safe, and one local elected official indicated that you are investigating my neighbor or you are investigating me and had the authority to fire the chief of police with the reason of one thing and then it became very clear that you were firing the chief of police who was actively engaged in a murder investigation that was going to help the whole community find the truth and bring the perpetrator to justice, you fired that police chief because it was either you that was being investigated, local elected official, or it was your neighbor that was being investigated, you just took it upon yourself to cease and desist of that investigation, and that is a simple explanation of what has happened here in Washington.

Because Washington is big, because this government is huge, because it is the leader of the free world, because all the nations look up to it gives it no greater authority to stop an active investigation that is based upon the duties of the FBI, but also the laws of this land, and that is just what happened. Director Comey was unceremoniously fired; a man who has had great tenure in law enforcement as an attorney and prosecutor and, now, over the FBI.

Of course, the so-called explanation—which, by the way, has just been repeated in the last 45 minutes on international television, saying the same thing, that his firing was based upon Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein's representation in a memorandum that many of us question that gave a whole explanation of the incidents regarding former Secretary Clinton, which, of course, she was not found to have warranted any further review or investigation or prosecution. But that was what

was used by President Trump just in the last, as I said, 30 to 45 minutes, when we know that the Deputy Attorney General has already denied that he was the cause and center of the firing of FBI Director Comey, yet it is still being repeated over and over and over and over again.

You would also know that not only did he deny—and we look forward to hearing him tomorrow, the House Members, as the Senate has already heard him. What he also indicated, or what was also said to vindicate him, is that the President came out on last Thursday with interviews with Lester Holt on NBC News that it wasn't anybody but him, and it was connected to this fake Russian thing. I am paraphrasing. I may not have all of the words.

So you have an executive that, one could analyze in a number of court decisions, may have been credited with an abuse of power. There was no legitimate failing in the work of Director Comey on this Russian investigation.

Just 30 to 45 minutes ago, another comment that was made is that he was unpopular, and that he did very, very poorly in the hearings last week. None of those are elements of dismissal. Maybe reprimand, maybe study a little bit more before you go to Senatorial hearings or House hearings, but that has nothing to do with being fired.

I don't know whether any of us want, every single day, as we make very tough decisions in this House, that we are assessed on whether or not we are very popular. What we want to do is do what is right for the American people. And whatever you might say, I assume Director Comey felt that he was doing what is right for the American people.

Many disagreed with his handling and assessment of the issues dealing with former Secretary Clinton, particularly in the October surprise. That is legitimate. But it is not legitimate to say, way past that incident and when this individual is actively engaged—and there is no question or no guarantee that, in spite of our displeasure as Democrats, if the Office of the Presidency had gone the other way that Director Comey would be fired. There was no suggestion of that, none whatsoever, even with disagreeing with actions.

But here we have not only the misrepresentation of the reason, but the declaration that the reason was because of this Russian thing.

Let me share with you the comments of Professor Tribe in a Washington Post article on May 13, 2017, as he recounts the whole issue of this action bearing upon the actions that are in the Constitution, such as impeachment, that relate to the questions of whether or not the Presidency or the President has acted appropriately:

“The question of Russian interference in the Presidential election and

possible collusion with the Trump campaign go to the heart of our system and ability to conduct free and fair elections.”

Therefore, it was free. It was what we do.

“Consider, too, how Trump embroiled Deputy Attorney General Rod J. Rosenstein and Attorney General Jeff Sessions, despite Sessions' recusal from involvement in the Russia investigation, in preparing admittedly phony justifications for the firing on which Trump had already decided. Consider how Trump used the Vice President and White House staff to propagate a set of blatant untruths—before giving an interview to NBC's Lester Holt that exposed his true motivation.

“Trump accompanied that confession with self-serving—and manifestly false—assertions about having been assured by Comey that Trump himself was not under investigation. By Trump's own account, he asked Comey about his investigative status even as he was conducting the equivalent of a job interview in which Comey sought to retain his position as a Director.”

So I believe that what we have here is a reasonable basis, those of us who have come to the floor tonight, to raise these questions and to be able to make sure that we do have a system of laws and that we do adhere to the rule of law.

□ 1715

We know that, subsequently, the Deputy Attorney General has appointed a special counsel under the provisions of the Attorney General. Of course, that individual could be fired. The regulation could be dismantled. But we hope that former Director Mueller of the FBI, who has impeccable credentials, will go forward and ensure that the American people know the truth.

That will be one part of it. I repeat, that will be one part of it. But, as I look at my closing remarks here, I want to ensure that we know that this is not something that is made up; that it continues to shock us, and it shocks the American people. It is not a made-up entity. It just continues with a long list of incidents, starting from the firing and then going up.

A comment Bill Moyers said: “The ensuing White House cover-up tries to pin the blame on a newly confirmed Deputy Attorney General whose hastily prepared memo criticizes Comey's 2016 statements. . . .”

But the late summer of 2015, a member of Trump's campaign staff called Lieutenant General Mike Flynn to ask if he is willing to meet with Trump. Trump agrees. Later Flynn says, four other Presidential candidates also reached out to him. There is a long list of items that may be true, may not be true, but clearly set a pattern, a pattern of the achilles heels of this Oval Office.

And so I would say to my colleagues that we should not turn a blind eye on this. I believe it is important to follow the facts. I have no quarrel with that. But neither am I afraid to use the term appropriately, an impeachment inquiry, but at least to find the facts of whether or not any of the actions that swirled around Director Comey, that swirled around General Flynn's and Director Comey's or the FBI's investigation of this particular series of incidents are in keeping with the responsibilities of the Congress, the Judiciary, in any elements there, or the Oval Office, the Presidency of the United States of America.

I think that the special prosecutor, for Americans to understand, deals specifically with pursuing or possible criminal acts. On the other hand, it is well known that the Congress can address how we fix this; how we make sure it doesn't happen again; how we work on behalf of the American people.

And so I hope that, as we conclude this Special Order, no one will point to any of the Members on this floor as taking this up as a personal cause against the President of the United States, or any President, and that we will respect the office, as we have always done. But it is our duty to shed light on these issues and shed light on these potential failures. It is our responsibility to take up the cause of curing, responding, fixing, and serving the American people.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congresswoman for those extremely thoughtful and lucid remarks. I also wish to associate myself with the idea that, here on this issue, we cannot act purely as partisans. I suppose I can make a partisan speech with the best of them, but we are called upon during these very trying days to speak not as partisans but as patriots and as constitutional patriots.

I have been a professor of constitutional law for 27 years at American University's Washington College of Law, and I am aware that the Founders of this country were determined to see that while we acted as partisans in the normal push and pull of legislative politics, when it comes to the basic character of our democracy, all of us try to need to act in a way that is consistent with the constitutional values that unify us.

Thomas Jefferson said: "If I could not go to heaven but with a party, I would not go there at all."

And George Washington said that we should never forget that the word "party" comes from the French word "partie." One part, each party is one part of the whole, and we have to try to keep our mind focused on the whole thing.

Well, the whole country is in danger right now. The events of the last week have been breathtaking and extraordinary. So let's take a moment to try

to catch our breath to remember what is really at stake with the Russian connection, with the firing of National Security Advisor Michael Flynn after 24 days, with the firing of FBI Director James Comey this week after he refused to drop the investigation into Michael Flynn, and the Russian connection.

All of this is about, in the big picture, an organized and systematic assault on the American form of government and our Democratic political institutions.

During the 2016 Presidential election, 17 of our U.S. intelligence agencies, including the FBI, the CIA, the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and more than a dozen of others, got together and produced a report where they said, with a very high degree of certainty, that Vladimir Putin and Russian agents had an organized campaign orchestrated to engage in cyber espionage of the United States of America and our political institutions, and cyber sabotage of our political institutions with paid operatives working to disseminate fake news and propaganda, and to engineer leaks of mixtures of real emails mixed in with fake news, and so on.

All of it meant to throw the Presidential election, to destroy the chances of Hillary Clinton, and to destabilize American political democracy. We know that this *modus operandi* was used before the 2016 election in America, and it was used again after, as recently as the election in the Netherlands with Mr. Wilders, who was the favorite of Vladimir Putin, and then again in France with Marine Le Pen and the National Front where Mr. Putin and his operatives did a data dump the weekend before the French Presidential election.

Right before the blackout on campaigning, they again orchestrated hacks of the Macron campaign, and then tried to put out, again, a complete disinformation package on behalf of Le Pen.

Well, the intelligence agencies warned us that this was just a dress rehearsal for 2020. This is what Vladimir Putin is doing. He is trying to organize every dictator, despot, and kleptocrat on Earth together to destroy the liberal democracies, from the outside and from the inside.

Now, militarily, he is no match for the United States of America. Economically, he is no match for the United States of America. Intellectually, in terms of our political institutions and the democracy we have built, our Constitution, he is no match for America.

But he perceives a weakness, and the weakness is all about the internet because the internet links the whole world together. And if he can use the internet in order to hack into our institutions, both our party institutions

and our election systems, and the media, and political campaigns, and then use that to sow confusion and propaganda, then he may, indeed, be able to gain control over the direction of our country, the sovereign people of America.

We were warned in that intelligence agency report, which is public, which everybody can find online, that this is their plan. It wasn't as if 2016 was a one-shot deal. This is exactly what Putin will continue to do.

So that is the background. Now, why is the firing of FBI Director James Comey so disturbing? He, of course, had a 10-year term, which was abruptly and suddenly cut off by President Trump after Comey told him—according to Comey's account, at least—that he would refuse to drop the investigation into Michael Flynn.

There are lots of people involved in this Russian connection story, including Page, and Stone, and Manafort, and Jared Kushner that go way beyond what we can talk about here tonight. But I just want to focus for the moment on Flynn.

Why is this sequence of events so disturbing? Well, it came out this week also that the Trump transition team, headed by none other than Vice President PENCE, knew that Flynn was under criminal investigation at the time that they decided to hire him as America's National Security Advisor. At a point when they decided to make him America's number one national security operative, they knew he was under criminal investigation for being a paid operative of the Turkish Government, a paid agent of the Turkish Government. And nonetheless, they brought him on.

And then when it was learned from the Acting Attorney General Sally Yates that Mr. Flynn was vulnerable to blackmail by Russians for having misled Vice President PENCE about his entanglement with the Russian Ambassador and his conversations with the Russian Ambassador, still they kept him on. So they brought him on, knowing he was under investigation, then they knew he lied about his connections to the Russians, and still they kept him on.

When the media finally broke the story of Flynn's collusive actions with foreign governments while he was the National Security Agency Director, Trump finally fired him, grudgingly, let him go, but said that Flynn was the victim somehow, and even tried to disassociate himself from the firing of Flynn.

Then we learn that the President tried to get the FBI Director James Comey to drop the investigation. Now, that is according to the FBI Director James Comey, who has never been accused of lying or perjury. So it is going to be his word against that of the President of the United States, who

has said things like: Well, TED CRUZ' father participated in the assassination of JFK; and 5 million people voted illegally in the United States, with no evidence at all; and Barack Obama was born in Kenya, or Indonesia; and he had his phones tapped, and so on.

And so that issue might come down to a swearing contest between the former Director of the FBI, Mr. Comey, and President Trump. But in any event, according to Comey, Trump said to him: Will you let it go? Will you let the investigation of Flynn go? And Comey said he would not. And then Comey was let go instead.

So the question is: What does Michael Flynn know that everybody bends over backwards in the Trump administration to try to please him and placate him?

This is an administration that doesn't mind insulting our longest and most cherished allies in the world: NATO, which he has said is obsolete; Mexico, which he has had no problem insulting and affronting; Australia; and so on. Yet with Michael Flynn, everybody is tiptoeing. Everybody is doing a tap dance. What does Michael Flynn know about President Trump? It would seem as if he has got some kind of information about the President that the President doesn't want to get out there.

That is why a special counsel had to be appointed, and I am glad a special counsel was appointed. And I believe that Mr. Mueller is up to the task. And he has been known as a straight shooter, and a nonpartisan, someone who will follow the facts where they will go.

Well, in the meantime, we have got to look at the much broader issue. Because, of course, that is about the criminal deeds or actions of particular people. And some people may end up facing prosecution for what they did. But there is a much larger issue here. Because as a country, we have got to stand up for strong democracy all over the world.

But what is happening with all of these shenanigans, and sinister contacts and connections with the Turkish Government, and the Russian Government, and Orban in Hungary, and the killer dictator Duterte in the Philippines who orders that people he thinks are drug users should be shot on sight in his country, who has been invited to the White House by President Trump?

Well, our country has got to stand up for what is great about our country: our Constitution and our Bill of Rights. President Trump said this is a witch hunt. But I want to close by telling you about a real witch hunt that is going on right now on the planet Earth.

And if we were not so distracted by the spreading staph infection in the White House, we would be able to help in terms of this situation. And I refer

to you an article that was in the newspaper a couple of days ago in The New York Times about the governor of Jakarta, one of the largest cities in Indonesia.

□ 1730

He is Christian. He is the Governor of Jakarta. Someone was running against him and said that all the Muslims should vote against him because he is Christian. They should have to vote for a Muslim because the Koran tells them to. The governor objected.

Mr. Basuki said: That is not right. The Koran doesn't say that Muslims must vote for Muslims. Muslims can vote for me, even though I am a Christian.

He was prosecuted, arrested for blasphemy against the Koran, against Islam, and sentenced to 2 years hard time in a maximum security prison in Indonesia.

In America, where we have a First Amendment and freedom of conscience, free exercise of religion, separation of church and State, we got rid of blasphemy a long time ago. But now we have got a human being—a governor, no less—who is in prison for hard time in Indonesia, one of our allies. We should not let that stand.

There are hundreds of people all over the Earth who are in prison for blasphemy or apostasy or heresy—religious offenses—and we are saying nothing about it. In Russia itself, there were just marches a month ago against political corruption and authoritarianism. Tens of thousands of people. Our government did nothing. Why? Some of them are on the payroll of Russian autocrats, and others just don't care.

We should be on the side of the people of Russia who are fighting for democracy, fighting for religious freedom, fighting for human rights. That is what America should be about. That is what is really at stake here.

Our government should not be consumed with self-interest and promoting people's corporate agendas. It should not be consumed with the personal vanity of the President. It should not be about private agendas. It should be about the public good of the American people and standing with democracies all over the Earth.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: DIRECTOR COMEY FIRING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE). She has been such a cham-

pion on progressive issues for so long. BARBARA LEE still speaks for me across the country.

Ms. LEE. Let me thank Congresswoman JAYAPAL for yielding and for holding this important issue on this existential threat to our democracy. Also, I just have to say that she has just hit the ground running here on behalf of the American people, on behalf of working men and women, on behalf of peace and security in the world, on behalf of our democracy. So I thank her for her leadership.

The constant stream of allegations and scandals springing from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue is really quite shocking. I have to admit that, after watching President Trump fire the FBI Director who was investigating him, I thought things could not get any worse. But just days later, President Trump blundered into sharing classified intelligence with Russian officials.

As the Nation and the world grappled with the aftermath of this revelation, yet more shocking news was breaking. The New York Times has alleged that, before he was fired, Director Comey was pressured by President Trump to shut down an ongoing investigation into General Michael Flynn's possible collusion with the Russians.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be very clear with the American people. If The New York Times report is true, President Trump's attempts to influence a Federal probe can only be described in one way, and that is obstruction of justice. And, yes, we all know obstruction of justice is an impeachable offense.

Right now, one thing, though, is crystal clear: The President's abuse of power has plunged this Nation into a full-blown constitutional crisis. This crisis goes far beyond party interests. Every American, Democrat or Republican, should be concerned by these allegations.

President Trump's actions have threatened national security, the rule of law, and the independence of our Nation's justice system. His actions dishonor the Office of the Presidency and place this Nation and our allies in danger.

The reports of last week underscore the need to establish a bipartisan, independent commission to get to the bottom of Russian interference in our elections once and for all. It is vitally important that Director Mueller—and I am very pleased that the Department of Justice appointed him; this is one step in the right direction—be given the resources and the autonomy to conduct an investigation.

Unfortunately, President Trump said that this investigation is a witch hunt. Nothing could be further from the truth. The American people deserve to know the facts about possible collusion between Russia and the Trump campaign. Our democracy must be defended at all costs.

I thank Congresswoman JAYAPAL for giving us a chance to speak tonight about this very dangerous moment that we are in, about Presidential abuse, and, really, about the preservation of our democracy. The Congressional Progressive Caucus continues to lead on so many issues that are important to this country and to the world.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), who has also been a leader in the Progressive Caucus on so many issues, from the death penalty to immigration to healthcare.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman JAYAPAL and the Congressional Progressive Caucus for convening this 1-hour discussion about our democracy at risk.

I don't think it is really an exaggeration that what we are seeing right now is our democracy actually under attack. Unfortunately, it is from our own White House.

I think Americans around the country, regardless of their political party or even political persuasion, are kind of shaking their head and saying: What the heck is going on?

Every day, there is some sort of a new and disturbing revelation. We found out that the President of the United States just seems to have blurted out highly, highly classified information in a meeting with the Russian Ambassador and the Russian Foreign Minister—information that was passed on, it seems, from the Israelis, but actually could put some of the people who are doing the most delicate work on the ground in some danger. And then, of course, last week, the President fired the FBI Director, James Comey.

As a Democrat, I certainly have had problems in the past with James Comey. I think that he helped influence the outcome of the election. But it turns out that on national television the President basically admitted, after giving various explanations of the firing, that it came down to the Russian investigation.

Then we find out that James Comey actually took notes of a meeting with the President where the President asked him to drop the investigation of General Flynn and his connection to the Russians. It is a real question of what is going on.

It was an important step when, yesterday, Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein took the important first step of appointing a special counsel to investigate the Russia connection and the relationship between this administration of President Trump and the Russians.

I am really happy. I was on the Intelligence Committee when Robert Mueller was the FBI Director. I have to tell you that I feel very confident in

his independence and his integrity. I know that he, importantly, would not allow the FBI to work with the CIA when they wanted to torture people, essentially, by using enhanced interrogation techniques. So I feel good that he is a very good choice.

But having done that, today I was happy to sign a discharge petition to create an independent commission that would also be looking into even the larger picture about what was going on with the Russian influence campaign involving itself in our elections, and then also, what was the connection between the Trump administration, Donald Trump himself, did they collude on influencing the election?

It is important to do both. They are complementary. They don't do the same thing.

I am going to quote from ADAM SCHIFF, who is our ranking Democrat on the Intelligence Committee. I think he put it really well: "The value an independent commission adds is you have a body that is truly independent of any political consideration and also has all the resources it needs and a single focus on the oversight of what Russia did, how we need to respond in the future, and it brings that political independence and staff and resources on task. So those are two different needs, and I think they're complementary, not in competition with each other."

The other reason I am very much in support not only of the special prosecutor, but of the independent commission is because, then, Congress has a role here. Congress itself is saying—hopefully, Republicans and Democrats. We have two Republicans right now on our discharge petition that would force the bill to come to the floor that would say that we, together, think that this is worthy, our democracy is worthy of this kind of in-depth investigation.

Finally, let me say we would find out a lot about the relationship of the President and Russia, plus other conflicts of interest, if we could see his tax returns, like every other President has done. Release his tax returns.

Again, I would hope that this has not devolved into strictly a partisan issue. All Americans should say: Let us look at those ties the President may have in countries around the world or with companies at home.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Again, I am very pleased as the Congressional Progressive Caucus to be able to host a Special Order every week. We pick a different topic every week, for those of you that are just beginning to listen. This week we want to focus attention on what we believe are some of the most serious and pressing issues facing our country today around the Trump administration's ties to Russia, around the firing of James Comey, and the many, many issues that have come forward over the last several months, but certainly in the last week.

Since last Tuesday, we have borne witness to a slew of alarming events within the White House and the Department of Justice. Last Tuesday afternoon, we received word that the President had fired FBI Director James Comey from his position.

That position, by the way, is a 10-year term. Congress designated it as a 10-year term specifically to ensure that we could protect any administration and the entire country against any conflict of interest that may come up. Obviously, that did not convince the President that he should keep Director Comey.

So we heard that he fired him. It seems as if each morning we wake up to a barrage of firings, tweets, or untruths that continue to erode the public's confidence in our democracy.

So what do we know today? Certainly, we don't know enough, but we do know that the President fired Director Comey under the guise of being unsatisfied with how he handled Secretary Hillary Clinton's email investigation.

□ 1745

But if that were the case, then why didn't he fire him months ago? Why now? Why did he choose to meet with Russian officials the day after firing Mr. Comey?

Mr. Trump's attempts to use Clinton's emails to divert attention from Comey's investigation into the campaign's ties to Russia are, unfortunately, very disingenuous, and I think that they are proving to be unsuccessful.

Despite his claims that Mr. Comey was not investigating him, the President must have been concerned about what Director Comey would find because the firing, interestingly, came just days after Director Comey had requested additional resources for the investigation.

White House officials attempted at first to say that the blame for the firing was Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein's fault. They said it was at his recommendation. Attorney General Jeff Sessions weighed in on that decision as well. But, in fact, shortly after, the President went on television and said that, no, this was his decision regardless of what had been proposed, this is where he was going to be.

On Wednesday, just 1 day after firing then-Director Comey, the President welcomed the Russian foreign minister, Sergey Lavrov; and the Russian Ambassador, Sergey Kislyak, into the Oval Office for a closed press meeting. Let's not forget that Kislyak met with former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn during the campaign, a meeting that Flynn then lied about. I think this is very important because there were a number of Trump administration or Trump campaign officials that met with Russian officials over

the course of many months before the election.

Those meetings in and of themselves are not a problem. The problem, however, is that these individuals continued to lie about those meetings, and that makes you wonder: What fire is there where the smoke is? Why would they lie about these things?

We certainly don't know that. We have been unable to get the transcripts of that conversation because the President has not been willing to release them.

Russian President Vladimir Putin is more willing to make that information public than our own President, but I find it outrageous that President Putin would actually propose to be sort of the backup of this information for the President. We are not looking to President Putin to provide corroboration of these meetings. We actually need an independent ability to look at the facts of this case.

On Monday, the news exploded with reports that the President released highly classified information to Lavrov and Kislyak during their discussion at the White House. This is extremely alarming. It is true that the President has the right to declassify any information, but the information that was shared was so sensitive that the United States had not even shared it with our allies. The President's decision to divulge that information to foreign officials—particularly Russian officials with whom our relationship is contentious at best—is dangerous and reckless.

There is no doubt in my mind that this will hinder our ability to build international coalitions to actually be able to share information with allies who provide that classified information to us with the understanding that we are going to protect that and guard that. Should any classified information then be declassified for some reason, it is done in consultation with the country that provided that information and with national security advisors. None of that happened in this situation.

President Trump also tweeted during the campaign that Hillary Clinton and her team were extremely careless in their handling of very sensitive and highly classified information. So this seems like a particular irony. The President claimed that Hillary Clinton's lack of ability to handle classified information actually made her unfit to be President.

Speaker PAUL RYAN said this: "It is simple: Individuals who are 'extremely careless' with classified information should be denied further access to it."

Reince Priebus, Trump's Chief of Staff, took it one step further, saying: "Those who mishandled classified info have had their sec clearances revoked, lost their jobs, faced fines, and even been sent to prison."

So this is a situation that we have to take extremely seriously.

Before we could even fully engage and vet that news, however, reports then came out that President Trump had actually asked FBI Director James Comey to drop the investigation into Michael Flynn. According to sources close to Comey, this request came just 1 day after Michael Flynn was fired. This is truly a new low. If this is true—and we are trying to get to the bottom of this—it would absolutely constitute an obstruction of justice. The President has put obstacle after obstacle in the way of any real investigation that gives us the information that we need to protect our national security and the American people.

In the 118 days since the Trump Presidency began, it has been scandal after scandal. The latest events have escalated this crisis to an even higher level. As I mentioned, the FBI Director serves a 10-year term specifically in order to be able to carry out these independent investigations free of partisanship or political pressure. The firing of James Comey and the fact that he was asked by the President for loyalty—again, this is apparently in Director Comey's memo, which we hope to be able to see—and to abandon the investigation against Michael Flynn are extremely serious offenses. They hurt our democracy and they hurt our country.

The President has tried to distract us time and time again, but we actually know that the American people deserve better. History smiles kindly on those who stand up and put country over party and on those who ensure that in the darkest of times and the most difficult of times, the times when we face a constitutional crisis, where our Nation wonders what direction we are going in, the times when we know that the need to preserve the institutions of democracy and justice are most necessary, those are the times when we need people to speak out on both sides of the aisle for the facts, for the truth, and for democracy.

This should not be a partisan issue. We are seeing that starting to emerge from our colleagues across the aisle. I commend those Republicans who have begun to ask for information, documents, and hearings; and I hope that more of my colleagues will join us in the pursuit of truth and in the pursuit of justice.

Last night we received news that Robert Mueller, who is the former FBI Director, has been appointed as special counsel for the investigation into the Trump campaign's ties with Russia. This is an extremely distinguished man. He has served the country with tremendous success and loyalty, and we are hopeful that Mr. Mueller will diligently investigate the allegations against Michael Flynn and other members of the Trump campaign with veracity and free from political influence. However, we still maintain that

an independent commission is necessary because a special counsel answers to the Attorney General, who can then overrule decisions that they make or even fire them at any time. So the appointment of Robert Mueller is a good first step, but it cannot be the last.

Director Mueller will still be in the chain of command under the Trump-appointed leadership of the Justice Department. He cannot take the place of a truly independent outside commission that is free from Trump's meddling.

I think that is why it is so important that we all join in signing the discharge petition that was introduced yesterday by my colleagues, Representative SWALWELL and Representative CUMMINGS, who is the ranking member on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. This discharge petition would essentially allow for a bill to move forward that would establish an independent commission that we could truly trust to seek justice. The commission would interview witnesses, would obtain documents, would issue subpoenas, and would receive public testimony in order to examine whether or not the Russian Government did, in fact, interfere with U.S. elections and how they carried that out.

This is a really crucial step to take because it is not only about the short term and the immediacy of what is in front of us—extremely important, the commission would deal with that as well—but it is also about how do we ensure that these things don't happen again? What did happen, first of all, and how do we make sure that we continue to protect our democracy in the face of what 17 independent intelligence agencies said, which is that the Russians hacked our election in the United States?

There is a lot we need to understand. We need the special counsel, but we also need this independent citizen commission not made up of Members of Congress, but appointed by the House and the Senate leaders of both parties in equal numbers so that we could actually have people who look at this from the perspective of all of America and not tainted by even the vestiges or the appearance of party.

Apparently when President Trump heard that special counsel had been named, he laughed out loud, saying that this is "the greatest witch hunt of a politician in American history."

No, Mr. President, we are seeking the truth. As the American people have shown us, they are not backing down, and we will continue to fight for this truth.

Now, in that vein, I also wanted to mention that my colleague, Representative RASKIN, and I actually introduced a package of bills that we are calling the Trump transparency package. It is because we really believe that the

American people deserve better. We believe that the American people deserve from us transparency. So what this package will do is, first, it will clearly forbid government officials from accepting anything of value from foreign governments in exchange for an official act. It would prohibit government employees from using their positions to further the financial interests of the President. It would ensure that the President's press pool continues to exist so that the American people receive honest answers, and it would require the President and his family to publicly report any foreign business deals that exceed \$10,000.

These are simple steps. They are not egregious and they are not outrageous. They would apply to anyone. They are not partisan. They are about transparency and accountability so that we know that the President of the United States and that others in government are actually accountable to the American people—not to their financial interests, not to their bank accounts, not to their stock portfolios, not to their hotels and golf courses, but to the American people. We have to hold every administration—and certainly this one—accountable. So now, more than ever, it is our moral duty to defend the Constitution, and this bill package goes a step in the right direction.

So I hope that all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would actually cosponsor the Trump transparency package with us so that we can continue to fight for the American people, for democracy, and for the notion that America is willing to question itself and for the notion that America is willing to always put our hands on that moral arc of the universe to push it more quickly towards justice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHENEY). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and are further reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, first, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues, to talk about restoring Congress' con-

stitutional oversight on matters of war and peace. I invite all of my colleagues to join me in demanding that this House immediately repeal the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Nearly 16 years ago, Congress passed an open-ended, blank check for endless war. This authorization gives any President the authority to wage limitless war at any time, anywhere, for any reason in perpetuity. The vote to relinquish our constitutional authority occurred just 3 days after the horrific terrorist attacks on 9/11. The American people were angry and anxious to take action.

Madam Speaker, I was just as outraged and devastated as every other American, but I voted against this 2001 AUMF because I believed then—as I believe now—that it was a blank check and set the stage for perpetual war.

This House rushed to pass the 60-word authorization with little debate. Sixty words, Madam Speaker, drastically altered history. In the almost 16 years since its passage, the 2001 AUMF—which was designed, mind you, to punish the perpetrators of the brutal and deadly attacks on September 11—has been used now by three Presidents to wage endless war around the globe. A recent report from the Congressional Research Service shows that this authorization has been used more than 37 times in 14 countries to justify military action.

□ 1800

These include operations at Guantanamo Bay, warrantless wiretapping, and recent military actions in Libya, Syria, Somalia, Yemen, and many more. This report only looks at unclassified military actions.

I would like to now yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN), who has been such a leader on so many issues, especially around issues of our constitutional responsibility, issues around war and peace.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Congresswoman for having this Special Order to address this issue and for continuing to be such a leader on behalf of this great democracy that we have.

Although I was not in Congress when this AUMF was established, more than 15 years later, it is clear this authorization is not designed for this endless and perpetual war on terror.

I commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her bravery and her unwavering stance for what is right.

Sadly, what the gentlewoman feared is now our reality. Just today, U.S. forces participated in an airstrike against the Assad regime under the umbrella of the same AUMF. This is just the latest example of this virtual endless war we are able to wage in the Middle East and beyond.

As of January 2013, DOD reported 7,008 U.S. military deaths in the war on terror in addition to the over 50,000 that have been wounded. This does not include the huge numbers of civilians killed and families that have been impacted by the U.S. military machine. This is compounded by the harsh reality that, according to Pentagon statistics, suicide, not combat, is the leading killer of U.S. troops deployed to the Middle East to fight Islamic State militants. Between 2001 and 2010, the rate of suicide in the military has doubled.

When we decide to commit our troops to our mission, it needs to be with clear goals and the explicit approval of Congress, approval that aligns with the goals of the administration and the Commander in Chief. Anything less puts personnel at risk, draining vital resources, finances, and our military.

We are taking our military away from readiness everywhere. We are making tactical and deliberate actions less feasible by spreading our military capacity thin. We are not doing our job if we allow carte blanche to any President to wage a nebulous war.

This is not just a bipartisan issue, this is an American issue.

I have voted against funding bills that maintain operations under the 2001 AUMF under the previous administration and feel no differently today. Quite frankly, based on the actions of this President, I have even less confidence that he has a reasonable and targeted plan to deal with such a complex military issue.

We need a deliberate process. We need a new AUMF that establishes strict parameters, attainable goals, and, most importantly, accountability. There is a real cost here, a human cost here; so whether it is an additional 1 or 1,000, our troops demand more, our allies demand more, and this country of ours deserves more.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for that very powerful statement and also for reminding us that this should not be a partisan issue.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO), who has been very diligent in his effort to repeal the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Mr. YOHIO. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for organizing this very important Special Order. This is something that she has been a champion on. This is my third term, and we have been talking about this for 4 years. Enough is enough. It is time to end this.

I rise today in support of Congress reclaiming its authority under Article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution. The United States must have a clear strategy with well-defined goals to counter nonstate actors like ISIS that

threaten the United States. They threaten our national security interests. We must also develop clear legal authority for our military to take action against these groups. Ending the 2001 AUMF is a crucial part of that effort.

According to scholars at Brown University's Watson Institute of International and Public Affairs, our government, our taxpayers, have spent \$4.8 trillion on the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, paid for almost entirely by borrowing.

As of today, 6,925 American soldiers have given their lives serving our country in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Inherent Resolve, and Operation Freedom's Sentinel, according to the Department of Defense. But what about the costs to take care of these young men and women for the next 60, 70, and 80 years in our country?

While our brave men and women in uniform continue to fight in the sands of Iraq and Syria and the mountains of Afghanistan, we have gone through three Presidential administrations without a statement articulating what victory is, except that "terrorism must be defeated."

No one disagrees with that goal, but it is an uncertain way to order our Nation's military posture and to commit our young men and women in the military serving this Nation without a clear, defined goal. We have been at war in Afghanistan for 16 years, yet the Taliban controls or contests 40 percent of Afghan districts, according to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction.

The U.S. intelligence community's worldwide threat assessment states that "the overall situation in Afghanistan will very likely continue to deteriorate, even if international support is sustained," and that "endemic state weaknesses, the government's political fragility, deficiencies of the Afghan National Security Forces, Taliban persistence, and regional interference will remain key impediments to improvement."

In addition to Afghanistan, the United States has also been involved in Iraq, on and off, since 2003.

Dr. James Zogby of the Arab American Institute conducted a poll of Iraqi public opinion in 2016, which found that 94 percent of Iraqis had an unfavorable attitude about the United States. Ninety-four percent of Iraqis polled say they do not think the U.S. contributes to peace and stability in the Arab world.

We need a much clearer strategy for our men and women in uniform than to tell them just to keep doing the same thing over and over again. We all know what the definition of insanity is, and we need to do better for them and for our partners around the world.

Our Nation has arrived at a historic and constitutional moment. Prior to

President Trump's inauguration, President Obama released a framework outlining his administration's formal legal view on the use of military force against Islamic terror groups around the globe. That report relied heavily on the 2001 AUMF, which has been used to justify numerous American military operations against an ever-expanding number of terror groups, many of which have only slight links to the perpetrators of the September 11, 2001, attacks.

In reality, our loose interpretation of the 2001 AUMF to have a perpetual war against terror might as well be using the authorization that Thomas Jefferson used to go after the Barbary pirates on the shores of Tripoli the way this has been stretched over and over again. It is unconscionable.

I hope that President Trump's administration will not continue to rely on that same legal framework but, rather, that he will formally ask Congress to pass a new authorization with a clear directive of what success is for the use of force that will not perpetually operate in constitutional gray areas.

Strikes against groups like al-Shabaab in Somalia take place in constitutional twilight zones where the Constitution's distribution of authority to use force is uncertain, as Justice Jackson wrote in *Youngstown v. Sawyer*.

To better preserve our Constitution's separation of powers structure, Congress must make it a priority to develop clear legal authority for American military action against Islamist terror organizations. Further, such authorization should be structured so it will not turn into the expanding grant of power like the 2001 AUMF has done.

If we fail to pass a new AUMF, it would do our servicemen and -women, as well as the American public, a fundamental disservice. It would prolong authorization of an endless war.

It is time to end the Middle East conflict. Let's end the authorization of the 2001 AUMF. Right now, I fear that many of our military operations do not have congressional authorization and do not comply with the clear statement of Article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution that gives Congress the power to declare war.

To show our servicemen and -women we support them, to uphold the Constitution, and for the good of our Nation, I hope we can work on the passage of a new AUMF with deliberate speed.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Her commitment to this cause is commendable.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman Yoho for his clear and concise statement laying out how explicit the Constitution is as it relates to matters of war and peace and how we must debate both if we are going to

continue to use force. We look forward to a bipartisan effort this year to get us where we need to be, and that is to repeal this authorization. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), who is the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and whom I served with on the committee for many years, and who really has a very clear understanding of foreign and military policy and has been such a leader on so many issues and someone on whom we rely on so many fronts.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman LEE. We are all grateful to you for being so clear and so principled.

As I have often said, Congress must fulfill its constitutional obligation to consider an updated AUMF, and as my colleagues said, that stands for the Authorization for the Use of Military Force. Right now, the administration is still using the authorization we passed after September 11, 2001, in the legal justification to fight ISIS. That is deeply problematic.

The 2001 AUMF has none of the limits many of us are seeking. We are a Congress. We are not a rubber stamp to any President. We have a right to vote on issues such as war and peace.

U.S. leadership to defeat ISIS is critical, but this doesn't require a large-scale deployment of U.S. forces. With American leadership, we were able to prevent the wholesale slaughter of the Yazidi people.

Iraqi partners were able to maintain control of the Mosul Dam, which, if breached by ISIS, could have resulted in death and displacement of up to 2 million people and endangered American personnel in Iraq. With our support, local forces have taken back about 80 percent of the territory from ISIS in Iraq and Syria.

So another large-scale, open-ended commitment of American troops is certainly not the answer. The disastrous intervention in Iraq last decade set the stage for the rise of ISIS in the first place. The 2001 AUMF has no limits at all on U.S. ground troops.

As troop levels continue to rise in the fight against ISIS, we just cannot put our heads in the sand. We need to sit together as a deliberative body and make these important decisions, not give any President or any administration a blank check.

I am working on legislation to limit the authority Congress provided after September 11. We need to tailor this authority to the threat we face today. September 11 happened 16 years ago. We need new parameters to define our mission and our goals. I voted for that AUMF 16 years ago, but I never would have imagined that 16 years later it would still be there and give a blank check to any President who would use

it anytime, anyplace, and to do anything. So we must fulfill our constitutional responsibility and consider what an appropriate authorization should include.

Using a 2001 authorization for a 2017 conflict sets a terrible constitutional precedent. Congress has a vital constitutional responsibility over America's war powers. This is one of the most important decisions we are charged with making. When we fail to live up to that responsibility, we weaken the balance of power that is the bedrock of our democracy. Considering an updated AUMF is not easy, but it is our job. We should do our job.

President Obama came to Congress well over a year ago with a proposed AUMF. Not many people cared for it, but it was a proposed AUMF. We could have changed it—it was a starting point—but we didn't do it. We threw it away because it just got too hard. That cannot happen again.

Congress has a responsibility to do its part here, and, unfortunately, we are not meeting that responsibility. We owe it to the American people and we owe it our men and women in uniform to do our job. Congressional inaction on an AUMF is inexcusable.

□ 1815

I want to say that it is a separate issue from the recent strikes against Assad. Congress has made no authorization whatsoever for sustained military action against Assad. The 60-day clock started ticking when the President notified Congress of his missile strike.

The administration must come to Congress on that issue as well. There cannot be long-term military action against Assad without Congressional say-so.

Assad is a bad guy, and I think that he should be deposed, quite frankly. I think that any future for Syria cannot include Assad, who has murdered hundreds of thousands of his own people.

But whether the United States must involve itself in every single war and ground troops using an outdated authorization for the use of force just strikes me as being something that should not happen and will lead us down a path in the future where we can't get out of it.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE). She has always stood up for her beliefs, whether they seem popular or unpopular when it happened. That is just the kind of people we want to serve in Congress: someone who speaks out and has been a consistent fighter.

I am proud to join with her tonight, and I hope that more colleagues on both sides of the aisle will understand that this is an important constitutional principle. It is not a matter of who is in power, who is the President, what party has the majority. As Americans and as legislators, we should all

be very concerned about giving any President a blank check to go to war.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for that very powerful statement and for really laying out the fact that Congress is missing in action and that this resolution, this AUMF, must be repealed so that we can move forward and make some determinations as to what Congress' role will be and what we think should happen in terms of our strategy as it relates to going to war.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for being here tonight and I thank him for his leadership and his expertise.

Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), who has been a friend, a supporter, who constantly is talking about why we need to protect our troops, support our troops, keep them out of harm's way, support our veterans. He is a great American, and I have the pleasure of working with him on so many issues.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for the leadership and also this opportunity. I could not agree more with where we are and why we are on the floor tonight.

If you believe in the Constitution, which the majority of us do because we raise our hands when we are sworn in, then we need to do our constitutional responsibility. What has been said tonight by my colleagues and will be ended by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) in just a few minutes is the fact that we do not do our constitutional duty or responsibility.

The 2001 AUMF to talk about going after Osama bin Laden after 9/11, meaning Afghanistan, made sense. The AUMF in 2002 should have never passed this House. I regret that I voted for it because Iraq was an unnecessary war. But that is history now.

What we are talking about is learning from history and dealing with the present and the future. Therefore, there is no reason that the leadership of the House, Mr. RYAN, will not permit the committees of jurisdiction to bring forward a new AUMF. It could be a blanket AUMF or it could mean Syria or maybe Afghanistan.

I have joined with colleagues on the other side, including the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), to put in H.R. 1666 that says, after 16 years, there needs to be a debate on the future involvement of the American people and the military into Afghanistan.

We have 300 Members of Congress sitting on the floor day in and day out who have never been part of a debate or a vote on the future of Afghanistan. After 16 years, \$800 billion spent, 2,000 Americans killed and 20,000 wounded, if we do not have a debate on whether we stay in Afghanistan or we talk about

coming home, then our leadership in the House are not doing their constitutional duty either.

Madam Speaker, tonight I wanted to be very supportive, as I will be. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and I have been on each other's bills as it deals with Syria, Afghanistan, or Iraq. It is time for us to demand from our leadership—I do not blame the Presidents, whether it be Trump or Obama, I do not blame them, because it is our responsibility.

James Madison was very clear, and I am going to paraphrase very quickly. It is the legislative branch that will debate and declare war, not the executive branch. What we have done with these AUMFs from 2001 and 2002, we have abdicated our responsibilities.

I know how the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) feels, and all those who spoke tonight and those who are not here tonight to speak, how we all feel. But it is up to us to demand from our leadership. Don't wait for a President to give direction, because Madison was very clear. It is our responsibility.

Madam Speaker, I have written five or six letters to Mr. RYAN, the Speaker of the House. I have written him additional letters with my colleagues on the other side asking him to permit us to meet our constitutional responsibility. At this point we have had no luck, and I am asking Mr. RYAN tonight, the Speaker of the House, to direct the committees of jurisdiction to come forward with one of these bills that have been introduced by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and other Members of the Democratic Party and those of us in the Republican Party to come forward and let's have a refresher course, so to speak, on the constitutional responsibility.

I have Camp Lejeune Marine Base in my district. I talked to marines as recently as 2 weeks ago. One has been five times to Afghanistan. He said it is not worth a dime to be there. We are spending billions and billions of dollars, and kids still getting killed.

I have signed over 10,000 letters to families and extended families who have lost loved ones because I knew I should never have voted to go into Iraq. That is my mistake, and I am living with my mistake. But what I am trying to do now is to join you and others to say we have a constitutional responsibility to debate war. If we are going to send our young men and women to die in war, we need to debate it.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for this opportunity. I look forward to working with her as we go forward. I think we really need to put pressure on the leadership to allow us to meet our responsibilities. I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for giving me this opportunity to be here with my colleagues.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for his statement tonight and for his leadership. I think, listening to him, listening to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO), and working with our colleagues in a bipartisan way, you know, we have to keep hope alive on this because our young men and women, our Constitution, our country, deserves it. You have been here from the beginning in terms of trying to help put Congress back into action because we have been missing in action.

Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), my colleague from the Silicon Valley, right next door to my district, who has come to Congress and has hit the ground running. He is a true advocate on so many issues as it relates to peace and justice and security.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her vision in making sure Congress votes on matters of war and peace.

When we were attacked, after 9/11, I, like many Americans, supported strikes on the people who attacked us. But no one in this country would have thought that a resolution would be used for perpetual war.

Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) had the courage back then and the foresight to stand up with courage and stand up against a resolution that has provided a blank check for the last 16 years. I do believe that that is the type of political courage that one day will be remembered in history, and I applaud the gentlewoman for that.

We have seen that, since 2001, the terrorists, which were contained on the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, have spread. They have spread to the Middle East. They have spread to Africa. And it is about time that we ask: What have all these interventions gotten us?

And this is not a partisan issue, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has mentioned and as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) just articulated. It goes back to our founding principles of John Quincy Adams, an early President who said: "We ought not to go overseas to slay monsters."

And he said the reason we shouldn't do that is we should give people who seek freedom our voice and our prayers; but if we go out to destroy monsters, we actually will be seen not as a liberating force, but as a dictatorial force because we often won't know who the truly freedom-seeking people are.

I wish every Member of Congress, every Senator would read John Quincy Adams' insight so that we had more restraint.

Consider the issue of Afghanistan, where 40 percent of the country is not

under our control. And here is the thing: I know this region. I was born here. But being of South Asian origin, on the Pakistan-India border, where there are 3,000 terrorists, there are 150,000 troops to take care of that.

Does anyone think sending 10,000 troops again and again has accomplished anything?

It has not. All it is doing is further antagonizing people and putting our troops at risk.

Then when we called for regime change in 2011 with Syria and Assad, we made Syria a magnet for terrorist groups. Now in Yemen, where we are aiding the Saudi Arabian Government, which is aligned, ironically, with al-Qaida, and al-Qaida, which has claimed responsibility for the shoe bomber and the underwear bomber in this country, we are aiding and intervening in a place where we are actually supporting groups that are harming us.

All the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is saying is we ought to debate these issues, that the American people ought to know what these interventions are getting us; why they are not making us more safe and why we are not having a thoughtful policy.

Madam Speaker, I applaud the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. LEE) vision and I applaud her leadership. I know that history will vindicate her.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) for those kind words, but also for his clarity and his vision and understanding that we must repeal this authorization to use force and put Congress back in the mix where we should have been from day one. I want to thank him again very much for being here.

Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. LEE. I will close now. Once again, I ask our Speaker a very simple question, and that is why he has not scheduled a debate on this vital issue that affects our national security.

We asked over and over again for a vote to repeal this authorization. We want a debate and we want to have a new vote based on the current realities of what is taking place as it relates to the use of force by our own government.

In February of 2015, Congressman ELIOT ENGEL mentioned that President Obama sent to Congress an ISIS-specific AUMF, and it was never taken up. There were no actions, no hearings, no formal debate. Not one vote.

We have a new President that is continuing to use the outdated 2001 AUMF in expanded ways, including justifying sending more troops to fight ISIS in Syria and spending more taxpayer dollars on war and putting our young men and women in harm's way.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank all of the Members who were here last night. Let's hope that this discussion will help more Members come to the floor and talk about why we need the Speaker to bring up the bill to repeal the authorization to use force.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SWALWELL of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through May 25 on account of birth of child.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 419. An act to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program, and for other purposes.

S. 583. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 19, 2017, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1369. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral James D. Syring, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1370. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2017 Annual Report to Congress on Chemical and Biological Warfare Defense, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1523(a); Public Law 103-160, Sec. 1703; (107 Stat. 1854); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1371. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Advanced Arresting Gear Selected Acquisition Report for the most recently concluded fiscal quarter, pursuant to Sec. 125 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2017, Public Law 114-328, and Secs. 2432 and 2433(g) of title 10 U.S.C.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1372. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of

the President, transmitting the Office's report on discretionary appropriations legislation within seven calendar days of enactment, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 901(a)(7)(B); Public Law 99-177, Sec. 251(a)(7)(B) (as amended by Public Law 114-113, Sec. 1003); (129 Stat. 3035); ; to the Committee on the Budget.

1373. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria — Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) Program [CFDA Number: 84.371C] [Docket No.: ED-2015-OESE-0129] (RIN: 1810-AB25) received May 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1374. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Promoting Diversification of Ownership in the Broadcasting Services [MB Docket No.: 07-294]; Amendment of Part 1 of the Commission's Rules, Concerning Practice and Procedure, Amendment of CORES Registration System [MD Docket No.: 10-234] received May 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1375. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.3555(e) of the Commission's Rules, National Television Multiple Ownership Rule [MB Docket No.: 13-236] received May 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1376. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-125, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1377. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-136, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1378. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-083, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1379. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-107, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1380. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report containing information about a proposed transaction, pursuant to Sec. 40(g)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1381. A letter from the Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the semiannual report prepared by the Inspector General of the Federal Reserve System for the six-month period ending March 31, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1382. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Depart-

ment's semiannual report from the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1383. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major final rule — Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; U.S. Navy Training Activities in the Gulf of Alaska Temporary Maritime Activities Area [Docket No.: 141125997-7365-02] (RIN: 0648-BE67) received May 16, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 953. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-131 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1726. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to improve the organization of such title and to incorporate certain transfers and modifications into such title, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2510. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2511. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to streamline the acquisition system, invest early in acquisition programs, improve the acquisition workforce, and improve transparency in the acquisition system; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 2512. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to expand foster parent training and provide new appropriations to support the attainment of a driver's license; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2513. A bill to allow certain off-duty law enforcement officers and retired law en-

forcement officers to carry a concealed firearm to protect children in a school zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 2514. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure that revenues collected from passengers as aviation security fees are used to help finance the costs of aviation security screening by repealing a requirement that a portion of such fees be credited as offsetting receipts and deposited in the general fund of the Treasury; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 2515. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to remove travel agencies from the partial list of establishments having no retail concept for the purposes of certain exemptions under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa (for himself, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 2516. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the individual mandate in areas with no Exchange plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2517. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for requirements relating to the reassignment of Department of Veterans Affairs senior executive employees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 2518. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2018 and 2019, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. ROE of

Tennessee, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BACON, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOST, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CURELO of Florida, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DUNN, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. JONES, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAST, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. POLIS, Mrs.

RADEWAGEN, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 2519. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. FLORES):

H.R. 2520. A bill to require providers of broadband internet access service and edge services to clearly and conspicuously notify users of the privacy policies of such providers, to give users opt-in or opt-out approval rights with respect to the use of, disclosure of, and access to user information collected by such providers based on the level of sensitivity of such information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. SANFORD):

H.R. 2521. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to include South Carolina as a part of the Virginia/Carolina peanut producing region for purposes of appointment to the Peanut Standards Board; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BANKS of Indiana:

H.R. 2522. A bill to require the Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency to submit reports to Congress on paper and property inventory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. LEE, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 2523. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to the scope of employee pension benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2524. A bill to provide for conveyance of a former immigration and customs facility from the Department of Homeland Security to Ventura County, California; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HIMES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas):

H.R. 2525. A bill to improve the financial literacy of students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr.

TAKANO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. LEE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 2526. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reinstate the authority of the Secretary of Education to make Federal Direct Stafford Loans to graduate and professional students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. LEE, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 2527. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to modify the dischargeability of debts for certain educational payments and loans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 2528. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide that Federal law shall not preempt State law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 2529. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a national intersection and interchange safety construction program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 2530. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make residents of Puerto Rico eligible for the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 2531. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to apply Medicare part B deemed enrollment process to residents of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H.R. 2532. A bill to realign structures and reallocate resources in the Federal Government in keeping with the core belief that families are the best protection for children and the bedrock of any society to bolster United States diplomacy targeted at ensuring that every child can grow up in a permanent, safe, nurturing, and loving family, and to ensure that intercountry adoption to the United States becomes a viable and fully developed option for providing families for children in need, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 2533. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for parent savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 2534. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rate of tax on domestic manufacturing income to 20 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 2535. A bill to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOEBACK:

H.R. 2536. A bill to provide for grants for energy efficiency improvements and renewable energy improvements at public school facilities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2537. A bill to designate the area between the intersections of International Drive Northwest and Van Ness Street Northwest and International Drive Northwest and International Place Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as "Liu Xiaobo Plaza", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2538. A bill to provide certain workplace protections to interns relating to discriminatory practices; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CAPUANO, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 2539. A bill to reestablish the Office of Noise Abatement and Control in the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2540. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to allow the District of Columbia to receive Federal funding under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 2541. A bill to provide for a report on the role of incubators and accelerators in the commercialization of federally funded research and regional economic development; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BEYER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 2542. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of General Services to incorporate bird-safe building materials and design features into public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2543. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for 2 years the exclusion from gross income of discharges of qualified principal residence indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 2544. A bill to require the Director of the National Institutes of Health to carry out a study to add to the scientific knowledge on reducing teacher stress and increasing teacher retention and well-being, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TORRES (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COLE, Mr. LAMALFA, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2545. A bill to reauthorize the special diabetes programs for Indians; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California:

H.R. 2546. A bill to ensure the Chief Information Office of the Federal Communications Commission has a significant role in decisions related to information technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WOODALL (for himself and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 2547. A bill to expand the Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals who may qualify to perform physical examinations on eligible veterans and issue medical certificates required for operation of a commercial motor vehicle, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. KHANNA):

H.J. Res. 101. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of terms an individual may serve as a Member of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. REICHERT):

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution expressing support for strengthening engagement between the United States and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. YOH, Mr. BARR, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. RENACCI):

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should withdraw from the Paris Agreement, adopted in December 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of October 28 as "Honoring the Nation's First Responders Day"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a museum should be established and operated in Washington, DC, for the purpose of memorializing the victims of communist regimes, educating Americans and foreign visitors about the ideology of communism and its history, and encouraging visitors to meet the challenges of the human rights abuses presented by communist regimes today; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. POLIS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HURD, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. MCSALLY, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H. Res. 336. A resolution reaffirming a strong commitment to the United States-Mexico partnership; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. EVANS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H. Res. 337. A resolution expressing support for designation of May as Stroke Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Ms. MENG, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SABLON, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LEE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H. Res. 338. A resolution recognizing the significance of Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month in May as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H. Res. 339. A resolution calling upon the United States Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 340. A resolution in support of baseball as the pastime of the United States and condemning racial slurs; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsyl-

vania, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. STEFANK, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. WITTMAN, and Ms. ROSEN):

H. Res. 341. A resolution recognizing the contributions of Defense laboratories to national security and supporting the designation of May 18, 2017, as the "Department of Defense Laboratory Day 2017"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H. Res. 342. A resolution recognizing the essential contributions of frontline health workers to strengthening the United States national security and economic prosperity, sustaining and expanding progress on global health, and saving the lives of millions of women, men, and children around the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 343. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding steps that Congress should take to restore democracy and change the way we do politics in the United States by reducing the influence of money and corporations and promoting the participation of the people in politics and government; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

41. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 38, memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal the standards set forth by the United States Environmental Protection Agency on portable fuel container design; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the common Defence", "to raise and support Armies", "to provide and maintain a Navy" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 and 18 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution. Article I, Section 8, clause 3, the Interstate Commerce Clause, gives Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes. Article I, Section 8, clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause, gives Congress the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 2515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 2516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 2517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 2518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 2519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 5 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 2520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The "necessary and proper" clause of Article I Section 8.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 2521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BANKS of Indiana:

H.R. 2522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, giving Congress the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 2523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, impost and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States)

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 2526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8 "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DeGETTE:

H.R. 2528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment X to the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 2529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7—

The Congress shall have Power . . . To establish Post Offices and Post Roads

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 2530.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I section I of the U.S. Constitution "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 2531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section I of the U.S. Constitution "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 2532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution that the Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 2533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have the Power To law and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1

"All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives"

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 2535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. LOEBACK:

H.R. 2536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the US Constitution

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2538.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 2542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution and the 16th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 2545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California:

H.R. 2546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. WOODALL:

H.R. 2547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States and establish Post Offices and post Roads.

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.J. Res. 101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V: The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this

Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BUDD, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 23: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 38: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.

H.R. 91: Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 104: Ms MOORE.

H.R. 110: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 113: Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 173: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 256: Mr. JODY B, HICE of Georgia and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 257: Mr. MEADOWS and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 305: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 350: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida and Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 358: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 426: Mr. TROTT, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 459: Mr. SMUCKER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 468: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 490: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 500: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 525: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 529: Mr. LOFGREN.

H.R. 619: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 695: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 747: Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 754: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 772: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 807: Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 816: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 820: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 821: Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 837: Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico.

H.R. 850: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 883: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 909: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 916: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 919: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 931: Mr. UPTON, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 953: Mr. UPTON and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 964: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 976: Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 1005: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1017: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1036: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1046: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1054: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1057: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 1090: Ms. ROSEN and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1092: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1098: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1104: Mr. JONES and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1156: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 1162: Miss GONZALEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1164: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1171: Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. BACON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MENG, Mr. TURNER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COLE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1200: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1235: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1243: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1247: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1279: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 1284: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1315: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 1328: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1329: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1339: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1344: Mr. HECK, Mr. COOK, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1347: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1361: Mr. TURNER, Ms. MENG, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1370: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1399: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 1405: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1414: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1422: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1439: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1441: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1443: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1494: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. GALLEG0, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1545: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1558: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H.R. 1566: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1568: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1599: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1625: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 1626: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 1661: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1676: Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1698: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1711: Mr. WALZ and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1730: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1740: Ms. TENNEY and Mr. DONOVAN.

- H.R. 1776: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1794: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1796: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1810: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 1820: Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1823: Mr. CORREA and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1824: Mr. CORREA and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1825: Mr. BOST, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. LONG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1847: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1865: Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 1873: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1881: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. DAVIDSON.
H.R. 1952: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MOULTON, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1953: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 1955: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1968: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 1988: Mr. PETERS and Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 2004: Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 2012: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2052: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2170: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2171: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2179: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 2181: Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 2215: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DEFazio, and Ms. BONAMICI.
- H.R. 2228: Mr. SMUCKER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. YOHO, Mr. KIND, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 2234: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2243: Mr. KIND and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 2249: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 2260: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2309: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2317: Mr. KILMER and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2319: Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 2320: Mr. SABLAN and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 2347: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 2353: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 2359: Mr. TROTT and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 2366: Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 2372: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. FASO, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2389: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2392: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2428: Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2452: Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2465: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. LANCE, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MENG, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2466: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2472: Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2499: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.J. Res. 48: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.J. Res. 100: Mr. SANFORD.
H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. HIMES and Mr. SOTO.
H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H. Res. 31: Mr. BARLETTA.
H. Res. 200: Mr. HIMES, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. STEWART, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Ms. ROSEN.
H. Res. 220: Mr. DENHAM.
H. Res. 244: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 249: Mr. AMODEI.
H. Res. 256: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. RUSH.
H. Res. 282: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Res. 311: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BERA, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H. Res. 327: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KILDEE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING TOMMY L.
McCULLOUGH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Mr. Tommy L. McCullough, who was born in Pickens, Madison County, Mississippi to the late parents of W.E.L. and Classie McCullough. He was the youngest of twenty siblings, where ten (10) were added by marriage.

Mr. Tommy L. McCullough was raised in Valley View, Mississippi and attended Nichols School until the eighth grade. Later he went to Cameron Street High School and left to go to the Army while he was in the 12th grade.

Mr. McCullough entered the Army on December 13, 1954, and was in the 25th Division at Scofield Barracks in Hawaii. While there an Honor Guard was formed after a few months, and height requirements were 5 feet 10 inches tall. But, because he was sharp and intelligent he was chosen to be a Guard, although he was 5 feet 8 inches tall. They later changed the title from Guard to Drill Platoon. No one could handle a rifle the way Mr. McCullough handled it, and he was recognized with many letters of congratulations for his performance in the Drill Platoon. He also went to the Non-Commission Officer Academy and received a diploma. Within two years, he went from a Private to SP3 (Specialist 3rd class). There he stayed until his discharge on November 27, 1956 and went back to Jackson, Mississippi.

He had many friends who were Civil Rights Activist, one of them was a Freedom Rider. Mr. Jake Freeze was one of the leaders in the Freedom Riders Movement that lived in his house in 1963, which was later called the Freedom House in Madison County. Pictures are on the wall of the Civil Rights Museum in Canton, Mississippi, today.

Mr. McCullough afterwards moved to Louisville, KY in 1965. He worked at Harshaws Chemical Company for about five years. He missed Mississippi so much that he came back and opened up a night club, Billa Farro, for five years in Jackson and later opened a Car Dealership, TC and III, and then he retired.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Tommy L. McCullough for his dedication to serving others.

TRIBUTE TO CONNIE AND GARY
PENICK

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Connie and Gary Penick of Milo, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 50th Wedding Anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on March 3rd, 2017.

Connie and Gary's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 50th Anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 50th year together, and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

RECOGNIZING MARION COUNTY
LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Marion County Sheriff Billy Woods, City of Belleview Police Chief Terry Holland, and the law enforcement officers who keep Marion County safe every single day.

This week marks the annual observance of Police Week. Though we set aside one week a year to honor law enforcement, I encourage all Americans to join me not only this week, but every day, in recognizing the honor, courage, and commitment of America's law enforcement.

Our law enforcement are heroes in the community. They keep us safe, and are willing to put their lives on the line every day in the course of their duties. It is impossible to fully express our gratitude or adequately recognize the professionalism of the men and women who voluntarily put their lives on the line for our safety and security. It is with deep respect that we pause today to honor the memory of the heroes who gave the last full measure of devotion and made the ultimate sacrifice.

I want to extend my sincere appreciation to Marion County Sheriff Billy Woods, City of Belleview Police Chief Terry Holland, and the law enforcement officers who bravely and selflessly serve Marion County. It is an honor to recognize them and all men and women in law enforcement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Vote No. 259, I would have voted Nay on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 323, providing for consideration of H.R. 115. On Roll Call Vote No. 260, I would have voted No on agreeing to H. Res. 323, providing for consideration of H.R. 115. On Roll Call Vote No. 261, I would have voted Nay on tabling the ruling of the Chair. On Roll Call Vote No. 262, I would have voted Yea on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1177, Removing Outdated Restrictions to Allow for Job Growth Act.

IN MEMORY OF LUCY CASADO

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of Lucy Casado, beloved matriarch of the landmark restaurant Lucy's El Adobe Café in Los Angeles, California, who passed away on May 2, 2017.

Lucy was born in El Paso, Texas on January 18, 1926. Although she originally wanted to pursue a career in medicine, she decided that cooking was a reasonable alternative. In 1964, she and her husband, Frank, opened a small one-room café, Lucy's El Adobe Café, as a family business, on Melrose Avenue, across the street from Paramount Studios in Los Angeles.

The warm, cozy restaurant grew to become a popular destination for a variety of actors such as John Belushi and Jack Nicholson, and musicians such as Linda Ronstadt, Jackson Browne and Don Henley. Also a favorite spot for politicians, Governor Jerry Brown frequented the café long before he became an elected official, and he became a close friend of the Casado family. Other elected officials such as Senator Bob Dole, Senator Robert Kennedy, and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey were known to patronize the café when visiting from Washington, DC. Many of the celebrities that were seen walking through the restaurant doors developed personal and long-lasting relationships with Lucy, and were proud to watch as El Adobe Café cemented itself as a beloved cornerstone of the Los Angeles community.

Lucy and her family had a passion for political and social activism, and in 1960, they co-founded the Mexican American Political Association (MAPA) as a way to elect Mexican-American candidates to public office, and to

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

work on social and economic justice issues. Mrs. Casado also supported numerous charitable causes, and Lucy's El Adobe Café hosted many fundraisers for worthwhile organizations, including her favorite charity, the Priestly Fraternity of Saint Peter Los Angeles.

Preceded in death by her husband Frank in 1990, Lucy is survived by her three children: daughter Patricia and sons Darryl and Frank James.

Lucy was an irreplaceable part of our community and she will be sorely missed by her family, friends and all those who called Lucy's El Adobe Café their home away from home. I ask all members to join me in remembering Lucy Casado.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLOTTE AND BOB BANCROFT

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Charlotte and Bob Bancroft of Atlantic, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 50th Wedding Anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on February 4, 2017.

Charlotte and Bob's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 50th Anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them nothing but the best.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 2017, I was not present for the recorded votes on rollcall No. 261 and 262. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair and YEA on H.R. 1177, the Removing Outdated Restrictions to Allow for Job Growth Act.

INVESTING IN AMERICA'S FUTURE THROUGH INFRASTRUCTURE

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to act to improve the sad state of our nation's infrastructure.

This week is national infrastructure week, where we recognize America's infrastructure. Sadly, what we have to recognize isn't particularly positive.

This year's infrastructure grade from the American Society of Civil Engineers is a "D+." Sound infrastructure is literally and figuratively the foundation of our nation's economy. We must do better than a D+.

We know from our country's history that infrastructure projects move forward most effectively when local, state, and federal governments all do their part.

We, in California, are no strangers to infrastructure problems caused by a lack of investment, but we are stepping up to make crucial improvements. In my district, Merced, Madera, and Fresno counties have all increased their local sales taxes in order to pay for crucial road repairs, new roads and highways, and other essential transportation projects. Last month California enacted a bill to increase the state gas tax and vehicle fees to pay for road, bridge, and other transportation improvement projects. Clearly these tough decisions come with policy implications and political risks. This includes Governor Brown's decision to pursue high speed rail, which the President supports.

There is a reason we are no longer investing in our infrastructure, and it is lack of political will.

Now it is time for the federal government to face this challenge head on, and we know we can because we have begun the process in California.

In the Valley, we have serious challenges with our water infrastructure. We need significant improvements to our water storage, water delivery, and drinking water systems. We have taken some initial steps to resolve these challenges, by acting at the state and federal level. In 2014, California passed Proposition 1, which authorized \$7.12 billion for state water infrastructure projects. Late last year, after years of hard work by myself and my colleagues in the California delegation, the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act, or the WIIN Act, became law. This law authorizes vital water projects across the country, including projects in the Valley, such as additional storage at the New Exchequer Dam and San Luis Reservoir in Merced County and increased funding for water recycling projects, like the North Valley Regional Recycled Water Program, which will provide 50,000 acre-feet of new water for Merced and Stanislaus counties.

Although more must be done to improve California's infrastructure, this good first step demonstrates the type of success we can achieve when all levels of government work to do their part on a bipartisan basis.

President Trump has stated that significant investment in infrastructure is one of his Administration's highest priorities. This is an opportunity for Congress and the Administration to work together on a bipartisan basis to invest in the future of our nation.

But he must be more specific about the breadth and width of his vision. He needs to answer the following questions: How much will it cost? Where will the money come from? How will he incentivize state and local governments to come up with matching funds and get the private sector to invest? Equally impor-

tant, what will the breakdown of investment be in the various types of infrastructure, such as transportation, port and harbor, and water infrastructure?

If the President works with members of Congress to create a serious and smart plan here, there is great possibility for bipartisan support because no bridge, road, or dam is Democratic or Republican.

RECOGNIZING AND CELEBRATING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF LA PORTE, TX

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 125th Anniversary of the City of La Porte, in Harris County, Texas.

Located just south of where the Houston Ship Channel meets Galveston Bay, La Porte is a small Texas town, rich in history, and built on community. French for "The Door," the City of La Porte was incorporated on August 10, 1892. The city founder's vision for La Porte consisted of four objectives: the establishment of a great commercial center and leading harbor on the coast of Texas; the establishment of a natural summer and winter resort area; the building of a manufacturing center for the Southwest; and the establishment of an education center second to none in the Southwest.

Today, La Porte is known as a sleepy escape from the big city and is home to numerous, shipyards and petrochemical manufacturing plants which play an inviolable role to our nation. Its community remains steeped in history, which still plays a vital role today. Two of Texas' most treasured historic landmarks are in present-day La Porte, the Battleship Texas and the San Jacinto Monument. La Porte sits just eight miles from the San Jacinto Battleground, where Texas gained its independence from Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to recognize and celebrate the 125th Anniversary of the City of La Porte. May God continue to bless La Porte in these next 125 years.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ANTONIO "TONY" ORENDAIN

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of civil rights leader Antonio "Tony" Orendain, who passed away on April 12, 2016.

Antonio was born on May 28, 1930, in Etzatlán, Mexico. At the age of 20, armed with little more than a sixth-grade education and an unwavering desire to succeed and sustain himself, he pursued a brighter future in the United States. Soon after arriving, he moved to Los Angeles where he worked in the fields of California and met César Chávez.

Inspired by the teachings of Chávez, Antonio became a lifelong activist, fighting to ensure that farm workers would one day be allowed to put a fair price on the sweat from their own brow. Antonio advocated for agricultural workers across the country, calling for higher wages and better working conditions. He later joined the Community Service Organization, a coalition dedicated to civil rights.

In the summer of 1969, Antonio and his family moved to the Rio Grande Valley. In 1975 he established the Texas Farm Workers Union, an organization dedicated to shortening the 14-hour workday and increasing wages for farmworkers in South Texas. Antonio later led members of the local United Farm Workers Organizing Committee on a march to the middle of the Roma Bridge. The group straddled the international boundary chanting "Nosotros Venceremos." We Shall Overcome, in support of their mission to improve the lives of agricultural laborers.

In February 1977, Antonio led a group of 40 farmworkers on a march for basic human rights from San Juan, Texas, to Austin, Texas, where they met with then-Governor Dolph Briscoe. The group traveled further north to Washington, D.C., where the march ended. By the time they reached the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, the group had grown to nearly 10,000 people.

For decades, Antonio fought to ensure that farmworkers would have "at least the basic necessities that the rest of society is used to." Antonio will long be remembered for his commitment to safeguarding farmworkers' rights and ending the exploitation of our nation's vulnerability.

Mr. Speaker, today we honor a champion of civil rights and a defender of the vulnerable. While Antonio Orendain is no longer with us, his contributions and revolutionary ideals will continue to inspire us. It is a privilege to honor this South Texas champion of equality.

TRIBUTE TO STEPHANIE CARLSON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Stephanie Carlson for being named the 2017 Emerging Iowa Leader by the Iowa State University College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

The Emerging Iowa Leader Award recognizes alumni from the College who have taken leadership roles in advocating for and bettering agriculture and life sciences in Iowa. Stephanie is the producer outreach and federal policy director for the Iowa Pork Producers Association, where she interacts with people from industry leaders to the local producer. Wendy Wintersteen, the endowed dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, noted the "positive impact" Stephanie has also had on the college itself, "from sharing her expertise with classes and student organizations, to advocating and raising awareness for college priorities through the Curtiss League and the Grow Iowa Agriculture organization."

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Stephanie Carlson on her recognition as the 2017 Emerging Iowa Leader, and I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Stephanie on her outstanding accomplishment.

HONORING CHIEF CHRIS PALMER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chief Chris Palmer.

Chief Chris Palmer was born to Carl Palmer and the late Classie Palmer. He is the fourth of six children. Chief Palmer is married to Kathy Robinson and they have five children and six grandchildren. He attended Crystal Springs High School and graduated from Jackson State University with a B.S. degree in Criminal Justice and Corrections.

Chief Palmer began his career with the Crystal Springs Police Department as a Dispatcher and became a Patrolman in 1994. During his tenure on patrol, Chief Palmer was contracted to the Mississippi Bureau of Narcotics as an undercover agent.

Four years later, Chief Palmer became the investigator for the City of Crystal Springs. As investigator, Chief Palmer worked all felony cases in the city for the next 15 years. These cases included Murder, Aggravated Assault, and Burglary along with numerous white collar crimes. While investigating these crimes Chief Palmer worked over 175 cases per year with a solvability rate of 94.6 percent and a conviction rate of 99.7 percent.

In February, 2015, Chief Palmer was promoted from Investigator to Captain. After a brief stint as Captain, Chief Palmer was promoted to his current position as Chief in October, 2015. Chief Palmer has an excellent staff that includes fifteen (15) police officers, six (6) dispatchers, a Court Clerk and a Deputy Court Clerk. Chief Palmer works diligently each day to make sure all employees are updated with hourly classes to make them better Dispatchers, Court Clerks and Officers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Chief Chris Palmer for his dedication to serving our great state of Mississippi.

RECOGNIZING HINKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL'S "COINS FOR COPS, CHANGE DRIVE"

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to recognize four, extraordinary students at Hinks Elementary School in Alpena, Michigan, for organizing the school's first "Coins for Cops, Change Drive." The students, Lilly Gembel, Avery Dubey, Cecelia Magdaleno, and Abbey Ruby, designed the program to raise money for the Michigan State Fallen Trooper Fund, which supports the families of

troopers who gave the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

After hearing stories from her grandfather, retired-Sheriff Deputy Ken Gembel, Lilly Gembel recruited Avery, Cecelia, and Abbey to begin collecting money for the families of fallen troopers. Setting an initial goal of \$500, the students and their fellow classmates started asking friends and family for donations, and, after one month, the girls had doubled their goal by raising \$1,000. The students scheduled their fundraising efforts to coincide with the Michigan State Police's 100th Anniversary in April. The "Coins for Cops, Change Drive" culminated at Hinks Elementary where the students presented a check to Michigan State Police Alpena Post Commander Lt. John Grimshaw and Trooper Ashley Simpson.

Our men and women in uniform work each and every day to provide safety and security in the communities where we live and work. Folks in the First District know how important it is to have a dedicated force working in some of the most remote areas in Michigan, and for 100 years, the Michigan State Police have acted as role models for young people throughout the state. The students at Hinks Elementary School have displayed tremendous compassion and leadership in honoring our law enforcement professionals, and I am confident they will continue to achieve great things by applying this maturity.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Lilly Gembel, Avery Dubey, Cecelia Magdaleno, and Abbey Ruby for their work in gathering support among their classmates to raise \$1,000 for the families of Michigan's fallen troopers. Michiganders can take great pride in knowing that Northern Michigan and the Upper Peninsula have such bright students with drive and passion that will allow them to do great things in whatever path they choose to follow. On behalf of my constituents across the First District, I wish to thank Lilly, Avery, Cecelia, Abbey, and their classmates at Hinks Elementary School for their selfless work in organizing the "Coins for Cops, Change Drive."

NATIONAL DIPG AWARENESS DAY

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support H. Res. 69, the National DIPG Awareness Resolution, in honor of Julia Barbara Psar—one of my constituents who passed away from Diffuse Intrinsic Pontine Glioma (DIPG) on May 17, 2016.

DIPG is the deadliest type of pediatric brain tumors. According to the CDC, brain tumors are the leading cause of childhood cancer death, and DIPG is the second most common malignant brain tumor found in children. DIPG has a less than 1 percent survival rate, and most children die within nine months after being diagnosed.

This little girl—Julia Barbara Psar—died just before her third birthday. I have always read and heard that the worst thing in the world is to outlive one of your own children, and I have no doubt this is true. I have met with my constituents Mr. and Mrs. Psar, and I do not believe someone can ever have closure after a

loss like theirs. Words cannot express how heartbreaking this tragedy is.

Our children urgently need us to find a cure for DIPG. Today, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 69, establishing May 17th as National DIPG Awareness Day in hopes of curing the deadliest type of pediatric brain tumors.

INTRODUCTION OF PRIVATE STUDENT LOAN BANKRUPTCY FAIRNESS ACT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Private Student Loan Bankruptcy Fairness Act, a bill I introduced earlier today with my colleagues DANNY DAVIS and ERIC SWALWELL which would restore fairness in student lending by treating privately issued student loans in bankruptcy the same as other types of private debt.

Graduation season is a time for joy, but increasingly that joy is tempered with worry about student debt.

It is sad enough that our children are increasingly burdened by a crushing weight of student debt. But the fact that students under the weight of this debt are treated so unfairly in bankruptcy is unconscionable.

Before 2005, private student loans issued by for-profit lenders were treated in bankruptcy like most other unsecured consumer debt, such as credit card debt. Our bill will ensure that privately issued student loans will once again be treated like other consumer debt and be dischargeable in bankruptcy.

Private student loans have much in common with credit cards and subprime mortgages. For example, private student loans often have onerous interest rates with no caps and can include exorbitant fees and hidden charges. In addition, many lenders have used aggressive marketing and high-pressure sales tactics to target particularly vulnerable people, namely, young men and women without financial experience, and older Americans seeking to restart their careers by pursuing higher education and training.

The harmful features of many private student loans have resulted in a substantial rise in the number of delinquencies.

To make matters worse, private student loans lack the critical consumer protections that come with federal student loans. For instance, private lenders are not required to—and typically do not—provide any of the deferments, income-based repayment plans, cancellation rights, or loan forgiveness programs that are available to federal student loan borrowers.

A hallmark of our Nation's bankruptcy law is to give an honest but unfortunate debtor a chance to obtain meaningful relief. To that end, the law exempts very few types of debt from elimination through the bankruptcy process, and only for principled policy reasons, such as debts for child support, taxes, criminal fines and intentional injury.

In 2005, however, Congress changed the bankruptcy law without any substantive anal-

ysis so that student loans made by private, for-profit lenders became very difficult to discharge in bankruptcy.

Currently, the Bankruptcy Code prohibits the discharge of private educational debt unless the debtor, in addition to meeting the already stringent requirements for personal bankruptcy, proves that repayment would impose an, "undue hardship," on the debtor and the debtor's dependents. In practice, however, it's hard for a debtor to ever successfully meet this standard.

The current bankruptcy law unjustly punishes hardworking Americans who are simply trying to improve their lives by pursuing a higher education and became victims of predatory private student loan lenders.

We can do better.

I urge my colleagues to support the Private Student Loan Bankruptcy Fairness Act.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ALAN ROBINSON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Dr. Alan Robinson of Atlantic, Iowa, for receiving the Hall of Fame Award sponsored by the Cass County Cattleman's Association.

Dr. Robinson graduated from Iowa State University in 1977 with a degree in veterinarian medicine. His career began with a successful veterinarian practice, but then an opportunity arose to start raising cattle. He continued to assist local veterinarians, even as his cattle operation continued to grow, to keep his hands in animal medicine.

His farm operation focuses on raising corn, soybeans, and feeder cattle. He said it is important to be progressive in your thinking with all the changes in farming over the past twenty years. After receiving this award, Dr. Robinson said he was "humbled" to receive it and that he is honored to know people in the business respect his contributions to the industry.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Dr. Robinson for earning this outstanding award. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating him for his many accomplishments in the agriculture industry and in wishing him nothing but continued success in all his endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE A.L. BROWN HIGH SCHOOL ROBOTICS TEAM

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the A.L. Brown High School Robotics team for their victory in the 2017 North Carolina Beta Club's Robotics competition state championship. This year, the team of Jason Chamnangam, Marco Gonzalez, Jack-

son Holsclaw, Jack Parker, Jesse Peterson, and Randon Philips captured the top prize after besting eight other high school teams in North Carolina.

The North Carolina Beta Club conducts competitions like this every year at their state convention. However, this was the first year the Beta Club added a robotics event to its yearly contests. The robotics championship pits North Carolina high school students against each other to test skills in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM). After months of work and preparation, the A.L. Brown students took home the grand prize.

This year's event brought a host of talent and I am extremely proud of all of the students who participated. I am also thankful for the teachers and volunteers who made the event possible. I look forward to many more years of a successful competition and wish all the students well as they continue their academic pursuits.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in congratulating the A.L. Brown High School Robotics team on their state championship.

RECOGNIZING FIRE CHIEF DIANA J. MATTY

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Diana J. Matty, who will become the first woman Fire Chief of West Palm Beach when she is sworn in on Monday.

Since joining the department in 1994 at the age of 18, Diana has risen through the ranks and held almost every position from firefighter to assistant fire chief. She is a decorated fire officer with multiple Firefighter of the Year awards to her name, and has traveled the nation as a hazmat instructor. Her promotion to Fire Chief marks the achievement of a career-long goal, and one that is unquestionably deserved.

I have known Diana since my time as the Mayor of West Palm Beach and I am thrilled to see such a well-deserving firefighter serve in this position.

Diana is a great role model for any aspiring firefighter, and I am pleased to honor her today and wish her the best of luck as West Palm Beach's new Fire Chief.

THE SOUTH CAROLINA PEANUT PARITY ACT

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in the 2002 Farm Bill, the U.S. Department of Agriculture established the Peanut Standards Board, a board that advises the Secretary of Agriculture and Department on peanut quality and handling standards. By law, members of the Peanut Standards Board must be from a state in one of the three designated

regions. South Carolina was not represented, leaving the state's peanut farmers without a voice, despite being the nation's fourth largest peanut-producing state and producing over eight percent of the nation's peanuts.

Peanuts are appreciated in South Carolina where every August the Pelion Peanut Party at Pelion in Lexington County is a highlight of the summer. Additionally, the General Assembly has legislated the beloved boiled peanut as the official State snack.

Today, I am grateful to introduce the South Carolina Peanut Parity Act, legislation that will grant peanut producers the opportunity to represent South Carolina's agricultural community on the Peanut Standards Board.

I appreciate the support of the South Carolina Farm Bureau, led by President Harry Ott, for this legislation, and am grateful that the entire South Carolina delegation joins me in introducing the South Carolina Peanut Parity Act.

In conclusion, God Bless Our Troops and we will never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ROGELIO BOTELLO RIOS

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of beloved Rio Grande Valley radio and television host Rogelio Botello Rios, who passed away on Wednesday, May 3, 2017.

Rogelio began his broadcasting career in 1961 at the radio station X.E.Z.D. in Camargo, Tamaulipas, Mexico. Six years later he joined the staff at KGBT Radio in Harlingen, Texas, and in 1971 he was promoted to Program Director. He then served as Program Director for KIIWW radio for eight years. South Texans remember him most for his local variety show "Aqui Rogelio," which he hosted from 1968 to 2005.

Over the course of his career, Rogelio received numerous awards and accolades for his prolific work and efforts to promote the genre. Radio and Music Magazine named him Program Director of the Year and Billboard Magazine nominated him for the same honor. Rogelio was also inducted into the Tejano Hall of Fame and the Conjunto Hall of Fame in 1999 and 2011 respectively.

Rogelio will always be remembered for his loyalty to his family, work, and to the Rio Grande Valley. As a broadcaster, he dedicated much of his time promoting smaller, independent artists and helping them to gain more widespread recognition. Rogelio's colleagues held him in high regard as a consummate professional who valued high standards and punctuality.

Mr. Speaker, South Texas lost a broadcasting pioneer and legend in Rogelio Botello Rios this month. He will be sincerely missed by his family, friends, and his many fans in South Texas and Northern Mexico.

RECOGNIZING HERNANDO COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Hernando County Sheriff Al Nienhuis, City of Brooksville Police Chief George Turner, and the law enforcement officers who keep Hernando County safe every single day.

This week marks the annual observance of Police Week. Though we set aside one week a year to honor law enforcement, I encourage all Americans to join me not only this week, but every day, in recognizing the honor, courage, and commitment of America's law enforcement.

Our law enforcement officers are heroes in the community. They keep us safe, and are willing to put their lives on the line every day in the course of their duties. It is impossible to fully express our gratitude or adequately recognize the professionalism of the men and women who voluntarily put their lives on the line for our safety and security. It is with deep respect that we pause today to honor the memory of the heroes who gave the last full measure of devotion and made the ultimate sacrifice.

I want to extend my sincere appreciation to Hernando County Sheriff Al Nienhuis, City of Brooksville Police Chief George Turner, and the law enforcement officers who bravely and selflessly serve Hernando County. It is an honor to recognize them and all men and women in law enforcement.

RECOGNIZING THE EMMETT TILL MEMORIAL COMMISSION

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Emmett Till Memorial Commission based in Tallahatchie County of the Second Congressional District of Mississippi.

In 2006, the Tallahatchie County Board of Supervisors formed the Emmett Till Memorial Commission and charged them with the development and oversight of the Emmett Till Memorial Site. The site is a memorial to the memory of Mr. Emmett Louis Till, a 14-year old African American teenager who was brutally murdered in Mississippi and whose murderers were never brought to justice. The site also fosters racial reconciliation efforts and restorative justice programs. The Commission's mission statement is to remember, preserve, and educate the public about the history, stories and cultural legacy of the Civil Rights Movement of Tallahatchie County and other vital sites along the Emmett Till trail and their lasting effects on the County, State and the Nation. The Emmett Till Memorial Commission is comprised of 18 members and is multiracial in makeup.

In 2007 they began efforts to restore the Tallahatchie County Second District Courthouse to its 1955 character, where the trial of Mr. J.W. Milam and Mr. Roy Bryant, the two murderers of Emmett Till, took place despite a not-guilty verdict. On October 2, 2007, the project was officially launched with a racial healing ceremony organized by the William Winter Institute for Racial Reconciliation at the University of Mississippi.

Over 400 people attended including members of the Till family. Following the ceremony, a bus tour was conducted of the sites significant to the Emmett Till story. In 2012 funding was secured and the work began to establish the Emmett Till Interpretive Center on the square directly across from the entrance to the Tallahatchie Courthouse.

On March 21st, 2015 the courthouse reopened after an extensive restoration process. The restoration of the courthouse helped solidify the apology that the community wrote in 2007 that began by saying "We the citizens of Tallahatchie County believe that Racial Reconciliation begins by telling the truth." The courthouse and the Emmett Till Interpretive Center memorialize not only the murder and injustice, but of the brave actions of Mrs. Mamie Till, Mr. Mose Wright and others who forced the nation to acknowledge the racial injustices of the era. The restoration of the courthouse and the opening of the Emmett Till Interpretive Center could not have happened without the local leadership of the Emmett Till Memorial Commission of Tallahatchie County.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Emmett Till Memorial Commission located in Tallahatchie County, MS inside of the Second Congressional District of Mississippi.

TRIBUTE TO EAGLE SCOUT NICK PHILLIPS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Nick Phillips of Riverton, Iowa, for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout. Nick is a member of Boy Scout Troop 218 in Shenandoah.

The Eagle Scout designation is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Approximately five percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained over the past century.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as completing an Eagle Project to benefit the community. Nick's Eagle Project revolved around restoring portions of the Riverton City Park. He installed various landscape blocks around three separate sides of the recently-constructed restrooms with the purpose of reducing the erosion from rain water running off the roof and to put the finishing touches on the new facilities. The work ethic Nick has displayed in his Eagle Project, and every other

project leading to his Eagle Scout rank, speaks volumes of his commitment to serving a cause greater than himself and assisting his community.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent Nick and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating him on obtaining the Eagle Scout ranking and in wishing him nothing but continued success in his future education and career.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF SALLY BLAUVELT

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor an outstanding public servant, federal employee, and advocate in Maine's 1st District upon her retirement. After many years of service in the Washington headquarters of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Sally Blauvelt came to Maine six years ago to become the Field Office Director for USCIS.

Sally has been instrumental in creating relationships with stakeholders serving the immigrant community in Maine. She has embodied the principles of common good, service to others, and social equity, engendering a respectful and customer-service focused environment in the local field office. And she has mentored a committed team of individuals who understand the challenges and hopes of those needing help and information, seeking to be of service whenever possible. Without fail, visitors to the USCIS office in my district are treated with dignity and respect.

Sally Blauvelt understands that the arrival of new Mainers from across the globe adds diversity, vitality, and energy to communities across my state. I am sincerely grateful for her many contributions to my constituents, to Maine, and to our nation.

My state has been all the better for Sally Blauvelt's decision to make Maine her home, and it is my honor to represent her in the U.S. Congress.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, circumstances have arisen which have caused me to return home to my district early this week. However, had I been present, I would have voted: yea on Roll Call No. 258; yea on Roll Call No. 259; yea on Roll Call No. 260; yea on Roll Call No. 261; and yea on Roll Call No. 262.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. FRANK GORNICK

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Mr. Frank Gornick for twenty three years of dedicated service as Chancellor of the West Hills Community College District.

A Chicago native, Mr. Gornick moved to Coalinga, California to play football for West Hills Community College. He earned an Associates Degree at West Hills College, Coalinga in 1966 and went on to study at California State University, Sacramento, where he met his wife, Gloria and the couple married on June 1, 1968. Shortly after, he received his Bachelor of Arts degree in 1971 and later pursued higher education at St. Louis University, graduating with a Doctorate of Philosophy in 1979.

In 1971, Frank began his career in education at Howard County Community College in Columbia, Maryland, where he taught Psychology and Human Development courses. From 1972 to 1975, Frank held the position of Director of Financial Aid and Placement at Richland College in Dallas, Texas. In 1975, he began his nine year career at Belleville Area College in Illinois, where he served as Provost of the Granite City Center. Frank left his position as Provost in 1984 and returned to California, where he dedicated nine years to Bakersfield College as Dean of Student Services.

Mr. Frank Gornick was welcomed back to West Hills Community College District in 1994 as Superintendent and President. During this time, Mr. Gornick provided oversight to the process for West Hills College Lemoore, which at the time was one of California's newest community colleges. Frank is responsible for a successful federal bond which generated \$38 million in local property taxes and state dollars for the renovation and construction of the Coalinga and Lemoore campuses. In 2001, he was promoted to Chancellor and has held the position for the past sixteen years.

During his tenure at West Hills College District, Mr. Gornick led many efforts resulting in renovation and construction of the campus. In 2004, Frank was recognized for his outstanding efforts and awarded the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Diversity Award for Education.

As Chancellor, Mr. Gornick has developed a transition for multi-college system, centralizing services to the colleges and eliminating duplication, and has made a significant investment in developing a philanthropic vision for the West Hills Community College Foundation.

Outside of work, Frank enjoys spending time with his wife, Gloria, his three children, Frank, Victoria, and Christina, and his granddaughter, Isabella. In his retirement, Frank is looking forward to many road trips with his family.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join us in commending Mr. Frank Gornick on the eve of his retirement for his service to the people of the Central Valley and wishing him well as he embarks on the next chapter of his life.

HONORING PASTOR CASEY D. FISHER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a God-fearing and impressionistic man, Pastor Casey D. Fisher. Pastor Fisher has shown what can be done through tenacity, dedication and a desire to serve God.

A Spirit-fed and Spirit-led minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Pastor Casey D. Fisher was born in Utica, Mississippi, on July 8, 1966. He is the son of Sharkey and Katie Fisher. He received his formal education from the Hinds County School system and graduated from Utica High School in 1984. He attended the University of Southern Mississippi, where he majored in Business Administration. He later received a Bachelor in Religious Education, a Masters of Divinity and a Doctorate of Ministry from Living Word Bible Institution in Tyler, Texas.

Pastor Fisher is married to the former Michele Chambers. They were married on September 17, 1988. He is the father of three lovely children: twin sons, Bryan and Ryan and a daughter, Casey Michele. Pastor Fisher finds time to love and care for his family as Christ does the church. He is devoted to strengthening them and helping them to grow in their everyday walk with the Lord, just as he does with the church.

Pastor Fisher has served his country as a soldier in the United States Army. During this time, he truly accepted Jesus Christ as his personal savior on October 23, 1993 in Livorno, Italy. He served eight years in the U.S. Army, where he was part of two tours in Southwest Asia. He departed military service in July 1997. Afterwards, he was employed with the U.S. Postal service in Vicksburg, Mississippi, where he recently retired in December, 2010.

He is currently a Life Member of the Vicksburg Alumni Chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc. and serves as the Guide Right Chairman. His purpose is Achievement, in which he mentors young men, twelve through eighteen years of age, providing them with tutoring, community involvement and religious principles. He is also a member of Masonic Order of Prince Hall Free and Accepted Mason.

In 1984, Pastor Fisher became the first known athlete in Mississippi to be selected All-State in four sports. While attending University of Southern Mississippi, he was member of the basketball team, in which he led the Golden Eagles to the NIT championship in 1987 and later was inducted into the USM hall of fame. Although he loves basketball, he also has a passion for golfing! Dr. Fisher is a die-hard fan of the Los Angeles Lakers and the Dallas Cowboys.

Pastor Fisher's motto is "If you don't take it personal, it will make you a better person". He is inspired by one of the Greatest Ministers, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., because of his willingness to serve and his willingness to give up his life for humanity. Greater Grove Street M.

B. Church has stood the test of time through dedication, faith, stewardship, and commitment from this soldier on the battlefield for the Lord. He is a man of integrity, loyalty, dignity, and honesty leading his people to do the will of God.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Pastor Casey D. Fisher for his dedication to God, family, community and country.

TRIBUTE TO DON SANDOR

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Don Sandor ahead of his retirement as City Administrator of Pleasant Hill, Iowa, on June 30th, 2017.

Don has spent 35 years in city administration. After administration jobs in Oskaloosa and other cities in Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Iowa, Don came to Pleasant Hill in 2007. Even though he arrived at the start of a recession and in the midst of some controversy with previous projects, Don's stability and guidance helped him to eventually bring in more development and projects to grow the community. During his time as city administrator, the population of Pleasant Hill has grown by 20 percent, and the taxable valuation of properties has increased by 93 percent. Throughout the almost 10 years he has dedicated to his job, Don helped to ensure that Pleasant Hill is one of the places people look to for doing business, living, and raising their families.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Don on his retirement and his exemplary work as City Administrator. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating him on a successful career and in wishing him nothing but the best in his retirement.

COMMEMORATING PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY AND HER WORK ON BEHALF OF INVENTORS AND THE U.S. PATENT SYSTEM

HON. DAVE BRAT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate an outstanding conservative leader with whom I had the privilege of working with and learning from over my political career: Phyllis Schlafly. Her efforts advocating for America's inventors and the patent system that protects their inventions will be highlighted at an upcoming event of the Eagle Forum Education & Legal Defense Fund entitled "Phyllis Schlafly: Celebrating an Untiring Advocate of Inventors and the Economic Freedom to Invent." Therefore, I wish to add a word commemorating the contribution of this bold patriot who was an indispensable force to our great nation's success.

America has long been a haven for innovations in the marketplace. Through the years,

American inventors have looked to Article I, Section 8 of our U.S. Constitution and its power vested in Congress to protect creators' "exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries." As a result, America has held the distinction of being a global leader in cutting-edge innovations and novel inventions.

Phyllis Schlafly recognized this vital part of our free enterprise system and was a strong voice on behalf of American inventors. She was quick to praise the American patent system, which was unique when the Founding Fathers put it into the U.S. Constitution and is still unique today. She decried other nations that advance themselves by stealing American designs while clutching to inferior patent systems that punish inventors and stymie progress.

Phyllis Schlafly understood that the superiority of American ingenuity is not a matter of happenstance, but the product of a bold and inspired precedent set by our Founding Fathers and enshrined in our Constitution. Only through patent protection, the right to private property, and the free market can America motivate inventors to stretch the boundaries of what is possible and create the products that increase productivity, save time, and save lives every day. From the traffic light and GPS navigation, to the microwave oven and the Internet, every American has benefitted from our unique patent system.

For more than seventy years, Phyllis Schlafly was a tireless advocate for our patent system. I am proud to honor her and the many inventors she fought to protect.

IN RECOGNITION OF SARA ABLARD

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to use this time to recognize an outstanding constituent in Virginia's 10th District, Sara Ablard, who has had an incredible impact on increasing awareness for children with cleft palates and cleft lips. Working closely with the Smile Train, an organization that helps cover the \$250 surgery for infants with the birth defect known as cleft lip or cleft palate, Ms. Ablard founded the Sadie's Smile Foundation in honor of her daughter Sadie who passed away six years ago during a roller skating accident.

Ms. Ablard always remembers Sadie's beautiful smile and her compassion for other children. One day while walking through Dulles Town Center, Sadie saw a poster of a boy with a cleft palate and was intrigued and curious as to how she might be able to help him and others. That Christmas, Sadie and Ms. Ablard asked for donations instead of presents, and they were able to raise \$500, which fully funded two surgeries for infants with cleft palates and lips.

Sadie truly wanted to give others the chance to smile, as she once did so brightly and proudly, and when she passed away, Ms. Ablard made it her life goal to preserve Sadie's legacy through helping others. She

started the Sadie's Smile Foundation, which, this year, is hosting its 6th Annual 5K & Kids Fun Run for Smile Train, with the goal of raising \$478,250, signifying \$250 for each day her daughter was alive and smiling. The 5K and Fun Run not only increase awareness and raise money for the Smile Train organization, but the event also helps us all remember Sadie and bring the community together.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Sara Ablard's heroic actions and the memory of her beloved daughter, Sadie. Individuals, like Sara, who overcome terrible tragedies in their own lives and go on to help others, truly make me proud to serve Virginia's 10th District, and today, we honor and celebrate her contributions to our community and to those less fortunate. I wish Sara all the best in her future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING SPECIALIST JAMES STEVENS' SERVICE

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to honor Specialist James Stevens as he selflessly defended our nation.

A native of Knoxville, Iowa, Specialist Stevens grew up playing with "GI Joe" action figures and watching war movies, dreaming that one day he too would become a soldier. In 2010, James enlisted in the U.S. Army and then graduated from Infantry School at Fort Benning, Georgia, achieving his childhood dream. During his time at Infantry School, James learned how to defend this nation and the importance of brotherhood. Two years later, Specialist Stevens deployed to Afghanistan where he was stationed at Combat Outpost Zerok. In support of Operation Enduring Freedom, Specialist Stevens and his infantry unit were responsible for guard duty and combat patrols. Stevens' valor and leadership led him to serve as a decorated hero receiving the Afghanistan Campaign medal with Campaign Star, Army Commendation Medal, NATO Medal, and the Combat Infantryman's badge.

Currently a veteran, Stevens continues to serve members of his community in East Peoria, Illinois. As a proud father, he raises his two girls, Kirstin and Madison, and teaches his daughters the same lessons learned while serving aside his Army brothers at Fort Riley: loyalty, duty, respect, and honor. In addition, Stevens volunteers with the Habitat for Humanity Greater Peoria Area where communities come together to build homes for veterans and military families.

Specialist James Stevens is an American hero, who has dutifully served his nation and continues to proudly serve his family and community. Thanks to Specialist Stevens for his service and sacrifice. This country is blessed to have servicemen, like James Stevens, who selflessly devoted their careers to protecting this country. We owe him a debt that can never be repaid.

HONORING THE TOUGALOO COLLEGE/DELTA HEALTHPARTNERS HEALTHY START INITIATIVE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public health program designed to reduce infant mortality in the Mississippi Delta, the Tougaloo College/Delta HealthPartners Healthy Start Initiative.

This initiative is one of the 100 Healthy Start Initiatives throughout the nation working endlessly to give every child a healthy start in life. The Delta HealthPartners' Healthy Start program is housed under the auspices of Tougaloo College within the George A. and Ruth B. Owens Health and Wellness Center, under the direction of Dr. Sandra Carr Hayes, the executive director. The program serves a rural population in a seven county area in the Mississippi Delta (Tunica, Coahoma, Quitman, Tallahatchie, Sunflower, Bolivar, and Washington counties). These counties are among the poorest and most medically underserved in Mississippi and the nation.

The Healthy Start Initiative was implemented in 1999 with funding from the Health Resources and Services Administration under the leadership of Dr. Beverly W. Hogan, who now serves as President of Tougaloo College. Today, Ms. Arletha Howard serves as the project director. Ms. Howard is a registered nurse with over 28 years of experience in oncology, burn trauma, intensive care unit, pediatrics, home health, maternal and child health. She has worked with the Healthy Start Initiative for 16 years. In 2014, under Mrs. Howard's leadership, the Healthy Start Initiative was upgraded from a Level I individual based program to a Level II community based program.

Since its inception, the Healthy Start Initiative has provided case management services through a home visiting model to: (1) high-risk pregnant women of childbearing age 10–44 years, (2) their infants; and (3) fathers/co-parents.

Over the past 16 years, the program has achieved several major accomplishments: The Healthy Start Initiative has case managed over 900 mothers and infants just this past calendar year (January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015).

The Healthy Start Initiative has created the Coahoma County Community Action Network is responsible for opening the first Diaper Bank in the state of Mississippi funded by charitable donations and Northwest Mississippi Foundation.

The Healthy Start Initiative serves as the lead agency in partnership with the Mississippi State Department of Health in the Mississippi Delta Regional Fetal Infant Mortality Review program.

The Healthy Start Initiative has created Memorandums of Understandings (MOU) with 22 partnering schools in the Mississippi Delta to provide peer support groups to pregnant/parenting teens and co parents.

The Healthy Start Initiative has been featured in numerous publications and articles

(USA Today, Hechinger Report, Huffington Post, Clarksdale Press Register, Tunica Times, and WABG TV Interview) highlighting the comprehensive services of the project.

The Healthy Start Initiative has partnered with Parents for Public Schools to provide trainings for project parents on advocacy skills and educating and mobilizing parents to strengthen public schools.

The Healthy Start Initiative promotes breastfeeding in two (2) clinic sites by providing health education by project's Certified Lactation Counselors (Women's Clinic—Clarksdale, MS and Gamble Clinic—Greenville, MS).

The Healthy Start Initiative hosts a Community Baby Shower in partnership with local hospitals, Federally Qualified Community Health Centers (FQHC), other health care providers and key stakeholders each year in September to promote awareness of infant mortality during National Infant Mortality Awareness Month.

The Healthy Start Initiative has implemented a male outreach initiative to address parenting issues among male co-parents and hosts an Annual 5k Walk in June to promote Men's Health Awareness.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing The Tougaloo College Delta HealthPartners Healthy Start Initiative for its continued efforts to reduce infant mortality in the Mississippi Delta.

TRIBUTE TO LYNN UBBEN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Perry Community Schools Superintendent Lynn Ubben upon her retirement at the end of the 2016–2017 school year.

Lynn has been in education for 41 years, starting as a Special Education Teacher at Fredericksburg Community School in 1976. Lynn taught as she continued her own education. She completed her Masters of Arts in Elementary Special Education at Northwest Missouri State University in 1998 and later her Certificate of Advanced Studies in Education Administration and her Principal Endorsement at Iowa State University. After serving as a principal and a superintendent at other Iowa schools, Lynn came to Perry to serve as Superintendent in 2009 when she saw just how much the school board cared about the kids. And to Lynn, that is what it is about—the kids. She strives to build those close-knit relationships with her students, whether it's in the hallways of the school, or cheering from the stands at a sporting event or other extracurricular activity. While she may be retiring and spending more time with her family, there is no doubt that Lynn will still be there cheering on "her kids."

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Lynn for her 41 years as an educator, and I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating her on a successful career and in wishing her nothing but the best in her retirement.

RECOGNITION OF FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH (CENTRALIA)

HON. A. DONALD McEACHIN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. McEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, historic First Baptist Church (Centralia)—originally known as Salem African Baptist—was established in 1867, in Centralia, Virginia by freedmen from Salem Baptist Church. The mother Church is located two miles west of this site—on a hill by the railroad near the intersection of Centralia and Chester Roads.

Members of the first Board of Trustees—Daniel Wilkerson, Wilson Lewis, Lemuel Dodson, James White, and Emanuel Johnson—received the deed of trust for this plot of land from Mr. & Mrs. P. A. Chalkley of Salem Baptist. Mr. Ben Duval, also from Salem Baptist, donated lumber for the Church. Prior to the erection of the first modest sanctuary in 1867, the first worship services were held in a brush arbor at this sacred site.

Between 1867 and 1949, the Church prospered under the leadership of eleven pastors including Reverend Lewis Branch who was the first, Reverends Ned Bland; Eli Saunders; J. E. Brown; T. H. Johnson (1897 to 1906); William Thomas (1906 to 1915); H. M. Chapman (1915 to 1919); J. H. Binford (1919 to 1929); C. A. Cobbs (1929 to 1931); C. J. Washington (1932 to 1934); and W. B. Ball (1934 to 1949).

In the early 1900's during the pastorates of Reverend T.H. Johnson and J.H. Binford, the second edifice was erected and renovated into the edifice of historic and architectural significance for which it is renowned: Historic First Baptist (Centralia).

Per O'Dell (1983; pp. 346 and 356), "Another church departing somewhat from the standard plan is . . . First Baptist Church of Centralia, erected by a black congregation in the 1910s." Known for its twin towers, and architectural elements that included Gothic Revival, Colonial Revival, and Shingle styles, the edifice was according to O'Dell, "larger than any in the county at the time . . ." Also, the exterior decoration was reported to be "more elaborate than that on most rural churches of the period."

Needing more space for a growing discipleship, in 1963 under the leadership of Dr. Samuel Moss Carter, the twelfth pastor who served for forty years (1950 to 1990), First Baptist (Centralia) moved to its current edifice at 2920 Kingsdale Road—two miles northeast of the historic site at 4412 Centralia Road, Chester, VA.

On April 16, 1996, Historic First Baptist Church (Centralia) was razed by arson. Led by Divine intervention and forgiveness of the arsonists, the current and thirteenth pastor—Dr. Wilson E.B. Shannon (who was installed in 1991) and the congregation that included professionals with architectural drafting, brick masonry, plastering, and contracting—reconstructed Historic First Baptist (Centralia) to authentic specifications within one year (1997) of her being destroyed.

In July 2012, following an historic exposé designed for the Chesterfield Historical Society of Virginia (CHSVA), First Baptist Church

(Centralia): Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow (at which time, CHSVA recognized her historic and architectural significance), the Church was invited to apply for Chesterfield Historic Landmark status.

Designated as a Chesterfield County (VA) Historic Landmark in June 2014, the Church was also granted one of the highly coveted Virginia Historical Highway Markers by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources in December 2014. The marker was installed in November 2015 at a grand ceremony marking this epic achievement. While First Baptist (Centralia) is the third church in Chesterfield to earn distinction as an historic landmark, First Baptist (Centralia) is the first African American Church in Chesterfield to earn this distinction.

To further address family-life ministry and community needs, the shared vision of disciples and Dr. Shannon and First Lady Cynthia Smith Shannon—who just celebrated their 26th anniversary at First Baptist—includes expansion of the Samuel Moss Carter Family Life Center to a 45,000 square ft. edifice encompassing banquet facilities for 750 occupants, an indoor Olympic sized swimming pool, and other amenities supportive of family life ministry.

First Baptist Church (Centralia) has been blessed over the last 150 years to have been a spiritual beacon for her members, the Church community and beyond—supporting them through the challenges of independence, the Great Depression, societal changes, physical growth, world wars, arson, and familial joys and sorrows. She welcomes the next 150 years—Magnifying God's Word, Blessing His Name, and Aspiring to Exalt His Kingdom on Earth.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF JOSEPH RAY PERRY

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and memory of Joseph Ray Perry, a beloved Texan, World War II veteran, and father of Secretary of Energy Rick Perry. Ray passed away on April 27, 2017, at the age of 92.

Ray was a man of faith and country. In 1943, he enlisted in the U.S. Army, and over the next two years flew 35 combat missions as a tail gunner for the B17 bomber, *Heavy Date*. He was the last surviving member of the plane's crew. By the time he left the service in 1945, Ray had earned numerous awards, including the Air Medal, World War II Victory badge, Sharpshooters badge, and the Aerial Gunnery badge. Mr. Perry was part of the greatest generation who answered the call of duty and defended our flag during a time of considerable need. The legacy of the greatest generation will stand the test of time as it helped shape the freedoms we enjoy today. He was a west Texas farmer at heart and the Lone Star State was lucky to have him.

After the war, Ray moved back to Texas and operated a farm near rural Paint Creek, a small town just north of Abilene. He was an

active member of his community, a loving husband, a dedicated father, grandfather and great-grandfather. Ray was a quiet but influential man and a strong moral compass for all that knew him. He was elected Haskell County Precinct 3 commissioner in 1968, a position he held for nearly three decades. Mr. Perry also served on the Paint Creek school board for 10 years and on the West Texas Council of Governments for 6 years, during which time he helped organize the Paint Creek Water Supply Corp.

While we mourn the loss of Ray, we are grateful for his example of a life well lived, guided by the values of family and service.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Mr. Joseph Ray Perry. I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of Ray and in sending their thoughts and prayers to the Perry family.

TRIBUTE TO C.L. TRAMMELL

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. C.L. Trammell was a high school teacher and coach in my hometown of Knoxville, Tennessee for over 30 years.

When he was a boy, he always wanted to make it big as a baseball player, but had a different destiny instead.

He became the father of Bubba Trammell, a star Major League Baseball player for several major league teams.

Mr. C.L. Trammell is retired from teaching now, but is still very active.

Among his hobbies is the writing of poetry. One day he shared with me a poem he wrote about America's Pastime that I thoroughly enjoyed.

I include in the RECORD this poem Mr. Trammell wrote that is his personal favorite among his collection.

FORGOTTEN DREAMS: BY C.L. TRAMMELL

The wooden stands beside the fence
Are deathly quiet today
There's no one out there on the field
Where team mates used to play
The barren spot in the center field
Has all grown up in grass
And no one's down the third base line
Where players used to pass

The neighborhood where we were young
So sacred to us then
Forgotten now and growing old
Deserted by her friends
And flashing thoughts upon my mind
Of happenings long gone
Of growing up and learning there
Beliefs of right and wrong

The things we did within our youth
Important yesterday
Have somehow died or disappeared
Somewhere along the way
And funny how the time does fly
To me at least it seems
Buy years somehow just pass on by
When you forget your dreams

TRIBUTE TO BRAD BAKER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Brad Baker of Creston, Iowa, for being inducted into the Iowa High School Athletic Association Officials Hall of Fame.

This award was presented to Brad by the Iowa High School Athletic Association on March 10th, during the Boy's State Basketball Tournament. Brad started officiating in the late 1980s after taking a class at Southwestern Community College. Since then, he has been active as a basketball and football official.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by Brad embodies the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent him, and Iowans like him, in the United States Congress. I ask that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Brad for his achievement and in wishing him nothing but continued success.

HONORING YALE CANTOR'S LIFETIME OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Mr. Yale Cantor from Ellington, Connecticut for his lifetime of public service, and I enthusiastically endorse his enshrinement on the Ellington Wall of Honor.

Yale has been on Ellington's Democratic Town Committee for over 60 years, and has served as a mentor to generations of residents who have sought to become involved in local government. His decorated career includes more than a decade as Democratic Town Chairman, being named a Justice of the Peace, a year on the Board of Selectmen, membership and chairmanship of the Human Service Commission, and more than 20 years on the Hockanum Valley Community Council, where he also served as president. In the town of Ellington, Yale is always ready to get involved in improving the community, and he created a large local footprint and legacy due to his efforts. Yale also had a long record of service as a teacher, and improving quality and access of education at all levels is one of his abiding passions.

During his years of service, Yale had a major personal hand in launching the campaigns of many distinguished public officials from the state of Connecticut, including my predecessor Sam Gejdenson, who served 20 years in the U.S. House of Representatives. I too can attest to Yale's political legacy. When I began my political career as a candidate for state representative in the town of Vernon in 1986, Yale was right there to give me wise counsel and support. In every campaign since for the General Assembly, Lieutenant Governor and U.S. Congress, Yale has always been there, loyally supporting my efforts. He is

a true blue friend and a passionate advocate for democracy, fairness and civility. Those qualities are exactly what our nation needs today.

I would ask the chamber to please join me in congratulating Yale and his family for all they have done in Ellington, Connecticut and the nation over the years.

RECOGNIZING COMMUNITY ACTION
MONTH AND THE SARATOGA
COUNTY ECONOMIC OPPOR-
TUNITY COUNCIL

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Saratoga County Economic Opportunity Council as they participate in Community Action Month.

With the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964, Congress made way for the establishment of Community Action Agencies. These groups are typically comprised of local business and community leaders, who work as part of a statewide network to provide essential services for the impoverished in their communities.

For over 40 years, the Saratoga Economic Opportunity Council has been working as the designated Community Action Agency for their region. This organization works to help their neighbors by supporting a variety of initiatives, including Head Start and the Community Lunch Program. Through these efforts, the Saratoga EOC has helped to improve thousands of lives, making their community a better place for everyone in the process.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to recognize the Saratoga Economic Opportunity Council for their legacy of public service. We are proud of their dedication to helping the Saratoga community, and thank them for their tireless efforts.

HONORING THE GOOD NEIGHBOR
HEALTH CLINIC

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to honor the good work of over twenty-five years of the Good Neighbor Health Clinic in White River Junction. Our community faces the challenge of providing healthcare to folks who don't have it. The Good Neighbor Health Clinic was founded in 1992. It was the inspiration of two dedicated doctors, Paul Manganiello and Peter Mason, who asked in 1991, "What kind of healthcare do the homeless have?" The answer was: "None." Those doctors set out to work with other physicians and healthcare professionals to change that by creating a clinic with volunteer staff to deliver services to people without any ability to pay for care. Later, they were joined by dentist Robert Keene, and the Red Logan Dental Clinic was added.

For over twenty five years, the Good Neighbor Health Clinics have managed to provide fine, professional primary care to people in our community who can't afford it—free of charge. Just last year, 175 volunteer physicians, nurses, dentists, physician assistants, administrators, and about 50 medical students from the nearby Geisel School of Medicine served 1,253 low income residents, with 2,763 patient visits, a total of 3,267 patient interactions. With the additional help of dental students from regional schools, the dental clinic manages to fill cavities, pull teeth, create dentures, and clean the teeth of over 600 patients a year. And, to help foster ownership of one's own health care, the clinics offer workshops on such topics as diabetes, nutrition, substance misuse, smoking cessation, mental health, blood pressure, and heart disease, among other concerns.

In other words, while taking care of immediate needs, this Good Neighbor has been creating a more lasting legacy and a culture of health awareness. People who had been afraid to see a doctor for fear of what they might find out, folks who never trusted the medical system, or avoided the dentist, immigrant farm workers who didn't believe they could find medical care in a place they inhabited only seasonally and where the language wasn't their own, and even those local citizens who thought they didn't have the language to speak about their problems with doctors have found help at these clinics.

The voices of patients say it all: "They make me feel welcome." "They listen to me without my feeling that I'm being judged at the same time." And, "They treat me like a real human being." We all know the difference that can make.

I believe the Good Neighbor Health Clinic and the Red Logan Dental Clinic are not only giving good care. They are caring, and, by being so, are saving lives in many different ways.

I ask you today to join me in honoring the good work and the good people of the Good Neighbor Health Clinic.

HONORING GEORGE WILLIAM
MACE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today, I give honor to Mr. George William Mace of Edwards, Mississippi located in Hinds County, Mississippi.

Mr. George William Mace, was born in Edwards, Mississippi, in the Learned Community. Mr. George William Mace, was the 7th child born into a family of 8 children. He was the baby boy. He was born to George Mace, Sr. and Pattie Marie Sublett Mace. He got the nickname, Beau, because he had a gentleman reputation with the ladies, where he never disrespected one.

Do not resist growing old, many are denied that privilege. In 1904 when Mr. Mace was born, the average life expectancy in the United States was forty-seven, there were only eight-

thousand cars and one-hundred and forty-four miles of paved roads; only fourteen percent of the homes had bathtubs, and along with Alabama, Iowa, and Tennessee, Mississippi was more heavily populated than California. Having defied all life expectancies in the history of the United States, George lived to be 104 years old.

A man's educational start is directly connected to his future. Mr. Mace attended Elementary School in the Edwards Community. He attended Belmont/Popular Grove School and Oak Ridge School. He also attended Alcorn Agriculture College in Lorman, Mississippi. He returned home from Alcorn, to help work on his family's farm.

Come let us bow down and worship, let us kneel before the Lord God our maker. Mr. Mace, joined Old Oak Ridge M. B. Church (formerly known as Oak Ridge Church), where he served as an usher.

Faithful and hard work is rewarded. Mr. Mace's lifelong journey was extensive. He left home as an adult and applied for work with Illinois Central Railroad as a Pullman Porter. He worked in this position from 1933 until his retirement in 1972. Being the gentleman that he was, he was excellent in this chosen career. He was also a self-employed businessman while residing in Minneapolis, Minnesota. He owned his own barber shop and employed others to work with him.

Doing nothing out of selfish ambition or vain conceit, but in humility he considered others before himself, while making a difference in society. When George retired from the railroad, he returned home to his family's farm. He became a cattleman along with his other siblings. He was also a member of the Masonic Family, Newman Lodge No. 522. He became a part of and joined the Mississippi Soil Conservation Association. He was a blessing to this community, touching the lives of family and friends. He was a compassionate man always willing to lend a helping hand and going the extra mile to make life better for others.

Reputation is what men and women think of us, but the family is the vessel of hope, that it may transcend the boundaries of earthly days and continue throughout endless eternity. Character is what God and his angels know of us. This is what the community knew of George "Beau" William Mace. He served his family and community well. His nieces and nephews thought very highly of him.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring, Mr. George William Mace of the Mississippi Second Congressional District.

TRIBUTE TO COLLEEN BICKFORD

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Colleen Bickford of Corning, Iowa, for being honored with the Volunteer Award from the Corning Main Street Organization Committee.

Colleen volunteers regularly at the Carl Church, serves at the congregational meal site, and is an active member of the Senior Citizens Committee for the Adams County Fair.

She also works with the Main Street Corning's Public Relations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by Colleen demonstrates the rewards of harnessing one's talents and sharing them with her community. Her efforts embody the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent her, and Iowans like her, in the United States Congress. I ask that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Colleen for her achievements and in wishing her nothing but continued success.

RECOGNIZING LAKE COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Lake County Sheriff Peyton Grinnell, Town of Lady Lake's Police Chief Chris McKinstry, City of Leesburg Police Chief Rob Hicks, City of Tavares Police Chief Stoney Lubins, Town of Howey-in-the-Hills Police Chief Rick Thomas, City of Fruitland Park Police Chief Michael Fewless, City of Mascotte Police Chief Eric Pedersen, and the law enforcement officers who keep Lake County safe every single day.

This week marks the annual observance of Police Week. Though we set aside one week a year to honor law enforcement, I encourage all Americans to join me not only this week, but every day, in recognizing the honor, courage, and commitment of America's law enforcement.

Our law enforcement officers are heroes in the community. They keep us safe, and are willing to put their lives on the line every day in the course of their duties. It is impossible to fully express our gratitude or adequately recognize the professionalism of the men and women who voluntarily put their lives on the line for our safety and security. It is with deep respect that we pause today to honor the memory of the heroes who gave the last full measure of devotion and made the ultimate sacrifice.

I want to extend my sincere appreciation to Lake County Sheriff Peyton Grinnell, Town of Lady Lake's Police Chief Chris McKinstry, City of Leesburg Police Chief Rob Hicks, City of Tavares Police Chief Stoney Lubins, Town of Howey-in-the-Hills Police Chief Rick Thomas, City of Fruitland Park Police Chief Michael Fewless, City of Mascotte Police Chief Eric Pedersen, and the law enforcement officers who bravely and selflessly serve Lake County. It is an honor to recognize them and all men and women in law enforcement.

JOHNSON & JOHNSON'S COMMITMENT TO VETERANS

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues a story of a cor-

porate leader whose commitment to our nation's veterans is unmatched. Under the leadership of Alex Gorsky as CEO, Johnson and Johnson's commitment to providing the highest quality medical products is only matched by the firm's efforts to provide for the military service members it employs.

Johnson & Johnson's long history of supporting military service members began as early as the Spanish-American War. Beginning in 1898, Johnson & Johnson began retaining positions and paying salaries to employees during military service. For the past century, Johnson & Johnson has been at the cutting edge of developing initiatives to cater to the unique needs of military service members and veterans. Alex Gorsky has doubled down on this impressive record with an unwavering dedication to continuing these traditions for those who have served our nation.

Under Gorsky's leadership, Johnson & Johnson continues to make groundbreaking strides in support of those who have served with initiatives like the Johnson & Johnson Veterans Leadership Council (VLC). The VLC provides for the company's retired service members in an unprecedented manner by supporting the health care and recovery needs of our American heroes in 26 chapters across 11 states.

I was particularly impressed to learn of Johnson & Johnson's Enhanced Military Leave Policy, also instituted by Mr. Gorsky, which enables active service members to defend our nation without fear of job instability, falling behind on bills, or being overlooked during the transition period back at work. I've learned that Mr. Gorsky's own distinguished military career has given him insight into the inherent value of hiring active and retired military service members. A graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point, Alex previously served as a U.S. Army Ranger and finished his career with the rank of Captain. Given his commendable service and past experience, Mr. Gorsky recognizes the importance of hiring veterans as they bring invaluable contributions to the workplace like discipline, integrity, critical thinking, and leadership skills.

Johnson & Johnson's military support is not just good corporate culture. Alex Gorsky has led the way in offering financial stability and resources for service members and their families across America, and rewarded out nation's finest for their noble, patriotic service. I believe his legacy as a corporate leader in veteran advocacy creates unquestioned good will, which is valued by consumers, service members, and community leaders. I commend Mr. Gorsky's efforts to put military service members first as they protect our nation at home and abroad, and help Johnson & Johnson tackle our pressing health care needs.

TRIBUTE TO SCOTT GILES

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Scott

Giles of Mount Ayr, Iowa, for being inducted into the Iowa High School Athletic Association Officials Hall of Fame.

This award was presented to Scott by the Iowa High School Athletic Association on March 10th, during the Boy's State Basketball Tournament. Scott has been officiating basketball for 34 years, including regular season, district, sub-state games and state tournaments. He has also officiated high school football for 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by Scott embodies the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent him, and Iowans like him, in the United States Congress. I ask that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating him for this achievement and in wishing him nothing but continued success.

COMMEMORATING THE ALPENA COUNTY GEORGE N. FLETCHER LIBRARY'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to recognize the Alpena County George N. Fletcher Library as it celebrates 50 years of meaningful work in the Alpena community. Michiganders understand how important it is to have reliable access to library services, and we are so grateful for Alpena County Library's half-century of community service.

The establishment of a public library in Alpena dates to 1860 when the up-and-coming community commissioned just \$25 a year to maintain a collection in the private home of Diane Morse Richardson. Thirteen years later, the Alpena Public Schools system began housing the library's collection at Alpena High School, where it remained until a temporary location on Second Avenue was acquired. In 1967, the Alpena County George N. Fletcher Library was officially established as a county library serving the educational, social, and historical interests of the community. Serving a community of just 2,700 people in 1860, the library now accommodates a population nearly 15 times that size by circulating some 120,000 articles and books.

In addition to offering an extensive collection of literature and other resources, the Alpena County George N. Fletcher Library has consistently proven itself to be a leader in the community through targeted initiatives that enhance the wellbeing of all citizens. Programs like READ Tutors, which helps students achieve new reading levels and learn English as a second language, engages our young people in activities that help them reach their potential and prepare them for the next steps in their lives. The library has also started a new early childhood literacy-project called 1,000 Books Before Kindergarten, which encourages parents to read 200 books a year to their children before the age of five. This program exemplifies the library's tremendous efforts to foster academic achievement within the community, and promotes childhood development in a robust family setting.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Alpena County George N. Fletcher Library for 50 years of service in the Alpena community. Northern Michigan residents can take great pride in knowing that Alpena is a better place thanks to the work and dedication of the Alpena County George N. Fletcher Library. On behalf of my constituents across Michigan's First District, I thank the Alpena Community Library for its work and look forward to its continued success.

**HONORING CPL. HAROLD
WESBECHER (RET.)**

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Harold Wesbecher's honorable service to our nation during the Korean War.

Born February 16, 1929, in Evansville, Illinois, Harold graduated from Red Bud High School in 1947 and was drafted into the U.S. Army on June 19, 1952.

Faithfully serving our country over a two year deployment in the Southwest Pacific, Harold toured Mt. Fuji and Sendi, Japan alongside Pusan and the Chun Chon Valley of Korea. Guarding the Neutral Nations Inspection Team in Korea until May of 1954, Harold returned home to continue farming beef cattle and row crops for 60 years upon being discharged from the service.

The husband to Gerry Wesbecher and father of two children, Harold is known to his family as "The Boss" because of his hard work, integrity, and honesty. Today, he continues to be a lifelong member of St. Mary's Catholic Church, where he serves on the parish board.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the service that Harold dutifully gave to our nation during the Korean War. We are forever grateful for his service.

**THE GROWING RUSSIAN MILITARY
THREAT IN EUROPE**

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in my capacity as Co-Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, also known as the Helsinki Commission, I participated in a hearing to examine Russian military threats in the OSCE region.

Russia today stands in violation of the central commitments of the Helsinki Final Act. These commitments include respect for the territorial integrity of States, fundamental freedoms, and the fulfillment in good faith of obligations under international law. In violating these commitments, Russia is threatening the foundations of European security and recklessly endangering the lives of millions.

One such victim of Russian aggression is Joseph Stone, the 36-year-old American

medic who was killed by a landmine while on patrol in separatist-controlled eastern Ukraine with the OSCE's Special Monitoring Mission on April 23rd. If it weren't for Russia's unjustifiable aggression toward Ukraine's sovereignty there would be no need for such a monitoring mission. And yet, day after day, OSCE monitors put themselves in harm's way to try to reduce the tensions created by the reckless conduct of Russia and its proxies in eastern Ukraine. It is a conflict that has already claimed over ten thousand lives, and sadly is sure to claim more.

Russian aggression is not a localized phenomenon—it threatens the entire region. Moscow has seized sovereign territory by force, threatened to use tactical nuclear weapons against other countries, harassed U.S. and NATO military assets, and abandoned key transparency measures and commitments. These actions are unacceptable.

In the face of such provocations, the United States must leave no doubt that we stand behind our Eastern European and Baltic Allies. There is no time to waste: we must ensure the confidence of our friends at this critical juncture.

One way to do this is to continue building a credible conventional deterrent to Russian aggression alongside our allies, in particular Poland and the Baltic States. I have consistently supported robust funding for the European Reassurance Initiative. With the support of this initiative, since 2014, NATO members have held over 1,000 military exercises in Europe. ERI has allowed the U.S. to participate more extensively in such exercises and increase its deployment of soldiers and military assets in allied countries. Furthermore, it has helped us to build the capacity of our partners and generally make our commitment to European security felt. These kinds of activities must be sustained and expanded to ensure that we are ready to counter any threat at any time.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must act, bilaterally and within NATO, to robustly deter, defend against, and roll back Russian aggression in the OSCE region. This includes ensuring that Ukraine has the defensive weapons it needs to more effectively repel Russian occupying forces and respond to Russian-backed proxies. As Ukraine President Petro Poroshenko told a joint session of Congress several years ago, "One cannot win the war with blankets." That is at true today as it was then.

If Russia's invasion, occupation, and fracturing of Ukraine stands, then Russia will be emboldened to do likewise in other neighboring countries. It is in the interests of the United States to help ensure that the Russian Federation does not become the new Soviet Union, invading, occupying and annexing its neighbors.

**IN RECOGNITION OF THE AMERICAN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL'S
WORK TO PROTECT CITIZENS' INDIVIDUAL LIBERTIES**

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the American Human Rights Council for their advocacy and efforts. The AHRC has been a steadfast champion in ensuring that all Americans, regardless of background, are able to exercise their civil liberties.

Founded in 2014, the AHRC brings together community leaders and civil rights activists to promote and defend human rights defined in the United States' Constitution and by the United Nations' Declaration of Human Rights. Initially focused on protecting and preserving the rights of prisoners, the AHRC has expanded its advocacy efforts to address pressing humanitarian issues in the United States and abroad. In addition to its work on prisoners' rights, the organization has also strongly pushed for a peaceful resolution to the conflict in Yemen and relief for the humanitarian issues facing the country's citizens, as well as opposed the Syrian government's attacks on innocent civilians during the Syrian civil war. The AHRC also recognizes outstanding individuals who work to further the group's mission during its annual Spirit of Humanity Gala event.

The AHRC has played a critical role in protecting and advancing human rights both in the community and around the world. By working with state and local partners, the AHRC has been able to draw attention to human rights issues by hosting public forums and educational awareness events. In the past year, AHRC has investigated dozens of inmate inquiries relating to issues in prison facilities and participated in multiple community forums, including discussions about community policing initiatives and an annual Capitol Day visit to Lansing in order to highlight the organization's mission and its concerns with elected officials. These efforts have helped raise awareness while driving action to further the AHRC's mission of promoting human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the American Human Rights Council for its work to protect and preserve Americans' civil liberties. The AHRC's work has helped safeguard our nation's fundamental rights.

**RECOGNIZING M. SMITH COFFMAN
FOR HER INSPIRATIONAL POEM,
GHOSTS OF THE PAST**

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize M. Smith Coffman for her powerful poem and kind words of inspiration to many. While the poem is meant to move and

inspire our service members and veterans in times of need, I believe everyone should experience it. I intend for everyone to procure some good fortune and hope from her message.

GHOSTS OF THE PAST

The fog shrouded, silent vale,
comes to life before my trail.
Ghosts of the past, ride in the predawn mist,
in their stirring I am by angels kissed.

Here, the plan of war was born,
and there, soldiers' lives were torn.
Brave warriors on snorting, restless steeds,
our heroes against men of evil deeds.

See Lexington and Concord's men of pride.
Rebs and Yanks who at Chickamauga died.
See the tired, straggling wagon train,
faces parched by sun, in battle's strain.

Indians silently move their camps,
past sod houses lit by dim oil lamps.
I see the brave men from the Alamo,
as on, and on, and on they go.

Oh, ancient rocks, you saw it all,
you saw where gallant man did fall.
You echoed the shot, felt the glance of spear,
the price for freedom, we hold dear.

Our troops who fell on foreign soils,
they the victors, won the spoils.
There were those from the sky
and from the sea,
They gave of themselves to keep us free.
Their souls, at last, are at home,
no more foreign lands to roam.

All are soothed in the mist,
as o'er their separate paths they twist.
Their laughter softly echoes from the rills,
and across the windswept, rugged hills.
Mingling, they have enemies no more,
here at home or foreign shore.

In cadence, I heard them say,
"Let not our sons go this way.
Alas the new born cries at birth,
but men must know of joy on earth.
Oh, that we could right the wrong,
Oh, that we could leave but song."

Oh Lord, many of our brave, gallant men of
pride,
put their lives upon the line, fought and
died.

Men with bodies and emotions torn,
this great loss we all should mourn.
I stand and salute you, one and all.
You went through hell, for country's call.

Dear Lord, I pray their pain relive,
give them strength and hope, and ease.
They should receive the best of care,
FOR 'TIS BY THEM WE BREATHE FREE
AIR.

For freedom's cause they did not bend,
they pledged their allegiance to the flag
until the end.

"Children, Listen," the midst does sing.
"We know not what this day or the years
will bring.

Stand brave and strong for liberty's call.
Your country needs you one and all.
Give thanks for all that was and is,
and for the heroes who lived, and live.
Give thanks for freedom that was not lost.
Give thanks to those who paid the cost."

The mist soon melted into the morning sun.
THEY ARE OUR HEART'S BLOOD
THEY ARE NOT GONE.

These brave men and women did not live or
die in vain.

Our flag unfurled we will sustain.

IN GOD WE TRUST

AMEN

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distin-

guished colleagues to join me in recognizing M. Smith Coffman for her encouraging words.

IN RECOGNITION OF PETTY OFFICER
MICHAEL JOHN CRUTCHFIELD

HON. DAVID A. TROTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise, today, to highlight the distinguished career of one of my constituents, Petty Officer Michael John Crutchfield.

On April 27, 1970, when others were awaiting their draft notices, 20-year-old Petty Officer Crutchfield took it upon himself to enlist in the United States Coast Guard and serve his county.

A true patriot, in February 1972, Petty Officer Crutchfield, once again, decided to volunteer for our country, this time in Vietnam. Despite landing unarmed with a dozen of his colleagues, Michael fulfilled his mission and returned to Barbers Point, Hawaii, where he served the balance of his three-year assignment.

Following his service in Hawaii, Petty Officer Crutchfield served as a member of the U.S. Coast Guard Heilo No. 1377 crew, conducting search and rescue missions in a HH-52A helicopter based out of Selfridge Air National Guard Base.

Petty Officer Crutchfield's service to our nation is exemplified by such acts as saving a young man from having his legs amputated and aiding the search of 29 crewmen who perished when the Edmund Fitzgerald sank in the icy water of Lake Superior in November of 1975.

But, Petty Officer Crutchfield is more than one man—he is a testament of the selfless patriotism and sacrifice embodied by the over 35,000 veterans in Southeast Michigan.

He is a representation of the bravery and honor embodied by so many servicemen and women in my district.

Today, I would like to recognize each and every one of them, especially Petty Officer Crutchfield, for their outstanding service to our great nation.

Representing them in Congress is my utmost honor, and I will continue to work tirelessly for them to give them the recognition and respect they deserve.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FLOOD PREVENTION ACT OF 2017

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Flood Prevention Act of 2017. The bill would amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA) to include the nation's capital in the definition of "coastal state." Our bill would correct an apparent oversight in the omission of the District of Co-

lumbia, and would make the District eligible to receive federal funding and provide oversight for federally issued permits/facilities/ actions that affect the coastal waters of the District. The District urgently needs the protection of the CZMA because of serious flood risks that currently affect both residents, businesses and federal assets, including the National Mall and the cluster of downtown federal agencies.

In an effort to reduce coastal flood risk, Congress has authorized a number of programs to help states and territories respond to floods and mitigate risk through resiliency projects. Among these programs, the CZMA provides planning and technical services to assist states in protecting, restoring and developing coastal communities and resources. Once the federal government approves a state's coastal management plan, the state becomes eligible for grants. Federal actions must be consistent with the state plans and vice versa.

Even though the District is located on two rivers and has suffered substantial coastal floods in the past, D.C. was omitted from the list of eligible states and territories in the CZMA. This oversight may have occurred because the CZMA was passed in 1972—before the District achieved home rule or had a Member of Congress. Under Section 304 of the CZMA, "coastal state[s]" include the states and the U.S. territories (Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, and American Samoa). Absent from this definition is the District, even though the District, including the federal complex, is under a serious threat from rising sea levels. Because the territories are included in the definition of "coastal states," it appears that D.C.'s omission is a mistake, which only Congress can correct.

Scientists have predicted that the tides on the Atlantic Coast could rise two to four feet by the year 2100, causing property worth as much as \$7 billion in the District to be routinely under threat by floodwaters. This damage not only includes private homes and businesses, but the National Mall, federal buildings, and three military bases located in the District. The Anacostia and Potomac rivers are both tidally influenced, showing tangible salt water effects (and fish) and are part of an "intertidal-zone" existing between high and low maritime tides. In addition, the Maryland and Virginia coastal zones each include the tidal Potomac River, with Maryland's zone ending at the District line. Because of these factors, the District should be eligible for CZMA grants just like the states and territories already listed in the CZMA.

I urge support for this bill.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. STEVE ANDREWS

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor today to acknowledge the life of a devoted public servant and United States Veteran,

Steve Andrews, who died at the age of 67 on Saturday, January 28, 2017 in Petoskey, Michigan.

Steve was born on October 15, 1949, to Tracy and Barbara Andrews and grew up in the heart of Northern Michigan in the city of Gaylord. Following his high school graduation in 1967, Steve joined the United States Navy where he worked as a medic on a number of bases around the world. Steve served with distinction from the U.S. Naval Hospital in Guam to the 1st Marine Division and Marine 1st Force Reconnaissance Company in Vietnam and was awarded the Purple Heart and the Navy Commendation Medal for his role in saving countless Marines' lives during the Vietnam War.

After coming back home, Steve became a successful entrepreneur, and in 1978, Northern Michigan residents recognized Steve's commitment to community service by electing him to serve as State Representative for the 106th Michigan House District. Steve retired from the Michigan legislature in 1982 after serving two terms and refocused his efforts on his small business and family.

During the next 35 years, Steve and his wife, Karen, grew their small business, Sturgeon River Pottery, into a well-established and widely respected Midwest retailer with a robust operation and thousands of supporters across the country. Further, Steve's creative talents and generosity led him to be an active member in his community where, in addition to being a successful small business owner, he coached youth football and baseball teams, served on the Board of Trustees of North Central Michigan College, served as President of the Petoskey Regional Chamber of Commerce, and was a founding member of Petoskey's Art in the Park.

Mr. Speaker, Steve's contributions to Northern Michigan cannot be overstated, and his family and community can take pride in knowing that Northern Michigan is a better place thanks to his life's work. On behalf of Michigan's 1st Congressional District, I ask you to join me in recognizing an outstanding public servant whose contributions will continue to bless Northern Michigan residents for many

years to come. May God bless Steve and his family always.

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET R.
GAITER

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to pay tribute to a longtime friend and one of the finest women I have ever known.

Margaret Gaiter recently passed away on May 12, 2017 at the age of 91. I was honored to know Mrs. Gaiter and her late Husband, Felix. They both helped me as a young attorney by giving me the privilege of representing their business. Mrs. Gaiter had always been very kind to me and was a person who treated everyone with love and respect.

A 1947 graduate of Knoxville College, Ms. Gaiter worked for the Knoxville Housing Authority in the 1950s and 1960s where she helped families relocate from dilapidated homes and buildings. She also worked for the Knox County Public School System's parent involvement program which she retired from in 1988.

A member of Rogers Memorial Baptist Church in Knoxville, she served as minister of music for the church for over three decades. Mrs. Gaiter always lived her life by the Golden Rule.

In 2007, Mrs. Gaiter and her late husband Felix were awarded the Knoxville Area Urban League's Whitney M. Young, Jr. Lifetime Award for their work on social justice and civil rights issues. This speaks to the role she played as a leader in her community.

In 2007, after the Knoxville News-Sentinel wrote a very nice series of articles about Felix and Margaret Gaiter, I wrote a letter to the paper commending it for doing so. In my letter I stated: "The Gaiters have touched thousands of lives in kind and positive ways and have set an outstanding example for everyone. This

Nation is a better place today because of Felix and Margaret Gaiter."

My wife Lynn went to visit Mrs. Gaiter a few weeks ago when she found out Margaret might possibly be nearing her death. Lynn and I send our condolences to Mrs. Gaiter's children and many grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, Margaret Gaiter was a wonderful wife, mother, and citizen. I call her life and accomplishments to the attention of my Colleagues and others. This Nation would be a much better place if we had more people like her.

HONORING JUDGE PATRICIA D.
WISE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Judge Patricia D. Wise, elected in 1989, is one of four Chancellors of the Fifth Chancery Court District of Hinds County, Mississippi.

Formerly Mrs. Wise was managing attorney and partner in the law firm of Dockins & Wise, Attorneys at Law, Jackson, Mississippi. Her private practice was in the area of Domestic Relations-Family Law, Personal Injury and General Civil practice. She served as Family Law Resource Attorney for Central Mississippi Legal Services.

An Oxford, Mississippi native, she has lived in Jackson, Mississippi for the past thirty-five years. She received her Bachelors of Science in Special Education, her Masters of Communicative Disorders and her Juris Doctorate degree all from the University of Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Judge Patricia D. Wise for her dedication to serving others.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, May 19, 2017*

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless the Members of the people's House during these decisive days. May they remain genuine enough to preserve their integrity, great enough to be humble, and good enough to keep their faith, always regarding public office as a sacred trust. Give them the wisdom and the courage to fail not their fellow citizens nor You.

Bless as well all those who serve: those men and women who are in the Armed Forces and, at the end of this week, those men and women of the blue line, who protect us daily in our homes, towns, and cities.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WOMACK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

DRUG COURT SUPPORT

(Mr. WOMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of drug courts and veterans treatment courts in America.

No one disputes the issues of rampant drug use and abuse in our Nation and the tremendous hardship it is placing on families, on businesses, and our criminal justice system. Recently, I met a remarkable young man from Arkansas who epitomizes the critical need to expand these lifesaving programs.

Blayne was facing 20 years in prison because of a 10-year addiction to opioid prescription drugs that spiraled out of control while experimenting in college. Today he is a father to three beautiful children, owns his own home, and is giving back to his community—all because a drug court in Arkansas saved him.

This month is National Drug Court Month. Drug courts represent one of our Nation's most successful strategies for intervention.

I support drug courts and veterans treatment courts. I am counting on my colleagues to ensure they are properly supported and funded. The return on investment is incalculable.

DIRECT CONNECT TO SUCCESS ACT

(Mr. SOTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Direct Connect to Success Act.

In my district and across the State of Florida, hundreds of thousands of striving students start in community colleges and automatically get admitted into our 4-year universities if they graduate with a minimum of 2.0. A 4-year degree opens up even more opportunities for these students, many of whom come from underserved and rural areas.

This has been a nationally recognized program that is only available in a few

States, but by expanding this simple, proven program nationwide, we will extend the opportunity to continue higher education to millions more hard-working, deserving students.

We can all agree that government has a role to play in reducing barriers to success, and this guaranteed admission is a low-cost, highly efficient way to remove this big barrier. I ask you and others to join me in support of the Direct Connect to Success Act to create more opportunities to pursue the American Dream for all students.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

(Mr. CULBERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, every day law enforcement officers across America put their lives on the line to protect our communities and our fellow citizens. National Police Week is an opportunity for all Americans to recognize and express our deep appreciation for those law enforcement officers and first responders for their selfless service.

I want to take a moment to honor those who have lost their lives in the line of duty.

In Harris County, Texas, we recognize and remember the lives of Chief Clint Greenwood and Deputy Darren Goforth, who worked tirelessly to keep Houston safe. Both of these men served their communities and families honorably, and we are so grateful for their sacrifice.

As chairman of the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, it is and will continue to be one of my top priorities to ensure that our law enforcement officers have the resources they need to protect our communities and to protect themselves. We must always honor and protect those who protect us.

I express a deep thanks to the people of Texas and America, to all our uniformed officers, for their dedicated service to our Nation.

HONORING BUD SIMMONS

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in praise of a good Missourian and a good friend who has done a great deal to honor our men and women in uniform.

For 18 years, Bud Simmons has hosted a Troop Hero Appreciation Day at his Pier 31 Marina and Restaurant on Lake of the Ozarks in Missouri, where he treats military families to a delicious meal, boat rides on the lake, numerous prizes, and a day together as a family away from the stresses of military life.

If you ask Bud why he does it, he will tell you that freedom is not free and that he wants to honor our heroes who are pledging their lives to protect ours. He remembers how many troops returning from Vietnam were never thanked for their sacrifices, and he doesn't want that mistake repeated.

This year's event on Saturday, June 10, is the last time that Bud will host this event. I want to thank Bud for his efforts to honor those who serve. He has made a difference in countless lives of servicemen, servicewomen, and their families, and we are all grateful for his example, his leadership, and his patriotism.

God bless you, Bud.

HONORING FALLEN POLICE OFFICERS

(Mr. BERGMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Michigan's police officers for their selfless service and to honor the fallen.

Isaiah 6:8 says: "Whom shall I send? And who will go for us? And I said, 'Here I am. Send me.'"

Every time our law enforcement officers put on their uniform, they are saying, "Send me."

In cities and small towns all over the United States, law enforcement officers act as our protectors, defenders, and ambassadors of peace. They hold that thin blue line between thriving, healthy communities and chaos.

During the past few months, I have had the pleasure of getting to know officers serving the Escanaba, Gaylord, and Traverse City communities in specific, and all across the First District, and I can say without pause that Michiganders are in capable and caring hands.

We owe a debt of gratitude, a debt of cooperation, and a debt of consistent support to our law enforcement officers.

God rest the souls of the fallen. Keep their friends, families, and fellow officers in your hearts and prayers.

PROBATION OFFICER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 324, I call up the bill (H.R. 1039) to amend section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, to grant probation officers authority to arrest hostile third parties who ob-

struct or impede a probation officer in the performance of official duties, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 324, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1039

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Probation Officer Protection Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY OF PROBATION OFFICERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking "**and return of a probationer**" and by inserting "**authority of probation officers**";

(2) by striking "If there" and inserting "(a) If there"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) A probation officer, while in the performance of his or her official duties, may arrest a person without a warrant if there is probable cause to believe that the person has forcibly assaulted, resisted, opposed, impeded, intimidated, or interfered with the probation officer, or a fellow probation officer, in violation of section 111. The arrest authority described in this subsection shall be exercised under such rules and regulations as the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall prescribe."

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 229 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 3606 and inserting the following:

"3606. Arrest authority of probation officers."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in House Report 115-127, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1039.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1039, PROBATION OFFICER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting the amendment to H.R.

1039 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before I address the bill under consideration today, I would like to take a few minutes to honor a very special member of my staff, Burak Guvensoylar, who lost his courageous battle with cancer this past weekend.

Burak was a valued member of the Judiciary Committee team and worked on a variety of issues, including digital privacy and intellectual property. His vast knowledge and grasp of the issues impacting the technology community was a tremendous asset to the committee.

Most recently, Burak's work included the development of the committee's Innovation and Competitiveness Agenda; and his steadfast work and tenacious attitude were not only essential in making this initiative a success, but were also a testament to his character. In fact, while he was undergoing intensive cancer treatments, he was actively working and sending follow-up emails from his hospital bed. And just days before Burak passed away, he met with FCC Commissioner Ajit Pai to discuss a number of Judiciary Committee priorities. For Burak, nothing could prevent him from an opportunity to discuss and advance the policies he was so passionate about.

Burak was a true technology policy enthusiast. Prior to joining the staff of the Judiciary Committee, Burak served as a legislative adviser for Congressman Randy Forbes. While working for Congressman Forbes, Burak handled the diverse range of issues that fall under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, but it was always evident that technology policy was his first love.

He cofounded the Congressional Tech Staff Association and served as an executive officer responsible for the professional development program.

Prior to his career on Capitol Hill, Burak worked at TechAmerica and CompTIA, focusing on international trade policy.

Burak has many friends here in the Halls of Congress on both sides of the aisle. I know all of my colleagues join me in extending our deepest sympathies to his mother, Filiz; his sister, Aylin Forbes; his girlfriend, Ashley Newsome; and all of his loved ones.

Burak will be deeply missed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1039, the Probation Officer Protection Act of 2017, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I want to thank the primary author of the bill, the gentleman from Washington, Congressman REICHERT, for his

leadership on this and many other law enforcement issues.

Under current law, a Federal probation officer may arrest a probationer or an offender on supervised release if the officer has probable cause to believe that the offender has violated a condition of his or her probation or release. The officer may make the arrest with or without a warrant.

Unfortunately, current law does not grant probation officers arrest authority in situations where a third party attempts to physically obstruct an officer or inflict physical harm on the officer. Despite the fact that interfering with a probation officer in the performance of his or her official duties is in itself a crime, Federal probation officers lack the authority to correct or restrain a physically interfering third party.

In fact, a probation officer's only course of action is to retreat from the situation. This not only exposes these officers to a heightened risk of harm, as they are not permitted to subdue the assailant, it also allows the probationer to conceal evidence that he has violated terms of his probation or supervised release or any other criminal activity.

H.R. 1039 is a reasonable and responsible remedy to this very real problem. This bill, which has the support of the Judicial Conference of the United States and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, will protect probation officers and enhance their ability to do their job by giving them authority to arrest a third party who forcibly interferes with an officer's performance of his or her official duties.

□ 0915

This bill would not give probation officers general arrest authority. Rather, as noted, it grants them the very limited authority to arrest a third party who is interfering with the duties of the officer, which is already a Federal crime.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense measure to ensure that these dedicated men and women have the necessary authority to undertake their duties safely and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, to the chairman and to the Republican team, let me offer, on behalf of the Democrats and Mr. CONYERS, our deepest sympathy for the loss of Burak, and to also acknowledge how important our staff is and how important we are as a family on the Judiciary Committee; staff, Republican and Democratic staff members, working together around legislation that makes a difference in the lives of Americans. To hear the dedication of Burak only warms our hearts to

recognize that we still live in the greatest country in the world because we have young people willing to serve and sacrifice on behalf of their Nation. I offer my deepest sympathy to you and to his family as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the underlying bill, and that is H.R. 1039. Again, as we finish Police Week, let me say to all of those in law enforcement, including our Federal law enforcement, local, county, and State, a very large "thank you" for the work that you have done.

In my work as a former judge in the city of Houston, I have seen their work up close and personal, and as well, I have had the opportunity, on a number of cases, where I have asked and interacted with them as they have proceeded with their investigation to find the culprit, the perpetrator, and to make the community safe.

Federal probation officers perform a critical service in interacting with and managing their supervisees. They have a central role in seeking to achieve the important goals of supervision, which includes rehabilitating the defendant, safeguarding society from further criminal conduct by the defendant, and protecting the rights of victims.

Although probation officers do have the ability to arrest a supervisee under certain circumscribed conditions, they should not take on the role of police officers. Rather, they should focus on their role of working in a constructive manner with supervisees to maximize the chances of adherence to the conditions of supervision.

We certainly do not want probation officers to be threatened or assaulted while performing their duties, nor do we want anyone to obstruct the performance of those duties. In many instances, those probation officers can be assisted by backup officers or other Federal officers in the line of their duty. That is why Congress enacted section 111 of title 18 of the United States Code which prohibits such behavior. If violated, these crimes should be investigated, charges brought when appropriate, but also the probation officer can seek assistance.

In fact, probation officers have long relied on law enforcement officers to provide support during searches, and I believe that is still the best course. Section 111, however, itself presents serious issues about the vagueness of some of its terms that define violation, such as "interferes" or "opposes."

May I remind my colleagues that we have a First Amendment. We have the right of freedom of speech and freedom of access, freedom of movement. This exacerbates my concerns about allowing probation officers to arrest individuals whom they are not supervising for violations of this section.

Indeed, we are told by proponents of the bill that Federal probation officers plan to use lesser-included authority to

detain violators instead of bringing them in for charges after an arrest. At a time when we need to do more to de-escalate circumstances involving confrontations between law enforcement and citizens, I am concerned that establishing this authority would only lead to more confrontation.

In concluding, as I indicated, the bill would authorize Federal probation officers to arrest, without a warrant, an individual other than their supervisee if there is probable cause to believe that person assaulted or interfered with a probation officer in the course of their duties.

I believe there are conflicting constitutional issues here, and I ask my colleagues, with all due respect, to oppose the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1039, the "Probation Officer Protection Act."

I must oppose this bill for several important reasons.

To begin with, this bill raises serious constitutional and practical concerns that could have been identified and explored had our Committee held any hearings on the subject matter.

This bill would authorize federal probation officers to arrest without a warrant an individual—other than supervisees—if there is probable cause to believe that person assaulted or interfered with a probation officer in the course of their duties.

The changes this bill would make to current law would significantly alter the role of federal probation officers and invite abuse in the application of the proposed expanded authority.

Federal probation officers perform a critical service in interacting with and managing their supervisees. They have a central role in seeking to achieve the important goals of supervision, which includes:

- (1) rehabilitating the defendant;
- (2) safeguarding society from further criminal conduct by the defendant; and
- (3) protecting the rights of victims.

Although probation officers do have the ability to arrest a supervisee under certain circumscribed conditions, they should not take on the role of police officers. Rather, they should focus on their role of working in a constructive manner with supervisees to maximize the chances of adherence to the conditions of supervision.

We certainly do not want probation officers to be threatened or assaulted while performing their duties, nor do we want anyone to obstruct the performance of those duties.

That is why Congress enacted Section 111 of Title 18 of the United States Code, which prohibits such behavior. If violated, these crimes should be investigated and charges brought when appropriate.

In fact, probation officers have long relied on law enforcement officers to provide support during searches, and I believe that is still the best course to continue.

Section 111, however, itself presents serious issues about the vagueness of some of its terms that define violations, such as "interferes" or "opposes."

This exacerbates my concerns about allowing probation officers to arrest individuals

whom they are not supervising for violations of this section.

Making such determinations on vague terms invites abuse.

Indeed, we are told by proponents of the bill that federal probation officers plan to use “lesser included” authority to “detain” violators instead of bringing them in for charges after an arrest.

This is an invitation for abuse as it indicates the statute may be used—at times—when not necessary.

And, at a time when we need to do more to de-escalate circumstances involving confrontations between law enforcement and citizens, I am concerned that establishing this authority will only lead to more confrontation.

This is all the more troubling because of constitutional concerns regarding such detentions. As the Federal Public Defenders of New York explains: “the Fourth Amendment does not permit probation officers to exercise this ‘lesser included’ power. Under an exception to the Fourth Amendment’s probable cause requirement, police officers, when executing a search warrant, are permitted to temporarily restrain third parties absent probable cause for arrest, including by using handcuffs. In holding such detentions to be ‘reasonable,’ the Supreme Court emphasized the fact—‘of prime importance’—that the search was authorized by a neutral magistrate’s finding of probable cause to search the premises.”

In the circumstances contemplated by this bill, the probation officers would have the right to be on the premises, but their underlying authority to detain individuals—not based on a probable cause warrant—would fail this constitutional requirement.

Overall, the extension of third-party arrest authority to federal probation officers is a step in the wrong direction. As the Federal Defenders warn, the “bill represents a retreat from the current constructive role of probation officers in reintegrating offenders into society. If probation officers assumed the role of police, directing and restraining, or arresting, family and friends, progress in individual cases and the system as a whole would be undermined.”

Likewise, the American Civil Liberties Union and the Leadership Counsel for Civil and Human Rights have expressed strong opposition to this bill.

I appreciate the dedication of federal probation officers in carrying out their important duties. And it is because of my respect for the role that they play that I fear that this bill will ultimately serve to undermine it.

Accordingly, I ask that my colleagues join me in opposing this well-intentioned, but harmful bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), the chief sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, today I am here to talk about a bill that should be a fully bipartisan bill supported by all Members of this body. It gives our probation officers the tools they need to defend themselves, but also, at the same time, protect the peo-

ple who are on probation that the probation officers are trying to help and protect and keep on track and get them back on a path to productive citizenship in this country. Sometimes they are impeded from doing their job, not just verbally.

I was a cop for 33 years. I was verbally abused thousands of times. I have lost track. Those bounce off the badge, and that is what probation officers do. Verbal abuse is verbal abuse. You deal with it, you handle it, and you go about your day. But when somebody puts their hands on you, or they spit on you, that is physical. That is assault. Probation officers should be able to protect themselves and take actions in those instances when they are assaulted. You don’t need an arrest warrant. You don’t need a search warrant to arrest someone who has just assaulted an officer. This is common sense.

So to say you need a search warrant or an arrest warrant to arrest someone who has assaulted you is the wrong way to look at this law. The person who is being supervised lives in a residence, and the probation officer has the authority to go to that residence and has the authority, by the way, Mr. Speaker, to walk into that residence. They have the authority to force their way into that residence if it is known to be owned by the person who is on probation. And if they are obstructed in doing that, it is a violation of the law. Furthermore, if they are assaulted, it is another violation.

In the past, what has happened is that the probation officers had to step away, walk away, and say: Oh, well. The guy just spit in my face. He punched me in the face. He pushed me. He obstructed me. I guess I will go back to my car and get on the radio, and 30 minutes from now when police officers can finally show up—because we are shorthanded across this Nation as far as police officers go. We have hundreds and hundreds, thousands, of vacancies across this Nation in every police department, every sheriff’s office. So we are going to just step away, we are going to call for backup, and we are going to wait for a half an hour and see what happens.

I think this not only puts the probation officer at risk, but it also puts the person who is on probation at risk. What is happening in that house that that person doesn’t want us to come in and see?

I have worked with, as you might guess, probation officers from the local level, Federal level, all across the spectrum. They are well trained. They have an academy that they go through. They raise their right hand and swear to uphold the Constitution, all the laws of this country. They are trained. Every year they have a minimal amount of training, 40 hours. That is the minimum. They have additional

training on top of that on specific issues on how to handle situations where it escalates to a physical event. They know how to de-escalate verbal events. These are professional people who are doing a job that a lot of people don’t want.

And already States across this country have recognized that their State probation officers need this sort of authority. In some States, for example, they have given them full police authority. I repeat, full police authority.

In this case, it is very limited. It is limited to the obstruction. It is limited to the physical obstruction of the probation officer doing their job that we have asked them to do on behalf of all of us in this country. The least we can do, as we wrap up National Police Week, is to say we support law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, there are Members in this body who have found a way—decided that there is a way that I can vote “no” on this instead of standing up and saying—there are Members here that have had police officers added to the memorial wall this past week; in some cases, five people from one State. Those Members have decided to find a way to not support law enforcement, and they are going to vote “no.”

Mr. Speaker, we can yak all we want about supporting cops, but if we don’t show it with this vote, it is all talk. When I was a cop, you had to walk the talk. And today, Members of this body, if you support law enforcement, you better walk the talk.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman and indicate that there is no doubt we want our officers to be safe.

I do want to bring to the attention of my colleagues that we don’t want probation officers to be threatened or assaulted while performing their work or their duties, nor do we want to obstruct the performance of those duties.

Let me remind my colleagues that many times probation officers are going into homes. There are moms and grandmoms or granddads or children, and certainly we realize that emotions of concern may occur.

We want our probation officers to be safe. That is why Congress enacted section 111 of title 18 of the United States Code which prohibits such behavior. And if violated, these crimes should be investigated, and charges are brought.

But the other point is that our probation officers undergo an initial 6 weeks of training and some additional training during the year. They still do not have the degree of training of law enforcement officers. I want them to be protected. That is why I think it is important that they have the assistance of trained law enforcement officers.

Not all probation officers carry a firearm, as it varies in each judicial district. We want them protected, and we would rather follow the law, which is section 111.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who has a longstanding record of advocacy and support for the Nation's law enforcement and first responders, and he is a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, as we just heard from my good friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), as co-chairs of the Law Enforcement Caucus, this is an important piece of legislation for us.

Mr. Speaker, as the lead Democrat sponsor of this bill, the Probation Officer Protection Act, I rise in strong support of closing a gap in the current law to help Federal probation officers more safely and effectively carry out their duties.

Despite the fact that assaulting, resisting, or otherwise preventing Federal probation officers from performing their official duties is against the law, current law does not provide the same officers the authority to correct or restrain an interfering third party. This act simply expands the authority of the Federal probation officers to arrest a third party with probable cause in cases where a third party tries to physically obstruct or harm the officer.

I understand that some of my friends worry about the implications of expanding arrest authority for law enforcement. I have to say there are a lot of trumped up arguments being made against this bill. For starters, Federal probation officers are fully trained and sworn Federal law enforcement officers. They have a tremendous training program in Charleston, South Carolina, the Law Enforcement Training Center. They understand that this training is a continuing process as well.

These officers receive extensive, ongoing, nationally standardized training to safely arrest individuals on supervised release with probable cause without a warrant. This training is also applicable to the limited arrest authority granted by this bill.

The idea that expanding probation officers' arrest authority to third parties will somehow lead to probation officers going on an unwarranted arresting spree, violating individuals' civil rights with impunity, is nonsense.

□ 0930

The bill includes language to ensure that the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts would issue national guidelines to implement this new, limited authority. The authority will not give Federal probation officers plenary law enforcement powers or general arrest authority. Probable cause still must exist to carry out an arrest. That is very clear in the legislation. The bill does nothing to alter Federal probation officers' scope of responsibility. To suggest so undermines the training these officers receive and the oaths that they take.

Secondly, I understand that constitutional concerns have been raised by my colleagues about the due process and rights of these third parties. Nothing in this bill, Mr. Speaker, alters the due process or rights of third parties. Nothing in the bill.

If a third party agrees to house an individual on supervised release, they consent to the Federal probation officer having access to common areas and any part of the home to which the offender has access. Additionally, Federal probation officers build a relationship with the third party housing the individual on supervised release in order to manage their expectations on what it means to have a supervised probationer living under their roof.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Federal probation officers conducted a total of 1,060 searches pursuant to a court-ordered search condition or with consent last year. More than half of the searches had at least one third party present. Despite relying on other law enforcement agencies for support and assistance during 493 of these searches, Federal probation officers encountered uncooperative third parties on 39 occasions.

So, Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues have acknowledged, we are not talking about a significant number of instances where this additional authority is needed—remember, only 39 instances last year. Opponents claim these numbers are low, making this a solution in search of a problem. But in these 39 instances, a third party threatened, intimidated, refused to cooperate, and denied officers entry into residence to prevent an officer from doing their job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, opponents claim, that is their claim that they have.

This is against the law, plain and simple. The probation officer in these instances did not have the authority they needed to remedy the situation.

No one wants to increase the number of arrests. That is not the purpose of the legislation. In a perfect world, everyone wants a situation to be deescalated before an arrest or a detention happens. Ideally, Federal probation officers would have the resources to visit their probe with a law enforcement officer.

However, we don't live in a perfect world. Oh? These resources are not always available. Third parties sometimes intentionally interfere to prevent a Federal probation officer from performing their official duties.

I urge my colleagues to support the Probation Officer Protection Act to ensure Federal probation officers are able to do their job safely and more effectively by giving them third-party ar-

rest authority when probable cause exists.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on this legislation, I think it is important that individuals understand probation officers. I worked at the courthouse in Houston, Texas, as a prosecutor and then as a criminal court judge for 22 years. I had probation officers report to me. That was our system. I knew a lot of probation officers, Federal and State. I think our society does not understand how important their job is.

A person comes to court charged with a crime, and the judge decides to release that person on supervised probation. The person goes back out into the community and is supposed to follow a bunch of rules or the probation could be revoked. Probation officers not only have probationers come to their office to report, but probation officers go out there where these probationers are—in their homes and where they are working—and check up on them, trying to make sure they toe the line. It is a very, very dangerous job, in my opinion.

Many of these probation officers work alone, just because of budget problems. So they will go out there, and they will talk to some probationer about their probation and try to encourage them to, for example, get a job. That is what you are supposed to do when you are on probation. And they encounter other people—sometimes family members, sometimes friends, sometimes roommates, business associates—and they start yelling and screaming at the probation officer. Sometimes they commit a crime against the probation officer. What is the probation officer supposed to do? Call the police? No.

Under this legislation, it allows the probation officer to arrest other people who are basically committing a crime against the probation officer, whether it is an assault or whether it is a threat or whether it is interfering, maybe, with the arrest of the probationer. That is what this legislation does. It helps protect the probation officer when they are out there trying to rehabilitate probationers.

I have heard stories over the 22 years at the courthouse from probation officers about how, when they go out in one of these areas of Houston, Texas, some of the people that are there with the probationer aren't the nicest folks in the world, and they start yelling, screaming, and actually will commit a crime against the probation officer—for example, a threat, or maybe even an assault.

Remember, many of these individuals are working alone. They don't go out there with a SWAT team. They are out

there by themselves, and they are doing, really, what we want them to do to keep that probationer following the straight and narrow, make sure they are doing what they are supposed to do. And then sometimes people interfere. This legislation protects the probation officer and allows the officer to keep those folks at bay and arrest them.

Now, I have heard the concerns of whether or not this is a violation of the Fourth Amendment. There is no one more supportive of the Fourth Amendment than I am. It does not violate the Fourth Amendment. It gives the probation officer authority to arrest only after probable cause because a crime was committed. Rather than call for help, call for the Texas Rangers, they can actually arrest that individual who is interfering.

I do not believe it is a violation of the Fourth Amendment. I would hope those people who think so would read the Fourth Amendment and then read the statute as well.

I support this legislation. I appreciate what the chairman and Sheriff REICHERT had to say.

And that is just the way it is, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the other side has any additional speakers?

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

First of all, let me indicate the important work that all law enforcement do and, as well, those who serve in the probation departments of our State and Federal Government. In particular, we are talking about Federal probation officers. I think it is important to give them a debt of gratitude.

But they are not police officers. They are probation officers. Their training is quite different. Their role is quite different. They are to engage in a constructive relationship with the probationer, rehabilitation, making sure they adhere to their rules and confinement or what is detailed by the court. They do it very well; so much so, that we have determined that the incidents are very low.

Of the 987 searches that were conducted by Federal probation officers, only 30 involved uncooperative third parties, or 3 percent. We would like it to be zero. Of the 1,060 searches conducted in 2016, only 39 involved uncooperative third parties, which amounts to about 3.7 percent.

But I agree, no probation officer should be subjected to encountering any manner that threatens them. But this legislation is vague; it is constitutionally weak. It is weak as relates to the Constitution. Its premises, as unopposed and interfered, invite abuse.

I still maintain that many of these probation officers go to the homes of

either the probationer or their family, and likely, in many instances, it is close individuals.

I believe probationers can be assisted by law enforcement officers. Remember, the training is distinctly different. What it lends itself to is overbroad interpretations of interference with probation officers, whose duties may lead to overzealous exercise of arrest authority, which does violate the Constitution.

We are now looking at ways to work with law enforcement, and the solution would not be even more training, because we do not want to turn probation officers into police officers, which would undermine the constructive role probation officers have in the rehabilitation of supervisees. Detaining, arresting, and issuing orders to family, friends, employers, and coworkers of supervisees will not advance the goals of supervision but would escalate conflict and lead to greater danger.

These are high goals that my colleagues have spoken of, and I certainly believe that these are worthy goals, but I would offer to say that third parties are not in the same position as those who are supervised with respect to their rights. They have given up none of their rights and should not be detained or arrested in violation of the Fourth Amendment. It is and can be a violation of the Fourth Amendment, of unreasonable search and seizure. It is too vague a description to allow an on-site determination as to whether someone should be arrested.

So, in the name of the respect and dignity of all and the appreciation of probation officers, if they view the situation as inappropriate or threatening, as the law allows, those cases should be investigated and prosecuted, but they can call law enforcement officers. Federal probation officers should never be threatened, intimidated, assaulted, or precluded from doing their jobs. Nevertheless, H.R. 1039, rather than improving their ability to execute their responsibilities, would, unfortunately, have the opposite result.

In addition to presenting the constitutional concerns, the bill fails to provide an acceptable, practical, or necessary preventative measure. Further, as the public defenders of New York have indicated, the Fourth Amendment does not permit probation officers to exercise this lesser included power. Under an exception to the Fourth Amendment's probable cause requirement, police officers, when executing a search warrant, are permitted to temporarily restrain third parties, absent probable cause for arrest, including by using handcuffs.

Holding such detentions to be reasonable, the Supreme Court emphasized the fact of prime importance: that the search was authorized by a neutral magistrate's finding of probable cause to search the premises. That is not

what the probation officer comes into that place with. They are not a law enforcement officer.

In caution to our efforts to recognize and respect these fine men and women, let us find a different way, and let us adhere to the established law that will protect the probation officer and all those whom he or she may come in contact with.

Again, with great respect for law enforcement and those who serve, I would ask my colleagues to recognize the broadness and vagueness of this legislation and oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 0945

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard many arguments in opposition to this legislation. We have carefully explained how each of these arguments is unfounded.

I simply want to again urge my colleagues to vote for this very simple, yet much-needed, piece of bipartisan legislation. Support the men and women of law enforcement with your vote. Support the Fraternal Order of Police who wrote a letter supporting this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I enter in the RECORD the FOP letter.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL

ORDER OF POLICE,

Washington, DC, 15 February 2017.

Hon. DAVID G. REICHERT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE REICHERT: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for H.R. 1039, the "Probation Officer Protection Act." This legislation will amend section 3606 of Title 18, United States Code, to grant probation officers authority to arrest hostile third parties who obstruct or impede a probation officer in the performance of official duties.

Probation officers supervise men, women and juveniles who are convicted of a crime. Instead of a judge sentencing these offenders to prison, the judge sentences them to close supervision while continuing to live and work with the general public. A probation officer's job title comes with an inherent element of danger due to the supervision of offenders such as drug addicts, sexual offenders and domestic violence offenders who could turn violent at any time. Offenders are often intimidated by the amount of power a probation officer has over their freedom. If they feel the officer will recommend a prison sentence or report illegal activity, which may lead to a prison sentence, they may try to eliminate this threat by harming the officer.

When probation officers are accosted by a violent third party, they are forced to retreat because they have no third-party arrest authority. They also cannot assist any police officer at the scene who may have been called to assist. This subjects everyone involved in the situation to greater risk and can result in the loss of evidence, the escape of an offender, or harm to an individual.

In the past, offenders typically reported to the probation officer's office for scheduled visits. Now many probation officers are required to make home visits where the offender may have easy access to weapons.

While the officer may carry a gun, and have armed back up in some cases, often he or she will go into the home or workplace alone without knowing anything about other persons at the site.

For these reasons, this authority is needed and we are proud to support your bill and look forward to working with you on it.

On behalf of more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I want to thank you for introducing this legislation and amendment. If I can be of further help, please do not hesitate to contact me or my Senior Advisor, Jim Pasco, in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, support the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, who called H.R. 1039 a "critical officer safety measure" in their letter of endorsement.

Support the National Association of Police Organizations, who said H.R. 1039 is a "sensible solution that ensures the safety of the officer, the probationer, and the community."

Mr. Speaker, I enter in the RECORD these letters.

FEDERAL LAW
ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Cabin John, MD, May 17, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
*Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND LEADER PELOSI: I am writing on behalf of the nearly 27,000 members of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association to advise you of our strong support for H.R. 1039, the "Probation Officer Protection Act," and to express our appreciation for the Congress's consideration of this important officer safety measure during National Police Week. FLEOA opposes the amendment that will be offered on the floor to sunset the authority provided by the bill, as you cannot put a stopwatch on critical law enforcement officer protection measures such as H.R. 1039.

The "Probation Officer Protection Act" is a critical officer safety measure. At a time when U.S. Probation Officers have seen their workloads increase due to changes in sentencing policy and are being asked to "do more with the same," ensuring that they have the means to protect themselves when placed in harm's way is paramount. H.R. 1039 will fully authorize a U.S. Probation Officer to arrest any third party who violates 18 USC 111. This statute has been on the books since the 1940s and makes it a crime for any person to forcibly assault, resist, intimidate, or interfere with any federal officer in the performance of their official duties. Current law, however, only allows Probation Officers to make arrests of individuals on probation or under supervised release who violate 18 USC 111. This authority does not extend to "third parties," which could include a former associate of the offender or an unidentified member of the community. In many instances third parties are well aware that a federal officer's authority is limited to individuals on supervision, and when a third party does impede or assault a U.S. Probation Officer, the Officer's only recourse is to retreat and call for local law enforcement. While in major cities local law en-

forcement may respond depending on availability, the same is not true for U.S. Probation Officers who work in rural communities where response by local law enforcement may be a single officer or none. This places Probation Officers at even greater risk, particularly in those situations where retreat is not even a reasonably safe alternative.

During the forthcoming debate on this bill, there will undoubtedly be those who go to great lengths to demean U.S. Probation Officers as something less than "real" law enforcement officers or to diminish the hazards that they face. Some may also raise inchoate objections about the constitutionality of H.R. 1039. For example, you will hear that Congress cannot extend Executive Branch police powers to the Judicial Branch, despite the fact that it was Congress that established the U.S. Supreme Court Police that resides directly across the street from the U.S. Capitol. Not only are such statements factually inaccurate, they display a basic lack of understanding about those who serve our nation as U.S. Probation Officers and the purposes behind the "Probation Officer Protection Act."

Make no mistake: U.S. Probation Officers are fully trained federal law enforcement officers. They attend basic training at the National Training Academy at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Charleston, SC, and receive ongoing in-service training throughout the year. Their training covers everything from firearms regulation and safety and defensive tactics to handcuffing, the use of force, de-escalation training, and reality-based scenario training. It may be difficult for some to acknowledge, but there is an inherent risk to the work U.S. Probation Officers do—a risk that often outweighs that of traditional law enforcement. They do not enter into sterile offices, but often into environments that are uncertain. They are required to have frequent and regular contacts in the home and community and knowingly come into daily contact with individuals who have a history of violence, mental health issues, problems with authority, and troubles with substance abuse. U.S. Probation Officers are not able to anticipate what is going to occur during all contacts. There are and have been occasions when U.S. Probation Officers are threatened and/or attacked by third parties and they need the ability to take an affirmative step to protect themselves.

U.S. Probation Officers are a unique profession. They have a knowledge base in law and human behavior, and a mix of skills in investigation, communication, and analysis. They strive to make our communities safer, to make a positive difference in the lives of those they serve, and promote fairness in process and excellence in service. But as the volume of approved searches they must conduct has markedly increased over the past year due to changes in sentencing policy, the absence of any authority to restrain or direct the movements of third parties places U.S. Probation Officers at a greater and unnecessary risk of physical harm. H.R. 1039 provides a modest expansion of U.S. Probation Officers' existing arrest authority to cover only violations of 18 USC 111. It does not in any way provide them "peace officer" status or grant them the same general arrest authority that state-level probation officers enjoy in many jurisdictions. Granting U.S. Probation Officers the authority to arrest third parties would not change who they are and what they are seeking. Nor will it interfere with or otherwise diminish U.S. Probation Officers' use of the de-escalation tech-

niques that are the hallmark of their profession. It would simply afford them another tool, another avenue, if ever needed.

In the end, this legislation will enhance officer safety while also protecting probationers and third parties by preventing obstruction from escalating to actual violence. Thank you in advance for your consideration of this legislation and for helping U.S. Probation Officers do their job more safely by passing H.R. 1039, the "Probation Officer Protection Act."

Sincerely,

NATHAN R. CATURA,
National President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
POLICE ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,
Alexandria, VA, May 17, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: On behalf of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), I am writing to advise you of our support for H.R. 1039, the Probation Officer Protection Act.

NAPO is a coalition of police units and associations from across the United States that serves to advance the interests of America's law enforcement through legislative and legal advocacy, political action, and education. Founded in 1978, NAPO now represents more than 1,000 police units and associations, 241,000 sworn law enforcement officers, and more than 100,000 citizens who share a common dedication to fair and effective crime control and law enforcement.

Probation officers in the United States have experienced a significant increase in their workloads due to the recent changes in federal sentencing guidelines, but they are being asked to do more with the same amount of resources. With these officers spread thin, it is important that they have every means available to protect themselves when put in harm's way. The Probation Officer Protection Act narrowly expands current law to grant federal probation officers the authority to arrest any third party who forcibly assaults, resists, intimidates, or interferes with the officer in the performance of his or her official duties.

Currently, when a federal probation officer is assaulted or threatened by a third party, they must retreat and call local law enforcement. This not only places the probation officer in danger, particularly if there is no way to withdraw from the situation, but it is a strain on local law enforcement agencies, many of which do not have enough officers just to patrol their communities. The Probation Officer Protection Act is a sensible solution that ensures the safety of the officer, the probationer and the community.

We appreciate Congress considering this important officer safety bill during National Police Week. If we can provide any assistance, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. JOHNSON,
Executive Director.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, collectively, these organizations represent over half a million sworn law enforcement officers. On this last day of National Police Week, let's join them in supporting this bill.

In this body, Members tend to frequently use the term "common sense" to describe a piece of legislation. I don't think many more pieces of legislation are as common sense as this bill.

It really boils down to this question: Should a law enforcement officer be able to arrest the individual who forcibly assaulted, resisted, opposed, impeded, intimidated, or interfered with that officer?

That is it. That is all we are talking about today. Common sense tells us that the answer is a resounding "yes."

It has been insinuated that probation officers aren't real law enforcement and lack the training to make arrests. I think the brave men and women who serve as Federal probation officers, who have received extensive training, and have ongoing training requirements as part of their jobs, might disagree with that insinuation.

Further, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and its Federal Probation and Pretrial Academy offer nationally standardized training programs and advanced training programs targeting specialized areas of supervision. Common sense tells us that these officers are qualified to make arrests.

Opponents of this bill would prefer to have these law enforcement officers retreat when confronted by third parties. Let's think about what some of the consequences of retreat might mean. If forced to retreat, that officer is forced to terminate interaction with a probationer who may urgently require services, such as substance abuse or mental health treatment. It also means contraband, such as firearms or narcotics, which could have been removed by the parole officer, remains in the community.

In short, the consequences of retreat place public safety in jeopardy. Common sense tells us that retreat is not a viable option.

There is nothing revolutionary going on here. There is no new Federal crime being added. This bill simply says that when someone forcibly assaults, resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates, or interferes with a probation officer, that probation officer can arrest that individual.

It is already a crime to engage in the behavior I just described. An individual who commits that act is going to get arrested. All we are debating today is who puts the handcuffs on the arrestee. Common sense tells us that the officer who was assaulted should have the authority to make the arrest.

Use common sense. Support H.R. 1039, the Probation Officer Protection Act of 2017, so that Federal probation officers can do their jobs safely and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:
SEC. 3. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON NEW AUTHORITY OF PROBATION OFFICERS.

Not later than 2 years after the effective date of this act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study, and report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate on the results thereof, on the arrest authority provided to probation officers under subsection (b) of section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act. Such study shall include information about—

- (1) any instance of an abuse of power in the exercise of such arrest authority;
- (2) any complaints filed about the exercise of such arrest authority; and
- (3) any harm resulting from the exercise of such arrest authority, including any civil action alleging the violation of a civil right in the exercise of such arrest authority.

SEC. 4. SUNSET OF ARREST AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b) of this section, section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) of this section shall take effect on the date that is 30 months after the effective date of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 324, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, my amendment preserves the trust and integrity between probation officers and supervisees while ensuring public safety.

While I understand the intended goal in the underlying bill, there are some unique concerns that it raises, and my amendment addresses and will, I believe, provide additional information.

My amendment calls for a comprehensive study by the GAO of the newly granted authority to determine the impact on probationers, supervisees, third parties, and the overall probation practice, if that authority is so granted by the vote of this body. This study shall sunset at 30 months after the effective date of this act.

These are concerns that we should all have if we want to ensure that this bill works and reaches its intended purpose, if it is voted on by my colleagues and passes.

In allowing the study, we will ascertain information that we otherwise would not have but would have learned had we proceeded with a hearing on this bill.

This amendment will focus on the bill's impact in application. The study will first review instances of abuse of power in the exercise of such arrest authority.

Second, it will document any complaints made and/or filed regarding the

exercise of the probationer's arrest authority of third parties.

Third, it will study any harm resulting from the exercise of such arrest authority, including any civil action alleging the violation of a civil right in the exercise of this expanded authority.

I am confident that my colleagues would agree that public safety is paramount, the safety of the probation officer is paramount, the safety of those who are in the immediate custody of the probationer, and, of course, those other individuals.

We want this to be a sound policy, so implementing sound policies will foster trust and, thereby, public safety.

I want to thank the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order, and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the Jackson Lee amendment.

While I understand the intended goal in the underline bill, there are some unique concerns that it raises and my amendment addresses and will fix those concerns.

My amendment calls for a comprehensive study by GAO of the newly granted authority, to determine its impact on probationers, supervisees, third parties and the overall probation practice. This study shall sunset at 30 months after the effective date of this act.

These are concerns we should all have if we want to ensure that this bill works and reaches its intended purpose effectively.

In allowing the study, we will ascertain information that we otherwise, do not have but would have learned had we proceeded with a hearing on this bill.

This amendment will focus on the bill's impact in application.

The study will first review instances of any abuse of power in the exercise of such arrest authority.

Second, it will document any complaints made and/or filed regarding the exercise of probation officer arrest authority of third parties.

Third, it will study any harm resulting from the exercise of such arrest authority, including any civil action alleging the violation of a civil right in the exercise of this expanded authority.

I am confident that my colleagues would agree that public safety is paramount and that we should do everything we can to ensure that we are implementing sound policies that will foster trust and thereby, public safety.

The Rules Committee saw it fitting to rule my amendment in order, and now I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my friend.

Her amendment would sunset the very modest, yet necessary and appropriate, authority that we are seeking to grant Federal probation officers today. No valid reason has been given for the need to sunset this provision. In fact, ample evidence is available showing why probation officers need this authority to perform their duties safely and effectively.

Just last year, over one-third of the safety-related incidents reported by Federal probation and pretrial staff involved third parties encountered by officers while performing their official duties.

For example, during an unannounced home visit to an apartment by officers, as they approached the apartment, two unidentified subjects entered the hall from another unit. Officers knocked on the resident's door and there was no answer. One third party stated: "Hey, five-oh, who are you looking for?" And they began approaching the officers in a menacing manner.

One of the third parties pulled out a cell phone and started videoing, yelling obscenities, and making other statements to the officers. Another individual, in response to the commotion, entered the hallway possessing a knife and drew it as he moved toward the officers.

These types of threats, Mr. Speaker, are very real and very dangerous to the brave men and women who serve the criminal justice system as Federal probation officers. The types of threats that exist today will continue to exist in 2½ years when the gentlewoman's amendment would sunset the proposed arrest authority.

I want to make one thing very clear, Mr. Speaker. The bill before us today does not create a new Federal crime. It is already a Federal crime to assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a Federal probation officer for which an individual can be placed under arrest. The only thing the bill today does is say that probation officers can make that arrest.

And why shouldn't they be able to make that arrest?

Probation officers have a unique role in our criminal justice system, balancing the skills of a law enforcement officer with the skills of a social worker. In addition to the 6 weeks of initial training, Federal probation officers are required to complete at least 40 hours of continuing education and training annually.

I don't think it is a radical idea to suggest that Federal law enforcement officers should be able to arrest someone who commits a Federal crime by interfering with the duties being performed by that officer.

Let them do their part in keeping the public safe. Let them do their jobs safely. Let them do their jobs effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I believe this amendment is a very important amendment, and I believe that it provides the kind of guidance that is necessary because it is a clear ascertaining of the impact.

Remember, we are talking about possible constitutional ramifications. Unreasonable search and seizure. We are talking about not having assaults against police officers. There is a law that will already provide for that protection, as well as the fact that probation officers who are not police officers can, in fact, have the ability of law enforcement backup or support.

In addition, we realize that there is a greater burden on law enforcement officers in an arrest situation. That burden is not on the probation officer because they are not a law enforcement officer.

It is important for this study to be enacted so that we have the facts. Do we not, as legislators, want to have the facts regarding the Constitution and the impact it may have?

So I would ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment. It is, in fact, not an amendment that negates, if this bill passes, the acts of the probation officer. But what it does do is study whether there is an enhanced impact and whether grandmother, mother, a little child, an aunt, or an uncle, in the sanctity of their home, are unreasonably detained or arrested.

We as Americans should at least be concerned about the rights of our fellow citizens and be able to respect them in their home. A probation officer has the right to call in a law enforcement officer if the actions of the home, or wherever that individual happens to be, gets in a way that interferes with his or her ability to arrest his probationer.

Let me remind everyone that the relationship between a probation officer and a probationer is a constructive one, one of rehabilitation. And, sadly, if on one incident, or 39 incidents, or 3 percent of the incidents, if something occurs, that probation officer has the right to be able to call a law enforcement officer to assist.

This study is a constructive, forthright study to help us better protect the rights of citizens and of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from the Federal Defenders of New York, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and the ACLU opposing the underlying bill.

FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF
NEW YORK, INC.,
New York, NY, March 30, 2017.

Re Probation Officer Protection Act of 2017
(H.R. 1039)

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chair, House Judiciary Committee, Washington,
DC.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, JR.,
Ranking Member, House Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

Hon. TREY GOWDY,
Chair, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism,
Homeland Security, and Investigations,
Washington, DC.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Ranking Member, House Subcommittee on
Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and
Investigations, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. GOODLATTE, MR. CONYERS, MR. GOWDY AND MS. JACKSON LEE: We write on behalf of the Federal Public and Community Defenders in response to inquiries for our views on H.R. 1039, which would amend 18 U.S.C. §3606 to give probation officers the authority to arrest, without a warrant, persons not subject to court supervision if there is probable cause to believe that the person has impeded or interfered with a probation officer in violation of 18 U.S.C. §111. The bill was introduced last Congress, and we understand that there has been discussion of it being introduced again.

We oppose the bill because it would violate the Separation of Powers, would invite Fourth Amendment violations, is unnecessary for purposes of supervision or safety, and would instead escalate the risk of harm to all concerned and undermine effective supervision. The arrest or detention (to any degree) of persons not subject to court supervision should be left to law enforcement officers.

SUMMARY

The bill would violate the Separation of Powers. Probation officers serve as administrative units employed by Article III courts. Congress may not assign to them the executive function of enforcing a criminal statute against private citizens not subject to court supervision. The bill would also undermine the integrity of the Judicial Branch by putting courts in the position of ruling on the constitutionality of arrests by their own agents, who are also interested arresting officers and alleged victims of an offense.

The bill would create serious Fourth Amendment problems. Assuming probation officers would use the bill's arrest authority only to formally arrest persons believed to have violated §111, the bill would result in Fourth Amendment violations. Because §111 is notoriously unclear, probation officers would inevitably arrest persons who are merely "uncooperative" but have not actually violated the statute. To allay concerns about giving probation officers the equivalent of police power over private citizens, the Judicial Conference assures Congress that probation officers would rarely make formal arrests but would instead exercise a "lesser included" power to control or temporarily restrain third parties short of formal arrest. But the Fourth Amendment would not permit probation officers to exercise such "lesser included" power. In holding that the Fourth Amendment allows police officers to temporarily restrain third parties during a search, the Supreme Court deemed it "of prime importance" that the officer had a warrant based on probable cause to search the premises. The bill would not change the fact that probation officers conduct searches without a warrant based on probable cause.

Thus, any restraint of a third party by a probation officer absent probable cause to arrest would violate the Fourth Amendment.

The bill is unnecessary. Probation officers have authority under current law to search the homes of people they supervise (without a warrant or probable cause) and to arrest them for violating conditions of supervision (with probable cause). Pursuant to Judiciary Policy, probation officers have long relied on trained law enforcement officers to provide support during searches, including by managing third parties not under probation officers' supervision. No evidence has been presented, and we have found none, of any instance in which law enforcement officers have not assisted when asked, or in which anyone has been hurt by a third party during a search. Allowing probation officers to restrain and arrest third parties would likely increase, not diminish, any risk of harm.

The bill would undermine effective supervision. The bill represents a retreat from the current constructive role of probation officers in reintegrating offenders into society. If probation officers assumed the role of police, directing and restraining, or arresting, family and friends, progress in individual cases and the system as a whole would be undermined.

BACKGROUND

Under current law, probation officers have limited special authority to conduct searches and seizures of persons on probation or supervised release for the sole purpose of assisting the district courts in supervising those persons. They are permitted, with or without a warrant, to conduct a search of a supervisee's home based only on "reasonable suspicion" that there is evidence on the premises that the supervisee has violated a condition of his or her supervision, and to arrest a supervisee whom they have "probable cause to believe has violated a condition" of his or her supervision.

Judiciary Policy directs probation officers, in planning a search, to "strongly consider requesting assistance from law enforcement officers for protection, instruction, and taking possession of contraband during a search," and to terminate any search "if it is unsafe for the [probation] officer to continue."

Probation officers are further directed that they "may not restrain third parties during a search." This is so because there is no authority for probation officers to detain third parties. The Supreme Court's decisions holding that the Fourth Amendment allows police officers to detain third parties during a search do not apply to probation officers, who both lack general law enforcement authority, and conduct searches in the absence of a finding by a neutral magistrate of probable cause to search the premises. Instead, probation officers rely on law enforcement officers to manage third parties if needed, thereby avoiding Fourth Amendment violations and reducing any risk of harm.

A. THE BILL WOULD VIOLATE THE SEPARATION OF POWERS

H.R. 1039 would authorize probation officers to arrest, without a warrant, a person not subject to supervision if there is probable cause to believe the person has interfered with or impeded a probation officer "while in the performance of his or her official duties" in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 111. By its terms, the statute would authorize probation officers to make such arrests at any time or place—during a search of a supervisee's home, on the street or at a place of business, or during a meeting at the probation officer's office.

By authorizing probation officers to enforce § 111 against private citizens not subject to court supervision, H.R. 1039 would violate the Separation of Powers. Probation officers are employed by the Judicial Branch to serve as administrative units of the district court, appointed by the court and removable by the court. A probation officer performs no Article III function, but serves a statutory duty to assist the court in supervising offenders.

Detecting crimes and enforcing criminal laws, in contrast, are "quintessential law enforcement functions vested in the Executive Branch." Just as Congress may not confer executive duties "of a nonjudicial nature" on Article III judges, Congress may not enlist an administrative arm of the Judicial Branch to perform an executive function.

This is not only a formalistic concern. A probation officer who has arrested a private citizen for impeding the probation officer in his duties would naturally have a direct, personal interest in both the legality of the arrest and the outcome of any resulting criminal case. The court, in turn, is the probation officer's employer. When ruling on a challenge to the constitutionality of an arrest by a probation officer, the court would thus review the actions of its own agent, who is also the interested arresting officer and alleged victim of an offense. By putting the court in the triple position of judge, vicarious victim, and arresting agent of ordinary citizens, H.R. 1039 would undermine the integrity of the Judicial Branch.

B. THE BILL WOULD CREATE SERIOUS FOURTH AMENDMENT PROBLEMS

Subject to "only a few specifically established and well delineated exceptions," the Fourth Amendment prohibits police officers from detaining persons (to any degree) absent probable cause or "prior approval by judge or magistrate." Even assuming probation officers used the bill's arrest authority for no other purpose but to make formal arrests based on probable cause that a person has violated § 111, the bill would result in unconstitutional detentions.

Section 111 prohibits "forcibly" assaulting, resisting, opposing, impeding, intimidating, or interfering with an officer "while engaged in" the performance of official duties. While one would think that "forcible" conduct is easy to recognize in this context, the term is notoriously ambiguous, involving a "troublesome question of degree." No physical contact is required even for assault, and "forcibly" has been held to cover such conduct as a "fighting stance" with an "uncooperative attitude," but not to cover running away and struggling when tackled by police. The statute is "not a model of clarity," "inartfully drafted," and leaving "major ambiguities," often requiring many pages of legal analysis to decipher.

If even the courts find the statute unclear, a probation officer surely cannot be expected to make an accurate on-the-scene assessment of probable cause that a person has violated it. Some probation officers would inevitably use their new authority to arrest persons who are merely "uncooperative"—such as by refusing to identify themselves, declining to open a door, or attempting to leave the scene of a search—but who have not violated § 111. The bill would thus invite Fourth Amendment violations.

To allay potential concerns about giving probation officers the equivalent of police power over private citizens, the Judicial Conference assures Congress that probation officers would rarely make formal arrests for violations of § 111. Instead, they would use a

purported "lesser included" authority, during "searches and other work-related contacts (e.g., home visits)," to "verbally or if necessary by temporarily restraining" (i.e., with handcuffs) "uncooperative or hostile" third parties short of arrest. Probation officers would not need probable cause to believe that a third party had violated § 111 in order to exercise this "lesser-included" authority; instead, they would direct, control and temporarily detain third parties whom they merely suspect have violated or will violate § 111, or believe to present a "potential safety risk."

But the Fourth Amendment does not permit probation officers to exercise this "lesser included" power. Under an exception to the Fourth Amendment's probable cause requirement, police officers, when executing a search warrant, are permitted to temporarily restrain third parties absent probable cause for arrest, including by using handcuffs. In holding such detentions to be "reasonable," the Supreme Court emphasized the fact—"of prime importance"—that the search was authorized by a neutral magistrate's finding of probable cause to search the premises.

Probation officers, however, conduct searches without a warrant based on a finding of probable cause by a neutral magistrate, and they conduct home visits with no suspicion at all. For these reasons, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts in 2007 reaffirmed its policy that probation officers "may not restrain" "restrict[]" the movement of third parties" present during a search. Under established Fourth Amendment law, third parties are "under no obligation to cooperate and must be free to leave." The AO's General Counsel correctly noted that "increas[ing] [probation] officers' statutory arrest authority under § 3606" would not solve the Fourth Amendment problem because probation officers would still conduct searches without a warrant based on probable cause.

Likewise, H.R. 1039 would not change the fact that probation officers conduct searches without a warrant based on a finding of probable cause, the factor "of prime importance" to the constitutionality of police officers restraining third parties during a search. As a result, any restraint or control of third parties by probation officers absent grounds for arrest would be an unconstitutional detention. The bill does not obviate this fundamental Fourth Amendment problem.

C. THE BILL IS UNNECESSARY

U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services reported that in both 2014 and 2015, probation officers encountered third parties described as "uncooperative" (defined to include refusal to identify themselves, to come out of a closed room, or to remain in a designated area) in only 3 percent of reported searches. Only two incidents of any significance were reported. In one, the supervisee's mother drove her car toward two officers "in an apparent attempt to hit them," but law enforcement officers were present and able to take any action needed. In the other, a third party "refused to come out" of a closed room, but law enforcement officers were present, forced the door open, and found the person swallowing marijuana cigarettes.

Nonetheless, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association ("FLEOA") claims that there is, a new "heightened danger in field and office contacts" and that giving probation officers third-party arrest authority is the "only [] solution." It claims that probation officers' ability to enlist law enforcement officers "provides little, if any, help"

because sometimes only one police officer is available. It gives three anecdotal examples, but they do not support the FLEOA's argument, and in fact demonstrate that the bill is not the "only solution," much less a safe solution.

In the Northern District of Alabama, probation officers came to see their supervisee, but he was not at home. They were leaving the premises when they encountered his father, who was intoxicated, made threats, and threw an empty liquor bottle at their car. The probation officers drew their weapons, called 911, got behind their vehicle, then drove away. The FLEOA states that with arrest authority, the probation officers "would have taken the third party into custody for assaulting them and for damaging government property." But the FLEOA does not explain why this would have been necessary for the purpose of supervising the son, who was not there, or to ensure anyone's safety. The police were fully capable of subduing or arresting the father, and most likely did, though that detail is omitted. Had the probation officers confronted the father, with guns drawn, they, the father, or innocent bystanders, including the offender's cooperative mother, may well have been hurt.

In the District of Utah, probation officers knocked on the door of their supervisee's residence and were told by his girlfriend that he was not at home and that no one else was there. The probation officers "ultimately encountered two third party felons hiding in separate locations," one of whom was suspected of homicide. The officers "issued their verbal commands," and the man became confrontational and challenged the officers to "shoot him." The officers retreated, and "local police ultimately subdued the third party and took him into custody." Again, the FLEOA does not explain how arrest authority would have increased the probation officers' or public safety any better than the police in fact accomplished.

In the Southern District of New York, probation officers looking to confirm that their supervisee did not live at his reported residence were "confronted" outside the residence, where the supervisee apparently did not live, with "a belligerent, unknown, third party." A physical altercation ensued, when "another third party charged forward swinging a pipe wrench." The officers used pepper spray and left. The FLEOA asserts that the probation officers "did not have the option to control the third parties," but instead were "forced to retreat." But the FLEOA does not explain how controlling the third parties, which would likely have escalated a potentially dangerous confrontation, was safer than retreat, much less the "only solution." The probation officers' mission was not urgent, and they were free to return with police support.

The Judicial Conference provides no empirical evidence or even anecdotal examples illustrating the purported need for H.R. 1039. It says that, "in the absence of other law enforcement officers acting in a supporting role," a supervisee can work with a "hostile or uncooperative" third party "to conceal violations of the terms of supervision, or even new criminal activity." But the solution is the very one suggested and that has been directed by Judiciary Policy and followed by probation officers all along: obtain support from law enforcement officers.

There is not a single instance cited in the U.S. Probation Search-and-Seizure reports, in the FLEOA's proposal or recent letter, or in the Judicial Conference's proposal or recent letter, in which probation officers re-

quested law enforcement assistance in advance, or called for assistance from the scene, and law enforcement declined to assist or failed to show up. One of the dangers of the bill is that probation officers would not request law enforcement support, thinking they can handle any problems with their arrest authority. But potential problems are best averted by law enforcement officers, who not only have arrest authority, but "provide perimeter security, manage third parties, provide special services such as K9 support, and conduct initial security sweeps."

D. THE BILL WOULD UNDERMINE EFFECTIVE SUPERVISION

H.R. 1039 represents an unfortunate retreat from the current role of probation officers, which has evolved from an oppositional focus on enforcement and punishment to a constructive collaboration aimed at addressing clients' criminogenic needs, reducing their risk of recidivism, and reintegrating them into society. These "concerted efforts to bring to life state-of-the-art evidence-based supervision practices into the federal system" coincide with "measurable decreases in federal recidivism." As the Judicial Conference has recognized, supporting the offender "in efforts to turn away from criminal conduct . . . will necessarily . . . promote public safety." And it has cautioned that searches "may undermine the rapport that an officer has developed with an offender and may hinder the progress that an offender has made." We fear that the progress that has been made in individual cases and in the system as a whole would be undermined if probation officers assumed the role of police, directing, restraining and arresting family and friends, and potentially escalating the risk of confrontation and danger to all concerned.

Thank you for considering our views, and please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

Very Truly Yours,

DAVID PATTON,
*Executive Director,
Federal Defenders of
New York, Co-Chair,
Federal Defender
Legislative Committee.*

JON SANDS,
*Federal Defender, Dis-
trict of Arizona, Co-
Chair, Federal De-
fender Legislative
Committee.*

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2017.

OPPOSE H.R. 1039, THE PROBATION OFFICER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

DEAR HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE MEMBER: On behalf of The Leadership on Civil and Human Rights and the 16 undersigned organizations, we urge you to oppose H.R. 1039, the Probation Officer Protection Act of 2017 (POPA), which would broadly authorize federal probation officers to make warrantless arrests of parties not under their supervision. Authorizing probation officers to arrest third parties is unnecessary and dangerous; would inhibit successful reentry; and would implicate serious constitutional concerns. Moreover, there are alternatives available that ensure the protection of probation officers while avoiding the pitfalls of broadly expanding their arrest authority.

POPA GIVES BROAD ARREST AUTHORITY

Under 18 U.S.C. §3606, a federal probation officer has the authority to arrest a probationer or person on supervised release if the probation officer has probable cause to believe that the probationer has violated a condition of his or her release. Currently, federal probation officers are not permitted to arrest third parties. POPA would amend 18 U.S.C. §3606 to permit probation officers to arrest "a person without a warrant if there is probable cause to believe that the person has forcibly assaulted, resisted, opposed, impeded, intimidated, or interfered with a probation officer, or a fellow probation officer, in violation of section 111. In other words, probation officers would be authorized to arrest—without a warrant—any third party on the scene who the officer claims is "interfering" with their work. This broad definition of behavior triggering third party arrest authority raises Fourth Amendment concerns.

POPA IS UNNECESSARY

There is no evidence that expanding federal probation officers' warrantless arrest authority is necessary. Statistics from the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA) show that only 2 percent of searches conducted by federal probation officers in 2013 resulted in any confrontation with "uncooperative" third parties. Furthermore, of the 909 searches conducted by federal probation officers in 2013, only seven led to the arrest of a third party when probation officers sought the assistance of local law enforcement. Similarly, in 2014, only 1.7 percent of the 1,566 searches conducted by probation officers involved any "reportedly uncooperative" third parties, and only five of these encounters resulted in a third party arrest by local law enforcement.

POPA WOULD BE DANGEROUS

Members of Congress should be reluctant to extend law enforcement-like powers to anyone not trained as a law enforcement officer—and probation officers are not police officers. Federal probation officers complete only six weeks of orientation training. In contrast, new law enforcement officers complete 16 to 21 weeks of classroom training and they often must complete three additional weeks of on-the-ground field training. If probation officers try to confront, restrain, and arrest uncooperative third parties, they are likely to heighten the physical danger they face in the field, not reduce it. The threat of arrest—and therefore physical seizure—could increase and escalate the physical confrontations between probation officers and third parties. De-escalation is the desirable outcome—not an extended violent altercation in which probation officers attempt to arrest third parties. In North Carolina, a probationer died while his probation officer attempted to arrest him. Incidents that result in violence or in arguably unlawful arrest may create expensive and time-consuming litigation for the U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services System. Instead of engaging hostile third parties, probation officers should remove themselves from dangerous situations and call for the assistance of trained local law enforcement who are fully prepared to handle hostile situations. Probation officers already do this, and it works.

POPA WOULD INHIBIT SUCCESSFUL REENTRY

Allowing probation officers to arrest third parties would also inhibit successful reentry for probationers. Part of the benefit of the probation system is that it allows probationers to live in society with their families

while they serve out their sentences and transition to full reentry into the community. But the prospect of arrest for the individuals who agree to help with the probationer's reentry may deter them from serving as hosts and may make it harder to achieve this transition successfully. Probation officers must have reasonable suspicion to conduct a warrantless search of a probationer's home; absent reasonable suspicion, the probationer or a third party must consent to a search and may limit the consent to search only to public areas. But if, for example, a mother, who has opened her home to her son on probation, blocks a probation officer from searching her bedroom for various reasons (e.g., because her grandchildren are in the bedroom), under POPA she could be arrested for "interfering" with the probation officer. Such scenarios could deter people from agreeing to host probationers who have nowhere else to live. This would undermine the probation system. These scenarios also threaten an innocent third party's ability to exercise his or her Fourth Amendment rights.

THERE ARE ALTERNATIVES TO POPA

Since 2006, more than 80 state and county criminal justice departments have adopted the Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS) model to improve relationships between probation and parole officers and their probationers or parolees. EPICS focuses on behavioral change rather than threats of re-incarceration and officers play a more direct role in changing criminal behavior. Reducing the hostility between the probationer and the probation officer will likely cause less hostility between the officer and third parties as well.

Probation officers can protect themselves by enlisting the help of trained law enforcement. Every jurisdiction gives probation officers the option of calling law enforcement officers for support when conducting home visits, and law enforcement officers can arrest hostile third parties if necessary. In Connecticut, probation officers do not have the authority to make arrests but they may detain an individual for a reasonable time until a law enforcement officer arrives or transport the individual to the nearest location where a law enforcement officer can make an arrest. Calling more fully-trained law enforcement for backup is likely to prevent the situation from becoming more volatile, and it is therefore preferable to probation officer arrests. Additionally, probation officers can be better trained on de-escalation techniques and strategies to improve the relationship between the probation officer and the probationer.

Probation officers' role within our judicial system is to assist with a probationer's transition back into society and report to the court on a probationer's progress. To expand probation officers' authority to allow probation officers to arrest—without a warrant—any person whom they claim is opposing or impeding their work in some way is unnecessary, likely to be dangerous, and would inhibit successful reentry. For the probation system to work, we need the cooperation of the third parties contemplated by this bill—family and friends—assisting probationers and individuals on supervised release as well as the probation officers visiting them. The threat of arrests of third parties in a probationer's environment will erode the goodwill necessary for that vital cooperation.

For the foregoing reasons, we urge you to oppose the Probation Officer Protection Act of 2017. If you have any questions, please

contact Sakira Cook, Senior Counsel, The Leadership Conference.

Sincerely,

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, The American Civil Liberties Union, AFL-CIO, African American Policy Forum, Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), Drug Policy Alliance, Equity Matters, Lambda Legal, MomsRising.

NAACP, The NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, National Association of Social Workers, National Center for Transgender Equality, The National Council of Churches, StoptheDrugWar.org, Trans United.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,

April 26, 2017.

Re ACLU Opposes H.R. 1039, The Probation Officer Protection Act (POPA) of 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, JR.,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE AND RANKING MEMBER CONYERS: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), we urge you to oppose H.R. 1039, the Probation Officer Protection Act (POPA) of 2017, a bill that would amend 18 U.S.C. Sec. 3606 to give federal probation officers authority to arrest third parties without a warrant. The ACLU represents almost 2 million members, activists, and supporters who are working to advance the ACLU's mission of defending the principles of liberty and equality embodied in our Constitution and our civil rights laws.

H.R. 1039 is a solution in search of a problem since there is no statistical or evidence otherwise to support the need to expand federal probation officers' arrest authority. Federal probation officers are not at substantial risk from third parties. Additionally, H.R. 1039 creates safety concerns for both probation officers and the community and has the potential of violating a third party's Fourth Amendment rights.

THE PROBATION OFFICER PROTECTION ACT IS A SOLUTION IN SEARCH OF A PROBLEM

There is no evidence suggesting that federal probation officers need arrest authority beyond what is currently authorized by law. One of the bill's primary proponents, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA), offers no helpful statistics to support the position that federal probation officers need third party arrest authority. FLEOA's statements are actually counter to their position. In a January 6, 2017, letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee, FLEOA itself admits that "formal arrests by probation officers are rare." There is no data-driven imperative for expanding federal probation officer arrest authority.

In fact, the Federal Probation & Pretrial Officers Association (FPPOA) February 13, 2017, letter states that in 2015, of the 987 searches that were conducted, only 30 involved uncooperative third parties. That is 3%. And furthermore, FPPOA does not indicate how many of those 30 incidents resulted in actual arrests. With federal probation officers' encounters involving so few uncooperative third parties and apparently even fewer incidents that actually result in arrest, the federal probation officers' own statistics lead to the conclusion that there is no need for probation officers to execute arrests of third parties. When probation officers face genuine physical danger, they should retreat and seek the assistance of trained law enforcement.

THE PROBATION OFFICER PROTECTION ACT WOULD PUT PROBATION OFFICERS IN DANGER

Probation officers are not trained law enforcement officers, so they should not be given increased police powers, the exercise of which could put them in harm's way. If probation officers are given authority to restrain and arrest uncooperative third parties, they are likely to heighten the physical danger for themselves and third parties.

Instead of engaging with resistant third parties, probation officers should rely upon the assistance of trained local law enforcement. This is the existing practice of probation officers, and according to their own statistics, this seems to work. Currently, federal probation officers are required to call in the United States Marshals or other law enforcement in order to arrest third parties. The reason is that probation officers lack the training necessary to safely execute an arrest, while the other law enforcement agents have the capacity to do so. Federal probation officers complete only six weeks of orientation training. New law enforcement officers complete 16 to 21 weeks of classroom training and they often must complete three additional weeks of field training.

THE PROBATION OFFICER PROTECTION ACT IS OVERLY BROAD AND RAISES FOURTH AMENDMENT CONCERNS

Federal probation officers would be authorized in POPA to arrest "a person without a warrant if there is probable cause to believe that the person has forcibly assaulted, resisted, opposed, impeded, intimidated, or interfered with a probation officer, or a fellow probation officer." Currently, 18 U.S.C. §3606 authorizes probation officers to arrest probationers without a warrant based on probable cause that the probationer has violated the conditions of his or her probation or release. However, probation officers do not have the training or on the job experience to make probable cause determinations necessary to make arrests of third parties compared to local law enforcement officers and the U.S. Marshals.

A real world implication of giving federal probation officers third party arrest authority could be that the mother of a son on probation is arrested for denying a probation officer access to her private space, like her bedroom. This bill would give a probation officer authority to decide that the mother's decision constituted "interference" and subsequently arrest her. Although probationers willingly surrender some of their Fourth Amendment rights as a condition of probation, third parties housing a probationer do not when it comes to their private spaces.

THE PROBATION OFFICER PROTECTION ACT HINDERS SUCCESSFUL REENTRY

Allowing probation officers to arrest third parties would also inhibit successful reentry for probationers. Part of the benefit of the probation system is that it allows probationers to live in society with their families while they serve out their sentences and transition to full reentry into the community. But the prospect of arrest for individuals who assist people on probation reentering their communities may deter family members from providing a home to people on probation. This also runs counter to part of the mission of the U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services, which is "to bring about long-term positive change in individuals under supervision."

For the reasons above, the ACLU opposes the Probation Officer Protection Act and we urge the Members to oppose this legislation when it is considered by the Committee. If

you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact Kanya Bennett, Legislative Counsel.

Sincerely,

FAIZ SHAKIR,
National Political Director.
KANYA BENNETT,
Legislative Counsel.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, there is no Fourth Amendment violation, the bill makes no reference whatsoever to the issue of searches, and there is no objection to the gentlewoman's request for a study. But there continues to be, and needs to be, objection and opposition to a sunset provision with respect to the authority that probation officers need to perform their duties safely and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 11:15 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 58 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1116

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) at 11 o'clock and 16 minutes a.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adopting the amendment to H.R. 1039;

Passing H.R. 1039, if ordered; and Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROBATION OFFICER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on adopting the amendment to the bill (H.R. 1039) to amend section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, to grant probation officers authority to arrest hostile third parties who obstruct or impede a probation officer in the performance of official duties, offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 178, nays 229, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

YEAS—178

Adams	Dingell	Lieu, Ted
Aguilar	Doggett	Lipinski
Amash	Doyle, Michael	Loebach
Barragán	F.	Lowenthal
Bass	Ellison	Lowey
Beatty	Engel	Lujan Grisham,
Bera	Eshoo	M.
Beyer	Española	Luján, Ben Ray
Bishop (GA)	Esty (CT)	Lynch
Blumenauer	Evans	Maloney,
Blunt Rochester	Foster	Carolyn B.
Bonamici	Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean
Boyle, Brendan	Fudge	Massie
F.	Gabbard	Matsui
Brady (PA)	Gallego	McCollum
Brown (MD)	Garamendi	McEachin
Brownley (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)	McGovern
Bustos	Green, Al	McNerney
Butterfield	Green, Gene	Meng
Capuano	Griffith	Mooney (WV)
Carbajal	Grijalva	Moore
Carson (IN)	Hanabusa	Moulton
Cartwright	Hastings	Nadler
Castor (FL)	Heck	Neal
Castro (TX)	Higgins (NY)	Nolan
Chu, Judy	Hoyer	Norcross
Cicilline	Huffman	O'Halleran
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	O'Rourke
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Pallone
Cleaver	Jeffries	Panetta
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Connolly	Jones	Peters
Conyers	Kaptur	Pingree
Correa	Keating	Pocan
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Polis
Crist	Kennedy	Posey
Crowley	Khanna	Price (NC)
Cuellar	Kihuen	Quigley
Cummings	Kildee	Raskin
Davis (CA)	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Davis, Danny	Kind	Rosen
DeFazio	Krishnamoorthi	Roybal-Allard
DeGette	Kuster (NH)	Ruiz
Delaney	Langevin	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Rush
DelBene	Lawrence	Ryan (OH)
Demings	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez
DeSaulnier	Levin	Sanford
Deutch	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema

Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suzuki
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas

Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—229

Abraham	Gowdy	Paulsen
Aderholt	Granger	Pearce
Allen	Graves (GA)	Perlmutter
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Perry
Arrington	Graves (MO)	Peterson
Babin	Grothman	Pittenger
Bacon	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Banks (IN)	Harper	Poliquin
Barletta	Harris	Ratcliffe
Barr	Hartzler	Reed
Barton	Hensarling	Reichert
Bergman	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Biggs	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Roby
Bishop (MI)	Hill	Roe (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Himes	Rogers (AL)
Black	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Blum	Hollingsworth	Rohrabacher
Bost	Hudson	Rokita
Brady (TX)	Huizenga	Rooney, Francis
Brat	Hultgren	Rooney, Thomas
Bridenstine	Hunter	J.
Brooks (AL)	Hurd	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Roskam
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Buck	Jenkins (WV)	Rothfus
Bucshon	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Budd	Johnson (OH)	Royce (CA)
Burgess	Jordan	Rutherford
Byrne	Joyce (OH)	Scalise
Calvert	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Carter (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Carter (TX)	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	King (NY)	Sessions
Cheney	Kinziger	Shimkus
Coffman	Knight	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Sires
Comer	LaHood	Smith (MO)
Comstock	LaMalfa	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Lamborn	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Lance	Smith (TX)
Cooper	Latta	Smucker
Costello (PA)	Lewis (MN)	Stefanik
Cramer	LoBiondo	Stewart
Culberson	Long	Stivers
Davidson	Loudermilk	Taylor
Davis, Rodney	Love	Tenney
Denham	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry
DeSantis	MacArthur	Tiberi
DesJarlais	Marchant	Tipton
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Trott
Donovan	Marshall	Turner
Duffy	Mast	Upton
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy	Valadao
Dunn	McCauley	Vela
Emmer	McClintock	Walberg
Estes (KS)	McHenry	Walden
Farenthold	McKinley	Walker
Faso	McMorris	Walterski
Ferguson	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi
Fitzpatrick	McSally	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Flores	Meehan	Welch
Fortenberry	Meeks	Wenstrup
Fox	Messer	Westerman
Franks (AZ)	Mitchell	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Mullin	Wittman
Gallagher	Murphy (FL)	Womack
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Gibbs	Nunes	Yoder
Gohmert	Olson	Yoho
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Gosar	Palmer	Young (IA)
Gottheimer	Pascrell	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—23

Blackburn	Clay	Crawford
Cárdenas	Cole	Curbelo (FL)
Chaffetz	Costa	Duncan (SC)

Gutiérrez Johnson, Sam
Katko Larson (CT)
Lee

Lofgren Napolitano
Newhouse Noem
Richmond

Russell Swallow (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Wagner

Mast McCarthy
McCauley McClintock
McHenry McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally Meehan
Mitchell Moolenaar
Mullin Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci

Rice (SC) Roby
Roe (TN) Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY) Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Rutherford
Scalise
Schneider
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart

Stivers Suozzi
Taylor Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Waters, Maxine Welch
Watson Coleman Wilson (FL)
Wittman Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Blackburn Demings
Cárdenas Duncan (SC)
Chaffetz Gutiérrez
Clay Johnson, Sam
Cole Katko
Costa Larson (CT)
Crawford Lee
Curbelo (FL) Lofgren

Napolitano
Newhouse
Noem
Richmond
Russell
Swallow (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Wagner

□ 1139

Messrs. COOK, WALDEN, SMITH of Texas, LABRADOR, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. ROKITA, MCCARTHY, BISHOP of Michigan, and WITTMAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. NOLAN, CLYBURN, HOYER, SANFORD, and Mrs. LOWEY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 177, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

YEAS—229

Abraham Crist
Aderholt Cuellar
Allen Culberson
Amodei Davis, Rodney
Arrington DeFazio
Bacon Delaney
Barletta DeLauro
Barr Denham
Barton Dent
Bergman DeSantis
Biggs DesJarlais
Billirakis Diaz-Balart
Bishop (MI) Donovan
Bishop (UT) Duffy
Black Dunn
Blum Emmer
Bost Eshoo
Boyle, Brendan Estes (KS)
F. Farenthold
Brady (TX) Faso
Brooks (AL) Ferguson
Brooks (IN) Fitzpatrick
Buchanan Fleischmann
Buck Flores
Bucshon Fortenberry
Budd Foxx
Burgess Franks (AZ)
Byrne Frelinghuysen
Calvert Gaetz
Carter (GA) Gallagher
Carter (TX) Garamendi
Cartwright Gibbs
Chabot Gohmert
Cheney Goodlatte
Coffman Gottheimer
Collins (GA) Gowdy
Collins (NY) Granger
Comstock Graves (LA)
Conaway Graves (MO)
Cook Grothman
Cooper Guthrie
Correa Harper
Costello (PA) Harris
Courtney Hartzler
Cramer Hensarling

Adams
Agullar
Amash
Babin
Banks (IN)
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Comer
Connolly
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

NAYS—177

Gallego
Garrett
Gonzalez (TX)
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Hill
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Loebach
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerny
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mooney (WV)

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. DELAUNO. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall Vote No. 268 on H.R. 1039, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yea” when I should have voted “No.”

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, my vote did not register when I used my voting card. I have reported the malfunctioning card to the Clerk's office. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 268.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, circumstances have arisen, which caused me to return home to Oklahoma early; however, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 267 and “yea” on rollcall No. 268.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I was unable to be present for votes on May 19, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 267 and “yea” on rollcall No. 268.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on account of a family obligation in the district. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 267 and “yea” on rollcall No. 268.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend the vote series on May 19, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 267 and “yea” on rollcall No. 268.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 19th 2017, I was not present for rollcall votes 267 and 268. If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted: “Yea” on rollcall vote 267 and “yea” on rollcall vote 268.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

MAY 18, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Pursuant to Section 4 of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 (Pub. L. 114-196), I am pleased to appoint the following Members to serve as Commissioners to the United States Semiquincentennial Commission:

The Honorable Robert Brady of Pennsylvania

The Honorable Joseph Crowley of New York

And from private life:

Richard Trumka of Rockville, Maryland

Thank you for your attention to these recommendations.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

MAY 18, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Pursuant to Section 114(b) of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development Act (2 U.S.C. 1103), I hereby reappoint the Honorable Terri A. Sewell of Alabama to the Board of Trustees for the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development for a term of six years.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purpose of the majority leader telling us in-depth the schedule for the weeks to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today. This list will include a series of bills to honor our Nation's veterans.

With Memorial Day around the corner, it is important for this House to show our appreciation to those who

have defended our freedoms, especially the men and women who made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, next week in the House is Combating Human Trafficking and Child Protection Week.

In addition to a series of suspensions, the House will consider H.R. 1973, the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act, sponsored by Representative SUSAN BROOKS. This bill would require prompt reporting of suspected cases of abuse, as well as implementation of procedures for addressing such allegations.

We will also consider H.R. 1761, the Protecting Against Child Exploitation Act, sponsored by Representative MIKE JOHNSON. This bill would protect victims of sexual abuse by ensuring that predators who send explicit content are subject to appropriate punishment.

Mr. Speaker, human trafficking is an incredibly serious issue in our Nation. With the passage of these bipartisan bills, we will show our continued commitment to ending this modern-day form of slavery, while supporting and assisting all survivors.

Now, lastly, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 953, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act, sponsored by Representative BOB GIBBS. My district is home to many hardworking farmers, so I know this issue quite well. This bill will reduce red tape that makes it more costly for farmers to protect their crops and our Nation's food supply.

In addition, the CDC reports that there are still 119 cases of individuals with Zika in the United States and 495 cases in U.S. territories. With the summer season approaching, this bill will ensure we can use pesticides to control mosquitos.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to thank a true public servant. Next week, Brian Cooper will retire from the House Parliamentarian's Office after 35 years on Capitol Hill.

Brian is a professional in every sense of the word. Much of his work is done behind the scenes, but it has not gone unnoticed. From timekeeping to processing bills, to preparing for joint sessions, Brian has made sure this body works in an orderly and fair way. It is my understanding that even my predecessor, Bill Thomas, could not challenge Brian's timekeeping.

On behalf of all those on this side of the aisle, we wish you well in your retirement, Brian, and from a very grateful nation for your service. I am sure you are ready to trade late nights on this floor for late nights watching the Orioles play baseball.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for those remarks.

I want to join him in thanking our colleague, Brian Cooper. I am not sure, Brian, that I adopt the sentiments of the majority leader with respect to

what Mr. Thomas could and could not do. Apparently he chose not to, and that is good.

But, Brian Cooper, we want to thank you for three and a half decades of service to this House; three and a half decades of service to this House in a role that most people, including Members of this House, would not recognize, but that is critically important to the good management and flow of the people's business through this House.

As the majority leader referenced, he will continue to root for the Baltimore Orioles because he is from Baltimore. He is a Marylander, and we are very proud of him. I want to thank him for his service and wish him the very best in the days ahead.

I now will go to the schedule.

□ 1200

By law, under the Budget Control Act, a budget is supposed to be brought to this floor on April 15. The majority leader would quickly observe that neither Democrats nor Republicans have always met that deadline. However, we are unusually late in the budget process, in my view, and despite months of promising to return to regular order, we have not yet done so as it relates to the budget, and the budget has not been marked up in committee, Mr. Speaker.

Monday marked the statutory date by which the Appropriations Committee no longer has to wait to bring bills to the floor of the House because the majority has failed to meet its obligation to pass a budget on time.

Now, again, I want to quickly note that both parties have failed to meet that deadline in times past, but I cannot remember us being as late in the session in getting to the appropriations process, because there really has been no direction from the administration as to what their budget priorities should be, would be, other than the so-called "skinny budget" that was sent down, which, in my view, almost every Member of Congress thought was a totally unrealistic, unadoptable, and unworthy budget priority document; and if it were to be adopted, the security of the United States, both abroad and at home, would be put at substantial risk.

So, Mr. Majority Leader, can you provide some indication? I know it is not on the floor next week.

And I want to say that I join with the majority leader. The issue of human trafficking is one of the critical issues that confronts us, as a country, and the global community. It puts millions of young women and young men at risk—and not so young men and women at risk—on a daily basis. It is appropriate that we deal with this issue. Hopefully, we will deal with it, as the majority leader said, in a bipartisan fashion and that we will produce more effective ways to stop and to hold accountable those who put human beings at risk by human slavery.

But can the gentleman tell me when the Budget Committee will mark up a budget and when we will have such a budget considered on the floor?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

As my friend knows, we do expect to receive the formal budget request from the President next week, which, as my friend also knows, is common for the first year of a new administration.

Now, as the gentleman said, maybe this is later, but this is the latest in the history of America that any President has had to wait for a Cabinet, which is always helpful. He still has many more positions to be filled and confirmed, and as that progresses, I think actions will be able to move forward even faster.

But, as is tradition, the Budget Committee has announced its intention to host OMB Director Mick Mulvaney, as the gentleman knows, a former colleague here, to answer questions Members may have about the President's budget request following its release. This will kick off the regular order process of the committee work on crafting an FY 2018 budget resolution.

Likewise, with appropriations, the committee is looking forward to marking up bills through regular order. Now, as soon as action is scheduled for the floor, the gentleman will know that I will notify all Members.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

With respect to the appropriations process, as the gentleman knows, there are 12 discrete appropriation bills dealing with national security and domestic spending. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not we still intend to consider, on a timely basis, discretely, that is, one at a time, the 12 appropriation bills?

I don't think any of them have been marked up as of this point in time. Obviously, not having a budget would preclude that from happening. I understand that. But, as the gentleman knows and I know from experience of serving on the appropriations process, frankly, it was at the beginning of this month, historically, that we would start to mark up appropriation bills, with the intent to use much of June and July for the purposes of passing appropriations bills so that we might send them to the Senate for consideration and have some chance of getting them done prior to the expiration of the fiscal year on September 30.

Does the gentleman anticipate that we will be considering separately the 12 appropriation bills between now and the August break?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman will be happy to know that Appropriations has already held 47 hearings dealing with FY 2018, so, as we receive the President's budget and are

able to ask questions of the OMB Director, we will continue to move forward. But it is our intention always to go through regular order and, in all cases, if possible, individually, down onto the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I hope that we do, in fact, get that done.

Now, Mr. Leader, I was shocked yesterday to learn that the process that, from my perspective and our side's perspective, was extraordinarily accelerated, undermining the opportunity for careful and thorough consideration, the bill that is known as the American Health Care Act, or otherwise known as the bill to attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act. That bill, as the gentleman knows, was introduced on March 6. It had not a single hearing and was marked up less than 2 full days later in the Ways and Means Committee, on March 8. It was marked up on March 8 and 9 in the Energy and Commerce Committee, in the Budget Committee on March 16, in the Rules Committee on March 22, and brought to the floor with a CBO score on March 23. In other words, in my view, Mr. Speaker, it moved so quickly that no one could have given it thoughtful consideration. In fact, Mr. Speaker, on March 24, that bill was brought to the floor, was subjected to some debate, and then was pulled. The judgment was made that, apparently, it was not ready for prime time.

That bill was then brought back to the floor some 2-plus weeks, about 2 weeks later, on Thursday, May 4 of this year. It was passed on a Thursday, notwithstanding the fact it had not been noted for consideration on Thursday at the beginning of the week or in the week prior. It passed on a vote of 217-213, with a significant number of Republicans voting against it and a significant number of Republicans who voted for it saying "no, I haven't read the bill" in response to inquiries from the press.

That afternoon, Mr. Speaker, there were buses out in front of the Capitol to take my Republican colleagues down to the White House to cheer its passage, an accomplishment of what our Republican colleagues had pledged for 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, you can imagine my shock, chagrin, and surprise when I learned yesterday that bill has not gone to the Senate. Apparently, it has gone from one chair to maybe the other chair in the desks before me. It has been held, Mr. Speaker. It has been held because there was no CBO score to ensure that, in fact, it complied with the rules.

A lot of talk about regular order, Mr. Speaker.

So the bill that was cheered at the White House and the President saying "I'm so glad this passed," apparently, may not have passed this House in a form that is consistent with the rules.

And so, my colleagues, I want you to know that you may think you have passed the bill, but it is still here 2 weeks later.

I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, why we couldn't have waited for a CBO score, other than the political imperative of going home and having Members be able to say, "We passed the bill."

Well, it is still here, folks. It is still within the bosom of the House, warmly embraced, aging, unfortunately, not to perfection.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the majority leader: When might we pass this bill? Is the bill going to have another hearing? Are we going to wait for the CBO score? And will another vote be necessary to, again, confirm the 217-213 votes?

I will not ask you whether or not you think you still have 217 votes, but let me ask you: When might this bill be considered again on this floor? And when might this bill go to the United States Senate, as everybody thought it had on the 4th of May?

I yield to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank him for his long question.

Mr. HOYER. But he got the point, I am sure.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Let me first answer the number of points you have made because I want history to be written correctly.

First of all, you were shocked. I don't know why you were shocked. I thought you were going to say you were shocked that that exact same week, when you read the paper, 94 counties out of 99 in Iowa would have no healthcare if ObamaCare continued to go forward. I thought that would have shocked you.

Then, when you wanted to put dates down and talk about hearings, we had more than 113 hearings. That is more than the number of hearings you had for ObamaCare.

Our bill is less than 150 pages. That is thousands of pages less than ObamaCare.

You talk of CBO. You know that CBO scored this bill, but those eight pages of amendments you were shocked by. You shouldn't be shocked to know the rules of the House, that you do not move a bill until the CBO score of those eight pages is done. That will be done next week, and we will move it right along.

But let's go on further because I do want history to be written correctly.

We marked up this bill in three separate committees, with over 18 hours of debate in Ways and Means and over 27 hours of debate in Energy and Commerce. We debated countless amendments in committees, from both Republicans and Democrats, even the ones where the Democrats asked that they change the name to have some

hashtag. We spent hours on that, but we did that because we believed that was important to you.

Now, our bill eliminates the many taxes and mandates of ObamaCare. It gives patients enhanced tools to take control of their own healthcare decisions, and it expands choice for Americans.

So, yes, I am shocked every day I read the paper that more Americans are going to lose their healthcare if ObamaCare stays where it is or that people will even pay more, because I remember the promise the President made that our premiums would go down or we could keep our own doctor, which so many thousands of Americans found out to be a lie.

So, Mr. Speaker, I understand politics. I understand the phrases and the adjectives people can use, but there is no reason to be shocked that we kept our word of what we would do for the last 6 years. There is no reason to be shocked that the American public put a majority in the House and the Senate and the Presidency which, I would argue for the main purpose, that they want greater choice in their healthcare system.

So, yes, if I go to Iowa, I go to Tennessee, those 16 counties there that will no longer have healthcare—or what about Aetna? You didn't even mention them pulling out of Virginia. You weren't shocked by that either.

But you know what? Eight pages of amendments that stayed out there for everybody to read—not more than 2,000—yes, we will wait until the CBO finishes scoring the amendments and send it to the Senate. Yes, we know what is in those amendments, just as everybody else had the opportunity to read them, just as we went through the Rules Committee.

□ 1215

So there are lots of things to be shocked by, but don't ever be shocked by: We go by the rules of the House. I think you should be shocked by the number of faces, the number of families that will not have healthcare if we did not act.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have had a similar conversation before, and the majority leader would love to rely on the hearings that were held before this bill that we passed was introduced. The 113 hearings were on the repeal. This bill, as surely the majority leader knows and Members who voted on it know, was not repealed. It does not repeal.

Now, it is said that the gentleman is correct that the insurance industry has been very badly roiled, and confidence in the marketplace has been very badly undermined by this administration since its first day in office, and badly undermined by the Republicans' continued attempts to repeal, and passage of repeal legislation that didn't become

law, and so insurers have, in fact, lost confidence that the marketplace will be stable, an absolutely critical component of pricing their product correctly.

The administration continues, as does the House itself and the Republican leadership in the Senate, to undermine the confidence that there will be a market. So, yes, Mr. Speaker, the majority leader is correct. The insurance market is not as stable. But almost everybody who speaks to that—and there is a Los Angeles Times story today, relatively lengthy on that—in terms of what steps the administration has taken from the very beginning, starting with the IRS, don't worry about the mandate. Don't worry about the fact you have insurance.

It is like the automobile people saying, don't worry about having automobile insurance; there is going to be no penalty. Well, if that was the case, I bet you a lot of people would not have automobile insurance, and if they hit you, you would be exposed to the expense yourself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the majority leader says he wants to follow the rules. They want to follow regular order, and, of course, they will do that. My, my, my.

Mr. Speaker, on May 4 of this month, why did we not have such a CBO score?

He says we didn't send it because the rule will not allow us unless we have a CBO score.

Frankly, I think there are some additional reasons because they are not sure that they are complying with the Byrd rule in the United States Senate, and they have got to see. So they may have to pass this again, to which the majority leader did not address himself.

But there was no reason not to wait other than politics, other than to have those buses go down to the Capitol and cheer one another. They had no idea what CBO is going to come up with next week. So they did not wait, consistent with the rules. We should have had a score when we passed the bill. But that was not convenient for the politics of repeal.

Now, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, has not told me when we are going to consider that bill again or if we are going to need to consider that bill again. And perhaps the honest answer is the majority leader does not have that knowledge as to whether he is going to have to bring that bill to the floor again because he is going to need the CBO score to make that determination. I understand that. And we should have waited, Mr. Speaker, not rushed to judgment.

He talks about hearings. There were no hearings on this bill. One reason there were no hearings on these bills is because my Republican colleagues have been having town meetings, and they are hearing about the public's thoughts about their bill. And some of them are

not having town meetings because they don't want to hear any more than they wanted to have hearings here in the House to hear what the public thought.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that the majority leader will be able to, perhaps at some point in time in the relatively near future, give us a clear picture as to when we may either consider this bill again or when we are going to send it to the United States Senate; flawed, though, it may be.

Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield to my friend, the majority leader, if he would like to say something further. If not, I will yield back.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am actually shocked. I don't want to put words in your mouth, but did you actually make the argument that those 94 counties out of 99 in Iowa pulled out just because we were bringing a bill up?

Did you actually believe the 18 out of 23 CO-OPs that were given more than \$2 billion pulled out because somehow they knew we would probably capture the White House, too, and keep the Senate and the House? So that is why it failed?

Or maybe those 16 counties in Tennessee that were told almost a year ago that they wouldn't have healthcare the next year; somehow people could look into the future, and just because a Republican took office, that is who we are going to blame?

I know President Bush is no longer here, but do we have to continue to put blame on others instead of having the facts?

So let's talk about a few things. Now, let's be clear of what you asked me earlier because, I apologize, I got off—you had a lot of adjectives out there. I wanted to make sure that I had answered them all. But I am very confident that this bill will hit the mark for reconciliation and it will move across the aisle over to the other Chambers.

Now, you talk about the House, and you are going to blame us for everything. Let's go to facts. They are not my facts. There is a recent report from Quorum, which is a data analysis company in D.C. These are bright, young people; a lot of them are Stanford grads. Here are the facts, because they just went and analyzed the first 100 days:

In the first 100 days, President Trump signed 30 pieces of legislation into law. Now, that is more than President Obama, Bush, Clinton, or H.W. Bush signed in their first 100 days.

Only once before in history has a Congressional Review Act been signed into law, only one. Now we have 14 overturned regulations through the Congressional Review Act, saving Americans \$3.7 billion in regulatory cost, and 4.2 million hours in filling out paperwork.

Now, my favorite quote of this report, this House, the one we stand in today, passed 103 bills out of this Chamber, edging out former Speaker PELOSI's House as the most productive during the first 100 days of a Presidency since H.W. Bush.

Now, just this week we passed the Modernizing Government Technology Act, and I do thank my friend for his hard work on this. It is going to upgrade government IT to better serve our constituents. So if we are shocked, maybe that shocked you. Maybe we ought to stop playing politics. Maybe we ought to stop blaming things that just aren't even there. Maybe we ought to just take responsibility for where we currently are, understand that this is the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth, and it was "... conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

No, we are not going to blame others for our problems. And if you want to go along that line, I can go into all of the things that were promised in the more than 2,000 pages of ObamaCare.

But you know what?

Today I live currently, and what I currently see is that 18 of the 23 CO-OPs have collapsed. And the current law says we are going to penalize the people who actually paid the CO-OPs to get their healthcare, but they have no healthcare to get.

I want to read the facts where more Americans took the penalty or the exemption than actually signed up for ObamaCare; that prior to a bill even passing on this floor—something we promised for 6 years—that a number of companies pulled out because it was not working. But the biggest shock I had all week is that somehow it is our fault.

I could not look an American in the eye knowing the knowledge that we all have. I don't care what party you are in; you don't sit on a carpet that has red on one side and blue on the other. This is the American House. You know people are hurting. You know people have lost their doctors. You know they are pulling out of these counties. Don't make up some political spin to make yourself feel better for some vote.

We promised we would repeal ObamaCare and give people greater choice. That is what we did. You disagree with it, then disagree with it, but don't lay blame where it is not true.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I listened to his comments with interest. I want to touch on a number of comments he made, however.

First of all, in a very partisan vote from 3 a.m. in the morning until 6 a.m. in the morning, my Republican colleagues passed a bill in a partisan fashion—there were a few Democrats; not many—that passed part D prescription drugs for seniors.

We voted against that. And then we took the majority. And what did we do, Mr. Speaker? We acted in a way to ensure that the part D prescription drug package that the Republicans had passed in the previous Congress did, in fact, work; and it is a success today because we did that.

That is exactly the opposite of what our Republican colleagues did, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Affordable Care Act. In fact, the Affordable Care Act, as my friend knows and polling now shows that over 55 percent of Americans believe that the Affordable Care Act ought to be kept; and 75 percent of them, three out of four Americans, believe we ought to fix the Affordable Care Act, not repeal it.

That has not changed, however, the Republicans' attempt and rhetoric to repeal. Now, there were a number of things that the Republicans did, contrary to what we did with respect to the prescription drug bill for seniors, to undermine and create this situation of which the majority leader speaks where there are some insurance companies that have pulled out, that are not doing as well as they should have and we wanted them to have.

One thing, many Republican Governors refuse to join the Medicaid expansion program, adversely affecting millions of Americans.

Secondly, they did not find the risk corridors. We knew when we established this problem that there was going to be a very tough time in making valid judgments on what costs were going to be two years into this program. We did not fund it. The CO-OPs also did not receive the support that was contemplated by the statute.

The cost-sharing subsidies the administration has put at risk. Now, we were assured just before the bill passed that: Oh, no, we are going to pay for the cost-sharing subsidies.

But the Republicans, Mr. Speaker, filed suit, and the court said: Oh, no, you have to appropriate those moneys on the cost-sharing subsidies.

The majority leader knows—certainly everybody on the Energy and Commerce knows, and every Member ought to know—without those subsidies, the insurance companies will have mispriced their product, for deductibles and copays, in particular.

□ 1230

That, Mr. Speaker, is what I speak of, in terms of the actions that have been taken over the last 6 years to undermine the confidence of the marketplace. Everybody knows that confidence is an important factor in any marketplace.

I am sure we are going to debate this again. Mr. Speaker, again, I would simply ask: Is this bill coming back to the House? Will we expect another vote on it?

The CBO report is due next week. I believe that if, in fact, we are going to

schedule that, we ought to at least be given notice that that either is or may be a piece of legislation that will be on the floor next week, prior to our break for Memorial Day.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. As I said earlier, this is a technical issue. I have all the confidence in the world the CBO score will come back, we will meet the reconciliation number, and we will move it to the Senate.

If my colleague wants to schedule something, I will schedule with you. We can walk the bill over there together. I believe the American people are waiting for it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 22, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next and that the order of the House of January 3, 2017, regarding morning-hour debate not apply on that day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BIGGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LIONFISH

(Mr. GAETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, in the warm waters off Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, the Carolinas, and my beloved Florida, a reef assassin lurks.

Lionfish are an invasive species, with no predators, huge appetites, and exploding populations. Just one female lionfish will release 10 million eggs during her lifetime. Each lionfish can eat 65 juvenile reef fish in one meal. NOAA ecologists call the lionfish one of the greatest threats of the century to reefs.

Reefs support tourism, recreational fishing, commercial fishing, and our way of life. Lionfish threaten a multi-billion-dollar reef economy. To date, all efforts to eradicate the lionfish have failed. Bounty programs are uneconomical, and rodeos, while helpful, are unscalable.

Today, I filed legislation to turn the tables on the lionfish. Our proposition is simple: Fishermen who slay 100 lionfish can earn one tag to fish red snapper, gag grouper, triggerfish, or amberjack whenever they want. Anyone who kills 100 lionfish has done their part to save hundreds, if not thousands, of coveted reef fish.

The Reef Assassin Act costs no money and uses our natural resources

to protect our natural resources. I encourage my colleagues to support the Reef Assassin Act.

CONGRATULATING LEIGHTON DURHAM IV

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Leighton Durham IV of Dallas, Texas, as he and his family celebrate his selection as an Eagle Scout.

The Boy Scouts of America has a long tradition of preparing young men for leadership, and the Eagle Scout award recognizes the highest rank within that program. Only 4 percent of Boy Scouts are granted this recognition, after a lengthy review process which includes the verification of 21 merit badges, a demonstrated Scout spirit, and a youth-led service project.

For Leighton, his involvement in the service organization began when he was only 8 years old. Since then, the Boy Scouts program has helped foster a sense of service and leadership.

This past year, as part of his Eagle Scout project, Leighton led efforts to refurbish a previously neglected classroom at the Tyler Street United Methodist Church in Oak Cliff. As a result of Leighton's project, the classroom is now in use for middle school youth.

Please join me in congratulating Leighton in his latest achievement. I look forward to seeing his continued leadership in our community.

RECOGNIZING MR. WALTER PARRISH

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Walter Parrish, a 98-year-old World War II veteran in Georgia's First Congressional District.

Mr. Parrish was born on March 12, 1919, less than 6 months after the end of World War I. Originally from New Jersey, Mr. Parrish served 5 years in the Navy as a signalman on destroyer ships, where he used lamps and visual objects to communicate with others in the water.

Mr. Parrish served both in the Atlantic and the Pacific theaters of the war, and it is undoubted that his role was crucial to the success of his shipmates.

Although winning World War II is a major accomplishment, Mr. Parrish enjoyed another important milestone during the war when he married his wife. He asked her hand in marriage on a Sunday and married her less than a week later, on Wednesday.

Mr. Parrish, thank you for your service to our country, and I hope your in-

spiring life will serve as a lesson for all those who know your story.

With Memorial Day approaching, I encourage everyone in our Nation to take time to reflect on the sacrifices of our veterans, thank our Nation's veterans, and understand the importance of their service.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF REFUGIO OIL SPILL

(Mr. CARBAJAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to recognize the second anniversary of the devastating Refugio oil spill off the Gaviota coast in my district.

I remember all too well the horrifying sights and smells when over 100,000 barrels of crude oil poured from the Plains All American pipeline rupture. Our local funds were stretched as we mounted our cleanup effort that ended up costing over \$100 million. The full extent of the damage to our local economy and environment in our region won't be fully known for years.

I was pleased that President Obama signed into law last year the SAFE PIPES Act, directing the Department of Transportation's pipeline safety program, PHMSA, to increase the frequency of their pipeline monitoring on the California coast. We must ensure that PHMSA is fully funded to ensure that it can effectively monitor our oil pipelines and hopefully prevent future disasters like the Refugio Plains All American pipeline oil spill.

HONORING DEPUTY MICHAEL SCOTT WILLIAMS

(Mr. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of fallen Taylor County Sheriff's Deputy Michael Scott Williams.

On the morning of October 31, 2016, Deputy Williams put on his uniform and climbed into his patrol car, heading to the job he loved. He was tragically killed in a collision that morning.

Deputy Williams joined the Taylor County Sheriff's Department in May of 2015, and was promoted to officer in charge, serving as his sergeant's second in command. He dedicated his life to law enforcement. For him, it was not just a job; it was a calling. Friends and family described Deputy Williams as a quick study and an experienced lawman who loved to make people laugh.

This week, Deputy Williams was honored at the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service in Washington, a fitting reminder that his heroism will not be forgotten.

Please join me in honoring Deputy Michael Scott Williams and all of our

fallen law enforcement heroes who have made the ultimate sacrifice to ensure our safety.

TAX SYSTEM BROKEN

(Mr. PETERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, our tax system is broken and in desperate need of comprehensive reform. I am ready to get to work on a simpler Tax Code that is fiscally responsible, makes our businesses more competitive, and gives relief to our working families. But President Trump's plan, if you can call it that, is not the answer.

According to the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, Trump's tax plan will cost \$5.5 trillion over the next 10 years. Instead of targeting relief to the deserving middle class, President Trump wants to give big breaks to the wealthiest Americans. It is time to stop pretending that tax cuts that favor the wealthy somehow pay for themselves. They don't.

Conservative economist Gregory Mankiw has said that only one-third of the cost of tax costs is recouped from growth. So Trump's tax plan would actually be paid for by blowing up the national debt. That will crowd out investment and hurt economic growth, which is the opposite of what we want.

We have to do better for working Americans, and I express my interest in working with Members on both sides of the aisle to do just that.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Police Week, an opportunity to recognize the brave men and women in blue.

This week is meaningful to me and my family, for my oldest son is a police officer in Michigan, and I could not be more proud of him and his service.

Too often, we take for granted those who every day put on a badge and a vest to protect us and our communities. Events across this country have been politicized and stretch the relationship between law enforcement and their community. Let us not have politics overwhelm the dedication and commitment of our men and women in blue. Our lives, and indeed our freedoms, are safeguarded by the thin blue line. We owe the men and women in uniform, those who put themselves at risk every day, a simple thank you and simply our respect.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to give the police officers at our doors here, the officers throughout our communities, and my son, a simple thank you.

COMMON SENSE

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, the Republican healthcare repeal bill is a giant step backwards. It will leave millions of Americans without any insurance and many more paying more money for less coverage. Worse, it will reduce protections requiring insurers to treat fairly those of us with pre-existing conditions.

Instead of this disastrous plan, we should be working together to improve healthcare, building on the progress of the ACA, and finding solutions to what isn't working.

Let me offer one example. I recently introduced the Common Sense Employer Notification of Special Enrollment Act, or Common SENSE Act. This bill would require employers to inform people leaving a job that they not only qualify for COBRA but also qualify for a special enrollment period to purchase insurance on the ACA marketplace or enroll in Medicare, which is often less expensive than COBRA.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will help Americans save money and seniors avoid last-minute enrollment penalties. I urge my colleagues to support the Common SENSE Act and join me in finding commonsense ways to improve our healthcare, not to dismantle it.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT WEEK

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sincere thanks to all of the men and women who serve and have served in law enforcement in the State of Colorado. These men and women put themselves in harm's way to protect the citizens of our great State.

I would like to especially recognize the Aurora, Littleton, Greenwood Village, and Brighton Police Departments, as well as the Arapahoe, Douglas, and Adams County Sheriff's Departments for their tireless work in doing their best to keep our communities safe.

I am proud to say that these municipal police and county sheriff's departments within the Sixth Congressional District of Colorado are exceptional and should be recognized for their extraordinary public service.

These men and women of law enforcement are dedicated to public safety. In honor of National Law Enforcement Week, I would like to thank not only those who serve in law enforcement in the State of Colorado but all those who serve across our country.

POLICE WEEK

(Mr. GOTTHEIMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Police Week and to say "thank you" to the men and women in New Jersey and in our country who keep our community safe, and especially to honor those who paid the ultimate price in their efforts to do so.

Sadly, this year alone, we have lost 48 police officers in the line of duty across the United States. We cannot repay the debt our communities owe to these heroes and their families, but we can start by expressing appreciation for their bravery, dedication, and service, and making sure law enforcement knows that they have our full support.

Our police officers and all first responders can't protect us and themselves without the resources they need to do their job safely and effectively. Not only do police protect us from criminals, but they are on the front lines of the war on terror, especially as we have seen the rise of homegrown and lone-wolf terror after 9/11.

To close, I want to reiterate my deep appreciation for the work of local, county, and State police officers in my district in New Jersey and across our country who keep our communities safe.

□ 1245

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

(Mr. MEEHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the men and women of law enforcement who put their lives on the line day and night protecting our communities, like my nephew Ethan Meehan.

As we close this year's Police Week, I would like to pay particular tribute to the law enforcement personnel who have been killed or wounded in the line of duty, like Officer Christopher Dorman of Folcroft, Delaware County, Pennsylvania, who was shot and wounded last June but bravely back on the job just weeks later.

Sadly, four of Pennsylvania's finest lost their lives in the line of duty last year:

Pennsylvania State Trooper Eugene Weaver;
Canonsburg Patrolman Scott Bashoum;
Pennsylvania Corrections Officer David Weaver; and
Luzerne County Corrections Officer Kristopher Moules.

We thank them for their service, and we are indebted for their sacrifice. We honor their memories, and our thoughts and prayers are with their families.

SAUDI ARABIAN JURISPRUDENCE

(Mr. RASKIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, President Trump is headed to Saudi Arabia today, which is an authoritarian, theocratic state which bans any criticism of the government and executes people or imprisons them for allegedly insulting Islam.

Just a few weeks ago, a Saudi man, Ahmad Al Shamri, who is in his early twenties, was sentenced to death for atheism and apostasy. Another Saudi man, Raif Badawi, a few years ago was sentenced to serve 10 years in prison, to suffer 1,000 lashes, and to pay 1,000,000 Saudi rials for insulting Islam simply for advocating secular thought and the separation of church and state.

There are dozens of Saudis languishing in prison for blasphemy, apostasy, heresy, sorcery, witchcraft, and other imaginary offenses. Mr. Trump, please use at least 2 minutes of your time while you are in Saudi Arabia to plead with the rulers there to release all religious prisoners and stop executing and incarcerating people for these imaginary religious crimes in the 21st century.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

FIREFIGHTER SCOTT DEAN, SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the hot Texas sun set in the west last night at about 10 p.m., the brave first responders of the San Antonio Fire Department answered the alarms as a strip mall went up in a fiery inferno. Sixty-one fire trucks with lights and sirens sped to the scene. The firefighters dashed into the buildings performing a search-and-recovery operation, making sure no one was there.

As the fire grew, the intense smoke and heat became suffocating. Two firefighters were injured, but their lives were saved by other firefighters. But Firefighter Scott Dean was trapped in the inferno. This 6-year veteran of the force's life was stolen by the hellish blaze. He gave his life while saving others from harm.

Texas lost another one of its finest last night. Firefighters such as Scott Dean are a rare and tenacious breed. They are the American breed. They run into the flames that everyone else desperately flees from.

Firefighters restore order from chaos, answering the alarm. Mr. Speaker, they always answer the alarm.

It has been said that all people are created equal, but a few turn out to be

firefighters. One of those rare breed was firefighter Scott Dean. So the last alarm has sounded for Scott Dean. He answered the call, and he gave it all for the people of San Antonio, Texas.

And that is just the way it is.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS

(Mr. HUIZENGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 75th anniversary of the National Association of Home Builders.

For three-quarters of a century, the NAHB has been fighting for homeowners, home builders, and communities across the country. Today, the federation includes over 700 local and State home builder associations who are committed to fostering a pro-growth climate and sensible, cost-effective housing policies.

How do I know? Because my family has been involved in our local chapter for decades.

The NAHB has long supported the builders who create beautiful homes in west Michigan—my home—as well as across the Nation. Many of these builders are small-business men and women who represent the backbone of the American economy.

By standing up to regulatory overreach and promoting a pro-growth environment, the NAHB is helping these entrepreneurial small businesses to have a voice. Thanks in part to the efforts of the NAHB, builders and consumers throughout the country are back on their feet, housing production has increased, and builders are increasingly confident in the market.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the National Association of Home Builders as they work to keep the home building industry moving forward.

Congratulations for those 75 years.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor to rise today to recognize National Police Week, honoring our heroes of the thin blue line. During this week each year, our Nation joins together to honor our brave men and women in blue.

In their mission to serve and protect, our law enforcement officers put their lives on the line each day, keeping our families and our communities safe from harm. Day in and day out, we witness the countless sacrifices made by the men and women who serve as our front line of defense here at home.

We stand to recognize their service this week. We also pay tribute to those who have tragically lost their lives in the line of duty. Their bravery and sacrifice will never be forgotten.

I would like to specifically thank the dedicated officers serving throughout the State of New York. From the New York State troopers to the county sheriffs and to our local law enforcement, the heroism and bravery of the men and women in blue continues to inspire us all.

BIKE TO WORK ACT

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, this week, along with Congressman CROWLEY, we reintroduced the Bike to Work Act. As an avid biker myself, I am thrilled to bring forth an initiative that encourages more biking. This is fitting, given that today is National Bike to Work Day.

This bipartisan legislation we have introduced will allow workers to use their pretax commuter benefits for bikeshare programs, just as they already can do for other forms of transportation.

According to one report, from 2000 to 2013, the number of bicycle commuters grew by more than 62 percent. As these programs grow, putting them on equal footing with other modes of transportation that commuters use to get to and from work is important.

Bikesharing is very popular in Minnesota, and through this initiative, we can ensure that more Americans have the opportunity to get to work with more flexibility and more convenience.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, this is a special week in the United States, here in our Capital, and across the country. This is National Police Week, and so I rise to honor our men and women in service across our country who wear the uniform every day: our first responders who are police officers who rush to trouble, as opposed to running from, and who put themselves in harm's way to keep us safe. Every day, they get up and keep our families safe and our communities safe. They are our heroes.

So this week, Mr. Speaker, Congress has welcomed many of these policemen and -women and their families to D.C. to recognize them for their heroism and to remember those whom we have lost.

In Kansas, we are all too aware of the sacrifices that law enforcement makes

to keep us safe. Brad Lancaster, Dave Melton, and Brandon Collins all made the ultimate sacrifice over the last year in my district alone, and they are on my mind this week and each and every day along with the other fallen officers across our country.

Mr. Speaker, let us never forget the selflessness and bravery of police officers around the country who work tirelessly each and every day to enforce our laws, protect our communities, and save lives.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MAY 19, 2017, TO MONDAY, MAY 22, 2017

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, May 22, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HONORING KBTX-TV

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks made during this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize KBTX-TV, who, on May 22, will be celebrating 60 years of service in the Brazos Valley of Texas.

In 1957, KBTX began broadcasting from a four-room brick studio on East 29th Street in Bryan, Texas. Today, the studio is still located at the same location, but just like the surrounding area, it has grown immensely.

Starting out, KBTX was both a CBS and an ABC affiliate. In 1984, they became a CBS affiliate exclusively. The station prides itself on its commitment and dedication to responsible reporting and community involvement. Fittingly, the station's slogan is "The People You Know, The News You Trust."

KBTX has set the standard for television and news in the Brazos Valley. They were the first television station in the Brazos Valley, and over the past 60 years, they have had many more impressive firsts in the Brazos Valley, including the following:

The first television station capable of color transmission and the use of videotape;

The first television station to use color news film;

The first to cover live sports, news, and weather, as well as community events using remote, live trucks with cameras and out-of-studio editing capabilities;

The first television station with Doppler radar;

The first 24-hour television station; and

The first commercial television station to broadcast in high-definition television.

The KBTX news and creative services teams have also received many prestigious awards, which include the following: multiple Lone Star Emmys; multiple Telly Awards; multiple Texas Associated Press Broadcasters Awards, including the 2013 TAPB Overall Excellence in Television Award; multiple ADDY Awards; and the Edward R. Murrow Award in 2013.

I would like to congratulate KBTX-TV on all of their achievements and for their 60 years of service to the Brazos Valley. It is an honor for me to represent in Congress such a great team and a pillar for our community.

As I close these remarks, I ask everyone to continue praying for our country, our military, and our first responders who selflessly serve and sacrifice to protect us.

HONORING J.B. OWEN, JR.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor J.B. Owen, Jr., of Woodway, Texas, who passed away on March 5, 2017.

J.B. was born in Mathis, Texas, on November 19, 1928. He attended grade school in this small community with just three other students. Upon graduation from Mathis High School, J.B. went to Southwest Texas State University in San Marcos, where he would go on to earn a bachelor of business administration in general business.

He began his career by teaching business classes in Dilley, Texas, before a diagnosis of tuberculosis landed him in the hospital for 15 months. Thankfully, J.B. made a full recovery and set out to become an insurance agent with Texas Farm Bureau Insurance Company. J.B. was an exemplary leader at Farm Bureau for 41 years before his retirement in 1992.

In 1965, J.B. married Lillian Holley Rector, known as Lil, a Georgia peach he met on a blind date with the help of a coworker. In their 50-plus years of marriage, Lil and J.B. raised three children—Richard, Holley, and J.B. III. They were blessed with nine grandchildren, including triplets, who were born in 2001.

Along with being loving grandparents, J.B. and Lil enjoyed traveling, both in Texas and beyond.

J.B. is recognized as an exemplary steward for the greater Waco commu-

nity. He was an active volunteer and community member, serving on the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Community Development Board. He also served as an elder at Highland Baptist Church and taught Sunday school for 35 years.

J.B. served as the president of the Northwest Waco Rotary Club, president of the Harlingen PTA, and as president of Kids & Co., a childcare center. He was also a member of Gideons International, a Christian business association.

Mr. Speaker, J.B. Owen worked tirelessly to better our central Texas and Waco communities. He is loved by his city and certainly left an enduring impression on central Texas. He will be forever remembered as a great philanthropist, community member, husband, father, grandfather, and friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Owen family. We also lift up his wife, Lil, and family and friends of J.B. Owen, Jr., in our prayers.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over the United States Capitol to honor the life and legacy of J.B. Owen, Jr.

As I close these remarks, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

□ 1300

HONORING BOB J. SUROVIK

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Bob J. Surovik of Bryan, Texas, who passed away on February 7, 2017.

Bob was born in Glen Rose, Texas, on October 27, 1936. In 1954, he graduated from Mount Pleasant High School and went on to Texas A&M University, an institution he cherished for the rest of his life. At Texas A&M, Bob was active in the student body as the president of the Student Senate and in the Singing Cadets. He also served in Town Hall, the Prelaw Society, the Accounting Society, and the Memorial Student Leadership Council.

He was named as a “Who’s Who” Among Students in American Colleges and Universities.

After graduation from Texas A&M in 1958 with a degree in business administration, he married the love of his life, Elaine Maedgen. Later that year, he and Elaine moved to Austin, where Bob pursued a law degree, and Elaine pursued a bachelor’s degree from the University of Texas. Bob earned his law degree in 1961, and Elaine earned her undergraduate degree in 1960.

Upon graduation from law school, Bob joined the United States Army. While serving his country, he was awarded the Army Commendation Medal for meritorious service.

He began his legal career in 1963, starting out with the McMahon Law

Firm. In 1973, Bob was named as the State Junior Bar Outstanding Young Lawyer of the Year and was admitted and qualified as an attorney and counselor of the Supreme Court of the United States. He would go on to become president of McMahon, Surovik, Suttle, P.C., where he practiced for 50 years.

Bob was an exceptional steward for Texas A&M in the Abilene community. He was the president of the Abilene A&M Club, and a member of the Texas Aggie Bar Association. He was an avid Fightin’ Texas Aggie football fan and attended almost all home games at Kyle Field.

In 2011, Texas A&M named him Aggie Lawyer of the Year, and in 2012, named him as a Distinguished Alumnus, the highest award that can be given to a former student of Texas A&M University.

In Abilene, Bob was known for his community service, coaching Little League baseball, serving as a director of the chamber of commerce, president of the Abilene Bar Association, and chairman of the Community Foundation. He was also an active parishioner at St. Paul United Methodist Church, where his favorite activity was teaching Sunday school to the kindergarten class, which he did for 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, Bob Surovik worked tirelessly to better the Abilene and Texas A&M communities and to help those around him. He is loved in these places, and he left an enduring impression on countless Texans. He will be forever remembered as a great philanthropist, community member, husband, father, and friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Surovik family. We also lift up the family and friends of Bob Surovik in our prayers.

I request that a United States flag be flown over the United States Capitol to honor the life and legacy of Bob Surovik.

As I close these remarks, I urge all Americans to continue to pray for our country during these difficult times and for our military men and women who sacrifice to protect us.

HONORING ELWYN L. BASS

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a person who is very special to my family and me. Today I am celebrating the life and legacy of my father-in-law, Mr. Elwyn L. Bass. Mr. Bass was more commonly known as Sam to his friends, and he passed away on April 26, 2017.

Sam was born in Vealmoor, Texas, on January 26, 1934. At the young age of 16, he graduated from Ackerly High School. Upon graduation from Ackerly, Sam married a beautiful young woman, Johnette Carr, and went on to attend Baylor University in Waco. While at Baylor, he joined the United States Army.

After finishing his service in the Army and following his graduation from Baylor, Sam devoted his career to public education. He began that career by serving as a teacher and principal at Dawson High School. He later served as superintendent for Grady ISD in west Texas, followed by service as superintendent for Follett ISD, a small town in the Texas Panhandle. His next position was superintendent of schools at Stratford Independent School District in my hometown of Stratford, a Texas community in the northwest part of the panhandle.

In 1990, Sam retired after 35 years of service to the Texas public school system. At that time, he was so beloved by the Stratford community that our local sports stadium was named E. L. "Sam" Bass Stadium in his honor.

At the beginning of his retirement, he moved to east Texas and lived in a home that he constructed with his own hands and with a little help from friends and family.

Sam suffered a loss in 1992 when Johnette, his beloved wife of 42 years, passed away.

In 1994, he married Jo Anna Morton. Soon thereafter, he returned to education, teaching and coaching basketball for 10 years at Faith Lutheran School in Sugar Land, Texas.

Sam was known as a generous and caring man who was active in the community. He remained active throughout his life in the churches he attended, serving as a deacon at the First Baptist Church in Stratford and on the board at Parkway United Methodist Church in Sugar Land. Sam was known for his strong Christian faith and for his love of old hymns, a few of which he sang off key. His friends and family will always remember how he saw the good in people and his positive outlook on life.

Mr. Bass' life reminds me of a passage from a book, entitled, "The Applause of Heaven," written by Max Lucado. In that book, he has a moving passage which describes all of our lives. The passage reads as follows: "You'll be home soon. You may not have noticed it, but you are closer to home than ever before. Each moment is a step taken. Each breath is a page turned. Each day is a mile marked, a mountain climbed. You are closer to home than you've ever been. Before you know it, your appointed arrival time will come; you'll descend the ramp and enter the City. You'll see the faces that are waiting for you. You'll hear your name spoken by those who love you. And maybe, just maybe—in the back, behind the crowd—the One who would rather die than live without you will remove his nail-pierced hands from His heavenly robe . . . and applaud."

Mr. Speaker, Sam Bass worked tirelessly for the youth of Texas and to better the communities around him. He

is loved by his family and friends, of which there are many.

Sam left an enduring impression on the lives he touched. He will be forever remembered as a great educator, community member, husband, father, great-grandfather, and friend. I am certain that when he took his last breath on Earth, Jesus welcomed him with the words of Matthew 25:23: "Well done, good and faithful servant." His friends and I will continue to pray for his family over the coming days and weeks ahead.

I recently requested that an American flag be flown over the Capitol to honor the life and legacy of my father-in-law, Sam Bass.

Mr. Speaker, as I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us at home.

It is particularly poignant this week that it is National Police Week, and so we should recognize those police who serve us. In 2 weeks, we are going to celebrate Memorial Day, and it is important that we recognize our men and women in uniform of the United States military.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE WEEK IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUDD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from College Station for the profound tribute to a great man, great people.

It has been an interesting week. Our President is headed for the Middle East, and it has gotten rather vitriolic, condemnation of our President for firing the FBI Director.

The FBI Director is supposed to be more concerned with law enforcement than with press conferences. Since he is not elected, his job is not to go out and appear to be, politically, a substitute and, particularly, not to help one party over another.

It seemed that under Director Comey's tenuous head of the FBI—I was thrilled when he replaced Mueller. Mueller did a lot of damage to the FBI with his 5-year up-or-out policy, where anyone in a supervisory position for 5 years anywhere outside of Washington, at the end of the 5 years, had to either leave the FBI or come to Washington and be a minion up here for the Director.

We lost thousands and thousands of years of valuable FBI experience under Director Mueller. In fact, no one has

done more damage to the rank and file of our outstanding FBI agents than Director Mueller. I keep hearing all these glowing things. Well, he did a lot of damage.

Plus, under his time as FBI Director, Mueller had the training material that would help FBI employees and agents understand more about radical Islam.

The FBI, in the 1990s, had done an outstanding job of gathering information about radical Islam, of groups like the Holy Land Foundation, individuals associated with supporting terrorism. After the 1993 attempt to bomb the World Trade Center, he did a good job gathering evidence for that trial. By the time Director Mueller came along under President George W. Bush, they had gotten pretty good at figuring out what radical Islam was.

Kim Jensen, with the FBI, had a 700-page program to train FBI agents on what radical Islam was, how you go about spotting people that had been radicalized, the things they believe, understanding which scriptures in the Koran they focused on. It really helped FBI agents figure out how to stop radical Islam.

But the reason the FBI took so much criticism after so many people across America have been killed needlessly from people who were on the FBI radar is because, under Bob Mueller, the FBI agents were not allowed to know how to spot radical Islam, and, in fact, they could hurt their career if they attempted to point out that someone had been radicalized.

So that is why, when Russia told the United States twice—once, directly told the FBI, as I understand it—that the older Tsarnaev brother had been radicalized and where he had traveled and where he had been radicalized over in the former Soviet Union area, the FBI, the best we can find out from the public hearings we had, apparently, under Mueller, they sent somebody to ask Tsarnaev if he was a radical terrorist, and he assured them he wasn't. And they sent somebody to ask Tsarnaev's mother, and she, in essence, said, "No, he is a good boy; he is not a terrorist," and that was their investigation.

I challenged Mueller: You didn't even go to the mosques, the main Boston mosque where these guys attended to see and investigate whether they had been radicalized.

□ 1315

He refuted that. He said we did go to those mosques, but then he added: "In our outreach program."

It turns out, as he admitted, he did not even know that the Boston mosque where the Tsarnaev radicalization was heightened was started by a man named Alamoudi. Alamoudi helped the Clinton administration back before they started making so much money on who they were. But the Clinton administration used Alamoudi to help

them find the perfect Muslims to be chaplains at prisons, the perfect Muslims to help advise the government, the perfect Muslims to plug in to help our United States Government.

And it is what I have asked more than once and have gotten no answer: Who was it that encouraged or placed Huma Abedin Weiner next to Hillary Clinton as an intern in 1996? Who was it that put her in that position next to the First Lady, where she grew from being intern to being helper and ultimately her number one closest adviser as secretary of state?

Had Hillary Clinton been elected President, she would have been the foremost closest adviser to the President of the United States with some strong direct ties from her family to the Muslim Brotherhood.

In fact, Osama bin Laden had indicated that a couple of things that radicalized him, made him want to kill people like Americans for being infidels, was a booklet written by an Egyptian Muslim brother named Qutb—Q-u-t-b—called “Milestones.” He also gave great credit to a guy named Naseef, who was head of a number of Muslim activities—still is. But he had a journal that was a favorite publication of the Muslim Brotherhood.

And come to find out that, gee, back when she was working for Hillary Clinton, Huma Abedin was listed on the masthead as being a part of that publication, contributing to being part of that publication, along with, at different times, one or two other family members. That is the journal that Naseef started for the Muslim group.

Quite interesting, the ties that she had. Some of us asked for the inspector general—all we did was ask five different inspectors general and five different departments or agencies if they would investigate the extent of Muslim brother influence in their particular department or agency, and one was the State Department. There is not one single thing that we put in any of those five letters that was inaccurate. They were all factually correct. But there was a firestorm. JOHN MCCAIN rushed to the Senate floor to condemn us. We were right about everything we put in those letters. We are still right.

Bob Mueller did a lot of damage to our ability—as one of our agents told me, we have been blinded of our ability to see who our enemy is.

In recent days, since Director Comey was fired by the President—which he totally has the authority to do for any reason or for no reason—there have been all these glowing comments by my Democratic friends in the House and Senate condemning the firing of Comey. President Trump has been vilified even for commenting today and yesterday that he thought when he fired Comey he would have wide bipartisan support. Because he had heard so many comments, he thought that

would be widely appreciated on both sides of the aisle, because clearly the FBI had become about Comey and not about law enforcement.

It certainly seemed inappropriate, what he said last summer, when basically he laid out the case of how Hillary Clinton had committed a Federal crime that did not require intent, but then he added an element to the offense that Congress didn’t add, that is not part of the law, of specific intent. Didn’t exist. Not necessary to prove. It hadn’t been proved in other cases where we have got people that have been put in the penitentiary for a lot less than what Hillary Clinton did. But he exonerated her. No prosecutor in his right mind would prosecute this case, when, actually, there are a lot of prosecutors who would have prosecuted that case if they were not so politically attuned as Mr. Comey was and is.

I thought it would be helpful, Mr. Speaker, to just go back and revisit comments from some of our friends across the aisle about the FBI Director Comey. In fact, nobody has been more vocal since Director Comey’s firing than our friend down the hall, Senator CHUCK SCHUMER, Democrat from New York.

I am quoting from my friend CHUCK SCHUMER. He came out bluntly on November 2, 2016: “I do not have confidence in him any longer.”

Published in Bloomberg. So being a man of his word, we know that as of November 2, Senator SCHUMER had no confidence in Director Comey any longer.

Despite what he has said in recent days, beloved Senator BERNIE SANDERS from Vermont did an interview with ABC News in January of this year. The headline from the ABC News story: “Sanders: ‘Would Not Be Bad Thing for the American People’ if FBI Director Comey Steps Down.”

Then the story went on to say: “Asked by ABC News’ George Stephanopoulos in an exclusive interview on ‘This Week’ if Comey should leave his post, Sanders responded, ‘I think he should take a hard look at what he has done and I think it would not be a bad thing for the American people if he did step down.’”

“‘I think that Comey acted in an outrageous way during the campaign,’ Sanders said. ‘No one can say that this was decisive, or this is what elected Trump, but clearly his behavior during the campaign in terms of what he said during the week or two before the election was unacceptable.’”

Then we have former Senator Harry Reid. All those who know him to be a man of his word can take his comments seriously because as of October 30, 2016, Senator Harry Reid from Nevada said in a letter to Director Comey: “Dear Director Comey: Your actions in recent months have demonstrated a disturbing double standard for the treat-

ment of sensitive information, with what appears to be a clear intent to aid one political party over another. I am writing to inform you that my office has determined that these actions may violate the Hatch Act, which bars FBI officials from using their official authority to influence an election. Through your partisan actions, you may have broken the law.”

Again, this is Harry Reid to Director Comey. Harry Reid goes on: “The double standard established by your actions is clear. In my communications with you and other top officials in the national security community, it has become clear that you possess explosive information about close ties and coordination between Donald Trump, his top advisers, and the Russian Government, a foreign interest openly hostile to the United States, which Trump praises at every opportunity.”

And I will insert here parenthetically, we now know that the FBI did not possess explosive information about close ties and coordination between Donald Trump, his top advisers, and the Russian Government. In fact, the Obama administration, intelligence, law enforcement officials have repeatedly testified that despite all their inferences, despite all the things they wanted to find, they could not point to any evidence of the Russian Government affecting our election, of the Russian Government colluding with the Trump administration or with Donald Trump’s campaign to affect the election. No evidence.

Anyway, we know more now than we did at the time that Harry Reid wrote this letter.

Senator Reid went on: “The public has a right to know this information. I wrote to you months ago calling for this information to be released to the public. There is no danger to American interests from releasing it. And yet, you continue to resist calls to inform the public of this critical information.”

“By contrast, as soon as you came into possession of the slightest innuendo related to Secretary Clinton, you rushed to publicize it in the most negative light possible.

“Moreover, in tarring Secretary Clinton with thin innuendo, you overruled longstanding tradition and the explicit guidance of your own department. You rushed to take this step 11 days before a Presidential election, despite the fact that for all you know, the information you possess could be entirely duplicative of the information you already examined which exonerated Secretary Clinton.”

Well, again parenthetically, we know now it actually condemned Secretary Clinton, showed she committed a crime. She may not have had the intent to violate the law, but had the certain intent to do what she did, and that was a violation of the law.

He goes on. This is Harry Reid talking to and about Comey. He says: “As

you know, a memo authored by Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates on March 10, 2016, makes clear that all Justice Department employees, including you, are subject to the Hatch Act. The memo defines political activity prohibited under the Hatch Act as, ‘activity directed toward the success or failure of a political party, candidate for partisan political office, or partisan political group.’

“The clear double standard established by your actions strongly suggests that your highly selective approach to publicizing information, along with your timing, was intended for the success or failure of a partisan candidate or political group.

“Please keep in mind that I have been a supporter of yours in the past. When Republicans filibustered your nomination and delayed your confirmation longer than any previous nominee to your position, I led the fight to get you confirmed because I believed you to be a principled public servant.

“With deepest regret, I now see that I was wrong.

“Sincerely,

“Senator Harry Reid.”

So as of last October 30, Reid believed Comey was not fit for being Director of the FBI.

On May 5: “Senator Tim Kaine of Virginia told CNN’s Alisyn Camerota on Friday that the letter FBI Director James Comey sent to Congress days before the 2016 election notifying lawmakers of the reopened investigation into Hillary Clinton’s email practices was ‘probably the lowest moment in the history of the FBI’ next to wiretapping Martin Luther King Jr.”

□ 1330

TIM KAINE, Senator KAINE, went on: “‘It will go down as probably the lowest moment in the history of the FBI, probably next to the decision of J. Edgar Hoover to wiretap Martin Luther King. And it was unfortunate,’ Kaine said.” That was from the Free Beacon.

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN from California, November 6, 2016, had this to say about Director Comey of the FBI: “‘The FBI has a history of extreme caution near election day so as not to influence the results. Today’s break from that tradition is appalling.’”

Senator CHRIS MURPHY, Democrat from Connecticut, said this on May 10 on MSNBC: “‘It is absolutely true the Democrats have been very critical of James Comey, and many of us did call for his resignation.’”

Senator CORY BOOKER from New Jersey, back on November 6 of 2016, said: “‘Hillary Clinton was sharply critical of the FBI in the wake of the surprise announcement that investigators were examining newly discovered emails that could be related to her former private server, but she has avoided the issue more recently.

“So it was striking that Senator Cory Booker took a swipe at the law enforcement agency on Sunday when he introduced Clinton at a black church here.”

This actually is a story from the LA Times.

“Without mentioning the email probe specifically, Booker said there have been ‘reruns’ in this election.

“‘We saw what the FBI did in MLK’s day,’ he said, a reference to how it targeted the civil rights leader decades ago.

“FBI Director James B. Comey has faced withering criticism from Democrats and even some Republicans for notifying Congress so close to the election that the agency was examining additional emails.

“But Booker’s reference to the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., was also interesting in light of how Comey has required FBI trainees to study the lessons from the ‘shameful’ investigations of the civil rights leader.”

In an interview with NPR back on November 8, 2016, Senator CORY BOOKER of New Jersey had an interviewer say this to him: “Now, earlier today, we had House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi calling the FBI Director James Comey’s recent announcements a Molotov cocktail. And she was saying it might have affected down-ballot races for House and Senate, saying it might have made things more of an obstacle for Democrats. What concerns do you have about that in the Senate?”

Senator BOOKER, again this is November 8, 2016, said: “Well, I really think that it was a big impact on the election. I don’t have any, obviously, data to back that up, and hopefully through an analysis we will see. But clearly our Senate candidates and our Presidential candidates were surging—or at the time that news came, it sucked the momentum out a lot of those races. And we think it could likely affect the outcome of some very tight Senate races as well. It’s unfortunate that he would break with precedent. It’s—to me, it showed a grave lack of judgment, to put something like that into an election days before it would come to pass. And I think he did a disservice to the United States of America.” That was from NPR on condemning the actions of Director Comey.

Just so that we know what the theme is we are talking about here, basically Farewell to Director Comey as FBI Director, and I am just giving quotes that our friends across the aisle, Democrats, have made about Director Comey.

Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI said this November 2, 2016: “‘Maybe he’s not in the right job.’ . . .

“‘I think that we have to just get through this election and just see what the casualties are along the way.’”

Our friend, Representative G. K. BUTTERFIELD, Democrat here in the

House, serving nobly, former head of the Congressional Black Caucus, he said this year, January 24: “‘I can’t speak for Democrats, but I can speak for myself, and I think that James Comey needs to fade away into oblivion.’”

“‘He embarrassed this Nation, he possibly influenced the outcome of a presidential election, and he should not hold any position of trust, whatsoever, in our government.’”

And my friend, Representative STEVE COHEN from Tennessee, we serve together on the Committee on the Judiciary. This was his press release October 30, 2016. The press release his office sent out said: “Congressman Steve Cohen, ranking member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, today called on James Comey to resign as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.”

Then it has a quote in the Cohen press release: “‘FBI Director James Comey’s recent public comments on former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and her emails, apparently before seeing any evidence, and against the advice of the Justice Department according to press reports, and even, some have suggested, in violation of the Hatch Act, make it clear that for the good of the FBI and the Justice Department, he should resign his position effective immediately,’ said Congressman Cohen. ‘In the past, even quite recently, I have expressed my appreciation for Director Comey. I appreciated his courage as Deputy Attorney General when he stood up to President Bush’s Chief of Staff Andrew Card and White House Counsel Alberto Gonzales when they attempted to persuade hospitalized Attorney General John Ashcroft to reauthorize Bush’s domestic surveillance program, which the Justice Department had just determined was illegal. When, in July of this year, Director Comey recommended no criminal charges against Hillary Clinton for her handling of classified information while she was Secretary of State but added his own sidebar of opinions to the announcement, I gave Director Comey the benefit of the doubt, despite the fact that his making such highly unusual remarks was called into question by many.’”

“Congressman Cohen elaborated, ‘While I cannot know Director Comey’s reasoning for his recent letter to House Members notifying them about the FBI’s review of emails that he deemed ‘potentially related’ to Hillary Clinton’s personal server, it was plainly premature, careless and unprecedented in its potential impact upon a Presidential election without a speck of information regarding the emails in question, their validity, substance or relevance. Director Comey stated in the letter that he had no idea of ‘the significance of this newly discovered

collection of emails,” which makes his decision all the more disturbing.

“There is a reason that FBI investigations are not usually made public until they are completed. To do so gives an impression of guilt before all the facts have been determined. That was the case during the FBI’s investigation of Secretary Clinton’s emails that led Director Comey to state that there was no evidence that Secretary Clinton intentionally transmitted or willfully mishandled classified information and that “no reasonable prosecutor” would bring a case against her. In light of that finding and the Department of Justice’s prohibition and practice against influencing elections, it is clear that Director Comey’s actions, no matter his motivations, have called into question his judgment and ethics. That is unacceptable as the FBI Director must, like Caesar’s wife, be above suspicion. I agree with CNN’s Paul Callan who, in calling for Director Comey to resign wrote ‘Trashing the Justice and FBI rule books in the interest of ‘openness’ is likely to put the FBI front and center in one of the most contentious Presidential races in recent U.S. history.’”

“Congressman Cohen continued, ‘Additionally revelatory is The New York Times opinion written by Richard Painter, chief White House ethics lawyer for President George W. Bush, in which he states: Absent extraordinary circumstances that might justify it, a public communication about a pending FBI investigation involving a candidate that is made on the eve of an election is thus very likely to be a violation of the Hatch Act and a misuse of an official position. Serious questions also arise under lawyers’ professional conduct rules that require prosecutors to avoid excessive publicity and unnecessary statements that could cause public condemnation even of people who have been accused of a crime, not to mention people like Mrs. Clinton, who have never been charged with a crime.’”

“Congressman Cohen concluded, ‘The fairness of our electoral system is like the fairness of a trial, and no justice official should act in such a way to potentially influence an election whether intended to or not. Standards must be upheld and an FBI Director needs to investigate, not inject issues into a Presidential election when no investigation dictates action or basis for action. At a minimum, Director Comey’s actions are, to use his own verbiage, “extremely careless” this close to the election and without any apparent substance. If Director Comey cares about the Bureau and the rule of law, as I have felt he has in the past, I’m sure upon reflection of this action, he will submit his letter of resignation for the Nation’s good.’”

So that is my friend, Congressman STEVE COHEN from Tennessee, saying,

for the good of the country basically, Comey ought to submit his letter of resignation back last October.

Also, when Congressman COHEN appeared on MSNBC, he said: “‘What he’s done’—talking about Comey—is put the FBI in a position that it has never been in. The FBI Director is supposed to investigate and keep his judgments quiet and not get involved in elections . . . and while he’s made the right decision, even though he went too far, this summer in not indicting the Secretary, what he did here was just wrong, and something the FBI Director needs to exert extreme control over themselves not to get involved, and he just made a mistake, and I think he should resign, because he’s damaged the FBI’s reputation.’”

“‘. . . in fact, he’s been excessively careless now. I gave him the benefit of the doubt I guess based on the result but I didn’t like the way he had cut to the process in which he got to the substance of the decision.’”

October 31, 2016, also Congressman COHEN from Tennessee appeared on CNN, and the CNN reporter said: “‘Congressman, up until the last few days, you didn’t just think the FBI Director was doing a good job—you thought he was doing a great job. You told him last month in a hearing, you said “You are a credit to the FBI, you are a credit to government service.” How do you explain you’re . . .’”

And then Congressman COHEN said: “‘Because he went too far with this one.’”

November 3, 2016, The Hill said this: “‘As a nearly ten-year veteran of the House Judiciary Committee—the committee responsible for oversight of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Department of Justice—and ranking member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, earlier this week I called on FBI Director James Comey to resign his position after his recent communication with Members of Congress regarding the Bureau’s review of emails potentially related to Hillary Clinton’s personal email server.’”

Anyway, it goes on—it is a long story—but again feeding Congressman COHEN’s call for FBI Director Comey to resign.

December 16, 2016, in a tweet attributed to Congressman COHEN of Tennessee: “‘#Comey was wrong to hide hacking of #DNC #DCCC, but he should not resign. Trump would appoint worse. #FBI & Senators bulwark for next admin.’”

So by December he was already thinking differently.

But December 10, in a statement, he said: “‘I applaud Senate Minority Leader Harry Reid for also calling on FBI Director James Comey to resign after new information came to light that Director Comey may have known the CIA had secretly concluded that

the Russians were trying to help Donald Trump win the Presidency. . . .’”

So, anyway, back and forth. But our friend, Representative KEITH ELLISON, Democrat from Minnesota, November 6, 2016, from Twitter said: “‘I’m not surprised at all ‘Comey says latest emails don’t change decision.’”

□ 1345

Representative ELIJAH CUMMINGS from Maryland, my friend, a Democrat, January 13 of this year, said: “‘I was willing to give him the benefit of the doubt. Today, I must tell you, when I left the hearing, I felt a great sense of disappointment.’”

My friend, RUBEN GALLEG0, a Congressman from Arizona, a Democrat, said: “‘What I heard in the briefing made me not trust him, that’s all.’”

My friend, HANK JOHNSON, a Democrat from Georgia, said: “‘My confidence in the FBI Director’s ability to lead this agency has been shaken.’”

On January 13, HANK JOHNSON also said: “‘He should pack his things and go.’”

He was talking about Comey.

JOHNSON said: “‘I don’t have confidence in this man to lead the FBI in the coming weeks and months ahead, with all the work that must be done to get to the bottom of Russian hacking into our electoral process.’”

Then my friend, JERRY NADLER, a Democrat from New York, November 14, 2016, said: “‘The President can fire him for cause and ought to. He violated all the guidelines and put his thumb on the scale of an election. Whether it was decisive or not is a different question.’”

House Democratic Caucus vice Chairwoman LINDA SÁNCHEZ, my friend from California, said: “‘I don’t believe that Director Comey conducted himself during the election in a way that was impartial. I have concerns about that. But I also have concerns about who would the replacement be.’”

Also, my friend, Representative DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from Florida, said: “‘I think Director Comey has taken enough actions that call into question his ability to continue to serve credibly. I would lean in the direction that he no longer is able to serve in a neutral and credible way.’”

My friend, Representative MARK TAKANO from California, said: “‘I’m extremely concerned—extremely. I’ll just—I’m very angry.’”

He was talking about Comey as FBI Director.

Representative TIM WALZ, my friend from Minnesota, said on January 13: “‘I was nonjudgmental until the last 15 minutes. I no longer have that confidence in him.’”

And then so many of the media have been condemning President Trump for firing the FBI Director. Yet, if we just go back a little bit, those same people in the media—Paul Callan from CNN, on October 30, 2016, said: “‘Perhaps it’s

time for the embattled FBI Director who seems to have forgotten how to conduct a proper investigation to resign."

Kurt Eichenwald said on November 7, 2016: "James Comey should not simply be fired as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He must be barred forever from any form of public service."

"He has done more damage to the reputation of the FBI than any Director since the Nixon administration. Comey will, without doubt, be listed as second only to Hoover as the worst Director to ever hold the office because of his willingness to abuse his power."

Ian Millhiser, on October 31, 2016, said: "We also know that Comey violated longstanding Justice Department protocol when he decided to disclose the very few facts that he actually did disclose in his letter to the Republican chairs. And we know that he wrote the letter over the explicit objections of Attorney General Loretta Lynch. Taken together, these actions constitute a fireable offense."

The New York Daily News editorial board called on Comey to resign, and said: "FBI Director James Comey's democracy-bending decision to inform America, 11 days before its Presidential election, that the Bureau is digging into a trove of additional emails demands the highest condemnation. And he must resign."

The Wall Street Journal editorial board said: "But if the FBI Director has demonstrated anything in the last year, it is that he has lost the trust of nearly everyone in Washington, along with every American who believes the FBI must maintain its reputation as a politically impartial Federal agency."

"The best service Mr. Comey can render his country now is to resign. Failing that, Jeff Sessions should invite him in for a meeting after he is confirmed as attorney general and ask him to resign. If Mr. Comey declines, Donald Trump can and should fire him in the best interests of the Nation's most important law enforcement agency."

Keith Olbermann with GQ tweeted out: "Very simple: FBI Director Comey needs to clarify—today—that these are not emails from, or withheld by, Clinton or resign immediately."

The Washington Post said on October 29, 2016: "James Comey is damaging our democracy."

Michael Cohen with The Boston Globe on October 21, 2016, said: "FBI Director James Comey should resign. James Comey really messed up. The FBI Director did not commit some garden-variety mistake. This is not an 'oops' moment. For reasons that have more to do with protecting himself from dishonest Republican attacks, Comey committed an overly egregious and political act that roiled the Nation's politics 11 days before election

day—and undermined public trust in the Nation's criminal justice institution. And he needs to go."

That is The Boston Globe.

Anyway, Mortimer B. Zuckerman, chairman and editor of U.S. News and World Report, on November 4, 2016, said: "Time to resign—FBI Director James Comey needs to step down over his handling of the Clinton email investigation."

This is what they said.

"The self-righteous James Comey has served his country badly. Comey seems oblivious of the effect of handing Trump a piece of dynamite."

And he goes on condemning Comey over and over.

Jeff Jarvis from BuzzFeed said on November 6, 2016, in a tweet: "Now resign, Comey, resign."

On October 31, 2016, a tweet from Bret Stephens of The New York Times, said: "FBI Director James Comey needs to resign now, while he can salvage his honor. My Wall Street Journal column explains."

You have the Clinton campaign on May 10—it was republished on May 10, but it first went out on October 30, 2016, and it talks about having worked with Director Comey: "But his unprecedented decision to publicly comment on evidence in what may be an ongoing inquiry just 11 days before a Presidential election leaves us both astonished and perplexed."

It went on to say that they were "moved" to speak out publicly because Comey's action violated "settled" DOJ tenets.

And Hillary Clinton herself said: "It's pretty strange to put something like that out with such little information, right before an election. In fact, it's not just strange, it's unprecedented and it's deeply troubling. I was on the way to winning until the combination of Jim Comey's letter on October 28 and Russian WikiLeaks raised doubts in the minds of people who were inclined to vote for me but got scared off. If the election was on October 27, I would be your President."

John Podesta, it turns out, is on the board of directors of one or more companies and had dealings with Russia. He said: "It's extraordinary that we would see something like this just 11 days out from a Presidential election."

"Light on facts, heavy on innuendo, knowing full what Republicans would do with it. It is not up to him who owes the public answers to questions that are now on the table."

He also said that he has "not been forthcoming with the facts."

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I just thought it would be interesting to understand why President Donald Trump would have said in the last 2 days he thought that firing Comey would be applauded in a bipartisan fashion, because he knew all of these quotes from Democratic leaders, mainstream leaders that

are mainstream media-leading publications weighed in demanding Comey's resignation. President Trump demands his resignation or fires him.

So it seems to me President Trump is in a situation where it is understandable he would think the Democrats would appreciate him firing Comey, just like Republicans.

I know President Trump is relatively new to politics, but hopefully this is a lesson to President Trump. Just because Democratic leaders and the mainstream media say one thing in righteous indignation one day does not mean they are not going to turn around and say exactly the opposite the very next day or the next month.

The President, I know he is learning—he is a quick learner—but he is bound to learning as he goes. You can't always trust what a Democratic leader says one moment, because they may turn around and completely contradict themselves immediately thereafter.

So I think if the President just relies on what our Democratic Senators and House Members said, he will be in good stead. And I think the country is better off, depending on who is appointed, but I have faith it will be an improvement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy:

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY, Florida

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CURBELO of Florida (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for after 3:30 p.m. on May 18 and the balance of the week on account of family obligations in the district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 22, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1384. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Defense Production Act (DPA) Title III Fund for Fiscal Year 2016, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 4534(f)(3); Sept. 8, 1950, ch. 932, title III, Sec. 304 (as added by Public Law 111-67, Sec. 7); (123 Stat. 2017); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1385. A letter from the Acting Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Imposition of Special Measure Against North Korea as a Jurisdiction of Primary Money Laundering Concern (RIN: 1506-AB35) received May 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1386. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria — Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) Program [CFDA Number: 84.371C] [Docket ID: ED-2015-OESE-0129] (RIN: 1810-AB25) received May 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1387. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90]; ETC Annual Reports and Certifications [WC Docket No.: 14-58]; Developing a Unified Inter-carrier Compensation Regime [CC Docket No.: 01-92] received May 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1388. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1389. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Executive Order 13637, Transmittal No. 05-17 informing of an intent to sign Amendment One to the Memorandum of Understanding Among Canada, the Kingdom of Denmark, Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, New Zealand, and the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1390. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's FY 2016 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1391. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Chief Human Capital Officers (CHCO) Council's Report to Congress for Fiscal Years 2014-2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1401 note; Public Law 107-296, Sec. 1303(d); (116 Stat. 2289); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1392. A letter from the Attorney, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland

Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Navy UNDET, Apra Outer Harbor and Piti, GU [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0214] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1393. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Bush River, Harford County, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0067] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received May 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1394. A letter from the Attorney, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and Indian Creek, Miami, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0768] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1395. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Hebda Cup Rowing Regatta; Detroit River, Trenton Channel; Wyandotte, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0305] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received May 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1396. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Chapel Street over Mill River Bridge Rehabilitation — New Haven, CT [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0257] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1397. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Security Zone; Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, PA [Docket No.: USCGF-2017-0152] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received May 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROE of Tennessee: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1725. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the treatment of medical evidence provided by non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals in support of claims for disability compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 115-133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1329. A bill to increase,

effective as of December 1, 2017, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, to improve the processing of claims by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 115-134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2288. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 2548. A bill to reauthorize the programs and activities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 2549. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the administration of the educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 2550. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an incremental expansion of telehealth coverage under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 2551. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the exclusion for employer-provided educational assistance and to expand the availability of the student loan interest deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOMERT, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. BIGGS):

H.R. 2552. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion in gross income of Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mrs. LOVE, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DUFFY, Ms. TENNEY, Mr.

LOUDERMILK, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. TROTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 2553. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to bring the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection into the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CRIST, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 2554. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a program that automatically enrolls certain community college graduates into 4-year public institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. LOVE (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2555. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure compliance of medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs with requirements relating to the scheduling of appointments, to require appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate of certain health care officials of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HARPER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 2556. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCHSHON (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 2557. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of certain DNA Specimen Provenance Assay clinical diagnostic laboratory tests; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Mr. LONG, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 2558. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue guidance with respect to three-dimensional human tissue models, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 2559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat bicycle sharing systems as mass transit facilities for purposes of the qualified transportation fringe; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAETZ (for himself, Mr. SOTO, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS,

Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DUNN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MAST, and Mr. YOHIO):

H.R. 2560. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to encourage elimination of lionfish from United States waters by allowing individuals to exchange lionfish for tags authorizing fishing for certain species in addition to the number of such species otherwise authorized to be taken by such individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH (for himself and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 2561. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to permit uniformed law enforcement officers to carry agency-issued firearms in certain Federal facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2562. A bill to improve access to prescription drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 2563. A bill to codify the Small Business Administration's Entrepreneurial Education Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. JONES, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 2564. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require an annual report on the personnel, training, and equipment needs of the non-federalized National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 2565. A bill to require the use of replacement cost value in determining the premium rates for flood insurance coverage under the National Flood Insurance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 2566. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules prohibiting deceptive advertising of abortion services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2567. A bill to establish certain duties for pharmacies to ensure provision of Food and Drug Administration-approved contraception, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 2568. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a study of the feasibility of establishing an ethane storage and distribution hub in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 2569. A bill to promote transparency in health care pricing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on

Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2570. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to clarify that the points and fees in connection with a mortgage loan do not include certain compensation amounts already taken into account in setting the interest rate on such loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. BRIDENSTINE):

H.R. 2571. A bill to amend title 51 of the United States Code to improve the safety of commercial space flight operations by authorizing the operation of aircraft with experimental certificates carrying persons or property to support research and training for space flight participants and crew, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SIRE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CORREA, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ):

H.R. 2572. A bill to establish humane practices for the repatriation of aliens at the border, establish effective standards for the treatment of certain aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 2573. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize additional grant activities for Hispanic-serving institutions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 2574. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to help build a stronger health care workforce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 2575. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a system to educate individuals approaching Medicare eligibility, to simplify and modernize the eligibility enrollment process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 2576. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of small business start-up savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 2577. A bill to establish an employment-based immigrant visa for alien entrepreneurs who have received significant capital from investors to establish a business in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2578. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the National Labor Relations Act to protect the health benefits of retirees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 2579. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 2580. A bill to simplify and improve the Federal student loan program through income-contingent repayment to provide stronger protections for borrowers, encourage responsible borrowing, and save money for taxpayers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution expressing support for a month to be known as Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. LEE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KIND, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CRIST, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. KEATING):

H. Res. 344. A resolution recognizing the contributions of senior volunteers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H. Res. 345. A resolution urging the President to faithfully carry out the Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. WELCH, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. PANETTA):

H. Res. 346. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that

specialty crops are a vital part of agriculture in the United States, and that Congress should fund programs that support specialty crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BOST, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Res. 347. A resolution expressing support for designation of May 2017 as "National Brain Tumor Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 2549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 2550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Sec 1

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 2551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 2552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for the Senior Citizens Tax Elimination Act is found in Article I, Section 8, which gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 2553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time)

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 2554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 2555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution Article I Section 8

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 2557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 2559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . ."

By Mr. GAETZ:

H.R. 2560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 2561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 2563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 2564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 2565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to repeal any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2568.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 2569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—"The Congress shall have the power to . . . regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;"

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 2573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 2574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 2575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 2576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 2577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 2579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 2580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 113: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 291: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 355: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 377: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. DAVIDSON, and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 426: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 448: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 468: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 480: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 490: Mr. MARINO, Mr. BUDD, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 539: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 545: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 620: Mr. RUSH and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 631: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 635: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 669: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 695: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 731: Ms. LEE, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 758: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 790: Ms. BARRAGÁN and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 795: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 807: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 817: Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 820: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 821: Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 823: Mr. ENGEL and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 828: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 846: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ISSA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 851: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 861: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 873: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER,

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, and Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 881: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 904: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 916: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 930: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CRIST, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. BARR, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 1046: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1057: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1071: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. MCEACHIN.

H.R. 1098: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1116: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1143: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1155: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1200: Mr. GOHMERT and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1205: Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1207: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. FLORES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HURD, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1208: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. FLORES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HURD, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1209: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. FLORES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HURD, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1210: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. FLORES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HURD, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr.

WILLIAMS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1211: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. FLORES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HURD, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1212: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1222: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 1225: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1232: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1310: Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 1318: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1341: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1358: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 1361: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1377: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1379: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 1406: Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1421: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1439: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1445: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1456: Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 1474: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1475: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1528: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1566: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1647: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1663: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1680: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1683: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. REED, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1697: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1730: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1761: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1772: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1777: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1817: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1821: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 1832: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1921: Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 1943: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 1949: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1953: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1970: Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 1973: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 2002: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2015: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2044: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KIND, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2052: Mr. MESSER, Mr. KATKO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. LOVE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WALKER, Mr.

POLIQIN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. CRIST, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. SOTO, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2056: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2062: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2068: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 2084: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2099: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2106: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2119: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2120: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2134: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 2135: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2147: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 2174: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2175: Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 2197: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 2207: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2208: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2209: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2230: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. POLIS, Ms. ROSEN, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 2240: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 2262: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2327: Mr. KIND, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. YOHIO, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2328: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2340: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2353: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 2358: Mr. GALLEGGO, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2369: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 2383: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 2392: Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2399: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 2428: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2434: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2452: Mr. RUSH and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2472: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2495: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 2532: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 2541: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H. Con. Res. 8: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. CULBERSON.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. HASTINGS.
H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 30: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H. Res. 69: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Res. 218: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 274: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BUDD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H. Res. 279: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Ms. ROSEN.

H. Res. 309: Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H. Res. 311: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H. Res. 320: Mr. DONOVAN.

H. Res. 341: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. PETERS.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 2, May 17, 2017, by Mr. SWALWELL of California on H.R. 356, was signed by the following Members: Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Cummings, Ms. Lofgren, Ms. Jayapal, Mr. Crist, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Khanna, Ms. Hanabusa, Mr. Lynch, Ms. Lee, Mr. Ben Ray Lujan of New Mexico, Mr. Brown of Maryland, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Mr. Takano, Mr. Carabajal, Mrs. Murphy of Florida, Mr. Correa, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Polis, Mr. Kilmer, Ms. Adams, Ms. Brownley of California, Mr. Krishnamoorthi, Mr. Peters, Ms. Meng, Mr. Lipinski, Mr. Beyer, Mrs. Bustos, Mr. Aguilar, Ms. Blunt Rochester, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Al Green of Texas, Mr. McGovern, Mrs. Torres, Mr. Engel, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Schneider, Mr. Heck, Mr. Bera, Ms. Esty of Connecticut, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. O'Halleran, Ms. DelBene, Mr. Schiff, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Raskin, Ms. Slaughter, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Kihuen, Mr. Keating, Mr. Lowenthal, Mrs. Beatty, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Ms. Castor of Florida, Mr. Yarmuth, Ms. McCollum, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. Ruiz, Mr. Butterfield, Ms. Sewell of Alabama, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Ms. Moore, Mr. Langevin, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Rosen, Mrs. Demings, Ms. Titus, Mr. Espallat, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Hoyer, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Miss Rice of New York, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Garamendi, Mr. Pascrell, Ms. Sinema, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Pannetta, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Huffman, Mr. Cárdenas, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Welch, Mr. Perlmutter, Mr. Ellison, Mr. Soto, Mr. Delaney, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Mr. DeSaulnier, Mr. Evans, Ms. Clarke of New York, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. Clyburn, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Jones, Mr. Vela, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Jeffries, Mr. Walz, Ms. Frankel of Florida, Mr. Levin, Mr. McEachin, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Meeks, Mr. McNerney, Mr. Sires, Mr. Clay, Ms. Bass, Mrs. Davis of California, Ms. Matsui, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Ms. Fudge, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Ms. Sánchez, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Loebsack, Mr. Quigley, Mrs. Dingell, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Suozzi, Mr. Neal, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mrs. Lawrence, Ms. Barragan, Mrs. Lowey, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Veasey, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Foster, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Ms. DeLauro, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Ms. Gabbard, Mr. O'Rourke, Ms. Tsongas, Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, Ms. Maxine Waters of

California, Mr. Michael F. Doyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Smith of Washington, Mr. Tonko, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, Mr. Carson of Indiana, Mr. Castro of Texas, Mr. Deutch, Mr. Richmond, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Rush, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Nolan, Ms. Speier, Ms. Shea-Porter, Mr. Higgins of New

York, Ms. Pelosi, Ms. Pingree, Mr. Pocan, Mr. Schrader, Mr. Himes, Mr. Crowley, Ms. DeGette, Mr. Cuellar, Mr. Vargas, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Costa, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Kind, Mr. Payne, and Ms. Kaptur.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—
ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Member added his name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 1 by Ms. ESHOO on H.R. 305: Mr. JONES.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING PRESIDENT
TSAI ING-WEN OF TAIWAN

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, May 20th, is the first anniversary of President Tsai Ing-wen's inauguration. Having met President Tsai twice during her first year in office, I would like to congratulate her and the people of Taiwan on this occasion.

Taiwan has become a vibrant democracy, where power at the presidential level has been peacefully transferred from one political party to another three times—most recently in last year's election. Taiwan's democracy is a shining example for both the Asia-Pacific region, and for the world. At the same time, Taiwan has endeavored to be a good global citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I treasure the U.S.-Taiwan relationship, which is one between like-minded friends who share the same values. I admire the distance the people of Taiwan have come in the face of many challenges. As a friend to Taiwan, I commend its people and President Tsai on this anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO MAXINE MARTENS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ms. Maxine Martens on the occasion of her 100th birthday. Maxine, along with her family and friends, celebrated on April 24th.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Maxine's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Maxine has lived through eighteen United States Presidents and twenty-four Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Maxine Martens in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish her a very happy 100th birthday. I invite my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Maxine on reaching this incredible milestone, and in wishing her even more health and happiness in the years to come.

HONORING SPIRIT XPLOSION

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable professional minority business Spirit Xplosion Home of CE All Stars of Cleveland, Mississippi.

Mrs. Kimetria Parks, owner/coach is a native of Holly Springs, Mississippi. She moved to Cleveland, Mississippi in 1999 while attending Delta State University. She's married to Mr. Christopher Parks, Co-Owner/Coach and they have two beautiful daughters named Paris Kaitlyn Parks and Layken Parks. Mrs. Parks earned a Bachelor of Business Administration in 2003 and a Masters of Business Administration in 2013 from Delta State University. She is the Finance Officer of Mississippi United to End Homelessness and owner/coach of Spirit Xplosion Home of CE All Stars. She fellowships with St. Peter MB Church in Sunflower, Mississippi. Mr. Parks graduated from Delta State University in 2005 with a Bachelor of Science in General Studies and Minor in Family Consumer Science and Criminal Justice, and in 2012 with a Masters in Physical Education with an Emphasis on Human Performance.

She has a great love and compassion for young people. Her ministry is to inspire young people to excel in all things with God's leading and to encourage women. Everything she does is done with the spirit of excellence. Her motto is: "If I can help somebody then her living is not in vain." She loves God wholeheartedly and thrives to live according to his will and his way; not just on Sunday, but every day. She's a genuine giver and does it cheerfully. Everything she has God gave it to her, everything she owns God has blessed her with it, and she has faith the size of a mustard seed and know that it's not over until God says it's over.

Spirit Xplosion Home of CE All Stars was established in 2011 and kicked off their first season in February, 2012. Their competitive teams have won several UCA, Athletic Championship, Jam Fest, Deep South, WSA, and local competitions. They strongly believe that their success originates from the dedication and commitment of the athletes and parents. Furthermore, they realize the importance of hard work, discipline, a family atmosphere, and perhaps most importantly—fun. Each child is an individual and is treated as such to instill confidence and a sense of personal accomplishment. Their main focus is to prepare children for the challenges that lie ahead of them. Their ability to work as a team, striving toward a common goal, will prove to be a lifelong skill. The encouragement to reach that goal is CE All-Stars passion.

Spirit Xplosion Home of CE All Stars competitive teams are not recreational. They train

to compete at a high level of intensity. Two of their main goals are to create award winning routines, and to be an active group in the community. This type of goal requires commitment to attendance and structured workouts. Spirit Xplosion Home of CE All-Stars athletes commit twelve months to the program. CE All-Stars is a family and love building new relationships with everyone that walks through their doors.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an outstanding minority business in the Mississippi Delta.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN
SOLDIER AIR FORCE STAFF
SERGEANT (SSGT) JOHN THOMAS
SELF

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of fallen soldier Air Force Staff Sergeant (SSGT) John Thomas Self who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our nation on May 14, 2007, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. SSGT Self was killed by an improvised explosive device in an attack that wounded three other airmen near Baghdad, Iraq, during his fourth tour of duty.

SSGT Self was assigned to the 314th Security Forces Squadron, Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas. A fire team leader with Detachment 3,732 Expeditionary Security Forces Squadron, SSGT Self was on his 79th combat patrol when he was killed. His detachment was tasked with training Iraqi police. Self's mother, Jill Self, told the Associated Press that he volunteered for his fourth tour of duty because he wanted to serve his country. He was only home from his third tour of duty for a few weeks before he volunteered for his fourth tour.

SSGT Self was born on November 2, 1977 in Tupelo, MS. He graduated from South Pontotoc High School, where he was a trumpet player in the marching band. He joined the Air Force in 1999 after attending Itawamba Community College. SSGT Self's mother, Jill Self, told the Associated Press, "He loved to deer hunt and fish and play computer games. He was a loving child. He was there for his family and friends. I loved him very much and he's going to be missed."

SSGT Self is survived by his mother and step father, Jill Long Self and Terry L. Self; his sisters, Misty D. Gann and Sandy Pennington, and his brothers, Ronnie Self and Sam Self. He is preceded in death by his father Robert A. Self.

The sacrifice of this brave soldier will always be remembered.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARINA WHITMAN FOR HER ACCOMPLISHED CAREER AS AN ECONOMIST

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Marina Whitman on the date of her retirement from the University of Michigan for her distinguished career over half a century as a world-renowned economist and extraordinary woman. Dr. Whitman helped forge a path for generations of women as she rose to the top of government, business and academia throughout her career and broke down barriers for all of us.

Many do not know that Dr. Whitman is the daughter of renowned mathematician John von Neumann, one of the foremost mathematicians and scholars of the 20th century. He is recognized as inventing game theory, pioneering developments in computer science and contributing to the Manhattan Project, among other achievements. Marina charted her own course and outgrew her father's shadow early in her career, leaving a mark wherever she went.

After receiving her doctorate in Columbia University, Dr. Whitman began her career in academia with the University of Pittsburgh in 1962, eventually being named a Distinguished Public Service Professor with the university. She then took a leave of absence to serve with the federal government, first as an economist with the President's Council of Economic Advisors, then on President Nixon's National Price Commission. As the first woman to be named to the President's Council of Economic Advisors, Dr. Whitman wrote about how the media focused not on her intellectual achievements, but instead "talk[ed] about what I looked like and that my eye shadow matched my dress. Some woman from the Pittsburgh Press wanted to know how my daughter's gerbil survived the trip to Washington."

After serving in government, Dr. Whitman worked as a Vice President and Chief Economist for General Motors from 1979 to 1985, and Vice President and Group Executive for Public Affairs until 1992. During this time, she oversaw GM's economics policies, as well as its environmental and industry-government relations activities. At the time, she was the highest ranking woman in the United States automotive industry.

Since 1994, Dr. Whitman has been a Professor of Business Administration and Public Policy at the University of Michigan. Her work has focused on international trade and labor markets, and she is well-known internationally for her expertise on corporate governance and social responsibility.

As one of the nation's foremost economists, Dr. Whitman has conducted pioneering research which helped to reshape international monetary and financial systems. She contributed to the success of one of America's largest corporations and worked to educate the auto industry about the changing dynamics of globalization and its impact on the industry. Her work and research has transformed our

understanding of economics. She has been widely recognized for her outstanding work, having served on the boards of the National Bureau of Economic Research and the Institute for Advanced Study. Additionally, Dr. Whitman has received numerous awards throughout her career and holds honorary degrees from over twenty colleges and universities.

Even more significant than the mark she has left on many institutions is the mentoring of women she has done for a lifetime. I am lucky to have benefitted from that personally and do not believe I would stand here today without the benefit of her wisdom. Dr. Whitman sees her role as having been front and center in a transitional generation. She coaxed social change from inside the places where policy decisions are made or demanded it from outside—a generation that demarcated before this and after this. She observed, "I literally transitioned from the world in which women were secretaries and were not allowed to matriculate at the Harvard Business School to a world in which we have women who are CEOs of corporations . . . and I'm the in-between." Her patience, wisdom and pragmatism guided generations of women in both the workplace and the realism of how to do it all including being a parent, a spouse and a child of the sandwich generation.

She leaves behind a peerless record of success, and I wish her well as she moves on from her position at the University of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Marina Whitman for her outstanding career as an economist. Her extraordinary work has impacted countless lives.

TRIBUTE TO MARCY WORDEN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Marcy Worden of Council Bluffs, Iowa, who recently retired after 25 years of dedicated service to Council Bluffs as the City Clerk.

Marcy's career with the City of Council Bluffs started in April 1991. She joined the Parks and Recreation and Public Property Department as a clerk-typist, and in 1995 she transferred to the City Clerk's office. In 2002, the City Council appointed her the deputy City Clerk and promoted her to the City Clerk in 2009. Marcy said she estimates that she has attended 191 city council meetings during her tenure, and that her retirement is "bittersweet." She remarked, "There are lots of people I'll miss in City Hall." Council Bluffs Mayor Matt Walsh said, "She's done a great job and will be missed."

Mr. Speaker, Marcy has made a difference by helping and serving others and it is with great honor that I recognize her today. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in honoring her accomplishments and in wishing her nothing but the best in her retirement.

HONORING MALDONADO FAMILY VINEYARDS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jose Guadalupe and Hugo Maldonado, co-founders of Maldonado Family Vineyards. Their hard work and dedication to the art of viticulture is evident in their carefully crafted single-vineyard wines.

Guadalupe, or 'Lupe' as he is warmly referred to, immigrated to the United States in 1962 from the small farming community of Atacheo de Regalado in Michoacán, Mexico, where he managed his family's goat herd in the mountains. In 1971, while working for Sterling Vineyards, Lupe was asked to aid in the development of a winery for vintner Peter Newton, where he served as vineyard manager for over thirty years. Inspired by his father's work in the field, Hugo pursued a formal education in enology and viticulture at the University of California Davis. Hugo succeeded his father in his role as vineyard manager in 1999.

In 2007 Lupe and Hugo broke ground on a small hillside just outside of Calistoga and began to form the family's own wine caves and winemaking facility to establish Maldonado Family Vineyards. In their 13 years, the facility has grown from 250 cases to more than 10,000 cases of wine. Together Hugo and Lupe shaped Maldonado Family Vineyards to reflect their family history. On their label the words 'Farm Worker' can be found to note the family's decades of caring for and tending to vines.

Hugo traveled to Washington, D.C. this week as part of a group of Mexican-American vintners to support the mission of the Smithsonian Institution. They shared their amazing stories of immigration, sacrifice and determination and helped the attendees understand the vital contributions Mexican Americans make to our economy and community.

Mr. Speaker, Lupe and Hugo Maldonado have cultivated a winery which not only reflects their family history and Mexican American heritage, but honors the skilled laborer. I am proud to have such dedicated business owners living and working in our community. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor them here today.

HONORING MARY HARRISON LEE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Mrs. Mary Harrison Lee who was born on July 22, 1939 in Manila, Philippines to Ida Lloren. She was adopted at an early age by Reverend and Mrs. Ernest Harrison. Her adopted father was a chaplain in the army giving her the opportunity to live in many places, such as Captieux, France, Erlangen, Germany, Fort Riley, Kansas, and San Antonio, Texas.

Mary graduated from Rochefort American High School in France. Upon returning to the United States, she visited Tougaloo College and immediately fell in love with its quaintness, intimacy, the hanging moss from the oak trees, and the family atmosphere. She was convinced that this was where she wanted to spend her next four years and enrolled in the upcoming semester.

She became a member of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. on December 13, 1959. She felt the plight of the Civil Rights movement and volunteered to become a Freedom Rider. Mary helped lead a "sit-in" at the Trailways Bus Station in Downtown Jackson. She was arrested and jailed during this protest. She did not waiver from the overall mission to gain equality for African Americans. As a result, on June 23, 1961, Freedom Riders from Tougaloo College set a precedent and became the first residents of Mississippi to lead in the movement.

While at Tougaloo College, Mary met and fell in love with Gene Lee. They were married in 1963. She and Gene were natural educators. Mary dedicated her working career educating youth. She began as a teacher in Picayune, Mississippi; later moving to Kansas City, Missouri. In 1973, she relocated with her family to Germany and taught within the Department of Defense American School system.

In 1981, Mary and her family returned to the United States and settled in Jackson, Mississippi, where she retired in 2001 as Principal from Boyd Elementary School. Mary and Gene were blessed with three beautiful children: Geno (Angie), Daryl (Cassie), and Angel (Chris), and eight grandchildren: Jessica, Tori, Gabby, Nick, Bella, Alexa, McKenzie, and Malita.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Mary Harrison Lee for her dedication to serving.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I mistakenly voted no when I meant to vote yes on roll call vote no. 266.

HONORING BURAK M. GUVENSOYLAR

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a very special member of my staff, Burak Guvensoylar, who lost his courageous battle with cancer this past weekend.

Burak was a valued member of the Judiciary Committee team and worked on a variety of issues, including digital privacy and intellectual property. His vast knowledge and grasp of the issues impacting the technology community was a tremendous asset to the Com-

mittee. Most recently, Burak's work included the development of the Committee's Innovation and Competitiveness Agenda, and his steadfast work and tenacious attitude were not only essential to making this initiative a success, but were also a testament to his character. In fact, while he was undergoing intensive cancer treatments, he was actively working and sending follow up emails from his hospital bed. And just days before Burak passed away he met with FCC Commissioner Ajit Pai to discuss a number of Judiciary Committee priorities. For Burak, nothing could prevent him from an opportunity to discuss and advance the policies he was so passionate about.

Burak was a true technology policy enthusiast. Prior to joining the staff of the Judiciary Committee, Burak served as a Legislative Advisor for Congressman Randy Forbes. While working for Congressman Forbes, Burak handled the diverse range of issues that fall under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee but it was always evident that technology policy was his first love. He co-founded the Congressional Tech Staff Association and served as an Executive Officer responsible for the professional development program. Prior to his career on Capitol Hill, Burak worked at TechAmerica and CompTIA focusing on international trade policy.

Burak has many friends here in the halls of Congress, on both sides of the aisle. I know all of you will join me in extending our deepest sympathies to his mother Filiz Guvensoylar, his sister Aylin Forbes, his girlfriend Ashley Newsome, and all of his loved ones. Burak will be deeply missed.

TRIBUTE TO KEITH KINYON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Keith Kinyon for his many years of service to the American Legion and to his country. Keith was recently honored for being a 70-year member with the American Legion.

The American Legion was chartered and incorporated by Congress in 1919 as a patriotic veterans organization devoted to mutual helpfulness. The organization is committed to mentoring youth and sponsorship of wholesome programs in communities, advocating patriotism and honor and continued devotion to their fellow service members and veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Keith for his service to our country's veterans and his dedication to his community. It is an honor to represent him in the United States Congress. I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in commending Keith for his outstanding service and in wishing him nothing but continued success.

CELEBRATING THE 2017 CONGRESSIONAL ART COMPETITION

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, once again, I come to the floor to recognize the great success of strong local schools working with dedicated parents and teachers. I rise today to congratulate and honor a number of outstanding high school artists from the 11th Congressional District of New Jersey. Each of these talented young men and women participated in the 2017 Congressional Arts Competition, "An Artistic Discovery." Their works of art are exceptional.

Fifty-five participated. That is a wonderful response, and I would very much like to build on that participation for future competitions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the winners of our art competition. First place was awarded to Barbara Benda from Nutley High School for her digital tablet painting entitled, "Don't Look." Second place was awarded to Emma Jang from West Morris Mendham High School for her acrylic entitled, "Wide Awake." Third place was awarded to Emily Wang from Wayne Valley High School for her pen and ink entitled, "Black Rain."

Honorable Mentions were awarded to: Michelle Tolochko from Boonton High School for her acrylic entitled, "Self Portrait," Ashley O'Brien from Montville Township High School for her watercolor entitled, "Aphrodite," Jaclyn Larsen from Hanover Park High School for her digital photo entitled, "Messi," and Christopher Cortez from the Passaic County Technical Institute for his acrylic entitled, "Shades of Beauty."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize each artist for their participation by indicating their high school, their name and the title of their contest entries for the official RECORD.

BOONTON HIGH SCHOOL

Kristen Dalrymple, "Ghost of you"
Amanda Roberts, "Bitter Cold"
Michelle Tolochko, "Self Portrait"
Giancarlo Venturini, "My Friend Liz"

DELBARTON SCHOOL

Tim Adami, "Victory"
Sean Taylor, "The Alpine Adventurer"
EASTERN CHRISTIAN HIGH SCHOOL
Steve Blanco, "Epitaph"
Juliana Struyk, "Perception Of Fruit"

HANOVER PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Valentina Mattfeld, "Dallas"
Megan Canzonieri, "Ophelia"
Jaclyn Larsen, "Messi"
Sarah Court, "Dash"

LIVINGSTON HIGH SCHOOL

Rachel Kogut, "Imagination"

MEWE ART

Julia Hou, "Fire and Water"

MONTVILLE TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL

Madeleine Morris, "Wildflowers"
Ashley O'Brien, "Aphrodite"
Darrel Tsinadze, "Red Pearls"
Alexander Tullo, "Samantha's Columns"

MORRISTOWN HIGH SCHOOL

Deanna C. Swanson, "Vanitas"

MORRIS KNOLLS HIGH SCHOOL

Alyssa DeFilippis, "Melodic Vibes"

Megan Ramos, "Angel"
Divya Patel, "Lola"
Claire Weber, "Livid"

MORRIS CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL

Tina Yi, "Sadness"
Yang Jason Yang, "Geometrics"

MORRIS COUNTY SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY

Caroline Yorke, "Crime Scene"
Brenna Corsi, "Grow"
Alexa Metro, "True Colors"

MOUNTAIN LAKES HIGH SCHOOL

Joy Xie, "We Grew Up Here"

NUTLEY HIGH SCHOOL

Barbara Benda, "Don't Look"
Raven Cardone-Imor, "Tragic"
Devin Lemongello, "Self Portrait"
Joanne Salise, "Green Abstract"

PARSIPPANY CHRISTIAN SCHOOL

Nohemy Zabala, "The Beautiful District of Columbia"
Daniel Jordan McMillen, "The Other Side"
Camille Dieppa, "The Lincoln Memorial"

PARSIPPANY HILLS HIGH SCHOOL

Rachel Jacovsky, "American Pride"

PASSAIC COUNTY TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

Christopher Cortez, "Shades of Beauty"
Jamie Loverdi, "Retro Dine & Drive"

PASSAIC VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL

Maya Adham, "Game-Boy"
Danielle Burden, "OZ"
Erika Duarte, "Red in Snow"
Angelika Dulak, "Róze"

PEQUANNOCK TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL

Julia Blahut, "Carbon Footprints"
Thomas Carruthers, "Quiet Summer"

WAYNE VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL

Madeline Corb, "Focus"
Brooke Demore, "Look"
Liz Rozenblat, "Great dangers await"
Emily Wang, "Black Rain"

WEST MORRIS MENDHAM HIGH SCHOOL

Matthew Fabrizio, "Jack in a Hat"
Emma Jang, "I Donut Understand Puns"
Maximilian Scheidl, "Life Goes On"
Kayla O'Neill, "Where I'm Supposed to Be"

WHIPPANY PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Eric Kahn, "Waves of Rock"
Alex Maietta, "What Once Was"

Each year the winner of the competition has their artwork displayed with other winners from across the country in a special corridor here at the U.S. Capitol. Thousands of our fellow Americans walk through the exhibition and are reminded of the vast talents of our young men and women. Indeed, all of these young artists are winners, and we should be proud of their achievements so early in life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating these talented young people from New Jersey's 11th Congressional District.

IN HONOR OF LT. GEN. THOMAS H. TACKABERRY

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Lieutenant General Thomas H. Tackaberry, who passed away on Monday, April 3, 2017 at the age of 93. A

Commander of the 18th Airborne Corps, 82nd Airborne Division, and Fort Bragg, as well as a veteran of World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War, Lt. Gen. Tackaberry is a true American hero and our thoughts and prayers go out to his friends and family as they mourn the loss of this great man.

Thomas Tackaberry was a high school star in the classroom and on the track field, and when his country needed him the most, he stood ready to answer the call to serve our great nation. Lt. Gen. Tackaberry enlisted in the Army Reserve during World War II at the age of 19. After being commissioned as a Second Lieutenant, he served in Germany from 1945 to 1948. Lt. Gen. Tackaberry went on to fight in Korea and Vietnam, becoming highly decorated as the recipient of three Distinguished Service Crosses, five Silver Stars, a Distinguished Flying Cross, and a Soldier's Medal.

Described as a "grunt's angel," Lt. Gen. Tackaberry was devoted to his men, not only ensuring they were always supplied for the fight but physically prepared as well. Leading from the front, Lt. Gen. Tackaberry set a high bar for fitness with his men and led them on long training runs. He even remained dedicated to fitness well into his later life, completing 10 push-ups, despite being 93 years old and confined to a wheel chair, after being challenged by a family member. After 38 years in the military, Lt. Gen. Tackaberry retired to civilian life, managing a local real estate business and counseling the military of the Republic of China for BDC Corp.

Despite all of his accomplishments, Lt. Gen. Tackaberry never boasted of his military decorations or accomplished private sector career, instead focusing his energy on his family. He raised his twin sons to be accomplished military leaders in their own right and currently has several grandchildren serving in the U.S. military as well. This country cannot repay the debt we owe to Lt. Gen. Tackaberry; he was truly one of a kind and a model American. While we may have lost this great man, his legacy lives on forever.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in commemorating the life of Lieutenant General Thomas H. Tackaberry for his service to God and country.

SUPPORT FOR TAIWAN PARTICIPATION IN THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

HON. ROB BISHOP

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the independent nation of Taiwan is a highly-advanced industrialized democracy which contributes greatly to the world economy, particularly in the area of high tech, and is a long-time stalwart ally of the United States. We congratulate President Tsai Ing-wen on her one year anniversary as President of Taiwan.

The economic and military ties between our two nations have been built steadily over the past several decades, and I believe that it is important that the U.S. remains committed to this important bilateral relationship.

While our two countries have much to celebrate on this occasion, at the same time, some of the old diplomatic and political challenges are resurfacing which threaten Taiwan's participation as a constructive member of the global community. Recently, the World Health Organization (WHO), an arm of the United Nations, declined to invite Taiwan to participate in its annual World Health Assembly despite Taiwan's participation and contributions during the previous 8 years running.

Mr. Speaker, this deliberate snub was politically motivated, and violated the WHO's Constitution by excluding the people of Taiwan for no legitimate reason. The 23 million citizens of Taiwan should not be denied access to this and future annual meetings, especially if the stated goal of the World Health Organization is to provide a better healthier future to all peoples of the world.

I believe that the United States has an obligation to step forward and express strong disapproval of this WHO action.

To ensure that there is no gap in the disease prevention network and that, together, all might work for the advancement of human health worldwide, it is imperative that the United States Congress and the Administration rise in full support for Taiwan in this matter. The WHO Secretariat should be admonished regarding its moral and legal obligation to uphold its charter of independence and impartiality. The WHO and its leadership should not be at the service of any member state in particular. I ask my colleagues to join me in voicing our support for Taiwan's full and meaningful participation in the WHO, as well as other international organizations now and in the future.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLOTTE AND BOB BANCROFT

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Charlotte and Bob Bancroft of Atlantic, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on February 4, 2017.

Charlotte and Bob's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 50th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them nothing but the best.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN SOLDIER ARMY SERGEANT (SGT) JASON WALTER VAUGHN

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of fallen soldier Army Sergeant (SGT) Jason Walter Vaughn who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our nation on May 10, 2007, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. SGT Vaughn died of wounds from an improvised explosive device that detonated near his vehicle in Baqubah, Iraq, during his second tour of duty.

SGT Vaughn was assigned to the 5th Battalion, 20th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade, 2nd Infantry Division, Fort Lewis, Washington. He joined the Army in 2002, serving in Iraq from November 2003 to November 2004, and then returning in July 2006. He received his initial training at Fort Benning, Georgia. SGT Vaughn held the rank of Specialist at the time of his death and was posthumously promoted to Sergeant. During his military service, SGT Vaughn received the Army Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terror Expeditionary Medal and the Global War on Terror Service Medal. He was also awarded the Bronze Star Medal, the Purple Heart and the Combat Infantryman's Badge.

SGT Vaughn was born in Memphis, TN, moving a few times before his family settled in Iuka, MS. He graduated from Tishomingo County High School in Iuka, MS in 1996. He later attended Northeast Mississippi Community College and Mississippi State University.

According to his mother, RaNae Vaughn, "Jason was a kindhearted, selfless person. He was a beautiful person inside and out. His memory inspires us to be better, do better and dream big." His father, Walter Vaughn, told the Associated Press, "The world lost a leader. My son was a born leader."

SGT Vaughn's survivors include his wife, Contessa Williams Vaughn; stepdaughter, Ashley Martin; father and stepmother, Walter and Pat Vaughn; mother, RaNae Smith Vaughn, as well as a brother, sister, and two step-sisters.

In 2011, H.R. 2213, introduced by Representative Alan Nunnelee, designated the Iuka, MS Post Office as the "Sergeant Jason W. Vaughn Post Office." As of July 1, 2017, the portion of Mississippi Highway 25 within the city limits of Iuka, MS will be known as the "SGT Jason Vaughn Memorial Highway."

The sacrifice of this brave soldier will always be remembered.

TRIBUTE TO DUKE PRESIDENT
RICHARD BRODHEAD

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the career of Duke University

President Richard Brodhead, who is stepping down after 13 years of service.

Dick Brodhead succeeded Nan Keohane in 2004 as the 9th president of Duke University, attracted by what another president, former Governor Terry Sanford, defined as the university's "outrageous ambition." President Brodhead has led the university on a new trajectory of growth and international renown. In one of his first major actions as president, he led an effort to greatly expand the endowment for financial aid, which has allowed academically talented students to pursue a Duke degree regardless of their financial circumstances. President Brodhead's time at Duke has been transformative, from the renewal of campus gems such as Duke Chapel, Baldwin Auditorium, West Union, and athletic facilities to the construction of a series of stunning new research facilities.

Dick Brodhead also embraced and amplified one of Duke's enduring themes: knowledge in the service of society. He launched DukeEngage, a civic engagement program that provides undergraduates the opportunity to apply their knowledge to challenges in communities in the U.S. and around the globe. Under his leadership, Duke established the Duke Global Health Institute, which translates research to address health inequities around the world.

Further expanding Duke's global reach were the creation of Duke Kunshan University in China and the construction of the Duke-NUS Medical School in Singapore. Closer to home, he enriched Duke's relationship with the City of Durham by investing in K-12 education, community health clinics, and neighborhood revitalization and helping spark the renaissance of downtown Durham.

President Brodhead had the opportunity to help Duke celebrate ten NCAA national championships won by men's basketball and lacrosse and women's golf and tennis teams, while a host of Duke student-athletes were victorious as individual national champions and Olympic medalists. At the same time, Duke ensured that athletics upheld the academic mission of the university.

An expert in 19th-century American literature, President Brodhead came to Duke after a distinguished teaching and administrative career at Yale University. He has authored or edited more than a dozen books on America's great writers, including analysis of the works of Hawthorne, Faulkner, and Welty.

President Brodhead has also assumed a national leadership role in higher education. Elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 2004, he was named the Co-Chair of the Academy's Commission on the Humanities and Social Sciences, created at the request of a bipartisan group of House and Senate members, including myself, to bolster teaching and research in the humanities and social sciences. The Commission's 2013 report, *The Heart of the Matter: The Humanities and Social Sciences for a Vibrant, Competitive, and Secure Nation*, stands out for the persuasiveness of its argument and its practical import. Dick Brodhead was a hands-on co-chairman and has played an active role in the report's dissemination.

Cindy Brodhead has been of indispensable support to Dick throughout his tenure. Cindy

has a background in corporate and regulatory law and has made significant contributions to the arts and humanities across our state. She has served on the boards of the Carolina Ballet and Preservation North Carolina and has rendered outstanding service as chair of the North Carolina Humanities Council.

My wife Lisa joins me in thanking Dick and Cindy Brodhead for their friendship and for all they have given to Duke, Durham, and North Carolina. We are fortunate indeed that they have devoted their great energy and talent to our community, and we wish them well as they open the next chapter in their lives.

IN MEMORY OF FURMAN
RAYMOND YOUNGINER

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 2017, South Carolina lost a dedicated public servant with the death of Furman Younginer. As the Mayor of Irmo for 16 years, he was a crucial part of the modernization and transformation of the town from a sleepy village to one of America's fastest growing communities. He was also a committed Christian, dedicated family man, and U.S. Army veteran. He will be greatly missed.

The following thoughtful obituary was published in *The State* on February 18, 2017:

Furman Raymond Younginer passed peacefully into eternal life Thursday, February 16, 2017. Born November 14, 1923, in Irmo, SC, he was the son of the late Raymond Samuel Younginer and Gertrude Petty Younginer of Irmo. He was predeceased by his wife of 62 years, Louise O'Sheal Younginer.

A lifelong resident of Irmo, Mr. Younginer was educated in the Irmo schools and graduated from Irmo High in 1941. After graduation, he began working in the Accounting Department with the Columbia, Newberry, and Laurens (CN&L) Railroad and continued in this position until he was drafted into the U.S. Army at the age of 19. He served in the U.S. Army during World War II, from April 15, 1943 until he was honorably discharged December 14, 1945.

His years of service for his country began with basic training at Fort Jackson. He was sent to Washington, D.C. for a short while and in September 1943 he was sent to Camp Patrick Henry (Newport News, VA) where he boarded a Liberty ship. He traveled across the ocean for 17 days to begin his service in the European theatre of operations. He first landed in Casablanca and then traveled via train, in boxcars, across North Africa. He was sent to Italy to serve in the Allied Control Commission (Military Government for the Italy 2675th Regiment) under the command of General Mark Clark. Mr. Younginer was based in a number of Italian cities, but he was assigned to Rome for the majority of his time and while there, he attended classes at the University of Rome. He often recalled that while in Rome, he learned the good news of the wars end and that he would soon return home.

Following the end of World War II, he returned to Irmo, attended the University of South Carolina, and continued his work in accounting for the CN&L Railroad (now, part of CSX Railroad). His job position was Assistant Secretary/Treasurer and he was responsible for the financial and managerial

junctions in the Columbia office of the CN&L. He was employed by the CN&L Railroad for 42 years and retired in March 1983.

As a member of America's Greatest Generation, Mr. Younginer's experiences in World War II gave him many insights which he related to and envisioned for his hometown of Irmo. He acknowledged the positive aspects of the many places to which he had been assigned or visited and sought to incorporate those features that would promote civics, leadership, and progress in the community. In 1951, Furman Younginer was elected to the Irmo Town Council and he remained on the Council until 1961 when he was elected Mayor of Irmo. He served as Irmo's mayor for 16 years (1961-1977) and during his administration many changes and improvements occurred in the community. The Irmo area became well-known as an ideal place for families to live. Mr. Younginer cooperated with industry and real estate developers, envisioning a bright and productive future for Irmo.

Mr. Younginer was a lifelong member of the Irmo Pentecostal Holiness Church (now known as Irmo Family Worship Center). He accepted Jesus Christ as his Lord and Savior at age 9 and his faith and trust in God never wavered. He served multiple positions in the church including secretary-treasurer and Sunday School superintendent.

Furman Younginer will be forever remembered in the hearts of his friends and family. He leaves to cherish his memory, his five children and spouses: Miriam Y. and Donald E. Lovett, Caroline Y. and Frederick E. Sojourner, Ann Y. and Robert Gunning IV, Paul F. and Angela M. Younginer, Lucy Y. and Dr. R. Paul Austin. His ten beloved grandchildren are Furman D. Lovett (Emily), Maria L. Cole (Ryan), Caroline Ingram, Robert Gunning V. (Hannah), Laura Gunning Morgan (Tommy), Andrew Gunning, Anna Younginer, Robert Paul Austin III, Lewis Austin, Smith Austin. His four great-grandchildren are Charles Cole, Lily Cole, Molley Gunning, Sophie Gunning. His dearly loved sisters are Orine Younginer, Mildred Younginer, Blanche Younginer (deceased), Betty Younginer, and Vernelle Y. Jones (Rev. Sanford Jones).

The family appreciates the expressions of kindness bestowed upon Mr. Younginer throughout his life. He took pride in wearing his cap with the emblem, World War II Veteran, and individuals frequently greeted him with appreciation for his service to our country. He maintained and treasured his friendships with former coworkers, community members, church family, and his many devoted friends.

Visitation will be from 4 until 6:00 PM, Saturday, February 18, 2017, at Dunbar Funeral Home, Dutch Fork Chapel, Irmo. The funeral will be at 3:00 PM, Sunday, February 19, 2017 at Irmo Family Worship Center at 10501 Broad River Rd, Irmo, SC 29063 with burial immediately following in the church cemetery.

TRIBUTE TO THE ALTOONA LIONS CLUB

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Altoona Lions Club as

they celebrate their 70th anniversary. The club was chartered on April 24th, 1947.

Some of the current members were children when their parents became charter members of the club, and for them, Lions has been a way of life. They remember when the sheriff, who was a member, would go out and "arrest" members who were not at a meeting, or an undertaker who would use his hearse to pick up absent members and make them ride in the back. While these jokes are now a thing of the past, what hasn't changed is the club's focus to help serve and better their community. The Altoona chapter makes it a priority to ensure there are plenty of opportunities for members to volunteer their time and skills.

For the past 53 years, the club has run a spin art booth at the Iowa State Fair, and their website features a lengthy page listing all of the services and activities they are involved with, including food banks, eye care, scouting, veterans memorials, local law enforcement and local parks. It is surely hard to determine just how many people have benefited from the big hearts of Lions Club members over the past 70 years, but Altoona is undoubtedly a better place because of it.

Mr. Speaker, the volunteer spirit is alive and well in groups like the Altoona Lions Club, and I am honored to represent their members in the United States Congress. I ask that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating the Altoona Lions Club on 70 great years, and in wishing them continued growth and success in the years to come.

HONORING MR. RABBI LEE T. BYCEL

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rabbi Lee T. Bycel upon his retirement after serving Congregation Beth Shalom (CBS) and the Napa community since 2012. In addition to being a well-liked and respected spiritual leader, Rabbi Bycel served as an Adjunct Professor of Jewish Studies and Social Justice at the University of San Francisco.

Rabbi Bycel graduated from the University of California at Berkeley with a BA in Philosophy, received his rabbinic ordination from the Hebrew Union College, and earned a doctorate from the Claremont School of Theology. Growing up in Southeast Los Angeles County, he learned the importance of diversity and inclusiveness. He was raised in a mostly Latino neighborhood, in one of just two Jewish families in the community. Rabbi Bycel has said, "I respect and care about all human beings on this earth," and has demonstrated this through his countless humanitarian efforts.

A leader in educational, cultural, and social justice, he has made several humanitarian trips to East Africa, including Darfur, Chad, South Sudan, Kenya, Haiti, Ethiopia, and Rwanda. In Rwanda, he visited refugee and internally displaced person camps, helped address poverty and disease, and spoke out

against genocide. Rabbi Bycel is one of the coalition founders and 2017 Co-Chair of MLK Monday: A Day of Action and Compassion, which is a community of over 80 nonprofit organizations, faith groups, government officials, and agencies, local businesses, and local service organizations who join together each year to celebrate the life and legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. In 2014, Rabbi Bycel was appointed by President Obama to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Council. He has been recognized for his work with the Humanitarian Award of the National Conference for Community and Justice (NCCJ).

Rabbi Bycel is also an educational leader, sharing with the Congregation Beth Shalom his fifteen years of experience as the Dean of the Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion in Los Angeles. There he also served as the Senior Academic and Administrative Officer of the campus and director of the rabbinic school. He served as Assistant Professor of Leadership and Applied Theology and the Smither Visiting Professor of World Religions at the Claremont School of Theology.

Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Bycel is a humanitarian anchored in Jewish values. He is an exceptional community leader, humanitarian, and husband in our community. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor him here today and extend our best wishes for an enjoyable retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes Wednesday, May 17, 2017. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on roll call votes 259, 260, 261, and "Yea" on roll call vote 262.

HONORING THE LIFE OF PEGGY DIETRICK

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Mrs. Peggy Dietrick, a beloved artist and entrepreneur from Laredo, Texas.

Mrs. Dietrick was born on July 24th, 1924, to parents Adolph and Flavia (Branch) Dietrick in Salem, Illinois. Over the course of her career, she traveled throughout the world to perform. Her career led her to Las Vegas, where she performed for several years before ultimately moving to Texas. After moving to Laredo in 1965, Dietrick established the Laredo Beauty College, which is still in operation today.

An actress, musician and singer, Dietrick was unquestionably an instrumental force in the local theater community. She was involved

in productions with the Laredo Little Theater, where she starred in many plays, performed with the Laredo Philharmonic Orchestra and was a patron of the Laredo Theater Guild International. Her dedication to the arts serves as a model that all should strive to emulate.

Serving others was at the heart of all that Dietrick did throughout her life. Her commitment to improving the lives of others, such as through helping people to find employment opportunities after graduating from the beauty college, exemplifies her passion for serving others. In addition, her commitment to the arts highlights her firm belief in the value of education for the public. Without a doubt, her life clearly demonstrates what it means to be a charitable and caring person.

Peggy is survived by her husband, John of St. Louis, Missouri; nephew, Michael Rhoads of San Antonio, Texas; niece, Deborah Dietrick; great-nephews, Christopher Holm (Ashley), Andrew Holm (Anne), Scott Holm (Susan) and Chad Rhoads; as well as many great-great nieces, nephews, other family members and countless friends. Both her family and the community as a whole will remember Peggy for her unforgettable charm, utter kindness and commitment to service.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize the life of Mrs. Peggy Dietrick.

HONORING CHARLES SELMON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a public servant, Charles Selmon. Mr. Selmon has shown what can be done through tenacity, dedication and a desire to serve Warren County.

Mr. Selmon earned a Bachelor of Science in Social Work and a Master's Degree in Counseling Psychology from Mississippi College. He studied Economic Development at the University of Southern Mississippi. He furthered his studies in the Post Master's Degree program at Jackson State University. Mr. Selmon has received National Security Training from the U.S. Army War College located in Carlisle, PA.

Mr. Selmon has served as a Psychology Instructor at both Alcorn State University and Hinds Community College. Mr. Selmon was elected to the Warren County Board of Supervisors position in 1996. He was elected to a fifth term with the Warren County Board of Supervisors. While serving on the Board of Supervisors Mr. Selmon has served as President and Vice-President. He has also served as President of the Mississippi Association of Supervisors (MAS) and as President of the Mississippi Association of Supervisors Minority Caucus. Mr. Selmon was chosen to represent the State of Mississippi with the National Association of Counties regarding Human Services.

Mr. Selmon is a member of the Warren County Economic Development Committee, Back-To-School Committee (School Day Supplies), Warren County Community Develop-

ment Committee (Senior Citizens Dinner), and serves on the Workforce Investment Board. He is the President of the Boys and Girls Club of Vicksburg which he established.

Mr. Selmon was appointed Superintendent of Sunday School and selected to the Deacon Board of Travelers Rest Baptist Church.

Mr. Selmon received the President Award for Distinguished Leadership in Government.

Mr. Selmon is the father of twin daughters, Alyshia and Tericka Selmon. He is married to Fredia Selmon.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Supervisor Charles Selmon for his services to Warren County.

TRIBUTE TO EVELYN AND TED PIKE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Evelyn and Ted Pike of Des Moines, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 65th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on May 3rd, 2017.

Evelyn and Ted's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 65th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 65th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them nothing but continued happiness.

INTRODUCTION OF STOP DECEPTIVE ADVERTISING FOR WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE SERVICES

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to reintroduce the Stop Deceptive Advertising for Women's Healthcare Services Act to make sure that women receive honest information about family planning services.

Expecting mothers should never be misled about critical health information and services. Yet that is exactly what is happening today all across the country. Commonly called crisis pregnancy centers (CPCs), these centers often have an anti-choice agenda and deliberately misinform or mislead pregnant women seeking information about family planning services, including abortion. CPC's masquerade as sources of unbiased pregnancy counseling or even abortion providers, yet they often have no medical professionals on staff. CPC's use deceptive propaganda to dis-

suade women from considering comprehensive birth control options or legal abortion. These fake reproductive health clinics entice women with unintended pregnancies through their doors under the pretense of providing the full range of reproductive options and services. Instead, they peddle scientifically unfounded information claiming that abortion leads to adverse health outcomes or can affect chances of pregnancy in the future. CPCs should be held accountable if they deliberately mislead women who are seeking legitimate medical assistance and advice.

The Stop Deceptive Advertising for Women's Healthcare Services Act directs the Federal Trade Commission to promulgate rules under the Federal Trade Commission Act, declaring it an unfair or deceptive act for an entity, such as a crisis pregnancy center, to advertise as a provider of abortion services if the entity does not provide abortion services.

I thank my friend Rep. SUZANNE BONAMICI for leading this critical effort with me. During National Women's Health Week, I hope you will join us in cosponsoring this legislation that demands that crisis pregnancy centers, some of which receive federal funds, are prohibited from making false advertising claims that intimidate and harm women who are looking for help and honest medical advice.

IN RECOGNITION OF THERESE LEDOUX

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Therese Ledoux on the occasion of her 100th birthday this month.

Born on May 5, 1917 to George Ethier and Albina Chevalier, Mrs. Ledoux attended boarding school in Canada before leaving to work for her father's insurance business in Woonsocket, Rhode Island. Starting in 1958 she became the Town of Acushnet's first kindergarten teacher at the St. Francis Xavier Elementary School—where she remained for more than 30 years as a beloved kindergarten teacher. To this day, Mrs. Ledoux continues to volunteer each week at the school, where she is considered a local celebrity and is held in the highest esteem by staff, students, and the Acushnet community alike.

Active both in mind and soul, Mrs. Ledoux's hobbies include doing puzzles and knitting. Her knitting projects include blankets for newly baptized children at the St. Francis Xavier Church in Acushnet. Additionally, she has made it a tradition to bake meat pies for New Year's Day—a practice she has passed onto to her daughters and grandchildren.

Over the more than seventy years she has lived in Acushnet, Mrs. Ledoux has been honored for her outstanding services by being awarded the Marian Medal by the Fall River Diocese and being named the Acushnet Woman of the Year by the Standard Times newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Therese Ledoux on this joyous occasion. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing her many more

years of health and happiness surrounded by her children, grandchildren, great grandchildren, and great great grandchildren.

DISAPPEARED, JAILED, AND TORTURED IN CHINA: WIVES PETITION FOR THEIR HUSBANDS' FREEDOM

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, lawyer Xie Yang was tortured for the better part of two years because he dared to represent China's poor and persecuted. The account of his detention is both harrowing and horrible.

Xie Yang was sleep deprived and kept in isolation. Squads of police punched and kicked him for hours at a time. He was forced to sit still for hours on a precarious stack of plastic chairs; his feet dangling painfully off the ground. Police made threats to his wife and children and said they would turn him into an "invalid" unless he confessed to political crimes.

Xie Yang and his fellow human rights lawyers wanted the best for China, but they got the very worst.

Since July 2015, almost 250 lawyers and legal assistants were detained sending a chilling message to those fighting for legal reforms and human rights.

At yesterday's hearing in the human rights subcommittee that I chair, we came together to shine a light on the brutal, illegal, and dehumanizing use of torture and forced disappearance of human rights lawyers and rights advocates in China.

We shine a light on dictatorships because nothing good happens in the dark. And, as we learned yesterday, there are some very dark places in China.

Chinese officials repeatedly tell me I should focus more on the positive aspects of China and not dwell so much on the negative.

That is a difficult task when you read Xie Yang's story, read Gao Zhisheng's account of his torture, or read the accounts of Yu Jie or Golog Jigme or Yin Liping.

It is a difficult task when you look at Li Chunfu and his brother Li Heping.

These are some of China's best and bravest—now with broken bodies, shattered minds and faces that have aged 20 years after two years of solitary confinement and torture.

It is shocking, offensive, immoral, and inhumane. It is also completely possible that Chinese officials believe the international community will not hold them accountable.

While President Xi Jinping is feted at Davos and lauded in foreign capitals for his public commitment to openness, his government is torturing and abusing those seeking rights guaranteed by China's own Constitution and its international obligations.

One Oxford university scholar has said that Xi has built the "perfect dictatorship"—an increasingly repressive garrison state that avoids any international censure.

Through the UN and the sanctions available in the Global Magnitsky Act, we should be

seeking to hold accountable any Chinese officials complicit in torture and illegal detentions.

Xie Yang identified at least 10 police officers who tortured him. We are in the process of gathering names and identifying information. I will then send those names to President Trump, Secretary of State Tillerson, UN Ambassador Nikki Haley, and the Chairs and ranking members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

We will seek UN investigations into the torture of China's human rights lawyers and human rights defenders because their treatment in detention violates China's obligations as signatory of the UN Torture Convention.

We will also seek investigations under the Global Magnitsky Act. I introduced the House version of that bill, which was signed into law last year.

That law says explicitly that any foreign government officials who engages in or is complicit in torture can be sanctioned—by denying entry visas into the United State or by imposing financial sanctions.

Those who tortured Xie Yang and Li Heping should never benefit from access to the United States or our financial system.

We will hear testimony yesterday from the wives of detained human rights lawyers. We also heard from Ms. Li Ching-Yu, the wife of detained Taiwanese democracy advocate Lee Ming-che.

After entering mainland China in March of this year for a personal trip, Mr. Lee went missing for 10 days before Chinese officials confirmed that he was being held on so-called "national security" grounds.

Many fear Mr. Lee is being detained under a harsh new Chinese law to monitor and control foreignfunded NGOs, enforced earlier this year as part of a crackdown on civil society. His detention fits the trend of the Chinese government targeting activists, dissidents, or even scholars based abroad.

The Taiwan government is working behind the scenes to resolve Lee Ming-che's case, though I am sure such efforts are hindered by Taiwan's lack of international clout and its complicated diplomatic ties with Beijing.

As I have said before, Taiwan is an important democratic ally and a beacon of peace and democracy in Asia. The U.S. should remain committed to the Taiwan Relations Act and the "Six Assurances" as cornerstones of U.S.-Taiwan relations.

Political issues between China and Taiwan should be resolved through appropriate mechanisms between the two sides. The Chinese government decision to detain Lee Ming-che signaled Chinese officials' willingness to break its international human rights obligations for political gains, needlessly straining cross-strait relations.

We welcomed Ms. Li Ching-Yu's testimony yesterday in order to increase the level of international interest and attention to her husband's case.

The Chinese government is facing a new and unexpected phenomenon—effective advocacy campaigns waged by the wives of tortured and detained rights advocates. I truly admire the brave women who are challenging the Chinese government to live up to its highest ideals. They are an inspiration.

Through the testimony provided during yesterday's hearing, we considered the almost two year effort by President Xi Jinping's government to eviscerate China's network of human rights lawyers and consider how the continued detention of Lee Ming-che has negatively impacted cross-strait relations between Beijing and Taipei.

HONORING ASHLEY WILSON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable young lady, Ms. Ashley Wilson of Crystal Springs, Mississippi. Ashley is a proud native of Crystal Springs, MS. She is a recent graduate of Jackson State University, where she obtained a Bachelor of Science in Healthcare Administration.

Ashley is a Senior Intern who serves as the Financial/Events Planning Specialist at One Voice. She has been with the organization since 2011 and is set to serve as the Chair for the organization's 10th Year Anniversary Celebration.

Making a difference in her home town, Ashley has served as an advocate for her community, where she has served as an Advisory Member to the Crystal Springs Mayoral Council and a member of the Citizens Making a Difference (CMADCS), an organization that acts as a voice for the people's concerns for the city of Crystal Springs.

Furthermore, Ashley has also served on many other committees across the state, such as the 50th Anniversary Commemoration Committee, Mississippi Meeting of the Minds Planning Committee and many other various committees where she has played a vital role in being a voice for change not only in her community, but across the state of Mississippi.

Ashley is currently an active member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). As a healthcare advocate for the Mississippi State Conference NAACP, she has worked with several healthcare related projects. The projects that have touched her heart the most include the NAACP's Childhood Obesity Project and the national GET HYPE Initiative, which focuses on healthy eating for today's youth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Ashley Wilson for her dedication to serving throughout her community and throughout organizations around Mississippi.

TRIBUTE TO MILDRED HARMON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mildred Harmon of Windsor Heights, Iowa, on the special occasion of celebrating her 105th birthday on May 4th, 2017.

It was 1912 when Mildred entered this world on a farm near St. Charles, Iowa. It was a world much different than ours today. In an October 2013 interview with Iowa Living Magazine, Mildred recounted how she started school at the age of four at a country school, walking 1.25 miles round trip each day. That gave her more than enough exercise for her lifetime, she said. She graduated from high school, and then beauty school and became a hairstylist. She married Paris Harmon on December 20, 1936, starting a family that would go on to include three daughters, 10 grandchildren and 7 great grandchildren. Mildred's husband passed away in 2006, however she continues to be that strong and loving influence that her family relies on. Iowa Living Magazine discovered that her key to a long and happy life was humor, which she said was "the only way to get through life."

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent Mildred in the United States Congress and I'm proud to recognize her today on this momentous occasion. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating her and in wishing her nothing but continued happiness.

HONORING METROPOLITAN BAPTIST CHURCH ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 52ND ANNIVERSARY

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 52nd Anniversary of Metropolitan Baptist Church located in my Congressional district in the City of Rocky Mount, North Carolina. This Church has been a beacon of light in the community for more than half a century and has positively impacted generations of families in eastern North Carolina.

Metropolitan Baptist Church was founded on May 4, 1965, by a group of devout Christians eager to proclaim the goodness of the Lord. The Church's first worship service was held just five days later on May 9, 1965 in the auditorium of the Lincoln School. Reverend Benjamin Daniels, a Shaw University ministerial student, was the first to preach at Metropolitan. Despite these humble beginnings, the congregation remained faithful and steadfast and would go on to grow by leaps and bounds.

On July 23, 1967, Metropolitan Baptist Church held a groundbreaking ceremony to commemorate construction of a sanctuary at 1213 Leggett Road, where it still stands today. Reverend John W. Fleming presided over the first worship service in the new edifice on July 14, 1968.

Under the leadership of Reverend Dr. J. E. Arnette, Metropolitan Baptist Church continued to grow both physically and spiritually. Dr. Arnette oversaw the establishment of Boy and Girl Scout Troops, a Young Adult Sunday School Class, and provided food for needy families. These good deeds led to Metropolitan Baptist Church to be ranked 12th out of more than 1,700 Baptist Churches in North

Carolina by the General Baptist State Convention of North Carolina.

Reverend Raymond L. Privott succeeded Dr. Arnette and continued the tradition of providing outreach services that enhanced the growth and development of children. This included providing tutoring in community schools and providing preliminary SAT studies that greatly benefited young people in the Rocky Mount area.

Reverend Norman T. Davis served as interim pastor for two and a half years and continued Metropolitan Baptist Church's commitment to both God and the community. He was followed by Pastor Richard Allen Gerald, who has served as Senior Pastor of Metropolitan since 2004 and has been the spiritual leader to many families and individuals. His strong faith in God and preparedness for the ministry, has earned him a stellar reputation among Christian believers throughout our great state.

Mr. Speaker, by the grace of God, Metropolitan Baptist Church has been blessed for 52 long years as it has witnessed for Christ each and every day. The Church's faithfulness and scripture-based ministry will ensure that Metropolitan continues to thrive for years to come.

On behalf of the United States House of Representatives and the people of the First Congressional District of North Carolina, I extend to the Pastor and Members of Metropolitan Baptist Church my best wishes on this auspicious occasion.

CONGRATULATING JOHN T. LEWIS ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor John T. Lewis, the Director of Logistics and Support for the Chief Administrative Officer of the U.S. House of Representatives, on his upcoming retirement on June 2, 2017.

Beginning on June 1, 1978, John spent his entire thirty-nine year career with the U.S. House of Representatives and for over twenty years worked as an upholsterer. Starting as a laborer in the Clerk's office, John moved up the ranks to become a master upholsterer. One of his major accomplishments was learning how to upholster the special type of Turkish chairs used by Members of Congress. Many of these historic chairs remain in use by Members to this day.

John was then asked to take on a managerial role, serving as the Supervisor of Workflow Management, which involved developing purchasing spreadsheets and building asset tracking systems. However, after a couple of years in that position, John returned to the trade he loved in serving as the manager of the Textiles Department. In that role, John supervised the day-to-day operations of several shops, including upholstery, cabinet, finishing, drapery, and carpets.

Throughout his career, John oversaw several important projects including the redressing of the Lincoln catafalque, the replacement of the House Floor carpet, the re-upholstery of

every seat on the House Floor and in the Gallery, the complete refinishing of the House Floor dais, the construction of the lecterns and stenographers' desk, and the total refurbishment of the Speaker's chair. John led or assisted in twenty Congressional transitions and ten Presidential inaugurations. Among his most significant contributions was nurturing the furnishings team and coaching its members to be some of the most talented craftsman on Capitol Hill.

In his retirement, I hope John will enjoy time spent with his wife of thirty-seven years, Lisa, and his two daughters, Joanna Emily Caputi and Lauren Elisabeth Lewis, his parents, Bill and Anne Lewis, and other members of his extended family. On behalf of the entire House, I extend my congratulations and thanks to John T. Lewis for his many years of dedication and outstanding contributions to this institution. I wish him many wonderful years ahead.

IN RECOGNITION OF DAVID DiCHIERA FOR HIS LIFETIME OF ADVOCACY AND WORK WITH THE ARTS

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize David DiChiera for his outstanding legacy. As founder and artistic director of the Michigan Opera Theatre, Mr. DiChiera has built a culture of artistic excellence in Michigan.

After earning a doctorate in musicology from UCLA, Mr. DiChiera joined the faculty of Oakland University in Michigan in 1962, where he was eventually elected chairman of the school's Department of Music. During his time, he also oversaw the Detroit Grand Opera Association's education initiative known as the Overture to Opera. Under the leadership of Mr. DiChiera, Overture to Opera began performing full-length productions in 1970 and was officially reestablished as the Michigan Opera Theatre in 1971. The Michigan Opera Theatre has grown to become an internationally recognized institution that has brought world-class performances to Michigan while inspiring a new generation of artists and musicians. Mr. DiChiera had the vision to push for the restoration of the Detroit Opera House in 1996, and this effort played a critical role in revitalizing downtown Detroit. The Theatre has hosted renowned musicians like Luciano Pavarotti, as well as performances by the American Ballet Theater and other notable groups.

Mr. DiChiera's lifetime of artistic advocacy and passion for theatre has been critical to the growth and development of the arts in southeast Michigan. His love of the arts has taught and inspired generations to appreciate the importance of the arts to a community. He also galvanized so many to experience the opera and engage with the arts for their entire lives. Throughout his career, Mr. DiChiera has received numerous accolades for his work, including the National Endowment for the Arts'

Opera Honors award, as well as recognition by the governments of France and Italy. In addition to this outstanding record of achievement, Mr. DiChiera is well known in the Detroit community for his kindness and generosity. He has been a true champion for Michigan, and his energy and dedication to our state and the arts will be missed as he retires from his current position with the Michigan Opera Theatre.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring David DiChiera for his lifetime of work with the arts. Mr. DiChiera's work with the Michigan Opera Theatre has inspired generations of performers and helped the city understand the importance of arts in the community.

HONORING GUSTAVO BRAMBILA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gustavo Brambila, who owns and operates Gustavo Wine. Passion, skill, and dedication to his craft led Gustavo to the successes he sees today.

Born in Jalisco, Mexico, Gustavo immigrated to the United States with his mother and brothers to join his father in Oakville, California in 1957. The family moved to Rutherford, California in 1960, where Gustavo's father José worked in winery maintenance. Surrounded by the culture and devotion of famous winemakers from an early age, Gustavo grew up with a keen interest in winemaking. He attended the University of Oregon on a baseball scholarship, but his heart remained in wine country. He transferred to the University of California Davis, where he was one of the first Latinos to obtain a degree in Fermentation Sciences.

In 1976, Gustavo joined Mike Grgich and Jim Barrett at Chateau Montelena to begin his career. Soon after, he joined Grgich Hills Cellar, where, in his first harvest, he produced the winning Chardonnay in the Great Chardonnay Showdown of 1980. Gustavo continued with Grgich Hills Cellar for 23 years, honing his craft and working to define wine excellence.

Gustavo started his own wine enterprise, Gustavo Wines in 1996. Today he makes Napa Valley wines inspired by old-world winemaking techniques, with a dedication to small vineyards and quality fruit. He believes each wine should take you back "to a memory of each vintage".

Gustavo traveled to Washington, D.C. this week as part of a group of Mexican-American vintners to support the mission of the Smithsonian Institution. They shared their amazing stories of immigration, sacrifice and determination and helped the attendees understand the vital contributions Mexican Americans make to our economy and community.

Mr. Speaker, Gustavo Brambila has built a successful business and is producing extraordinary wines. I am proud to have such a dedicated business owner living and working in our community. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor him here today.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT PAUL VANCE ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with respect and admiration that I rise today to join all of those gathered in extending my sincere thanks and appreciation to Lieutenant Paul Vance as he celebrates his retirement after forty-three years of dedicated service to the Connecticut State Police force. His retirement marks the end of a distinguished career in law enforcement and the Connecticut State Police will simply not be the same without him.

Lieutenant Vance entered the Connecticut State Police Training Academy as a member of the 85th Training Troop in July of 1974. Following his graduation later that year, he embarked on a career that earned him a respected reputation amongst colleagues and civilians alike. Serving in a variety of posts, including Troop L in Litchfield and as a Resident State Trooper in Prospect, Lieutenant Vance rose through the ranks and is perhaps best known for his leadership as a member of the Connecticut State Police force's Public Information Office.

In a position he held for nearly one third of his career, Lieutenant Vance became, for many in Connecticut, the public face of our State Police. As a Public Information Officer, it was he who so often brought a sense of calm and order to very difficult circumstances. That composure was put to the ultimate test as he guided a grieving state and stunned nation through the aftermath of tragedy at the Sandy Hook Elementary School in December of 2012.

I hold a deep respect for the men and women who dedicate their professional careers to law enforcement—facing situations and circumstances that few of us can even imagine. Lieutenant Vance is a reflection of the very best of our law enforcement community. Over the course of his career, his commitment and leadership has made all the difference and we owe him a debt of gratitude that can never fully be paid. Lieutenant—though it does not seem enough, thank you for all of your good work on our behalf. You leave a legacy of service that will most certainly serve as an inspiration to others for years to come.

Lieutenant Paul Vance has led a remarkable career, leaving an indelible mark on the Connecticut State Police force as well as the State of Connecticut. Today, it is my great privilege to stand and join his wife, Meg, their three children and six grandchildren, as well as family, friends, and colleagues in wishing him the very best for many more years of health and happiness in this next chapter of his life.

RECOGNIZING E COMPANY, 141ST INFANTRY REGIMENT

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to recognize E Company, 141st Infantry Regiment, which served with valor and distinction during World War II.

In 1940, E Company, along with the entire 141st Infantry Regiment was federalized and assigned to the 36th Infantry Division. E Company was distinct in its heritage and was composed almost entirely of Mexican-American soldiers. A vast majority of E Company's soldiers hailed from El Paso.

The 141st Infantry Regiment shipped off to North Africa in April 1943. The regiment was one of the units in the amphibious invasion of Italy at Salerno, and they suffered heavy casualties. As the 141st fought its way through Italy, the regiment, as well as E Company, fought with distinction. The 141st reinforced units at Anzio, helped tip the scales to rout the Germans, and entered Rome in June 1944. This culminated 137 days of combat during which the 141st Infantry Regiment suffered over 3,000 casualties. The Germans called the 141st "wild men from Texas, skilled in fieldcraft and fighting."

The regiment then participated in a third amphibious landing, its second combat assault against a fortified beachhead, and entered Southern France. The 141st continued to fight through Central Europe. E Company participated with the regiment in all its major campaigns and battles. The unit deactivated in December 1945 after the war. The regiment had suffered 1,126 killed, more than 5,000 wounded, and over 500 missing in action. Its soldiers were awarded an astonishing three Medals of Honor, 31 Distinguished Service Crosses, 492 Silver Stars, and 1,685 Bronze Stars.

The valor and bravery of the soldiers of E Company, 141st Infantry Regiment must not be forgotten. As America prepares to reflect on the sacrifices made by our service members this Memorial Day, I ask that we take a moment to remember the soldiers of E Company. They represented the best of El Paso, Texas, and the nation as our brave service members valiantly fought the forces of tyranny. I am honored to represent the men and women of El Paso who carry on the legacy of E Company as they continue to stand against injustice and pursue the American dream.

TRIBUTE TO MARTHA AND JACK BLACKFORD

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Martha and Jack Blackford of Des Moines, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on April 16th, 2017.

Martha and Jack's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them nothing but the best in the years to come.

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPUTY JEFFERY DEAN
ASSISTS ROBBERY VICTIM

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding public service of San Bernardino County Sheriff's Deputy Jeffery Dean, who is assigned to the department's Victorville City Station. For the past three years, Deputy Dean has served as a patrol deputy, traffic division deputy, and is also a certified Major Accident Investigation Team (MAIT) deputy.

On May 14, 2017, Deputy Dean was on patrol in Victorville, California when he made contact with a young man from the State of Washington who was working in the area as a magazine salesman. Deputy Dean noticed injuries to the man's face and was told that they were the result of a robbery in which the victim's wallet and cell phone were stolen.

Realizing the man's dire situation, Deputy Dean took it upon himself to pay for the man to stay in a hotel room, and he purchased a bus ticket so the victim could return to his family in Washington.

Every day, men and women in the law enforcement profession work tirelessly to make a difference in our communities. However, often times, their work goes unnoticed in the media and press. I would like to take a moment to highlight the great work of Deputy Dean and the entire San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department for their commitment to public service.

HONORING CONSTANCE BLAND

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Constance Bland, who is an Educator, a Leader and Public Servant.

Constance G. Bland, Ph.D. was appointed Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) at Mississippi Valley State University (MVSU) in the spring of 2014. As VPAA, she is responsible for leadership, educational policy, academic programs, budgeting and resource allocation; supervision of staff development pro-

grams, federal grant program administration; monitoring of personnel actions and transactions, and participation in academic personnel policy development and negotiation. She is also responsible for relationships with the wider educational and occupational community, particularly the public schools, as well as additional responsibilities as assigned by the President.

Before becoming VPAA, Dr. Bland was Professor and Chair of the Department of Mathematics, Computer and Information Sciences. She developed computer science educational curriculum related to database management systems, software engineering and introduction to computer science. In an effort to impact retention of computer science majors, she was involved in a project to determine the impact of introducing the concepts of object oriented programming for first year computer science students using a visual animation tool known as Alice.

Dr. Bland also acquired significant external funding for the department from sources including the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), Eisenhower (state of Mississippi), SUN Microsystems and mini-grants from Jackson State University. Her last external funds secured for the department included an S-STEM scholarship grant and an HBCU-UP implementation grant. A major focus of the scholarship grants secured by Dr. Bland involved initiatives to increase the number of computer science and mathematics majors at MVSU. Funds secured were used to institute tutorial services, provide student development activities and support debt reduction through scholarships to decrease external employment of students seeking degrees. The goal of the latest HBCU-UP grant is to encourage STEM graduates to pursue graduate education.

Dr. Bland has devoted 23 years of service to MVSU, and has demonstrated her passion and commitment to the University, faculty, staff and students. Her involvement has been extensive, yet she finds time and energy to serve, work and lead, shouldering countless burdens with good humor and grace. She is a tower of strength and a strong force for progressive efficient public service. She always shows patience and tolerance, qualities of an experienced and committed leader. Dr. Bland is a visionary leader who inspires staff, students and the community. She is responsible for developing MVSU's first Women in Science and Technology Conference (WIST) designed to encourage young girls in grades 7th through 12th to consider majoring in STEM disciplines. The conference will celebrate its 20th anniversary in Spring 2016 and can boast of numerous female students who have gone on to become practicing women in science and technology.

Dr. Bland holds an Associate's degree in Mathematics from Coahoma Junior College, a Bachelor of Arts in mathematics, Bachelor of Science in computer science, Master of Science degree in computer science and a Doctoral degree in computer engineering from the University of Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Constance Bland, an Educator, a leader and Public Servant for her dedication

to serving others and giving back to the African American community.

RECOGNIZING THE DEDICATION OF
THE WASHINGTON SPY TRAIL ON
LONG ISLAND AND THE SERVICE
OF THE CULPER SPY RING IN
THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. LEE M. ZELDIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today alongside my colleague Mr. SUOZZI to recognize the dedication of Route 25A on Long Island's North Shore as the Washington Spy Trail and to pay special tribute to the brave men and women of the Culper Spy Ring, considered the first organized espionage ring in the United States. We thank these dedicated patriots for their loyalty and bravery. During the American Revolution, Long Island's North Country Road (now State Route 25A) was the road traveled by George Washington in 1790 to thank patriots for helping him win the American Revolution. It is also the road that Culper Spy Austin Roe traveled to cross enemy lines to pick up and deliver secret messages to other brave men and women serving in the Continental Army's military intelligence and espionage units in New York City. Today, a special dedication ceremony will take place at the Brewster House (built in 1665) in Setauket, NY, where three historical markers will be unveiled across this route to commemorate the unsung sacrifice of the Culper Spy Ring and the critical role they played in our nation's struggle for independence.

The Culper Ring, also known as the Setauket Spy Ring, was a group of operatives whose purpose was to make General George Washington aware of the movements of the British in New York City and on Long Island. The Long Island Culper Spy Ring was a band of dedicated and brave patriots who served valiantly at a time when getting caught as a spy could mean certain death by hanging or rotting to death on a British prison ship. The Culper Spy Ring's strategic location on Long Island's North Shore, situated between patriot New England and British occupied New York City, had a tremendous impact on the outcome of the war. The ring was of great military importance and contributed to many of the decisive victories of the Continental Army, including those at Trenton, Saratoga, and Yorktown. The critical intelligence gathered by the Culper Spies also uncovered the betrayal of Benedict Arnold and his treasonous plan to surrender West Point to the British. The brave work of the Culper Spies was also critical in thwarting a planned British assault on newly arrived French allied forces that landed at Rhode Island in 1780 to help turn the tide of the war.

Mr. Speaker, many of these brave men and women, through the nature of their clandestine service to the American Revolution, never had their names recorded in history. For the names that we do know, I ask my colleagues to honor their bravery and service, and I include their names in the RECORD.

Benjamin Tallmadge: (Code Name: John Bolton.) He reported directly to General

George Washington, and was his director of military intelligence. He created the patriot spy ring operating out of New York City and headed the Culper Ring out of the village of Setauket on Long Island.

Robert Townsend: The Chief informant of the Culper Spy Ring and Benjamin Tallmadge's right hand man. He posed as a Tory merchant and befriended many British soldiers in New York City to gather intelligence. Because of his society connections, he was widely known in British circles. He was a resident of Oyster Bay, NY.

Austin Roe: He served as the messenger for Robert Townsend. He owned a store and tavern in Setauket and rode fifty-five miles back and forth to New York City several times per week through British held areas to deliver and pick up coded messages written in invisible ink.

Abraham Woodhull: (Code Name: Samuel Culper Sr.) He was an intricate part of the circuitous way the ring shared critical intelligence. Woodhull's farm in Setauket was his base of operation and it was there that he allowed Austin Roe to pasture his cows so they had a place to hide messages in a secret box.

Caleb Brewster: As a member of the ring, he was the intermediary between Abraham Woodhull's farm in Setauket and Major Tallmadge's headquarters in Connecticut. Brewster was a seafarer from Setauket and used his whaleboats to cross the Long Island Sound to Connecticut. He was also responsible for capturing many British supply ships that were carrying messages.

Anna Smith Strong: Setauket native Anna Smith Strong's assignment in the Culper Ring was to signal Brewster's arrival to Abraham Woodhull. She did this by hanging laundry on her clothesline in pre-arranged configurations, a system that fooled everyone by the wisdom of its simplicity. If she hung up a black petticoat, it meant that Brewster was in town to share critical intelligence.

These brave patriots will be recognized today, May 18, 2017, at the dedication of the Washington Spy Trail. Mr. Speaker, we should be extremely grateful as both a people and a nation to each and everyone of these individuals. To honor their memory, we must continue to uphold the values of the American Revolution that these brave men and women were willing to give up their lives and freedom for: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in celebration of National Infrastructure Week.

Here in Washington, meetings have brought together planners and civil engineers, builders and innovators, labor unions and developers—all dedicated to modernizing our American infrastructure. And it does need modernizing.

In my home state of Rhode Island, for example, one in four bridges is deficient, the worst rate in the country. They are battered by

storms and suffering from aging concrete and steel. Families and businesses alike suffer from this infrastructure debt.

That's why this week I introduced the "SAFE Bridges Act," which will provide a renewed focus on the safety of bridges across the country. It will create a discrete new way to prioritize those bridges most in need.

Mr. Speaker, it is "Time to Build." We need to invest in bread-and-butter projects, highways and transit that Americans depend on every day.

IN HONOR OF REDWOOD CITY'S SESQUICENTENNIAL

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the 150th birthday of one of the most beautiful and vibrant cities in my Congressional District: Redwood City.

Long before Redwood City was incorporated, the area was inhabited by the Ohlone who lived by hunting, fishing and gathering. The Ohlone had a rich culture and thrived on both sides of the mountain range that divides San Mateo County. Their villages dotted the countryside and the residents traded regularly with nearby tribes.

Spanish and Mexican explorers and settlers came later, and with them came rapid and substantial change. After the Mexican-American War, Spanish and Mexican land grants were challenged. Such was the case for Dona Arguello, who hired Simon Mezes to defend her land title. His payment was the land that now includes most of downtown Redwood City. Rather than fighting the squatters, he laid out the town and sold lots to them, naming his town Mezesville.

Access to San Francisco Bay made Redwood City an ideal location for a port. The port and the railway revolutionized shipping and travel in the 1800s. Industries continued to develop from oyster farming and canning to cement and salt production, to nurseries and small manufacturing plants.

Redwood City was incorporated in 1867 with the purpose of raising funds to pave downtown streets. The city has always been home to a diverse population. Joining the large Latino population, German immigrants started breweries and a tannery, the Chinese helped build the railroads and were engaged in shrimp fishing, and the Japanese brought the floral industry. In 1926, the Chamber of Commerce proclaimed Redwood City the "Chrysanthemum Capital of the World." The floral industry thrived until one of the darkest chapters of U.S. history, the internment of Japanese Americans during WWII.

Redwood City experienced several population and housing booms. The 1906 San Francisco earthquake displaced thousands who built new neighborhoods on the Peninsula. By 1920, many Redwood City residents were commuting to jobs outside the city. In the 1930s the population doubled. By 1937, a municipal marina and an international port with a widened channel were ready to ship cargo.

The largest population increase took place after World War II when Redwood City grew from 12,400 in 1940 to 46,300 in 1960. Today, there are 82,000 residents.

No one can mention Redwood City without celebrating its schools and the families that thrive through the district's services. Two great public high schools and multiple public elementary and middle schools, as well as several charter schools, offer the American dream of a quality, free public education to all. The city also incorporates several quality private schools.

Redwood City has amazing parks and is dotted with redwood trees. Beautiful hillsides in a nearby county park are covered with a plethora of wildflowers and are home to majestic mountain lions. The city itself is home to the San Mateo County History Museum. The city is also the county seat of San Mateo where I started my political career and have watched history unfold. Courthouse Square anchors a revitalized city core that includes a wonderful theater, restaurants and bakeries.

Redwood City is family-focused and young, with nearly 25 percent of its residents being under age 18. It offers cultural and recreational events in Courthouse Square throughout the year, aided in part by the city's wonderful weather. In fact, the beautiful weather is famously memorialized by the city's motto "Climate Best by Government Test." There are celebrations of multiple national backgrounds, religions and cultures that are welcomed by city residents. Foreign-born residents are 32 percent of all residents. The people of Redwood City are proud that their city is a miniature United Nations, speaking to America through dozens of languages heard daily on its streets.

In the heart of Silicon Valley, the city is home to such global brands as Oracle, Box.com and Google. One of today's newer and smaller companies creates 3D printers that will save our armed forces tens of millions of dollars and strengthen our national defense, while another small company seeks to end the dangers of hospital infection and opioid addiction by transforming the delivery of pain medications.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members of the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the sesquicentennial of Redwood City, a community that serves as a model for vibrancy and friendliness. It's a place where innovation soars because the celebration of the American spirit is ever-present. It is the real frontier of America because tomorrow is emerging through the celebration of our shared past, present and future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for roll call votes 263, 264, 265, and 266 on Thursday, May 18, 2017. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on roll call votes 263, 264, and

265; I would have voted "Yea" on roll call vote 266.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN SOLDIER MARINE CORPORAL (CPL) WILLIAM JUSTIN LEE COOPER

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of fallen soldier Marine Corporal William Justin Lee Cooper who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our nation on May 19, 2008, during Operation Enduring Freedom. Cpl Cooper was killed in combat near Garmsir, Afghanistan.

Cpl Cooper was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment, 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. According to 40 Days of Honor, Cpl Cooper's skill as a marksman earned him a position on a sniper team. It was in fulfillment of his duties as a sniper that he was killed. During his military service, Cpl Cooper was awarded the Good Conduct Medal, Combat Action Ribbon, Iraq Campaign Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Medal and two Sea Service Deployment Ribbons.

After graduating from Europa High School in 2004, Cpl Cooper briefly attended Holmes Community College. It was Christmas Eve of 2004 when Cpl Cooper told his father he was joining the Marine Corps. His father told the Associated Press, "I remember telling him that he needed to have a lot of thought before doing this. He felt his country needed him at the time more than he needed school." He also said of his son, "He had more friends than anyone I know. He was daddy's hero; now he's everyone's hero."

Cpl Cooper's friend, Heather Burchfield, told the Associated Press, "Coop was that fun-loving, crazy guy everyone liked. He's the one you always wanted on your side because he is always going to take up for you. Even in high school, he had a soldier's heart. He was a very loyal friend."

Cpl Cooper is survived by his parents, Alan Cooper and Debra Cooper.

The sacrifice of this brave soldier will always be remembered.

IN CELEBRATION OF 100 YEARS OF CHEERWINE

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor North Carolina's favorite soft drink, Cheerwine, which is celebrating their 100th anniversary on May 20, 2017.

Handcrafted in Salisbury, North Carolina, Cheerwine was created by L.D. Peeler, who sought to create a soft drink of his own during sugar rationing amid World War I. L.D. Peeler purchased cherry flavoring from a traveling salesman and experimented with the flavor until he created the one-of-a-kind soft drink. The end result is the delicious soft drink we know as Cheerwine.

Over the years, Cheerwine's unique flavor has stood the test of time—through the Great Depression, two World Wars and many other trials in our nation's history—Cheerwine has remained an independent family owned and operated business in North Carolina. Cheerwine was presented the "Pillar of the Community" award at the Family Business Awards for their excellence, innovation, ethics, philanthropy and contribution to the region and Cheerwine continues to invest in those communities that fostered its growth today. Presidents Dwight Eisenhower, George H.W. Bush, and Barack Obama all enjoyed Cheerwine during their trips to North Carolina and there is no doubt in my mind many more presidents will too.

L.D. Peeler and Cheerwine are deserving of their success and I wish them continued success as they continue to be a great source of pride for Rowan County and all of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today to congratulate Cheerwine on a century of success and to recognize the tremendous contributions they've made to the State of North Carolina.

HONORING VERKILYA ELESIA HOGAN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable person, an unsung hero, Ms. Verkilya Eleshia Hogan.

Ms. Verkilya Eleshia Hogan was born on July 25, 1999 to her proud parents Vernon and Sheronda Jackson. She is an intelligent, obedient, and outgoing young lady. She is also very passionate and dedicated to every task that she takes on.

Ms. Hogan very actively participates in many organizations and programs. She has

been a cheerleader since the fifth-grade and currently serves as Captain of the Holmes County Central High Varsity Cheer-Squad. She has remarkable leadership skills and continues to be a positive influence to those around her.

At an early age Ms. Hogan proudly experienced an amazing miracle of God which encouraged her to serve Him more daily. On May 18, 2016, she was involved in a detrimental UTV accident. A portion of her left forearm had to be amputated on May 24, 2016. As a teenager, this was disheartening because she didn't know how her future would be with her condition, but she knew God had already worked things out in her favor. She never lost faith through her circumstances, because she appreciated the simple fact that she could see and breathe each day. The Bible says, "From the fullness of his grace we have all received one blessing after another" John 1:16. This scripture, she believes, gives her good reason to give all glory and praises to God.

She will finish her senior year in high school with honors and attend the University of Southern Mississippi, majoring in Kinesiology and pursuing a career as a Physical Therapist. She is determined to go above and beyond to reach her goals and continue to walk in a positive direction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Verkilya Eleshia Hogan, an unsung hero, for her dedication to the community.

TRIBUTE TO JAY HOWE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jay Howe for his many years of service to the American Legion and to his country. Jay was recently honored for being a 50-year member with the American Legion.

The American Legion was chartered and incorporated by Congress in 1919 as a patriotic veterans organization devoted to mutual helpfulness. The organization is committed to mentoring youth and sponsorship of wholesome programs in communities, advocating patriotism and honor and continued devotion to their fellow service members and veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Jay for his service to our country's veterans and his dedication to his community. It is an honor to represent him in the United States Congress. I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in commending Jay for his service and in wishing him nothing but continued success.

SENATE—Monday, May 22, 2017

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our hearts rise up to meet You as the day rises to meet the Sun. Humble our lawmakers in Your presence that they may delight in the power You provide. Help them to remember that before honor comes humility. Give them also the wisdom to know that their sufficiency comes from You.

Lord, teach them Your wisdom as You infuse them with the spirit of reverence for You. May they make the commitment to faithfully serve You and country with their whole hearts.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Branstad nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Terry Branstad, of Iowa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, since last week's all-Senators briefing with Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein, some of my friends on the other side of the aisle have alleged that his appointment of a special counsel impedes the congressional investigation into Russian interference in our elections and whether the Trump campaign was involved. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The executive branch investigation under the special counsel looks at criminal wrongdoing. The congressional investigation takes a broader approach. The two can proceed on parallel tracks, as has happened many times in the past. If anything the congressional investigation is doing potentially interferes with the special counsel's activities, the two parties will discuss it. It is a process called deconfliction. They know how to do it. They have done it before. There is no reason whatsoever for the congressional investigation to slow down or stop.

Mr. Mueller's appointment as special counsel in no way diminishes the need for Congress to play an active role in helping to get to the bottom of all the recent events. Let me repeat. This is our solemn constitutional duty, the very bedrock of the separation of powers and coequal branches of government designed by our Founding Fathers to preserve something we all cherish: American liberty and American democracy. Let me outline three things that should happen.

First, Intelligence Committee Chair BURR and Ranking Member WARNER should continue to pursue their committee's investigation into these matters with just as much vigor. That investigation has been proceeding in a bipartisan way, and it absolutely should continue as such. For example, my friends Senators BURR and WARNER have recently requested financial records of key Trump campaign officials from the Treasury Department. They should be given that information and continue to pursue whatever other avenues they view as helpful to the committee's investigation.

Second, Mr. Comey should testify in both the Judiciary and the Intelligence Committees to discuss the events surrounding his dismissal. The committees should be given access to memos he reportedly drafted following interactions with President Trump, and Congress should also be provided any transcripts or tapes the White House might have of Mr. Comey's conversations with President Trump.

Third, the Intelligence Committee must be provided the details of transcripts relating to President Trump's reported disclosure of information to the Russian Foreign Minister and Ambassador. There is a great deal of dispute about what was said at that meeting. The committee should have access to both Mr. Comey's notes and the White House's notes.

Finally, the Senate must demand the next FBI Director be nonpartisan, independent, fearless, and of unimpeachable integrity, just as Mr. Mueller is. A career politician of either party or anyone who suggests a lack of impartiality should not be considered a fit choice for that office. Every one of these, by the way, deals with congressional oversight—some directly, like the appointment of an FBI Director; some a little more indirectly, such as figuring out what exactly was said in the room with the Russian Foreign Minister and Ambassador, but all of it is clearly within what the Constitution requires and the Founding Fathers wanted Congress to be. So the congressional committees have really an obligation to our democracy to continue their role.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, on another matter—healthcare. Today, the Trump administration delayed for another 90 days their decision on whether to defend the administration's position in a lawsuit filed by the House Republicans about the cost-sharing payments in the Affordable Care Act. It is a decision that greatly increases the uncertainty in our healthcare system.

The cost-sharing program keeps healthcare costs low for working Americans and helps insurers stay in the marketplace, giving Americans more choices. It keeps the average person's premiums down, keeps their deductibles low. It makes it a lot easier for many working Americans to afford healthcare. That was its purpose, and it is succeeding in its purpose, but by continuing to sow uncertainty about this program, both by refusing to defend the lawsuit and by making outright threats to end it, the Trump administration has already caused insurers to flee the marketplace or propose rate increases for the next year. Let me repeat. Right now, the Trump administration's actions are sowing great uncertainty that causes insurers to pull out of States and increase their costs, making it more likely that working Americans won't be able to afford coverage next year.

A spokesperson for America's Health Insurance Plans, AHIP, the industry's main trade group, said the following, and this is their quote, not mine:

We need swift action and long-term certainty on [the cost-sharing program]. It is the single most destabilizing factor in the individual market, and millions of Americans could soon feel the impact of fewer choices, higher costs and reduced access to care.

The insurance industry itself is saying that the No. 1 thing that could be done to keep costs down, to keep other insurers in the marketplace, is to make permanent cost sharing.

President Trump's attempt to blame what is happening on ObamaCare is totally contradicted by what the health insurance plans say when it comes to cost sharing. So refusing to guarantee the cost-sharing payments is sabotage, plain and simple, and the Trump administration knows it.

The administration made the last cost-sharing payment but refuses to say they will continue to make them permanently. They know they will get blamed for the chaos that would ensue should they end these payments. They are afraid to do that. But they also want to threaten the stability of the healthcare system in order to get Democrats to work with them on their healthcare bill. So what they tried to do is have their cake and eat it too. They said: We are going to delay the lawsuit, but we are still going to have that uncertainty that hurts Americans out there. That is profoundly irresponsible.

Threatening to defund healthcare in order to win political leverage is hostage-taking at its very worst because it holds hostage millions of innocent Americans who very much need healthcare costs to be lower and affordable. It is already causing massive uncertainty. It will only get worse if the administration continues to kick the can down the road 3 months at a time.

There is one very simple solution: Instead of delaying the decision every 3 months, the White House ought to step up to the plate and say once and for all that they will make those payments permanently—payments which help millions of Americans pay less for their healthcare, payments which the insurance industry itself says would help stabilize markets and help people gain healthcare.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Next, Mr. President, on the budget, the President of the United States will release his budget for 2018 this week. It could come as early as tomorrow. All indications are that it will be similar to his skinny budget from earlier this year. I want to remind everyone here in the Senate what a disaster that budget would be if it were ever implemented by Congress.

The President told the American people he would help create jobs and provide greater economic security for families. This budget does exactly the opposite. It is not a jobs budget. It is not an economic security budget. It is a budget that takes a meat cleaver to

the middle class by gutting programs that help them the most, including many that create jobs and power the economy. Transportation is cut. Education is cut. Programs that promote scientific and medical research are cut. Programs that protect clean air and clean water are cut. All of these programs are favored by the American people. They have been favored by a vast majority of my Republican friends across the aisle. But the President's budget is an outlier, way out there. It fits with Mr. Mulvaney's beliefs, but he was an outlier in the Congress when he called for the government to be shut down and when he wanted to have the government play so little a role in helping the middle class. That is harmful to America.

Here is another one that really is worrisome: Recent reports say that the President's budget will target Medicaid for significant cuts—as large or larger than the \$880 billion the House Republicans would cut in their TrumpCare bill. This would pull the rug out from so many Americans who need help—those suffering from opioid and heroin addiction, people in nursing homes and their families who care for them, the elderly, the disabled, and children.

Medicaid has become a middle-class program. Opioid addiction. What about a 40- or 50-year-old couple who is trying to raise their kids, saving for college, and has a parent who needs to be in a nursing home. Right now, Medicaid pays for it. What are they going to do when that is cut? They have two choices: Shell a huge amount of money out of their own pockets, which they can't afford, or maybe bring mom or dad back home, where there may be no room for them. What a horrible choice. What a horrible choice. Well, that is what the President is proposing to do when he dramatically slashes Medicaid.

I will repeat. Medicaid helps the very poor, but it also helps the middle class, and the majority of its money now seems to go to the middle class. I believe something like 60 percent goes to nursing homes or some high percentage like that.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that a cut to Medicaid of this size would deprive roughly 10 million Americans of Medicaid benefits over the next decade. Medicaid has always benefited the poor, and that is a good thing, but I remind my colleagues that it has increasingly become a middle-class program. Here is where it goes: Medicaid provides benefits for 60 percent of Americans in nursing homes.

Listen to this, Mr. President and my colleagues: Medicaid helps 1.75 million veterans—1 in 10. It provides services for Americans struggling with opioid addiction, which is a problem that affects so many.

If the reporting is accurate, these cuts to Medicaid that are in the Presi-

dent's budget carry a staggering human cost. Once again, Donald Trump is breaking his promise to the working people of America.

We have seen promise after promise broken as if they did not even matter. What he said in the campaign and what he governs as has almost no overlap in so many areas. Here is what Candidate Trump said when he campaigned: "I'm not going to cut Social Security like every other Republican and I'm not going to cut Medicare or Medicaid." He promised he would help take care of those suffering from opioid addiction. If he cuts Medicaid, he is breaking that promise—boom—right in half.

Candidate Trump campaigned as a populist and said he wanted to help the working people, but since he has taken office, he has governed like a hard-right conservative, pushing policies that help the uber-wealthy at the expense of the middle class. TrumpCare and the budget the President will be proposing tomorrow says one thing and does another.

Many of my Republican friends come from States that have significantly expanded their Medicaid Programs over the past few years, insuring hundreds of thousands, sometimes millions of their constituents.

Based on what we know about this budget, the good news—the only good news—is that it is likely to be roundly rejected by Members of both parties here in the Senate, just as the last budget was. Democrats and Republicans, on the 2017 budget, virtually ignored the President and his proposal. We got together, and we compromised. Not everyone got everything they wanted, but we produced a budget that America can be proud of and one that helps the middle class.

We have shown Democrats and Republicans, the House and Senate, can come together to compromise on appropriations in 2017. We should follow that same blueprint in 2018. We should ignore the President's budget which would devastate the middle class and instead work across the aisle to advance reasonable compromise legislation later this year.

I yield the floor to my good friend from Texas.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I came to the floor during the last part of the remarks of the distinguished Democratic leader, and it just reminded me of a headline I saw in this morning's newspaper that just, to me, exemplifies how dishonest, sometimes, the way questions are framed here when it comes to dealing with our financial responsibilities. The headline in the Washington Post talked about President Trump's proposal slashing Medicaid, like the Democrats have criticized the House healthcare replacement bill slashing Medicaid even

though, as a factual matter, Medicaid would continue to grow year after year after year.

As the distinguished Presiding Officer and I have previously discussed, one question is, What is a responsible rate of Consumer Price Index or inflation to deal with medical inflation so that when we return Medicaid to the States, spending at let's say 2016 levels, what is a responsible rate of continued growth to deal with medical inflation so that the States are not left with an unsustainable burden?

But the idea that spending at current levels, plus an additional cost-of-living index year after year after year, means that Medicaid spending won't go up every year—next year it will be more than this year. The following year it will be more than next year. So only in the fevered imagination of, apparently, the headline writers at the Washington Post and in some of our Democratic friends could that be considered a cut. In the rest of the country, they would consider that as Medicaid growing, not being cut.

It is true that one of the things the House did that I think is an important reform of one of our principle entitlement provisions was to put some sort of sustainable cap on the growth of spending on entitlements, which perviously had been uncapped.

Some day there is going to be a day of reckoning in this country when it comes to spending. We have \$20 trillion in debt. We know now that the Federal Reserve is loosening its hold on interest rates, that those are creeping up, and one of the estimates is that if interest rates due to improved economic performance were to reach historic norms, we would soon be paying more for interest on the national debt than we would be paying for defense spending. That is simply unsustainable, not to mention the fact that we would then be essentially appropriating 30 percent of what the Federal Government spends and leaving 70 percent untouched.

We can't get the country on a sustainable financial path just dealing with 30 percent of what the Federal Government spends, and we need to have a serious conversation, not a misleading characterization of the problem. We need a serious conversation about the reality facing our country and future generations because right now we are spending their inheritance, so to speak. In other words, I consider it an act of immorality for me to be spending money and forcing my children and future generations to pay it back. That is just not fair to them, and we need to come to grips with that sooner rather than later.

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. President, on another note, last week, the administration sent official notice to Congress of its intent to renegotiate the North American Free

Trade Agreement, or NAFTA. It was a big part of President Trump's campaign platform that the United States needed smarter, fairer trade deals that benefit more Americans. I certainly agree with that principle.

I do think, in some quarters, NAFTA has been unfairly maligned. But it is true that it is 23 years old, and it needs to be modernized. I think all of us can rally around that, consistent with the principle in President Trump's campaign that America needs smarter, fairer trade deals that benefit more Americans.

Free trade has, after all, been a boon to the American economy—and certainly the Texas economy because we are the No. 1 exporting State in the Nation. Our farmers, ranchers, and small business owners have benefited from trade agreements, particularly NAFTA, that help them send more of the products they raise, grow, and build to more markets around the world, principally to Canada and Mexico; but certainly, other trade agreements allow those manufactured goods, stock raised, and produce grown to go to markets around the world.

We comprise in America about 5 percent of the potential markets in the world, so 95 percent is the rest of the world and a market to buy the things we make and grow and raise here. Why not help create more jobs and a stronger economy here at home by encouraging that kind of free and fair trade?

There has been significant growth in exports since NAFTA was agreed to 23 years ago. Of course, Mexico continues to be an important economic partner, helping my State, Texas, grow and specifically creating a vibrant ecosystem along the border, but the rest of the country benefits too.

The national Chamber of Commerce estimates that there are 5 million American jobs as a result of binational trade with Mexico. With Canada, it is about 8 million. Why in the world would we want to do anything to jeopardize that? I suggest we don't.

Free trade doesn't just mean more opportunities for our agricultural sector or business owners, but it also helps American families buy more affordable products here at home, too, and that is why we need to make sure that any changes to NAFTA are improvements to the overall agreement.

I was encouraged just this last week when Ambassador Lighthizer, the U.S. Trade Representative, and Secretary of Commerce Ross met with members of the Senate Finance Committee. Essentially, what they said is that their first principle, when it comes to renegotiating NAFTA, is to do no harm. That is a pretty good rule of thumb. In fact, it reminds me of the Hippocratic Oath that doctors take when treating patients: First, do no harm. Well, I believe that is a good place to start.

Over the last two decades under this agreement, the economy in my State of

Texas—which has been the engine that has been pulling the national economy in many respects—has grown significantly because of the tremendous access afforded by trade. We have to be careful not to do any harm to that and to look for ways to improve it.

There is no denying that this agreement is an old one created well before the digital and global economy of today. It was written before the energy renaissance in North America occurred, whereby instead of peak energy production—which is what we thought we had reached—we now have so much natural gas and oil that we export it to the world. That is great for jobs here at home. It is great to be able to do that for our allies around the world who need a dependable, alternative supply of energy in many respects, rather than being the victims of energy being used as a weapon against them. So the energy renaissance is another good reason that updating NAFTA makes sense.

I look forward to working with the President and his team to take great care that any efforts to modernize NAFTA don't sacrifice the benefits we have enjoyed for the last two decades. Hopefully, we can modernize it in a way that will allow more Americans to take advantage of it, and our economy will continue to grow and prosper as a result.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, on another matter, as we all know, this Chamber continues to consider the best way forward to repeal and replace ObamaCare. The entire Republican Conference, all 52 of us, have been meeting regularly in small groups and larger groups so we can finally put ObamaCare behind us. I have to say it is a shame that none of our Democratic colleagues appear willing to lift a finger to help us do that, even though they know that ObamaCare is in meltdown mode.

We have promised multiple times, at least in the last three elections, to do away with this disaster of a healthcare law so that American families can get the healthcare they need at a price they can afford. This isn't just a talking point. This is our goal. This is our objective.

When I said that ObamaCare has been a failure, I am reminded of a letter written to me by one of my constituents from the Dallas-Fort Worth area. This gentleman is a small business owner. Since the implementation of ObamaCare, he has had to change his insurance each year, and every time, his rates have increased. He estimates they had gone up from roughly \$350 a month now to \$800 a month, not to mention his out-of-pocket costs. They have skyrocketed from \$3,500 to \$14,000. That is not affordable healthcare. At that price, I can't imagine it does him much good at all, particularly when you couple those high premiums with higher deductibles, in many instances

\$6,000 or more for the deductible alone. So even though you are paying premiums for insurance and those premiums are going up every year, you still have such a high deductible that it effectively makes you self-insured, and you don't benefit from the insurance you actually have.

The first time this gentleman was forced to change his healthcare plan was because his insurance carrier completely pulled out of the marketplace, and that is something we are hearing across the country. It is not just a Texas phenomenon. I imagine there are similar stories in States like Indiana, North Dakota, Wisconsin, Missouri, Michigan, and Montana, just to mention a few. It is simply proof that the ObamaCare experiment is a failure, and the government-mandated, one-size-fits-all approach to healthcare doesn't work very well.

The next year, this same gentleman went with a different insurance company, but they canceled the plan he was already on. Then that insurance company pulled all individual healthcare plans from the State, so he had to find another health insurance plan.

That is not where the bad news ends. The doctor he has had for 20 years didn't accept the new health insurance plan, so instead of finding a new doctor, which he didn't want to do, he is now paying out of pocket so that he can keep the doctor he wants.

Remember what President Obama said countless times: If you like your plan, you can keep it. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. He said that a family of four would find, on average, a savings of \$2,500 a year in their health insurance premiums. None of that has proved to be true. This is an experiment that has ended in failure. It didn't turn out to be the case for this constituent of mine; each time his plan changed, he saw a price increase and a coverage decrease.

Even if Hillary Clinton had been elected President of the United States, we would still need to revisit the failures of ObamaCare because the situation is simply not sustainable for roughly about 11 million people—about 6 percent of the people who get their insurance in the individual market.

In spite of knowing that many of their constituents are being hurt by the failures of ObamaCare, our Democratic colleagues—even though they know it—refuse to do anything about it. Again, we invite them to work with us, not for our benefit but for the benefit of the people they represent.

This is not making life any easier for my constituents in Texas, and I am confident that is the case for people across the country. That is why our efforts to replace ObamaCare are so important, and that is why we will keep fighting to get it done because families across the country need access to qual-

ity healthcare they can afford that is not chosen for them but is what they choose because it suits their needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all quorum calls until 5:30 p.m. today be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last week, we confirmed two well-qualified nominees, Jeffrey Rosen as Deputy Secretary of Transportation and Rachel Brand as Associate Attorney General, and today we will have an opportunity to confirm another excellent nominee, Gov. Terry Branstad to be U.S. Ambassador to China.

While I am pleased the Senate is working to fill these important positions, it has been disappointing to see so much pointless obstruction by our friends across the aisle. They have continuously forced procedural hurdles on nominees for no other reason than to stall confirmations, launching more filibusters against this President's Cabinet than any other in history. They have done so not to change the result but simply to eat up floor time that could be used for legislation to help our constituents.

Take the floor vote they forced last week on the Branstad nomination. The Senate voted overwhelmingly, 86 to 12, on that motion, proving once again that our Democratic colleagues' tactics have little to do with the nominees themselves but are just delaying for delay's sake. It is really past time to stop the games.

Once confirmed as Ambassador to China, Governor Branstad will be tasked with a portfolio that is important not only for our diplomatic relationship with China but also for our trade policies with that country. He has earned the support of Senators on both sides of the aisle and was reported out of the Foreign Relations Committee by a voice vote.

Having served as the Governor of Iowa for more than two decades, Branstad has developed a strong understanding of agriculture, trade, and other key national interests. His experience on these issues will guide him as he works to strengthen our relationship with China and pursue trade policies that can benefit American workers and businesses. I look forward to confirming him as our Nation's next Ambassador to China so he can get started on the important tasks before him.

NOMINATION OF JOHN SULLIVAN

Mr. President, after we confirm Governor Branstad, we will vote to advance another well-qualified nominee to serve as our Nation's Deputy Secretary of State, John J. Sullivan. It is both a critical and challenging role, but Mr. Sullivan's extensive background has prepared him for the task ahead. Through the years, he has worked at the Defense Department and the Justice Department. He also served as the Deputy Secretary of Commerce. I am confident that his experience will serve him well as he works as a key adviser to Secretary Tillerson and helps lead our Nation in addressing the range of security issues we face. We look forward to confirming him soon.

Having these key officials in place at the State Department is of great importance as we work with the administration on shaping our foreign policy and strengthening our posture in the international community.

THE PRESIDENT'S INTERNATIONAL TRIP

As we know, the President is currently traveling on his first international trip as our Commander in Chief. The trip provides the President with an important opportunity to engage with key allies, discuss our shared interests, and continue conversations on issues where we can work together in the future. So we wish the President and the First Lady both a successful trip and safe travels as they return to the United States later this week.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all quorum calls until 5:30 p.m. today be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arkansas.

NATIONAL DRUG COURT MONTH

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise to recognize National Drug Court Month and show my support for the positive impact drug courts have on cutting crime, saving money, and restoring lives.

I have seen firsthand the impact of drug courts in Arkansas. This proven approach has helped many Arkansans suffering from drug and alcohol abuse who have received the treatment and services they need to turn their lives around. For more than two decades, these courts have offered Arkansas' drug-addicted, nonviolent offenders an alternative to jail while rehabilitating them through a strenuous treatment program.

We have nearly 90 specialty courts in Arkansas that are providing lifesaving treatment to more than 3,000 individuals with substance use disorders, and the results are impressive. Our State saves \$45 million each year by diverting these offenders from prison to drug courts. Ninety percent of Arkansas drug court participants' drug tests come back negative for illegal substances, compared to 64 percent of those on probation and parole.

Drug courts are a critical component of today's criminal justice system. They have proven to be an effective alternative to jail for individuals convicted of nonviolent drug charges. Holding offenders with substance use and mental health disorders accountable through strict supervision and treatment, drug courts and veterans treatment courts have saved taxpayer dollars and the lives of more than 1.5 million people, including a remarkable man I recently met who shared his story.

Blayne was facing 20 years in prison because of crimes he had committed to support a 10-year addiction to prescription opioids. This epidemic currently takes 94 American lives every single day, but Blayne is one of the lucky ones. His community had a drug court. The drug court program gave him the tools he needed to stop using drugs and helped him reconnect with his family, find employment, and get his life back on track.

Instead of sitting in a jail cell on the taxpayers' dime, he is working as a teacher. Instead of breaking into homes, he owns one. Today, Blayne is a dedicated family man. He told me: "Drug court was a chance to become the father and husband that I wanted to be."

His story is similar to hundreds of Arkansans who have drug courts to thank for turning their lives around. An Arkansas drug court gave a woman named Sammy a second chance. She became addicted to painkillers at the age of 22 when she suffered a back injury. Her addiction led her down a very dangerous path, where she also started using meth every day. It also led her into the criminal justice system, and she was facing 20 years in prison. Drug court helped Sammy change her lifestyle. Now she is a positive role model for her children, holding down a full-time job and giving back to her community.

This is the power drug courts and other treatment courts have that change lives, heal families, and save money. The success of drug treatment courts has become a model tailored to the needs of different groups from veterans to juveniles. The willingness of the judicial system to adopt alternative methods to jail time is a cost-effective approach to changing the habits of drug addicts and saving the lives of people like Blayne and Sammy.

As Washington pursues options for criminal justice reform, drug courts are a great example of a program that works. More than 25 years of research has proven they reduce crime and substance abuse, break the vicious cycle of recidivism, and keep families together.

In Arkansas and every other State in the country, drug courts are making a real difference. I want to recognize and thank the more than 30,000 drug court judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys,

treatment providers, probation officers, court administrators, and other professionals who are on the frontlines of providing a path to recovery. As we recognize National Drug Court Month, this is a great opportunity to show our commitment for the Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program and the Veterans Treatment Court Initiative at the Department of Justice. While there are 150,000 Americans being served by drug courts and veterans treatment courts today, there are more than 1 million individuals in our justice system who do not yet have access to these lifesaving programs.

I ask you to join me in supporting resources for these programs to improve public safety, save taxpayer dollars, and, most importantly, save lives.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, the United States' relationship with China is one of our most complicated and consequential in the world. The United States must maintain a constructive partnership with China to address global threats ranging from climate change to North Korea's nuclear program. While our interests are often at odds, our relationship with China must be built on respect, not rebuffs—on tact, not tweets.

On the campaign trail, President Trump's rhetoric about China was as caustic as it was hollow. He claimed that climate change was a "hoax perpetrated by the Chinese." He contended that we could not "continue to allow China to rape our country." He declared China was "our enemy" and that he would direct the Treasury Department to label China a currency manipulator on his first day in office. He said he would not honor the "one China policy" without extracting concessions from the Chinese on trade. None of these threats materialized when Trump assumed office, of course. When rhetoric met reality, Trump retreated.

Even while he railed against China during his campaign, Trump simultaneously extolled his deep financial ties with the country. He credited the Chinese for much of his own personal fortune, saying, "I've made a lot of money with China," and "I do great with China, I sell them condos, I have the largest bank in the world from China, the largest in the world by far. They're a tenant of mine in a building I own in Manhattan."

Trump is the only President in modern history who has not divested his financial holdings or established a blind trust, and his financial entanglements with China have grown since his inauguration. Earlier this year, China gave the Trump Organization preliminary approval for 38 trademarks, paving the way for the President and his family to develop a host of branded business from hotels, to insurance, to bodyguard and escort services. On the very same night

that Ivanka Trump and Jared Kushner dined with Chinese President Xi at Mar-a-Lago, China granted Ivanka Trump's company three new trademarks. All of this points to the very real possibility that Trump and his family are using the Presidency to increase their personal profit, in violation of the Constitution, and that the Chinese are accommodating them.

Governor Terry Branstad is far from an ideal choice for the U.S. Ambassador to China. His record on labor rights is deeply troubling, including his decision earlier this year to sign into law a bill that dramatically scales back the rights of workers to bargain collectively for their health insurance, evaluation procedures, and supplemental pay.

However, in an administration that has put forward few qualified candidates for public office, Governor Branstad possesses some of the experience required for this critical diplomatic post. Governor Branstad has worked with the Chinese and with Chinese President Xi specifically for several decades. In his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he alleged he would use this longstanding relationship to press President Xi on the North Korean nuclear threat. He acknowledged the importance of opening Chinese markets to U.S. goods while recognizing the need to hold them accountable for unfair trade practices. He claimed that he would promote American values abroad, including human rights, the importance of a free press, and a rules-based international order.

Governor Branstad's recognition of the importance of these basic American values, values President Trump himself does not acknowledge, is vital in our engagements with China and countries around the world. Governor Branstad's longstanding relationships in China suggest he may be more responsible and disciplined in his statements and behavior than President Trump. Given the vast array of global issues that require China's cooperation, I hope Governor Branstad remains faithful to his testimony and attempts to foster a productive relationship with China. For these reasons, I support his nomination for U.S. Ambassador to China.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STOP ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I came to the floor last week to talk about our police officers. It was during

Police Week. We talked about the bravery and heroism of our officers back home. I talked about tragic stories of police officers who were gunned down in the line of duty and talked about what they do for us every day.

Today I want to talk about an issue that is endangering their lives and the lives of so many in our communities but specifically law enforcement. This happens in every single State represented in this Chamber. This danger is this new epidemic of synthetic heroin, of opioids.

We know more about heroin and prescription drugs. Now we have these synthetic heroins coming in that are even more powerful. Being a police officer has always been a tough job, but it is becoming riskier today because of this. Some people have heard it as carfentanil or fentanyl or U4. Most of this synthetic poison coming into our communities is coming through the mail system. It is coming from overseas, primarily from China, where they have laboratories, where some evil scientist is mixing up this chemical mix and sending it over here into our communities.

Let me tell you about something that happened last Friday in East Liverpool, OH. Some of you may know the name "East Liverpool" because it is the same city where there was a photograph that went viral on the Internet of a couple who had overdosed in the front of a car, with their 3-year-old grandson in a car seat behind them. It showed the grandson, and it showed the two who had overdosed passed out in the front of the car.

In this same town of East Liverpool, OH, an officer by the name of Chris Green pulled over a car in a routine traffic stop. As he came up to the car, he noticed there was white powder sprinkled around the car. He took the appropriate precautions. He put on his gloves, he put on a mask, and he began to deal with the situation at hand. The people in the car apparently had spread the powder to try to avoid it being detected, but it was easily detectable.

At the end of his arrest process, there was a small amount of powder that was left on his jacket, which he did not notice. He went back to the police station. When he got there, he noticed the powder on his shirt and instinctively he went like this to get the powder off of his shirt. This small amount of powder touching his hand caused him to overdose. Officer Green is not a small guy; he is about 6 feet 3 inches, 225 pounds. He is a big, strong police officer who overdosed just by trying to get a few flakes of powder off of his jacket. Why? Because this fentanyl is so powerful. It is so deadly.

Fortunately, his fellow police officers were able to save his life with naloxone. This is a miracle drug which reverses the effects of an overdose and which is being used on our streets

every single day to save people from dying from overdoses. In this case, it was used to keep a police officer who was doing his duty and who had simply tried to get a few flakes of powder off of his uniform from dying of an overdose.

East Liverpool police chief John Lane put it this way:

If he had been alone, he'd be dead. That's how dangerous this stuff is.

Chief Lane later made the point that if Officer Green had gone home in that shirt and unknowingly had this powder on his shirt or his jacket, he could have endangered the lives of his family. That is a scary thought. Obviously, that is true. That is how deadly these drugs are.

It only takes a few milligrams, just a few specks, to kill you. This chart will show you how much it takes. Here you see that 10 milligrams of carfentanil is powerful enough to sedate a 15,000-pound elephant. Here is the carfentanil over here, as shown on this chart. You will see why a fatal dose can be a very, very small amount—30 milligrams for heroin, 3 milligrams for fentanyl, even less than 3 milligrams for carfentanil.

By the way, for those of you at home, if you look at a penny, you will see Abraham Lincoln's profile on one side of it. The deadly dose of fentanyl that we are talking about here is enough to only cover up the face of Abraham Lincoln on a penny. That is how little we are talking about and how deadly this stuff is. You can see why our law enforcement officers are so concerned about this.

Officer Green is not the only one to experience this. There was a famous case last year where two officers in Atlantic County, NJ—Detective Dan Kallen and Detective Eric Price—overdosed on fentanyl just by breathing fentanyl in the air at a crime scene. As some of you have heard, fentanyl is so dangerous that they are afraid to use dogs to try to sniff it out because just by trying to sniff these packages to see whether fentanyl is included in them, the dogs could overdose and die. Fentanyl is dangerous stuff.

By the way, it is taking up more and more of the resources of our police officers and other first responders. Earlier this year, I came to the floor and talked about Officer Ben Rhodes of Chillicothe, OH. Last year Officer Rhodes reversed more than 50 drug overdoses. This is one officer in one small town.

Talk to the firefighters in your community and ask them whether they go on more fire runs or more heroin and fentanyl and carfentanil overdose runs. I almost guarantee you they will say they go on more overdose runs. As a result, in some communities, those firefighters are not there to be able to protect us as you would typically think from the fires that still continue to be

a major problem. So this is a real issue. It is taking up more and more of their time and more resources and causing more and more crime.

On Thursday, in Middletown, OH, which is a town in Southern Ohio, a family was getting ready to leave the house. In fact, they had already strapped their 3-month-old baby into a car seat. It is not clear whether they had shot up with heroin before they put the baby in the car seat or after, but they went back into the house and they overdosed in the house. They had the baby in the car seat in the car. They overdosed in the home.

They have another son who is 5 years old. He ran out of the house barefoot. He went to a neighbor's house, to his stepfather's home, which is a few blocks away, and yelled at the door: Mom and dad are dead. Mom and dad are dead.

The grandfather called the police, and they rushed to the scene. They were able to revive the boy's dad with naloxone. They used seven doses of naloxone on the mother, but she still couldn't wake up. From talking to police officers about this, they tell me that there is a very good sign this involved fentanyl, perhaps carfentanil, because after two, three, four, five, six, seven doses of naloxone, she still could not be revived. Fortunately, the police rushed her to the hospital, where they were finally able to bring her back.

Again, this is what police officers are facing every day in my home State of Ohio, in your State, in your community.

After this incident, the Middletown Police said on Facebook:

It has to stop. Please get help before it's too late. Not only to save yourself, but to save your kids. Give these kids a chance by getting help. If you or someone you love has a drug problem, please seek help right now.

This is a cry from our police officers saying that this can't continue.

Talk to the firefighters and police officers who have administered naloxone to the same individual time and time again, overdose after overdose. These brave officers and police officers around the country are feeling overwhelmed.

Drug overdoses are now the No. 1 cause of accidental death in the United States of America. It has now surpassed car accidents. It has way surpassed gun violence. In the last 3 years, more Americans have died of drug overdoses than died in the Vietnam war. More Americans are dying of drug overdoses now than died of AIDS at the peak of the AIDS epidemic in 1995. This year, 2017, more people will die from overdoses from opioids than died from AIDS at the peak in 1995—another tragedy. According to an article in the New York Times, more than four times as many people are dying every day from this epidemic than were dying of drug overdoses at the peak of the crack cocaine epidemic. When I say it is the

worst drug crisis we have faced in this country and that it is an epidemic, that is not overstating it.

The Fraternal Order of Police and the Major County Sheriffs of America are actually focused on this issue, and they want better tools to be able to at least try to stop some of this poison—the fentanyl and the carfentanil—from coming into our communities.

I mentioned earlier the fact that this actually comes by the mail system. Unbelievable. It doesn't come by all mail systems. It comes through the U.S. mail system, as opposed to the private carriers, such as FedEx, UPS, DHL, or others. One reason is because our mail system in the United States does not require the kind of advanced notice of where the package is from, what is in it, and where it is going that the private carriers require. So where do the traffickers go? They go to our mail service, the U.S. Postal Service, and the postal service in the country that interacts with and connects with our postal service.

This is why the Fraternal Order of Police, the Major County Sheriffs of America, and other law enforcement are saying: Help us by passing legislation called the STOP Act. The STOP Act is to help stop traffickers from bringing these deadly poisons into our communities, the kind of stuff that caused Officer Green to overdose.

Fentanyl and these other synthetic drugs are not just coming in from overseas; they are coming in through our mail system. What we are saying in the STOP Act is, let's close the loophole. Let's say that the mail system in the United States has to say the same thing that other private carriers say, which is, if you want to ship something through our system, that is fine, but you have to tell us what is in it. You have to tell us where it is from and where it is going. Otherwise, they can't effectively stop these packages. It is like finding a needle in a haystack.

I talked earlier about the difficulty of detecting it and how poisonous it is, and sniffing dogs can't be used because of the potential of them overdosing and dying. It is also very difficult for our officers to find these packages without some information. Expert testimony, including that from the Secretary of Homeland Security, General Kelly, from Customs and Border Protection, and from the folks at DEA all reach the same conclusion, which is that this policy change would make it easier for law enforcement to detect suspicious packages of fentanyl, carfentanil, and other synthetic drugs and help keep this poison out of our country.

Support for this legislation is bipartisan, and it is growing. We now have 16 cosponsors in the Senate—8 Democrats and 8 Republicans. Completely bipartisan. In the House, Congressman PAT TIBERI of Ohio and RICHARD NEAL of Massachusetts—a Republican and a

Democrat—have introduced bipartisan companion legislation. They now have 128 cosponsors. Support is building. It is an obvious way to help push back. Is it the silver bullet? No. There is not one silver bullet. We need to do more in terms of prevention, treatment, and recovery, and help our law enforcement more to make sure they have naloxone to be able to save lives.

At least, let's stop some of this poison from coming in, and let's at least increase the cost of the fentanyl because one reason you see this big increase in overdoses from fentanyl and carfentanil and traffickers using more of it is because of the cost. At the very least, by helping our law enforcement, giving them the tools they need, we can stop some of it and increase the cost on the street.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the STOP Act. We have a hearing on this legislation on Thursday of this week in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. We have experts coming in—law enforcement officers who care a lot about their colleagues. They talk about what a danger this is to them, what a danger this is to our communities. It is time for us in the U.S. Senate to stand up and take this important step, not the silver bullet but the important step to be able to help save lives and make our communities safer.

Thank you, Madam President.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. PORTMAN. Absolutely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Thank you, Madam President.

I say to the Senator, I appreciate what he is doing. I am a supporter and one of the cosponsors of his bill. This fentanyl problem is just devastating communities all over the country, including in my State of Florida.

What was surprising to me to find out was that fentanyl is so much more addictive and so much more lethal than so many others of these drugs that ultimately lead to a person becoming addicted so badly that they just crave fentanyl.

I appreciate very much what he has spoken about and given leadership to. I just want him to know there are a lot of us who are trying to raise the flags of awareness of this situation before it is too late.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank my colleague from Florida. He has been a stalwart on this issue. We have never made this a partisan issue, have we. We always kept this a bipartisan issue because this is a danger to our country, our communities—all Americans. The Senator is absolutely right. It is 30 to 50 times more powerful than heroin. A few flakes can kill you, as you see here.

It is absolutely necessary we figure out a way together, as Republicans and Democrats. With the recovery efforts the Senator supported and the Cures Act he already supported, this is the next logical step to deal with the new threat, which is this synthetic heroin coming to our country.

I thank my colleague from Florida.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORAN). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. In passing, I would say to the Senator from Ohio, what was so surprising to me was, just a few grains of this deadly drug, just by being touched by someone, is absorbed into the system through the skin, and it can be lethal—just that innocent act of touching a few grains. So, indeed, we have to get our arms around this problem.

HAITI

Mr. President, I want to address the Senate on a different subject. If you will recall the devastating earthquake in this little country of Haiti—the poorest nation in the entire Western Hemisphere—you can imagine what that earthquake did. Just as people are beginning to get their lives back together, here comes a hurricane, and it devastates even more. As a result, over the course of those years, a number of Haitians were admitted into the United States under TPS, temporary protected status. That is a special entry into the United States, usually because of a natural catastrophe that has occurred in another nation in the world, but it is with the understanding that, indeed, as the first word of TPS says, it is “temporary.”

So into the United States—allowing some relief on all of the stresses on the local economy and the government because of that devastating earthquake, and then later the hurricane on top of it—are approximately just less than 60,000 Haitians here legally on TPS. So the Government of the United States is making a decision and has just announced earlier today that it will extend TPS. I might say, that is a bipartisan request from many of us from the Florida delegation—to extend TPS until the nation of Haiti can, in fact, absorb 60,000 people back into its little island economy.

These are people who generally want to go back. Their families are there. These are people who have now earned a substantial savings that they send back as remittances to their families. These are people with skills that Haiti, as it continues to rebuild from a poverty-stricken nation, will want to have back because of their skills.

I might say that when I knew the Department of Homeland Security was considering this—whether to revoke the TPS status or to extend it—I felt quite confident that the Secretary of DHS, General Kelly, the former commander of Southcom, the U.S. Southern Command—that in his 3-year stint

as commander of Southcom, he in fact would understand all the nuances because he had lived with that problem. He understood it. He understood not only TPS for the Haitians, but he also understood the TPS that even years before had been given to a number of Central Americans when they came into the country under temporary protected status, which they likewise had been extended, and that status has not been revoked. I felt quite confident that General Kelly, as the Secretary of DHS, would extend TPS from ordering immediate removal to the Nation of Haiti of 60,000 people. Indeed, General Kelly announced that decision earlier today, and he has granted a 6-month extension.

Now, therein lies the problem. I have just spoken to General Kelly, who is really a tremendous, lifelong marine, very decorated, a true hero. He is someone that has comported with his duties, whatever it has been in his service to America, in the most exemplary manner. What I wanted to discuss with General Kelly was that there is just no way in 6 months that the Nation of Haiti can absorb 60,000 of its people back. It would be like trying to swallow a bite of food that is way too big in order to do it.

So what I urged General Kelly after this announcement was made, which has caused alarm in the Haitian-American community—it certainly caused alarm in the nation of Haiti, the Government of Haiti. Indeed, the Ambassador was asking for an extension of at least 18 months. I don't think it is out of the question that General Kelly will consider that. Therefore, I asked him to please confer with the leadership in the Haitian-American community in South Florida, a community he is well aware of since he lived in Miami for 3 years as the commander of U.S. Southern Command. I think he will follow that suggestion and meet in the not-too-distant future with the leaders.

General Kelly also told me he was planning a trip to Haiti to discuss this directly with the Government of Haiti. That is important because how can they reasonably absorb them back into society, utilize their skills—and over what period of time can that be done? Therefore, I commend General Kelly, the Secretary of DHS, on the way he has approached it. I would urge our Haitian-American communities in America to just be patient. Understand that General Kelly is going to do a comprehensive overview and that in 6 months, come January, suddenly 60,000 people are not going to be kicked out of the country.

The truth is, I am not sure the Government of the United States knows exactly where all the 60,000 are. So that is going to be another question of locating them, once the decision is made, which this Senator has certainly urged at least 18 months before that would

start. I have spoken to the Haitian Ambassador. He told me it is a newly formed government in Haiti and is working on a plan to further rebuild and develop the country so its people can make their lives there again. They have asked for the extension of TPS up to 18 months while they continue to rebuild. I think that by Secretary Kelly indicating he is going to Haiti very soon, that he has indicated he is going to reconsider the decision that was made about 6 months, suddenly revoking all of their TPS status. As Haiti continues to rebuild, repatriating 60,000 Haitians here in the United States needs to be pursued according to a plan that will not destabilize the new government's efforts.

Remember, this is a government that had a temporary government because there was a question about chicanery in the election. There was actually a temporary President that governed the country, and then new elections were held with an overwhelming winner who is now the President of Haiti. So in this newly formed government, you don't want to destabilize their efforts, which would divert precious resources to just reintegrating the people who would be sent back from the United States. It could cause a severe overburden on the government. Therefore, what this Senator is asking for—what I think, at the end of the day, will probably be 18 months, given that time, and then start an orderly transition of those TPS Haitians back to their own country.

Thus, the United States can continue to be focused on helping Haiti recover from all of these disasters they have suffered. Therefore, I feel quite confident Secretary Kelly will do that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if the Branstad nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support Iowa Governor Terry Branstad's nomination to be U.S. Ambassador to the People's Republic of China. The position of U.S. Ambassador to China is one of the most important ambassadorial positions in the world. I am confident that my friend and Governor, Terry Branstad, is the right person for the job.

Having worked alongside the Governor for many years, I know he will exemplify the same leadership, thoughtfulness, and dedication in his role as Ambassador to China on behalf of the United States as he did for the

people of Iowa. Importantly, Governor Branstad also knows China and its leaders well. He first met President Xi Jinping while he was visiting Iowa on an agricultural research trip in 1985.

They have kept in touch over the years, and Governor Branstad has visited China a number of times on behalf of the State of Iowa. Iowa's extensive trade relationship with China has given Governor Branstad a front-seat view of the complexities of our country's broader trade and economic relationship with China and will provide him with the foundation to effectively advocate for U.S. interests, as evidenced by his successful confirmation before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which approved his nomination by voice vote.

Governor Branstad will not only work tirelessly to foster our trade and economic interests with China, but he is also prepared to tackle the many other complex, bilateral issues we have with China, from North Korea to the South China Sea to human rights. It has been an honor to serve the people of Iowa alongside Governor Branstad, the longest serving Governor in U.S. history, and I am thrilled to continue to work with him in his new role serving the American people.

I thank Governor Branstad for his service to Iowa, and I wish him and his family the best as they prepare to depart for Beijing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Iowa in supporting Governor Branstad as our next Ambassador to China. I have the opportunity of being the ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I knew of Governor Branstad's reputation as the Governor of Iowa—that he was well thought of and that his leadership was recognized not only by the people of his State but in our Nation.

So I was, before the nomination was made, impressed by his dedication to public service. I then had a chance to meet with him in my office. I must tell you that I was extremely impressed about how he was prepared to move on to be the Ambassador to China and how he spoke in favor of our strong ideals.

We then had a confirmation hearing in our committee, and that very much confirmed his knowledge of the challenges that he has, his dedication to public service, and that he would be a strong advocate for American values. So I support his nomination and I urge my colleagues to confirm Governor Branstad. As Senator ERNST pointed out, our mission in China is a particularly important international responsibility.

We know that China plays a significant role—maybe even a dominating role—in regard to North Korea and in trying to get North Korea to give up its

nuclear arsenal. We also know that China has a very checkered record on protecting the human rights of its own citizens. We have major trade issues between the United States and China, in which our Ambassador needs to be engaged to protect American commercial interests.

We have the continuing saga between Taiwan and China and living up to our commitments to protect the integrity of Taiwan. Then, we have a very dangerous situation in the South China Sea, where China has done many provocative activities that will require the diplomacy of our Ambassador in Beijing in order to encourage the use of the rule of law in direct negotiations between the parties and not claiming territory by provocative actions.

So, for all of those issues, we need an experienced Ambassador in China to represent our interests. What really impressed me about Governor Branstad is that I do believe he has a passion for American values.

I particularly appreciated his willingness—and would even say he was anxious—to represent American and global interests for China's improving their human rights record and dealing with the right of religious minorities, dealing with the right of dissent, and dealing with the right of free expression and the press. He very much spoke about the need for the rule of law. So while we welcome the emergence of a prosperous China, we want one that follows international institutional laws and norms. That is going to be the challenge for our next Ambassador.

Let me comment on what I believe the Trump administration is doing that is going to make our next Ambassador's responsibilities even more challenging than perhaps they should be; that is, that we have seen already that in the discussions between President Xi and President Trump with respect to North Korea, it seems like the Trump administration is prepared to give up some of our American values in order to make progress with regard to North Korea, such as our interests in our American workers, our interests in the South China Sea, in maritime security, our relationship with Taiwan, and human rights, et cetera.

That would be a bad deal. Yes, we want North Korea to be under control and to give up its nuclear weapons. Yes, we want China to exercise a much stronger role in convincing North Korea that it is in their interests to give up their nuclear weapon program. We want to do that. There are ways we can. It is in China's interests that North Korea give up its nuclear weapon ambition. They want a nonnuclear Korean Peninsula. We should not trade our values in order for that to be able to occur.

The second matter, which I have talked about on the floor before, that is going to make it more difficult for

our next Ambassador is the President's continued unwillingness to comply with the emoluments clause of the Constitution.

As I have said on the floor before, every President before President Trump either divested of their conflicted ownership of assets or they set up a blind trust, but Mr. Trump did not. Shortly after his election, the Trump organization received trademarks through the Chinese Government that they had been unsuccessful in obtaining for years, in which they have spent literally hundreds of thousands of dollars if not more in legal fees.

All of a sudden, 1 week after the President is elected, the Chinese Government grants these trademarks. It is hard to believe that the fact that they were dealing with the President of the United States did not weigh into decisions made by the Chinese Government.

But it does not end there. We also know that a member of his family was in China to sell the EB-5 visas. That, again, presented a direct conflict. We actually know that his daughter received three new trademarks in an incredibly speedy turnaround—the same night that the daughter had dinner with President Xi.

These things don't look good. The emoluments clause is where a foreign government tries to influence our President through doing favors. It is going to be very difficult for the American people—in fact, very difficult for the international community—to believe that it was not, in part, due to the position that Mr. Trump holds that these actions took place.

That violates our Constitution. That is wrong.

The bottom line is that our next Ambassador is going to have to deal with those issues. We have a hard enough assignment in dealing with North Korea, trade, the South China Sea, Taiwan, and human rights to throw in these additional hurdles. So I urge my colleagues to support Mr. Branstad's nomination. I believe that he is well-qualified to represent this country. I hope the Trump administration will give him a stronger hand to play.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I think I will be done speaking before the time for the vote arrives, but I ask unanimous consent for permission to finish my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is finally considering the nomination of Governor Branstad of Iowa to be Ambassador to China. Before I speak about this very well-qualified nominee, I would like to express my great disappointment and great frustration with the seemingly endless obstruction on the part of the minority.

This nominee received unanimous support in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee more than a week ago. Yet the majority leader was required to file cloture on the nominee because there could not be consent given to move forward with it. We could have approved this nomination with just a few minutes of debate time. Yet the minority required that we have the cloture vote and the 30 hours afterwards, not because they wanted to debate the merits of the nominee but simply to delay the business of the Senate. It is unfortunate that their delay has kept an eminently qualified individual from getting into the job to promote America's interest in China sooner than it now will be.

I am honored to have the opportunity today to speak to my colleagues about my good friend, Governor Terry Branstad.

Governor Branstad is the longest-serving Governor in U.S. history. Let me make that clear. Out of 50 States for 230 years, no person in the United States has served their State as Governor of that State longer than Terry Branstad has now. He is a lifelong Iowan who has devoted his life to public service.

After more than 22 years as my home State's chief executive, I am proud to support Governor Branstad's nomination to serve our country as the next U.S. Ambassador to the People's Republic of China.

The fact is, Governor Branstad has been an ambassador for Iowa to the Nation and even to the world for his entire career. He has been a champion for Iowa and on behalf of Iowans around the globe. As Governor, he has been vigorous in promoting our State's economy and opening markets for our farm commodities, financial services, and manufacturing to the world marketplace.

His nomination should come as no surprise to the people of Iowa. We have long known and benefited from the relationship Governor Branstad has had with the people of China. A sister state relationship in 1983 has grown into a successful trade partnership that has benefited Iowa farmers and businesses.

Perhaps most notably, Governor Branstad enjoys a 30-year friendship with President Xi. Their first meeting took place in 1985 in Iowa when, then a Provincial official, Xi led an agricultural delegation to Iowa. President Xi visited Iowa again in 2012, when Governor Branstad was back at the helm in

his fifth term after a 12-year respite from being Governor. Their relationship reflects genuine goodwill and, more importantly, mutual respect.

Governor Branstad has never stopped working to expand Iowa's trade, investment, and economic partnerships on the world stage, including many trips to China. He will bring midwestern humility and level-headed leadership to the job. He is a workhorse who is unafraid to get into the trenches to get the job done. I have no doubt that he will stand strong for American values, such as freedom of the press and religious liberty, and that he will work to strengthen peace, stability, and prosperity between our two nations.

Once he is confirmed, I am confident that Governor Branstad will bring to bear his tireless commitment to solve problems and always move the ball forward. Although his heart will always be in Iowa, I know Governor Branstad will throw himself into this job wholeheartedly.

Governor Branstad is uniquely qualified to help strengthen the trade, economic, cultural, and geopolitical relationships between our two countries. I am pleased that he has now been called to serve our entire Nation, not just the State of Iowa, as Ambassador to China. I have every confidence that he will represent the United States well and will excel, just as he has throughout his entire public career.

Without reservation, then, I support this nomination. I also urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this nomination.

Thank you very much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Branstad nomination?

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea", the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) would have voted "yea", and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 133 Ex.]

YEAS—82

Barrasso	Franken	Paul
Bennet	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Reed
Burr	Hassan	Risch
Cantwell	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heinrich	Rounds
Cardin	Heitkamp	Rubio
Carper	Heller	Sasse
Casey	Hoeven	Schatz
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Johnson	Shaheen
Collins	Kaine	Shelby
Coons	Kennedy	Strange
Corker	King	Sullivan
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Tester
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Leahy	Tillis
Crapo	Manchin	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Udall
Daines	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Merkley	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	Young
Fischer	Murray	
Flake	Nelson	

NAYS—13

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Schumer
Blumenthal	Hirono	Stabenow
Booker	Markey	Warren
Brown	Peters	
Duckworth	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—5

Alexander	Isakson	Murkowski
Harris	Lee	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 59, Amul Thapar to be United States circuit judge for the Sixth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Amul R. Thapar, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Amul R. Thapar, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Jeff Flake, John Cornyn, Chuck Grassley, John Hoeven, James E. Risch, Mike Rounds, Deb Fischer, Mike Crapo, Jerry Moran, Pat Roberts, Lindsey Graham, John Kennedy, Steve Daines, David Perdue.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND DENNIS H. HOLTSCHNEIDER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to thank Reverend Dennis H. Holtschneider for all he has done to bring educational excellence to our State.

After nearly 13 years as president of DePaul University, the largest Catholic university in the country, Father Holtschneider will be retiring later this summer. He originally planned on stepping down in 2019 at the end of his contract, but always putting DePaul first, he decided that wouldn't fit with the university's planning cycle. After leading the university through two successful strategic plans, he said, "It's best for DePaul if I step aside in the summer of 2017 so that a new leader can assist the institution to name and ambitiously pursue its next set of strategic objectives." What a class act. It is no surprise, for more than a decade, Reverend Holtschneider has put DePaul University first.

During Father Holtschneider's tenure, U.S. News and World Report recognized DePaul University as among the country's "Most Innovative Universities." While many colleges and universities shift their missions over the

years, Reverend Holtschneider has always remained committed to DePaul University's founding principles—a devotion to first generation students. He has raised about \$460 million in philanthropic support for this noble cause, including \$333 million for the “Many Dreams, One Mission” campaign to ensure access to high quality education for future generations of DePaul students.

Born in Detroit, Father Holtschneider graduated from Niagara University with a bachelor's degree in mathematics, studied for the priesthood at Mary Immaculate Seminary, and also received a doctorate in higher education administration from Harvard University. Prior to joining DePaul University, Father Holtschneider served as executive vice president and chief operating officer of his alma mater, Niagara University. He also was the director and rector of Vincentian College Seminary and has been a faculty member in the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Since 2014, Father Holtschneider has chaired the board of Ascension, the Nation's largest Catholic and nonprofit health system, but will be stepping down to become executive vice president and chief operating officer later this summer.

Father Holtschneider has been the recipient of numerous awards, including the ACE Council of Fellows Mentor Award for his work preparing the next generation of academic leaders in higher education. He has been listed on the Diversity MBA Magazine's Top 100 and Under 50 Diverse Executive Leaders. I especially want to thank Father Holtschneider for his leadership on comprehensive immigration reform, which was honored by the Archdiocese of Chicago with its “Strangers No Longer Award.”

I congratulate Reverend Holtschneider on his many accomplishments throughout his long and distinguished career. I thank him for always being a trustworthy counselor and personal friend. I thank him for his service and wish him all the best as he begins the next chapter in his life. Those of us who have worked with him over the years know he will bring that same sense of professionalism and dedication to the field of healthcare at Ascension. Thank you.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, I was unavoidably absent during today's vote, Executive Calendar No. 55, due to my son's college graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted nay on the confirmation of Governor Terry E. Branstad to be the U.S. Ambassador to China. •

ARUS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER.

*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-04, concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$250 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J. W. RIXEY,
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-04

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment \$ 0 million.
Other \$250 million.
Total \$250 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): None.
Non-MDE includes:

Continuation of a naval blanket order training program inside and outside of Saudi Arabia that includes, but is not limited, to English Language training, professional military education, technical training, publications and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: SR-P-TCY.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: MAY 22, 2017.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia—Navy Blanket Order Training

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has requested the continuation of a naval blanket order training program inside and outside of Saudi Arabia that includes, but is not limited to English Language training, professional military education, technical training, publications and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support. The estimated value is \$250 million.

This proposed sale will enhance the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of a strategic regional partner that has been, and continues to be, an important force for political stability and economic progress in the Middle East.

The proposed sale will enable Saudi Arabia and the Royal Saudi Naval Force (RSNF) to maintain military performance levels and provide an increased ability to meet current and future maritime threats. The training will support the RSNF in its role patrolling and providing protection for critical industrial infrastructure and for the sea lines of communications. The RSNF will also use the training to enhance interoperability with the United States and other coalition maritime forces. Saudi Arabia will have no difficulty absorbing these services.

The proposed sale of this training will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be Kratos Defense & Security Solutions of San Diego, CA. There are no known offset agreements in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require the assignment of approximately 88 contractor representatives to Saudi Arabia for approximately three years to support personnel training. Implementation of this sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government representatives to Saudi Arabia.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, as we end Police Week, I wish to pay tribute to the police officers across the country who serve their communities with steadfast dedication. In particular, I rise to honor three brave New Jersey law enforcement officers who lost their lives in the line of duty last year.

In 1962, President Kennedy first proclaimed May 15 as National Peace Officers Memorial Day, and he proclaimed the calendar week in which May 15 falls as National Police Week. These designations pay special recognition to those law enforcement officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty and includes a number of events that brings together thousands of law enforcement professionals and families to our nations' capital.

On this Police Week, I reflected on the nearly 400 new names inscribed on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, DC. Of these names, at least 139 were killed last year, and roughly 250 were earlier deaths that had slipped through the cracks of history. The total number of names on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial will increase to more than 21,000, dating back to the first known officer fatality in 1791.

It is a deeply upsetting fact that, on average, one law enforcement officer is killed in the line of duty somewhere in the United States every 58 hours. We can and should do better than this, and we owe it to these brave men and women to give them the necessary tools and training to protect themselves. Those who protect us deserve to be protected as well.

In honor of National Police Week and in recognition of the supreme sacrifice made by these officers, I will now read the names of the three law enforcement officers from New Jersey who were killed in the line of duty in 2016: Sean Cullen, trooper, New Jersey State police; Nikeelan Semmon, senior corrections officer, New Jersey Department of Corrections; and Frankie Williams, trooper, New Jersey State police.

Today my thoughts and prayers go out to the families of these brave officers. I sincerely hope that we rededicate ourselves to doing everything we can to support all law enforcement officers across the country. We owe them, along with all those who serve our country, the deepest debt of gratitude.

WELCOMING OUR HONORABLE VETERANS TO THE NATION'S CAPITOL

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I am incredibly honored to rise and recognize a group of 25 heroic veterans who have traveled from West Virginia to visit our Nation's Capital as part of the eighth Always Free Honor Flight. On behalf of our State and Nation, it is a true privilege to recognize them for their courageous service and unparalleled sacrifice as they tour the memorials that have been built in their honor.

With one of our country's highest per capita rates of military servicemembers and veterans, West Virginia is undoubtedly one of our Nation's most patriotic States. According to the Department of Defense, West Virginia had the highest casualty rate in the Nation during the Vietnam war, and I am so proud that the Honor Flight will allow these West Virginia veterans to pay homage to their brethren at the Vietnam Wall. Throughout our State's history, West Virginians have demonstrated selflessness and courage time and again in making tremendous sacrifices to defend our freedoms and to

keep our homeland safe. As these veterans tour the monuments made in their honor, I offer my sincerest thanks to them on behalf of our Nation for their service.

The veterans joining us in Washington range in age from 62 to 94 and hail from the coalfields of West Virginia and Virginia. These patriots come from seven West Virginia coal mining counties and three Virginia counties. Of the Honor Flight veterans attending, two served in World War II, one served in the Korean war, two served in both the Korean and Vietnam wars, 18 served in the Vietnam war, and two Veterans served stateside. They have participated in decisive overseas battles and won a myriad of accolades for their accomplishments in uniform.

I would especially like to recognize our World War II veterans who will be on this Honor Flight for the second time. Ninety-four-year-old former SN William "Ray" Calvin Sexton from Tazewell joined the Navy in Bramwell, WV, in 1943 and was a gunner stationed in Panama and the Galapagos Islands. We will also be joined by Machinist Mate 3rd Class Marion Grey Noel who joined the Navy in the 1940s and bravely fought in the battles of Iwo Jima and Okinawa.

These men represent our Nation's Greatest Generation, and their sacrifices and valor embody American patriotism. They fought in such a pivotal war, in an era that threatened our existence as a nation. Unfortunately, as the years go by, we are losing so many of our World War II veterans, and we must show them our utmost gratitude each and every day.

As I mentioned, we will also be joined by veterans of the Korean and Vietnam wars. These men and women served courageously in a variety of ways, working both at home and abroad. They engaged in combat all over the world. They were pilots, helicopter gunners, and radio operators. One of these veterans is MSgt Reese Williamson Moore who joined the Air Force in 1951 in Bluefield, WV. He was first stationed in Iwo Jima as part of the Japan Occupation Forces in 1952. Then he moved to the Royal Thai Air Base Nam Phongin in the Kingdom of Thailand. He served during a pivotal time following World War II and went on to serve in the Vietnam war.

We will also be joined by Jaeger, WV, native Sergeant Marion "Mario" E. Deskins, who joined the Air Force in 1968 in Beckley, WV. He served with the 15th Aerial Port Squadron at Danang, where he maintained records on unit personnel and transported documentation to the headquarters of the 7th Air Force in Saigon via C-130 Hercules airplanes. Sergeant Deskins was awarded the Air Force Commendation Medal for his service in Vietnam.

Another Vietnam veteran participating in this week's Honor Flight is

Sergeant Marshal G. Mann from Princeton, WV. Sergeant Mann served in combat as an aircraft loadmaster, bravely preparing and air lifting urgently needed ammunition to combat troops fighting in the Republic of Vietnam. For his service and extraordinary achievement, Sergeant Mann received the Distinguished Flying Cross.

This week's Honor Flight and the continued support of our veterans would not be possible without the dedication of so many volunteers and caregivers. I would like to thank the five JROTC Cadets from Montcalm, Bluefield, Pikeview, and Princeton High Schools, as well as the military spouses serving as the guardians on this year's Honor Flight. The care and love these Patriots provide for our veterans is invaluable and deeply appreciated.

I also commend those in the Always Free Honor Flight network for their dedication to providing our veterans with such a unique and meaningful experience. Without the diligence and passion of Dreama Denver, president of Always Free Honor Flight network and owner of Princeton, WV, Little Buddy Radio, as well as Pam Coulbourne, the coordinator of these flights, many of our veterans would never have the opportunity to travel to Washington and pay homage to the men and women they fought beside. Dreama and Pam launched the Always Free Honor Flight in 2012, and every year, they continue to make this dream a reality for many of our West Virginia veterans.

I would also like to recognize SFC Paul Dorsey, vice president of Always Free Honor Flight and official photographer Steve Coleman, who have done a tremendous job of ensuring that our veterans receive the recognition they deserve. Dreama, Pam, and Steve have also dedicated themselves to the Denver Foundation, serving as incredible examples of how individuals can give back to their communities.

This week, as we celebrate these incredible veterans and their answering our Nation's call of duty, we must remember that the men and women who have given so much to ensure America's safety deserve the utmost care and support upon their return home. We must continue to fight for a Department of Veterans Affairs that provides our veterans with the services they very much need and deserve.

I am filled with pride every time I meet the patriots who have served our country, and I am so pleased to welcome West Virginia's most courageous veterans, who are all heroes, to Washington, DC. I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in saluting them. They truly inspire us all as we are reminded of their selfless service. It is because of their bravery that all Americans enjoy the greatest liberties and freedoms in the world.

God bless our many servicemembers and veterans, the great State of West

Virginia, and the United States of America.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and honor the sacrifice of West Virginia's veterans and to welcome them to Washington DC, as a part of the Always Free Honor Flight. West Virginia has a proud tradition of military service, and I am privileged to be able to recognize these brave men and women who put their lives on the line to preserve our freedoms during our Nation's most critical hours of need.

The Always Free Honor Flight program, run by the Denver Foundation, is dedicated to bringing our veterans to Washington, DC, to thank them for their bravery and selflessness. As a daughter of a World War II veteran, this is something that is very close to my heart, and I am so thankful for the folks at Always Free Honor Flight who have dedicated their time to making sure our veterans feel our immense gratitude and pride. This year, we have the privilege of being joined by 25 veterans, including veterans from World War II, Korea, and Vietnam.

These courageous individuals embody the very best of our Nation's values and have endeavored, through unimaginable hardship and danger, to ensure that all Americans may continue to live in the freedom and safety that we all cherish. Their courage, through some of the greatest conflicts of the 20th century, will not go unnoticed, and we must strive to show our appreciation every day.

On this Always Free Honor Flight, we will be joined by two World War II veterans: Storekeeper Second Class William "Ray" Calvin Sexton, USN, Tazewell, VA; and Motor Machinist's Mate Third Class Marion Grey Noel, USN, Roanoke, VA.

In addition to our World War II veterans, we will also be joined by Korean war veteran Gerald Marreese Richmond, North Tazewell, VA; and two veterans who served in both the Korean and Vietnam wars: Johnnie Lewis Gordon, Sr., USA, Princeton, WV; and MSgt Reese Williamson Moore, USAF, Bluefield, WV.

The Vietnam veterans participating are Samuel "Sam" J. Connor, USN, Princeton, WV; CPL William "Bill" Cox, USA, Bluefield, WV; Sergeant Marion "Mario" E. Deskins, USAF, Iaeger, WV; CPL Donald R. Dinger, USMC, Bluefield, WV; SGT James "Jim" W. England, USA, Bluefield, VA; Jackie W. Estep, USMC, Yukon, WV; SPC Carl A. Lane, USA, Pineville, WV; Sergeant Marshal G. Mann, USAF, Princeton, WV; SGT Owen C. Neff, USA, Summersville, WV; PO3 Donald "Donnie" W. Noel, USN, Salem, VA; CPL Raymond C. Palmer, USA, Mabscott, WV; SGT Ronald Pennington, USA, Princeton, WV; PFC Jackson Phillip Thompson, USA, Bluefield, WV; SPC Larry Malone Saunders,

USA, Madison, WV; PO1 Alan Brett Sexton, USN, Princeton, WV; SPC James Buck Tunnell, USA, Bandy, VA; CPL Ricky D. Williams, USMC, Beckley, WV; and CPT Jerry Sheffield, USA, Lavelette, WV.

Other veterans include PFC Willis Lee Helmandollar, USA, Rocky Gap, VA; and SrA Grover C. White, Jr., USAF, Princeton, WV.

This year, we are also proud of the ROTC cadets serving as escorts for our veterans, including Jacob Aaron Krabbe, Montcalm High School, Princeton, WV; Miaha Thompson, Montcalm High School, Rock, WV; and Lamont Devon Johnson, Bluefield High School, Bluefield, WV.

These young cadets are proof of West Virginia's continuing tradition of military service and are the next generation of brave men and women that serve our country with bravery and pride.

A great debt of gratitude is also owed to Dreama Denver, president of the Denver Foundation and Little Buddy Radio. These nonprofit organizations, which were founded by Dreama and her husband, Bob Denver, established the Always Free Honor Flight Network in West Virginia.

I am so proud of the service and sense of duty that defines West Virginians and, indeed, all Americans. We all benefit from their selflessness and courage, and one of the most sacred tasks we hold is properly honoring the dedication of our veterans. In bringing them together with the powerful monuments that recognize their sacrifice, we can express our unyielding gratitude while demonstrating our lasting commitment to preserving their memory. One of the greatest honors of serving in the U.S. Senate is representing citizens who have given so much to their country. I take seriously the duty of ensuring that their sacrifice is honored with the same steadfast conviction with which they defended the rights and freedoms of every American. Today I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming and thanking these exceptional West Virginia veterans.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL DANIEL B. ALLYN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to recognize GEN Daniel B. Allyn for his exemplary dedication to duty and service to the U.S. Army and to our Nation. For the last 3 years, he has served as the 35th Vice Chief of Staff of the Army and is planning to retire next month.

General Allyn is a fellow New Englander from Berwick, ME. He was commissioned as an infantry officer from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1981. General Allyn and his family were also fortunate to make a midcareer return to New England while he was a student at the Naval War College in Newport, RI.

General Allyn has commanded troops from the platoon through corps level and served as commander of U.S. Army Forces Command, along with myriad other staff assignments. He served an overseas assignment in Korea and operational deployments for Operation Urgent Fury in Grenada, two peacekeeping deployments to the Sinai Peninsula in Egypt, Operation Just Cause in Panama, Operation Desert Storm in Saudi Arabia, Operation Desert Spring in Kuwait, two tours in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Unified Response in Haiti, and one tour in Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

During a recent interview, General Allyn reflected on his time in uniform by saying "the only legacy we leave behind is the leaders that we develop on our watch." The U.S. Army is fortunate to have leaders like General Allyn, and those who have served under him have no doubt benefitted immeasurably from the mentorship he has provided. We should all be thankful for the generations of Army leaders who will follow in his footsteps and, in so doing, positively contribute to the security of our nation.

On behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending GEN Daniel B. Allyn for over 36 years of service to our country. We wish Dan and his wife, Debbie, the very best in the years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL H. MICHAEL EDWARDS

• Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and commend Maj. Gen. H. Michael Edwards, who retired on March 31, 2017, after 43 years of exceptional leadership and service to our country, including 36 years in the Colorado Air National Guard.

For almost a decade in the position of the adjutant general for Colorado, General Edwards was responsible for the command administration of over 5,300 Army and Air National Guard members.

He also served as the executive director of the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs and was a member of the Governor's cabinet.

He had responsibility for the Colorado National Guard's primary missions of national defense and State emergency response. In addition, he was responsible for supporting the missions of the Civil Air Patrol's Colorado wing.

General Edwards received his commission in 1973, after graduating from the Air Force Academy, and earned his pilot wings in 1974 at Reese Air Force Base, TX.

He served as an F-4 pilot and AT-38 fighter lead-in instructor pilot at Osan

Air Base, Korea, and Holloman Air Force Base, NM, respectively.

General Edwards joined the Colorado Air National Guard in August 1980. He has served in numerous assignments in flying and operations, as well as command positions at squadron, group, and wing levels—culminating as the adjutant general for Colorado.●

RECOGNIZING 77TH ANNUAL PIKES PEAK OR BUST RODEO

● Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the annual Pikes Peak or Bust Rodeo, an important part of the Western culture and history of the Pikes Peak Region. This year marks the 77th rodeo, making it one of the oldest and most prestigious in the county.

The Pikes Peak Region plays a significant role in our American history. For centuries, this area was home to Native Americans, pioneers, miners, farmers and ranchers, and other explorers. The Pikes Peak region became a prime location for trade and, eventually, the home of the “Pikes Peak or Bust” gold rush in 1857. Thousands of prospectors scrambled to the area for their piece of the gold fortune. This area became the pinnacle of the American frontier, which spurred development and innovation.

Today community-wide events, including the Pikes Peak or Bust rodeo, celebrate the adventurous spirit of the Pikes Peak region and its Western heritage. In addition, the rodeo donates all proceeds to charities that support military members and their families, such as the Fort Carson Outreach Program and the U.S. Air Force Academy’s Operation Warm Heart. Thank you to the Pikes Peak or Bust Rodeo leadership and entire El Paso County community for keeping these longstanding traditions alive.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:02 p.m., a message from the House of the Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading

clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 115. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim.

H.R. 1039. An act to amend section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, to grant probation officers authority to arrest hostile third parties who obstruct or impede a probation officer in the performance of official duties.

H.R. 1892. An act to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty.

The message also announced that pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 4 of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-196), the Minority Leader appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the United States Semiquincentennial Commission: Mr. ROBERT BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. JOSEPH CROWLEY of New York; And from private life: Mr. Richard Trumka of Rockville, Maryland.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 114(b) of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development Act (2 U.S.C. 1103), the Minority Leader reappoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees for the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development for a term of 6 years: Ms. TERRI A. SEWELL of Alabama.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the order of the Senate of January 3, 2017, the Secretary of the Senate, on May 18, 2017, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 419. An act to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers’ Benefits program, and for other purposes.

S. 583. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2017, the enrolled bills were signed on May 22, 2017, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 115. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1039. An act to amend section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, to grant probation officers authority to arrest hostile third parties who obstruct or impede a probation officer in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1892. An act to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 22, 2017, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 419. An act to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers’ Benefits program, and for other purposes.

S. 583. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds to hire veterans as career law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1610. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fluazinam; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9960-50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1611. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Flonicamid; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9959-91) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1612. A communication from the Acting Deputy Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of violations of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of Agriculture’s Working Capital Fund, National Finance Center; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1613. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral James D. Syring, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1614. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, an out-of-cycle Advanced Arresting Gear Selected Acquisition Report (SAR); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1615. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2017 Annual Report to Congress on the Department of Defense Chemical and Biological Defense Program"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1616. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Strategy, Plans, and Capabilities), transmitting, pursuant to law, a correction to the 2017 report on the plan for the nuclear weapons stockpile, complex, delivery systems, and command and control systems (OSS-2017-0501); to the Committees on Armed Services; Foreign Relations; and Appropriations.

EC-1617. A communication from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2016 management reports; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1618. A communication from the Acting Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Imposition of Special Measure against North Korea as a Jurisdiction of Primary Money Laundering Concern" (RIN1506-AB35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1619. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to discretionary appropriations legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-1620. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to Emissions Banking and Trading Programs and Compliance Flexibility" (FRL No. 9960-22-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1621. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Chemical Substances When Manufactured or Processed as Nanoscale Materials; TSCA Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements" (RIN2070-AK39) (FRL No. 9962-58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1622. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Abnormal Occurrences: Fiscal Year (FY) 2016"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1623. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Connect America Fund; ETC Annual Reports and Certifications; Developing a Unified Inter-carrier Compensation Regime" (RIN3060-AF85) (FCC 17-36) (WC Docket No. 10-90) (WC Docket No. 14-58) (CC Docket No. 01-92)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1624. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Depart-

ment of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2017-0077–2017-0091); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1625. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria—Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) Program" ((RIN1810-AB25) (Docket No. ED-2015-OESE-0129)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1626. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria—Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) Program" ((RIN1810-AB25) (Docket No. ED-2015-OESE-0129)) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1627. A communication from the Senior Vice President, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, Potomac Electric Power Company, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Company's Balance Sheet as of December 31, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1628. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the six-month period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1629. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Energy's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 to March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1630. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semi-annual report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1631. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semi-annual Report of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1632. A communication from the Acting Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2016 report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1633. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services Report on the Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1634. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Non-commercial Educational Station Fund-raising for Third-Party Non-Profit Organizations" ((MB Docket No. 12-106) (FCC 17-41)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1635. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; U.S. Navy Training Activities in the Gulf of Alaska Temporary Maritime Activities Area" (RIN0648-BE67) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1636. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; U.S. Navy Training Activities in the Gulf of Alaska Temporary Maritime Activities Area" (RIN0648-BE67) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 17, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-21. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of West Virginia urging the United States Congress and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to name the NASA IV and V Facility at Fairmont for West Virginia mathematician Katherine Coleman Johnson; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 26

Whereas, The NASA Independent Verification and Validation Facility was established at Fairmont, West Virginia in 1993 as part of an agency-wide strategy to provide the highest achievable levels of safety and cost effectiveness for mission critical software; and

Whereas, The NASA IV & V Facility was founded under the NASA Office of Safety and Mission Assurance (OSMA) as a direct result of recommendations made by the National Research Council (NRC) and the Report of the Presidential Commission on the Space Shuttle Challenger Accident; and

Whereas, NASA IV & V Facility has 270 permanent employees and high school and college interns during the summer months and makes an important contribution to the Fairmont, Marion County and West Virginia economies; and

Whereas, NASA mathematician Katherine Coleman Goble Johnson was born at White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia in 1918 and graduated from West Virginia State College summa cum laude in 1937 and was the first African American Woman to attend the graduate school at West Virginia University in 1938; and

Whereas, Katherine Johnson worked as a mathematician at the Langley Flight Research Division from 1953 to 1958 where she was an analyst for such topics as gust alleviation for aircraft; and

Whereas, Katherine Johnson worked as an aerospace technologist at the Spacecraft Controls Branch from 1958 to 1986 and was involved in performing calculations for all the important space missions during this period, including the sub-orbital flight of Alan Shepard, the first orbital flight by John Glenn and the 1969 Apollo 11 moon mission; and

Whereas, Katherine Johnson is the subject of a recently released motion picture “Hidden Figures” that highlights her life and career. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia:

That the Legislature urges Congress and NASA to name the NASA IV & V Facility at Fairmont for West Virginia mathematician Katherine Coleman Johnson; and be it further,

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Delegates forward a copy of this resolution to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the members of West Virginia’s congressional delegation.

POM-22. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of West Virginia requesting the United States Congress to fully support the National Park Service’s recommendations to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail to include additional sites along the Expeditions Eastern Legacy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 15

Whereas, The Lewis and Clark Expedition (“Expedition”) and the Corps of Discovery are nationally significant for their exploration of the Louisiana Territory and search for an all water route to the Pacific Ocean. Under orders by President Thomas Jefferson, the Expedition was responsible for mapping the territory explored, as well as documenting new species of plants and animals, and engaging with the American Indian tribes they encountered. Although part of the route was unmapped territory, the Lewis and Clark Expedition was able to use maps provided to them by American Indians, European explorers, and fur traders. Ultimately, the Expedition was able to link routes and maps together to find passage from St. Louis to the Pacific Ocean, a feat which had never before been accomplished; and

Whereas, In order to recognize the historic significance of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, the National Park Service previously designated a trail which runs from Wood River, Illinois to the West Coast in Oregon and Washington; and

Whereas, Public Law 110-229, passed by the United States Congress in 2008, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to study additional sites associated with the preparation and return phases of the Expedition, located in Virginia, the District of Columbia, Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Indiana, Missouri and Illinois. Those sites were to be considered for inclusion in the “Eastern Legacy” of the Expedition; and

Whereas, The National Park Service evaluated 25 distinct route segments used by the Corps of Discovery for the Expedition to determine if they met the criteria for national significance established by the National Trails System Act; and

Whereas, In August 2016, the National Park Service published its Draft Lewis and Clark National Trail Extension Study, finding that three sections meet the criteria established for inclusion in the Lewis and Clark Na-

tional Historic Trail. Those segments include the Ohio River, from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania to Louisville, Kentucky, from Louisville, Kentucky to the confluence with the Mississippi River, and from the Mississippi River’s confluence with the Ohio River at Cairo, Illinois, to Wood River, Illinois; and

Whereas, A portion of the proposed extension of the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail includes sites along the Ohio River in West Virginia. The inclusion of this segment along the Lewis and Clark National Trail is not only historically significant and appropriate, but may have a positive economic impact on those sites. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia:

That the Legislature requests Congress to adopt the National Park Service’s recommendations as to the additional segments for inclusion in the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the members of West Virginia’s congressional delegation.

POM-23. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota requesting the United States Congress and the President of the United States to enact legislation to expand and extend the current federal tax credit for carbon capture, utilization, and storage under Section 45Q of the Internal Revenue Code; to provide appropriations to the United States Department of Energy Sufficient to achieve and sustain a robust carbon capture research, development, demonstration, and deployment program; to support the inclusion of economically and environmentally beneficial carbon capture projects in any forthcoming federal infrastructure initiative; to support policies to increase the operational efficiency; and to support the preservation of a fuel-diverse electric generation portfolio critical to our domestic economic, energy, and national security; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 3037

Whereas, fossil fuels including coal, natural gas, and oil provide more than three-quarters of global and United States’ primary energy demand and, according to the International Energy Agency, will continue to do so for the next quarter-century or more under current energy and environmental policies; and

Whereas, recognition of the value and enduring role of fossil fuels as an essential source of energy around the world and in the United States for decades to come has led environmental advocates to support the accelerated development and broad deployment of carbon capture technologies for fossil fuels as part of a sustainable energy future; and

Whereas, recognition of the role carbon capture can play in creating new opportunities for fossil fuels has led fossil energy advocates to similarly support the development and deployment of carbon capture technologies for fossil fuels; and

Whereas, the United States and North Dakota have abundant supplies of fossil energy, the production and use of which provide important economic, energy, and national security benefits to our nation and our state; and

Whereas, North Dakota is the nation’s 6th largest producer of fossil energy, 2nd largest producer of oil, 2nd largest producer of lignite coal, 11th largest producer of natural gas, the largest consumer of coal for indus-

trial use, and the 10th largest consumer of coal for electricity generation; and

Whereas, according to the Department of Energy, “A diverse portfolio of energy resources is critical to U.S. energy and national policy . . . being more robust and resilient in comparison to a system that is heavily dependent on a limited set of energy resources . . . [and] helps insulate the economy from certain risks, including price volatility and risks from supply disruptions”; and

Whereas, reliable and affordable electricity is vital to economic growth and job creation in North Dakota and the overall welfare of our citizens; and

Whereas, 73 percent of the electricity generated in North Dakota is produced from fossil fuels and the average residential price of electricity in North Dakota is the 6th lowest in the nation and is 18 percent below the national average; and

Whereas, continued research and development of carbon reduction strategies for fossil fuels is an essential element of a forward-looking sustainable energy strategy for North Dakota, our nation, and the world which will simultaneously maximize both environmental quality and economic opportunity; and

Whereas, the Energy and Environmental Research Center at the University of North Dakota, the Great Plains Synfuels Plant in Beulah, and the Lignite Energy Council are engaged in efforts to address environmental, health, and economic impacts of energy production and use through collaborations on applied carbon dioxide research, practical applications, workforce development, and public education; and

Whereas, legislation was introduced in the 114th Congress to enhance and extend federal tax incentives, under Section 45Q of the Internal Revenue Code, which serve to sustain and promote such collaborations and to encourage private industry in energy generation, manufacturing, and agriculture to adopt and deploy existing and emerging technologies that increase carbon capture, utilization, and storage; and

Whereas, the coming together of environmental and energy advocates in support of carbon capture is reflected in the groundbreaking coalition of environmental advocacy groups, labor unions, and energy producers from the coal, oil and gas, ethanol, and algae-biomass industries working together in support of federal legislation; and

Whereas, similar legislation is now under consideration in the 115th Congress, and Congress and the President also are considering enactment of a large-scale federal infrastructure initiative to strengthen our nation’s transportation, public works, and energy infrastructure that also could serve as a vehicle for advancing “jobs-ready” carbon capture projects; and

Whereas, according to the Department of Energy, “A combination of tax incentives and research, development, demonstration, and deployment will be critical to developing transformational carbon capture technologies and to driving down the costs of capture”. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, That the Sixty-fifth Legislative Assembly requests Congress and the President of the United States to enact legislation to expand and extend the current federal tax credit for carbon capture, utilization, and storage under Section 45Q of the Internal Revenue Code; to provide appropriations to the United States Department of Energy sufficient to achieve and sustain a robust carbon

capture research, development, demonstration, and deployment program; to support the inclusion of economically and environmentally beneficial carbon capture projects in any forthcoming federal infrastructure initiative; to support policies to increase the operational efficiency, and thereby the environmental performance, of existing electric-generating units in the United States; and to support the preservation of a fuel-diverse electric generation portfolio critical to our domestic economic, energy, and national security; and be it further

Resolved, that the Secretary of State forward copies of this resolution by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the President of the United States, the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary of the United States Department of Energy, and to each member of the North Dakota Congressional Delegation.

POM-24. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of California relative to Commemoration of the Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide of 1915-1923; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 29

Whereas, Armenians have resided in Asia Minor and the Caucasus for approximately four millennia, and have a long and rich history in the region, including the establishment of many kingdoms, and despite Armenians' historic presence, stewardship, and autonomy in the region, Turkish rulers of the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey subjected Armenians to severe and unjust persecution and brutality, including wholesale massacres beginning in the 1890s; and

Whereas, The Armenian nation was subjected to a systematic and premeditated genocide officially beginning on April 24, 1915, at the hands of the Young Turk Government of the Ottoman Empire from 1915-1919 and continued at the hands of the Kemalist Movement of Turkey from 1920-1923 whereby over 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children were slaughtered or marched to their deaths in an effort to annihilate the Armenian nation in the first genocide of modern times, while thousands of surviving Armenian women and children were forcibly converted and Islamized, and hundreds of thousands more were subjected to ethnic cleansing during the period of the modern Republic of Turkey from 1924-1937; and

Whereas, During the genocides of the Christians living in the Ottoman Empire and surrounding regions, which occurred during the first one-half of the 20th century, 1.5 million men, women, and children of Armenian descent, and hundreds of thousands of Assyrians, Greeks, and other Christians, lost their lives at the hands of the Ottoman Turkish Empire and the Republic of Turkey, constituting one of the most atrocious violations of human rights in the history of the world; and

Whereas, These crimes against humanity also had the consequence of permanently removing all traces of the Armenians and other targeted people from their historic homelands of more than four millennia, and enriching the perpetrators with the lands and other property of the victims of these crimes, including the usurpation of several thousand churches; and

Whereas, In response to the genocide and at the behest of President Woodrow Wilson and the United States State Department, the Near East Relief organization was founded,

and became the first congressionally sanctioned American philanthropic effort created exclusively to provide humanitarian assistance and rescue to the Armenian nation and other Christian minorities from annihilation, who went on to survive and thrive outside of their ancestral homeland all over the world and specifically in this state; and

Whereas, Near East Relief succeeded, with the active participation of the citizens from this state, in delivering \$117 million in assistance, and saving more than one million refugees, including 132,000 orphans, between 1915 and 1930, by delivering food, clothing, and materials for shelter, setting up refugee camps, clinics, hospitals, and orphanages; and

Whereas, The Armenian nation survived the genocide despite the attempt by the Ottoman Empire to exterminate it; and

Whereas, Adolf Hitler, in persuading his army commanders that the merciless persecution and killing of Jews, Poles, and other people would bring no retribution, declared, "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"; and

Whereas, On November 4, 1918, immediately after the collapse of the Young Turk regime and before the founding of the Republic of Turkey by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in 1923, the Ottoman Parliament considered a motion on the crimes committed by the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) stating: "A population of one million people guilty of nothing except belonging to the Armenian nation were massacred and exterminated, including even women and children." The Minister of Interior at the time, Fethi Bey, responded by telling the Parliament: "It is the intention of the government to cure every single injustice done up until now, as far as the means allow, to make possible the return to their homes of those sent into exile, and to compensate for their material loss as far as possible"; and

Whereas, On August 1, 1926, in an interview published in the Los Angeles Examiner, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk admitted: "These left-overs from the former Young Turk Party, who should have been made to account for the lives of millions of our Christian subjects who were ruthlessly driven en masse, from their homes and massacred, have been restive under the Republican rule. They have hitherto lived on plunder, robbery and bribery and become inimical to any idea or suggestion to enlist in useful labor and earn their living by the honest sweat of their brow"; and

Whereas, The Parliamentary Investigative Committee proceeded to collect relevant documents describing the actions of those responsible for the Armenian mass killings and turned them over to the Turkish Military Tribunal. CUP's leading figures were found guilty of massacring Armenians and hanged or given lengthy prison sentences. The Turkish Military Tribunal requested that Germany extradite to Turkey the masterminds of the massacres who had fled the country. After German refusal, they were tried in absentia and sentenced to death; and

Whereas, Unlike other people and governments that have admitted and denounced the abuses and crimes of predecessor regimes, and despite the Turkish government's earlier admissions and the overwhelming proof of genocidal intent, the Republic of Turkey inexplicably and adamantly has denied the occurrence of the crimes against humanity committed by the Ottoman and Young Turk rulers for many years, and continues to do so a full century since the first crimes constituting genocide occurred; and

Whereas, Those denials compound the grief of the few remaining survivors and deprive the surviving Armenian nation of its individual and collective ancestral lands, property, cultural heritage, financial assets, and population growth; and

Whereas, The Republic of Turkey has escalated its international campaign of Armenian Genocide denial, maintained its blockade of Armenia, and increased its pressure on the small but growing movement in Turkey acknowledging the Armenian Genocide and seeking justice for this systematic campaign of destruction of millions of Armenians, Greeks, Assyrians, and other Christians upon their biblical-era homelands; and

Whereas, Those citizens of Turkey, both Armenian and non-Armenian, who continue to speak the truth about the Armenian Genocide, such as human rights activist and journalist Hrant Dink, continue to be silenced by violent means; and

Whereas, There is continued concern about the welfare of Christians in the Republic of Turkey, their right to worship and practice freely, and the legal status and condition of thousands of ancient Armenian churches, monasteries, cemeteries, and other historical and cultural structures, sites, and antiquities in the Republic of Turkey; and

Whereas, The United States is on record as having officially recognized the Armenian Genocide in the United States government's May 28, 1951, written statement to the International Court of Justice regarding the Reservations to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, through President Ronald Reagan's April 22, 1981, Proclamation No. 4838, and by congressional legislation including House Joint Resolution 148 adopted on April 9, 1975, and House Joint Resolution 247 adopted on September 12, 1984; and

Whereas, Prior to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the United States had a record of seeking just and constructive means to address the consequences of the Ottoman Empire's intentional destruction of the Armenian people, including through United States Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 adopted on February 9, 1916, United States Senate Resolution 359 adopted on May 11, 1920, and President Woodrow Wilson's November 22, 1920, decision titled, "The Frontier between Armenia and Turkey," which was issued as a binding arbitral award, yet has not been enforced to this date despite its legally binding status; and

Whereas, President Barack Obama entered office "calling for Turkey's acknowledgment of the Armenian Genocide" and on April 24, 2013, and similarly on April 24, 2014, he further stated, "A full, frank, and just acknowledgment of the facts is in all of our interests. Peoples and nations grow stronger, and build a more just and tolerant future, by acknowledging and reckoning with painful elements of the past"; and

Whereas, California is home to the largest Armenian American population in the United States, and Armenians living in California have enriched our state through their leadership and contribution in business, agriculture, academia, government, and the arts, many of whom have family members who experienced firsthand the horror and evil of the Armenian Genocide and its ongoing denial; and

Whereas, Every person should be made aware and educated about the Armenian Genocide and other crimes against humanity; and

Whereas, The State of California has been at the forefront of encouraging and promoting a curriculum relating to human

rights and genocide in order to empower future generations to prevent the recurrence of genocide; and

Whereas, April 24, 1915, is globally observed and recognized as the commencement of the Armenian Genocide; and

Whereas, Armenians in the State of California and throughout the world have not been provided with justice for the crimes perpetrated against the Armenian nation despite the fact that over a century has passed since the crimes were first committed; and

Whereas, The Armenian people in the State of California and throughout the world remain resolved and their spirit continues to thrive more than a century after their near annihilation. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Senate hereby designates the year of 2017 as “State of California Year or Commemoration of the Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide of 1915–1923” and in doing so, intends, through the enactment of legislation, that the Armenian Genocide is properly commemorated and taught to its citizens and visitors through statewide educational and cultural events; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate hereby designates the month of April 2017 as “State of California Month of Commemoration of the 102nd Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide of 1915–1923”; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate commends its conscientious educators who teach about human rights and genocide, and intends for them, through the enactment of legislation, to continue to enhance their efforts to educate students at all levels about the experience of the Armenians and other crimes against humanity; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate hereby commends the extraordinary service which was delivered by Near East Relief to the survivors of the Armenian Genocide and the Assyrian Genocide, including thousands of direct beneficiaries of American philanthropy who are the parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents of many Californian Armenians and Assyrians, and pledges its intent, through the enactment of legislation, to working with community groups, nonprofit organizations, citizens, state personnel, and the community at large to host statewide educational and cultural events; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate deplores the persistent, ongoing efforts by any person, in this country or abroad, to deny the historical fact of the Armenian Genocide; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate respectfully calls upon the President and the Congress of the United States to formally and consistently reaffirm the historical truth that the atrocities committed against the Armenian people constituted genocide; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate calls on the President of the United States to work toward equitable, constructive, stable, and durable Armenian-Turkish relations; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate calls on the President and the Congress of the United States, in all official contacts with Turkish and other world leaders and officials, to emphasize that Turkey should:

(1) End all forms of religious discrimination and persecution.

(2) Allow the rightful historical church and lay owners of Christian and other church properties, without hindrance or restriction, to organize and administer prayer services, religious education, clerical training, ap-

pointments, and succession, religious community gatherings, social services, including ministry to the needs of the poor and infirm, and other religious activities.

(3) Return to their rightful owners all historical Christian and other churches and other places of worship, monasteries, schools, hospitals, monuments, relics, holy sites, and other religious properties, including movable properties, such as artwork, manuscripts, vestments, vessels, and other artifacts.

(4) Allow the rightful Christian and other church and lay owners of church properties, without hindrance or restriction, to preserve, reconstruct, and repair, as they see fit, all churches and other places of worship, monasteries, schools, hospitals, monuments, relics, holy sites, and other religious properties within Turkey; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Governor of California, to every member of the California State Legislature, and to the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

POM-25. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of California urging the President of the United States and the Secretary of Homeland Security to reaffirm the principles and content of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement policy regarding enforcement actions at or focused on sensitive locations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 22

Whereas, Unfettered and secure public access to educational institutions, health care facilities, government buildings, community gatherings, courthouses, and places of worship is integral to the basic rights and well-being of all Californians; and

Whereas, The mere possibility that immigration enforcement activity is taking place at sensitive locations chills the participation in society of immigrants, documented and undocumented alike, as well as their family members, and all who, regardless of their status, may be profiled as immigrants; and

Whereas, Despite repeated statements by President Trump that his immigration enforcement efforts would focus on dangerous criminals, he has directed his administration to vastly expand the scope of those to be detained and deported to include nearly all of the three million undocumented immigrants living in California; and

Whereas, A child cannot feel safe and secure going to daycare, school, or university when immigration enforcement may take place there at any time; and

Whereas, The education of California's youth is of paramount importance and impacts us all; and

Whereas, A patient, individual feeling ill, or person seeking testing or preventative care cannot feel safe and secure accessing a hospital, clinic, dental office, or other place of medical care when immigration enforcement may take place there at any time; and

Whereas, The health of every Californian is vitally important and impacts us all; and

Whereas, An attorney, litigant, or witness cannot feel safe and secure entering a courthouse when immigration enforcement may take place there at any time; and

Whereas, Equal justice for all is of the utmost importance, is constitutionally required, and impacts us all; and

Whereas, A person of faith cannot feel safe and secure entering a church, mosque, synagogue, temple, or other house of worship when immigration enforcement may take place there at any time; and

Whereas, The free exercise of religion is deeply revered and constitutionally required; and

Whereas, An individual cannot feel safe and secure openly protesting, speaking at a news conference, attending a rally, going to a public hearing, or approaching a government building when immigration enforcement may take place there at any time; and

Whereas, Freedom of expression, freedom of association, and the right to petition the government for redress are critically important and constitutionally required for the health of our democracy; and

Whereas, On October 24, 2011, John Morton, then Director of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) within the United States Department of Homeland Security, issued a policy memorandum directing ICE agents not to conduct immigration enforcement actions at or focused on sensitive locations, such as schools, hospitals, institutions of worship, funerals, weddings, public demonstrations, marches, rallies, and parades, except as authorized; and

Whereas, Memoranda released on February 20, 2017, by John Kelly, the current Secretary of Homeland Security, do not contradict and therefore, by their own terms, do not repeal the federal policy limiting immigration enforcement at sensitive locations; and

Whereas, Nonetheless, there have been numerous reports since the beginning of President Trump's Administration of ICE agents conducting immigration enforcement arrests in and around those specific sensitive locations; and

Whereas, On February 8, 2017, ICE agents arrested a group of people emerging from a Virginia church basement that was operating as a hypothermia shelter for the homeless; and

Whereas, On February 9, 2017, security cameras captured video of ICE agents entering a Texas family law courthouse and detaining a domestic violence survivor who was there to obtain a restraining order. In a sworn court statement, the ICE agents indicated that they encountered the woman outside the courthouse; and

Whereas, On February 22, 2017, ICE agents entered a Texas hospital and detained for a second time a 26-year-old mother of two who had been diagnosed with a brain tumor just 11 days prior, and tied her at the hands and feet; and

Whereas, On March 1, 2017, ICE agents detained a 22-year-old woman who was previously registered with the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, moments after she had publicly spoken about immigration policy at a press conference outside the city hall located in Jackson, Mississippi; and

Whereas, The Trump administration has justified its vast expansion of those targeted for deportation by falsely portraying the United States as a country under siege by a flood of undocumented immigrants who threaten public safety, giving rise to anti-immigrant fervor and a nativist desire to preserve our nation's historically dominant Euro-Christian culture. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Senate calls upon President Trump and Secretary Kelly to publicly and explicitly reaffirm the principles and content of the ICE policy memorandum dated

October 24, 2011, regarding enforcement actions at or focused on sensitive locations; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate calls upon Secretary Kelly to underscore to the public and to all United States Department of Homeland Security personnel that the policy on sensitive locations is not limited to enforcement at the sensitive location, but also to enforcement focused on sensitive locations, and that in other words, waiting across the street from a church or school for people to emerge from the sensitive location violates the policy as much as entering the location itself, as does following someone away from a press conference or other sensitive location so as to detain them; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate calls upon Secretary Kelly to take affirmative steps, including public commitment to the sensitive locations policy, staff training, investigation or reports of past and future violations of the policy, including, but not limited to, investigating the incidents detailed in this resolution, and pursuing disciplinary action against personnel found to have violated the policy; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Minority Leader of the United States Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

POM-26. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to create a reliable, predictable stream of resources to address deferred maintenance needs in the National Park System and to designate April 15, 2017, through April 23, 2017, as "National Park Week" in Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 30

Whereas, on August 25, 1916, Congress established the National Park Service with the mission to preserve unimpaired natural and cultural resources and values of the National Park System for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of current and future generations; and

Whereas, in 2017, the National Park Service began its second century of stewardship of the National Park System after the 2016 National Park Service Centennial, which celebrated one hundred years of the work of the National Park Service to protect and manage majestic landscapes such as Barataria Preserve, hallowed battlefields such as Chalmette Battlefield, and iconic cultural and historical sites of the United States such as Poverty Point and the Cane River National Heritage Area; and

Whereas, the National Park Service's employees, volunteers, and park supporters continue to dedicate themselves to serving the parks' national and international visitors and to maintaining and improving the national parks for all to enjoy; and

Whereas, the national parks of the United States attracted record-breaking visitation during the National Park Service Centennial, with three hundred thirty-one million recreational visits in 2016; and

Whereas, in 2015, National Park Service estimates indicate that park visitors spent more than sixteen billion nine hundred million dollars at the sites and in the states and

local communities adjacent to national parks; and

Whereas, in 2015, National Park Service estimates indicate that park visitors spent more than twenty-eight million dollars at the sites in and local communities adjacent to Louisiana's national parks; and

Whereas, in 2016, the National Park Service estimated a deferred maintenance backlog of nearly twelve billion dollars, which includes repairs to aging historical structures, trails, sewers, drainage, thousands of miles of roads, bridges, tunnels, and other vital infrastructure needs; and

Whereas, in 2016, the National Park Service estimated a deferred maintenance backlog of over fifteen million dollars in Louisiana's national parks, which includes repairs to aging historical structures, trails, sewers, drainage, thousands of miles of roads, bridges, tunnels, and other vital infrastructure needs; and

Whereas, it has been found that every public dollar invested in the National Park Service returns ten dollars because of visitor spending that works through local, state, and national economies; and

Whereas, the people of the United States have inherited the remarkable legacy of the National Park System and are entrusted with its preservation as the United States marks the beginning of the second century of the National Park System. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved that the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to create a reliable, predictable stream of resources to address deferred maintenance needs in America's National Park System; and be it further

Resolved that the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby designate April 15, 2017, through April 23, 2017, as "National Park Week" in Louisiana and encourages the people of the United States and the world to visit and experience the treasured national parks of the state of Louisiana; and be it further

Resolved that a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-27. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Louisiana recognizing Wednesday, April 26, 2017, as the fifth annual Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Day at the state capitol and express support of the Louisiana Energy Export Association, LNG exports, and the streamlining and expedition of permit approval for pending export facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION No. 44

Whereas, plentiful natural gas supplies and unprecedented advances in technology have provided a historic opportunity for the United States to achieve energy self-sufficiency while creating jobs and wealth for our economy; and

Whereas, pioneering exploration and extraction methods have opened such vast natural gas resources to development in areas, such as the Haynesville Shale, that demand on United States natural gas markets can grow with little impact on domestic prices; and

Whereas, the Department of Energy estimates domestic natural gas production levels will increase by over 50% by 2050; and

Whereas, global demand for liquefied natural gas is expected to grow significantly over the next two decades, with Louisiana poised to play a major role in meeting such demand; and

Whereas, expanding markets for United States natural gas is consistent with national trade and security policy, because failure to expand liquefied natural gas exports would force our allies to continue to rely on regimes that are hostile to United States interests for their energy needs; and

Whereas, over 100 cargoes of LNG have already departed for international markets from Louisiana facilities; and

Whereas, continued growth in liquefied natural gas exports will create tens of thousands of construction and operations jobs in Louisiana; and

Whereas, the Louisiana Energy Export Association was formed in 2017 as a nonprofit grassroots organization to serve as a unifying voice for Louisiana's LNG exporters with the mission of supporting the exports of natural gas and educating public and policy leaders of the economic benefits LNG exports will bring to the United States; and

Whereas, Louisiana Energy Export Association member companies plan to invest over \$60 billion in Louisiana over the next decade, creating over 20,000 jobs, economic opportunity, and expanding the Louisiana tax base; and

Whereas, liquefied natural gas exports would provide incentives for new infrastructure investments worth billions of dollars and generate royalties and local tax revenues directly in communities across the state; and

Whereas, a diverse coalition of Louisiana LNG producers, energy and petroleum companies, business groups, service companies, and others have expressed their support for LNG exports. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby recognize Wednesday, April 26, 2017, as the fifth annual Liquefied Natural Gas Day at the state capitol and express support of the Louisiana Energy Export Association, LNG exports, and the streamlining and expedition of permit approval for pending export facilities so that the economic benefits of LNG exports can be magnified throughout the state of Louisiana, as well as the United States; and be it further

Resolved that a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-28. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan urging the United States Congress to eliminate the "widows' tax" on the surviving spouses of retired U.S. military service members; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 50

Whereas, Retired military service members may participate in the Survivor Benefit Program. The Survivor Benefit Program is an optional annuity designed to provide a lifetime monthly benefit to the surviving spouse of a service member. The annuity payments offset part of the retirement income lost as a result of the service member's death. The annuity's premium is paid by the retired service member through a deduction from their monthly retirement benefit check; and

Whereas, The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs provides a tax-free monthly benefit to the surviving spouses of eligible military service members who died as a result of service-related injuries or diseases. The Dependency and Indemnity Compensation program's earned benefit expresses a measure of thanks from a grateful nation to a fallen soldier's

family. Benefits start with a standard monthly allowance for the surviving spouse and additional benefits are provided under certain circumstances; and

Whereas, Under federal law, a surviving spouse is punished for having both a paid annuity and earned indemnity benefits. When a surviving spouse of a military retiree is eligible to receive a monthly annuity payment through the Survivor Benefit Program and has been awarded a monthly benefit through the Dependency and Indemnity Compensation program, the retirement annuity is offset dollar-for-dollar by the amount of benefits received because of their service-related death. This offset is commonly referred to throughout the veterans' community as the "widows' tax" and can cause \$14,580 a year or more in reduced payments to beneficiaries; and

Whereas, The indemnity compensation should be in addition to the retirement annuity rather than in place of it. The rationale and qualifications for these two programs are wholly different. The Survivor Benefit Program is a personal financial decision made by a military retiree to provide some degree of financial security to their surviving spouse while the Veterans Affairs indemnity program is an earned benefit awarded following a service-connected death. The Survivor Benefit Program's mandated premium payments set it apart from the indemnity program's survivor benefits, and the government should not be taking the annuity benefits bought by service members for their families. Congress should ensure that the families who have given so much in the service of their country receive all of their military survivor benefits and retirement annuities. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we urge the Congress of the United States to eliminate the "widows' tax" on the surviving spouses of retired U.S. military service members; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 39. A bill to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-75).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1190. A bill to extend the waiver of limitations with respect to excluding from gross income amounts received by wrongfully incarcerated individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 1191. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to refine how Medicare pays for orthotics and prosthetics and to im-

prove beneficiary experience and outcomes with orthotic and prosthetic care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1192. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for pro-rated charges to entitlement to educational assistance under Department of Veterans Affairs Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program for certain licensure and certification tests and national tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 1193. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for employer-provided job training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1194. A bill to provide for the coverage of medically necessary food and vitamins for digestive and inherited metabolic disorders under Federal health programs and private health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 1195. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1196. A bill to expand the capacity and capability of the ballistic missile defense system of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1197. A bill to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's disease; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1198. A bill to protect individuals who are eligible for increased pension under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on the basis of need of regular aid and attendance from dishonest, predatory, or otherwise unlawful practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 1199. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reauthorize the Border Enforcement Security Task Force program within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1200. A bill to require that certain prevailing wage determinations be made using representative statistical sample techniques; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 1201. A bill to allow individuals living in areas without qualified health plans offered through an Exchange to have similar access to health insurance coverage as Members of Congress and congressional staff; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. Res. 175. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the commissioned officer corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Con. Res. 17. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should withdraw from the Paris Agreement, adopted in December 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 122

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 122, a bill to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to provide for nonpreemption of measures by State and local governments to divest from entities that engage in commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activities targeting Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 319

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 319, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish within the Department of Veterans Affairs a center of excellence in the prevention, diagnosis, mitigation, treatment, and rehabilitation of health conditions relating to exposure to burn pits.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 339, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 407, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 428

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 428, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to authorize States to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through enhanced pediatric health homes, and for other purposes.

S. 446

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 446, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 482

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 482, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care.

S. 516

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 516, a bill to provide grants to assist States in developing and implementing plans to address cybersecurity threats or vulnerabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 524

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 524, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent certain provisions of the Heartland, Habitat, Harvest, and Horticulture Act of 2008 relating to timber.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 569

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 597

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 597, a bill to increase Federal Pell Grants for the children of fallen public safety officers, and for other purposes.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 622, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 693

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 693, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, social work schools, and other programs, including physician assistant education programs, to promote education and research in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 712

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 712, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

S. 766

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 766, a bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to improve and enhance authorities relating to the employment, use, status, and benefits of military technicians (dual status), and for other purposes.

S. 782

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 782, a bill to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes.

S. 808

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 808, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

S. 816

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 816, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow rollovers from 529 programs to ABLE accounts.

S. 817

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 817, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 818

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 818, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals with disabilities to save additional amounts in their ABLE accounts above the current annual maximum contribution if they work and earn income.

S. 829

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 829, a bill to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 915

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 915, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 916

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 916, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with regard to the provision of emergency medical services.

S. 936

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 936, a bill to designate certain National Forest System land and certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming as wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, wildland

recovery areas, and biological connecting corridors, and for other purposes.

S. 937

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 937, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit.

S. 980

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payments for certain rural health clinic and Federally qualified health center services furnished to hospice patients under the Medicare program.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1094, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1122

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1122, a bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to clarify when the time period for the issuance of citations under such Act begins and to require a rule to clarify that an employer's duty to make and maintain accurate records of work-related injuries and illnesses is an ongoing obligation.

S. 1132

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1132, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the removal of the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare program with respect to speech generating devices.

S. 1134

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1134, a bill to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 1136

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill to improve the structure of the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1154

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Connecticut

(Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1154, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the housing treatment of members of the Armed Forces and their spouses and dependents undergoing a permanent change of station in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1155

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1155, a bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to increase the amount of financial support available for working students.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises.

S. RES. 70

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 70, a resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of Executive Order 9066 and expressing the sense of the Senate that policies that discriminate against any individual based on the actual or perceived race, ethnicity, national origin, or religion of that individual would be a repetition of the mistakes of Executive Order 9066 and contrary to the values of the United States.

S. RES. 162

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 162, a resolution reaffirming the commitment of the United States to promoting religious freedom, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1190. A bill to extend the waiver of limitations with respect to excluding from gross income amounts received by wrongfully incarcerated individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1190

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF WAIVER OF LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO EXCLUDING FROM GROSS INCOME AMOUNTS RECEIVED BY WRONGFULLY INCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304(d) of the Protecting Americans from Tax Hikes Act of 2015 (26 U.S.C. 139F note) is amended by striking “1-year” and inserting “2-year”.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 304(d) of such Act (26 U.S.C. 139F note) is amended by striking “application of this Act” and inserting “application of this section”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 304 of the Protecting Americans from Tax Hikes Act of 2015.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 175—RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMISSIONED OFFICER CORPS OF THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 175

Whereas, on May 22, 1917, the forerunner to the commissioned officer corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (referred to in this preamble as the “NOAA Corps”) was created as the commissioned corps of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in order to provide officers to command coastal survey ships and field survey parties locally and abroad;

Whereas the heritage of the NOAA Corps is closely tied to the oldest scientific and technical agency of the United States, the Survey of the Coast, which was established by President Thomas Jefferson and Congress in 1807;

Whereas, on October 3, 1970, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration was established and the officers of that agency became members of the NOAA Corps;

Whereas, for the past 100 years, the central mission of the NOAA Corps and its predecessor has been to collect data at sea or in the air to enable decisions that have a great impact on the United States;

Whereas, since 1960, officers of the NOAA Corps and their predecessors have flown into 292 tropical cyclones, risking their lives to advance the science needed to save lives and livelihoods along the coastal communities of the United States;

Whereas, whatever the mission, the United States turns to the NOAA Corps for environmental leadership;

Whereas the motto of “Honor, Respect, Commitment” is the creed by which NOAA Corps officers live and serve; and

Whereas, regardless of the cause, location, or magnitude of a future hurricane, the United States can rely on the NOAA Corps to fly into the storm to carry out the missions entrusted to the NOAA Corps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses the appreciation of the people of the United States to the commissioned officer corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (referred to in this resolving clause as the "NOAA Corps"), and the officers who have served in the NOAA Corps, for 100 years of dedicated service;

(2) honors the valor, commitment, and sacrifice that officers of the NOAA Corps have displayed throughout the history of the NOAA Corps; and

(3) respectfully requests that the President issue a proclamation that—

(A) recognizes the 100th anniversary of the NOAA Corps and the dedicated service of the officers who have served in the NOAA Corps; and

(B) calls upon the people of the United States to observe that anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE UNITED STATES SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM THE PARIS AGREEMENT, ADOPTED IN DECEMBER 2015

Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 17

Whereas the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (in this resolution referred to as the "Convention"), adopted in May 1992, entered into force in 1994 and is being implemented;

Whereas the Paris Agreement, adopted in December 2015, is another attempt by the Convention's "Conference of Parties" to globally address climate change, similar to the Kyoto Protocol, the Durban Platform, the Copenhagen Accord, and the Cancun Agreements, all of which have failed to meaningfully slow global carbon emissions;

Whereas the Paris Agreement fails to consider adequately economies that would be negatively impacted by measures to respond to climate change, including those found within the United States, as addressed in Article 4, Paragraph 10 of the Convention;

Whereas the Paris Agreement has not been submitted to the United States Senate for review and ratification;

Whereas the Paris Agreement could result in serious harm to the United States economy, including significant job loss, increased energy and consumer costs, risks to grid reliability, or any combination thereof;

Whereas, by using the free market, the United States has significantly reduced carbon dioxide emissions to the lowest they have been in 15 years, and the United States energy-related carbon dioxide emissions are projected to remain below 2005 levels through 2040, while such emissions in the developing world are projected to grow to 120 percent above 2005 levels by 2040;

Whereas the People's Republic of China is the world's largest emitter of carbon dioxide and, in accordance with the 2014 agreement with the United States entered into during the Barack Obama presidency, intends to increase its coal consumption until 2030;

Whereas the Republic of India announced that, notwithstanding the Paris Agreement, it will continue its reliance on coal and plans

to double the nation's coal output within the next 5 years;

Whereas, according to an October 2015 MIT Technology Review report, increased coal consumption in the Republic of India will negate any global efforts to limit carbon dioxide, regardless of anything that the United States does to decrease its emissions; and

Whereas the emissions reduction goals of the Paris Agreement cannot be met without the global development and deployment of new technologies that are not currently in commercial existence or economically viable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should withdraw from the Paris Agreement, adopted in December 2015.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 107-252, Title II, Section 214, appoints the following individual to the Election Assistance Board of Advisors: Lawrence Norden of New York.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 156.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 156) recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster-care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster-care system.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 156) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 4, 2017, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMISSIONED OFFICER CORPS OF THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 175, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 175) recognizing the 100th anniversary of the commissioned officer corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 175) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 23, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, May 23; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Sullivan nomination, with the time until the cloture vote equally divided in the usual form; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings; finally, that if cloture is invoked, all time during morning business, leader remarks, recess, and adjournment count postcloture on the Sullivan nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator BROWN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

CONFIRMATION OF TERRY BRANSTAD

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition, understanding that the

vote has been taken but wanting to speak on the record about the nomination of Governor Terry Branstad to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of China.

This is a critical diplomatic post today, perhaps more than at any time in our history. It has certainly been increasingly important through every administration as China's expansionist views of the world grow, as China's economy becomes more and more dominant in East Asia, and as China, by not playing fair on economic issues, has caused, with the acquiescence of many, many American companies, far too many jobs to move there.

We have seen sort of a new business model for American business that has been around now for a quarter of a century—something that economic history never showed us before—where companies shut down in places like Willowick or Toledo or Dayton or Springfield, OH, and move overseas. They are getting tax breaks to do it. They build plants there and sell those products back into Ohio or into Oklahoma or into the United States in the other 48 States. Unfortunately, China has been part of that, while U.S. companies have acted, in many cases, irresponsibly, and China has played into it.

We have serious issues with China, from their currency manipulation to trade cheating that hurts the American steel industry to their dismal, documented record on human rights and religious freedom. On all of these fronts, we need to take a firm position with China. We need an ambassador who will advocate for American workers, for American businesses, and, yes, for American values. I don't believe Governor Branstad will be that ambassador.

When it comes to putting American workers first, Governor Branstad's record, frankly, is appalling. How can he advocate for American workers and for expanding the rights of working people around the world when he fought against it at home in his home State of Iowa? As Governor, Terry Branstad waged war on collective bargaining rights. He recently signed legislation that takes away the right of public employees to bargain for fair wages and for healthcare rights that they have guaranteed for 45 years—rights that were enshrined by a law signed by a former Republican Governor.

When the State Department measures labor rights in countries around the world, they look at whether a country's laws allow workers to organize and engage in collective bargaining. China's results have always been poor. They have been criticized for deplorable working conditions. How can our country—how can the United States—lead by example when it comes to ensuring that hard work pays off when the man representing us in Bei-

jing, when the man representing us at the negotiating table is taking away workers' rights in our own country? Don't think for a moment that the Chinese will not remind the American Ambassador of what he has done with workers' rights in his home State, as we perhaps argue—it is unclear if we will now, but perhaps we will argue—for expanding workers' rights in China.

I appreciate the questions for the record that Senator CARDIN submitted to Governor Branstad. Unfortunately, his answers were vague and did nothing to address the serious concerns that many of us have.

The President made a lot of campaign promises when it comes to standing up to China. I have been clear since the days after the election, when I called the President-elect's transition team, and in conversations since then with President Trump and with the U.S. Trade Representative, Ambassador Lighthizer, that I want to work with them on that—with the President and with the U.S. Trade Representative.

After his meeting with Chinese President Xi, I sent a letter to President Trump outlining steps he should take for fighting for American workers, particularly in the steel industry, in his 100-day plan on trade. But the person negotiating that 100-day plan needs to have America's workers first in their mind. Governor Branstad has made it clear that multinational corporations, not ordinary American workers—not people in Youngstown, Warren, Steubenville, and Columbus—will have his ear.

We can see corporate fingerprints on these trade agreements. Rarely do we see workers at the table advocating for workers' rights. We only see trade policy that reflects the interests of large corporations. Those corporations then use these trade policies to outsource jobs around the world.

It is not just workers' rights where China falls woefully short and where we need to take a tough stand. China's record on human rights and religious freedom is unacceptable. Our Ambassador needs to make that clear. When U.S. officials represent us in the world, they must not only be advocates for our business interests—they should be that, to be sure—but they must also be critical advocates on behalf of workers and on behalf of the Nation's values—values like freedom of speech, freedom to organize, and the freedom to challenge powerful special interests. These are values that go to the core of who we are as the American people. But, again, Governor Branstad has not led by example. He has waged war on women's access to healthcare.

Just this week, Planned Parenthood announced that they will be forced to shut down four Iowa health clinics because of the law signed by Governor Branstad that blocked its funding.

These clinics served 15,000 patients over the past 3 years—not providing abortions. The great majority of these 15,000 patients got primary care, preventive care, contraceptive coverage—all the things that women in every community in this country demand.

Many live in rural areas. Many have nowhere else to turn for care. Now, where do all of these women go for cancer screenings, diabetes screenings, and other preventive care? Yet Governor Branstad has signed legislation taking it away, forcing the shutdown of these clinics.

Access to healthcare is a basic right in this country, and it should be in all 50 States. We need to take care of American patients and American workers and set an example for the world. Our diplomats must be that example. But, instead, we now have a man at the negotiating table who again and again and again has proven that he wants to turn back the clock on healthcare and on workers' rights.

We need an ambassador with a record of championing American values. Only then can we be confident that he will stand up to China and put Ohio workers and American workers first. Frankly, I question Governor Branstad's ability to be that ambassador—to represent the people of this great country in the People's Republic of China.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:16 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 23, 2017, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

KEVIN K. MCALLENAN, OF HAWAII, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE R. GIL KERLIKOWSKIE.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DANIEL J. MACDONNELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DANIEL B. HENDRICKSON

REAR ADM. (LH) THOMAS W. MAROTTA

REAR ADM. (LH) MATTHEW A. ZIRKLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JACQUELYN MCCLELLAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JAMES M. BUTLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. EUGENE A. BURCHER
CAPT. RODNEY P. DEWALT
CAPT. JOEY B. DODGEN
CAPT. ANDREW J. MUELLER
CAPT. RICHARD A. RODRIGUEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) KEITH M. JONES
IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JERED N. FRY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

CHRISTOPHER R. BONEY
DANIEL D. REYES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

JEFFREY A. GARRETT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

ROGER A. LEE

To be major

JEFFREY R. ROSENBERY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

THEODORE L. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JASON S. CROSS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

PAUL D. MELVEY
ALEXANDER WOLDEMARIAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

WILLIAM J. BAILEY, JR.
MARK D. BAKER
DELNISEA M. BROADNAX
MATTHEW HAWKINS
COLIN A. KISOR
RAGHAV KOTVAL
ELLEN L. MCCURDY
CARL S. MCGUIRE
BRIAN L. MIZER
MATTHEW J. RINKA
JENNIFER STRAZZA
CARMEL T. TOMLINSON
CHRISTOPHER D. TUCKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

GINA A. BUONO
DIONNE R. GAY
DEAN T. GIACOBBE
LIONEL N. JACOB
ROBERT C. JACOBY
BILLY R. LEDBETTER, JR.
JEFFREY A. LOWELL
STEVEN T. OLIVE
TOBIAS A. PAIVA
WILLIAM D. PEFFLEY
MARK D. PRICE
WENDY E. SCHOFFER
MICHAEL J. SEBESTA
ROY E. SEITZ
LYNNE M. STERNI
MARK A. STOWERS
ROSEMARIE C. TAN
MICHAEL J. THORNTON
JOSHUA M. TOBIN
FRANK J. VILLAMARIA
SANDRA F. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

DAVID J. ALLEN
DARRYL L. JONES
ROBERT T. REEVES
ERIC F. SCHOENEBECK
RYAN C. STARKEY
TRACIE M. ZIELINSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

DAVID M. BUZZETTI
BRIAN D. FOOR
ERIC G. MONOSTORI
GABY M. SALIB
ERIC R. VETTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

DAVID E. BAILEY
RUFUS E. CAYETANO
DENNIS E. COLLINS
LEO C. CREGER
MICHAEL S. FLATLEY
MATTHEW B. HALL
DONNA M. JENKINS
ORLANDO R. LORIE
DARIN E. PERRINE
MICHAEL D. REINERS
CHRISTOPHER J. STEWART

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

JOHN R. ADAMS
CYRIL R. CARANDANG
STEPHEN C. DAKIN
KEITH A. GARTNER
JOHN J. JAROS
PATRICK B. UPshaw
DOUGLAS B. WHIMPEY
MARY C. WISE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

SEAN A. COX
THOMAS K. FRIZZELL, JR.
CHRISTOPHER S. FRONK
RENE P. LAWSON
PETER K. MUSCHINSKE
DAVID L. OTTEN
LUIS A. PEREZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

ELIZABETH W. BUNDT
DENISE H. GIVENS
MONTY D. JENNINGS
MARCI R. LUCAS
KELLY A. MATUCZINSKI
ABBY L. O'DONNELL
DAGOBERTO PEREZ
MATTHEW C. RIDDER
CYNTHIA D. SECREST
JON SKELTON
NICOLE M. STRATHEARN
DANIEL TRIGGS
MICHAEL G. WATSON

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 22, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

TERRY BRANSTAD, OF IOWA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, May 22, 2017

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

May 22, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE GALLAGHER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

FREE RAIIF BADAWI AND ALL PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE IN SAUDI ARABIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, June 17 will mark the fifth anniversary of the arrest of Raif Badawi, a human activist and writer who created the website “Free Saudi Liberals.” He is a prisoner of conscience sentenced to 1,000 lashes, 10 years in prison, and a 10-year travel ban for exercising his fundamental right to freedom of expression.

He was convicted of violating Saudi Arabia’s draconian information technology law and “insulting Islam.”

Since his imprisonment in 2012, Raif’s case has garnered international attention and outrage. For the courage he displayed as a free-speech advocate, he has won many awards, including the Reporters Without Borders World Press Freedom Prize in 2014, the PEN Pinter International Writer of Courage Prize, and the Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought in 2015.

His writings were a breath of fresh air in a country that ranks 168 out of

180 in Reporters Without Borders 2017 World Press Freedom Index.

In January 2015, Raif received the first 50 of the 1,000 lashes ordered by the so-called court that sentenced him. Try to imagine what that means, what it would feel like to have someone whip you 50 times in a row, what it would do to your body, and how it would cut you up and make you bleed. The lashing was carried out in public in front of a mosque as men stood around and cheered. It was barbaric.

A week after the first session of flogging, a doctor advised prison authorities that Raif’s wounds had not healed enough for him to undergo the second round of this brutal punishing. To date, the lashings have not continued, but they could resume at any time.

Last year, Raif had to resort to a hunger strike to get access to healthcare. It has been 5 years since he has seen his wife, Ensaf, and his three children. They are growing up, and he is missing it because he dared to write what he thought.

I am sorry to say that Raif is not an isolated case. Reporters Without Borders has identified another 10 journalists and citizen journalists detained in Saudi Arabia.

Waleed Abu al-Khair, a prominent human rights defender and Raif’s lawyer, was sentenced to 15 years in prison for “harming the reputation of the state by communicating with international organizations” and other supposed crimes, like “insulting the judiciary and questioning the integrity of judges” and “disobeying the ruler and seeking to remove his legitimacy.”

Many other human rights defenders are in prison for doing things like setting up human rights organizations without permission and calling for protests. All of the founders of the Saudi Civil and Political Rights Association have been wrongfully put on trial or imprisoned.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that Saudi Arabia is an ally of the United States, but we also know that Saudi Arabia’s human rights record is terrible. According to our own State Department, “The most important human rights problems include citizens’ lack of ability and legal means to choose their government, restrictions on universal rights such as freedom of expression, including on the internet, association, movement, and religion, and pervasive gender discrimination and lack of equal rights that affect most aspects of women’s lives.”

That is not exactly a short list, Mr. Speaker. Yet the President of the

United States just traveled to Saudi Arabia without saying a single word in public about human rights, without speaking up even once on behalf of all the people who are wasting away in jails because they chose to defend a client, advocate for minorities, or call for reform.

The President wants to buy cooperation in the fight against extremism with a \$110 billion arms deal, but Saudi Arabia will not achieve security or stability by repressing peaceful dissent. On the contrary, repression creates the conditions for extremism.

Haven’t we learned that lesson by now?

Senator JOHN MCCAIN, a former prisoner of war, understands what the President does not. We in the United States have long believed moral concerns must be an essential part of our foreign policy, not a departure from it. Our values are our great strength and greatest treasure. We have been the country that saw the world as it was and made it better.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today in the best tradition of the United States to call for the immediate and unconditional release of Raif Badawi, who must be allowed to be reunited with his wife and children in Canada. And I call also for all of the other prisoners of conscience in Saudi Arabia to be released.

The United States must not be silent while people sit in prison for exercising their most basic human rights.

RECOGNITION OF FALLEN OFFICERS JASON GARNER AND RASCHEL JOHNSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I sadly rise to honor two fallen officers from my community, Stanislaus County Sheriff’s Deputy Jason Garner, and Community Service Officer Raschel Johnson.

Deputy Garner and Officer Johnson tragically left this Earth on Saturday, May 13, 2017, as a result of a vehicular collision while en route to a reported residential burglary in Modesto. Both were committed public servants whose watches ended all too soon.

Deputy Garner served with the Stanislaus County Sheriff’s Department for 9½ years in the operations division and 1 year 3 months in the adult detention division. He was well-liked on both sides of the department. During his time in service to our community, he was recognized for a wide

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

range of accomplishments, including assisting a mother in locating her daughter at Oakdale Reservoir, working with junior high students from Big Valley Christian School to conduct a successful graffiti wipeout for our community, and assisting the probation department and their firearms instructors with radio training to improve their communication skills with the dispatch center.

Officer Johnson was a 15-year veteran of Stanislaus County Sheriff's Department who was known for going above and beyond. During her time with the department, she was recognized for her contributions to her team as well as our community, which included receiving the Sheriff's Award for Excellence for coordinating the model of the Patterson Police Services substation. She also helped to develop a program to more effectively dispatch community service officers and deputies, and she assisted with the 2006 homicide investigation of California Highway Patrol Officer Earl Scott.

Both Deputy Garner and Officer Johnson leave behind an entire community who grieve their loss. Their bravery and committed service will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the lives of Stanislaus County Sheriff's Deputy Jason Garner and Community Service Officer Raschel Johnson. My deepest gratitude and sympathies go out to their families and our law enforcement community as they forge ahead without their loved ones. May God bless and keep them always.

RECOGNIZING MILITARY CAREGIVERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, during Military Caregiver Month, I would like to recognize a population of heroes who often remain in the shadows: military caregivers.

Currently there are over 5 million military and veteran caregivers in the United States. This number continues to grow as our troops abroad place themselves in harm's way.

I recently sat down with one of my heroes, Senator Elizabeth Dole, who shed a light on this important population. While she spent time with Kansas Senator Bob Dole at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center in 2011, she noticed the many caregivers around her and the unique challenges that they face. Following this discovery, she established a foundation to raise awareness and serve as a resource for these hidden heroes.

I am a proud member of the Hidden Heroes Caucus, which raises awareness and develops legislation in support of caregivers. I urge my colleagues to join

this wonderful congressional caucus of hidden heroes.

STROKE AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address Stroke Awareness Month. Stroke is the Nation's number five killer, the second leading cause of dementia, and one of the leading causes of long-term disability.

During this important month of awareness, we in Congress must realize that we have a chance to make a difference. The FAST Act would expand access to telehealth-eligible home stroke services under Medicare.

I have personally witnessed one of Kansas' greatest victories in healthcare, where my alma mater, Kansas University Medical Center, led the Kansas Stroke Collaborative, where, through telemedicine, we have saved thousands of lives and prevented literally hundreds—perhaps thousands—of long-term injuries as well.

The American Stroke Association says that 80 percent of strokes are preventable, and the more strokes we end, the more lives we will save.

Strokes kill more than 133,000 Americans annually. We can bring that number down, and I hope my colleagues will join us in that effort. As a physician, I know how important and, in many cases, how necessary these services are. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation and always remain open to innovative solutions in the medical industry, like telemedicine.

ERADICATING POLIO

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about something very near and dear to my heart: the efforts to eradicate polio.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, we are this close to ending polio. Once a widespread global epidemic, it is now only endemic in two countries: Afghanistan and Pakistan.

When I was district governor of Rotary just a few short years ago, we were reporting 17 to 18 cases per year. And I am so excited that we have only had 2 reported cases this year.

There is one organization that has led this charge, though many have helped, but Rotary has led this since 1979, literally vaccinating over 2.5 billion people in 122 countries.

As a former Rotary district governor, I spent some time this past weekend at Fort Hays State University celebrating Rotary and all we have done, including the celebration of international students and the peace awards that they receive through our scholarships.

There is no cure for polio. It is preventable by a very simple vaccine. It is vital that we aid these last handful of countries, get us over the finish line with these resources, and end our fight against polio so we can tell future generations: Like smallpox, polio is no longer in this country.

REMEMBERING PRESIDENT KENNEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today we are one week away from Memorial Day. On May 29, we will celebrate Memorial Day this year. But this also, remarkably, would be the 100th birthday of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

It is hard to believe when we think of President Kennedy, his youthful vigor, the popular appeal that he had not only in this country and around the world, and forever in our hearts and minds, that vision of grace and dignity and wit and humor and public service and dedication.

It was President Kennedy, of course, who said we will put a man on the Moon and do it within 10 years, and we did it in 9.

Amongst his great legacies, of course, is that President Kennedy founded and was the creator of the Peace Corps. President Kennedy felt in those troubling times when there was the threat of nuclear annihilation, that what we needed to do is send forward America's best, let the world see what America is truly about. So he engaged this great Nation in the effort of sending our brightest and best abroad.

Today, many Americans might be surprised to know that in a nation of more than 330 million people, less than 1 percent—let me repeat that again, less than 1 percent—of the Nation serves in all of our military, including our Reserves and National Guard and in the Peace Corps, AmeriCorps VISTA, Teach For America, Senior Corps, City Year, and Corporation for National and Community Service.

□ 1215

The Corporation for National and Community Service has indicated, last year more than 400,000 of your fellow Americans wanted to serve their country, and yet they were turned away because of a lack of financing. Imagine in this day and age, with our budgets coming out, when we know, in fact, from all sources that the volunteerism that is provided more than pays for itself at almost a 4-to-1 clip.

That is why, this Thursday, we are going to drop a bill on national service. It is called ACTION, because that is what this country needs. We find too many Americans who want to serve their nation but are unable to do so, especially those who want to serve in a capacity other than the United States military. So it is up to this Congress to make sure that we provide an alternative to do just that. So we will drop a bill this week and are looking for original cosponsors who will sign on to that bill that says simply this: If you are willing to serve your country in

any of those capacities, if you are willing to serve your country, we will help you get a college education. If you have a college education and you have been out looking for a job, and you have been unsuccessful, but you still would like experience and to serve your country, we will pay for that as well. The bottom line: Serve your country, and we will take care of your college debt or help you get to college.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon the men and women of this, the people's House, as they return from a weekend at home. Help them, and, indeed, help us all to obey Your law, to do Your will, and to walk in Your way.

We ask Your blessing this day as our President visits holy sites in the Middle East and the various leaders in the region. Grant that Your children of different cultures and faiths might come together in peace and understanding.

May all that is done this day be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S FIRST OVERSEAS VISIT

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Donald Trump gave a remarkable speech yesterday during his first overseas visit. Speaking to over 50 representatives from Muslim nations, the President outlined the future for positive relations between the United States and predominantly Muslim nations around the world.

The President's remarks in Saudi Arabia were extraordinary. I was especially grateful to hear his call for unity of all people and all regional faiths—Islam, Christianity, and Judaism—as well as a strong condemnation of Islamic extremism and terrorism.

President Trump remarked: "We pray this special gathering may someday be remembered as the beginning of peace in the Middle East—and maybe, even all over the world. But this future can only be achieved through defeating terrorism and the ideology that drives it." The President also cited 95 percent of victims of terrorism are Muslim.

I appreciate the warm welcome the President received in Saudi Arabia as he promotes peace through strength.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Our sympathy to the family of Navy Captain Ken Clark of Swansea, South Carolina, a Naval Academy graduate of great service.

INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION INTO RUSSIAN MEDDLING IN U.S. ELECTION

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that a special prosecutor has been named to conduct an independent investigation into Russia's meddling in our 2016 election and any connections between the Trump campaign and Russia.

Appointing Robert Mueller is a step in the right direction, but he must be able to operate independently, without interference from the White House, without interference, even, from the Justice Department or any other administration officials.

We must also keep in mind that this particular investigation will be limited in its scope in the sense that it will be looking only at counterintelligence issues and only at potential criminality arising out of the investigation. What it won't do is give us that bigger picture, give the American people the sense of the connection that may have occurred between the campaign of Donald Trump and the Russians.

In order to get to that, in order to restore faith and confidence in our democracy and our national security, we need an independent commission to look at that bigger picture and let Congress deal with the big questions that the American people sent us here to address. That is the direction we must take.

VICTOR ACT

(Mr. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the promise we made to our veterans and introduce the Veterans Increased Choice for Transplanted Organs and Recovery Act of 2017, the VICTOR Act.

The VICTOR Act will allow veterans who live more than 100 miles from one of the Nation's 14 VA transplant centers to receive care at a local, federally certified facility.

From Florida's Second District, the closest VA facility which performs heart, lung, and liver transplants is in Nashville, Tennessee. A veteran in Ocala would have to travel more than 600 miles to receive a new liver, despite there being seven federally certified centers in Florida.

As a surgeon, I know that timely organ transplants can make the difference between life and death, and yet our veterans sit on waiting lists for organs they may never receive. Government bureaucracy should not hurt our Nation's veterans when they are in desperate need of care. The VICTOR Act will give those who fought for our freedom a fighting chance here at home.

FARM BUREAU CENTENNIAL

(Mr. SMITH of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the centennial anniversary of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, our State's leading and largest farm organization.

Since 1917, Nebraska Farm Bureau has been a grassroots, statewide organization led by farmers and ranchers who work to enhance and strengthen the lives of all Nebraskans. This Federation of 85 county farm bureaus has more than 61,000 member families in all 93 Nebraska counties.

For 100 years, Nebraska Farm Bureau has united our State's farm and ranch families under a common banner, doing together what they cannot do alone. Through the power of their grassroots policy development process, Nebraska Farm Bureau remains the trusted voice for Nebraska farm and ranch families.

This year marks the 100th anniversary of the Farm Bureau's existence, and we congratulate the organization

and all of its members on reaching this important milestone. We are excited for what the next 100 years have in store.

REMEMBERING KEVIN MAINHART

(Mr. WESTERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Lieutenant Deputy Kevin Mainhart. A Yell County Sheriff's deputy, Kevin was killed during a traffic stop on May 11, 2017.

Lieutenant Mainhart had served as a police officer for 20 years in West Memphis, Arkansas, before returning to Yell County 5 years ago to protect and serve his hometown. He lived a life of service that his wife, Pam, and two sons, Lucas and Cody, can be proud of.

While words will never be able to console the pain and grief his family, community, and the State of Arkansas feel, we can take solace in the words of Christ, who said: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

Yell County has lost a true friend and a servant. I thank Lieutenant Mainhart for his service and sacrifice and send my most sincere condolences to his friends, family, and all those affected by this senseless act of violence.

CHEMICAL ATTACK IN SYRIA

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, stories from the survivors of Assad's bombings and chemical attacks are almost impossible to read due to the grotesque descriptions of innocent people and children suffocating, foaming at the mouth, and suffering from seizures.

If, in 2013, the Obama administration had taken decisive leadership against the use of chemical weapons, insisted on a U.N. strategy to isolate Assad and Russia, verified the elimination of Syria's chemical weapons stockpile, and created no-fly zones, we might have avoided 500,000 innocent deaths and millions of refugees.

Through his appropriate and proportionate bombing, President Trump told Assad that America will no longer ignore the unspeakable acts of violence against innocent people. We also learned that the U.S.-led coalition aircraft bombed, last week, pro-regime forces after they breached a deconfliction zone and advanced on a base occupied by U.S. special forces.

I call on the United Nations to follow America's lead by pursuing a ceasefire in Syria, creating safe zones, and holding Assad accountable for his war crimes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1603

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GUTHRIE) at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

ADAM WALSH REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1188) to reauthorize certain programs established by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1188

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE (SOMA) PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 126(d) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16926(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General \$20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022, to be available only for the SOMA program."

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE WITH RESPECT TO VIOLATIONS OF REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS.

Section 142(b) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16941(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, of amounts made available to the United States Marshals Service, not less than \$60,000,000 shall be available to carry out this section."

SEC. 4. DURATION OF SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN JUVENILES.

Subparagraph (B) of section 115(b)(2) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of

2006 (42 U.S.C. 16915(b)(2)) is amended by striking "25 years" and inserting "15 years".

SEC. 5. PUBLIC ACCESS TO JUVENILE SEX OFFENDER INFORMATION.

Section 118(c) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16918(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" after the semicolon in paragraph (3);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"(4) any information about a sex offender for whom the offense giving rise to the duty to register was an offense for which the offender was adjudicated delinquent; and"

SEC. 6. PROTECTION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FROM STATE NONCOMPLIANCE PENALTY UNDER SORNA.

Section 125 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16925(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "jurisdiction" each place it appears and inserting "State";

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "subpart 1 of part E" and inserting "section 505(c)"; and

(B) by striking "(42 U.S.C. 3750 et seq.)" and inserting "(42 U.S.C. 3755(c))"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(e) CALCULATION OF ALLOCATION TO UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—Notwithstanding the formula under section 505(c) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755(c)), a State which is subject to a reduction in funding under subsection (a) shall—

"(1) calculate the amount to be made available to units of local government by the State pursuant to the formula under section 505(c) using the amount that would otherwise be allocated to that State for that fiscal year under section 505(c) of that Act, and make such amount available to such units of local government; and

"(2) retain for the purposes described in section 501 any amount remaining after the allocation required by paragraph (1)."

SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN ANNUAL REPORT ON ENFORCEMENT OF REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS.

Section 635 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16991) is amended—

(1) by striking "Not later than July 1 of each year" and inserting "On January 1 of each year";

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ", and an analysis of any common reasons for noncompliance with such Act";

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking "and" at the end;

(4) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(5) by adding after paragraph (5) the following:

"(6) the number of sex offenders registered in the National Sex Offender Registry;

"(7) the number of sex offenders registered in the National Sex Offender Registry who—

"(A) are adults;

"(B) are juveniles; and

"(C) are adults, but who are required to register as a result of conduct committed as a juvenile; and

"(8) to the extent such information is obtainable, of the number of sex offenders registered in the National Sex Offender Registry who are juveniles—

"(A) the percentage of such offenders who were adjudicated delinquent; and

"(B) the percentage of such offenders who were prosecuted as adults."

SEC. 8. ENSURING SUPERVISION OF RELEASED SEXUALLY DANGEROUS PERSONS.

(a) **PROBATION OFFICERS.**—Section 3603 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in paragraph (8)(A) by striking “or 4246” and inserting “, 4246, or 4248”.

(b) **PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICERS.**—Section 3154 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in paragraph (12)(A) by striking “or 4246” and inserting “, 4246, or 4248”.

SEC. 9. CIVIL REMEDY FOR SURVIVORS OF CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 2255(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “three years” and inserting “10 years”; and

(2) by inserting “ends” before the period at the end.

SEC. 10. TRIBAL ACCESS PROGRAM.

The Attorney General is authorized to provide technical assistance, including equipment, to tribal governments for the purpose of enabling such governments to access, enter information into, and obtain information from, Federal criminal information databases, as authorized under section 534(d) of title 28, United States Code. The Department of Justice Working Capital Fund (established under section 527 of title 28, United States Code) may be reimbursed by federally recognized tribes for technical assistance provided pursuant to this section.

SEC. 11. ALTERNATIVE MECHANISMS FOR IN-PERSON VERIFICATION.

Section 116 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16916) is amended—

(1) by striking “A sex offender shall” and inserting the following:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), a sex offender shall”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **ALTERNATIVE VERIFICATION METHOD.**—A jurisdiction may allow a sex offender to comply with the requirements under subsection (a) by an alternative verification method approved by the Attorney General, except that each offender shall appear in person not less than one time per year. The Attorney General shall approve an alternative verification method described in this subsection prior to its implementation by a jurisdiction in order to ensure that such method provides for verification that is sufficient to ensure the public safety.”.

SEC. 12. CLARIFICATION OF AGGRAVATED SEXUAL ABUSE.

Section 111(8) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16911(8)) is amended by inserting “subsection (a) or (b) of” before “section 2241 of title 18, United States Code”.

SEC. 13. COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION OF SEX OFFENDER ISSUES.

Section 634(c) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **ADDITIONAL REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of the Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act of 2017, the National Institute of Justice shall submit to Congress a report on the public safety impact, recidivism, and collateral consequences of long-term registration of juvenile sex offenders, based on the information collected for the study under subsection (a) and any other information the National Institute of Justice determines necessary for such report.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1188, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In preventing child victimization, Congress, working in tandem with law enforcement, has long recognized the importance of monitoring sex offenders.

In 1994, Congress passed the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act. This legislation mandated that States track violent sex offenders and establish guidelines for tracking those offenders.

Over the years, Congress continued its vigilance in monitoring sex offenders, which ultimately culminated in a comprehensive piece of legislation titled the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006. Among other things, the Adam Walsh Act established a national sex offender registry, provided for post-conviction civil commitment of certain sex offenders, eliminated the statute of limitations for certain sex offenses against children, and created an office at the Justice Department specifically designed to monitor sex offenders.

Today I am proud to be here on the floor to champion the reauthorization of this landmark legislation.

H.R. 1188, the Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act of 2017, authorizes funds for the Department of Justice's Sex Offender Management Assistance program and for the great work the United States Marshals do in locating and apprehending fugitive sex offenders who do not comply with the law's requirements.

H.R. 1188 also contains numerous measures to encourage more States and Tribal jurisdictions to comply with the requirements of the Federal system, in part by making changes to the law to address concerns some States have expressed.

For instance, the bill lowers the duration of sex offender registration requirements for certain juveniles and allows States to register juveniles adjudicated delinquent on a nonpublic system. It also clarifies that only juveniles who commit violent sexual assaults should be placed on a State registry.

The bill also permits alternative methods for in-person verification so that rural jurisdictions can verify location of offenders remotely, in most instances only requiring in-person verification once per year.

H.R. 1188 requires parole officers and pretrial services officers to stay informed of the conduct and provide supervision of sexually dangerous persons. Moreover, the bill strengthens civil remedies for survivors of exploitation and trafficking by allowing individuals who were victims of exploitation or trafficking as juveniles to have 10 years after becoming an adult to file suit for a civil remedy.

Mr. Speaker, we must not forget why we are here. In 1981, Adam Walsh, a 7-year-old boy, was abducted and brutally murdered in Hollywood, Florida. His death was devastating. And for many families, that kind of insupportable pain would be incapacitating. As a father and grandfather, I cannot even imagine it.

We are thankful for the work of the Walsh family, who have dedicated their lives to child advocacy and whose work is responsible for saving the lives of countless children. I am also grateful to our colleague, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, the author of the original Adam Walsh Act, for introducing this reauthorization bill and for his own tireless advocacy on behalf of our Nation's children.

Mr. Speaker, scripture reminds us that “children are a heritage from the Lord.” I urge my colleagues to support this strong, bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1188, the Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act of 2017.

For those of us who have met John Walsh and know of his family, it is both unspeakable and unimaginable the feeling that families have faced when a beautiful young child has gone missing and ultimately brutalized and killed. That is what happened to John, his wife, and his family's beautiful child in 1981.

So out of that came a lifelong commitment to ending this kind of violence against children, but, more importantly, finding the Nation's worst criminals who would brutalize families and fail to be apprehended.

The Adam Walsh Act, in particular, established the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act—often referred to as SORNA—as a national system for the registration of sex offenders.

This bill is an important bill, and I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) again for his energized and effective effort reauthorizing this legislation and his commitment to fighting for the needs of protecting children. We join him in that. I am reminded of the great work of the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children and how they have continued their work for years. As they came into fruition, it seemed that children were missing every day. Violence

was perpetrated, but laws were brought about to make a difference.

So I support this bill and I raise some reflective thoughts. I am glad that this bill reflects changes to SORNA that were agreed to by the Judiciary Committee when it last reauthorized the Adam Walsh Act in 2012 to improve the requirements for States to register sex offenders, for that was a very difficult system, and some States were complying and others were not.

Whatever one's belief may be about the wisdom of sex offender registries, prior to SORNA, many States had already developed sex offender registries on their own and devoted substantial resources to identify the most effective methods to manage sex offenders.

In the legislation, there was a certain way that SORNA wanted to handle that, therefore, States were made to disregard those efforts in favor of a one-size-fits-all. One of the principal concerns with SORNA is that it deprives States of flexibility in dealing with juvenile sex offender registration. I am glad that there is at least a recognition that States have put in good programs, so I am delighted that that flexibility can be addressed.

I also think that it is important to note that the bill has to address longstanding implementation issues. As we noted in 2012, although the legislation made some useful reforms, it failed to address fundamental concerns with SORNA, and we are still working to achieve that accomplishment.

Commendably, H.R. 1188, however, would allow States discretion in determining whether juvenile sex offender information would be accessible to the public via the internet. Of course, it continues to be a steadfast legal prohibition and structure to diminishing—or hopefully diminishing—the sex violence against children.

It will reduce the time that certain, but not all, juvenile sex offenders adjudicated as a delinquent are required to register from 25 to 15 years.

The bill has many merits, and I think the changes that have been made are extremely positive, one, in dealing with flexibility, and, two, with recognizing some flexibility as it relates to juvenile offenders.

This is legislation that many have poured their heart into because they believe that there should be a day when this kind of violence ends, and I hope my colleagues will support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 1188, the “Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act of 2017.” While it is an improvement over current law dealing with a very important subject, it should do more.

This bill is a step forward in our effort to address concerns about the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act, commonly known as SORNA.

There is no doubt that child sexual exploitation is a plague on our country.

The mistreatment of children should not be tolerated in any form.

Congress has a duty to carefully craft solutions to this problem without creating confusion or new problems.

The creation of a uniform, nationwide standard for sex offender registries in the Adam Walsh Act of 2006 was motivated by laudable goals—prevention and protection.

Congress soon found, however, that state implementation of SORNA would not occur quickly or easily.

Many states were unable to comply, and some would not comply because of disagreements about who should be subject to mandatory registration.

Problems with SORNA were still evident in 2012 when we last considered, but did not complete, reauthorization of the Adam Walsh Act.

Now, ten years after enactment, problems with SORNA remain.

According to the Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs (OJP), only 17 states, 3 territories, and 103 Indian tribes, have substantially implemented SORNA.

States continue to incur penalties imposed on Byrne Justice Assistance Grants funding for noncompliance, monies that fund essential state and local programs.

Juvenile registration is still the most significant barrier to state implementation of SORNA.

Research has shown that treatment of juvenile sex offenders can and does work through therapy that involves community-based intervention, adapted to the needs of juveniles, working within multiple systems—individual, family, and school—to address the various causes of childhood delinquency.

Researchers have also found that adolescents who completed sexual offender treatment had significantly lower recidivism rates than untreated adolescents, whereas registration serves only to marginalize and label youth, causing more harm than good.

In order to implement the approaches to the treatment of juvenile offenders that have proven successful, states must have flexibility in the manner in which they handle juvenile sex offenders—flexibility that is all but denied to states by SORNA.

Although I believe juveniles should be completely removed from registration requirements, I am glad that this bill includes a provision that allows states to exempt juveniles adjudicated delinquent for sex offenses from the public website and reduces the time some juveniles will be potentially required to register from 25 to 15 years.

Under this bill, the Attorney General's annual report to Congress on sex offender registration will now include an analysis of common reasons for state noncompliance, including more detailed information on offenders, particularly juveniles, including a breakdown of the number of registered offenders who are juveniles and adults who are required to register because of statutory rape convictions or other conduct committed as juveniles.

Hopefully, this information will inform future efforts to amend SORNA.

While this bill includes provisions that address some of the concerns raised when the Adam Walsh Act was considered by this Com-

mittee in 2012, it is clear that work remains to be done if the Act is to ever achieve its purpose.

I thank Mr. SENSENBRENNER for his dedication to this issue.

I support this bill—as far as it goes—and hope my colleagues will support efforts to improve it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, as the chief sponsor of this legislation, as well as the chief sponsor of the original Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, I rise in support of this legislation and hope that it is swiftly enacted.

The Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act, enacted in 2006, is landmark legislation intended to keep our communities, and, most importantly, our children safe from sex offenders and other dangerous predators.

This bipartisan bill strengthened the sex offender registry requirements and enforcement, extended Federal registry requirements to Indian Tribes, and authorized funding for Federal programs intended to address and deter child exploitation.

□ 1615

The centerpiece of the Adam Walsh Act is the national Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act, or SORNA for short. SORNA's goal is to create a seamless national sex offender registry to assist law enforcement efforts to detect and track offenders. SORNA provides minimum standards for State sex offender registries and created the Dru Sjodin National Sex Offender Public Website, which allows law enforcement officials and the general public to search for sex offenders nationwide from just one website.

H.R. 1188, the Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act of 2017, reauthorizes two key programs from the original Adam Walsh Act: grants to the States and other jurisdictions to implement the Adam Walsh Act's sex offender registry requirements and funding for the U.S. marshals to locate and apprehend sex offenders who violate registration requirements. These programs are crucial to efforts to complete and enforce the national network of sex offender registries, particularly in light of the already passed deadline for States to come into compliance with SORNA.

Based on feedback from the States, H.R. 1188 makes targeted changes to the SORNA sex offender registry requirements. The bill changes the period of time after which juveniles adjudicated delinquent can petition to be removed from the sex offender registry for a clean record from 25 to 15 years,

and provides that juveniles do not need to be included on publicly viewed sex offender registries. Instead, it is sufficient for juveniles to be included on registries that are only viewed by law enforcement entities. I believe these provisions strike an appropriate balance between being tough on juveniles who commit serious sex crimes and understanding that there can be differences between adult and juvenile offenders.

The bill also recognizes the unique challenges that tribes face in implementing SORNA. H.R. 1188 provides technical assistance to tribes so they can access, and enter information into, the Federal criminal information databases.

Finally, H.R. 1188 amends the statute of limitations to allow individuals who were victims of exploitation or trafficking as juveniles to have 10 years after becoming an adult to file suit for a civil remedy. It is my hope that, with these commonsense changes, more States will come into compliance.

With the passage of this legislation, Congress can send a strong message to all Americans about our continued commitment to keeping our Nation's children safe. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

First of all, we will be doing a series of bills that are extremely important, and I will make note of my interest in protecting children, but as well to broaden our work as we work in the Committee on the Judiciary on matters dealing with criminal justice reform and specifically dealing with the issue of solitary confinement, alternative sentencing for young people, and Ban the Box. I also hope that we will work on issues dealing with criminal justice reform sentencing reduction that are crucial and prison reform. There is a lot of work for us to do as we do the work on the floor today. People are waiting, and in some instances languishing, in the Nation's juvenile detention centers and various juvenile justice courts for a statement to be made by the Federal Government on seeking a second chance for those who are in the juvenile justice system.

As relates to the Adam Walsh legislation, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the other cosponsors of H.R. 1188 for their steadfast work on these issues. Nevertheless, as I indicated, let's do more with respect to dealing with the registration of juvenile offenders in terms of attempting to ensure that they will have an opportunity for rehabilitation.

While I hope we may still work to make additional improvements to this legislation, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to again consider the importance of our duty to protect children

from sexual predators in as efficient and broad-based manner as we possibly can.

I want to thank the continued service of John Walsh and offer again, as we all do, our deepest expression of remorse for the loss that he and so many families tragically have experienced at the hands of horrific sexual predators and those who would attack our children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important bipartisan legislation. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY), and the chief sponsor, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), for working with me and my staff on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1188, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLOBAL CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1862) to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand the scope of certain definitions pertaining to unlawful sexual conduct, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1862

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Global Child Protection Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. EXPANDING THE DEFINITION OF ILLICIT SEXUAL CONDUCT.

Section 2423(f)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "a sexual act (as defined in section 2246) with" and inserting "any conduct involving"; and

(2) by striking "if the sexual act" and inserting "if the conduct".

SEC. 3. EXPANDING THE DEFINITION OF FEDERAL SEX OFFENSE.

Section 3559 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(2)(A)—

(A) by inserting after "2244(a)(1)" the following "or 2244(a)(5)";

(B) by striking the "or" before "2423(a)";

(C) by striking "into prostitution"; and

(D) by inserting "or 2423(c) (relating to illicit sexual conduct)" before the semicolon at the end; and

(2) in subsection (e)(3), by striking "or 2423(a)" and inserting "2423(a), or 2423(c)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1862, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Children are the most vulnerable and innocent members of our society, and we have a duty to make sure our laws protect them to the fullest extent possible. H.R. 1862, the Global Child Protection Act of 2017, closes regrettable loopholes in existing child exploitation statutes to do just that.

Currently, dangerous sexual predators who violate children overseas can avoid culpability simply by engaging in what the United States Code defines as sexual contact rather than what the law defines as illicit sexual conduct. That is, they can go abroad, cause a child to sexually touch them, and return, without exposure to the criminal liability they would face had they engaged in what the law defines as illicit sexual conduct.

I am sure my colleagues would agree that it should not matter whether the offender engages in sexual conduct or contact with a child. Either way, he is a child predator. This is the very definition of a loophole, and it is putting children at risk. That is because these predators are aware of this loophole, and they are able to share this information quickly in chat groups on the internet. They plot their foreign sex tourism accordingly, to circumvent criminal liability.

H.R. 1862 closes this loophole by expanding the definition of illicit sexual conduct to include sexual contact. No longer will these predators be able to escape justice and continue to offend with impunity.

This bill also closes a loophole for recidivist offenders. It is estimated that only between 8 and 20 percent of victims of childhood sexual abuse report they have been abused. That is why it is vitally important that, when we do become aware of these offenses and secure convictions, our justice system imposes penalties to adequately punish and deter this evil.

Current law provides that an offender convicted of committing a Federal sex offense against a minor shall be sentenced to life imprisonment if that offender has a prior conviction for a sex offense against a minor. In defining sex offense, however, this provision inexplicably excludes two serious offenses. It is missing offenses covering abusive sexual contact with a minor under 12 and also does not apply to offenders who commit their sex crimes against children overseas. H.R. 1862 fixes these oversights—and they were clearly oversights—by adding these provisions into the definition of Federal sex offense.

When an offender has previously harmed a child, been punished for that offense, and goes on to harm another child, the risk that he will go on to abuse again is extremely high, and we must ensure our children are safe from such a dangerous predator. That dynamic of deterrence, ensuring repeat offenders face harsher penalties, is at the core of our system of justice. It is even more important here where the victims are our children. Children are one-third of our population and all of our future. We must prioritize their protection.

I commend the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for introducing this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly in opposition to H.R. 1862, and I regret this opposition because it would add a new offense—well, new offenses—to the current provision in the criminal code providing for mandatory life imprisonment for certain repeat sex offenders.

Now, under section 3559(e) of title 18 of the U.S. Code, a defendant who has been previously convicted of a Federal felony or State sex offense committed against a child, and who is guilty of a predicate Federal sex offense against a child, must be sentenced to life in prison. H.R. 1862 amends section 3559 to add more Federal predicate offenses on which to base imposition of a life sentence; namely, sexual contact with a minor under the age of 12, aggravated sexual contact with minors between the ages of 12 and 15, and illicit sexual conduct with a minor abroad by a U.S. citizen. The bill would also provide the requirement that a Federal predicate offense relating to coercion or enticement of a minor be related to prostitution.

Instead, H.R. 1862 would allow coercion or enticement of a minor into any criminal sexual activity to serve as a basis for imposition of a mandatory life sentence. Repeat offenders should, of course, be subject to increased penalties, and, for some offenses, life imprisonment is appropriate. Yet Con-

gress should not mandate that life imprisonment be the only sentencing option.

For far too long, the Federal criminal justice system has relied on an unsustainable system of mass incarceration that is largely driven by inflexible mandatory minimum sentencing. Mandatory minimums are not necessary to impose appropriate sentences. The judge at sentencing has all the information he or she needs to impose a sentence commensurate with the crime committed and the culpability of the offender. Arrived at this way, sentences may still be quite lengthy—perhaps, in some cases, life in prison—but these penalties must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Accordingly, I encourage my colleagues to join with me and others in opposing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chief sponsor of this legislation.

□ 1630

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for making our efforts to combat child exploitation and human trafficking a priority on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I was eager to join the Judiciary Committee was to play a role in combating crimes against children. I am proud to serve on the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, where, under the leadership of Chairman TREY GOWDY, we are working to protect innocent children, and make sure that those that would do them harm are brought to justice.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to talk about crimes against children, particularly those that are sexual in nature. Just speaking the term “global sex tourism” is enough to send chills up almost anyone’s spine. Because this subject is so ugly and uncomfortable, most Americans probably have no idea the extent to which children around the globe are at risk of exploitation. That is what makes it so important that we do talk about it and address the problem head-on.

Earlier this year, I met with experts from the Department of Justice to discuss how loopholes in current law are allowing child predators to evade punishment for their abuse of children in the United States overseas. Certain types of sexual contact with children are not explicitly covered under the criminal definition of “illicit sexual conduct.” This allows child predators engaged in global sex tourism to evade punishment for acts that are clearly abusive.

Also, current sentencing code does not treat contact offenses against child

victims under the age of 12 the same as it does against those victims between the ages of 12 and 18.

Mr. Speaker, these loopholes were, of course, never intended. Nonetheless, these technical flaws in the law are making it harder for authorities to put serial child abusers away where they belong.

H.R. 1862, the Global Child Protection Act, aims to close these loopholes and better equip law enforcement to protect people and punish abusers. Specifically, this bill would expand the definition of “illicit sexual conduct” to include “sexual contact,” thus allowing authorities to crack down on global sex tourism and punish these criminals.

This bill also seeks to protect the youngest child victims by broadening the sentencing code to ensure that all types of contact offenses against children of all ages are treated with the same level of seriousness.

To be clear, the current statute criminalizes the act of traveling abroad to do terrible things to children, but it does not criminalize the people who force children to perform sexual acts on them. This bill very simply closes the loophole when it comes to sex tourism and soliciting sexual acts from a minor, to include not just what someone would do to a child, but what they would force a child to do to them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our strong partners in the White House and the Department of Justice for their commitment to combating exploitation and abuse here in our country and abroad.

Last week I went with the chairman and others to the White House to participate in a bipartisan listening session on human trafficking and exploitation hosted by Ivanka Trump. I appreciate Ivanka for inviting me and my fellow lawmakers to be a part of this very important exchange. I believe that her involvement and leadership on this issue can be instrumental to achieving results.

Also, it certainly wasn’t lost on me that in his first official act after being sworn in, Attorney General Jeff Sessions presented the President with an executive order strengthening the enforcement of Federal law on international trafficking, including human trafficking. We have dedicated law enforcement professionals working hard every day to protect children and punish abusers, and we need to make sure that they have every tool at their disposal to do their job.

Mr. Speaker, it is our enduring responsibility to protect those among us who cannot protect themselves. We have an opportunity to do that today by passing the Global Child Protection Act and getting one step closer to closing these loopholes.

Of course, my bill is just part of a slate of Judiciary Committee bills

aimed to combat child exploitation and human trafficking. I urge my colleagues to approve all of these bills and to take action toward stopping this growing problem in this country and abroad.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), a distinguished former member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1862.

While I support the underlying goal of punishing sex offenders, the existing Federal statutes already severely punish these offenses. This legislation, unfortunately, will impose a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment.

This expansion of mandatory minimum sentences of life without parole comes on the heels of Attorney General Sessions' memorandum of May 12, 2017, which has been roundly criticized for rescinding the Holder memo. The Sessions memo directs all Federal prosecutors to pursue the most serious charges and the maximum sentence to include mandatory minimum sentences. This directive takes away from Federal prosecutors and judges the ability to individually assess unique circumstances of each case, including any factors that may mitigate against imposing a life sentence in every case.

A life sentence is a most severe form of punishment, second only to the death penalty. Careful consideration should be given when our society imposes a life sentence, and judges should have the discretion in determining when this severe punishment should be imposed.

Now, I point out that this punishment would be imposed not only on the ringleader, but on anyone involved in a conspiracy. We have seen how that works in drug conspiracies where a girlfriend who takes a phone message or drives her boyfriend to a deal would be included in the boyfriend's conspiracy and subject to the same draconian mandatory minimum the boyfriend is subjected to.

In this case, the defendant would have to have a prior conviction. But life without parole would be the penalty upon a conviction, with no consideration being given to how long ago the conviction occurred or how serious a conviction was or what role the defendant played in the instant case.

For decades now, extensive research and evidence has demonstrated that mandatory minimums fail to reduce crime, they waste the taxpayers' money, they discriminate against minorities, and often require a judge to impose a sentence so bizarre as to violate common sense. Unfortunately, there are already too many mandatory minimums in the Federal code. If we ever expect to do anything about that problem and address this major driver of mass incarceration, the first step we

have to take is to stop passing new mandatory minimums or bills that expand mandatory minimums.

Mandatory minimums did not get in the Federal code all at once—they got there one at a time, each one part of a larger bill, which, on balance, might have been a good idea. The only way to stop passing new mandatory minimums is to stop passing bills that contain mandatory minimums.

Giving lip service to a suggestion that you would have preferred that the mandatory minimum not have been in the bill and then voting for it anyway, just creates another mandatory minimum, and guarantees that those who support mandatory minimums will include them in the next bill. That is how we became number one in the world on incarceration.

Recent studies have shown that we lock up so many people that our incarceration rate is actually counterproductive. There are so many people in jail, so many people being raised with parents in prison, so many people with felony records, and so much of the Justice Department budget being used on prisons that aren't doing any good, that could have been used for constructive activities. We lock up so many people that the incarceration rate is actually counterproductive.

Mr. Speaker, I support the underlying goals of H.R. 1862 to punish sex offenders against children, but I do not support expanding mandatory minimums, in this case, life without parole.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would not be controversial if it had not included mandatory minimums, but, unfortunately, it does. So I, therefore, urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1862.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, let me make it very clear that there are no new mandatory minimums in this bill. The mandatory minimum that is already in the law is appropriate for those who are a danger to children, particularly where these enhancements apply when they have abused a minor, not once, but twice.

We are closing a loophole in the current law and we are adding to this provision the sexual abuse of children under 12 years old. Having already harmed two children, an offender poses too great a risk to our vulnerable citizens. There are victims here and potential victims to protect.

As I mentioned before, child victims report abuse at a shockingly low level. It is important that this conduct is adequately deterred for someone who has already abused a child. Clearly, one conviction was not adequate.

Prosecutorial discretion in these cases act as an appropriate buffer to ensure these provisions are being used reasonably. There are no new mandatory minimums in this bill. We simply close a loophole to make sure that peo-

ple do not sexually abuse children under 12 years of age, not once, not twice, but more than twice. That is why this mandatory minimum should have a loophole closed to include it, but there is not a new mandatory minimum sentence in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my good friend from Virginia, the chairman of the committee, that the acts are heinous. It appears that there is no addition to the underlying aspect of section 3559(e) of title 18 that says, a defendant who has been previously convicted of a felony Federal or State sex offense committed against a child and who is guilty of a predicate Federal sex offense against a child must be sentenced to life imprisonment.

But, again, the bill is not written that way. I agree with everything my good friend, the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. ROBY) said. I want to congratulate her for her commitment, as so many of us, as women who have come to the United States Congress who are mothers, have a special interest in children, and, in particular, to avoid the horrific abuse of children, and sexual abuse. That is an important cause, and the underlying bill is important and crucial.

But I maintain that there is a lack of clarity into whether or not, in fact, there are additional mandatory minimums because it is broken down in these elements. The imposition of a life sentence, namely, sexual contact with a minor under the age of 12, aggravated sexual contact with a minor between the ages of 12 and 15, and illicit sexual conduct with a minor abroad by a U.S. citizen.

The question is: Is the discretion of the court and the prosecutor there?

I am not in the court. I don't know what the facts are, except for the heinousness of tainting and violating a child. I want that criminal brought to justice, but I want that prosecutor and that judge and the defense under this existing statute to be able to address that question and to be able to address the vileness or the mitigating factors in that instance.

I don't want repeat offenders. Some have alleged that there should be a variety of responses to sex offenders. I am aware of international sex trafficking and men that travel to international places to have sex with a child. I can't imagine that that would not fall on deaf ears in a courtroom under the existing statute of 3559(e). And that is the imposition of life imprisonment.

But there is merit to the question of discretion and the assessment of the court. Now, I might say, with a little

aside, that there are some populations that don't get fair treatment, no matter what the case is, yet I am yielding to the court because I do think there is merit to this idea of one mandatory sentence after another, and that that is the only response that one must get the mandatory minimum.

In the backdrop of this Attorney General, who has expressed no interest in rehabilitation, in treatment, or in real criminal justice reform, I am frightened. I am frightened about what will happen in the Nation's U.S. attorneys and Federal courts across America.

Will we again reinstitute the wave of incarcerated persons marching in under mandatory minimums?

□ 1645

Will the epidemic begin again?

It is a difficult posture to stand on the floor of the House when you are discussing a baby, a child, a 12-year-old. There is no divide between my belief and Congresswoman ROBY's belief. It is heinous. They should be punished.

We may have a disagreement of what may be a process that reenacts and restores our pathway on mass incarceration. It is not clear in the bill, plain and simple.

I heard the response of the chairman: There is nothing new. Then it should have been tied to 3559(c) and just say, "must be sentenced to life in prison, as it is." But it seems that there is a refinement, so more and more opportunities for mandatory minimums and no discretion for the judge.

In a courtroom, the judge, at sentencing, has all the information he or she needs to impose a sentence commensurate with the crime committed and the culpability of the offender. At that time, lock them up, throw the key away.

I am not sure what the Department of Justice is speaking about in terms of loopholes. There are some very fine men and women who have headed up U.S. Attorneys Offices over the years and decades, and they have gotten their man or woman.

So the question is: With an Attorney General that we have, who stood in the way of criminal justice reform in the last Congress as we were on the precipice of doing great things, now I am supposed to be convinced that he is in any way sympathetic to the mass incarceration which disproportionately impacts African Americans.

No, this is not a case that is a bill that points or focuses on African Americans. I am very clear about that. I don't suggest that at all. But I know the ultimate result of mandatory minimums has a disproportionate impact on African Americans, as evidenced by the census population in the Federal Prison Bureau, in the Federal criminal justice system, and in State prisons across America.

I want to work with my colleagues. I want to save children. All of us are brought to tears when some heinous, vile human being wants to taint a child. But if a judge can't understand that, shame on them. If a prosecutor doesn't understand that, shame on them.

And they have got 3559(e) that expresses that, which would include the illicit sexual conduct with a minor abroad by a U.S. citizen and, if not, that could be stated in there, and the language "must be sentenced to life in prison."

I am not sure where we are going, but I would hope that we could clarify that 3559(e) answers all the questions and that we don't find added mandatory minimums which impact communities disproportionately as the only solution to getting a dastardly person off the streets.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would like everyone to think about this in a very general way, that expanding the scope of offenses subject to mandatory minimums is just as harmful as enacting new ones. It is the same thing. And so, accordingly, I oppose this legislation.

Those who commit crimes against children deserve to be punished, and repeat offenders most certainly deserve to face increased penalties. There is no one that, I don't think, in this House, disagrees with that.

But nevertheless, I oppose mandatory minimum sentencing and, therefore, I must oppose this legislation. I believe that judges are the best suited to determine the just and appropriate punishment in each case.

So for the foregoing reasons, I urge each and every one of my colleagues here to oppose H.R. 1862.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the ranking member, asked that we look at this in a broad and general way, but that is not what this bill is all about. I ask my colleagues to look at this in the very specific way that this bill is designed: to address a loophole in current law that allows sexual predators of children under 12 years old to avoid the sentencing consequences of their actions.

We are about protecting children. This law is about protecting children. But predators know this loophole in the law, and it needs to be closed, so that is what this is about.

This is about making sure that sexual predators are taken off the streets and prevented from not abusing children once or twice, but many more times. This will stop that. This will close that loophole.

This is not the place—sexual predators for children under 12 years old. This is not the place to have a general, broad discussion about mandatory minimum sentences.

Let's fix this problem. And we can and will as we address criminal justice reform, look at our overall sentencing, but this problem needs to be addressed. It needs to be addressed now for the sake of protecting our children. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1862.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

STRENGTHENING CHILDREN'S SAFETY ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1842) to amend title 18, United States Code, to include State crimes of violence as grounds for an enhanced penalty when sex offenders fail to register or report certain information as required by Federal law, to include prior military offenses for purposes of recidivist sentencing provisions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1842

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening Children's Safety Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. FAILURE OF SEX OFFENDERS TO REGISTER.

Section 2250(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after "Federal law (including the Uniform Code of Military Justice)," the following: "State law,"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'crime of violence' has the meaning given such term in section 16."

SEC. 3. PRIOR MILITARY OFFENSES INCLUDED FOR PURPOSES OF RECIDIVIST SENTENCING PROVISIONS.

(a) AGGRAVATED SEXUAL ABUSE.—Section 2241(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "State offense" the following: "or an offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice".

(b) SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN.—Section 2251(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "section 920 of

title 10 (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or under" each place it appears and inserting "the Uniform Code of Military Justice or".

(c) CERTAIN ACTIVITIES RELATING TO MATERIAL INVOLVING THE SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF MINORS.—Section 2252 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "section 920 of title 10 (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or under" and inserting "the Uniform Code of Military Justice or"; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking "section 920 of title 10 (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or under" and inserting "the Uniform Code of Military Justice or".

(d) CERTAIN ACTIVITIES RELATING TO MATERIAL CONSTITUTING OR CONTAINING CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.—Section 2252A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "section 920 of title 10 (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or under" and inserting "the Uniform Code of Military Justice or"; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking "section 920 of title 10 (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or under" and inserting "the Uniform Code of Military Justice or".

(e) REPEAT OFFENDERS.—Section 2426(b)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "State law" the following: "or the Uniform Code of Military Justice".

(f) SENTENCING CLASSIFICATION.—Section 3559 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(2)(B)—

(A) by striking "State sex offense" and inserting "State or Military sex offense"; and

(B) by inserting after "under State law" the following: "or the Uniform Code of Military Justice"; and

(2) in subsection (e)(2)(C), by inserting after "State" the following: "or Military".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1842, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For victims, the effects of child sexual abuse are devastating. It disrupts the victim's development and increases the likelihood that he or she will experience other sexual assaults in the future, and it is, likely, one of the most underreported crimes in the United States. That is why we have to do all we can to prevent these crimes. We promote prevention by closely monitoring sex offenders and by imposing recidivist enhancements on those who

have shown a proclivity to abuse children.

H.R. 1842, the Strengthening Children's Safety Act of 2017, closes two significant loopholes to help accomplish these goals.

First, the bill closes a loophole in the statute that criminalizes a sex offender's failure to register. Under current law, a sex offender who fails to comply with registration requirements is guilty of a crime. An enhanced penalty applies to offenders who, while in non-compliant status, commit a Federal crime of violence, a crime of violence under the D.C. Code, a military code crime of violence, a Tribal crime of violence, or a crime of violence in any territory or possession of the United States. This is logical since offenders who have been convicted of both crimes against children and crimes of violence are deserving of more severe punishment.

However, significantly, this provision fails to include offenders who have been convicted of crimes of violence under State laws. It makes no sense that a person convicted of a crime of violence under the D.C. Code is subject to an enhanced penalty, while a person who committed the same offense in Virginia would not be. Given their propensity for violence, these offenders, regardless of what U.S. jurisdiction convicts them, must be held accountable when they fall off the radar.

The bill further ensures that those offenders who have been previously convicted of sex crimes under the Uniform Code of Military Justice are exposed to the same recidivist enhancements as those convicted of the same crimes in Federal, State, and Tribal courts. The way the U.S. Code is currently written, many of these Federal recidivist statutes unintentionally fail to cover significant sex crimes committed under military law, including certain child pornography offenses. Again, it is important that repeat offenders are subject to the same sentencing enhancements, no matter where they were convicted, in order to protect our children.

H.R. 1842 is commonsense legislation that closes loopholes in Federal law, promotes uniformity, and will help keep our children safe.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE), a member of the Judiciary Committee, for introducing this important bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1842, a bill that is intended to address gaps in our child protection laws.

Now, this bill makes a number of changes to the Federal criminal code that, unfortunately, makes the same error that was previously made. It re-

sults in the expanded imposition of mandatory minimum sentences. I don't know where we get this notion that mandatory minimum sentences are a solution.

H.R. 1842 amends section 2250(d) of the criminal code, which provides for an enhanced penalty for sex offenders who commit a crime of violence while in noncompliance of sex offender registration and reporting requirements.

In addition to the Federal crimes of violence already included in that statute, this bill would add State crimes of violence as predicate offenses that, in turn, would require the imposition of a mandatory 5-year prison sentence to be served consecutively to any sentence imposed for failing to register or comply with sex offender registration and reporting requirements.

H.R. 1842 would also add prior military child sex offenses to several recidivist sentencing provisions, most of which carry mandatory minimum penalties of at least 15 years or life, itself.

Perhaps we should expand coverage of enhanced sentences for the offenses added by this bill, but we should do so without expanding the number of mandatory minimums. The judges, not the Congress—not us—are in the best position to impose sentences for even the most offensive criminal violations because they know the facts and circumstances of each case.

□ 1700

There is an increasing bipartisan, national recognition that mandatory minimum sentences are not only unfair, but they are also counterproductive. Instead of expanding the coverage of mandatory minimums, we should be eliminating them. Individuals convicted of serious offenses will still receive appropriately lengthy sentences, but they will not be set on a one-size-fits-all basis.

We want to examine the facts, the circumstances in each case, and the judge is in the best position to do that. We should not be assuming that we can sit here and pass these national laws that will not help and will make it difficult for judges to do their work.

Unfortunately, this bill takes the opposite course, and that is why I must oppose it. I encourage my colleagues to think about what we are doing here and oppose H.R. 1842. I urge your support against this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE), the chief author of this legislation.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1842, the Strengthening Children's Safety Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, there are few things more shocking to the conscience or sickening to the soul than crimes

against children—the most innocent, the most vulnerable members of our society.

In my time as a Federal prosecutor, the child exploitation images that I was forced to review as part of the evidence were, by far, the most disturbing and difficult part of that job. All of these years later, I still can't erase those depraved images from my mind, and I doubt that I will ever be able to do that.

But crimes against children should stick with us, they should haunt us, and then they should spur us to take action. If we do anything here in Congress, it should be working to protect children. We talk all day long in this Chamber about the future of this country. Well, Mr. Speaker, the children are the future of this country. We need to put our words into action.

So today I am introducing H.R. 1842, the Strengthening Children's Safety Act of 2017, a bill which closes two sets of loopholes in Federal child exploitation laws to make sure that all dangerous sex offenders are treated the same and are subject to the same enhanced penalties under the law.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, current law establishes minimum national standards for sex offender registration and notification in all 50 States, in the District of Columbia, in U.S. territories, and Tribal jurisdictions. If a sex offender knowingly fails to register or update a registration, that individual faces a fine and imprisonment of up to 10 years.

There is also an enhanced penalty of 5 to 30 years imprisonment if the offender, while in that noncompliance status, also commits a crime of violence under Federal law, under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the law of the District of Columbia, Indian Tribal law, or the law of any territory or possession of the United States.

But here is the problem, Mr. Speaker: Right now, only individuals committing crimes of violence under these Federal, military, and Tribal laws are subject to the enhanced penalty, while individuals committing the same crimes of violence under State law are not.

Mr. Speaker, hopefully, we can all agree that child predators committing crimes of violence should be subject to the same enhanced penalties, regardless of whether these crimes are being charged in Federal court or at the State level. So this bill adds similar State crimes of violence to that list to ensure that the enhanced penalty applies equally to all dangerous offenders.

Mr. Speaker, the second portion of H.R. 1842 addresses enhanced sentences for individuals with prior sex offenses. Fortunately, our child exploitation laws consistently do call for higher sentences any time a defendant has a prior conviction for Federal or State

sex offenses. But currently, these sentencing provisions do not consistently include all similar sex offense convictions that arise under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

H.R. 1842 amends those Federal child exploitation laws to include all child sexual exploitation offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice in the recidivist provisions, as appropriate. Again, I think it is critical, Mr. Speaker, that we close this loophole to ensure that all prior child exploitation convictions are penalized for repeat offenders.

Many issues in Congress these days are partisan, but it is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that Members on both sides of the aisle today will be able to come together to support stronger protections for children who are sexually abused. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as usual, we are indebted to the gentleman from Virginia, who, for years, was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations in the Judiciary Committee and still carries with him the understanding and the experience that leads him to be on the floor with us today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) in support of his position.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1842.

While I support the underlying goal of punishing sex offenders, the existing sentencing laws already provide serious punishment for this conduct. Unfortunately, this legislation expands non-mandatory minimums to additional offenders.

This expansion of mandatory of minimums comes at the heels of Attorney General Sessions' memo, which has been roundly criticized for rescinding the Holder memo and directing all Federal prosecutors to pursue the most serious charges and the maximum sentence, to include mandatory minimum sentences.

The Sessions memo takes away, from Federal prosecutors, the ability to individually assess the unique circumstances of their cases and any factors which would mitigate against seeking the harshest sentence in every case. Once that offense triggers a mandatory minimum and once that is charged, the sentencing judge loses any discretion to assess the unique circumstances of the case and, upon conviction, must impose the mandatory minimum provided in the code.

This legislation is remarkable in that it extends a number of exceptionally high mandatory minimums to most defendants. The mandatory sentence of life without parole is expanded to apply to more cases. The mandatory sentence of 35 years is expanded. In other cases,

the mandatory minimum would triple from 5 years to 15 years.

These are grave sentences, and the judge should have discretion in determining when they should be imposed. And these sentences would apply not only to the ring leader, but to everyone who may be involved in the activity and subject to a conspiracy conviction. The mandatory minimum eliminates the ability of the judge to consider the individual circumstances of the case or the culpability or the role of the defendant in that case.

For decades now, extensive research has been done on mandatory minimums, and the conclusions are: they do not reduce crime; they do not protect anybody; they waste the taxpayers' money; they discriminate against minorities; and they often require judges to impose sentences so bizarre that they violate common sense.

When you see how these are worked in drug cases, you can be reminded of President Obama's policy to consider full commutation. Those who are, essentially, first offenders who have been convicted of nonviolent, low-level activity in a drug case would be considered for commutation after 10 years.

Now, that seems reasonable, but what you ought to ask is the question: How did a low-level, nonviolent first offender get so much time that, after 10 years, they still need help from the President? The answer is: mandatory minimums. The judge had no choice but to impose that bizarre sentence.

Unfortunately, there are already too many mandatory minimums in the Federal code. If we ever expect to do anything about the problem and address that driver of mass incarceration, the first step we have to take is to stop passing new mandatory minimums or bills that expand existing mandatory minimums.

Mandatory minimums in the code did not get there all at once; they got there one at a time, each, part of a larger bill which, on balance, seemed like a good idea. Therefore, the first step we have to take in reducing mandatory minimums is to stop passing new ones or to stop passing bills that expand mandatory minimums.

For these reasons, while I support the underlying goals of H.R. 1842, to punish sex offenses against children, I oppose expanding the application of severe mandatory minimum sentences such as the 15 and 35 and life imprisonment.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would not be controversial without the mandatory minimums; but, unfortunately, they are in the bill, and I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again, this bill has no new mandatory minimum sentences. These are

not low-level offenders. These are not nonviolent offenders. They are violent sexual predators, and these added offenders—which this bill does to close, again, a loophole—these added offenders have committed the exact same crimes with the exact same conduct as those already covered in existing law. This bill aims to apply the mandatory minimums equitably, and that, I think, should be an important goal for all of us.

Again, there are no new mandatory minimums in this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations in the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership and, as well, the gentleman who is a proponent of this legislation which, on its face, provides for an enhanced penalty for sex offenders who commit a crime of violence while in noncompliance of sex offender registration and reporting requirements. That offense can apply to that in the Military Code of Justice, Tribal law, State law, and Federal law.

It also adds State crimes of violence as a predicate offense that, in turn, would require the imposition of a mandatory or an enhanced sentencing to be served consecutively to any sentence imposed for failing to register or comply with the sex offender registration reporting requirements.

I believe, as my colleagues have said, that the underlying premise of this bill will join us together in linking arms, there is no doubt. It should be the rule of this Congress and the rule of elected officials from State to local government, the U.S. Military Code of Justice, and Tribal law to protect our children; and certainly, the idea of noncompliance with sex registration should be addressed in any court proceeding dealing with these offenders.

The issue, I believe, is the question, again, of: What do we gain by the implementing of a mandatory minimum? In this instance, it is an enhanced 5-year sentence. But there may be a number of reasons in terms of an individual moving from State to State where the person is not registered.

Again, I have to turn my attention to where we are and where we stand on this day, May 22, 2017. It makes a difference. It makes a difference if we have an Attorney General that does not seem to have any interest in rehabilitation, any interest in ensuring that the mass incarceration ends, the disparate treatment of different races and ethnic groups in the criminal justice system ends.

As has been noted already, the previous policies of Attorney General

Holder that were fair and did not add to the enhancement of crime, which allowed discretion by prosecutors of not adding up on the particular defendant any number of offenses that would create 200- and 300-year sentencing and, therefore, having people languish in prisons across this country, building up the record of private prisons, and seeing teeming numbers in our Federal prison system, that is what we are facing now.

□ 1715

There is no doubt that the present law, I believe, does, in fact, cover the efforts of the proponent of this legislation. Obviously, there will be a difference of opinion, but I believe that there is sufficient coverage in the underlying legislation without adding this particular enhancement.

I would hope that our colleagues who are in support of this bill, just as I respect their commitment to fighting against sexual violence, sexual contact, and sexual criminal acts against children, would recognize that a discussion about mandatory minimums does not, in any way, diminish one's commitment to the underlying premise of this legislation.

There are too many unknown variables with the leadership of the Attorney General and his indication as to what kind of treatment there should be for underlying crimes and his wish to have newly appointed U.S. Attorneys, many of whom are not appointed, not confirmed, so that we can, again, overcriminalize America, overcriminalize the acts of individuals, and create another siege of mass incarceration.

We will have a number of other bills that will be on the floor with the same concerns that will be expressed. Again, let me say that I support the idea of fighting against child sex trafficking and violent sexual crimes perpetrated against children. I support the opposition to such and the incarceration of those and bringing those individuals to justice. I do believe, however, that there are many ways of dealing with this, including incarceration without a continuous either enhancement or continued increase of the number of mandatory minimums that are continuing to be added to individuals who are recidivists and who are convicted of Federal, State, or military crimes, in this instance.

Mr. CONYERS. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I commend the gentlewoman for her consistent understanding and explaining why mass incarceration is at the base of all of the debate that is going on.

I am hoping that more and more people who listen to these discussions that we have here in the House of Representatives will begin to understand

that mass incarceration is not the answer to our problems. As a matter of fact, they compound the problems.

I salute the gentlewoman for her tenacity and understanding and explaining this situation to everyone who can listen to our discussions here.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for that very thoughtful addition and his kind words.

I think what I want to say to Mr. CONYERS, in concluding, is that mass incarceration is real. We have lived with this for decades. We finally have gotten to the point that judges recognize that there are many different ways to deal with individuals who are recidivists at sentencing, regardless of whether or not the previous conviction, as I said earlier, was Federal, State, or military court, and now Tribal. That is the only point that we are making here.

Next week, we will have 10 more bills with mandatory minimums. We will all agree with the underlying premise, which is to lock the bad guys up, but we do believe that there is some value to the discretion of judges and courts. I don't believe anyone on this floor—none of us, Republicans or Democrats—would have any argument—none—on the underlying premise of our absolute responsibility, without question, of defending and protecting children from these vile individuals. But I don't have the facts inside the courtroom, and there is not a one-size-fits-all answer. That is what mandatory minimums are. All it does is load our prison systems with bodies, one after another.

I conclude with this. The courts have asked for discretion. I would hope that in the Federal system those who are appointed have, in fact, both the wherewithal, the knowledge, the sense of justice, and the right to make the decision based upon the laws and based upon the vileness of what has been engaged in.

This is not an opposition. This is a plea for collaboration.

If I may say one thing personally. There are neighbors that I know in my community who have been accused of certain things. They are dignified citizens—not with regard to this particular underlying act—but dignified citizens, former military persons, and they are languishing under a mandatory minimum. It is disgraceful. Let me be very clear: It is not a sex offense, not an offense of violence. It is minimal, at best. But they are operating under a mandatory. It literally is disgraceful how this has destroyed their lives.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1842 is a well-intentioned bill meant to ensure that repeat sex offenders are punished for their crimes, whether their prior offenses are State, Federal, or military.

While I believe that repeat sex offenders of any kind should receive appropriately lengthy sentences, I disagree with the imposition of mandatory minimums. We are not the court. We are not the judge. We do not hear the facts and circumstances in each case.

I appeal to good common sense and good legal analysis that we oppose this legislation that would amplify the difficulties that we already know exist. I hope that we will oppose this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Texas cited a personal experience she had with someone she knows who has been convicted of a crime and given a mandatory minimum sentence. It was not a violent crime, not a sex crime, and not relevant to this bill, which does not add any new mandatory minimum sentences. It simply makes sure that the sentences already imposed under the law are equitably applied, regardless of where their prior offenses took place.

These are sexual crimes. These are violent crimes. These offenders should receive the exact same sentences for the exact same conduct as others already covered under the current law.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to protect our children and get sexual predators off the street.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1842.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

TARGETING CHILD PREDATORS ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 883) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a certification process for the issuance of nondisclosure requirements accompanying certain administrative subpoenas, to provide for judicial review of such nondisclosure requirements, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 883

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Targeting Child Predators Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. NONDISCLOSURE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPOENAS.

Section 3486(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “the Secretary of the Treasury” each place it appears and inserting “the Secretary of Homeland Security”;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking “ordered by a court”; and

(3) by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

“(6)(A)(i) If a subpoena issued under this section is accompanied by a certification under clause (ii) and notice of the right to judicial review under subparagraph (C), no recipient of a subpoena under this section shall disclose to any person that the Federal official who issued the subpoena has sought or obtained access to information or records under this section, for a period of 180 days.

“(ii) The requirements of clause (i) shall apply if the Federal official who issued the subpoena certifies that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

“(I) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

“(II) flight from prosecution;

“(III) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(IV) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

“(V) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or unduly delaying a trial.

“(B)(i) A recipient of a subpoena under this section may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

“(I) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

“(II) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

“(III) other persons as permitted by the Federal official who issued the subpoena.

“(ii) A person to whom disclosure is made under clause (i) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a subpoena is issued under this section in the same manner as the person to whom the subpoena was issued.

“(iii) Any recipient that discloses to a person described in clause (i) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall notify the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(iv) At the request of the Federal official who issued the subpoena, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under subclause (I) or (III) of clause (i) shall identify to the individual making the request under this clause the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.

“(C)(i) A nondisclosure requirement imposed under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to judicial review under section 3486A.

“(ii) A subpoena issued under this section, in connection with which a nondisclosure requirement under subparagraph (A) is imposed, shall include notice of the availability of judicial review described in clause (i).

“(D) A nondisclosure requirement imposed under subparagraph (A) may be extended in accordance with section 3486A(a)(4).”.

SEC. 3. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF NONDISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3486 the following:

“§ 3486A. Judicial review of nondisclosure requirements

“(a) NONDISCLOSURE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) NOTICE.—If a recipient of a subpoena under section 3486 wishes to have a court review a nondisclosure requirement imposed in connection with the subpoena, the recipient may notify the Government or file a petition for judicial review in any court described in subsection (a)(5) of section 3486.

“(B) APPLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of a notification under subparagraph (A), the Government shall apply for an order prohibiting the disclosure of the existence or contents of the relevant subpoena. An application under this subparagraph may be filed in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the recipient of the subpoena is doing business or in the district court of the United States for any judicial district within which the authorized investigation that is the basis for the subpoena is being conducted. The applicable nondisclosure requirement shall remain in effect during the pendency of proceedings relating to the requirement.

“(C) CONSIDERATION.—A district court of the United States that receives a petition under subparagraph (A) or an application under subparagraph (B) should rule expeditiously, and shall, subject to paragraph (3), issue a nondisclosure order that includes conditions appropriate to the circumstances.

“(2) APPLICATION CONTENTS.—An application for a nondisclosure order or extension thereof or a response to a petition filed under paragraph (1) shall include a certification from the Federal official who issued the subpoena indicating that the absence of a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection may result in—

“(A) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

“(B) flight from prosecution;

“(C) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(D) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

“(E) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or unduly delaying a trial.

“(3) STANDARD.—A district court of the United States shall issue a nondisclosure order or extension thereof under this subsection if the court determines that there is reason to believe that disclosure of the information subject to the nondisclosure requirement during the applicable time period may result in—

“(A) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

“(B) flight from prosecution;

“(C) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(D) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

“(E) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or unduly delaying a trial.

“(4) EXTENSION.—Upon a showing that the circumstances described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (3) continue to exist, a district court of the United States may issue an ex parte order extending a nondisclosure order imposed under this subsection or under section 3486(a)(6)(A) for additional periods of 180 days, or, if the court determines that the circumstances necessitate a longer period of nondisclosure, for additional periods which are longer than 180 days.

“(b) CLOSED HEARINGS.—In all proceedings under this section, subject to any right to an open hearing in a contempt proceeding, the

court must close any hearing to the extent necessary to prevent an unauthorized disclosure of a request for records, a report, or other information made to any person or entity under section 3486. Petitions, filings, records, orders, certifications, and subpoenas must also be kept under seal to the extent and as long as necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of a subpoena under section 3486."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3486 the following:

"3486A. Judicial review of nondisclosure requirements."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 883, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, over the years, we as a society have made great strides in combating crimes against children. As with many crimes, however, law enforcement often struggles to keep pace with modern technology. That is why H.R. 883, the Targeting Child Predators Act, is both an important and a timely piece of legislation.

While many of the bills we have discussed today have been aimed at prevention and punishment, H.R. 883 provides law enforcement with the tools necessary to stop ongoing abuse, occurring in real time, and to locate offenders.

Because of the severity of sex crimes committed against children and the often irreparable harm they cause, we must take steps to ensure that law enforcement has the ability to swiftly locate sexual predators.

In 1998, Congress recognized this urgency by passing the Protection of Children From Sexual Predators Act, which permitted the FBI to use administrative subpoenas in cases of child exploitation. That legislation was intended to enhance the FBI's ability to investigate online child exploitation offenses in an expeditious manner.

Administrative subpoenas are especially useful in child exploitation cases because they are not burdened with grand jury secrecy obligations, so the information may be shared among law enforcement to quickly locate offenders in emergency situations.

Under current law, the FBI is permitted to use an administrative subpoena to obtain non-content information from internet service providers in child exploitation cases.

H.R. 883 allows the government to prohibit the recipient of a subpoena from disclosing the existence of the subpoena, provided the government certifies there is reason to believe that disclosure may result in endangerment to the life or physical safety of any person, flight to avoid prosecution, destruction of or tampering with evidence, or intimidation of potential witnesses.

Presently, if agents want to obtain this information with a nondisclosure provision, it must go through the courts, which, of course, defeats the purpose of a speedy mechanism to obtain non-content information.

Importantly, the bill contains a provision that allows a company in receipt of such a subpoena to insist that the government obtain a court order prohibiting the company from disclosing the subpoena to the target. Alternatively, the company may initiate such proceedings itself in a relevant court to challenge the nondisclosure requirement.

Mr. Speaker, a nondisclosure provision is vitally important in child exploitation cases. If a bad guy who has taken a child knows that law enforcement is on to him, or is looking for him, what might he do to get away? What might he do to that child?

H.R. 883 is an important bill which promotes Congress' original intent to ensure law enforcement has quick access to this information. It is narrowly tailored to ensure that its provisions apply in cases where time is of the essence. It provides a mechanism for companies to challenge the nondisclosure requirements.

□ 1730

I commend Mr. DESANTIS, the gentleman from Florida and a member of the Judiciary Committee, for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise in opposition to H.R. 883, the Targeting Child Predators Act of 2017.

You see, child sexual exploitation and abuse are reprehensible crimes committed against the most vulnerable members of our society. Unfortunately, these offenses have been increasingly facilitated by the use of the internet in recent years. H.R. 883 would change the administrative subpoena statute to facilitate the prosecution of criminals who commit these terrible crimes against children.

Without question, I support the goal of pursuing these criminals, but, never-

theless, I am concerned that this bill would eliminate judicial oversight of nondisclosure orders currently required prior to the issuance of the administrative subpoenas.

Section 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code authorizes investigators to request a 90-day order of nondisclosure from a district court judge. The order of nondisclosure forbids the recipient, such as an internet service provider, from alerting the target of the investigation of the law enforcement's inquiry. H.R. 883 would extend the nondisclosure period from 90 days to 180 days to allow investigators more time to complete their investigations before the target is informed of the inquiry.

Although I would like to have more information about why it is necessary to extend this time period, it is particularly problematic combined with the other significant change to the law made by this very legislation. H.R. 883 would allow investigators to require nondisclosure of internet service providers without the approval of a judge, thereby eliminating any judicial oversight prior to issuance of the subpoena.

The administrative subpoena authority is an extraordinary power given to certain agencies by Congress under its limited circumstances. While the legislation would allow a recipient to challenge a nondisclosure order in court, I am concerned about the bill's elimination of judicial approval on the front end.

I understand the desire to do more to facilitate the investigation of these crimes and that the online context for them has raised issues that we should continue to examine, but I do not believe we have been given enough information justifying this bill, at least in its current form.

Elimination of prior judicial approval of nondisclosure orders is a step we should undertake only based on evidence and careful deliberation. A bill such as the one before us warrants at least a legislative hearing to consider its potential ramifications. I don't think that is asking too much that we have a hearing on this matter before we decide what to do with the proposal rather than not have one at all. Our committee has not had the benefit of any such hearing on this legislation, and I think this is not the proper way the members of the House Judiciary Committee, who are mostly lawyers, should proceed.

Mr. Speaker, accordingly, I oppose H.R. 883, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), who is the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, every year, thousands of children are victims

of cyber exploitation. As a former prosecutor who has handled child exploitation cases, I know just how important it is to preserve evidence that can bring predators to justice.

After speaking with Florida law enforcement officials about the challenges they face when tracking suspects online, I introduced the Targeting Child Predators Act. This is a sensible reform that will better protect our children by preventing suspected child predators from destroying evidence and covering their tracks.

When tracking a suspected child predator online, law enforcement far too often hits roadblocks that can critically threaten their investigation. Internet service providers who have been issued a duly issued, lawful subpoena from law enforcement will often inform the suspect that police investigators have requested their information. Once notified that they are the target of an investigation, child predators can wipe their systems clean and go into hiding, leaving law enforcement empty-handed and potentially putting their victims at further risk.

The Targeting Child Predators Act is a simple and necessary amendment to our criminal code requiring that ISPs wait 180 days before disclosing to suspected child predators that their information has been requested by law enforcement. The bill is narrowly targeted to child exploitation cases where the destruction of valuable evidence could endanger the safety of a child or seriously jeopardize an ongoing investigation. Additionally, the Targeting Child Predators Act provides judicial review of subpoenas and affords both ISPs and suspects due process as required by law.

The Targeting Child Predators Act will protect our children from those who wish to exploit them while maintaining the constitutional rights of suspected criminals. This is an issue that should garner wide bipartisan support from the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to step up. Let's support our vulnerable children. Let's target child predators, and let's vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is one of the consistent leaders for a good criminal justice system.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member very much, and I thank him for his work.

I think the work that we are doing in Judiciary certainly has far-reaching impact. It is important to try to make more efficient the way that we address these very heinous acts against our children.

As a strong advocate for children throughout my career, I agree that we in Congress must do everything within our power and authority to prevent child sexual exploitation and abuse.

The Targeting Child Predators Act of 2017 is intended to assist investigators in their pursuit of online predators.

I fully support efforts to locate and prosecute individuals who commit such heinous crimes. However, I believe we should discuss the proposal before us with more information from all who would be impacted prior to approving the changes to the law this bill proposes.

This has a lot of moving parts and participants, particularly in relation to online internet and the variety of providers that are stakeholders in all of this.

This bill would modify a powerful yet historically controversial investigatory tool: the administrative subpoena. Administrative subpoenas allow certain investigators investigating specified crimes to obtain private records without judicial approval. I can account for the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there are many instances where this may be a vital approach.

We know that we live in a very difficult time, and a number of incidents dealing with national security and others may certainly be impacted by such; but, obviously, there are other subpoenas that are attendant to those particular acts. But the administrative subpoenas, as indicated, allow Federal investigators investigating specified crimes to obtain private records, as indicated, without judicial approval.

Although investigators do not need sign-off from a judge before issuing such a subpoena, there is one layer of judicial review that prevents them from abusing their subpoena power. That is the judicial consideration of nondisclosure orders prior to the issuance of subpoenas.

At present, a district court judge must determine if circumstances exist to justify issuance of a 90-day nondisclosure order in connection with administrative subpoenas. Under the terms that I understand are in this proposed bill, investigators could require nondisclosure by subpoena recipients for a longer period—180 days—and without first receiving the approval of a district judge, effectively eliminating judicial consideration of nondisclosure orders prior to the issuance of subpoenas. Subpoena recipients would have the ability to seek judicial review of the nondisclosure requirement only after receiving the subpoena. I believe that this provision raises concerns that remove the wisdom of district judges from this process at the time the gag orders are imposed.

Congress authorized the use of these subpoenas to allow investigators to obtain information quickly and expeditiously, and I think they work that way. The intervention of judicial review has not proven to be an obstruction so much so that you might remove it and the wisdom of the court. Congress also expressly required that in-

vestigators seek the approval of a district judge for nondisclosure orders connected to these subpoenas.

I share my colleagues' desire to locate and prosecute those who commit child exploitation and abuse crimes, and, in essence, let's get them, but I do think that the willingness to remove judicial review is one of question.

Those individuals who hide behind computer screens committing abhorrent acts against children on the internet must be apprehended and made to answer for their crimes. I would think that the judge would be well aware of how sensitive this is and use their best impression to get moving and to allow the process to proceed.

I think this Nation is a land of laws. We abide by the rule of law, and Congress has a right to draft laws. But I do think, in this instance, the rule of law, abiding by the rule of law, allowing for the active participation of the court and the wisdom of the court is not too much to ask in a nation that believes in democracy, believes in the rights of the offenders and, as well, the victims.

So I am very concerned about this bill, and I would hope that we would have the opportunity to have this addressed or the issues addressed, or addressed in the Senate; and I look forward to those issues being addressed in the Senate so that we can, together, handle the concerns that are being expressed and have a bill that does not remove judicial oversight and the wisdom of the court.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 883, the "Targeting Child Predators Act of 2017." As a strong advocate for children throughout my career, I agree that we in Congress must do everything within our power and authority to prevent child sexual exploitation and abuse.

The "Targeting Child Predators Act of 2017" is intended to assist investigators in their pursuit of online child predators.

I fully support efforts to locate and prosecute individuals who commit such heinous crimes. However, I believe we should discuss the proposal before us—with more information from all who would be impacted—prior to approving the changes to the law this bill proposes.

This bill would modify a powerful, yet historically controversial, investigatory tool—the administrative subpoena.

Administrative subpoenas allow certain Federal investigators, investigating specified crimes, to obtain private records without judicial approval.

Although investigators do not need sign-off from a judge before issuing such a subpoena, there is one layer of judicial review that prevents them from abusing their subpoena power.

That is the judicial consideration of nondisclosure orders prior to the issuance of subpoenas.

At present, a district court judge must determine if circumstances exist to justify issuance of a 90-day nondisclosure order in connection with administrative subpoenas.

Under the terms proposed in this bill, investigators could require nondisclosure by subpoena recipients for a longer period—180 days—and without first receiving the approval of a district judge, effectively eliminating judicial consideration of nondisclosure orders prior to the issuance of subpoenas.

Subpoena recipients would have the ability to seek judicial review of the nondisclosure requirement only after receiving the subpoena.

I am deeply concerned with the provision that would remove the wisdom of district judges from this process at the time the gag orders are imposed.

Congress authorized the use of these subpoenas to allow investigators to obtain information quickly and expeditiously.

But, Congress also expressly required that investigators seek the approval of a district judge for nondisclosure orders connected to these subpoenas.

I share my colleagues' desire to locate and prosecute those who commit child exploitation and abuse crimes.

Those individuals, who hide behind computer screens, committing abhorrent acts against children on the internet, must be apprehended and made to answer for their crimes.

I am not convinced that this bill is the best way to go about doing so.

I hope we can find a way to address this issue, with more information from all concerned.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the most problematic aspect of H.R. 883 is that it would eliminate prior judicial approval of nondisclosure orders. I am firmly opposed to that. And while I fully support efforts to investigate crime, particularly those perpetrated against children, I cannot support this bill without knowing more about how it will affect an already extraordinary investigative power.

Let's have a hearing. That is what our committee is for. The Judiciary Committee should inquire into this very carefully, and, in the absence of such evidence, I must urge, at this time, our colleagues join me in opposing H.R. 883.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to urge my colleagues to support this very important, very targeted legislation.

This is not some broad authority. This is very targeted under circumstances where the sexual predator has the child and the authorities need to get information from third parties now so they can find that child and they need those third parties to not disclose information that they are yielding to the government about their whereabouts and other information about them because of the emergency

circumstances that are at play here, or you are dealing with someone who has a child and needs to be found so that child can be saved. That is the purpose of this legislation.

□ 1745

It is a good purpose. This legislation should be supported by all the Members of the House. I urge them to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 883.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 695) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 695

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Child Protection Improvements Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECK AND CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW PROGRAM.

The National Child Protection Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 5119 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3—

(A) by amending subsection (a)(3) to read as follows:

"(3)(A) The Attorney General shall establish a program, in accordance with this section, to provide qualified entities located in States which do not have in effect procedures described in paragraph (1), or qualified entities located in States which do not prohibit the use of the program established under this paragraph, with access to national criminal history background checks on, and criminal history reviews of, covered individuals.

"(B) A qualified entity described in subparagraph (A) may submit to the appropriate designated entity a request for a national criminal history background check on, and a criminal history review of, a covered individual. Qualified entities making a request under this paragraph shall comply with the guidelines set forth in subsection (b), and with any additional applicable procedures set forth by the Attorney General or by the State in which the entity is located."

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(E), by striking "unsupervised";

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by redesignating subparagraph (A) as clause (i);

(II) in subparagraph (B)—

(aa) by adding "and" at the end; and

(bb) by redesignating such subparagraph as clause (ii);

(III) by striking "that each provider who is the subject of a background check" and inserting "(A) that each covered individual who is the subject of a background check conducted pursuant to the procedures established pursuant to subsection (a)(1)"; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) that each covered individual who is the subject of a national criminal history background check and criminal history review conducted pursuant to the procedures established pursuant to subsection (a)(3) is entitled to challenge the accuracy and completeness of any information in the criminal history record of the individual by contacting the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the procedure set forth in section 16.34 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.";

(iii) in paragraph (3), by inserting after "authorized agency" the following: "or designated entity, as applicable"; and

(iv) in paragraph (4), by inserting after "authorized agency" the following: "or designated entity, as applicable";;

(C) in subsection (d), by inserting after "officer or employee thereof," the following: "nor shall any designated entity nor any officer or employee thereof,";

(D) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) FEES.—

"(1) STATE PROGRAM.—In the case of a background check conducted pursuant to a State requirement adopted after December 20, 1993, conducted with fingerprints on a covered individual, the fees collected by authorized State agencies and the Federal Bureau of Investigation may not exceed eighteen dollars, respectively, or the actual cost, whichever is less, of the background check conducted with fingerprints.

"(2) FEDERAL PROGRAM.—In the case of a national criminal history background check and criminal history review conducted pursuant to the procedures established pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the fees collected by a designated entity shall be set at a level that will ensure the recovery of the full costs of providing all such services. The designated entity shall remit the appropriate portion of such fee to the Attorney General, which amount is in accordance with the amount published in the Federal Register to be collected for the provision of a criminal history background check by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"(3) ENSURING FEES DO NOT DISCOURAGE VOLUNTEERS.—A fee system under this subsection shall be established in a manner that ensures that fees to qualified entities for background checks do not discourage volunteers from participating in programs to care for children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities.";

(E) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

"(f) NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECK AND CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW PROGRAM.—

"(1) NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECK.—Upon a designated entity receiving notice of a request submitted by a qualified entity pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the designated entity shall forward the request to the Attorney General, who shall, acting through the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, complete a fingerprint-based check of the

national criminal history background check system, and provide the information received in response to such national criminal history background check to the appropriate designated entity. The designated entity may, upon request from a qualified entity, complete a check of a State criminal history database.

“(2) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW.—

“(A) DESIGNATED ENTITIES.—The Attorney General shall designate, and enter into an agreement with, one or more entities to make determinations described in paragraph (2). The Attorney General may not designate and enter into an agreement with a Federal agency under this subparagraph.

“(B) DETERMINATIONS.—A designated entity shall, upon the receipt of the information described in paragraph (1), make a determination of fitness described in subsection (b)(4), using the criteria described in subparagraph (C).

“(C) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW CRITERIA.—The Attorney General shall, by rule, establish the criteria for use by designated entities in making a determination of fitness described in subsection (b)(4). Such criteria shall be based on the criteria established pursuant to section 108(a)(3)(G)(i) of the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 5119a note).”; and

(F) by striking—

(i) “provider” each place it appears, and inserting “covered individual”; and

(ii) “provider’s” each place it appears, and inserting “covered individual’s”; and

(2) in section 5—

(A) by amending paragraph (9) to read as follows:

“(9) the term ‘covered individual’ means an individual—

“(A) who has, seeks to have, or may have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, served by a qualified entity; and

“(B) who—

“(i) is employed by or volunteers with, or seeks to be employed by or volunteer with, a qualified entity; or

“(ii) owns or operates, or seeks to own or operate, a qualified entity.”;

(B) in paragraph (10), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (11), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:

“(12) the term ‘designated entity’ means an entity designated by the Attorney General under section 3(f)(2)(A).”.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be fully implemented by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 695, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent a great deal of time this afternoon discussing legislation designed to detect and punish sexual predators. These bills are all strong, well crafted, and laudable. I urge my colleagues to support them.

However, there is another facet to this problem, which is prevention. This may be the most important action we as Congress can take in the realm of child exploitation laws. We must do all we can to prevent child exploitation from happening in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am pleased to bring H.R. 695, the Child Protection Improvements Act, before the House today. This legislation is extremely important in that it makes permanent a successful pilot program that allowed youth-serving organizations access to FBI fingerprint database searches.

In 2003, the PROTECT Act created the Child Safety Pilot Program, which ran from 2003 until 2011, and provided access to FBI fingerprint background checks for a variety of child-serving nonprofits.

The pilot conducted over 105,000 background checks during its existence. 6.2 percent of potential volunteers were found to have criminal records of concern. While that may seem like a small percentage, Mr. Speaker, it works out to over 6,500 individuals.

In addition, over 40 percent of individuals with criminal records of concern had crimes in States other than where they were applying to volunteer, meaning that only a nationwide check would have flagged these individuals' criminal records.

The criminal offenses detected among some of these checks included convictions for criminal sexual conduct with a child, child endangerment, and manslaughter. Twenty-six percent of these individuals showed a different name on their record than the one they used on their job application.

H.R. 695 allows organizations such as the YMCA to submit fingerprints to a designated entity which, in turn, submits them to the FBI for processing. The system protects privacy rights by ensuring that the specifics of a criminal record are never disclosed without explicit consent by the applicant, and it provides opportunity for individuals to correct errors in their records directly with the FBI.

Importantly, the bill does not mandate that youth-serving organizations use this process. It merely makes the process more accessible and more affordable for organizations that wish to use it.

Mr. Speaker, the harsh reality is that there are individuals who will put themselves in positions where they are entrusted with children so they can

then betray that trust in the worst way imaginable. That is why bills like H.R. 695, and other bills we have discussed today, are so important.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this strong bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 695, the Child Protection Improvements Act, and tip my hat to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the author of the bill, who we will hear from shortly.

We have a special responsibility to protect our young people and vulnerable adults. For that reason, I am pleased that we are considering this measure which would provide a robust, easily accessible, cost-effective background check system for organizations that work with youth and vulnerable adults. I support it for a number of reasons.

To begin with, it will facilitate more comprehensive criminal background checks which provide a critical layer of protection. These checks help identify individuals who could potentially harm participants in programs for children, young people, and vulnerable adults as well.

Background checks also serve to ensure the integrity and accountability of the organizations that sponsor these programs by reducing potential threats. Results from background checks that search criminal histories nationwide are more reliable than background checks that only search criminal histories in a few States. I think that is obvious.

Secondly, the State background checks are no substitute whatsoever for the FBI's fingerprint-based system, which is the only nationwide database that allows a search of criminal histories in every single State.

Currently, this database can only be accessed through the State law enforcement agencies, and many States limit the ability of organizations to access the system, with some States completely even forbidding access—no access whatsoever. As a result, organizations must navigate a labyrinth of State laws or rely on private companies to perform background checks of employees and volunteers.

H.R. 695, on the other hand, would provide organizations with the ability to access the FBI's superior system without impacting the autonomy of States or the organizations. States would be able to continue or establish their own background check systems, and organizations would not be required to perform FBI background checks of potential applicants or volunteers.

Finally, the need for this legislation is clearly justified by the Child Safety Pilot Program, which we implemented over a decade ago. This program documented the effectiveness of nationwide background checks for youth-serving organizations. Based on a comprehensive review of thousands of criminal history records spanning an 8-year period, the program demonstrated that people who might pose a risk to the safety of children, nevertheless, attempted to work with children.

For example, the program identified applicants who, to avoid detection, used aliases, incorrect dates of birth, or wrong Social Security numbers. Some of these applicants had serious criminal histories, including even homicides, sexual assaults, child endangerment, and even rape.

More than a third of criminal history hits were from out-of-state, and more than half of the people with criminal history hits failed to disclose them on their application.

H.R. 695 would give organizations access to the FBI's comprehensive background check system and thereby help ensure the safety of our youth and others.

Accordingly, I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this important measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP), one of the two chief sponsors of this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for his great work in bringing this matter forward.

Mr. Speaker, protection of children is not a partisan matter, and I am grateful to the committee, committee staff, and Chairman GOODLATTE for his leadership in this matter and bringing this forward.

With school ending and summer camp starting, this is the time to bring awareness to and pass the Child Protection Improvements Act.

Every year, millions of people work with or volunteer to help our children wherever they are as camp counselors, local youth sports coaches, mentors. You name it. All across America, there are organizations where people can make a difference in the lives of our Nation's youth, and our children can absolutely benefit from these programs. Take the Boys and Girls Clubs, MENTOR, or the YMCA, just to name a few. These groups and dozens of others, which exist virtually in all of our districts, have come to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and to me asking for help.

Just like any parent, they too want to ensure that people working with our kids are decent, with clean back-

grounds and good intentions. Mr. Speaker, that is where Congress comes in. We have a duty to ensure every youth-serving organization in America can afford and access the best background checks on staff and volunteers so they can properly vet people who might have traveled across State lines. This means utilizing the FBI's gold-standard database.

Shockingly enough, not every organization has the option today, but we have the ability to change that. The Child Protection Improvements Act would allow all youth-serving organizations to utilize the FBI fingerprint-based background checks. We are simply eliminating the red tape that prevents the access in some of these States so every organization can adequately look out for our children, no matter where they live.

For those who are justifiably concerned about the cost, it should also be noted that the CPIA is fiscally responsible, as it does not authorize any new spending. The program will be supported by fees assessed for background checks by the requesting nonprofit organizations.

Mr. Speaker, every kid deserves a childhood where they can explore, grow, and do fun things beyond the walls of their home and school. As a father of three myself, I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense measure to catch potential threats and keep our kids safe.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) for his contribution.

I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee and the author of the bill.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Child Protection Improvements Act. I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) who has been an excellent partner working with me on this bill, the first version of which was introduced in 2007.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS for their work on the bill as well.

I volunteered with Big Brothers Big Sisters many years ago. I was paired with an extraordinary young man named David who is now himself a Big Brother. I have always said that I have learned as much or more from David and the program as he ever learned from me.

The experience also helped me understand the huge amount of trust that we put in volunteers at organizations all around the country. In the vast majority of cases, that trust is well placed. But, unfortunately, there are exceptions.

For that reason, in 2003, Congress created the Child Safety Pilot Program to demonstrate the feasibility of allowing youth-serving nonprofits to access FBI background checks.

□ 1800

The FBI maintains the database of criminal histories from every State in the Nation, searchable by fingerprint. An FBI search is really the gold standard when it comes to background checks, as it cannot be evaded by using a fake name, and it will find convictions from every State. I believe that the gold standard is what we should strive for when it comes to protecting children, seniors, and individuals with disabilities who are put in a potentially vulnerable situation.

Between 2003 and 2011, youth-serving organizations were able to run over 100,000 background checks through this pilot program, and about 6 percent of the potential volunteers were revealed to have criminal records of concern. Applicants were found with convictions for everything from murder to child abuse, to sexual assault; and frequently those convictions were from out of State, so only a national background check would have found them.

H.R. 695 ensures that every child-serving organization in America will have access to the most comprehensive and effective background check possible. H.R. 695 will also protect the applicant's privacy and does not allow for the individual's specific criminal record to be disclosed without explicit consent by the potential volunteer.

We have demonstrated that background checks for nonprofits working with children can be conducted quickly, affordably, and accurately. It is time to create a system that is permanent and that will protect children and other vulnerable populations while ensuring the privacy of volunteers.

I urge the passage of this bipartisan bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me also congratulate Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. BISHOP. And as was indicated on the floor, thank you very much, Mr. CONYERS.

This is the kind of bill that is corrective and effective. This bill would allow a more effective and comprehensive criminal background check, which will help identify the integrity and accountability of the organizations that sponsor these programs.

Many of us have worked with the Boys and Girls Clubs, Boys and Girls Scouts, and many other organizations that really work to help children. These nationwide criminal background

checks are more reliable than background checks that only search criminal histories in a few States.

Many States currently limit the ability of organizations to access their database and, thus, force organizations to depend on private companies to perform background checks of employees and volunteers. If anybody has been on the board of a nonprofit dealing with children, you realize that you want to put most of your resources investing in the programs to help these children. H.R. 695, however, would alleviate this burden of expense and allow organizations to access the FBI's more robust system.

In the Child Safety Pilot Program, which we implemented over 10 years ago, it demonstrates the effectiveness of nationwide background checks for youth-serving organizations. The program has effectively exposed applicants who use aliases, incorrect dates of birth, and other identifiers, some of whom have serious criminal backgrounds. That is the preventative way to protect our children, by ensuring a very healthy, robust vetting of individuals who want to engage with our children.

H.R. 695 would allow organizations to access the FBI's comprehensive background check system and to create a more accurate determination of individuals who want to work with children. Volunteers we welcome, but we want to ensure that those volunteers are there to take care of our children, to help our children, and improve the lives of our children. H.R. 695 is a very important contributor to that effort.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I am pleased to make my closing remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the Child Protection Improvements Act is a reasonable, bipartisan piece of legislation intended to protect our children and vulnerable adults from harm and give those who love them peace of mind.

Although we still have work to do to address the accuracy and reliability of some criminal history records and give individuals an opportunity to challenge incomplete or inaccurate records, this is a good bill. For those reasons, I urge everyone in this Chamber to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP). I thank the ranking member of the full committee and the ranking member of the subcommittee and the chairman of the subcommittee for working on this important legislation with me and the committee staff.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 695, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TARGETED REWARDS FOR THE GLOBAL ERADICATION OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1625) to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to include severe forms of trafficking in persons within the definition of transnational organized crime for purposes of the rewards program of the Department of State, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1625

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Targeted Rewards for the Global Eradication of Human Trafficking" or the "TARGET Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Trafficking in persons is a major transnational crime that threatens United States national security and humanitarian interests.

(2) Trafficking in persons is increasingly perpetrated by organized, sophisticated criminal enterprises.

(3) Combating trafficking in persons requires a global approach to identifying and apprehending the world's worst human trafficking rings.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Department of State's rewards program is a powerful tool in combating sophisticated international crime and that the Department of State and Federal law enforcement should work in concert to offer rewards that target human traffickers who threaten United States national security and humanitarian interests by preying on the most vulnerable people around the world.

SEC. 3. REWARDS FOR JUSTICE.

Paragraph (5) of section 36(k) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2708(k)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "means";

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and moving such clauses, as so redesignated, two ems to the right;

(3) by inserting before clause (i), as so redesignated, the following:

"(A) means—";

(4) in clause (ii), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(5) by adding at the end following new subparagraph:

"(B) includes severe forms of trafficking in persons, as such term is defined in section

103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1625 is the human trafficking TARGET Act. It authorizes the State Department and Federal law enforcement to target international human traffickers, and they can do that by offering rewards for their arrest or conviction anywhere around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I think for all of us, with some of the cases we have had in our districts, some of our constituents, some of the victims, this is pretty close to all of us. It has touched many of our communities, because trafficking in persons here in the U.S. and worldwide is a major global crime that destroys countless lives at home and abroad, and the most vulnerable are destroyed by this.

Many of these persons—and they are primarily women and children—are trafficked into international sex trade by force or by fraud or by coercion. And I will remind everyone, out in southern California, in L.A., the average age of a girl being trafficked is 14. In Orange County, the average age is 14.

So when I say "by force," we are talking about abduction. When I say "by fraud," that is a situation where they get one of these gigolos, one of those Romeos—they call them—to go out, convince some girl to run off with him, get her out of State, and then he sells her to a criminal gang. The gang sells her to the crime syndicate. Now her fate is sealed. Or through coercion, and we have heard these cases. At 14, young people are pretty gullible, what this criminal organization is going to do to her sister or to her parents if she does not go along.

So this transnational crime also includes forced labor. It involves significant violations of public health, human rights standards worldwide, and every other kind of moral standard you could think of. And that is why, as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and as Representative for the 39th District in California, I have, over

the last few years, made working on this issue and moving legislation on this horrific crime a top priority for the committee, and we have had bipartisan support throughout for this legislation. We have enacted many bills in recent years, including the International Megan's Law last February. We have held committee hearings in Washington, in L.A., and in Orange County to hear firsthand from victims.

For example, at a field hearing in Fullerton, we heard from Angela Guanzon, who was trafficked from the Philippines into coerced servitude in Los Angeles where she worked for 18 hours a day every day without a weekend off, without a holiday off, was forced to sleep on the hallway floor until a sharp-eyed neighbor finally alerted law enforcement.

I helped establish a Human Trafficking Congressional Advisory Committee. I established that in the 39th District for L.A., Orange County, and San Bernardino. We have local law enforcement involved in that as well as the Federal authorities, victims rights groups, and community advocates in California to address these concerns, to try to come up with solutions.

Mr. Speaker, we have made progress, but there is still so much work to be done. If we are going to end human trafficking, it will take all of us working together, so I want to thank Ranking Member ENGEL, of course, Congressman CONNOLLY, and the coauthor of my legislation here, LOIS FRANKEL, for their outstanding work on this measure.

As has been discussed today, trafficking in persons is increasingly perpetuated and perpetrated by sophisticated transnational criminal enterprises. The traffickers themselves operate outside sometimes of our borders. Other times they are inside our borders, but the profits from the trafficking industry contribute to the expansion of organized crime and terrorism here and worldwide.

That is why combating human trafficking requires a global approach to identify and apprehend the world's worst offenders. This TARGET Act for traffickers does that. It targets human trafficking globally through the Department of State's very successful Rewards Programs.

Rewards issued under these programs have led to the capture of major terrorists and international criminals, including—I will remind Members—Ramzi Yousef, who was convicted in the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center, several members of the Abu Sayyaf terrorist group who kidnapped and killed American citizens, and over 60 major international drug traffickers. All of them were convicted with the help of this particular program that we want to expand now, that we want to apply here.

A reward on one's head creates real fear for terrorists and criminals. At

one committee hearing, a State Department official testified that one captured narcotics trafficker told DEA agents he would no longer trust anyone in his organization after the U.S. put a \$5 million reward for his capture.

I remember the quote. He said he felt like a hunted man.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we want human traffickers to know the fear of being hunted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1815

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I laud the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and my good friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), for taking a particular lead in our committee on this terribly important topic.

I rise in support of H.R. 1625, the Targeted Rewards for the Global Eradication of Human Trafficking Act. Let me start by again thanking both of my colleagues for their leadership. I am also proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill to help bring human traffickers to justice.

Human trafficking is an abhorrent practice, increasingly perpetrated by organized criminal enterprises, that deprives people of their most precious gift: human autonomy. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness presume autonomy. Without autonomy, identity is lost, and the ability to pursue those inalienable rights Thomas Jefferson wrote about in our Declaration of Independence do not exist. They are nullified. This major transnational crime threatens United States security and humanitarian interests all over the world.

This bill would allow the State Department to pay cash through the Rewards for Justice program for information leading to the arrest and conviction of human traffickers worldwide. These cash rewards are a proven method for cracking open international criminal networks.

Congress originally established the program to gain more information in terrorism cases. We have since expanded it to include other crimes as well. With this legislation, we will give law enforcement the ability to use this valuable tool in the fight against human trafficking.

Over the last two decades, the United States has actively fought human trafficking through provisions laid out in the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act, which established the annual Trafficking in Persons Report and subsequent reauthorizations.

Human trafficking is nothing short of modern-day slavery. As the TIP Report demonstrates, human trafficking affects, unfortunately, every country

in the world, including, of course, the United States, as the distinguished chairman described.

As ranking member of the House Oversight Subcommittee on Government Operations, I joined with the then-subcommittee chairman, JAMES LANKFORD, now Senator from Oklahoma, to investigate the abuse of foreign nationals employed by government contractors. Together, we introduced the End Trafficking in Government Contracting Act, which was enacted as part of the fiscal 2013 National Defense Authorization Act.

Whether it takes the form of forced labor or sexual exploitation, every case of human trafficking deprives an individual of their basic human rights. More than 20 million people fall victim to this heinous crime every year. A disproportionate share of the victims are women and children, and only a very small fraction will ever see their traffickers held accountable. We must and can do more to bring the perpetrators of this heinous crime to justice.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It will give law enforcement a proven method to help finally bring an end to this modern-day slave trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), my good friend and coauthor of this important piece of legislation.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CONNOLLY and, of course, the chair of our committee for his fine work and our ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard already, human trafficking is a global crisis of epic proportions. An estimated 12 to 20 million men and women around the world are being subjected to slavery of some sort. In fact, it is the number two criminal enterprise on Earth.

I have seen the effects of this human trafficking up close. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a couple visits I made.

When I went to Peru, I went to a couple shelters there, which were now the homes of young girls who had been trafficked. The first one I went to, there were girls in their mid-teens who had been raised in families that were very, very poor. Their families were approached by these traffickers, who told them they would take their children, take their daughters to "the promised land." They were going to take them to an area in Peru where they would be educated, well fed, and well nourished.

What they really ended up doing was taking these young girls and basically enslaving them. They found themselves in people's homes where they would be locked up, literally, for years. From

the time the Sun came up to the time the Sun went down, these children told their stories of having to, for example, peel potatoes, peel potatoes day and night. No education, no mingling with their peers, just deprived of the joy of childhood.

At another shelter we went to, we visited young girls, again, who had been saved from their slavery. They had been kidnapped off the streets—they were now teenagers—when they were 9 and 10 and 11. I mean, it was just hard for me to hear these stories. I am sure it will be hard for you to hear these stories. When they were preteens, they were kidnapped off the streets. Some of them were locked in trunks. They were beaten. They were forced in submission to become sex slaves to miners. Again, children deprived of their education, deprived of their innocence.

I am not only haunted when I think back on them, I am haunted because I remember looking in their eyes—looking in their eyes—and saying to myself: How could this happen? How in our civilization do we let this happen to innocent children?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when I returned home to the United States, I heard a story from a young woman named Shandra, who had a work visa to come over here from Indonesia to work in a hotel. On her way over, she was kidnapped by traffickers and forced into commercial sex slavery for 2 to 3 years on the I-95 corridor. The way she escaped was through a bathroom window.

I thank Mr. ROYCE for letting me have an opportunity to join him in this legislation, which is going to target these sex and labor traffickers, give a powerful tool to stop what we call modern-day slavery. I am very proud to support the TARGET Act.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) especially for the trips that she has made overseas—not just here in the United States—to do this investigative work to expose trafficking and for being the original lead Democratic coauthor with me on this bill. I also want to again thank GERRY CONNOLLY for his work.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade. He has done a great deal of work over the years on this issue as well.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent piece of legislation.

Like Ms. FRANKEL mentioned during her comments on the floor, we had the opportunity to go to Peru together to visit children who were way up in the

mountains being protected from those deviants who wanted to traffic them not only in Peru, but other parts of South America.

I had, also, the opportunity to go to Costa Rica and meet some young girls who were being trafficked in Costa Rica and into other foreign countries. I remember one girl named Lilli. She was 7 years of age when I met her. She did not talk at all, even though she had the physical ability to talk, but she did not talk because of the trauma that she had been through before she had been rescued and put in that shelter in Costa Rica.

There are a lot of little girls like Lilli throughout the world, including in the United States. Societies must make the decision now that we will not tolerate the stolen innocence of young children by those who sell them on the marketplace of slavery for money, whether that is the trafficker, the slave master, or the buyer, the consumer. We, as a world, cannot tolerate that.

The United States has taken the lead on international trafficking and, I believe, on trafficking here in the U.S. This legislation, the TARGET Act, makes it clear that we are not going to tolerate this conduct and that those people who act this way in the slave trade are going to be held accountable for their conduct, and the consequences for what they do are not going to be pleasant. Plus, we are going to rescue those young children.

I support this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let every Member of Congress who is a parent, let every American who is a parent ask himself or herself: How would you feel if your loved one, your child were made prey by human traffickers? Imagine the heartache. Imagine the terrible grief, the trauma and tragedy of such a situation—and now remember 20 million fellow human beings go through that experience every year.

This is a crime that is repugnant to all human value. This is a crime we can stop. This is a subject matter that can bring us together, irrespective of whether we are Democrats or Republicans, for the sake of our fellow human beings, for the sake of that human autonomy that is celebrated in the Declaration of Independence and enshrined in the Constitution of the United States and the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Let us take this step today. Let us rededicate ourselves to the idea that all human autonomy is sacred and that that is what we, too, are dedicated to support and uphold. I urge passage of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say that, for republics in Europe and our United States, we credit our civilizations with having eradicated slavery some 150 years or more ago, but clearly Judge POE uses the right word here: Slavery is, in fact, what is committed in these acts.

I can tell you, my chief of staff, having worked in relief efforts in south Asia and in Cambodia with underaged girls as young as the ones described by Judge POE—7, 8, 9 years old—the most vulnerable people on this planet are being sold into slavery. As long as force and fraud, coercion is used to prey upon the most vulnerable, as long as profits from these victims suffering from the ill-gotten gains are used to build out criminal networks to snare more and more of these children, as long as trafficking in persons is a global crime that extends beyond the capacity of certain governments, then it requires a global response and, again, as my colleagues have said, requires that the United States, therefore, lead.

□ 1830

So this bill targets human traffickers around the world through the Department of State's successful reward programs by offering rewards for their capture anywhere on Earth, it lets the victims of human trafficking know we will not stop until they are free, and it tells the predators that we will not stop until they are behind bars.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1625.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 953, REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2017

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-145) on the resolution (H. Res. 348) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 953) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1862, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1842, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

GLOBAL CHILD PROTECTION ACT
OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1862) to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand the scope of certain definitions pertaining to unlawful sexual conduct, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 372, nays 30, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

YEAS—372

Abraham	Carbajal	DeSantis
Adams	Cárdenas	DesJarlais
Aderholt	Carson (IN)	Diaz-Balart
Aguilar	Carter (GA)	Dingell
Allen	Cartwright	Doggett
Amodeli	Castor (FL)	Donovan
Arrington	Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael F.
Babin	Chabot	Duffy
Bacon	Cheney	Duncan (SC)
Banks (IN)	Clark (MA)	Duncan (TN)
Barletta	Clay	Dunn
Barr	Cleaver	Emmer
Barragán	Coffman	Engel
Barton	Cohen	Eshoo
Beatty	Cole	Españillat
Bera	Collins (GA)	Estes (KS)
Bergman	Comer	Farenthold
Biggs	Comstock	Faso
Bilirakis	Conaway	Ferguson
Bishop (GA)	Connolly	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (MI)	Cook	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Cooper	Flores
Blackburn	Correa	Fortenberry
Blum	Costa	Foster
Blumenauer	Costello (PA)	Fox
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Frankel (FL)
Bonamici	Cramer	Franks (AZ)
Bost	Crawford	Frelinghuysen
Boyle, Brendan	Crist	Gabbard
F.	Crowley	Gaetz
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Gallagher
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Gallego
Brat	Curbelo (FL)	Garamendi
Bridenstine	Davidson	Garrett
Brooks (IN)	Davis (CA)	Gibbs
Brown (MD)	Davis, Danny	Gohmert
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Rodney	Gonzalez (TX)
Buck	DeFazio	Goodlatte
Bucshon	DeGette	Gosar
Budd	Delaney	Gottheimer
Burgess	DeLauro	Gowdy
Bustos	DelBene	Graves (GA)
Butterfield	Demings	Graves (LA)
Byrne	Denham	Green, Al
Calvert	Dent	

Green, Gene	Marchant	Russell
Griffith	Marino	Rutherford
Grijalva	Ryan (OH)	Ryan (OH)
Grothman	Sánchez	Sánchez
Guthrie	Sanford	Sanford
Hanabusa	Sarbanes	Sarbanes
Harper	Scalise	Scalise
Harris	McCaul	Schiff
Hartzer	McClintock	Schneider
Heck	McCollum	Schrader
Hensarling	McHenry	Schweikert
Herrera Beutler	McKinley	Scott, Austin
Hice, Jody B.	McMorris	Scott, David
Higgins (LA)	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner
Higgins (NY)	McNerney	Serrano
Hill	McSally	Sessions
Himes	Meadows	Sewell (AL)
Holding	Meehan	Shea-Porter
Hollingsworth	Meeks	Sherman
Hoyer	Meng	Shimkus
Hudson	Messer	Shuster
Hultgren	Mitchell	Simpson
Hunter	Moolenaar	Sinema
Hurd	Mooney (WV)	Sires
Issa	Moore	Slaughter
Jeffries	Moulton	Smith (MO)
Jenkins (KS)	Mullin	Smith (NE)
Jenkins (WV)	Murphy (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (LA)	Murphy (PA)	Smucker
Johnson (OH)	Napolitano	Soto
Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Speier
Jones	Noem	Stefanik
Jordan	Nolan	Stewart
Joyce (OH)	Norcross	Stivers
Kaptur	Nunes	Suozzi
Katko	O'Halleran	Taylor
Keating	O'Rourke	Tenney
Kelly (IL)	Olson	Thompson (CA)
Kelly (MS)	Palazzo	Thompson (MS)
Kelly (PA)	Pallone	Thompson (PA)
Kennedy	Palmer	Thornberry
Kihuen	Panetta	Tipton
Kildee	Paulsen	Titus
Kilmer	Pearce	Tonko
King (IA)	Pelosi	Torres
King (NY)	Perlmutter	Trott
Kinzinger	Perry	Tsongas
Knight	Peters	Turner
Krishnamoorthi	Peterson	Upton
Kuster (NH)	Pingree	Vargas
Kustoff (TN)	Pittenger	Veasey
LaHood	Pocan	Vela
LaMalfa	Poe (TX)	Velázquez
Lamborn	Poliquin	Visclosky
Lance	Posey	Wagner
Langevin	Price (NC)	Walberg
Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Walden
Larson (CT)	Raskin	Walker
Latta	Ratcliffe	Walorski
Lawrence	Reed	Walters, Mimi
Lawson (FL)	Reichert	Walz
Levin	Renacci	Wasserman
Lewis (MN)	Rice (NY)	Schultz
Lieu, Ted	Rice (SC)	Weber (TX)
Lipinski	Roby	Webster (FL)
LoBiondo	Roe (TN)	Welch
Loebuck	Rogers (AL)	Wenstrup
Lofgren	Rogers (KY)	Westerman
Long	Rokita	Williams
Loudermilk	Rooney, Francis	Wilson (FL)
Love	Rooney, Thomas J.	Wilson (SC)
Lowenthal	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman
Lowey	Rosen	Womack
Lucas	Roskam	Woodall
Luetkemeyer	Ross	Yarmuth
Lujan Grisham, M.	Rothfus	Yoder
Luján, Ben Ray	Rouzer	Yoho
MacArthur	Roybal-Allard	Young (AK)
Maloney	Royce (CA)	Young (IA)
Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Zeldin
	Ruppersberger	
	Rush	

NAYS—30

Amash	Evans	McEachin
Bass	Fudge	McGovern
Beyer	Hastings	Nadler
Capuano	Huffman	Richmond
Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Smith (WA)
Conyers	Khanna	Takano
DeSaulnier	Lee	Waters, Maxine
Ellison	Massie	Watson Coleman

NOT VOTING—28

Black	Granger	Pascrell
Brooks (AL)	Graves (MO)	Payne
Buchanan	Gutiérrez	Polis
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Rohrabacher
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Smith (TX)
Ciциlline	Kind	Swalwell (CA)
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Tiberi
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Valadao
Deutch	Lynch	
Esty (CT)	Newhouse	

□ 1857

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mr. HASTINGS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, JEFFRIES, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ALLEN, and Ms. ADAMS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING CHILDREN'S
SAFETY ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHENEY). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1842) to amend title 18, United States Code, to include State crimes of violence as grounds for an enhanced penalty when sex offenders fail to register or report certain information as required by Federal law, to include prior military offenses for purposes of recidivist sentencing provisions, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 371, nays 30, answered “present” 1, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 270]

YEAS—371

Abraham	Bishop (UT)	Butterfield
Adams	Blackburn	Byrne
Aderholt	Blum	Calvert
Aguilar	Blumenauer	Carbajal
Allen	Blunt Rochester	Cárdenas
Amodeli	Bonamici	Carson (IN)
Arrington	Bost	Carter (GA)
Babin	Boyle, Brendan F.	Cartwright
Bacon		Castor (FL)
Banks (IN)	Brady (PA)	Castro (TX)
Barletta	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Barr	Brat	Cheney
Barragán	Bridenstine	Clark (MA)
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Clay
Beatty	Brown (MD)	Cleaver
Bera	Brownley (CA)	Coffman
Bergman	Buck	Cohen
Beyer	Bucshon	Cole
Biggs	Budd	Collins (GA)
Bilirakis	Burgess	Comer
Bishop (GA)	Bustos	Comstock

Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallo
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd

Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Levin
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone

Palmer
Panetta
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez

Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz

Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—30

Amash
Bass
Capuano
Chu, Judy
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Conyers
DeSaulnier
Ellison
Español
Evans
Fudge
Huffman
Jayapal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Khanna
Lee
Massie
McEchin

McGovern
Moore
Nadler
Richmond
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Smith (WA)
Takano
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Jackson Lee

NOT VOTING—28

Bishop (MI)
Black
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Carter (TX)
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Collins (NY)
Cummings
Deutch

Esty (CT)
Granger
Graves (MO)
Gutiérrez
Huizenga
Johnson, Sam
Kind
Labrador
Lewis (GA)
Newhouse

Pascrell
Payne
Polis
Rohrabacher
Smith (TX)
Swalwell (CA)
Tiberi
Valadao

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1904

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 269 and "yea" on rollcall No. 270.

REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO LIBRARY OF CONGRESS TRUST FUND BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to section 1 of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board Act (2 U.S.C. 154), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a 5-year term:

Ambassador Richard Fredericks, San Francisco, California

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76h(a)), amended by Public Law 107-117, and the order of the House of

January 3, 2017, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts:

Mr. MACARTHUR, New Jersey

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 4003(e) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Pub. L. 114-255), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Health Information Technology Advisory Committee:

Mr. Patrick Soon-Shiong, Culver City, California

HONORING BRIAN C. COOPER

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Brian Cooper, who is retiring from the Office of the Parliamentarian after 35 years on Capitol Hill. Brian's first job came in 1982, when he was hired in the stock room of the Longworth Building working in Publication and Distribution Services.

Since then, Brian held a variety of positions in Congress, where he learned the intricacies of the legislative process, and the inner workings of House operations—skills that earned him a job at the House Parliamentarian Office, where he currently serves as Chief Clerk. A consummate professional, Brian has spent his career committed to assisting with an orderly and accurate legislative process, observed in a fair and nonpartisan manner.

Madam Speaker, I ask my congressional colleagues to join me in congratulating Brian Cooper on his long-deserved retirement and wish him all the best as he pursues his passions, including his artistic endeavors, traveling, spending more time with his family, and cheering on his favorite Baltimore sports teams.

Bon voyage and Godspeed to Brian Cooper.

FUND CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

(Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Madam Speaker, in our increasingly competitive world, the importance of education beyond our K-12 system has only grown. As we address this reality, it is vital that we recognize the importance of career and technical education, in addition to colleges and universities.

That is why I am proud to be the lead Democrat on the bipartisan Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act. This bill, which passed the Education and the Workforce Committee last week unanimously, will increase funding for career and technical education by 9 percent over the next 6 years to modernize these initiatives and to ensure students have the skills employers are looking for.

Through investing in our citizens and our economy, this bill will help hard-working families across the country join and stay in the middle class. I am proud to work with my colleagues from both parties, including Congressman THOMPSON from Pennsylvania, to build a more promising future for millions of Americans, and I hope this bill will soon receive consideration on the House floor.

CONGRATULATIONS TO COREY BULMAN AS MINNESOTA TEACHER OF THE YEAR

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Corey Bulman, an English and literature teacher at Mound Westonka High School, on being named Minnesota's Teacher of the Year. This is an extraordinary achievement and a tribute to his enthusiasm both inside and outside of the classroom.

Mr. Bulman began teaching at Mound Westonka 17 years ago, where he devoted his entire tenure as an educator to enriching students in the classroom through his creative, imaginative, and insightful curriculums. What sets him apart is the meaningful and empowering connections he develops with his students.

As one of his former students said: "Corey was an adult, who showed me he believed I was smart, and cared about my ideas. He was honest, funny, and made me believe in myself."

Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that Mr. Bulman has touched so many of his students' lives. He understands how forming these bonds can inspire students for future success.

Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate Corey and thank him for dedicating himself on educating, inspiring, and empowering our young students.

HONORING NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH AND KENNATH FORSYTH-SEARS

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Foster

Youth Caucus, I rise in recognition of National Foster Care Month and in honor of the remarkable foster youth alumnus that I am fortunate to host this week: Kennath Forsyth-Sears.

Kennath hails from the Ocean State, where he attends my alma mater, Rhode Island College, and aspires to work with children with disabilities.

Kennath is a reminder of why we must ensure every child has the opportunity to reach their full potential. Madam Speaker, all children need the support and love of a family, yet finding "forever families" for foster youth is one of our biggest challenges.

Madam Speaker, it is our moral duty to care for these children as we would our own, including by supporting permanency for foster youth.

I thank my co-chair of the Congressional Foster Youth Caucus and the leader of our Caucus, Congresswoman KAREN BASS of California, for bringing young people like Kennath to Capitol Hill for Foster Youth Shadow Day, and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring National Foster Care Month.

□ 1915

ERDOGAN: THE VIOLATOR OF DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, it looks like Turkish President Erdogan has brought his brutal crackdown on human rights to Washington, D.C.

For years, Erdogan has attacked Turkey's democratic institutions, undermined the rule of law, and violated Turkish civil liberties. On Tuesday, several bullies violently assaulted protesters outside the Turkish Embassy here in Washington. These Gestapo-type body guards beat peaceful demonstrators, in one case kicking a woman lying on the ground. This type of behavior is unacceptable.

Erdogan is becoming a Turkish dictator. One of the traits of a dictator is to violently quash opposition. He is showing he doesn't believe in the democratic principles of free speech and peaceful assembly. But, Madam Speaker, we will have no foreign tyrant violating these sacred rights on American soil without consequences.

And that is just the way it is.

5000 ROLE MODELS OF EXCELLENCE PROJECT

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, tomorrow 50 Miami-Dade County ninth grade boys from various chapters of the 5000 Role Models of Excellence Project will visit Washington,

D.C. They are all college-bound and have earned the promise of a 4-year scholarship from the program.

5000 Role Models is an in-school dropout prevention program that will turn 25 years old in January 2018. There are 6,000 participants in Miami-Dade County, 3,000 in St. Petersburg, and 2,000 in Jacksonville school districts.

The program's goal is to mentor minority boys beginning in elementary school, middle school, and high school, all the while guiding them along a carefully charted path to manhood and sending them to college.

Madam Speaker, in this season of youth violence, during which boys get entangled in the school-to-prison pipeline, we are proud of the project and the tens of thousands of boys it has helped to become successful, contributing men in society. For example, Barry Jenkins, director of the Oscar-winning film "Moonlight," is a 1998 graduate of the program.

I look forward to welcoming these young men here tomorrow and hope you will get a chance to meet them, also. If you do, give them a hug and tell them that you love them.

ALS AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, May is ALS Awareness Month. It is a time many lend their voices to the fight against ALS and help raise awareness about this devastating disease.

ALS is often referred to as Lou Gehrig's disease, after the baseball great was diagnosed with the progressive neurodegenerative disease that affects the nerve cells in the brain and spinal cord.

Recently, I had the honor of meeting with people from Pennsylvania to talk about ALS, including Michael Bond, who has ALS, and his wife and caretaker, Karen Bond, both of Edinboro, Pennsylvania; and Jayne Cawthorne of Centre County, Pennsylvania, who is a long-time advocate for the ALS Association. Jayne and her daughter have been visiting with me since I was first elected to Congress, and their advocacy continues to build hope while their association aggressively searches for new treatments and cures.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1361, which would ensure access to complex rehabilitation technology such as power wheelchairs and their components and accessories. When you have lost the ability to walk, move your hands, or hold your head up, these technologies are critical.

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

(Ms. BARRAGÁN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Maritime Day.

Since America's founding, our men and women who serve as mariners have dedicated themselves to protecting our economy and our interests at home and abroad. Whether it be through ensuring the delivery of goods, supporting us during times of peace, or standing up during times of war, the maritime industry has held strong.

The Port of Los Angeles, which I am proud to represent, has made countless contributions not only to California but to every other congressional district.

As a member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I work to ensure the safety and security of the Port of Los Angeles so that it can continue to serve as America's port. Along with the Port of Long Beach, the ports employ twice as many men and women as the Hollywood entertainment industry.

Today, I am proud to honor those men and women who serve and have served as U.S. merchant mariners. I ask that we continue to support the maritime industry today, and every day.

SUPPORT OUR VETERANS

(Mr. BERGMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2288, the Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act of 2017, a bill that addresses the Department of Veterans Affairs' broken appeals process.

As of April 1, 2017, the number of pending appeals for disability compensation with the VA has reached 470,000. That is more than a 20 percent increase since fiscal year 2015. At current funding levels and using its current operational structure, the Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that it will take at least 5 years to address the backlog of appeals claims.

That is unsatisfactory. We can do better. We must do better. Our veterans deserve better. They have risked their lives to protect the freedoms we hold so dear, and it is up to us to make sure they receive the benefits they have earned and deserve.

H.R. 2288 modernizes the appeals process to efficiently and effectively resolve backlogged claims and prevent this kind of backlog from happening in the future. This bipartisan piece of legislation takes a giant leap toward a more efficient Department of Veterans Affairs, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

SABOTAGE X 2

(Mr. SOTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, sabotage.

A plot is afoot in Washington. It is time to sound the alarms. It is time to let the people know. It is time to ride like Paul Revere across our Nation and awaken Americans to this sinister scheme.

President Trump is sabotaging the Affordable Care Act. Trump has threatened to cut subsidies to millions of Americans, creating more uncertainty today by stalling in court. He has refused to fund the high-risk corridors, causing insurance companies to flee States like Iowa and Kentucky. He has cut the public notices to keep those in need of healthcare in the dark. He has cut the sign-up period in half to prevent more Americans from signing up.

Is sabotage destroying the healthcare market worth it? Is robbing millions of Americans of healthcare coverage worth it? Is that the price Trump is willing to pay for repeal? To give tax cuts to billionaires?

Mr. Trump, ObamaCare works. If you break it, you own it. When you sabotage healthcare for millions of Americans, you are responsible. And the people ought to know.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

(Mr. ARRINGTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, if history has taught us anything over the years, it is that freedom is not free. It comes at a great price.

It is easy to take for granted the freedoms we enjoy, but this Military Appreciation Month I pray that we all reflect upon the sacrifices the men and women of our Armed Forces have made for our liberty and our security.

Specifically, I am reminded today of the 5,100 dedicated men and women serving at Dyess Air Force Base, home of the 7th Bomb Wing and the 317th Airlift Group, and the 40,000 veterans in my district in west Texas.

It is with them in mind, Madam Speaker, that I would like to express my gratitude for those who have served, my sorrow for those who did not make it back home, and my condolences to those who have lost someone dear in service to our great country. Let us never forget them. Let us always remind our children and grandchildren of the sacrifices of those who gave up their today so that we can have our tomorrow.

God bless our men and women in uniform. And God bless these United States of America.

WORLD AT A CROSSROADS

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, as I stand here, our world stands at a crossroads. As I stand here, 20 million stand at risk of starvation at the hands of what has the potential to become the worst humanitarian crisis since World War II: famine in South Sudan and impending famine in northeast Nigeria, Somalia, and Yemen. Additional funding is needed to avert the destabilization of entire regions and to support refugees fleeing into neighboring countries.

Earlier this year, a bipartisan group of Members proposed that the U.S. allocate \$1 billion in emergency funding for famine response. Thanks to those efforts, Congress pledged to provide \$990 million in emergency funding in fiscal year appropriations.

Foreign aid is an investment. It makes our country, and those overseas fighting for us, dramatically safer. With leadership comes responsibility. Providing aid is a moral imperative.

WHAT DO WE HAVE TO LOSE: NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to anchor this CBC Special Order. For the next 60 minutes, we have a chance to speak directly to the American people on issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus, Congress, the constituents we represent, and all Americans.

Tonight, we will highlight the President's action to undermine our national security, including, but not limited to, abruptly firing FBI Director Comey in order to ease pressure on the Russian investigation just 1 day before sharing classified information with a Russian official.

Madam Speaker, many in this country believe Congress continues to have trouble accomplishing the basic requirements of its job. Up until a few weeks ago, we were still scrambling yet again to complete spending legislation to prevent a government shutdown.

If the only measure of national security success during the President's first 100 days were avoiding catastrophe,

okay, President Trump has succeeded: no attacks on the U.S., no new wars, no nuclear Armageddon.

These are good things, and in the moment we can breathe a sigh of relief. However, these outcomes, arguably, owe more to the national security machine built by the President's predecessors than any decision of the 45th President.

President Trump's first major budget proposal will be released tomorrow. It is reported to include massive cuts to Medicaid and will call for drastically and unprecedented changes to anti-poverty programs.

As for Medicaid, the State Federal programs that provide healthcare to low-income Americans, Trump's draconian budget plan would follow through on a bill passed by House Republicans to cut more than \$800 billion over 10 years.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that this would cut off Medicaid benefits for 10 million people over the next decade. That is unacceptable.

The dysfunctional relationship between Congress and the Trump administration has helped to bog down and complicate the fiscal 2017 budget process and has stymied the work of this Congress when it comes to passing legislation that will help our constituents.

A recent survey found that 48 percent of Americans now prefer increased government spending in areas like healthcare, veterans care, education, and infrastructure—things that the people of my district, the Virgin Islands, desperately need, with a 15 percent unemployment rate and 33 percent of our children living in poverty.

□ 1930

It is time for Congress to get back to work for the people that have put us here.

I want to highlight three pieces of legislation that I have introduced that will help my constituents in the Virgin Islands in various ways.

With a special counsel now having been appointed to look into the distractions the White House has created, it is time that Congress focus on our job and proceed to hold hearings on these bills followed by a vote on the House floor, and, hopefully, these commonsense bills will be signed into law by the President.

Healthcare: President Trump and the Republican Congress are planning to cut more than \$800 billion out of Medicaid funding over 10 years while converting the program to a cap block grant to the States and territories and eliminating ACA's Medicaid expansion. These provisions are in the American Health Care Act, the House GOP's ObamaCare repeal bill.

As a Member representing the Virgin Islands, I believe we need to get back to doing the work of the people, and

that is working to pass laws that better the lives of our constituents.

I introduced improving the treatment of the U.S. territories under the Federal healthcare program, which would eliminate existing inequities the territories face under Medicaid and Medicare. There are numerous bills that my other colleagues have introduced to assist their constituents and all Americans in areas of healthcare. We need to bring those bills to the floor and vote them up or vote them down.

Veterans: There are few places in the United States with higher per capita rates of military service than the United States Virgin Islands. As a Member, I am committed to ensuring Virgin Islands veterans have full and equal access to health, housing, education, and employment benefits they have rightfully earned. Our constituents have deployed to Afghanistan and Iraq more than 30,000 times since September 11, and about 120,000 military veterans live in the territories, yet none are allowed to cast a ballot to choose their Commander in Chief.

We need to remember that nearly 4 million Americans call Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa home, a combined population greater than 22 States. We represent those Americans in the U.S. House who cannot vote for their interests on the House floor. Our constituents are denied representation in the U.S. Senate and are barred from the general election for President and Vice President. When the Presidential vote was tabulated in 2016, it was as if 4 million Americans we represent do not exist. There is a time, however, when our people are counted—when the country goes to war.

I have introduced H. Res. 91, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding Presidential elections, voting rights for residents of all United States territories and commonwealths.

Education: We have to fix the education system. We have to give our young people better choices. We need to allow our children to be able to be educated in a place that is hospitable to learning. That does not occur right now in many places in the United States. The President's budget cut would remove support to schools for infrastructure, for afterschool programs, and for summer reading programs.

We cannot continue with this if we want to have national security. National security is the security of our young people to be educated and to grow safely. That is not happening in the Virgin Islands or anyplace in the United States at this time.

I recently introduced the United States Virgin Islands College Access Act of 2017, which will allow college students who are residents of the Vir-

gin Islands to receive more reasonable tuition rates at participating 4-year institutions of higher education.

It is time for Congress to stop doing business as usual. With budget decisions impacting everything from national security to infrastructure investment, Congress needs to focus on doing its job and doing it with more than the next few months or current fiscal year in mind. Moving forward, we as Members of Congress need to make sure that we deal with our legislative and budgetary responsibilities with more thoughtfulness and foresight.

Congressman DWIGHT EVANS represents the wonderful city of Philadelphia and the people of Pennsylvania. He is a legislator for many years. Although he comes here as a freshman, none of us consider him as a freshman having served in the legislature in Pennsylvania for more than 20 years. I would ask him to speak on the topic that the Congressional Black Caucus' Special Order hour has introduced: What Do We Have to Lose: National Security.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from the great Virgin Islands, and I really appreciate her leadership.

I would like to thank my colleagues for bringing forward such an important topic for tonight's Special Order hour. National security is an issue of utmost importance to all of us.

The bottom line is this: If the President thinks it is okay to share classified information with our adversaries, we have a big problem. I will be reemphasizing that point: If the President of the United States of America shared classified information with our enemies, then the lives of the American people are at risk.

Regardless of political party, if, in fact, President Trump did willingly share classified information with Russia, then this further proves that the President does not understand the consequences of his actions. It proves that he doesn't understand how much we stand to lose as a result of these actions.

The bigger question now that people are asking is: Do you think the President is in so much trouble?

It is clear from the news that the Russian investigation is the gift that keeps giving. But I want to be really, really clear with you. I did not vote for President Trump. I did not support him when he was running, and I fought hard to stop President Trump from becoming elected.

If you want to know, I think the President is in trouble. I will tell you this. President Trump and his administration are not ready for prime time. The campaign is over. The President needs to focus on governing, and we

have not seen him do that yet. He needs to learn how to govern.

We know that the Comey firing has sent a potential signal of the President's collusion with Russia. For this reason, I called for the special prosecutor and the independent commission so that the American people truly can know the Trump-Russia connection.

I am glad to see former FBI Director Bob Mueller named as special counsel to oversee the investigation, but we still need to make sure that Congress is able to conduct an independent investigation into the Trump administration's ties to Russia and interference in the 2016 election. The American people deserve to know the facts. The American people deserve to know the facts.

I was in my district over the weekend in Lower Merion, and all anyone asked to talk about was Comey and Russia. They want answers, and they want to get to the bottom line of this.

I want to, but what I want to do is to raise the dialogue on the issues that really matter here, the issues that we really have a lot to lose on. For example, last week, I hosted a briefing on middle neighborhoods. Middle neighborhoods are neighborhoods caught between bust and boom. They are communities doing just well enough that our cities aren't focusing our resources or attention on them.

Of course, we need to get to the bottom line of collusion between Russia and the President. I want to, and we will get to the bottom line of this as the American people deserve the facts. At the same time, I want to make sure we are fighting for dialogue on the ways we can make a difference and make an impact on our communities in need.

We need to find ways to tackle food insecurity, help our public schools, and expand access to capital and credit on every corner to build stronger neighborhoods block by block. This will not be easy. We need to work together. It is in our collective interest to ensure national security is not a partisan issue. It should be a bipartisan issue.

So I stand here in the well of this House, Madam Speaker, to indicate that I want to ensure that national security is important. I hope, Madam Speaker, that the President also understands that it is important.

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, I thank the Congressman so much for his comments.

I think it was very interesting that the gentleman was saying that the American people and people that he spoke with over the weekend want the truth. I think that is what we all here in Congress want. We want the facts. We want to hear specifically what has happened so that the people of the United States can make a decision about what happens next.

I am not here to ask for impeachment or ask for any rash decision, but

I am asking that the American people be able to see a transparent Congress and a transparent process that allows them to then speak to us as Members of Congress as to what they would like.

Several months ago, almost 2 months now, several colleagues of mine and I wrote a letter to the Department of Justice, to the Acting Attorney General, requesting that he institute a special counsel, a special prosecutor, in this matter. We are grateful that that has happened. But a special counsel cannot replace an independent, outside commission and vigorous congressional investigation.

The appointment of a special counsel speaks to the urgency of investigating the Trump connection to Russia's interference in our election and the gravity of the President's abuse of power in trying to shut down the FBI Director; but the American people need to understand that, while a special counsel could bring charges against those individuals who were, in fact, if the facts prove to be so, in collusion with the Russians, it cannot do anything to the President except bring a report to this Congress for this Congress to act on.

This Congress needs to remember that we are a separate branch of government than the White House. This Congress seems to be acting as if it is part of the White House, an extension of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, when, in fact, this Congress stands alone.

We have a separate set of rules, a separate power, and a separate responsibility than the President of the United States. As such, Madam Speaker, it is important that we demonstrate to the American people that we are acting that way. A special counsel within the Trump-controlled Justice Department cannot replace a truly independent, outside commission, because it is the commission which would then be able to make a decision about our President.

I say it is our President because we all respect the Office of the President, and we want the world to know that we respect and hold in reverence the individual who holds that and hold him accountable for that position that he holds. An independent, outside commission, as special counsel, Director Muller's actions will still be subject to review and approval by the President Trump-appointed leadership of the Justice Department.

Congress must act to create an independent, outside commission that is completely free of the Trump administration's meddling. A special counsel cannot be used as a pretext for Republicans to shut down investigations by Congress or hide the facts of the President's wrongdoing from the American people.

Now, I have heard the Justice Department and others talk about this being a criminal investigation, that the special counsel is using it as a spe-

cial criminal investigation. As a lawyer, as someone who has been a prosecutor, I understand that the burden of proof for criminal charges are much different than this Congress would hold for a President if it were to ask for impeachment.

So this Congress must not abdicate its responsibility because the work needs to be done. Jobs need to be created and infrastructure needs to be put in place so that commerce can be done in this country. Healthcare needs to be put in place for Americans. We cannot lose more Americans' healthcare. We need to gain more Americans having healthcare. We need to settle the issues of immigration.

Madam Speaker, never mind criminal justice reform. It seems that this Congress has completely forgotten that, in the last Congress, we agreed, both Republicans and Democrats, to reform criminal justice. We are seeing our young people die not from the Justice Department and not just from what is happening on the streets, and never mind what is happening in our criminal justice system. I understand that a bill is going to be coming on the floor asking for minimum mandatory sentencing for a slew of charges which will again increase the school-to-prison, cradle-to-death pipeline of prisons in this country.

So these are the things that we as Congress need to be concerned with. The national security issues that our President has are things that we need to continue to look at.

There is an old Washington cliché: personnel is policy. The same reflects the wisdom that any President's agenda depends on his political appointees to refine and implement that vision. Trump's White House has failed first and most spectacularly in this requirement. That failure may not even be the President's failure at this time but the people he has put in place by both building a dysfunctional White House and National Security Council and by failing to staff his national security agencies with the appointees necessary to oversee and direct foreign policy.

For now, the failures of Trump's political favorites with his new establishment professionals likely mean incoherence on the national security front for some time, with the White House lurching from one crisis to the next, its actions and words disconnected from any broader doctrine.

Bad personnel decisions have also dogged the Trump administration during its first 100 days. Michael Flynn and K.T. McFarland hardly did well in leading the NSC during their brief sojourns there. Low-level hires have also continued poor performance.

□ 1945

The most obvious foreign policy failures are that there is no policy, no doctrine, no strategy that knits together

Trump's desired ends with the government's ways and means. That should be of concern to my Republican colleagues who want this Republican President to succeed. If you want him to succeed, you need to help him. The help needs to come in terms of the personnel that he has put in place, in terms of the transparency, and as they said, cleaning the swamp, getting rid of the swamp, so that there can be those professionals and those above reproach in the White House carrying out the mission of this President.

At the agency level, the Trump's White House political appointments machine has been incredibly dysfunctional, reportedly because of fights between the White House factions over personnel picks.

This has starved the Pentagon, State Department, Justice Department, and other agencies of under secretaries, assistant secretaries, deputy assistant secretaries, special assistants who actually are carrying out the President's agenda.

In the absence of an entire team, the uniformed military leadership and career civil servants of these agencies have carried on, but with significant friction given the personal disdain for these people during the campaign and afterwards.

The personnel failures have worsened the second category of the failures, those of process. If there was personnel, we also have process failures going on right now.

The NSC was codified in 1947, along with the modern Defense Department, CIA, and Joint Chiefs of Staff to correct perceived process failures during World War II. The big idea behind the National Security Act was to create a process that could withstand poor personnel by ensuring the institution of the presidency was well served by its national security agencies and could, therefore, make better informed decisions.

Despite its aspirations to run the White House like a fine-tuned machine, the administration has uniformly failed to implement processes to serve its agenda. Indeed, at times—an example being the 63-hour rush to strike Syria with cruise missiles or its announcement of a tax plan before the details were ironed out—the White House seems at war with the very idea of process, as if budgets, planning, and coordination were toxic features of the Washington swamp, to be rejected at all costs.

The biggest process failures have been those that affected the entire government. Trump's failure to develop detailed budgets, let alone to agree with Congress on the funding levels and priorities, nearly led the country to the brink of a government shutdown. All indications point to the impasse being settled, but the outcome will likely be a continuing resolution

once again that punts all the major budget decisions and keeps agencies in limbo on major programs, including, if we are talking about national security, major weapons systems, acquisitions, spending on important training and exercises, and outlays for servicemembers and military families. This is something that is going to cause all Americans to suffer, spectacularly in some cases.

One of the President's biggest campaign promises, the pledge to build a wall on America's border with Mexico, has stalled for lack of funding, and proposals will likely remain stuck in the government contracts process for months, if not years.

His immigration orders have been held unconstitutional because of errors that his Justice Department or Department of Homeland Security lawyers would have caught and corrected had they been there or had a chance.

In some cases, the process failures have had deadlier consequences. President Trump ordered a risky special operations raid on Yemen over a dinner meeting with his senior staff with scant process or coordination. The raid went badly, as military operations sometimes do. Instead of taking responsibility, the White House blamed the military, both for the substantive failure on the ground and the faulty decision process that put the SEALs there. Disconnects between the White House, Department of Defense, and the U.S. Pacific Command resulted in a confusing saga regarding the movements of a U.S. aircraft carrier, resulting in the dilution of any deterrent value that President Trump's words might hold in Moscow or Beijing.

The personnel and process failures contribute to policy failures across the national security chessboard. The most obvious Trump foreign policy failure is that there is no policy, no doctrine at this time. We deserve better in the Middle East, in Afghanistan, in China, in North Korea, but most importantly, here on the home front. We as Americans deserve a coherent, comprehensive process oriented as well as personnel driven with career intelligence individuals at the helm and within the ranks of each one of these agencies because we have a lot to lose.

We have our young people to lose if we go into wars that have not been thought out and have not been process driven. Our young people deserve better. Our world deserves better because the world is looking to America to still be the ones—although we seem to be abdicating our responsibility, whether it be in war or in the other forms of diplomacy that we engage in—to keep this a safe place. Famines that are going on in Sudan, in Yemen, and in other places, it is the American might, the might of our aid and our support to them, that keeps democracy alive, not just on the ground and in fact, but in

the hearts and minds of those who yearn for it in other places.

That is the national security that this America needs to be engaged in, and it is that kind of national security that this Congress needs to be concerned with. We need to get back. We have a week of bills that are dysfunctional in themselves that do not serve the best interests of the American people. This Congress needs to stop scuttling legislation, scuttling bills that their colleagues are trying to put forward. Vote them up or vote them down. Let the American people know where you stand on every issue. We need to stop the voice votes that are going on in committees that allow Members to hide behind what their positions are with their constituents. I know it is not easy, but that is why we are all adults here. We want to put on our big girl pants and be the kind of people who can stand for what we believe.

So let's bring those bills forward. Let's support the infrastructure jobs activity, as well as national security and support for the world abroad. That is what we have to lose if we do not hold this President, this White House, and all of his agencies and his Cabinet accountable for the work that they are doing.

Madam Speaker, it appears that I do not have additional Members who would like to speak in this Special Order hour.

Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 35 minutes remaining.

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, protecting our national security should be among one of the top concerns of any administration—Republican or Democrat. Yet, President Trump has demonstrated an alarming disregard for the national security interests of the United States.

There have been a number of incidents that I believe warrant additional scrutiny by Congress and the American people. Just last week, it was reported that President Trump revealed highly classified information to the Russian foreign minister and ambassador during a White House meeting. In direct contravention of standing diplomatic agreements with our closest allies, President Trump also reportedly divulged the source of that highly classified information. Not only did this blatant disregard for protocol damage our credibility among the international community, but President Trump may have very well also exposed extremely sensitive information about U.S. and allied intelligence operations abroad.

Earlier this month, President Trump also took a bold step in firing former FBI Director James Comey in the midst of an investigation into his administration and alleged ties to Russian officials. Shortly after Director Comey was

fired, an unnamed White House source revealed that President Trump told Russian officials during the same meeting that he did so in order to ease some of the pressure from the Russia investigation. This is deeply alarming, if not simply just ironic.

During the Presidential election, House Speaker PAUL RYAN criticized Hillary Clinton over her mishandling of classified emails on a private email server. He stated, "individuals who are 'extremely careless' with classified information should be denied further access to such info." Today, I have yet to hear Speaker RYAN—or other key House Republicans—speak out against this blatant mishandling of classified information. It is hypocrisy in its purest form.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford the unauthorized divulging of classified information and national security secrets, especially to hostile nations such as Russia. I find it deeply troubling that a sitting president would display such a blatant disregard for the safeguarding of U.S. national security interests. I continue to join my colleagues in calling for an independent commission to investigate any possible collusion between the Trump Campaign and the Kremlin.

ARMED FORCES DAY AND MEMORIAL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERGMAN. The topic of today's Special Order is to recognize the importance of Armed Forces Day and Memorial Day.

I am not going to give a history lesson here tonight, but, rather, a series of personal remembrances that started when I was about 5 or 6 years old in the early 1950s.

My father, a World War II veteran, and some of his fellow veterans organized the local VFW in Minnesota where I was born. We would spend Memorial Day in the morning visiting three cemeteries in our local town.

At each cemetery, the color guard would post the colors, the rifles would give their report, and taps would play. Everyone who attended—and when I say everyone who attended, that was really the whole town—came out in a long train of automobiles to go to these three cemeteries to honor the veterans who were no longer of this Earth.

I remember the solemnness of that day. I remember the tears for family members and friends who had passed on, those who had worn the cloth of our Nation both in peace and in war. Those kinds of memories, as I stand here and talk tonight, are very vivid in my mind.

Some years later, in the mid-1960s, we were involved in Vietnam, and I was a sophomore in college. Because of the fact that my parents had both stepped up during World War II, I felt—and with their support—it was the right thing to stand up and take the oath that sent me into the Marine Corps to serve our country.

When you go into harm's way, you don't know what the outcome is going to be, but you do know that those you serve with are going to give it their all and you are going to remember them and honor them for as long as we walk this Earth.

I was very fortunate to have absolutely spectacular commanding officers along the way that taught me what it was like to be a young leader and what it meant to take care of your marines—most notably my commanding officer in Vietnam, who, thankfully, is still with us. He was the kind of individual that made the tough calls because he understood the sacrifices needed and the outcomes that were required.

One by one, we all pass. Memorial Day is our opportunity to remember, share stories, share tears, share laughter for those who have now gone on into God's hands. The past and the present set the tone for the future.

As David French said:

Sacrifice sustains our Nation far beyond the battlefield. As iron sharpens iron, so one man sharpens another in times of stress. In times when we are under great duress, that ability to sharpen not each other's bodies but each other's souls carries us on.

We remember on Memorial Day those who have made that effort.

In the Marine Corps, we believe a lot of things, but three words encompass them all: honor, courage, and commitment.

Tonight we honor those who fought for our country, who made the ultimate sacrifice and gave their lives in the service of our country, and those who have passed on since their service. It is our job to make sure that their sacrifice wasn't in vain.

Courage: there is moral courage and there is physical courage. You never know until the time comes whether you have the physical courage, but you do find out. It is the moral courage that we know from the beginning, and it is set by our predecessors that sets our attitude and our mindset in stone that we know that we have that. And when it is tested, we are ready.

□ 2000

Commitment: Our commitment is always to the mission and to one an-

other. We never leave anyone behind. Never. No one is more invested in peace than our men and women in uniform. They take the risks. They make the sacrifices, and they bear the cost of the battle in full force. Those rows of white headstones across the bridge in Arlington remind us of their commitment every day, and for that we owe them more than gratitude. We owe them every effort to keep our world at peace.

On Memorial Day in 1982, President Reagan said:

"War will not come again, other young men will not have to die, if we will speak honestly of the dangers that confront us and remain strong enough to meet those dangers."

"It's not just strength or courage that we need, but understanding and a measure of wisdom as well."

We owe it to our men and women who have fought and died for our country to take a stand, to prepare for peace not by ignoring the dangers we face and placating the enemies of freedom but by facing them head on.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield to my fellow Members who will be presenting and speaking tonight. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I, too, am honored to join my colleagues here tonight to recognize the bravery and the sacrifice of those who serve in our military. I also want to thank General Bergman for his years of dedicated service and for his leadership tonight.

While May is Military Appreciation Month, it is important that every month we continue to recognize those who are fighting and still putting their lives on the line each and every day. Since the founding of our country, there have always been brave men and women who understood what it takes to protect our freedom and our way of life. They are patriots who represent the very best of America.

I am especially grateful to the members of my family who served. My father, James, served in the Army during World War II; and my two brothers, Rick in the Navy and Reg in the Marines, served during Vietnam. Like many of us, I recall seeing my older brothers go off to war in Vietnam, and I vividly remember the difference between the Blue Star and, tragically, Gold Star families during that conflict.

Throughout our Nation's history, we have paid a heavy price for freedom. It has not been easy. One week from today, we will remember those who made the ultimate sacrifice for our country. On Memorial Day, we remember those who gave their lives in the service of these United States. Our fallen soldiers were born in different generations, fought in different wars, faced unique challenges, but they are all part of the fabric and history of this great land, America.

Through their service and selflessness, our Nation's sons and daughters have kept our country strong and free. Thank you to the fallen. Thank you to the veterans and those currently serving here and abroad. God bless America.

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is our job not just to remember but to carry the torch of freedom forward so that the sacrifices of our brothers and sisters have not and will not be in vain.

Oliver Wendell Holmes said: "But grief is not the end of all. . . . Our dead brothers still live for us, and bid us think of life, not death—of life to which in their youth they lent the passion and joy of the spring."

I would strongly encourage all, all of our American citizens, next Monday, May 29, the official observance of this year's Memorial Day, to take your families to a local cemetery, walk around, look at those headstones and those gravestones, explain to your children and your grandchildren, and anyone else who may have questions, the meaning and the significance of the many flags that fly next to those headstones.

Those folks, those comrades, sacrificed it all so we can be here today. It is up to us to honor them, to remember them, and to carry on to ensure that the challenges we face as a country will be defended against and protected because of our willingness to sacrifice for the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NEWHOUSE (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and for the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 23, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1398. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing four officers to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral, pursuant to 10

U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); ; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1399. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 2016 Merger Decisions Report, pursuant to Sec. 18(c)(9) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1400. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — 340B Drug Pricing Program Ceiling Price and Manufacturer Civil Monetary Penalties Regulation (RIN: 0906-AA89) received May 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1401. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; El Paso Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R06-OAR-2016-0550; FRL-9962-20-Region 6] received May 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1402. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Louisiana; Volatile Organic Compounds Rule Revision and Stage II Vapor Recovery [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0167; FRL-9962-21-Region 6] received May 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1403. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Compliance Date Extension; Formaldehyde Emission Standards for Composite Wood Products [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2017-0244; FRL-9962-86] (RIN: 2070-AK35) received May 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1404. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Designations for the 2012 Primary Annual Fine Particle (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for Areas in Tennessee [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0918; FRL-9962-89-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT44) received May 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1405. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticides; Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule; Delay of Effective Date [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0183; FRL-9962-94] received May 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1406. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a periodic report prepared by the Department's Bureau of Industry and Security on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001 and continued, caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act

of 1979 for August 26, 2016 to February 25, 2017, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627) and 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1407. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination and certification to waive for a period of six months the restrictions of section 1003 of Public Law 100-204; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1408. A letter from the Director, Office of Financial Management, United States Capitol Police, transmitting the Statement of Disbursements for the United States Capitol Police for the period of October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1910(a); Public Law 109-55, Sec. 1005; (119 Stat. 575) (H. Doc. No. 115-43); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1409. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Advancing Care Coordination Through Episode Payment Models (EPMs); Cardiac Rehabilitation Incentive Payment Model; and Changes to the Comprehensive Care for Joint Replacement Model (CJR); Delay of Effective Date [CMS-5519-F3] (RIN: 0938-AS90) received May 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1973. A bill to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-136, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1761. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to criminalize the knowing consent of the visual depiction, or live transmission, of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 695. A bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1862. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand the scope of certain definitions pertaining to unlawful sexual conduct, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1842. A bill to amend title 18,

United States Code, to include State crimes of violence as grounds for an enhanced penalty when sex offenders fail to register or report certain information as required by Federal law, to include prior military offenses for purposes of recidivist sentencing provisions, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 883. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a certification process for the issuance of nondisclosure requirements accompanying certain administrative subpoenas, to provide for judicial review of such nondisclosure requirements, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1188. A bill to reauthorize certain programs established by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1370. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance and develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-143, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1545. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to disclose certain patient information to State controlled substance monitoring programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 348. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 953) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-145). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1370 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Education and the Workforce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1973 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENACCI, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 2581. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the provision of social security numbers as a condition of receiving the health insurance premium tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 2582. A bill to authorize the State of Utah to select certain lands that are available for disposal under the Pony Express Resource Management Plan to be used for the support and benefit of State institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CRIST, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 2583. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a Community Resilience Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HURD (for himself, Mr. KILMER, Mr. REICHERT, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 2584. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TONKO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2585. A bill to reduce risks to the financial system by limiting banks' ability to engage in certain risky activities and limiting conflicts of interest, to reinstate certain Glass-Steagall Act protections that were repealed by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 2586. A bill to require an independent assessment and report of subversive activities of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 2587. A bill to provide for the coverage of medically necessary food and vitamins for digestive and inherited metabolic disorders under Federal health programs and private health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2588. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to codify the prohibition on the acquisition of "about" communications under section 702 of such Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HECK, Mr. STEWART, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. YODER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FLORES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 2589. A bill to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's disease; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIMALVA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. POLIS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2590. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to carry out a program to increase access to prekindergarten through grade 12 computer science education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 2591. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to modernize the funding of wildlife conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

H.R. 2592. A bill to amend the definitions relating to HUBZones in the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. JONES, Mr. COOK, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. HIMES, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COLE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BOST, Mr. COFFMAN, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. HILL, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CORREA, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. BANKS of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H. Res. 349. A resolution calling for the global repeal of blasphemy, heresy, and apostasy laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARPER:

H. Res. 350. A resolution permitting official photographs of the House of Representatives to be taken while the House is in actual session on a date designated by the Speaker; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

42. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Resolution No. 574, opposing United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 and requesting its repeal of fundamental alteration; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

43. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 15, requesting Congress to fully support the National Park Service's recommendations to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail to include additional sites along the Expedition's Eastern Legacy; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

44. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 30, memorializing the Congress of the United States to create a reliable, predictable stream of resources to address deferred maintenance needs in the America's National Park System; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

45. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 26, urging Congress and NASA to name the NASA IV & V Facility at Fairmont for West Virginia mathematician Katherine Coleman Johnson; which was referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

46. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Resolution No. 1184, condemning the international Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement against the State of Israel and calls upon the governmental institutions of this state to denounce hatred and discrimination whenever they appear; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

47. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 44, recognizing Wednesday, April 26, 2017, as the fifth annual Liquefied Natural Gas Day at the state capitol and express support of the Louisiana Energy Export Association, LNG exports, and the streamlining and expedition of permit approval for pending export facilities; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 2581.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 2582.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2583.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HURD:

H.R. 2584.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2585.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 2586.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2587.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 2588.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1;

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 2589.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 2590.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The Congress shall have power. . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes; . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 2591.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2592.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. BUCK.
H.R. 48: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 52: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 106: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 113: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 179: Ms. MOORE and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 299: Mr. STEWART and Mr. REED.
H.R. 324: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 350: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 358: Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 398: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 457: Mr. PETERS and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 467: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 468: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 484: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 490: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 535: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 566: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 586: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 608: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 620: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 681: Mr. DUNN and Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 695: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 719: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 721: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 747: Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 750: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 754: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 757: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 807: Mr. TROTT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BLUM, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MESSER, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 820: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SIRES, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 825: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 838: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 839: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 840: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 848: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. BOST.
H.R. 850: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 871: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 880: Mr. WALZ and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 883: Ms. TENNEY and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 909: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 919: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 953: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. PITTENGER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 972: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 975: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 982: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 993: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1005: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 1017: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1078: Mr. STEWART and Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 1089: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

- H.R. 1090: Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 1148: Mr. SOTO and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1155: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 1156: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 1164: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1171: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CRIST, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VELA, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1179: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1188: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1200: Mr. FLORES, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. PITTINGER.
H.R. 1223: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 1231: Mr. BARTON and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1247: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. VELA, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LEE, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1253: Mr. WALZ and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1267: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1299: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 1300: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1310: Mr. MAST.
H.R. 1318: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 1339: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 1361: Mr. BACON, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1370: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. DONOVAN, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1393: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1405: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1409: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1413: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1421: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1422: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 1454: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 1456: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 1485: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1544: Mr. MAST and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1560: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 1563: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. PIN-GREE.
H.R. 1584: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 1599: Mr. RICE of South Carolina and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1600: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1615: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 1625: Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1626: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1639: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1645: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1651: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1663: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1676: Mr. REICHERT and Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 1681: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1692: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 1697: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 1698: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. YOHO, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. WOMACK, and Ms. CHENEY.
H.R. 1761: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 1762: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1810: Mr. KIHUEN and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 1826: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 1836: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 1042: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 1844: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 1862: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 1924: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1926: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1928: Mr. MAST, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. WALZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1940: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1953: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1955: Mr. GRIFFITH and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 1960: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1968: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 1969: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1973: Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 1988: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2028: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2038: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2052: Mr. RUSH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 2063: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2106: Mr. MULLIN and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2108: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2124: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2141: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2200: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2206: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2215: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 2244: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2248: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2268: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 2272: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2276: Mr. PITTINGER and Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 2317: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2318: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BACON, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2319: Mr. SIRES and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2326: Mr. MAST and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 2353: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2354: Mr. MAST.
H.R. 2358: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 2372: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. NUNES, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2386: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 2392: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2428: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2431: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 2435: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2440: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2452: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2466: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 2475: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2477: Mr. BROWN of Maryland and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2482: Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. COOK, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2499: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2501: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 2506: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2508: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 2510: Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2519: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. LATTI, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KATKO, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2539: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2547: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2564: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.J. Res. 48: Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. HECK.
H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. BACON.
H. Con. Res. 43: Mr. EVANS.
H. Con. Res. 47: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Con. Res. 54: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H. Res. 15: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. MARINO.
H. Res. 31: Mr. FASO, Mr. MARINO, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 220: Mr. GARRETT and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H. Res. 256: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H. Res. 276: Mr. KIHUEN, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H. Res. 304: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H. Res. 325: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H. Res. 330: Mr. PALMER.
H. Res. 335: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H. Res. 344: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 346: Ms. GABBARD.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative ESTY (CT) or a designee, to H.R. 953 the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

46. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the town of Buckland, MA, relative to Article 27, calling upon the Massachusetts Legislature and the United States Congress to implement Carbon Fee and Dividend, placing a steadily rising fee on carbon-based fuels, and returning all fees collected, minus administrative costs, to households; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO BRIAN C. COOPER

HON. PAUL D. RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Brian C. Cooper, who is retiring from the Office of the Parliamentarian after 35 years on Capitol Hill.

Brian is the son of Dolores and Ellsworth Cooper, and the youngest of seven children. He is a native of Baltimore, Maryland, and has lived in the city (in the same house he grew up in) for his entire life. Brian is a graduate of Frederick Douglass High School, whose notable alumni include the Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall. Brian received a scholarship to the Community College of Baltimore (now Baltimore City Community College), where he received his degree in commercial and graphic arts.

Brian's first job on Capitol Hill came in September of 1982, when he was hired in the stock room of the Longworth Building, working in Publication and Distribution Services. Throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, Brian held a variety of positions on Capitol Hill, including work at the House Post Office and Document Room, before moving up to become staff assistant for the Small Business Committee and later the Government Operations Committee. In these roles, Brian learned the intricacies of the legislative process and the inner workings of House operations—skills that would serve him well when, in 1995, he was hired as an Assistant Clerk to the Parliamentarian.

Brian would spend the next 22 years in the House Parliamentarian's Office, and became Chief Clerk to the Parliamentarian in 2009. For over two decades, Brian has been a fixture at the House rostrum, dutifully assisting the presiding officer in timekeeping, recognizing Members on the floor, and preparing and reviewing reams of legislative paperwork for the House. Brian has also prepared the House for joint meetings to receive foreign dignitaries and other guests, and joint sessions of the House, including state of the Union addresses. As clerk, Brian also supervised House "documentarian" pages, and created the first computer network for the Parliamentarian.

An accomplished artist, Brian remains active in his artistic endeavors, which run the gamut from pencil drawings, watercolors, and oils, to photography, and architectural design. His retirement will offer new opportunities to continue these pursuits. His other retirement plans include travel and spending more time with family—including his numerous nieces and nephews. A devoted Baltimore sports fan, Brian will surely find his way to Camden Yards many times in the upcoming years to cheer on his beloved Orioles.

A consummate professional, Brian has spent his career on Capitol Hill committed to

assisting with an orderly and accurate legislative process, observed in a fair and non-partisan manner. Brian is a quintessential institutionalist, always striving to continue the traditions and customs of the House, and to pass on his institutional knowledge to others. The House of Representatives has known few individuals more dedicated to its proper functioning and legacy than Brian Cooper.

COMMENDING LOCAL 2017 HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES FOR THEIR DECISION TO ENLIST IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AND OUR COMMUNITY SALUTES OF FREDERICKSBURG, VIRGINIA FOR HOSTING THE SIXTH ANNUAL HIGH SCHOOL ENLISTEE RECOGNITION CEREMONY

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 11 Fredericksburg, Virginia area high school seniors who plan to enlist in the United States Air Force after graduation. These students have excelled in their academic and extracurricular activities, and I offer my sincere congratulations upon their high school graduation.

I commend these student leaders for their selflessness and courageous decision to serve their country as members of the United States Air Force:

Ashford, Jasmine; Beaty, Carter; Bratcher, Constance; Burton, Meghan; Erikson, Evan; Evertz, Kayla; Hibbs, Richard; Malpica, Alexis; Mathews, Adam; Papapetrou, Alexander; Smith, Christopher.

These students will be honored by the Greater Fredericksburg Chapter of Our Community Salutes at their 6th Annual Military Enlistee Recognition Ceremony on Saturday, June 3, 2017 at the University of Mary Washington in Fredericksburg, VA.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking these young men and women and their families for their dedication to serving this great Nation. We owe them and the many Americans who have served and will serve a debt of gratitude.

THE HOLY SEE

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the special diplomatic relationship between the United States and the Holy See.

As a non-hegemonic sovereign, the Holy See plays a unique role in world affairs through its use of the soft power diplomacy through moral persuasion that only it can exert. This gives the Holy See unparalleled influence in diplomacy and as a mediator in international disputes.

The United States and the Holy See have complemented each other in the past in combatting extremist ideologies, such as Nazism and communism, and on promoting human rights. From 2005–2008, I witnessed this firsthand as United States Ambassador to the Holy See. President Bush and Pope Benedict XVI worked together on combatting human trafficking, AIDS in Africa, promoting religious freedom and in denouncing radical Islamic extremism.

The strength of this relationship depends on how highly each president views the Holy See's soft power in world affairs. President Trump's choice to visit the Vatican on his first overseas trip is a good step toward a close relationship between the United States and the Holy See going forward.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE TAYLOR AUXILIARY POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR THEIR WORK PROTECTING THE CITY OF TAYLOR

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Taylor Auxiliary Police Department for their work protecting the City of Taylor and its residents. The auxiliary plays a critical role in protecting the city and supporting the work of the Taylor Police Department with individuals from all walks of life.

Established in 1962 as a volunteer civil defense organization to assist the Taylor Police Department, the Taylor Auxiliary Police play a key role in safeguarding the public. In addition to helping the full-time police department staff community events like high school sports events and assisting with regular police patrols, the auxiliary police also serve as a reserve force to assist the City of Taylor in the event of a disaster or emergency situation. Additionally, the auxiliary has partnered with the city to further crime prevention initiatives, including Taylor on Watch, an education and outreach program that shares best practices for neighborhood and community safety. These initiatives have helped make Taylor a safe city to live and work.

The Taylor Police Auxiliary is critical to safeguarding the city from crime and other threats. Each member of the auxiliary is well trained and credentialed, and the approximately 45 officers provide thousands of hours of annual community service and protection to the city

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

and its residents. In the past, the Taylor Auxiliary Police have helped provide traffic control during a visit by President Obama, as well as helping secure the annual Taylor Summer Festival and other community gatherings. These individuals perform the critical work of ensuring that the residents of Taylor remain safe at great personal risk, and it is my hope that the Taylor Police Auxiliary continues to build on its legacy of success.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Taylor Auxiliary Police Department for its public safety and service to the City of Taylor. The auxiliary volunteers have helped make the community safe through their work and activism.

HONORING THE 27TH ANNUAL D.C.
BLACK PRIDE CELEBRATION

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Ms. NORTON, Mr. Speaker, this Memorial Day Week, May 22nd to 29th, Washington, D.C. celebrates "The Ties that Bind: Twenty-Seven Years of D.C. Black Pride!"—the theme of the 27th annual D.C. Black Pride.

This multi-day festival begins on May 23rd at the Human Rights Campaign with the 2017 D.C. Black Pride Awards Reception. We congratulate Countess Clarke Cooper and Daryl Wilson, recipients of the Welmore Cook Award; Check It Enterprises, recognized with the Leadership Award; Unsung Heroes Savannah Wanzer and Shannon Garcon; Aaron Bryant, winner of the President's Award; and Maurice David Parker, the Charlotte Smallwood Volunteer of the Year for 2017.

Black Pride continues through Memorial Day with community town halls; educational and interfaith workshops; a poetry slam hosted by Mary Brown; a film festival; an interfaith worship service; and social events, including speed dating, breakfast, brunch, dinner and happy hours. The Black Pride parties range from Super to Grand; Mega to Ultimate; Picnic to Pool; and Purposeful to Epic. Performances by musicians, dancers, and artists enliven the festival. Sunday, the festival's penultimate day, features its main event, a Cultural Arts and Wellness Exposition and Epic Live, at the Walter E. Washington Convention Center. Black Pride culminates with a traditional Memorial Day picnic, the "Us Helping Us Annual Picnic in the Park" at Fort Lincoln Park and concludes with evening parties thereafter.

The D.C. Black Pride festival began during my freshman year in Congress, Sunday, May 26, 1991, at Banneker Field on Georgia Avenue across the street from Howard University. I have watched it mature from an ad hoc event to what is now widely considered to be one of the world's preeminent Black Pride celebrations. It now draws more than 30,000 participants from the United States, Africa, Europe, and the Americas to our nation's capital.

D.C. Black Pride fostered the beginning of the Center for Black Equity (formerly known as the International Federation of Black Prides, Inc.) and the "Black Pride Movement," which now consists of 40 Black Prides on four continents.

I commend Shannon Garcon, Genise Chambers-Woods, Reginald Shaw-Richardson, Ralph "Rocky" Ferguson and Gladece Knight, the volunteer Advisory Board that assists. Earl D. Fowlkes, Jr. and Kenya Hutton with the coordination, planning, and execution of D.C. Black Pride. I take pleasure in noting that this year Earl commences his third decade of involvement with D.C. Black Pride and the Black Pride Movement around the globe.

As Black Pride comes to town, I also take this opportunity to inform the celebrants and to remind my colleagues of the various limitations Congress has placed on the District of Columbia. Despite paying more federal taxes than 22 states and having the highest per capita federal tax rate in the United States, the residents of Washington, D.C. still have no full voting representation in Congress.

I ask the House to join me in welcoming all attending the 27th annual D.C. Black Pride celebration.

HONORING JAMIE MANCHESTER

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jamie Manchester of Davenport, Washington.

Mrs. Manchester recently received the Recognizing Inspirational School Employees (RISE) Award for her exemplary service to the students of Washington State. Sponsored by the National Coalition of Classified Education Support Employee Unions (NCCSEU), the RISE Award seeks to recognize all classified school education support employees across the country for their ongoing contributions to education, and for the key role they play in promoting and ensuring student achievement, student safety and overall well-being.

During her 10 years of service as a Library Technician and Technology Coordinator in Sprague, Lamont, and Davenport, Jamie has been a strong advocate for technology in the classroom, creating her school's first elementary computer lab, and implementing 1:1 Chromebooks for K-12. Furthermore, she has authored grants that helped to introduce STEM based curriculum and new technology in the classroom to enrich the education and overall lives of her students.

Jamie serves as the Vice President of the Creston Alumni Association, helping award over \$240,000 in scholarships to graduating seniors in the community. She has been a member of the Public School Employees (PSE) of Washington SEIU Local 1948 since 2006 and has served on the Education and Training Committee, as Chapter Vice President and Chapter Secretary, and as an Annual Convention Delegate.

Again I wish to send my congratulations to Jamie as PSE's first recipient of the national RISE Award recognizing her leadership and contributions to the students of Davenport, Creston, Sprague, and Lamont.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 2017 INTERFAITH
BRIDGE BUILDER AWARDS

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize this year's recipients of the Interfaith Bridge Builder Awards, Mr. Rizwan Jaka, Rabbi Jack Luxemburg, and Ms. Priscilla Martinez.

Since 1978, the InterFaith Conference of Metropolitan Washington (IFC) has brought together people of eleven historic faiths to promote a dialogue and advocate for religious tolerance and cooperation across our nation and region. In order to bring these religious groups and our diverse community together, the IFC hosts a variety of events, including award ceremonies and seminars. The IFC also engages in grassroots activity while providing a broad range of educational tools.

This year marks the 13th Annual InterFaith Bridge Builders Awards, in which the IFC recognizes the achievements and leadership of individuals in our region. Mr. Rizwan Jaka, Rabbi Jack Luxemburg, and Ms. Priscilla Martinez are not only exemplary leaders within the IFC, but they are also extremely respected in our communities.

Additionally, I want to specifically recognize my constituents and friends, Mr. Rizwan Jaka and Ms. Priscilla Martinez, who for years have been tremendous leaders in Northern Virginia, both with very active roles within the All Dulles Area Muslim Society (ADAMS). In these roles, they have not only strengthened our region's interfaith relations, but they have placed a great deal of emphasis on educating our youth. Mr. Jaka previously served as the President of ADAMS and is currently serving as a Member at Large of Islamic Society of North America (ISNA) and on the Board of Directors for the IFC.

Mr. Speaker, organizations, like the IFC, that focus on fostering strong and welcoming communities are vital to the success of our region. I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking the IFC for their continuous efforts and to congratulate Mr. Rizwan Jaka, Rabbi Jack Luxemburg, and Ms. Priscilla Martinez on receiving this year's Interfaith Bridge Builder Awards. I wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

COMMENDING LOCAL 2017 HIGH
SCHOOL GRADUATES FOR THEIR
DECISION TO ENLIST IN THE
UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS
AND OUR COMMUNITY SALUTES
OF FREDERICKSBURG, VIRGINIA
FOR HOSTING THE SIXTH ANNUAL
HIGH SCHOOL ENLISTEE
RECOGNITION CEREMONY

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 93 Fredericksburg, Virginia area

high school seniors who plan to enlist in the United States Marine Corps after graduation. These students have excelled in their academic and extracurricular activities, and I offer my sincere congratulations upon their high school graduation.

I commend these student leaders for their selflessness and courageous decision to serve their country as members of the United States Marine Corps.

Allander, Grace; Baez, Christopher; Bills, Scott; Blake, Elliot; Breland, William; Bridges, Brandon; Brown, Jalil; Buckles, Aaron; Campbell, Kailayjia; Carhuancho, Andy; Clemente, Timothy; Cook, Thomas; Conteh, Ibrahim; Corbett, David; Creed, Barton; Devin, Timothy; Dishman, John; Dobson, Hunter; Dolinger, Melinda; Doonis, Michael; Eclipse, Ernest; Fejar, Joshua; Felleta, Joseph; Figaro, Cynthia; Fejfar, Joshua; Fellingner, Noah; Garciabracamonte, Giancarlo; Garnett, Benjamin; Hall, Cameron; Hardy, Carter; Hawkins, Nathan; Hernandez Pereira, Bryan; Hernandez Pereira, Joel; Holman, Kyle; Horton, Ryan; James, Brandon; Jesser, Joshua; Klocek, Michael; Kroll, Brandon; Lalena, Victoria; Leon, Cameron; Lewis, Torrianno; Loncaric, Drake; Lopez, Juan; MacLeod, Jonathan; Maine, Daniel; Maine, David; Martin, Christopher; McArtor, Robert; McDonald, Sean; Mitchell, Jason; Morris, Dylan; Neil, William; Norman, Christian; Padarathsingh, Trinidad; Parker, James; Paskevicius, Jesse; Perkins, Joshua; Peters, Jacob; Peterson, Connor; Porch, Ethan; Poe, Matthew; Poitras, Tanner; Powell, Harley; Queiro, Jose; Quinteroscruz, Orlando; Ragon, Carmine; Reese, Parker; Reilly, Eric; Rice, Shane; Reuwer, Patrick; Rippetoe, Jake; Robinson, Ronald; Rodriguez, Javier; Romerobonilla, Jesus; Roush, Peter; Salgado, Erik; Sawdy, Riley; Schamel, Justin; Sinclair, Ethan; Skidmore, Jacob; Smith, Travis; Strickland, Luke; Surike, Charles; Terronesdorazi, Carlo; Villatoro, Ivette; Wagner, Zachary; Walley, David; Watson, Duncan; Watson, Joshua; Williamson, Matthew; Witt, Brennan; Yee, Jacob.

These students will be honored by the Greater Fredericksburg Chapter of Our Community Salutes at their 6th Annual Military Enlistee Recognition Ceremony on Saturday, June 3, 2017 at the University of Mary Washington in Fredericksburg, VA.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking these young men and women and their families for their dedication to serving this great Nation. We owe them and the many Americans who have served and will serve a debt of gratitude.

HONORING THE REGIONAL ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL TEACHERS IN BLOOMINGTON, IL

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the teachers and staff of the Regional Alternative School (RAS) in Bloomington, Illinois for their service to the students at the request of senior Logan Smith who graduates this month.

The Regional Alternative School serves students in four counties under the jurisdiction of the Regional Office of Education No. 17. That includes two counties that I serve, McLean and DeWitt, along with Livingston and Logan counties. RAS is dedicated to providing education programming for students considered to be at-risk of dropping out of school.

In April I had the opportunity to visit the school where I received a tour from three Student Ambassadors—Sabrina Ridgeway, Corrie Gardner, and Logan Smith. I got to see firsthand the excellent work the school is doing to better student lives. For most, the school is their best hope at graduating high school, gaining vital life skills, and transitioning to college or the workforce. This quality education and caring mentorship would not be possible without the hard-working, dedicated staff at the Regional Alternative School.

I am proud to help Logan honor and thank the teachers and staff of the Regional Alternative School. Thank you for dedicating your lives to supporting students and helping them realize their unlimited potential. And congratulations to Logan and his fellow graduates, I wish you all the very best of luck.

UNITED NATIONS AND NORTH KOREA

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to point out the hypocrisy of the United Nations. The behavior of the United Nations contradicts its charter, which states the organization should promote “better standards of life” and “international peace and security.”

If these are truly the goals of the United Nations, then why is the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), a United Nations agency, preparing an international patent application for North Korean production of sodium cyanide, a substance used to make nerve gas that is banned from North Korea by the UN Security Council?

It is disturbing that the United Nations would grant legitimacy to North Korean production of a dangerous gas that can be used as a chemical weapon. Even more concerning is that the UN would do this during a time of escalating North Korean aggression, with its increasing illegal missile tests and threats of mass destruction. This action undermines sanctions against the unstable regime which threatens the very “international security” the UN claims to promote.

The United Nations must stop rewarding rogue regimes that undermine global security, or the United States must reconsider participation in this illegitimate body.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER J. DODD ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE MOTION PICTURE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a highly distinguished former colleague and dear friend, Senator Chris Dodd, who recently announced his plans to retire as Chairman and CEO of the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) at the end of this year.

As the longest serving Senator in Connecticut's history, Senator Dodd brought accountability and historic reforms to Wall Street following the 2008 financial crisis. His extraordinary leadership resulted in the landmark Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, the largest overhaul of our financial system since the Great Depression. His bipartisan, landmark legislative accomplishments covered a broad range of issues from civil rights, to families and children, and to foreign policy.

After retiring from the Senate in 2011, Senator Dodd followed in the footsteps of the legendary Jack Valenti, taking the reins of the MPAA. The challenges of representing the six major film and television studios during a time of tumultuous changes in technology were met head on by Senator Dodd, and his leadership brought about an unprecedented expansion of American films to the international market. He improved diversity and secured valuable state tax credits for filmmaking here at home.

The motion picture industry has benefited greatly from Senator Dodd's steady hand and his years of experience developing consensus between stakeholders. He advanced one of America's great industries that shape the meaning of America around the world with a record of exceptional leadership brought to bear on behalf of the studios, filmmakers and the thousands of men and women who bring the magic of film and television to screens large and small. He leaves an indelible mark on the MPAA, just as he did in service to our nation in the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my House colleagues to join me in congratulating Senator Dodd for his brilliant leadership and countless achievements as Chairman and CEO of the MPAA, and wish he and his family every blessing in the next exciting chapter of their lives.

CONGRATULATING TAIWAN'S PRESIDENT TSAI ING-WEN

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the one-year anniversary of the inauguration of Taiwan's President, Tsai Ing-wen, I would like to offer my congratulations to her and the people of Taiwan.

For 38 years the United States has shared a mutually beneficial relationship with Taiwan, beginning with the Taiwan Relations Act and continuing through our shared beliefs in democratic government, human rights, free markets, and the rule of law.

This relationship has only grown further under President Tsai Ing-Wen. Last year, Taiwan was the United States' 10th largest trading partner overall and continues to be an important export market for almost every major sector. Additionally, Taiwan and the United States share cultural relations through hundreds of thousands of tourists, business travelers, and students from Taiwan that visit the U.S. each year.

As we reflect on this special occasion of President Tsai's first anniversary in office, I look forward to many more years of this successful relationship.

TRIBUTE TO HUNTER HOEPTNER

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to and memory of Hunter Hoeptner of Jackson County, Oregon, who passed away on May 9, 2017.

A resident of Eagle Point, Oregon, Hunter was a proud graduate of Eagle Point High School. Throughout school he displayed his tremendous leadership skills and commitment to serving others, even as a young man. Hunter served as class president at Eagle Point High and logged more than 100 hours of community service. He also led on the wrestling mat, where he won the Class 5A 160-pound State Championship for the Eagles in 2014. Long after graduation, he continued volunteering with the local youth wrestling program, inspiring others with his passion for the sport he loved.

That same tenacity and commitment to serving others motivated Hunter to serve his country in the Oregon Army National Guard.

He was assigned to Second Platoon, Alpha Company, 1st Battalion—186th Infantry Regiment, where he rose to the rank of Specialist and was preparing to attend Army Helicopter School.

Hunter's character left an impact on his fellow soldiers, and the local community. Over 100 military personnel attended Hunter's memorial service, which was complete with a military flyover.

Hunter's family, friends, neighbors, and total strangers touched by his story packed the stands of Eagle Point High School's football stadium to celebrate Hunter's life. At just 21 years old, this young man's life exemplified that of a community leader, star athlete, and American soldier devoted to serving others.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I offer my heartfelt condolences to Hunter's mother Lorelei and his father Kurt for the loss of their son.

IN RECOGNITION OF SUPER-INTENDENT RICHARD McCORKLE

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my personal congratulations to Mr. Richard "Ricky" McCorkle, Superintendent of the Marion County School District, on his retirement after 30 years as an educator and civic leader. He will be honored at a retirement celebration on Wednesday, May 24, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. at the Marion County Middle and High School cafeteria.

Before becoming an educator, Mr. McCorkle was an insurance salesman from 1977 until 1987. That year, he earned a bachelor of arts degree in history from Georgia Southwestern College. He then became a history teacher and a basketball and baseball coach at Tri-County High School. In 1997, he earned a Master of Science degree in Educational Leadership from Troy State University. That year, he became the Tri-County High School principal. Within two years, he was elected as Superintendent of the Marion County School District.

Aristotle once said, "Educating the mind without educating the heart is no education at all." Mr. McCorkle was an educator of both. He is rooted in the belief that children need constant love and encouragement. As such, he was most known for walking through Marion County schools on a regular basis and talking with students from pre-K to 12th grade. He frequently visited teachers and staff to show his care and support for them as well.

Outside of his tremendous scholastic dedication, Mr. McCorkle is also very involved within the community. He currently serves on the Board of Directors for South Georgia Technical College and is the Executive Director of Chattahoochee-Flint RESA. He is also a Board Member of the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce Valley Partnership Joint Development Authority and the River Valley Regional Commission. He is a member of the Buena Vista/Marion County Chamber of Commerce, Georgia School Superintendents Association, Georgia School Boards Association, and Georgia Association of Educational Leaders. He is a founder of Pastors Partnering with Education.

After retirement, Mr. McCorkle will enjoy spending time with his wife, Marie, and their two children and two grandchildren. His love for education was also instilled in his own children, both of whom are now educators and married to educators. Richard McCorkle has accomplished much in his life, but none of it would be possible without the love and support of the family he cherishes so dearly.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our sincerest appreciation and best wishes to Superintendent Richard McCorkle upon the occasion of his retirement from an outstanding career spanning 30 years in education.

COMMENDING LOCAL 2017 HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES FOR THEIR DECISION TO ENLIST IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY AND OUR COMMUNITY SALUTES OF FREDERICKSBURG, VIRGINIA FOR HOSTING THE SIXTH ANNUAL HIGH SCHOOL ENLISTEE RECOGNITION CEREMONY

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 8 Fredericksburg, Virginia area high school seniors who plan to enlist in the United States Navy after graduation. These students have excelled in their academic and extracurricular activities, and I offer my sincere congratulations upon their high school graduation.

I commend these student leaders for their selflessness and courageous decision to serve their country as members of the United States Navy.

Byer, Magalyana; Davis, Patrick; Deike, Iain; Phouminuh, Hongtavanah; Reynolds, Zachariah; Smith, Michael; Snyder, Walter; Thompson, Tyler.

These students will be honored by the Greater Fredericksburg Chapter of Our Community Salutes at their 6th Annual Military Enlistee Recognition Ceremony on Saturday, June 3, 2017 at the University of Mary Washington in Fredericksburg, VA.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking these young men and women and their families for their dedication to serving this great Nation. We owe them and the many Americans who have served and will serve a debt of gratitude.

RECOGNIZING GAINES CHAPEL A.M.E. CHURCH ON THEIR 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate May 21st, 2017 as Gaines Chapel A.M.E. Church's 100th Anniversary. As we celebrate its centennial, we celebrate the past while embracing all that the future holds for the congregation. On this occasion, I extend my gratitude to Claranne Perkins and Jeanette Hunter, Co-Chairs of this centennial celebration, and Pastor Cyrus Burns, the proud leader of this community.

Gaines Chapel A.M.E. Church has grown tremendously from its 10 original founders in 1917, and has since become an integral part of the City of East Moline. It has undergone many transformations over the past 100 years—new church buildings replaced old, and many different Pastors have contributed their wisdom. But from its original organization in Campbell School, the church has prospered and always remained true to its mission and values. Gaines Chapel A.M.E. Church has

gone above and beyond to enrich our community through their youth programs and extensive charitable work.

Mr. Speaker, I would once again like to congratulate Gaines Chapel A.M.E. Church on their 100th Anniversary. I am proud to know that organizations such as Gaines Chapel A.M.E. Church, are flourishing and strengthening our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. KEITH BALLARD AND SOUTHWEST MIDDLE SCHOOL MUSIC DEPARTMENT

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Keith Ballard and Southwest Middle School's Music Department for their exceptional work and dedication in promoting the arts.

Southwest Middle School is located a few minutes from the international border and serves a large Latino population. The school has one of the highest poverty rates in San Diego County. According to Sweetwater Union High School District officials, Southwest Middle School previously had a struggling music program requiring immediate attention and assistance.

In 2010, Mr. Ballard was involuntarily transferred to Southwest Middle School. He was told that he had been assigned to improve a failing music program in need of immediate help. Unfortunately, the conditions of both the school and the program did not make this an easy task. Mr. Ballard worked tirelessly with administrators, parents and the community to secure funding to rebuild the music program. He found resistance and opposition, as the project required time and resources that few were inclined to provide. In response, he used the media as a tool to shed light on the issue, which resulted in him securing the necessary support and resources for the project.

Today, Southwest Middle School has a thriving music program which offers multiple courses from different genres such as three mariachi music classes, one steel drum band class and one marching percussion/African drum ensemble class. The program is designed to connect students with their heritage through education, practice, and the promotion of arts and music. The school will be adding a band class for the 2017-18 school year. Presently, Southwest Middle School has one of the most multicultural and diversified music programs in the entire nation.

Southwest Middle School proves their commitment to the continuous social and emotional growth of their students by enabling youth to develop their talents.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT PITTENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I was in North Carolina attending to District related business. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 263, and YEA on Roll Call No. 264.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THOMAS J. KINSMAN

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Thomas Kinsman, a Vietnam veteran and Medal of Honor recipient.

Kinsman was born in Gainesville, Georgia and enlisted as a private first class in 1967. In February of 1968, his company came under attack during a reconnaissance in-force mission, and it was there that Kinsman performed the ultimate act of selflessness: He spared the lives of his comrades by throwing himself on top of a grenade.

President Nixon described Kinsman's selflessness best when he awarded him the Medal of Honor for "his indomitable courage, complete disregard for his personal safety and profound concern for his fellow soldiers."

Mr. Speaker, I believe selflessness and service are connected. We cannot fully serve our neighbors if we are not willing to sacrifice our own comfort, resources, and even well-being. Thomas Kinsman humbled himself in order to protect his fellow servicemen.

As Americans, we are indebted to servant heroes like Kinsman, for it is men and women like him that instruct us in what it means to defend the life and liberty of our fellow citizens. It is my hope that his legacy will live on as an example of what it truly means to serve others and our country.

I thank Mr. Kinsman.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALAMO MEXICAN KITCHEN

HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago our nation observed National Small Business Week and recognized the positive impact that entrepreneurs and small businesses have on our local economies and our communities. In that spirit, I wish to bring to the attention of the House one small business located in my hometown of Rockledge, Florida, called Alamo Mexican Kitchen.

Alamo Mexican Kitchen just recently celebrated its 50th Anniversary, a true milestone for any small business. Established in 1967 by

Irene and Alberto Enriquez, the Alamo has become a staple on Florida's Space Coast and favorite restaurant for many local patrons. In the mid-1960's, the Enriquez family moved to Florida from El Paso, Texas, with the Apollo program. A short time later, like many small business owners, they took a risk, opened Alamo Mexican Kitchen, and with it they brought an entirely new flavor to our area—Mexican food.

Before the Alamo, you couldn't find Mexican food anywhere in our area. In fact, when my own family moved from Southern California to Florida in 1956 with the space program, very few residents were familiar with Mexican food. My mother used to have our relatives send her tortilla shells so we could enjoy our weekly taco dinners. It wasn't until 1967, when Alamo opened, that we could enjoy real Mexican food in a local restaurant. Since then, Katie and I have been faithful patrons of the Alamo, owned by the same family for 50 years.

Today, five generations of the Enriquez family have worked at the Alamo, and many past Alamo employees have gone on to open their own successful Mexican restaurants—a true testament to the Alamo's success. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Alamo Mexican Kitchen, its employees, and the Enriquez family on celebrating 50 years of serving fine Mexican cuisine.

COMMENDING LOCAL 2017 HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES FOR THEIR DECISION TO ENLIST IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AND OUR COMMUNITY SALUTES OF FREDERICKSBURG, VIRGINIA FOR HOSTING THE SIXTH ANNUAL HIGH SCHOOL ENLISTEE RECOGNITION CEREMONY

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 33 Fredericksburg, Virginia area high school seniors who plan to enlist in the United States Army after graduation. These students have excelled in their academic and extracurricular activities, and I offer my sincere congratulations upon their high school graduation.

I commend these student leaders for their selflessness and courageous decision to serve their country as members of the United States Army:

Allison-Cook, Amanda; Bagley, Broderick; Beckham, Elijah; Barrino, Starr; Buelna Tapia, Cesar; Buffum, Jonathan; Dean, Davon; Elliott, Nicole; Harte, Brett; Jefferson, Kalie; Kelly, Joseph; Kuske, John; Lawrence, Skyler; McCallister, Mark; McHugh, Sean; McNabb, George; Moffo, Landry; Moore, Ronando; Morgan, Alexis; Phillips, Austin; Robey, Garrett; Roungrat, Jirayut; Russell, Robert; Saeed, Faisal; Scarborough, Ian; Slaughter, Darryl; Smith, Cordell; Sollowin, Michael; Tapsoba, Moussa; Van Doren, Nicole; Vacher, Andrew; Vasquez, Nicholas; Warren, Matthew.

These students will be honored by the Greater Fredericksburg Chapter of Our Community Salutes at their 6th Annual Military Enlistee Recognition Ceremony on Saturday,

June 3, 2017 at the University of Mary Washington in Fredericksburg, VA.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking these young men and women and their families for their dedication to serving this great Nation. We owe them and the many Americans who have served and will serve a debt of gratitude.

IN RECOGNITION OF LINCOLN
PARK HISTORICAL SOCIETY AND
MUSEUM FOR ITS PRESERVA-
TION OF THE CITY'S HISTORY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Lincoln Park Historical Society and Museum for its efforts to preserve and document the history of the City of Lincoln Park. The Lincoln Park Historical Museum provides an important venue for residents to learn about the city's history and development.

Founded in 1955 and located in a former Depression-era Post Office, the Lincoln Park Historical Society and Museum host exhibits and events that document the history of Lincoln Park and southeast Michigan. Pasi museum exhibits have featured historical Presidential and Congressional campaign memorabilia from national, state and local candidates, as well as displays of advertisements for old Lincoln Park businesses from the city's history. Additionally, the Museum also profiled prominent Lincoln Park natives, including Bill Simpson, an illustrator for Disney and The Simpson TV show, and Preston Tucker, a local automobile designer and entrepreneur. The organization also hosts authors, historians and other experts in public forums to provide additional historical background to its exhibits.

The Lincoln Park Historical Society and Museum not only plays a key role in documenting historically significant people and events, but also provides critical resources and education that helps Lincoln Park residents place their city's history and the role it has played in the growth and development of southeast Michigan in its proper context. The organization's sponsorship of local experts and rare artifacts, as well as its production and distribution of an educational newsletter, underscore its commitment to preserving the city's history. It is heartening to see the Lincoln Park community continue to support the incredible work that is being done by the Lincoln Park Historical Society, and I am confident that they will build on this success in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Lincoln Park Historical Society and Museum for their historical preservation efforts. The group provides cultural enrichment for Lincoln Park and its residents through its hosting of events and exhibits.

CONGRATULATING RODOLFO JOSÉ
CÁRDENAS

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Rodolfo José Cárdenas on his award-winning broadcasting excellence.

Rodolfo Cárdenas is the host of the daily morning radio show, 'Hablemos Hoy,' and recently received the Colorado Broadcaster Association's 2016 'Excellence Award' for his continued leadership in providing a show that has become a center piece of the Colorado Hispanic radio market. Hablemos Hoy also took home the top prize for being the 'Best Morning Show' in the Hispanic market. This is the second time that Hablemos Hoy has won this prestigious award.

I am grateful to have been a guest on Hablemos Hoy on a number of occasions and know that Mr. Cárdenas has a strong work ethic, dynamic hosting capabilities and the ability to bring together the Spanish speaking community across our state. Rodolfo Cárdenas' commitment to educate and inform those within our community about local and national issues further demonstrates his importance to the Hispanic community in the State of Colorado.

Again, I would like to congratulate Rodolfo Cárdenas and the entire staff of 'Hablemos Hoy' for their continued excellence and for receiving these prestigious awards. They serve as recognition for Rodolfo Cárdenas' unwavering commitment to quality broadcasting and to the Hispanic community.

IN RECOGNITION OF WOODIE
RUCKER-HUGHES

HON. MARK TAKANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the career of Waudier "Woodie" Rucker-Hughes, a tireless worker for civil rights and a pillar of the community in the Inland Empire of California.

Woodie was born in Washington, DC, and came to California in 1969 to begin a career in teaching at John W. North High School in Riverside. She later became the Dean of Students, an assistant principal and Manager of Child Welfare and Attendance for the Riverside Unified School District. In those roles, she helped young people to make the most of their education and their lives.

Woodie has spent her life building a stronger community through her leadership in the NAACP, and her involvement with non-profit organizations and commissions. The people of Riverside live in a city made better by the work of Woodie Rucker-Hughes.

This week, Woodie is retiring from the Riverside Unified School District. She has earned the thanks of a grateful community and the admiration of all that know her.

TRIBUTE TO MR. CLINTON
HAVRAN AND MRS. DEBORAH ORR

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the bus accident that took the lives of four people in Biloxi, Mississippi, on March 7, 2017.

Tragically, a tour bus from Austin, Texas found itself lodged on train tracks in Biloxi, and was subsequently struck by an oncoming train. Although passengers started to disembark from the bus, several could not make it off in time.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I stand to honor the lives of two of those individuals who were taken from us in the accident: Mr. Clinton Havran of Sealy, Texas, and Mrs. Deborah Orr of Bastrop, Texas. Clinton and Deborah were both pillars in our community.

Clinton served in the United States Army from 1958 to 1963, and subsequently had a long and distinguished career as a professional truck driver with Central Freight Lines and Steinhauser's of Texas. He is survived by his loving wife of 42 years, Annie Mae Havran, his children, and his grandchildren.

Deborah, or Debbie as her friends knew her, was known for her spirit and kindness. Debbie was a Jill-of-all-trades, and held jobs as a nursing assistant and assembly worker, among others. She actively volunteered in her community—with several organizations that work with needy children and as the Activities Director at the Bastrop Senior Center. Debbie is survived by her loving husband of 36 years, Tim Orr, as well as her children, grandchildren, and a great-grandchild.

I join their family, their friends, and the people of Bastrop and Sealy in rejoicing the lasting impression Clinton and Debbie left on us all. As our community grieves and continues to come together in this time of sorrow, I ask that we honor their memory by working together to ensure accidents like this do not happen in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the House offer their love and support for Clinton, Deborah, and their loved ones.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO GARY
PRUDEN, WORLDWIDE CHAIR-
MAN, MEDICAL DEVICES, JOHN-
SON & JOHNSON

HON. LEONARD LANCE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of New Jersey's most distinguished community and business leaders, Gary Pruden. Gary has dedicated the last thirty-three years of his life as a leader at Johnson & Johnson, creating a healthy, innovative world for patients everywhere.

Gary joined Johnson & Johnson in 1984 to serve in sales and marketing for Janssen Pharmaceuticals. He led Janssen commercial

efforts in Canada and after returning to the US in 2006, Gary joined the Ethicon franchise located in Somerville, New Jersey as Worldwide President of Ethicon Products. Gary's leadership and commitment to improving standards of care for patients helped to develop not only exceptional life-saving products but also better hospital conditions, education for surgeons and healthcare professionals'. He also supported many community and charitable programs to improve healthcare and patients' lives globally.

As Johnson & Johnson's medical device footprint grew around the world, Gary's portfolio also continued to expand and he soon became the global Company Group Chairman in 2012 and the Worldwide Chairman of Medical Devices and a member of the Johnson & Johnson Management and Executive Committees respectively in 2015 and 2016.

Gary has also become involved in the federal advocacy and legislative policy-making process with local, state and federal law makers. He has committed himself to advocating for sound, science-based public policy. He has been successful because of his commitment to building bi-cameral, bi-partisan relationships that support access to medical innovation and improve the U.S. healthcare system. Gary's leadership at national trade associations, community organizations and with elected and appointed government officials has made a lasting positive effect on patient care.

Of all the professional accolades Gary has received during his impressive career, however, I believe he is most proud of his devotion to his family as a committed husband and father. Gary's wife Georgeane and their two children Kyle and Chelsea are his highest priorities.

I wish Gary well in his personal and professional endeavors as he retires from Johnson & Johnson. I thank him for his exceptional service to our community.

HONORING FATHER KEVIN
WATERS, S.J.

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the retirement of Father Kevin Waters of Gonzaga University.

Father Waters joined the Society of Jesus in 1951, and has gone on to serve the students of Gonzaga University as a chaplain, professor, and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Additionally, Father Waters served as the chaplain of the DeSmet Residence Hall for the last 34 years. During his time as chaplain, Father Waters united the young men who lived in that dormitory with religious services, spiritual and personal guidance, and community building within the context of the Jesuit mission.

Among the unique services that Father Waters has provided to the residents of DeSmet over the years, it was his weekly Sunday night church service in the DeSmet basement that really stood out. When he began offering this weekly service during his

first year as Chaplain, Father Waters sought to offer the residents of this dormitory a place where they could go to gather and center on their faith, prayer, and community. Ultimately, he hoped to provide his residents with the opportunity to grow their relationship with God and others each and every Sunday.

I want to thank Father Waters for his invaluable service to the students of Gonzaga University, and I wish him a wonderful retirement.

COMMENDING LOCAL 2017 HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES FOR THEIR DECISION TO ENLIST IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD AND OUR COMMUNITY SALUTES OF FREDERICKSBURG, VIRGINIA FOR HOSTING THE SIXTH ANNUAL HIGH SCHOOL ENLISTEE RECOGNITION CEREMONY

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 4 Fredericksburg, Virginia area high school seniors who plan to enlist in the United States Coast Guard after graduation. These students have excelled in their academic and extracurricular activities, and I offer my sincere congratulations upon their high school graduation.

I commend these student leaders for their selflessness and courageous decision to serve their country as members of the United States Coast Guard:

Cronin, Erik; Cronin, Matthew; Foley, Dillon; Michaud, Joshua.

These students will be honored by the Greater Fredericksburg Chapter of Our Community Salutes at their 5th Annual Military Enlistee Recognition Ceremony on Saturday, June 3, 2017 at the University of Mary Washington in Fredericksburg, VA.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking these young men and their families for their dedication to serving this great Nation. We owe them and the many Americans who have served and will serve a debt of gratitude.

CELEBRATING THE WORK OF MR.
WILLIAM M. OVERBY

HON. SUZAN K. DeBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Ms. DeBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the great work of a constituent, Mr. William M. Overby. During a career spanning more than 32 years with State Parks, Bill served in several park ranger and management assignments throughout the state, and managed the Deception Pass Area for the final 20 years of his career.

While serving at Deception Pass, Bill began his association with Skagit Valley College as an instructor in its Parks Resources Management and the Criminal Justice programs, be-

coming a lead instructor the last 26 years. In July 2003, he began serving as the Department Chair of the Criminal Justice program.

Bill provided his passion and skills to Washington state, serving a five-year term as the charter Chair of the Washington State Safety, Security, and Emergency Management Council. He is also the recipient of the prestigious President's Award by the Washington Recreation and Park Association.

Bill's leadership and commitment to training the next generation of the National Park Service, U.S. Forest Service, and State Patrol members is admirable and his service will continue to benefit our communities for years to come.

As Bill enters his retirement journey, I wish him the very best in whatever his next venture may be.

STRONG SUPPORT FOR BILLS TO PREVENT CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND TO ENSURE JUSTICE FOR TRAFFICKERS AND ABUSERS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to offer my strong support for all six bills under consideration tonight to prevent children from suffering the horrors of sexual exploitation and ensure justice for traffickers and abusers.

I would also like to offer my sincere thanks to Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy for his consistent work to fight human trafficking and other forms of sexual exploitation of children.

As the prime author of the landmark Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 and of its 2003 and 2005 reauthorization, I know the heavy lift such bills can be—and also their critical importance. The Majority Leader's personal commitment to tonight's legislation, as well as to moving other anti-trafficking bills over the next few weeks, builds upon the work he has done in previous congresses to effectively help the victims of trafficking who are primarily women and children.

Sexual exploitation of children is a human rights violation that results in serious, lifelong consequences for the physical, psychological, and spiritual development and well-being of a child. In many instances, it is a form of human trafficking.

According to the International Labor Organization, almost 2 million children are still victimized every year by commercial sexual exploitation, which includes the use of girls and boys in sexual activities remunerated in cash or in kind, child sex tourism, the use of children in sex shows (public or private), and the production, promotion and distribution of pornography involving children.

Millions of other children suffer the honor and wounding of other forms of sexual abuse; most do not come forward out of misplaced shame, or the fear that the justice system will re-traumatize and then fail them.

The Strengthening Children's Safety Act of 2017, H.R. 1842, seeks to strengthen our efforts against repeat child sex offenders and

ensure they are subjected to increased penalties. As drafted, the bill will crack down on sex offenders who fail to register and then commit violent crimes under state law. It will also ensure that an offender's prior child-related sex offenses under Uniform Code of Military Justice are taken into account in subsequent prosecutions.

The Targeting Child Predators Act of 2017 (H.R. 883) also seeks to improve accountability for suspected crimes against children by ensuring that offenders are not tipped-off to law enforcement investigations of their IP addresses before law enforcement has a chance to gather the critical digital evidence of crimes against children.

The Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act of 2017 (H.R. 1188) ensures continued funding for the original Adam Walsh Act with important updates. The original Adam Walsh Act created a national registry of sex offenders and the means to enforce registration. While each state has its own registry, the national registry provides an efficient way to track sex offenders who move between states, and helps to systematize standards across states.

The Child Protection Improvement Act of 2017 (H.R. 695), ensures that organizations serving youth have access to the national sex offender registry—so that they are not limited to background checks within their state. This ensures that children are protected from sex offenders whether or not the offender has followed the law and registered in their state.

Last year, I applied this concept worldwide with the International Megan's Law to Prevent Child Exploitation and Other Sexual Crimes Through Advanced Notification of Traveling Sex Offenders (P.L. 114-119), so that countries are warned when individuals on a U.S. sex offender list for a crime against a child is traveling to their country. Since my bill became law, more than 2,000 notifications of pedophile travel have been sent to 64 countries, with a particular emphasis on countries known to be primary destinations for child sex tourism.

One of the other bills under consideration tonight, the Global Child Protection Act of 2017 (H.R. 1862), will make it easier to prosecute known offenders and others who abuse children abroad by expanding the definition of the term "illicit sexual contact" to cover any sexual contact with a child.

The TARGET Act (H.R. 1625), encourages accountability for international traffickers by allowing the State Department to provide rewards to people who are willing to bring down international criminal organizations trafficking in women and children. I am a cosponsor of HR 1625 and pleased to see it and all the aforementioned legislation advance tonight.

In addition to the legislation we adopt tonight, Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues may know that a strong bipartisan coalition is also working on the comprehensive reauthorization of America's leading anti-trafficking legislation—The Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA). This additional legislation, the Frederick Douglass Trafficking Victims Prevention and Protection Act of 2017 (H.R. 2200), honors the 200th birthday of slavery survivor and great abolitionist Frederick Douglass, and will reauthorize \$130 million in current funds across several federal programs dedicated to

fight human trafficking over the next four years.

I am pleased to be the prime author of the Frederick Douglass Trafficking Victims Prevention and Protection Act with lead Democrat cosponsor Rep. Karen Bass along with a strong bipartisan group including Chairman Ed Royce, Reps. Sheila Jackson Lee, Susan Brooks, Lois Frankel, Ann Wagner, Tony Cardenas, Ted Poe, and Ryan Costello.

H.R. 2200 is also endorsed by a broad-based coalition of NGOs that work on the frontlines in the battle against human trafficking including.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 17 years, we have seen progress on a number of anti-trafficking fronts: more than 250,000 victims have been rescued worldwide; the Department of Justice has federally funded some 42 anti-human trafficking task forces across the United States and more than 85,000 law enforcement officers have been trained. Additionally, over 300 laws around the world, influenced by American leadership, have enacted to combat trafficking.

We look forward to building upon this record through passage of The Frederick Douglass Trafficking Victims Prevention, Protection, and Reauthorization Act. Some of the important provisions of H.R. 2200 include:

Ensuring vulnerable children and other at-risk populations are educated to avoid traffickers;

Focusing grants for survivor care on housing for vulnerable groups;

Preferring in government travel contracts airlines and hotels that have in place anti-trafficking training and victim reporting policies for their employees;

Creating a special complaint mechanism in embassies whereby the U.S. is warned of traffickers exploiting the U.S. entry system;

Increasing transparency and oversight of U.S. government grants to fight trafficking;

Facilitating trafficking-free supply chains in private business by clarifying in Department of Labor reports the products that incorporate slavery-made goods;

Encouraging enforcement of the Tariff Act of 1930's prohibition on the importation of goods made with forced labor;

Strengthening federal efforts to reduce demand for services from trafficking victims by increasing prosecution of those who purchase services;

Designating one prosecutor in each of the Department of Justice's focus districts to investigate and prosecute labor trafficking cases;

Preventing abuse of domestic servants in embassies and diplomatic homes in the U.S.;

Encouraging credible and effective use of the trafficking tier ranking system by the U.S. Department of State in the annual Trafficking in Persons Report;

Educating procurement officers in U.S. government agencies to apply all U.S. law and regulations preventing purchases of goods made with trafficking or services from contractors who participate in human trafficking;

Ensuring that U.S. military assistance does not go to foreign governments that use child soldiers; and

Encouraging USAID to integrate human trafficking prevention into disaster relief.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, May 23, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 24

Time to be announced

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

TBA

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine industry perspectives on options and considerations for achieving a 355 ship Navy.

SR-232A

10 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine border insecurity, focusing on the rise of MS-13 and other transnational criminal organizations.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Vishal J. Amin, of Michigan, to be Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President, Stephen Elliott Boyd, of Alabama, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, and Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Navy and Marine Corps.

SD-192

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy

To hold hearings to examine American leadership in the Asia-Pacific, focusing on economic issues.

SD-419

May 22, 2017

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS, Vol. 163, Pt. 6

8215

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine Department of Energy atomic energy defense activities and programs.

SD-G50

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security

To hold hearings to examine pool safety, focusing on the tenth anniversary of the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act.

SR-253

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism

To hold hearings to examine law enforcement access to data stored across borders, focusing on facilitating cooperation and protecting rights.

SD-226

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 1094, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SR-418

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

MAY 25

Time to be announced

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 782, to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and the nominations of Noel J. Francisco, of the District of Columbia, to be Solicitor General of the United States, and Makan Delrahim, of California, and Steven Andrew Engel,

of the District of Columbia, both to be an Assistant Attorney General, all of the Department of Justice.

TBA

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Army in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2018 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To hold hearings to examine stopping the shipment of synthetic opioids, focusing on oversight of United States strategy to combat illicit drugs.

SD-342

9:45 a.m.

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine the President's fiscal year 2018 budget proposal.

SD-608

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine the Farm Economy, focusing on perspectives on rural America.

SR-328A

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Neil Chatterjee, of Kentucky, and Robert F. Powelson, of Pennsylvania, both to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and Dan R. Brouillette, of Texas, to be Deputy Secretary, all of the Department of Energy.

SD-366

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fis-

cal year 2018 for the Department of the Treasury, and tax reform.

SD-215

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Homeland Security.

SD-138

2 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy, and Environmental Policy

To hold hearings to examine the United Nations Human Rights Council.

SD-419

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

JUNE 7

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on National Parks

To hold hearings to examine working to improve the National Park Service workplace environment.

SD-366

JUNE 13

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Justice.

SD-192

SENATE—Tuesday, May 23, 2017

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the fountain of every blessing, we praise You for Your loving kindness and tender mercies. We are astounded by Your wonderful works to the children of humanity. Lord, we are incomplete without You. Fill our thirst for the knowledge of the sacred with Your Divine wisdom.

Today, inspire our lawmakers to do Your will. May they bring love where there is hate, light where there is darkness, and hope where there is despair. Lord, use them to transform dark yesterdays into bright tomorrows and to bring harmony from disharmony. May they rejoice because of the blessing of sins forgiven, striving to glorify You in all they do.

And Lord, stay close to those affected by the bombing in Manchester, England.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority leader is recognized.

MANCHESTER ATTACK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, before I say anything else this morning, I want to say this: What we saw in Manchester last night almost defies description. It was, in the words of Prime Minister May, a “callous terror attack” that stood out “for its appalling, sickening cowardice, deliberately targeting innocent, defenseless children and young people, who should have been enjoying one of the most memorable nights of their lives.”

Although we will continue to learn more about what happened, this much is very clear: Many have died, many more have been injured, and, as the Prime Minister told us, many of them were children. It is hard to imagine the

pain the families of these victims must be feeling today. On behalf of the Senate and our country, let me express our heartfelt condolences to the victims, their families, and to the British people, who have been our friends and allies through many challenges.

The Senate also recognizes the many first responders, medical professionals, and citizens who stepped in to provide help.

As I speak, I know that the intelligence professionals from both of our countries are already working to discover whether this was the result of an individual attacker or directed by ISIL. In either case, the people of America will stand with our allies and provide any assistance we possibly can.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET AND TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as colleagues know, it is once again the time of the year when Congress gets to work putting together the next budget. One of the initial steps in the process is typically for the President to send up a blueprint of his own laying out his priorities, as Members continue to work through conversations here as well.

The President's budget is being released this morning, and here are a few things we should know about it already: It builds on the progress made earlier this month on defense, prioritizing more of the resources our servicemembers need. It builds on progress made earlier this month on border security, calling for investing in more of the infrastructure and technology our law enforcement officers actually need. And, unlike any of President Obama's budget blueprints, this one actually achieves balance.

The provisions I mentioned are encouraging to see. I am sure they will serve as guideposts for Chairman ENZI and the Budget Committee as they move forward on this matter.

I also appreciate the President's commitment to slowing the growth of mandatory spending, which, if left unaddressed, could eventually limit our ability to invest in nearly anything else as the debt—and the interest we have to pay on it—increases and crowds out spending on other major priorities.

This Thursday, Treasury Secretary Mnuchin will testify in front of the Finance Committee on the budget blueprint and, with it, the administration's interest in tax reform. I know we are all eager to learn more from him and look forward to working with the administration to make our Tax Code

simpler and fairer for the American people and American businesses.

Over the years, our tax system has grown only more complex and more punitive, putting both individuals and employers at a disadvantage, while also inadvertently incentivizing American companies and jobs to leave this country to go overseas. It is evident that we need serious reforms to our Tax Code, the type that will help families keep more of their hard-earned money, while also helping businesses put more Americans to work.

By implementing tax reform, we can again encourage investment in our country, allowing American businesses to expand, hire more workers, improve wages, and offer better benefits. In turn, families will have access to more opportunities and will be better positioned to actually get ahead.

It has been over three decades since we passed comprehensive tax reform, and it is past time we do something about it. Fortunately, we now have an administration that shares this interest in finally improving our tax system instead of making it even more convoluted and constricting—and without demanding \$1 trillion in new taxes for the government.

Easing the burden on the middle class and getting the economy moving again are top concerns here in the Republican Senate. We understand that for the past 8 years, too many families struggled under the weight of an economy that failed to reach its potential, too many took home wages that didn't meet their needs, and too many saw opportunity slip away. We understand that these families deserve a change in direction and expect each of us to do what we can to get the economy moving again soon. That is why we passed legislation to provide relief from Obama-era regulations that stifle growth, and it is why we will keep working to advance more legislative solutions to help hard-working Americans. Tax reform is one way we can do just that.

This is an area where Republicans and Democrats have been able to find some common ground in the past, and I am hopeful our friends across the aisle will join us in working toward comprehensive tax reform one more time. Either way, the Republican Senate remains committed to enacting tax reform so we can help encourage American investment, boost job creation, and promote wage growth all across our country.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Sullivan nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 54, Courtney Elwood to be General Counsel of the CIA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Courtney Elwood, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Courtney Elwood, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mitch McConnell, John Barrasso, Mike Crapo, Jerry Moran, Michael B. Enzi, James M. Inhofe, Richard Burr, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, Shelley Moore Capito, Thom Tillis, Orrin G. Hatch, Marco Rubio, John Boozman, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, James E. Risch.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of the Sullivan nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally to the two sides.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

MANCHESTER ATTACK

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, the Senate's thoughts and prayers go out to everyone in Manchester, England. Such violence is particularly heartbreaking when it happens, as it did in Manchester, at a concert with so many young people there to enjoy.

We mourn the families of the victims of last night's terrorist attack. We hope the perpetrators are quickly found and brought to justice. I saw on TV a mother waiting, trying to email and text her daughter. She got no answer. She was wondering where her daughter was. It brought back the horrible memories for me after 9/11, the day after, when I went up there and saw hundreds of people holding up signs: "Have you seen my wife Evelyn?" "Have you seen my son John," not knowing if they were alive or dead. Most of them ended up being dead.

We hope and pray that mother, and all the other mothers, fathers, brothers, and sisters who are waiting for news that maybe their child, their relative, is alive, will find them alive. Our prayers go out to them.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, now, on another matter completely, last night, it was reported in the Washington Post that President Trump attempted to enlist the Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, and the Director of the National Security Agency, Admiral Rogers, in helping the administration push back against reports in the press about

an investigation into the President's campaign and its potential ties to Russia.

According to the same reporting, White House staff may also have "sounded out top intelligence officials about the possibility of intervening directly" with the FBI and Mr. Comey to get them to drop the investigation into General Flynn.

If these reports are accurate, it is another piece of now-mounting evidence that this White House has no interest—in allowing the Russia investigation to proceed without partisan interference, and the White House seems to have little respect for the principles of the rule of law. We have not quite seen anything like it in a very long time.

Such allegations only reinforce the correctness of the decision to appoint Special Counsel Mueller to oversee the investigation and should strengthen our resolve to ensure that he is insulated from interference from this White House. Such allegations also strengthen, again, the need for an independent, nonpartisan FBI Director.

With all these reports of attempts to interfere with the investigation, we cannot have an FBI Director who has a political background, who doesn't seem right down the middle, who doesn't seem to be a Director's Director, a prosecutor's prosecutor, an investigator's investigator. No politician or candidate with insufficient impartiality should be selected by the President or confirmed by the Senate. We Democrats will stand very strongly for that.

Given the almost daily reports about potential meddling and misconduct by this administration, Congress must exercise its oversight authority in order to keep this administration in check. Both the executive branch and the congressional investigations must proceed. This is not about politics or political advantage. When a foreign power, particularly an enemy of our country like Putin and Russia, tries to interfere in your elections—and will probably do it again in the future—we have to know everything that happened, who participated, and make sure it doesn't happen again.

If people who participated in it—if there are such people—get away with it this time, many more will do it next time. So this is an issue of national interest, national security, and even the future of our democracy. I remind colleagues that in our Constitution, the Founding Fathers worried about foreign interference in our government. When I read that in high school and again in college, I said: Well, that doesn't seem real. It is all too real today, showing both the wisdom of the Founding Fathers and the need for strong oversight.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. President, now, on the budget, today, the President will release his

full budget for fiscal year 2018. From all indications, the Trump budget will seek deep cuts to programs that help the middle class and working America while providing more handouts to the rich. It will cut to the bone programs that help the elderly, the poor, while adding money for an unnecessary, ineffective border wall that continues to have bipartisan opposition.

To make all the math work, the Trump budget makes entirely unfounded assumptions about economic growth. In short, the Trump budget takes a sledgehammer to the middle class and the working poor, lavishes tax breaks on the wealthy, and imagines all of the deficit problems away with fantasy math. The Trump budget exists somewhere over the rainbow, where the dreams of Nick Mulvaney, PAUL RYAN, and the Koch brothers really do come true.

Of course, these dreams are a nightmare for the average working American. We expect the Trump budget will make deep cuts to the National Institutes of Health and Centers for Disease Control. Let me ask, How many people in America want to cut cancer research when it has done such good? Well, President Trump evidently does. It is his budget.

They kneecap research that develops new cures, damaging our ability to contain or prevent the outbreak of disease. We are all living longer and healthier, in part because of this research. We want to stop it, cut it back, so we can give tax breaks to wealthy people who, God bless them, are doing great already?

We expect the Trump budget will gash programs like Meals on Wheels. I even read in the paper this morning that the head of the Freedom Caucus said that even for him some of these cuts were too great. The SNAP benefits, making sure no kid goes to bed hungry in America—this is America. We have always done this. The Children's Health Insurance Program, cruelly ripping away the lifelines from Americans who need it the most, the children, the working poor, the elderly.

We expect the Trump budget will cut transportation funding, education funding, and programs that help students repay their student loan debt. One of the great problems in America, the debt on the backs—the burden on average kids getting out of college, middle-class kids, we are going to make it harder? What is going on here? What is going on in the White House with this kind of budget?

Our college kids, when they get out, they need to be able to live real good lives and not have this burden of debt on their shoulders which they are struggling under now. We are going to make it worse. We also—it is amazing but true. The Trump budget will break President Trump's promise to protect Social Security and Medicaid from

cuts, both of these. He promised over and over again he would not cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

Medicare was not cut here, but Medicaid is and Social Security is. On Social Security, the budget will cut Social Security disability benefits to many Americans who have earned them and paid for those benefits. You can say: Well, it doesn't cut old-age benefits for the elderly. Wait. If they get away with this, the elderly will be next on the chopping block because the goal, it seems, of this budget is to cut everything you can so you can give even more tax breaks to the wealthiest people—the Koch brothers type of thinking.

It will also seek hundreds of billions of dollars—additional cuts—in Medicaid. The budget cuts Medicaid on top of the cuts that were made in the House bill for TrumpCare. What will that do? Medicaid has become a middle-class program. For sixty percent of the people in nursing homes, Medicaid funds it.

What are we going to tell a couple with three kids? Say, they are 40 or 45. They have three kids. They are saving for college, they are struggling, but at least they know that mom or dad, who needs help, is in a nursing home. If this budget passes, that family is going to have a terrible choice: Take hundreds of dollars a month out of their own budget and give it to pay for the nursing home or find a place for mom and dad to live, maybe at home. Maybe there is no room in the house. It is awful. That is what they are doing.

What else will it hurt? Opioid addiction. Much of the progress we are trying to make on opioid addiction comes through Medicaid because they give treatment. We need law enforcement—I am a tough law enforcement guy; you know that—but we also need treatment. I have had fathers cry in my arms because their sons—in this case, it was both sons—were waiting online for treatment and died of an overdose. What a burden a parent has to live with. We should cut that and cut it to give more tax breaks to the rich? It is an America turned upside down—this budget.

How about rural areas? I represent New York State. It is known for its big city, New York City. We have other great cities upstate, but we also have the third largest rural population in America. So I am very familiar with rural America. In many of my counties in upstate New York—and this is true in rural counties throughout America—the largest employer is the rural hospital. That hospital is the only hospital around for miles and miles and miles if, God forbid, you have a stroke and you have to be rushed there to get better.

Well, go talk to our rural hospitals. These rural hospitals are the beating heart of our local economy, employing

hundreds, sometimes even thousands, of people. Well, nearly one in three rural hospitals today is at risk of closure. It is more expensive to run a rural hospital. People in rural areas are entitled to the same healthcare, so that means buying all these fancy machines. In an urban area, those machines can run 24/7 and get the reimbursement back, but in a rural area they can't. There are not that many people, but they get some help.

The Trump cuts to Medicaid would cause a whole bunch of these rural hospitals to close and many more to lay off employees, hurting healthcare in rural America, and hurting jobs in rural America—places that need help.

The Trump budget on top of TrumpCare, which seeks more than \$800 billion in cuts to Medicaid, would decimate healthcare options for rural Americans and pull the plug on many of these rural hospitals. Some of my colleagues will be talking more about that this morning.

When you add all of it up, the Trump budget is comic-book-villain bad. Just like comic books, it relies on a fantasy to make all the numbers work. It is the kind of budget you might expect from someone who is openly rooting for a government shutdown. Haven't we heard the President say that? It is the latest example of the President breaking his promises to working Americans. This budget breaks promise after promise after promise that the President made to what he called the forgotten America, the working men and women of America. He said that he would help them, and this budget goes directly against them.

In his speech to Congress, for instance, earlier this year the President called education "the civil rights issue of our time," but his budget guts vital school programs, our future, our kids. He said: "Cures to illnesses that have always plagued us are not too much to hope," but his budget slashes funding at the NIH and CDC where they do this research. And he said: "Save Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security without cuts. Have to do it," but his budget cuts Social Security disability insurance and ends Medicaid as we know it.

The Trump budget is one giant, brazen, broken promise to the working men and women of America. It completely abandons them. Fundamentally, this is a deeply unserious proposal that should roundly be rejected by both parties here in Congress. I am optimistic that is what will happen.

We should follow the same blueprint we did in the 2017 budget: Both Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate, in a bipartisan way, everyone compromised. We should get together, negotiate a serious proposal that maintains our commitments to the middle class and actually sets up our economy to grow.

We cannot let the President turn America inside out with his budget. We

have to stand together, Democrats and Republicans, and reject it for the sake of middle-class and working Americans. The Trump budget hopefully will not see the light of day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it was quite edifying to be sitting here listening to the Democratic leader speak this morning during the morning remarks, expressing his concern for healthcare, rural hospitals, and talking about his concerns about delivering healthcare to the poor. It is indeed ironic because at a time when ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, is literally in meltdown with unaffordable premiums and deductibles, we are not seeing any help whatsoever from our Democratic colleagues. I would suggest, rather than rail against the President's budget, they ought to be engaged in a more constructive process of working with us to make sure we can deliver on the promise of affordable healthcare to all Americans.

Of course, there is the matter of the President's budget itself. I remember that President Obama's last budget got voted on here in the U.S. Senate. It got one vote—one vote. A President's budget is not binding on the Congress. The Congress passes a budget resolution, both houses, and we anticipate doing that again.

The President's budget is really a statement of the President's priorities. Frankly, there are some things in the President's proposed budget that I think are worthwhile—things like securing our border. At the end of the day, it is the job of Congress, though, to pass a budget that reflects the priorities of our country.

I think it is worth pointing out that several aspects of the President's budget are encouraging and a welcome change from the previous administration. For one, it balances in 10 years. I would love to have our Democratic colleagues express some concern for the fact that we continue to spend money we don't have and impose the burden of repaying that money someday on future generations. To me, that is one of the most immoral things we do in this country; we spend the money today, and we leave the debt to our children and grandchildren to pay that back, which they must at some point. So when the President proposes a budget that actually balances in 10 years, I think that is a good thing. What a welcome relief from a White House budget anchored around overspending and growing the size of government, which we have seen for the last 8 years.

The other thing the President's budget does is reverse the defense sequester. This is the artificial cap we put on defense spending.

Of all the things the Federal Government does, national security is the No.

1 job. You can't outsource that to anyone. It is our No. 1 responsibility to keep the country safe and to keep America strong. Under the Obama administration, there was a cap put in place that prevented increased military spending, and indeed we saw cuts to the military of about 20 percent during the Obama years.

One thing that President Trump has done, which I find a welcome sign, is to properly resource our military so we can better defend against increasing threats around the world. It is simply irresponsible for us to allow our men and women in the military to operate on slashed budgets and outdated equipment. They can't even train and be ready for the next fight. The best deterrent to war and the best assurance of peace is a strong America. The President's budget reflects a better understanding of the threat environment ahead, and for that I am grateful.

So rather than railing against the President's budget, which he knows will not be passed into law—because no President's budget ever becomes law; it is a proposal of the President's priorities. As I said, there is much to like among the President's priorities—balancing the budget, emphasizing national security spending, and the like. Ultimately, we will have to come up with a budget ourselves. So I find the Democratic leader's railing against the President's budget, which he knows will not become law as written, somewhat ironic.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, on another matter, I have the privilege of serving as the chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Border Security and Immigration. It is a role I take seriously in light of the many challenges our Nation faces when it comes to security and trade along our southern border.

The Texas-Mexico border makes up more than 60 percent of the total U.S. southern border. That means Texas is at the epicenter of the national security conversation when it comes to border security and protecting communities that thrive on cross-border trade, not to mention the U.S. economy that reaps 5 million jobs as a result of binational trade with Mexico alone.

Later today, the subcommittee will have a chance to examine this important topic and consider ways that Congress can help the Trump administration make America safer and our borders stronger. In particular, I look forward to hearing from Chief Ron Vitiello, who is currently Acting Deputy Commissioner for Customs and Border Protection. He actually is the head Border Patrol agent for the Federal Government, a man who has spent many years on the frontlines and knows from experience the challenges that exist in securing the border.

Customs and Border Protection agents and officers face a range of chal-

lenges every day, working in some of the most inhospitable environments and remote locations, often without adequate resources or equipment. They work tirelessly to combat drug trafficking, arms smuggling, illegal immigration, and human trafficking, while simultaneously working to facilitate legitimate trade and travel between Mexico and the United States.

I spoke a little bit about this yesterday in light of NAFTA's importance to the Texas and U.S. economy. Texas is a first port of entry for many goods and many people coming from all over the world, and it takes a solid team of Customs and Border Patrol professionals and good leadership to manage the border and the many ports of entry along it. I am grateful to Chief Vitiello for his hard work and look forward to his testimony this afternoon.

This administration has made clear that securing the border is a top priority, and I agree with that. I am confident that with topnotch leaders like Secretary Kelly of the Department of Homeland Security and Attorney General Jeff Sessions, we will finally make real progress toward getting it done.

The appropriations bill that was recently signed into law included the largest increase for border security technologies and infrastructure improvement in more than a decade. Fortunately, the President's budget supports increased investment in border security and immigration enforcement, as well, including new infrastructure and technologies to help us achieve operational control of the southern border. This focus on border security is a welcome change from the previous administration, and I am glad we now have leaders who will take the need to achieve true border security seriously.

I have always said that border security ultimately is a matter of political will. The Obama administration didn't have it; the Trump administration does. With the political will and with the guidance of experts like Chief Vitiello and others who tell us exactly what the Border Patrol needs in order to secure the border, I am confident of our ability to get it done.

I will just relate the conversation I had with the Chief of the Rio Grande Border Patrol sector, Chief Manny Padilla. Chief Padilla long served in the Border Patrol in many different places along the border.

Of course, the border is very different in San Diego than it is in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas. For one thing, Texas has virtually all private property along the border and, of course, is separated by the Rio Grande River from Mexico.

What Chief Padilla has said to me, which I believe is absolutely the case, is that it takes three different things to secure the border. It takes infrastructure. You can call it fencing, like the Secure Fence Act that we passed a

few years ago that almost all of our Democratic colleagues voted for. It takes things like levy walls, which we have in Hidalgo County and the Rio Grande Valley. But it also takes technology and personnel because we know that no piece of infrastructure alone is going to provide the security we need. But fundamentally we need to regain the people's trust and confidence that the Federal Government will carry out its primary responsibility to protect our citizens and defend our borders.

Border security is complex. It is multifaceted and requires an approach that includes air, sea, and land. That is why we need a multilayered approach to border security that includes infrastructure, like the President talks about frequently when he talks about the wall. It takes technology, and it takes the men and women in the Border Patrol who do the dangerous but important work of keeping our border secure and keeping our country safe.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, shortly we will be voting on cloture on the nomination of John Sullivan, the nominee to be Deputy Secretary of State, and as the ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I urge my colleagues to support the cloture motion and support the nomination of John Sullivan to be the next Deputy Secretary of State.

MANCHESTER ATTACK

Before I begin, I want to express that I strongly condemn yesterday's heart-breaking attack in Manchester. I want to express my sincere condolences to the families of those who lost loved ones, especially the innocent and defenseless children who were brutally killed. As a father and grandfather, I mourn with them, and I am praying for the recovery of the injured.

The United States stands in firm solidarity with our friends in the United Kingdom. The United States will provide the necessary assistance as British authorities work to bring those responsible to justice. I know I speak for all my colleagues in the Senate in our solidarity with our friends in the United Kingdom.

Mr. President, in regard to Mr. Sullivan's nomination to be Deputy Secretary of State, he is well qualified for that position. He served in the Justice Department and in the private practice of law. He served as Deputy General Counsel at the Department of Defense. He also has been involved in the Department of Commerce, where he was General Counsel and Deputy Secretary. He is well familiar with government. He served in public positions and also brings private experience as a lawyer to the position of Deputy Secretary of State.

I do want to point out—as I pointed out to Mr. Sullivan and as most mem-

bers of our committee did—that he will find himself home alone for a period of time, in that the Trump administration has not submitted to Congress nominees for important positions at the Department of State. Yes, I have confidence in the career people at the Department of State, but there are times that we have to have a confirmed person in control in order to advance policies. So it is important—from embassy security, to fighting terrorism, to helping with the humanitarian challenges we have around the world and the administration of our missions in all the countries around the world—that we have a team in place. The Trump administration has been slow in providing us with qualified individuals to fill these positions. Thus far, the administration has decided to treat the State Department as an inconvenience rather than as a critical national security asset.

Secondly, I want to express my concern about something that will make Mr. Sullivan's job a lot more difficult—the international affairs budget for fiscal year 2018 that the administration is unveiling today. Although we are still receiving details, as I look at the massive spending cuts to vital national security, it is impossible to conclude this is anything but an “America alone” budget—one that, if enacted, will have disastrous effects on our standing in the world.

Let me repeat one more time that the money we spend on development assistance, on diplomacy, and that we spend in regard to helping our allies around the world and countries around the world is part of our national security budget. It is part of our national security budget, and yet the President's fiscal year 2018 budget would compromise national security.

As Secretary Mattis has said—often quoted on this floor—if you don't give the Secretary of State and the State Department the resources they need, you better be prepared to give them more ammunition and more soldiers because it is going to be more costly for them to defend.

It is very disappointing that the budget slashes critical support to our allies in their efforts to defeat terrorism, including zeroing out counterinsurgency support in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan. It will slash funds to support the defense needs of countless foreign partner countries and offer them the unpalatable option of going into debt to the United States to get the defense equipment and support they need. This is certain to damage our security, counterterrorism, and security interests with these countries and prove a golden opportunity for Russia and China to take the place of the United States. This is serious business. If we don't help countries that are part of our coalition against terrorism, if we don't give them the re-

sources to help us, then, quite clearly, our enemies will move in. As we know, Russia has done many things against U.S. interests. The voids will be quickly picked up by Russia and China.

This is a budget proposal that cuts support to European allies to counter Russia's aggression—precisely when Russia's assault on our democracy and the democracies of our European democracies has reached a fever pitch. At a time when the United States should be standing up for our allies and partners in Europe, this budget zeros out the Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia—AEECA—account and eliminates the European Reassurance Initiative altogether. This was an initiative that was set up to counter Russia's influence in Europe, and we are going to zero that out?

This is a budget proposal that walks away from the promotion of democratic values. It slashes funding for human rights and democracy programs abroad and hollows out the ideas, initiatives, and institutions on which U.S. leadership and international order rests, like the United Nations Peacekeeping.

In his remarks in Saudi Arabia this past weekend, President Trump applauded Jordan, Turkey, and Lebanon for their role in hosting refugees. Yet draconian humanitarian funding cuts would harm these very friends and allies who are hosting millions of refugees. What an inconsistent message. It also eliminates the U.N. emergency food aid program at a time of famine in Africa and the Middle East. If these budget cuts are implemented, many people around the world will die as a result of diminished resources and support that would result. We can't let that happen.

It is a budget proposal that undermines our ability to deal with pressing national security challenges, including development assistance, humanitarian aid, and climate change. The administration's budget proposal slashes more than 30 percent from our foreign assistance budget and dramatically cuts support for critical programs to save the lives of mothers in childbirth, feed hungry children, educate young people, train farmers, and the like. These programs exemplify U.S. values and promote the power of democracy and the importance of protecting human rights.

America's trademark is its values, what we stand for, our leadership globally, and this budget would compromise our ability to promote American values.

This is a penny wise, pound foolish budget, as the security challenges that will grow from these humanitarian catastrophes will dwarf the cost of helping to address the challenges before they metastasize into failed states and havens for extremism. If we don't help, we will have to pay on the other end.

When we fail to help countries provide the stability they need to take care of their population, they become a breeding ground for terrorists. We then have to respond with the use of our military, and it is much more costly. It costs people their lives.

Climate change—perhaps the most pressing national security challenge that faces the globe in the 21st century—receives less than just neglect; this is a budget that actively provides a catastrophic effect on climate-induced instability. We will not be able to respond to our international obligations in regard to climate change.

I understand that for Mr. Sullivan, if confirmed, this is the budget proposal he has to accept and defend; however, both he and Secretary Tillerson should be put on notice that I—and I think I speak for a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—consider this budget dead on arrival. I would call on him to consider how, if confirmed, he will work with the Senate to develop a more serious budget proposal over the coming months that safeguards and promotes American interests in the world, that deepens our partnerships and alliances, that is sufficient to meet the challenges of an increasingly aggressive Russia and increasingly assertive China on the world stage, that provides our Nation the tools it needs to address the pressing humanitarian crises and challenges, and that supports and defends our universal values in the best tradition of our Nation.

That is what we need to do as a Congress. We are the ones who will pass the budget. We are the ones who have the responsibility to make sure our budget speaks to our priorities, our values, and our national interests. Yet it is very disappointing to see the President of the United States submit a budget that is just the opposite of what it should be in regard to putting money toward American values and national security. We will be looking upon Mr. Sullivan, if he is confirmed, to work with us so we can develop a budget that really speaks to American values and American interests.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

Mitch McConnell, Cory Gardner, Tom Cotton, Roy Blunt, Jeff Flake, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Ron Johnson, James E. Risch, Joni Ernst, John Thune, Mike Rounds, Orrin G. Hatch, Bob Corker, David Perdue, John Hoeven, James M. Inhofe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 93, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 134 Ex.]

YEAS—93

Alexander	Flake	Murray
Baldwin	Franken	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blumenthal	Grassley	Peters
Blunt	Hassan	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Reed
Brown	Heinrich	Risch
Burr	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cantwell	Heller	Rounds
Capito	Hirono	Rubio
Cardin	Hoeven	Sasse
Carper	Inhofe	Schatz
Casey	Johnson	Schumer
Cassidy	Kaine	Scott
Cochran	Kennedy	Shaheen
Collins	King	Shelby
Coons	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Corker	Lankford	Strange
Cornyn	Leahy	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lee	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	Markey	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McCaskey	Udall
Donnelly	McConnell	Van Hollen
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Enzi	Merkley	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden
Fischer	Murphy	Young

NAYS—6

Booker	Gillibrand	Sanders
Duckworth	Harris	Warren

NOT VOTING—1

Isakson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 93, the nays are 6.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Utah.

THE INTERNET

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Federal Communication Commission's welcome proposal to end utility-style regulation of the internet by reversing the 2015 open internet order.

Anyone who has followed the hyperbolic debate about net neutrality has likely heard that the FCC is moving to squelch competition, limit consumer choice, raise prices, and perhaps even destroy the internet. That is my favorite one. At least that is what some activists and crusading late-night comedians claim. But none of this is true—none of it.

Rather, the FCC is reviewing the light-touch regulatory environment that, from the outset, facilitated the kind of innovation that produced the internet and expanded internet access to millions of Americans over the course of many years.

In order to understand this complicated issue, we need to be honest about what led us to where we are today; that is, the FCC's 2015 open internet order. The Obama-era FCC claimed that its order implemented net neutrality, or the equal treatment of all data over the internet, but that isn't quite right. The actual change was far broader than that.

The FCC reclassified broadband internet access service as a title II telecommunication service, instead of a title I information service. That might sound like a small change, but this soundingly small—some might even say soundingly innocuous—change applied a whole host of New Deal era regulations that were meant to apply to monopolistic telephone companies, monopolistic utility companies, and they applied those to the internet.

It subjected 21st century technology to the same rules that governed rotary telephones in the 1930s. Why, then, did the FCC do this? It wasn't because a free and open internet was harming Americans. The activists and enter-tainers clamoring for more government control of the internet claimed that it was under attack by predatory internet service providers but, strangely enough, none of them actually provided evidence for that very serious assertion.

If you are going to make that claim, back it up, point to evidence. Instead, they speak about imaginary or hypothetical harms. The 400-page order uses words like “may,” “could,” “might,” or “potentially” not just here and there, not just a few times but several hundred times. Nor did the FCC issue the open internet order because Congress told it to.

On the contrary, nearly 20 years ago, our colleague Senator WYDEN, along with then-Senator John Kerry and others, expressly argued against the drastic action that would later be taken by the FCC in 2015. After passing the bipartisan Telecommunications Act in 1996, this group of Senators affirmed the internet's status as a free and open information service, stating that

“nothing in the 1996 Act or its legislative history suggests that Congress intended to alter the current classification of Internet and other information services or to expand traditional telephone regulation to new and advanced services.”

Finally, the FCC did not intervene because it had evidence of market failure. When the FCC issued its order, the internet was still an explosive source of growth and innovation throughout America and throughout the world—as it had been for decades—when greater and greater numbers of Americans gained access to the internet for the first time. Perhaps, because of this inconvenient fact, the FCC hardly considered the possible economic effects of its regulations. The FCC’s chief economist at the time went so far as to say the rules were an “economics-free zone.”

What the internet does need is regulatory certainty, which is why I recently introduced the Restoring Internet Freedom Act, along with several of my colleagues. This bill would fully repeal the FCC’s 2015 internet takeover. More importantly, it would prevent the FCC from interfering with the internet in the future unless such actions were specifically authorized by Congress.

We shouldn’t stop there. Instead of waiting for regulators and activists to find new excuses to restrict the internet, we should open it further to extend more choices to American consumers. In other words, we should ensure that Federal policy promotes competition.

As we know from experience, heavy-handed regulations like the FCC’s order tend to favor large, deep-pocketed companies over startups that can’t afford an army of lobbyists in Washington. Removing these regulatory barriers will allow upstart entrepreneurs to compete with incumbents for consumers’ loyalty. Those consumers—ordinary Americans and their families—will benefit from the improved service and lower prices that this kind of competition inevitably creates.

Most American households currently have access to at least one internet service provider. Many have access to two or more, which might look like a competitive market exists for those households, but regulations can keep these different options from being adequate substitutes for one another.

The government restricts access to valuable resources that could be used for high-quality internet services. According to a 2012 report by the Obama administration, the Federal Government is sitting on upwards of 60 percent of the best radio spectrum, so-called “beachfront” spectrum, which could be put to use for commercial internet services like 5G wireless broadband.

Meanwhile, excessive permitting, licensing, and environmental impact

regulations delayed broadband deployment over Federal and public lands, especially in the West.

Finally, the Office of Management and Budget found that private parties spend nearly \$800 million each year to comply with FCC paperwork requirements. The bill for this ends up being paid entirely by ordinary American families.

Thankfully, my colleagues in the Senate have already identified many of these problems and have done work to address them. Senators KLOBUCHAR and DAINES have spent considerable time on policies to streamline broadband internet deployment through their “dig-once” proposals. Senator HELLER is a champion for reducing barriers for deploying broadband throughout the West. Senators THUNE and NELSON, the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Commerce, have introduced measures in the past to free up radio spectrum held by Federal agencies and organizations.

These are just a few of the many thoughtful ideas to reduce barriers to entry and increase competition, which has the potential to improve quality and bring down prices. The bipartisan nature of these policies demonstrates a clear understanding that improvements can be made, and everyone should be able to agree that more competition is better for American consumers, especially those in rural or low-income housing.

Everyone should also be able to agree that consumers should be protected from unfair and deceptive business practices. Thankfully, the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission already enforce fair rules that protect Americans’ enjoyment of a free and open internet.

The combination of competition and strong enforcement of antitrust and consumer protections provides the benefits of an innovative marketplace while avoiding problems that come from tired, anti-consumer, outdated regulations like title II and like the 2015 open internet order.

For the sake of American consumers and innovators—not for entrenched business interests—I hope to work with partners in the House, Senate, and the FCC to promote competition in the technology sector, including among internet service providers. If that means underperforming companies have to work a little harder for their customers, that is all the better, because the end result of lively competition is more investment and innovation by businesses, which translates into more choices and better service for consumers.

I encourage my colleagues, regardless of party or ideology, to work with me on this project. If they are truly interested in a better internet—not just government intrusion and control for its own sake—I am sure they can help

me identify other barriers to entry to the information superhighway.

For now, a good start to ensure that American consumers and small businesses benefit from the internet is to repeal the FCC’s 2015 internet takeover, enforce antitrust, unfair, and deceptive practice standards, and encourage competition among internet firms. Only then can we guarantee an internet that is free and open for everyone.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO BONNIE SEAMAN

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, today I wish to commend Bonnie Seaman, who has loyally served the people of Pennsylvania for more than 40 years, more recently as the director of constituent services for my Senate office. Bonnie has not only been a trusted member of my staff but a very close family friend.

Bonnie was born and raised on a turkey farm in Leck Kill, PA. She is the youngest of four children. She first began her public service career in county government at what was then known as the Northumberland County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Department, where she touched the lives of people in her community.

In pursuit of a college degree, Bonnie attended Indiana University of Pennsylvania and graduated cum laude with a degree in education. After graduation, she worked as a special education teacher.

Bonnie’s passion for helping others steered her career to the Pennsylvania State Senate. While working in the Pennsylvania Senate, she was asked by her supervisor if she was interested in working on my father’s transition team after he was elected Governor of Pennsylvania in 1986. This transition job offer was supposed to be temporary, but Bonnie would spend the next 30 years working in State government for both then-Governor Casey and then me, when I got to State government years later.

She worked as the Governor’s executive assistant for 8 years, and of course she wore many hats, managing the Governor’s staff, scheduling events, and resolving constituent issues, but her most important role was providing support to the Governor. Her dedication and loyalty earned her the respect of her fellow employees in the Governor’s office as well as those she worked with outside of the office.

After working in Governor Casey's administration, Bonnie worked as well with my father on his autobiography entitled "Fighting for Life." In his book he pays tribute to her as follows:

I could never have made it through this project without my executive assistant, Bonnie Seaman. It's hard to think of any work I have done these past ten years without Bonnie. Another theme of this book is loyalty, and few people have taught me more about the trait than Bonnie. I am deeply indebted to her for the skill and good spirit she brings to our work right up to this day.

That was written more than 20 years ago—just about 22 years ago. Of course, I can say the same thing about Bonnie's work in the U.S. Senate. In 1996, when I was elected the State's auditor general, Bonnie was vital to, first, my transition team. Then she served as the director of the Office of the Auditor General for 8 years, where she oversaw day-to-day operations of my schedule and the management of staff. When I was elected State treasurer in 2004, Bonnie began work with the Treasury Department. Then, finally, when I was elected in 2006 to the Senate, I asked Bonnie to serve as director of constituent services. I knew that her dedication to public service and compassion for others would make her an excellent director. She led the office of constituent services for 10 years with distinction. With her gold standard professionalism, and unimpeachable ethics, she was a mentor to her staff and served as a shining example of quality public service. Through her work, Bonnie has touched the lives of over 60,000 Pennsylvania constituents.

On behalf of my family, as well as thousands of families across our Commonwealth, I express our gratitude to Bonnie Seaman for more than three decades of stellar public service. The building we worked in, in Harrisburg, has this inscription on the front of it, the finance building: "All public service is a trust, given in faith and accepted in honor." Bonnie accepted the trust that was placed in her. She kept faith with taxpayers and brought honor to her work. I wish Bonnie well in her retirement as she travels with her husband Tom, attends yoga classes, and enjoys time with her family and friends.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

(The remarks of Mr. COTTON pertaining to the introduction of S. 1202 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. COTTON. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:31 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore, the Senator from Utah.

INTERNATIONAL DATA PRIVACY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss international data privacy. This is a critically important issue that has become all the more important over the years as we become more sophisticated. It has become all the more pressing in recent months as a result of court decisions impacting law enforcement's ability to access electronic communications overseas.

I don't think it would surprise anyone to hear me say that our privacy laws have not kept pace with technological developments. The primary statute that governs law enforcement's ability to access electronic data, the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, or ECPA, was enacted over 30 years ago—long before most people had even heard of email or the internet. ECPA was drafted in a world in which electronic data was stored on personal computers or on servers located in offices or homes. It presumes a world where data is in one location and where in order to access data, a person simply goes to the relevant location and retrieves it. But that is not the world we live in, at least not today. Nowadays, much of our data is stored not on home or office computers but in the cloud, a network of remote servers spread throughout the world that allows us to access data from literally anywhere.

The rise of cloud and remote network computing has transformed the way companies and individuals store data. No longer is data stored on sites or in one discrete location; rather, data pertaining to a single individual or even to a single document may be stored at multiple sites, spread across countries or even across continents. This has created all sorts of complications for our laws.

ECPA requires law enforcement to obtain a warrant before it can access many types of electronic communications. It also prohibits disclosure to foreign entities. Warrants, however, traditionally have stopped at the water's edge. A judge here in Washington can issue a warrant authorizing law enforcement to search an office here in Washington but cannot issue a

warrant for searches in London or Paris.

So what is law enforcement to do in a world of cloud computing where pieces of the same electronic document might be stored in Washington, London, and Paris?

One possibility is to say that as long as the data is accessible from the United States—that is, so long as you can retrieve it by logging on to a computer somewhere in the United States—that is all that matters; law enforcement can order its disclosure.

This sort of maximalist approach, however, brings with it a whole host of problems. To begin with, it pays scant attention to the laws and interests of other countries, including our closest allies. Other countries, it turns out, have data privacy laws of their own, and just like ECPA, sometimes these laws prohibit disclosure to foreign entities, including foreign law enforcement. So to say U.S. law enforcement can compel disclosure and data stored anywhere in the world so long as that data is accessible in the United States is really to say that U.S. law enforcement can override the laws of other countries.

More particularly, it is to say U.S. law enforcement can order individuals or companies that store data overseas to violate the privacy laws of other countries. This is unfair to service providers who may find themselves on the wrong side of the law no matter which side they choose and does little to help international relations. It also undermines trust, drives customers to foreign competitors, and undermines the privacy of U.S. citizens by emboldening other countries with less robust privacy regimes that similarly seek unlimited extra territorial access to data.

Another possibility is to say that if the data is stored in the United States, then law enforcement may access it, but if it is stored outside our borders, it is off limits.

This is essentially the current state of affairs following a decision last summer by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit that ECPA warrants do not reach data stored abroad. Under the Second Circuit's decision, U.S. law enforcement can use compulsory process to access data stored in the United States but must work through diplomatic channels to obtain data stored overseas.

This sort of domestic storage regime has the benefit of avoiding the conflict-of-laws problems I have just described, but it also has very real drawbacks.

To begin with, it impedes law enforcement's ability to solve and prevent crime in cases where the needed data is stored outside the United States, even when the creator of the data is an American, the service provider storing the data is an American, and the crime being investigated took place here in the United States. The

mere happenstance that the data is stored beyond our borders, even though it may constantly or instantly be accessed from within our borders, places it off limits. Service providers' varying business practices in moving and holding data determine whether an investigation moves forward.

This sort of domestic storage regime also forces U.S. law enforcement to work through diplomatic channels, which sometimes are slow and sometimes very cumbersome and in many instances less protective of privacy than U.S. criminal process, which requires a warrant from a neutral magistrate and a finding of probable cause.

The upshot is that neither of these regimes is satisfactory. A maximalist regime that extends U.S. law enforcement jurisdiction worldwide creates serious conflict-of-law problems and places U.S. service providers in impossible positions. A more modest domestic storage regime, by contrast, hinders law enforcement's ability to solve crime and protect us from harm, based solely on where a particular document or piece of data happens to be stored at a given moment in time.

What we need is a sensible regime with clear rules that determine access based on factors that actually matter to the person whose data is being sought. Privacy laws are meant to protect people, not abstractions. We ought not get bogged down with mindless formalism. Most people could care less whether their data is stored at site A or site B or country A or country B as long as it is easily accessible and has robust privacy protections.

At the same time, we need to take proper account of the laws and interests of other countries, especially our allies. We ought to avoid, where possible, trampling on other nations' sovereignty or ignoring their own citizens' legitimate claims to privacy, whether here in the United States or abroad.

For this reason, I believe the right approach to international data privacy is to ground the analysis on the location of the person whose data is being sought. It is, after all, the person who has rights and the person whose interests are devalued when data is obtained without proper process.

Accordingly, I have proposed legislation called the International Communications Privacy Act, or ICPA, that sets clear rules for when and how U.S. law enforcement can access electronic data based on the location and nationality of the person whose data is being sought. I intend to introduce an updated version of this legislation in the very near future.

Here is what the updated version of this legislation will say: If a person is a U.S. national or located in the United States, then law enforcement may compel disclosure no matter where the data is stored, provided the data is accessible from a U.S. computer and law

enforcement uses proper criminal process. If a person is not a U.S. national, however, and is not located in the United States, then different rules apply.

These rules are founded on three principles: respect, comity, and reciprocity.

First, respect. If U.S. law enforcement wishes to access data belonging to a non-U.S. national located outside the United States, then law enforcement must notify the person's country of citizenship and provide that country an opportunity to object to the disclosure. This protocol shows respect to the other country and gives the country an opportunity to assert the privacy rights of its citizen.

Second, comity. If, after receiving notice, the other country lodges an objection, the U.S. court undertakes a comity analysis to determine whose interests should rightfully prevail—the U.S. interests in obtaining the data or the foreign interests in preventing disclosure. As part of this analysis, the court can consider such factors as the location of the crime, the seriousness of the crime, the importance of the data to the investigation, and the possibility of accessing the data through other means. This analysis prevents an obstinate foreign power from impeding investigations without good reason or where the U.S. interests in disclosure are particularly strong.

Third, reciprocity. In order to receive notice and an opportunity to object, the other country must provide reciprocal notice-and-objection rights to the United States. The country must also provide robust privacy protections within its own borders and satisfy international human rights standards. These requirements ensure that the U.S. provides its own citizens an equal or greater level of protection against foreign requests for data. They also offer incentives to foreign governments to properly safeguard the data of U.S. citizens within their jurisdiction.

Tomorrow, the Senate Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism will hold a hearing on law enforcement access to data stored abroad. That hearing, I hope, will elucidate many of the principles I just described.

Soon after the hearing, I will reintroduce the International Communications Privacy Act. The bill as reintroduced will incorporate feedback from law enforcement and privacy groups. I intend to push very hard for this legislation and will seek every opportunity to do so. I want my colleagues to know that I will be pursuing any and all legislative vehicles to get it across the finish line.

In the words of Utah businessman Jeff Hadfield, writing in the *Deseret News*, "It's imperative that Congress quickly address the ambiguity within our current law. As every company be-

comes a software company, we need legislation that supports our companies' ability to store data overseas, protects our individual privacy rights, and helps U.S. law enforcement do its important job." I could not agree more.

The International Communications Privacy Act provides critical guidance to law enforcement, while respecting the laws and interests of our allies. It brings a set of simple, straightforward rules to a chaotic area of law and creates an example for other countries to follow. It is a balanced approach and a smart approach, and it deserves this body's full support.

Mr. President, on another matter, I wish to register my strong support today for the confirmation of John Sullivan to be Deputy Secretary of State.

The nomination of John Sullivan is another example of President Trump choosing the best and brightest for national security positions in his administration.

I have known John Sullivan since he was confirmed as Deputy Secretary of Commerce during the George Bush administration. He excelled in this position, which bears many similarities to the Deputy Secretary of State role to which he has been nominated.

For example, as Deputy Secretary of Commerce, John was responsible for the day-to-day operations and management of a major Federal agency. As Deputy Secretary of State, he will assume the same managerial duties, but for a different Federal agency.

In facilitating international trade agreements at the Department of Commerce, John Sullivan also honed his negotiating abilities, developing a diplomatic skill set that will be critical in his new role at the State Department.

As the chairman of the Finance Committee, I closely followed John's tenure at Commerce. I was consistently impressed with his ability to promote American interests abroad while maintaining constructive relations with our trading partners. I have no doubt that he will continue to serve our Nation well as the Deputy Secretary of State.

In addition to his management expertise, John Sullivan is a practicing attorney with the law firm of Mayer Brown LLP. There, too, he has developed a reputation for excellence, especially in the area of national security law.

In John Sullivan we have a proven manager, a seasoned diplomat, and a sharp policy mind who will bring strong leadership to the State Department. In John Sullivan, President Trump and Secretary Tillerson have made an inspired choice.

Secretary Tillerson is doing a tremendous job at the State Department. With John Sullivan as his Deputy, even more can be accomplished.

In addition, I would like to thank John Sullivan for his willingness to serve. Of course, I would be remiss if I

did not also thank his family—especially his wife of 29 years, Grace Rodriguez, who has provided invaluable support to John throughout his public service. It is unlikely John would be here today without their consent and their constant support.

Few have the skills that John Sullivan possesses. Fewer still possess the patriotism, professionalism, and integrity he has displayed over a distinguished career. He is the best man for the job, which is why I urge my colleagues to confirm him without delay.

I appreciate this opportunity to make these points on the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, today many of my colleagues will come to the floor to speak about the devastating impact that TrumpCare will have on rural communities. I rise to join them in speaking on this topic and on the many other serious flaws in the Republicans' bill to replace ObamaCare.

When he was elected, President Trump promised he would provide healthcare for everyone, but President Trump and our Republican friends have turned their backs on that promise. The Republican healthcare proposal would put insurance companies back in the driver's seat, and that means less quality and more costs for all of us. Rural communities, working families, and people with medical conditions would be hit the hardest.

Today, we got a taste of how devastating TrumpCare would be. The President's budget proposal slashes billions of dollars for Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program. President Trump takes direct aim at bipartisan programs that have made historic progress for kids, for the disabled, and for the elderly.

Former Senator Hubert Humphrey once said: "The moral test of government is how it treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the aged; and those in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy and the handicapped."

When Senator Humphrey spoke those words, he had been diagnosed with terminal cancer. He died a few months later. His words are just as meaningful today.

TrumpCare fails Senator Humphrey's moral test. It doesn't cover more people or more services or improve healthcare. It raises costs and reduces quality. Compared to the ACA—or ObamaCare—TrumpCare would be a disaster for families in my home State.

In New Mexico, tens of thousands of people have healthcare, thanks to ObamaCare and the Medicaid expansion. Before the Affordable Care Act, New Mexico had one of the highest

rates of uninsured in the country. It was almost 20 percent, at 19.6 percent. That rate has been cut in half to 8.9 percent.

Approximately 300,000 more New Mexicans now have healthcare. And each one of these 300,000 people has a story about how having healthcare has made a difference—even saved lives.

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, hundreds of thousands of New Mexicans now have essential health benefits, including doctor visits, hospital care, prescription drugs, pregnancy and childbirth, and mental health services, and a range of preventive services, like mammograms and other cancer screenings, are available at no cost.

I am not saying that the ACA is perfect. Premiums are still too high, deductibles are increasing too much, and we still must bring down the cost of prescription drugs. We absolutely need to work to bring down costs. But, on balance, the Affordable Care Act passes all tests—many with flying colors. TrumpCare does not come close. TrumpCare gets an F.

Test No. 1: Does TrumpCare increase the number of Americans who will have healthcare? No, it decreases coverage and decreases it dramatically.

According to the most recent figures from the CBO, 24 million Americans will lose healthcare coverage under TrumpCare over the next decade. TrumpCare would dismantle the Medicaid expansion provisions that help so many working Americans, including 265,000 people in New Mexico, and TrumpCare would hit rural communities the hardest.

The National Rural Health Association has said that TrumpCare "does nothing to improve the health care crisis in rural America, and will lead to poorer rural health outcomes, more uninsured and an increase in the rural hospital closure crisis."

Rural areas like the ones we have in New Mexico have more elderly and disabled people, and fewer people have insurance through their jobs. TrumpCare is the hardest on these groups.

Rural hospitals are already struggling. They will have an even harder time keeping their doors open.

Many New Mexicans would have to drive an hour or more if their local hospital closed. And not only would closed hospitals mean less access to healthcare, it would also hurt the economy. In rural areas, hospitals are a big employer. If they close, the rural economy takes a hit too.

The administrator of the Guadalupe County Hospital in New Mexico, a fine woman by the name of Christina Campos, fears what might happen if TrumpCare becomes law. She is urging me to protect access to care in rural areas.

Guadalupe County is one of our smallest counties by population. The hospital's uninsured payer rate de-

clined from 14 percent to 4 percent from 2014 to 2016, thanks to the Affordable Care Act, and its uncompensated care increased 23 percent in that same period.

I can tell my colleagues that I will fight tooth and nail to keep residents in our rural areas insured and to keep rural hospitals in New Mexico open.

Test No. 2: Does TrumpCare increase coverage of healthcare services? No, it fails this test too. Under the ACA, insurance companies must cover essential healthcare services, period. But under TrumpCare, starting in 2020, States can get a waiver and define their own essential benefits for individual and small group plans. So States would be able to cut the benefits that people count on—and that are making patients healthier.

Test No. 3: Does TrumpCare make healthcare more affordable? It doesn't. It takes aim at the most vulnerable working and low-income families and seniors—the people most in need of care—and it cuts access to healthcare out from under them. If you are older and poorer, you lose big under TrumpCare. If you are young and wealthy, you win.

What is wrong with this picture? What is wrong is that it is unjust. And it is bad for healthcare costs over the long run. Trump and the Republicans are proposing drastic changes to our healthcare system—and they are changes for the worse. They want to go backward to a time when insurance companies could decide who gets healthcare and who doesn't.

Finally, TrumpCare would hurt anyone with a preexisting condition. One of the most popular provisions of ObamaCare is that it prohibits insurance companies from dropping you if you get sick and from refusing to cover you because of a preexisting condition. A preexisting condition could be something serious like cancer, but insurance companies have considered everything from childbirth to hand warts a preexisting condition.

Under TrumpCare, States would be able to decide whether to get a waiver from those patient protections. And then we would go back to that time when insurance companies decided who could get healthcare and who couldn't. States would have to set up high-risk pools to provide people with the option of insurance in catastrophic situations. But in the best cases, high-risk pools wouldn't protect many people from going bankrupt just to get healthcare, and TrumpCare wouldn't provide nearly enough funding for States to run them successfully.

Take Alexis from Albuquerque. Alexis is here in the photograph with her husband. Alexis had a stroke and brain surgeries when she was 28 years old. Even though she had no lingering effects, she was denied insurance in the private market and had to get insurance in New Mexico's high-risk pool.

According to Alexis, "It broke us financially." Alexis now has affordable health insurance with the help of the Affordable Care Act subsidies. Like most people, she doesn't want to risk going broke just to get healthcare. She shouldn't have to.

Finally, I want to tell you about a 1-year-old from Albuquerque, NM, whose name is Rafe. Rafe was born with cortical visual impairment—a kind of legal blindness—and significant developmental delays. His parents—Jessica, his mom, and his father, Sam, a veteran—have been able to access the intensive medical care, early intervention services, medical equipment, and therapy he needs through a combination of the military's insurance and Medicaid. But TrumpCare jeopardizes Medicaid by turning it into a block grant for States, which will most certainly result in deep cuts to Medicaid. It threatens Rafe's chances of a better life.

The President promised he would keep protections for people with pre-existing conditions—people who are sick. His broken promises can hurt tens of millions of Americans.

In the end, TrumpCare is not a real healthcare bill. It is a tax relief bill for the richest 1 percent. The CBO estimates that TrumpCare would cut taxes by \$346 billion over 10 years, at the expense of the healthcare of working families and seniors.

Our priorities for healthcare reform should be increasing coverage, increasing the services provided, making people healthier, and providing affordable healthcare. I strongly and unequivocally support all Americans having healthcare.

Let's get to that goal, and let's get to that goal now. Ninety-one percent of the American people are insured, thanks to the steps taken under the Affordable Care Act. Rather than repealing it, let's build on its strengths so 100 percent of people can afford to see a doctor when they are sick. We can do this. We can do better. Let's ensure that Americans in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the aged; and those in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the disabled, have the right to healthcare so that America meets the moral test of good governance.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if there is one thing that has become clear, it is that the ObamaCare status quo is not sustainable.

Prices continue to soar while choices are rapidly dwindling. Between 2016 and 2017, the average premium for a midlevel ObamaCare plan on the Federal exchange went up 25 percent—25 percent for just 1 year. Let's remember that this is on top of years—year after year—of premium increases under ObamaCare.

How many families can easily absorb a 25-percent premium increase? I would submit that not many. Again, that is just for 1 year. ObamaCare rate hikes aren't going anywhere. Numbers for next year are starting to emerge, and they are not looking good. Connecticut's ObamaCare insurers are requesting average premium increases in the double digits. One Connecticut insurer has requested an average rate hike of 33.8 percent—33.8 percent. In Virginia, one insurer has requested an average rate increase of 38 percent. Another has requested an average 45-percent rate hike. In Maryland, average increases range anywhere from 18 percent to almost 59 percent. One insurer has requested a staggering 150-percent rate increase—150 percent.

Obviously, these kinds of price increases are unaffordable for most families, but ObamaCare isn't leaving them any options. Along with soaring prices, choices on the exchanges are rapidly dwindling. Roughly one-third of U.S. counties have just one choice of health insurer on their exchange for 2017. Several States—including Alabama, Oklahoma, Alaska, and Wyoming—have just one choice of insurer for their entire State, and things are only getting worse.

In 2018, a number of counties may lack an ObamaCare insurer at all. In February, health insurer Humana announced its decision to completely withdraw from the ObamaCare exchanges for 2018, and 2 weeks ago, Aetna, which had already sharply reduced its participation in the exchanges for 2017, announced its decision to fully exit and completely get out of the market in 2018. That leaves the Nebraska and Delaware ObamaCare exchanges with just one insurer for 2018.

UnitedHealthcare is leaving Virginia, and Wellmark Blue Cross Blue Shield is withdrawing from Iowa. In the wake of Aetna and Wellmark's decision, Medica, the last ObamaCare insurer for most of Iowa, announced it will likely leave the State in 2018. That would leave 94 out of 99 counties in Iowa with no ObamaCare insurer next year—all but five counties in the State of Iowa with no ObamaCare insurer. Iowa families with ObamaCare subsidies would have no place to spend them. As my colleague Senator ALEXANDER likes to point out, that is like having a bus ticket in a town where there are no buses running.

Dwindling healthcare choices aren't limited to the ObamaCare exchanges,

either. Aetna is not only withdrawing from the exchanges. It is also withdrawing from the non-ObamaCare individual health insurance markets in several States. More than one insurance CEO has suggested that ObamaCare is in a death spiral, and I would have to say it is pretty hard to disagree. Combine soaring premiums with a steady insurer exodus, and sooner or later you get a partial or complete exchange collapse.

Then there are the other ObamaCare problems—like deductibles which are sometimes so high people can't afford to actually use their healthcare plans; or, narrow plan networks with few provider choices.

ObamaCare may have been well-intentioned, but good intentions don't make up for a lack of good policy—and ObamaCare was not good policy. ObamaCare took a healthcare system with problems and it made things worse. It is time to repeal this fatally flawed law and replace it with real healthcare reform.

Three weeks ago, the House of Representatives passed an ObamaCare repeal and replacement bill. The House's legislation repeals ObamaCare's tax increases, penalties, and mandates, and starts the process of restoring control of healthcare to States and individuals. My colleagues in the House have made a good start, and I am looking forward to building on their bill here in the United States Senate. We have a lot of Members with good healthcare ideas, and we are going to work hard to produce a bill that will start the process of giving the American people real healthcare reform.

ObamaCare is failing, and it is failing rapidly. Our Democrat colleagues need to stop pretending this law is ever going to do what it was supposed to do and come to the table to work with us on real healthcare reform. There is no question our healthcare system has problems, but ObamaCare is not, and it never has been, the solution.

Real reform is possible, though, and that is what we are focused on now here in the United States Senate—the kind of reform that will actually drive down prices, that will put patients and their doctors—not the government—in charge of healthcare decisions, that will empower States to embrace the solutions that are right for the citizens in their States and will give Americans more choices and real healthcare freedom.

That is the kind of healthcare reform Republicans are committed to delivering for the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICAID

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about the President's proposed budget as it relates to Medicaid and the fact that it is just a war on Medicaid; that is, it continues the wrongheaded ideas that have been proposed in the House bill on healthcare reform and takes that and continues to make cuts to Medicaid that are unsustainable for our healthcare system.

The President's budget would impose a block grant or per capita cap on States in 2020 in exchange for so-called flexibility. I haven't met one State administrator of healthcare in our State who says they need more flexibility. They have a lot of flexibility on Medicaid currently, but they know this is just a budget cap and a budget cut.

The budget would result in \$610 billion in cuts to States, in addition to what would happen if they were successful in passing the House bill in the Senate. As the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities put it, the Trump budget cuts Medicaid "considerably more deeply than the House bill's per capita cap proposal would do."

No doubt what the budget is proposing from the President today and what our House colleagues have proposed on healthcare means more damage for healthcare and more damage for Medicaid.

Let's be more specific. Medicaid for healthcare is about children. It is about seniors. It is about the disabled. It is about working families. It is about young people. Medicaid covers half of the births and the majority of long-term care stays.

What people may not realize is that the President's budget cut to Medicaid also cuts children's healthcare, as a new study reveals, by at least \$43 billion, according to Avalere Health. That is taking healthcare away from children, poor children, who need access to healthcare. Additionally, the budget impacts 1.75 million veterans who also get healthcare through Medicaid.

How can we possibly be standing here with a budget proposal by the President of the United States—after he promised not to cut Medicaid—that not only proposes to cut Medicaid but cuts children's and veterans' healthcare when they need it most?

Medicaid is a lifeline for people who can't get covered or can't get a fair deal. It is a highly cost-effective, dynamic, and innovative program that has worked well, and Medicaid is a winning economic strategy for how to help families get out of poverty. It is one of the most successful anti-poverty programs in the United States and the second largest program to combat extreme poverty.

Its expansion in Washington has helped create jobs indirectly and di-

rectly and has saved our State about \$353 million in our State budget. It injects billions into the economy and supports our high-wage, high-skill jobs throughout the healthcare economy.

As we know, our colleagues, in the House draconian healthcare act, would for the first time cut Medicaid's successful program by introducing a cap that would result in reductions every year to the Medicaid Program. Regardless of who needs access, regardless of those children, regardless of those veterans, it would continue to push down Medicaid funds by more each year.

I have said to my colleagues in the House that there are far more innovative ways to help our healthcare delivery system that are cost-effective, but simply cutting veterans or families or children off of Medicaid is not the way to do it.

The President's budget released today would reinforce this permanent cap. Currently, Medicaid is a needs-based partnership between the States and the Federal Government. During economic recessions, natural disasters, or public health emergencies, States know they can count on the Federal Government.

Under what has been proposed in the House, the per capita cap would give States only a fixed amount and start reducing the amount of money each year. It would leave a tsunami of seniors and others without new technologies, prescription drugs, or tools to address new healthcare threats.

There is nothing about it that is reform. It is not innovation. It is simply a budget mechanism to cut Medicaid. I don't know how the President, given that he promised before not to cut Medicaid could do this. He said: "I was the first & only potential GOP candidate to state there will be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare & Medicaid."

If that is what the President tweeted, if that is what he said he was going to do, why is he now proposing a budget that actually cuts Medicaid?

We do not want to throw 600,000 Medicaid beneficiaries off of coverage in my State—and 14 million across the country—and take \$1.4 billion out of Washington State's economy every year. These are numbers according to the Congressional Budget Office's most recent estimates and estimates by the State of Washington.

I think it is time to say no to the President's budget proposal. It is time to remind the President of his promise not to cut Medicaid, and it is time to stop talking about the silly idea of capping Medicaid and reducing funding to the States.

I mentioned the impact on children and veterans. I also want to mention the impact on those suffering from the opioid epidemic and what we have been trying to do to treat those individuals. Also, those facilities would be in great danger in continuing to treat that population if they don't have Medicaid.

So the notion that this is a smart healthcare strategy or a smart healthcare budget—it is not. It is a draconian measure that is going to leave many more Americans without healthcare. As I said, Medicaid is a successful program. The promise should be kept, and we should continue to improve the delivery system as a way to make it more cost-effective. I know we can't afford to leave sick children without access to healthcare, and now is not the time to leave veterans without the healthcare they deserve.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the healthcare bill the House of Representatives passed and is currently being considered behind closed doors by my Republican colleagues.

I travel around greater Minnesota all the time, and when the Republicans' healthcare plan first came out, I traveled to rural Minnesota to meet with rural hospitals, nursing home providers, and constituents to hear how this bill would impact their lives and communities. They are upset and they are frankly scared.

In Perham, MN, I heard from a woman who was in tears, not knowing where her mother would go if the Republican plan passed and she lost her nursing home coverage. This woman and her husband work full time, but together they cannot afford the around-the-clock care her mother needs.

Later, at a nursing home in Moorhead—that is in Minnesota across the river from Fargo—I also heard from a resident, Chrysann, who said this new plan wasn't about taking care of people but about "survival of the fittest." The hospitals and nursing home administrators I met with said the financial blow they would receive would cause them to cut services and in some cases even close their doors.

What I heard, and the real panic that I saw, is a far cry from what President Trump promised this past January when he said: "We're going to have insurance for everybody." He went on to say it would be "much less expensive and much better."

Versions of these promises keep coming from President Trump, his Cabinet, and from his allies in Congress—coverage for more people, at lower costs, with better quality. Those things all sound great, things that might help

people like Chrysann, but the fact is, the Republican bill does the exact opposite. It takes coverage away from people, it drives up costs, and it makes coverage worse. In other words, the GOP is selling this healthcare bill on false pretenses.

Today I would like to explain how the Republican bill betrays each one of these three fundamental promises, and let's take them one by one. We can start by the number of people who will be covered. President Trump promised that everyone would have insurance, but an analysis of an earlier version of the healthcare bill—the first iteration of this, which is actually not as bad as this one—an earlier version analysis conducted by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office found that under current law the House Republican plan would leave 24 million fewer people with health insurance by 2026. That means by 2026, nearly 1 in 5 Americans under the age of 65 would be uninsured, compared to just over 1 in 10 today.

One particular way the Republican bill cuts coverage is by gutting Medicaid, a program that covers more than 60 percent of all nursing home residents nationwide, covers kids with disabilities, and benefits nearly 70 million Americans. The Republican plan ends Medicaid expansion. It fundamentally undermines the structure of the Medicaid Program and cuts the program's budget by as much as one-quarter over 10 years, a more than \$800 billion cut.

On May 7, journalist Jake Tapper of CNN asked Health and Human Services Secretary Tom Price whether the hundreds of billions of proposed cuts would result in millions of Americans not getting Medicaid. Secretary Price responded: "Absolutely not." Well, that is absolutely false. When I say "absolutely," I mean that literally.

It doesn't take an expert to know that if you take funding away from this program, which provides health coverage for millions of Americans, the program will suffer, and the human beings who rely on Medicaid will suffer as well. Specifically, according to the Congressional Budget Office, 14 million of those 24 million people who will lose coverage under the Republican bill would lose their health insurance because of cuts to Medicaid. "Absolutely not," says the Secretary of HHS.

It is bad enough to push a bill that will take away care from millions who need it; it is extra galling to be so fundamentally dishonest about it in the process. Look, the Affordable Care Act is far from perfect and we have problems that need to be fixed, but let's step back and review how far we have come because of the ACA. Since it came into effect, about 20 million Americans have gained health insurance coverage, producing the lowest uninsured rate in the history of this country.

In Minnesota, the number of uninsured dropped by nearly half, with peo-

ple in rural areas seeing the largest gain in coverage. As a result, we have eliminated the gap in coverage between rural and urban Minnesotans. These coverage gains have increased access to vital health services, including access to treatment for mental illness and substance use disorders, but the Republican healthcare plan throws all of these gains into jeopardy, which is particularly troubling given that the country is still in the midst of battling a devastating opioid and heroin epidemic. Researchers estimate that 2.8 million Americans with substance use disorders will lose some or all of their insurance coverage under the ACA repeal.

Let's be clear. People will lose coverage as a result of the proposed Medicaid cuts; people will lose coverage because of the proposed insurance reforms; and tens of millions of more people will be uninsured and without care in the Republican plan than under current law.

Let's move on to the second point; the assertion that is repeated constantly by President Trump and by others that their bill brings down costs. In his Rose Garden celebration after the Republican health care bill passed the House—not after signing it into law but sort of an unprecedented Rose Garden celebration after merely the House passed the bill—President Trump said: "As far as I am concerned your premiums they are going to start to come down."

When Secretary Price was asked, again by Jake Tapper, if he stands by the President's statement, he responded: "Absolutely."

On an earlier date, Secretary Price actually said: "Nobody will be worse off financially" under the Republican plan.

This is just blatantly wrong. Republicans are actively sabotaging the individual market, needlessly driving up premiums in the short term, and in the long term what they are doing will result in exorbitant premium hikes for older, sicker people—so much so that CBO estimates some will eventually drop out of the market altogether.

Let me explain. For years, Republicans have taken deliberate steps to sabotage the individual market. First, Senator RUBIO ran through a last-minute change to the 2015 spending bill that undercut the Risk Corridor Program. The Risk Corridor Program, which was modeled after a similar program in the Medicare Part D Program, was included as part of the ACA to offset high costs incurred by insurers as they took on new enrollees in the early years of the ACA.

Here is how it worked. The Federal Government would make payments to health plans that enrolled a group of people who were sicker than expected and had higher healthcare costs than the insurer predicted when it set its

premiums. On the flip side, the Federal Government would receive payments from health plans that enrolled a group of people who were healthier than expected and needed less care. By limiting losses incurred by insurers, the Risk Corridor Program was designed to help make premiums more affordable for individuals and families who bought coverage on the exchange. Senator RUBIO's provision undercut all of this. It severely curtailed the payments that could be made under the Risk Corridor Program, which meant that premiums soared and health insurers left the market.

For example, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Minnesota lost about \$220 million between 2014 and 2016 under the weakened Risk Corridor Program, which the CEO told me in a meeting late last spring was a huge setback for the company. I was dismayed but not surprised when I heard, shortly after our meeting, that the company was leaving the individual market, which affected coverage for more than 100,000 Minnesotans and contributed to average premium increases of 36 to 67 percent in Minnesota's individual market in 2017.

Insurers across the country faced similar destabilizing losses, but that is not all. On top of that, for months, President Trump has been doing his part to sow uncertainty by repeatedly arguing that the individual market is in a death spiral. For example, on May 4, in response to Aetna's exit from the individual market in Virginia in 2018, President Trump shouted on Twitter: "Death spiral!" This is similar to his post on March 13 in which he said: "ObamaCare is imploding. It's a disaster and 2017 will be the worst year yet, by far!" But he is wrong.

Even the CBO noted in one of its scores that barring any significant changes, the individual market would probably be stable in most areas. This confirms what other research has found, which is that this year markets were starting to stabilize, which led Standard & Poor's to issue a report last December predicting that 2017 could see "continued improvement, with more insurers getting close to breakeven or better."

But this didn't faze President Trump or any of the Republicans. Instead, they seem to have used these reports as a guidebook on what changes are necessary to actually cause the individual market to collapse. For example, President Trump has been playing games with payments that are due to insurance companies that reduce out-of-pocket costs for working families. On numerous occasions, he has threatened to stop these payments altogether, but in practice, he has been holding these payments hostage on a month-to-month basis to push forward other insidious reforms. Just yesterday, his administration announced

that it would seek another short-term delay in the House's lawsuit, which aims to stop these payments permanently. These games are driving up the premiums for families and rattling health insurance markets.

Lastly, the administration has stopped enforcing the individual mandate. As a result, we are seeing enrollment in the individual markets stall for the first time since 2010, and if this results in younger, healthier people dropping their coverage, we could see prices rise dramatically for those left behind.

That is right. President Trump and the Republicans are actively attacking the insurance markets, causing premiums to go up. So if these markets falter and consumers suffer, it is because of what Republicans are doing right now and have been doing for years to undermine the individual market.

Still, you will often hear Republicans talk about the need to reduce costs. They even claim that their proposed healthcare plan would lower premiums in the long run. For millions of Americans, that is not true, but the reasons why it is untrue are slightly complicated. It goes to the CBO report for the Republican healthcare plan.

The March 13 CBO score says that average premiums for single people in the individual market would be 15 to 20 percent higher than under current law—than under the current ACA—in the first 2 years of its implementation. But it does say that they would be roughly 10 percent lower in 2026 under the House bill than they would be under current law.

At first blush, this sounds like prices would be coming down for people, right? That is certainly what the Republican leadership wants you to think. That day, House Speaker RYAN stated: "This report confirms that the American Health Care Act will lower premiums and improve access to quality, affordable care." House Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY got more specific. He said: "After 10 years, premiums will be 10 percent lower than under ObamaCare." But Speaker RYAN and Majority Leader MCCARTHY are being deliberately misleading. One of the reasons that average costs go down is that the price for some people would go up so much that they couldn't afford any insurance at all. If the people facing the most expensive insurance simply dropped out of the market, sure, average costs go down.

Here is how this works: Under the Republican plan, insurers would be able to charge older enrollees five times more than younger ones, which would dramatically increase premiums for people aged 50 to 64 years old while decreasing premiums for younger people. Meanwhile, the tax credits that help older Americans afford their premiums would be drastically slashed. The re-

sult is that, especially for older people of modest means, coverage would become unaffordable, so they disappear from the market. If only younger, healthier people can buy insurance, average premiums go down, but you have actually made the system much worse and much more expensive for the people who really need it.

But that is not all. The Republican plan would also allow States to waive crucial protections for patients with preexisting conditions, which means that in those States, we could go back to something like the old days when insurance companies could charge people with preexisting conditions much more—potentially as much as \$25,000 more for their coverage, as estimated by the AARP.

Republicans are quick to point out that their bill maintains a requirement that insurance companies have to offer plans to everyone, but it abandons the principle that the plans must be affordable, and an unaffordable plan does people about as much good as no plan at all.

If you are young, if you have no preexisting condition, it might be true that your premiums will go down under the Republican plan. But for millions of Americans, though, if the Republican bill passes, insurance costs are going to go up. For many people, they will go up so high that they will be out of reach.

That brings me to the third claim the Republicans are peddling—that their plan will result in higher quality coverage. In fact, Republicans want to open the door to junk insurance.

In defending the House Republican plan, Secretary Price recently stated that the plan allows "for every single person to get the access to the kind of coverage that they want." We have heard this before. This is a code for allowing insurers to offer garbage insurance plans that offer skimpy benefit packages and impose much higher deductibles and cost sharing on consumers.

Under the Affordable Care Act, you cannot sell junk plans on the insurance exchanges. Plans have to cover the essential health benefits. This is key. Under the ACA, plans have to cover the essential health benefits—10 key categories of benefits such as prescription drugs, maternity care, and mental health services. On top of that, the law prohibits insurers from imposing annual or lifetime limits on these essential health benefits. The goal is to make sure that when people get sick or if they have a preexisting condition, they don't go broke getting the care they need because of fine print in their health insurance plan.

The Republican bill would allow States to eliminate these essential health benefits. Consumers would be left with plans that leave them up a creek if they actually get sick. And

plans for people who are sick—the price of those plans will go sky high. No one would call that "better care," which is why Republicans aren't really being straight about it. What they call "flexibility" is actually just the removal of consumer protections.

To review, the Republican plan covers fewer people, costs too many people more—in many cases, much, much more—and provides worse coverage, and it is being sold by misleading people on each of these points.

It is not as though there aren't ways to cover more people, reduce costs, and provide better coverage. You could do a public option, for example. You could reduce prescription drug costs—an issue on which I recently introduced a comprehensive bill. You could improve coverage by increasing the number of healthcare providers in rural areas, as I proposed last year in my rural health bill. But the Republican plan does none of these things, which raises the question: What does it do? Why would anyone take the time to propose such a terrible bill? The answer is this: It gives a giant tax cut to the wealthy. That is the real point of this bill. It is not a healthcare bill; it is a "take healthcare away from people who need it and use the money to give a tax break to the rich" bill.

As Chrysann in Moorhead, MN, said, it is about "survival of the fittest."

The average tax savings for the 400 richest Americans under the Republican plan is \$7 million each—again, \$7 million each. For households earning \$1 million or more a year, it is more than \$50,000 apiece, each year. But for households earning \$50,000 a year, which is about the median income in the United States, the tax cut is next to nothing, or you could even face a tax increase. There are tax cuts specifically for insurance company CEOs. There are tax cuts specifically for drug companies. There is nothing comparable for the middle class. And all of those tax cuts are paid for by cutting healthcare programs that keep people alive, by cutting off funding that lets seniors age with dignity, and by cutting services for kids with disabilities.

This bill would take us back in time and roll back our progress. It is up to us here in the Senate to stop that from happening. This bill is literally sickening. It is vicious, it is cruel, and it should never be passed into law. I urge my Republican colleagues to walk away from this cruel effort and work with us to actually improve healthcare for Americans. And I urge everyone considering this bill to be straight with the American people about exactly what it is that this bill will do to them.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, obviously, a big problem before the country right now is, What do we do about rising healthcare premiums?

What we know under the Affordable Care Act—or the un-Affordable Care Act—or ObamaCare, as some call it, is that premiums are rising more and more. One of President Trump's campaign pledges was that premiums would come down and, actually, come down with, as he said in one place, beautiful coverage—that it is actually good coverage and premiums are lower. So let's kind of set the stage.

I just got a message on my Facebook page. I will read it. By the way, anybody can post on our Facebook page these sorts of stories, if they are interested in them.

Brian from Louisiana sent a message saying: My family plan is \$1700 a month for me, my wife, and two children—so roughly about \$20,000 a year. The ACA, or the Affordable Care Act, has brought me to my knees. I hope you can get something done as my credit cards are all maxed out. And 80 percent of my friends are in the same situation. The middle class is dwindling away. Can everyone just come together and figure this out?

Think about this: \$1,700 a month. He did not write this, but what would be standard for this sort of policy is a \$13,000 family deductible.

I say that because I have an acquaintance in San Francisco. San Francisco is so expensive for housing, transportation, and food, and the premium for their young family is \$20,000 a year, with each family member with their own separate \$6,000 deductible. This is under the un-Affordable Care Act, as I call it, or the Affordable Care Act, as others do.

A friend of mine back in Baton Rouge, whom I have quoted many times, put this on my Facebook page because people would not believe it: He and his wife, 60 and 61, their quote for their insurance last year was \$39,000. Their quote for their insurance was \$39,000.

Then I spoke to a fellow who is an insurance consultant here in Washington, DC—an insurance consultant. If anyone can get their premiums down, it would be he. For his family, their premium is \$24,000 a year with a \$13,000 family deductible. If they get in a car wreck, their family will be out \$37,000 before the insurance kicks in. Who can afford this? We must do something better.

When President Trump ran for office, President Trump clearly recognized this. On the campaign trail, he said over and over that he wished to lower

premiums. It is the President's genius, if you will, that he knew how to do so. You do so by expanding the risk pool. He said he wanted to continue coverage for all.

He gets away from the ObamaCare mandates, which people hate. The American people don't like being told what to do.

He also said he would care for those with preexisting conditions. This is how it works. When you cover many, you have a bigger risk pool. Those with preexisting conditions have the cost of their illness spread out over the many. So premiums come down for all.

My hat is off to the President for coming up with that. In fact, 5 days before he was sworn in, he echoed this, because one way to lower premiums is to give poor coverage. One way to lower premiums is to give folks such terrible coverage that it doesn't cost anything. On the other hand, it doesn't cover anything. The President seems to know this.

Five days before he was inaugurated, he said to the Washington Post about people covered under his replacement for ObamaCare:

[They] can expect to have great healthcare. It will be in a much simplified form. Much less expensive and much better.

We're going to have insurance for everybody. There was a philosophy in some circles that if you can't pay for it, you don't get it. That's not going to happen with us.

I am a physician, a doctor. Again, I admire President Trump's insights. As a physician, I know that whoever wants healthcare gets healthcare. Twenty or so years ago, Congress said that if you walk into an emergency room, the emergency room has to take care of you. It doesn't matter if you are an American citizen. It doesn't matter how much it costs. The hospital has to take care of you.

I told folks when I was practicing—it would be the middle of the night—that as long as that emergency room was open—and it was open 24/7—in through the door came folks vomiting blood, heart failure patients, folks with drug overdoses, schizophrenics, diabetics, asthmatics—you name it. They came through that door, and we cared for them all—and somebody paid.

President Trump understands that even if you say you can't afford it, everybody is going to be treated. That is our current system, and that is not going to happen under his watch.

We mentioned that one way to lower premiums is to give poor coverage. I think everyone knows, or many people know, of Mr. Kimmel, the late night comedian who pointed out that when his child was born, instead of celebrating and handing the baby to the mother so the mother could kiss and the father, Mr. Kimmel, could cuddle the baby, the nurses and the doctors looked at the baby and immediately recognized that something was wrong.

They recognized that this child was blue. He didn't have oxygen, and if something wasn't done immediately, this child would die.

Folks criticized Mr. Kimmel for being emotional. I totally get it. Instead of cuddling, you are signing a release waiver so your child can be transferred across the city of Los Angeles for emergency surgery. In his emotion, he asked that all children—and I would expand to all Americans—have the ability to get that sort of emergency care done.

Again, the President was about that. I came up with what I called the Kimmel test. Again, it echoes President Trump's contract with the American voter—that we would protect those with preexisting conditions, that we lower premiums, but as we lower premiums, we make sure that the coverage is adequate.

The Kimmel test, making sure there is adequate coverage while lowering premiums and caring for those with preexisting conditions, is so compatible with what President Trump said, because Americans need lower premiums.

Let me echo that one more time. We need to lower premiums. The President's approach, the contract he made with the voters on the campaign trail, is the right approach. You get a bigger risk pool, lots of younger people, so those who are older and sicker have the cost of their care spread out among the many.

We have a plan, the Cassidy-Collins plan, or the Patient Freedom Act, which I introduced with Senator SUSAN COLLINS and four other Senators. We have a way to go about it. One way to get young, healthy folks involved is to do something that we do on Medicare. If you are eligible, you are enrolled unless you call up and say you don't want to be. That is what we do with Medicare. By the way, that is what Fortune 500 companies do with their employees for 401(k) plans, and it works really well.

Ninety-five percent of employees are likely to participate in a 401(k), and they love it. As to people on Medicare, 99 percent stay on Medicare, and 1 percent call up and say: I don't want it. Usually they have better coverage someplace else. As a rule, no one feels coerced because they all know they can call up and say: I don't want it; I don't get it. As it turns out, most do.

The plan we have taken with Cassidy-Collins, in our attempt to fulfill President Trump's contract with the American voter, is that we allow a State to automatically enroll for this, and you would be in. The credit you receive would be sufficient to pay for the annual premium.

If you don't want it, call up. Make it easy. Get out of here. I don't want it.

As a rule, we think folks would be in. By doing this, you expand that risk

pool so those old and sicker, those with preexisting conditions, can have their conditions cared for, but we fulfill President Trump's campaign pledge. We also lowered those premiums.

Ultimately, to lower the cost of insurance, you have to lower the cost of healthcare. Cassidy-Collins does that with some conservative approaches that even liberals will like. One way is that we put in what is called price transparency. You would know the price. A mother would know the price of a procedure—an x-ray, a blood test—before she gets it for her daughter, as opposed to finding out 6 months later when she gets the final bill.

Let me give one example. We have all seen those urgent care centers. Some are run by hospitals. Typically, a visit there will cost you \$500 to \$1,500. Others are run by a group of physicians, or maybe a small business decides to set up an urgent care center. The same visit might cost you as little as \$75 to \$150. The patient doesn't know that until she gets the bill.

One door has exactly the same appearance and exactly the same type of facility with the same capabilities. In one door and it can cost \$500 to \$1,500, and in the other door and it can cost \$75 to \$150, and the patient never knows.

I think we can lower the cost of healthcare by giving the patient the power of knowing what is the price of healthcare.

Think of it. You walk up to a French restaurant in a city you are not familiar with, and you look at the menu posted on the door. You see the prices of the food. Oh, the food is pretty good, but look how expensive it is. Let me go down the street. You go down the street. The food looks good, and it is less expensive.

The power of price informs the patient of what is the best deal for both our health and for our pocketbook. One way we can lower the cost of health insurance is by lowering the cost of healthcare. There are other ways of doing so as well.

Let me return once more to what I said earlier. Americans need lower premiums. President Trump, during the campaign—his contract with the voter, I think, is the right approach to get there.

I will summarize with this. He said he wanted to maintain coverage for those who have insurance, lower premiums, that preexisting conditions would be cared for, and eliminate the ObamaCare mandates. If we fulfill President Trump's goals—and these are goals that folks on the right and left can get behind. By the way, if we do get behind them, premiums will be lower. If we can fulfill President Trump's campaign contract with the American voter, we will lower those premiums, and we will do so by achieving these other great goals.

I yield back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JERUSALEM DAY

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today to mark a momentous day. Starting this evening, millions around the world will celebrate Yom Yerushalayim, also known as Jerusalem Day. I am proud to join our close ally, Israel, and the Jewish people in celebrating this historic 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem.

Half a century ago, overcoming Arab armies intent on Israel's destruction, the Israel defense forces liberated the Old City of Jerusalem during the Six-Day War. They courageously and miraculously fought their way to the Temple Mount and the Western Wall, the holiest sites in Judaism. The commander of the paratroopers, Mordechai Gur, unable to contain his emotion, exclaimed through his wireless radio: "The Temple Mount is in our hands!" The army rabbi blew the shofar, and the eternal capital of Israel was reunited.

This war was not the first time that Israel was threatened with annihilation. After the Jewish people established the modern State of Israel in their ancient homeland just 19 years earlier, neighboring Arab States responded to Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion's declaration of independence with an invasion. The Arab armies failed to destroy the newly established Jewish State, but Jerusalem, the ancient and Holy City central to the identity of the Jewish people, was left divided and occupied by Jordan.

Residents of the Old City were murdered or expelled. Jews were prohibited from visiting and praying at the Temple Mount and Western Wall. Their synagogues were destroyed, and their cemeteries, such as the Mount of Olives, were desecrated. Access for Christians to their holy sites was also severely restricted.

Leading up to June of 1967, Arab leaders repeatedly and openly expressed their desire to wipe Israel off the map. Syria was engaging in attacks on Israel from the Golan Heights and soon started to mobilize its forces for battle. Egypt began moving troops into the Sinai Peninsula in a massive military buildup, demanded and achieved the withdrawal of the U.N. Emergency Force that had been stationed in the Sinai, and then closed the Straits of Tehran, imposing an illegal blockade on Israel and cutting off a vital shipping lane for the Jewish State. Jordan then signed a mutual defense agreement with Egypt.

Outnumbered and outgunned and against all odds in the face of external pressure not to act first to ensure its survival, the Jewish State launched a successful, preemptive strike against its hostile neighbors and prevailed in a defensive war. When it was over, Jerusalem was liberated, reuniting the city and Judaism's holiest sites with the Jewish people and putting an end to almost two decades of exclusion from the Old City.

Since coming under its sovereignty, Israel, the one true democracy in the Middle East that shares our values of freedom, has protected people of all faiths in Jerusalem and ensured their access to holy sites so that they might worship freely. They have protected the rights of Jews, of Christians, and of Muslims. This has occurred even while religious minorities are being targeted, persecuted, and attacked throughout the Middle East and religious and historical sites are being demolished today by radical Islamic terrorists.

Today is a day where we must also reassert historical truth: The historical connection between the Jewish people and Jerusalem and the land of Israel did not begin in 1967. These profound ties to Jerusalem have existed for thousands of years. They can be traced back and have been reaffirmed through numerous archeological excavations such as those in the city of David.

In the past several years, I have traveled to Israel three times. There is something that stirs inside each time I am there. It is remarkable to observe the great successes and achievements of this small and yet mighty country that is one of America's strongest allies in the world.

It is long past time that America do something it should have done two decades ago: Move the American Embassy to Jerusalem and formally recognize Jerusalem as Israel's eternal and undivided capital. In every nation on Earth our Embassy is in its capital city except for Israel. There is no reason Israel should be treated any worse when they are such a reliable and unshakeable ally.

We should honor the promise that Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents have made for decades and move our Embassy to Jerusalem. So I stand today to express my solidarity with Israel and with the Jewish people during this major celebration. Now, more than ever, America stands strong with our unshakeable friend and ally, the nation of Israel.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here to discuss what you might call the Scott Pruitt philosophy of environmental regulation. In a recent interview, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency expressed his view that the EPA should “simply pass regulations that provide fairness and equity and allow utilities to make decisions based upon stability, cost, and security to the consumers that they serve.” Did we notice anything missing in that assertion of what EPA’s role should be? How about no mention of the environment, no mention of climate change, no mention of public health? So my 168th “Time to Wake Up” speech will look at how paid-for Administrator Pruitt is by the very industries he is supposed to be regulating. Often, the word for this is “corruption.”

Scott Pruitt is a functionary of fossil fuel money. He has a long record of dark money fundraising and long, cozy relationships with big fossil fuel political donors.

As you can see, energy interests contributed over \$136,000 to Pruitt’s 2014 campaign even though he ran unopposed. During the 2010 and 2014 election cycles, oil and gas giants Devon Energy and Koch Industries—yes, of those infamous Koch brothers—maxed out to Pruitt’s campaigns.

Thanks to Pulitzer Prize-winning reporting by the New York Times, we know that backing Pruitt was a good fossil fuel investment, particularly for Devon Energy. In 2011, Attorney General Scott Pruitt took a letter written by Devon Energy, he put it onto his Oklahoma attorney general letterhead, he signed it for them, and he sent it off to EPA, pleading Devon Energy’s anti-regulatory case as if it were his own.

As attorney general of Oklahoma, Pruitt directly solicited political donations from companies now regulated by EPA, then regulated by EPA as well.

He spoke at dozens of industry events but never at a public health or environmental event.

He led the boards of political organizations, like the Republican Attorneys General Association and its dark money political fundraising arm, the so-called Rule of Law Defense Fund, this thing. Pruitt was a member of the RAGA executive committee—RAGA being Republican Attorneys General Association. He was a member of their executive committee between 2014 and 2016, when RAGA raised \$530,000 from Koch Industries—yes, those same infamous Koch brothers—and \$125,000 from

Devon Energy—yes, of the letter he put onto his own letterhead.

Coal giant Murray Energy donated \$50,000 to Liberty 2.0, Pruitt’s own super PAC, and it donated \$350,000 to RAGA between 2014 and 2016.

The Rule of Law Defense Fund doesn’t have to disclose its donors. They hide in a loophole in the law. But other public reporting has shown that it received at least \$175,000 from something called Freedom Partners. With a name like that, you know it is up to no good. Sure enough, it is another dark money group run by several Koch Industries executives. That is not Coca-Cola; that is the Koch brothers’ fossil fuel processing company.

We don’t know more about this. Why do we not know more about this? Because Republicans in the Senate protected Scott Pruitt from having to answer these questions during his confirmation process.

While he was busily helping raise dark money, dark money groups, in turn, came back and worked hard to help Pruitt get confirmed to the EPA. A Republican opposition research PAC called America Rising launched a pro-Pruitt ad campaign, and its dark money arm, America Rising Squared, funded confirmpruitt.com. A 501(c)(4) dark money entity ironically named Protecting America Now was created solely to help confirm Pruitt to the EPA. Its fliers asked for contributions ranging from \$25,000 to \$500,000. Just another grassroots group trying to get a good guy confirmed. Koch Industries’ own lobbying disclosure forms reveal it spent part of \$3.1 million lobbying to confirm Scott Pruitt.

In Trump’s science-denial Cabinet, Administrator Pruitt seems to see little reason to hide his anti-environment and Republican political interests. He has spoken at the Conservative Political Action Conference and the American Farm Bureau board meeting. He attended rallies with coal miners against his own regulations and met with the National Mining Association’s executive committee “to lay out his concerns with the Paris accord” the day before the mining association voted to press President Trump to withdraw from that agreement.

Administrator Pruitt planned to appear as the keynote speaker at the Oklahoma Republican Party Gala on May 5. This invitation mentioned his official position as EPA Administrator three times. It featured this photo of him being sworn in as the EPA Administrator. It promised donors a “once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to hear him discuss his plans to slash regulations, bring back jobs to Oklahoma, and decrease the size of the EPA.” Well, the 1939 Act to Prevent Pernicious Political Activities, more commonly known as the Hatch Act, forbids this, so I filed a Hatch Act complaint and Administrator Pruitt’s appearance was can-

celed. The Office of Special Counsel is now conducting a full investigation.

But it wasn’t just there. He goes to other dinners. On February 28, 2017, Pruitt was a speaker at a RAGA major donors dinner. You know who major donors are by now. Days after the RAGA major donors dinner, Pruitt unilaterally withdrew an EPA request for information from oil and gas producers about their methane emissions, citing a letter from nine members of RAGA and two Republican Governors, who alleged the methane information request “furthers the previous administration’s climate agenda and supports . . . the imposition of burdensome climate rules on existing sites, the cost and expense of which will be enormous.”

There was no public comment period. There was no request for input from other States. This basically was a little party favor for his RAGA pals right after the RAGA dinner.

This EPA Administrator has solicited thousands, if not millions, of dollars from corporations he now regulates. Our current ethics laws do not require nominees in the confirmation process to disclose their political and dark money connections, so the Senate and the public are kept blind to the conflicts of interest of such nominees, and we have no idea how those conflicts would manifest in their offices. Pruitt knows who gave dark money to his political causes. The corporations know what dark money they gave. It is just the rest of us who are in the dark.

This is new, and this is weird. This was not a problem for President Obama’s nominees because the dark money political tsunami that has swamped our politics in slime did not exist when President Obama was elected. It was the Citizens United decision of 2010 that allowed unlimited political spending by big special interests, and that unlimited money found dark money channels.

To address the gaping loophole in our Federal ethics laws, I have introduced the Conflicts from Political Fundraising Act with Senators UDALL, CARPER, VAN HOLLEN, and FRANKEN. This bill would require Presidentially appointed Federal officials like Scott Pruitt to disclose their political fundraising, and it would require Federal ethics officials to address these conflicts by, for example, making sure officials are recused from decisions affecting big political donors, making sure the public has the information to know they should ask for a recusal because the director is conflicted by reason of his political relationship with big dark money donors.

I wish the conflicts at EPA stopped with the Administrator, but they don’t. It is a swarm of swampy conflict over there. Pruitt has surrounded himself with political operatives and fossil fuel lobbyists. The Associate EPA Administrator for Policy previously worked at

RAGA, the Rule of Law Defense Fund, and something called the Freedom Partners Chamber of Commerce—a Koch brothers-funded dark money group that has underwritten the Rule of Law Defense Fund. EPA's Senior Adviser for Regional and State Affairs came from Pruitt's own fossil fuel-funded super PAC, Oklahoma Strong. The Assistant Administrator for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations came from the oil company, the Hess Corporation. One Deputy Associate Administrator is the former president of the Ohio Coal Association. Another Deputy Associate Administrator was a registered lobbyist at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, where she specifically lobbied against EPA's Clean Power Plan and New Source Performance Standard, the clean water rule, the ozone standard, EPA enforcement, pesticides bills, budget resolutions, and EPA appropriations bills.

This corruption of EPA is the work of the fossil fuel industry. One day there must come a reckoning.

Just this weekend, the New York Times reported "How Rollbacks at Scott Pruitt's E.P.A. Are a Boon to Oil and Gas." The article included a checklist of rollbacks that specifically benefit long-time Pruitt beneficiary Devon Energy—the one that got the letter—delaying a rule raising royalties on fossil energy production on Federal land, undoing new fracking standards, rolling back rules on the leaking and flaring of methane, and rolling back reporting of methane emissions.

In another matter, Devon Energy had been preparing to pay a settlement of over \$100,000 and to install emissions scrubbing equipment to remedy illegal emissions from a Wyoming natural gas facility. Five days after Pruitt was installed at EPA, the company told officials it was "re-evaluating its settlement posture," offering a quarter of what it had previously proposed to settle the charges and scrapping the emissions controls entirely. They know their Administrator Pruitt.

Pruitt's record at EPA reveals he is unabashedly looking out for his industry donors at the expense of public health and the environment. As far as I can tell, every action he has taken since taking office will lead to an enriched industry—at the expense of dirtier air and dirtier water—and a more imperiled climate.

Myron Ebell is someone I don't quote often. He is the head of President Trump's EPA transition team and a prominent climate denier. He has something interesting to say about Scott Pruitt. He has said that he thinks Scott Pruitt is using EPA as a "stepping stone to political office" and that "everything he does is going to be a political calculation about what furthers his own political career."

This is not a liberal environmentalist making these accusations. This is

somebody who is right in Scott Pruitt's climate denial wheelhouse. This is someone from the Trump science denial EPA destruction team. This is the guy who is in the club of fossil fuel-funded climate denial, and he thinks everything Pruitt does is a political calculation about what furthers Pruitt's own political career. If that is the case, everything Scott Pruitt does is a conflict of interest, as he sees regulated industry as the funders of his next political campaign. They pay for him now, and he delivers.

Sadly, the people who own Pruitt also own Congress. So good luck getting an honest look at this mess from our fossil fuel-funded colleagues in the majority.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL J. McLAUGHLIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to acknowledge my friend, Mayor Daniel J. McLaughlin of the Village of Orland Park, in my home State of Illinois. There is no stronger advocate for the people of Orland Park than Dan McLaughlin. For more than three decades, he has served his community with distinction.

Dan began his service to Orland Park in 1983 as a village trustee. A decade later, he was elected mayor and would go on to serve for six terms. In 1995, Mayor McLaughlin created the Orland Park Open Lands program, which preserved nearly 300 acres of open space, two family farms, and created the village's nature center. In the same year, he completed the Orland Park Veterans Memorial. Each Memorial and Veterans Day, the village gathers at the memorial, Ara Pace—Place of Peace, at the Orland Park Village Center—and adds the names of veterans to the granite wall surrounding the memorial. It is a wonderful tribute that allows residents of Orland Park to thank those who bravely served our country.

During his tenure, Mayor McLaughlin also brought the community together through an increase in village sponsored events and outdoor concerts. He believed in fitness for fun, and his leadership helped save the Orland Park Health and Fitness Center, created Centennial Park West, and expanded the aquatic center, which now includes ice skating, sledding, a dog park, and bicycle paths.

His governing philosophy was simple, "plan for people not cars." That vision led to a pedestrian-friendly center in the heart of downtown Orland Park in the historic 143rd train station, where people can come together to play and work. Throughout his career, Mayor McLaughlin grew Orland Park's economy by marketing the I-80 corridor, helping to bring in new businesses while retaining the ones already thriving in the village.

Mayor McLaughlin has been honored by numerous organizations, including the American Institute of Architects; Chaddick Institute; Chicago Magazine; Chicago Southland Convention & Visitors' Bureau; Congress of New Urbanism; Government Finance Officers Association; Home Builders Association of Greater Chicago; Illinois Arts Council; Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police; Metropolitan Mayors Caucus; Moraine Valley Community College; the Chicago Building Congress; the United States Conference of Mayors; and the United States Green Building Council—just to name a few.

I want to thank Mayor McLaughlin for his commitment to the people of Orland Park. I especially want to thank Dan's wife, Patricia McLaughlin, and four children—Bridget, Mary Kate, Dan, and Matt—for sharing so much of their husband and father with the Village of Orland Park. Now as he moves to the next chapter in his life, I wish him and his family all the best.

LIFESPAN RESPITE CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator BALDWIN, in introducing the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act of 2017.

Every day, an estimated 43 million family caregivers attend to loved ones who are experiencing chronic, disabling health conditions. While many of these individuals care for an older adult, almost one-third of caregivers attend to persons under the age of 50. Caregivers help individuals remain at home, often delaying the need for nursing home or foster care placements. The value of their efforts are tremendous, amounting to more than \$470 billion in uncompensated care. This task, however, can take a toll. Caregivers experience higher mortality rates and are more likely to acquire acute and chronic health

conditions. That is why respite care is so important. It provides temporary relief to caregivers from their ongoing responsibilities, reducing the toll they experience. Respite care helps keep caregivers healthy, keeps families intact, and provides a substantial public value.

Recently, the Senate Aging Committee, which I chair, held a hearing on age-friendly communities. Meg Callaway, the project director of the Piscataquis Thriving in Place Coalition in Dover-Foxcroft, ME, testified that “the one most critical service is respite.” We have heard this time and time again.

In 2006, when the Lifespan Respite Care Act was originally enacted, the goal was to improve the delivery and quality of respite care available to all caregivers. Since that time, 35 States and the District of Columbia have received grants to increase the availability and quality of respite services.

Still, with an increasing number of Americans with chronic conditions who require some amount of caregiver support on a daily basis, the need for respite care continues to increase and outpace available resources.

The legislation that we are introducing would authorize \$15 million per year for 5 years, through 2022, to extend the program. Such funding would provide competitive grants to States to establish or enhance statewide Lifespan Respite systems that maximize existing resources and help ensure that quality respite care is available and accessible to all family caregivers. This reauthorization also would require grantees to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of programs and activities funded under such grants.

Thirty-six aging and disability organizations have endorsed the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act, including the ARCH National Respite Network, the Alzheimer’s Association, the Michael J. Fox Foundation, and the Elizabeth Dole Foundation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARGARET CHASE SMITH LIBRARY

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, in 1973, when Senator Margaret Chase Smith returned to private life and her hometown of Skowhegan, ME, she brought with her hundreds of thousands of documents, photographs, recordings, and memorabilia accumulated during her remarkable 33 years of public service. Nine years later, in 1982, with the support and encouragement of her many friends and admirers, her dream of establishing a library was realized. Today I wish to commemorate the 35th anniversary of the Margaret Chase Smith Library.

The Margaret Chase Smith Library is one of our Nation’s premier free-

standing congressional libraries, a priceless archive and museum, and an invaluable educational center. From the very start, it was Senator Smith’s wish for the library to be more than a storehouse of papers and a collection of mementos. She wanted it to be a place of aspirations, an institution where students would be inspired to public service. She wanted it to be a source of insight and information for historical scholarship from the perspective of a historic leader. Just as important, she wanted it to be a place where citizens would come together to discuss important policy issues in an atmosphere of civility and respect.

Senator Smith did more than wish for those things; she worked to bring them about. From opening day in August of 1982 until shortly before her passing in 1995, she presided over the facility, meeting with schoolchildren, researchers, policymakers, and engaged citizens. The library as it exists today stands on the foundation of a great leader’s commitment to service.

This great accomplishment is the work of many hands. Outstanding directors, dedicated staff, an exceptional board of directors, Northwood University, the Margaret Chase Smith Policy Center at the University of Maine, the Margaret Chase Smith Foundation, and Senator Smith’s close friend and adviser, Merton Henry, have worked together in a collaborative spirit that pays the highest tribute to Senator Smith and her legacy.

That legacy is, above all, a reminder of the obligation we all share to uphold the values and ideals of our Nation. Thanks to the Margaret Chase Smith Library, that message remains strong. I congratulate its staff and many supporters on this 35th anniversary and know that this library will continue to inspire us for generations to come.

RECOGNIZING LONGFELLOW’S GREENHOUSE

Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 40th anniversary of Longfellow’s Greenhouse of Manchester, ME, a family-owned small business and a leader in the greenhouse industry.

Longfellow’s Greenhouse opened during the winter of 1977. That year, with the help of their son, Scott, owners Lawrence and Mavis Longfellow built 12 large greenhouses and a retail shop on a meadow in Manchester. In the years that followed, the business flourished and expanded. Scott has been integral to that success, applying the knowledge and expertise learned through his studies at the University of Maine at Orono and holding the positions of grower and general manager up until this year. Today Scott’s son, Will, carries on the tradition as general manager.

Over the course of four decades, the Longfellow family and their devoted

employees have built more than a business. They have created a seasonal destination, especially in the spring and holidays, where families can gather to create gardens, landscapes, and traditions filled with flowers, plants, and fond memories. In addition to providing outstanding services and a great experience, they are widely known for giving back to the community through both their time and proceeds. Longfellow’s has helped create new ideas that enrich the gardening experience for their customers, all the while placing a special emphasis on presentation and education by holding special events that offer demonstrations, lectures, and hands-on classes.

Today Longfellow’s stands out with 21 greenhouses, where they produce 40,000 geraniums, 22,000 fall mums, 15,000 flowering hanging baskets, 75,000 perennials, and 25,000 poinsettias. Among the diverse flowers and plants they house are 800 varieties of perennials, 200 varieties of herbs and scented geraniums—over half of which are grown on site—more than 500 varieties of trees, shrubs, and vines, and 100 varieties of roses.

Longfellow’s Greenhouse has set the standard for horticulture in Maine, and they have done so while promoting civic engagement and practicing honest and ethical business—all of which will continue to make it a special part of central Maine. Not only have they fostered a positive culture around gardening, but their efforts have also engaged the imagination of people of all ages. I am proud and honored to join with all those who are celebrating this achievement and recognizing their high quality of work on behalf of all Maine people. I thank them for their tremendous contributions to our State.

TRIBUTE TO RANDALL D. BOOKOUT

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute and offer my deep appreciation to Randy Bookout for his many years of dedicated service as a professional staff member on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, SSCI. Randy joined the committee staff in October 1999 and served in various capacities, most recently as the committee’s budget monitor for the Central Intelligence Agency, CIA. During his almost 18 years with the committee, Randy established a solid reputation of fairness and professionalism that was widely respected by members and staff, regardless of party, and officials within intelligence community elements over which he conducted oversight.

Randall D. Bookout joined the committee after serving a 28-year career with the Army, retiring as a colonel in the infantry. His distinguished Army career included assignments as a company commander in Korea and Panama

and as an infantry battalion commander in Alaska. He served as a staff officer in the Office of the Army Chief of Staff and later as the senior military aide to Secretary of the Army Togo D. West, Jr. His last duty in the Army was as the Army's Chief of Legislative Liaison for the Senate from 1995-1999. Randy graduated with a bachelor of science degree from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and a master's degree in business administration from the University of Northern Colorado. He attended the Army's War College at Carlisle Barracks, PA, as well as airborne and Ranger training.

Senator RICHARD SHELBY of Alabama, who often traveled with Colonel Bookout when he served as the Army chief liaison for the Senate, was chairman of the SSCI in 1999 and asked Randy to interview for a nonpartisan staff job on the committee. Randy retired from the Army on a Friday and began work at SSCI the following Monday. As often was the case, Randy took to the challenge of this new role with a deep commitment, including long hours of study to learn an entire new encyclopedia of acronyms from the ones he knew after 28 years in the Army.

Much of Randy's work for the committee must remain unspoken. I will simply say here that he has made significant contributions to this country's national security and to the operations and activities of the CIA and the rest of the intelligence community. He knew the Agency in detail, seriously challenged it at times, and fiercely defended it at others. He forced changes that improved its operations, while at all times respecting its mission and, most importantly, respecting the women and men who worked there.

In fact, one of Randy's greatest traits and admirable qualities is that he cared not only for the organization, but genuinely cared about the individuals. His job was to focus on big programs, run by hundreds if not thousands of people, worth hundreds of millions of dollars, and affecting the lives of countless others. He did that oversight job exceptionally well. He also saw and noticed each person who was a part of these big operations. Randy did what he could to help them perform their mission and to help them in their personal lives when something was amiss. For example, he helped a woman who served admirably for both the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the CIA, who unjustly lost her American citizenship. Randy helped get her legal resident status back. He helped an intelligence official, who left government service due to health problems incurred in a war zone, get the retirement ceremony he rightly deserved and was important to him and his family. After every trip he took for the committee, he left a trail of handwritten thank you notes that traced his path. He not

only never forgot the little guy, Randy knew their name.

In the committee office, Randy always represents the highest standard of professionalism and collegiality. He always took the time to mentor young staffers, was willing to share his knowledge on programs or activities, and has never shied away from a request for assistance from a colleague. A fellow staff noted that Randy "treats colleagues, superiors and the most junior staff member with respect and encouragement. He treats the intelligence officials with whom we interact in the same manner. So many times I've seen him engage with junior officers in challenging and remote settings at odd hours of the night, and his interest and enthusiasm for their work leaves them invigorated and inspired to do their work."

Staff have shared many interesting stories and traits about Randy. He is generally the first to arrive in the office, around 5 to 6 a.m. For his 60th birthday, he ran an Iron Man triathlon. Colleagues talked about his love of travel, strange penchant for weird hats, participation in a Tough Mudder, and the particularly interesting fact that he and his family were chosen to be on the "Family Feud" TV show. They won. Staff also have noted his constant positive demeanor, even when addressing difficult and challenging issues, but, foremost, they noted his commitment to and pride in his family.

After 46 years of serving his Nation, Randy will retire next week to the great State of North Carolina with his wife of 44 years, Cindi Bookout. He talks proudly and lovingly of her and their two children. Their son, LTC Josh Bookout, graduated from West Point and is currently serving his third tour in Afghanistan as a battalion commander. Their daughter, Whitney Corey, achieved a master's degree in psychology and is currently in San Diego. Retirement will give Randy and Cindi well-deserved time to be grandparents to their six wonderful grandchildren: Cade, Brock, Colt, Ali, Chloe, and Ainsley.

Let me close by again noting that Randy's commitment to his mission, his colleagues, his family, and his country is unquestioned. I want to thank him for his energy, his intellect, his passion, and his efforts on my behalf and on behalf of the committee. I am certain that I can on the Senate floor here today also express the appreciation of the six chairmen and vice chairmen of the committee, all of whom Randy served, for his service and share our collective wish for great joy and happiness in the next stage of his life.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING RUTH'S REUSABLE RESOURCES

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the efforts of Ruth Libby and her work with Ruth's Reusable Resources. Her organization operates in southern Maine and is dedicated to ensuring that students ranging from preschool to 12th grade are adequately prepared with the basic tools of learning.

When Ruth Libby's son was in kindergarten, she received a note from his teacher requesting household items such as egg cartons, meat trays, and juice can lids for use in craft projects. Ruth responded to this request in full force and went above and beyond by not only getting supplies to her son's classroom, but also for other classrooms in the school. As time went on, she began receiving, sorting, and stocking products donated by corporations, businesses, and individuals for use by local classrooms. Ruth started by delivering these items to the school, and a few years later, she established a "storeroom" in her basement where teachers could come and "shop" at their convenience. With financial assistance from the Unum Group and a grant from the State of Maine Department of Education, Ruth was able to create a unique and effective nonprofit organization and relocate to the organization's current 21,000-square-foot warehouse and 7,000-square-foot teacher store in Portland, ME.

Since its inception in 1994, Ruth's Reusable Resources has provided more than \$60 million worth of surplus furniture, paper, books, office supplies, and computers to nonprofits and schools. They have also received donated furniture, paper, books, office supplies, and computers from corporations, businesses, and individuals across the State of Maine. In turn, Ruth's Reusable Resources allows staff members of participating schools to "shop" for supplies at no charge. Ruth, together with a diverse group of hard-working volunteers, ranging from retired teachers, students, current teachers, corporate groups, retirees, court appointed volunteers, civic groups, collegiate ministries, and many more, work to ensure that every Maine student is provided with the necessary supplies to succeed in school.

Ruth's Reusable Resources is a shining example of what can happen when you have determination and a passion to make a difference. Ruth is an outstanding example of a hard-working Mainer who is making a difference in her community and across our State. She has played an instrumental role in providing resources for classrooms in Maine which has furthered the education of many students. Thank you, Ruth, for all you have already done for

both the students and their teachers in communities throughout Maine. I look forward to following your continued success.●

170TH ANNIVERSARY OF CLIFFS NATURAL RESOURCES

● Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today I wish to offer my congratulations to Cliffs Natural Resources and its outstanding employees on the company's 170th anniversary. I am honored to celebrate this milestone with the largest and oldest independent iron ore mining company in the United States.

In 1847, 11 men from Cleveland founded Cliffs Natural Resources to develop ore in Michigan's Upper Peninsula. Cliffs has since grown to be a leader in North American mining, employing thousands and providing U.S. steelmakers with world-class raw materials.

Mining has always been a way of life for families on Minnesota's Iron Range, including my own. My grandfather worked 1,500 feet underground in the mines of Ely, MN. His generation helped build our Nation's steel industry into the global power it is today. The Iron Range has the largest concentration of iron ore in the United States. Right now, Minnesota is first in the Nation in the movement of iron ore, with more than 4,000 jobs associated with the iron ore and steel industries. Throughout our State's history, iron ore mining has not only brought jobs to the region, it has also built our country, from our roads, bridges, buildings, and railways, to the tanks and ships critical to our Nation's defense. The Iron Range also supplied most of the iron used in World War II.

In recent years, Cliffs has focused its energies on revitalizing iron ore mines and processing plants in the United States. In August of last year, Cliffs broke ground on a \$75 million expansion at its United Taconite plant in Forbes, MN. I am proud to support companies like Cliffs that are committed to creating jobs for Minnesotans for generations to come. Cliffs is also well known for its commitment to corporate stewardship. From contributing to building homes for families through Habitat for Humanity, to helping ensure children in need get a nutritious meal through United Way programs, Cliffs has been committed to Minnesota families and communities.

This 170th anniversary of Cliffs' founding is a remarkable achievement. I am pleased to take this opportunity to congratulate Cliffs chairman, president, and chief executive officer Lourenco Goncalves and the employees of Cliffs on celebrating this occasion. Best wishes for much continued success.●

REMEMBERING SUE SHAFFER

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to honor a rare and wonderful individual known throughout Oregon and the Nation who passed away on April 11 at the age of 94. Chairman Sue Shaffer, of the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe of Indians, lived a powerful life as a nonstop advocate for her family, her Tribe, and her community. As a mother, wife, daughter and friend, Sue created an atmosphere of energy, honesty, and kindness wherever she went. For Sue, no person or job was too big or too small to embrace.

Sue was a descendant of one of the seven founding families of the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe. She grew up during the Great Depression in rural Douglas County at a time when everything was scarce. Despite her family's own struggle, their door was always open to neighbors in need of food or lodging, and they were always willing to support their community members. As she liked to recall, she grew up in a household where honesty, moral integrity, education, hard work, and helping others were all high priorities. For Sue and her family, life's rewards came from working hard and reaching out to others—and that is just what she did.

Sue's mother, Nellie Crispin, kept records of the Tribe's heritage and passed down to her daughter the desire to fight for Tribal recognition. That vision and determination drove Sue to play an instrumental role in convincing Congress to formally recognize the Tribe in 1982. In 1983, Sue Shaffer became chair of the newly restored Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe, and for nearly 30 years, she worked with her Tribe and the community and expanded the Tribe's prominence by growing its economic footprint.

Sue served as delegate to the National Congress of American Indians, delegate to the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, and delegate to Indian Women's Leadership White House Conference, but her leadership in the community was not limited to the Tribe. Sue served on a myriad of boards in the community, including Umpqua Community College, becoming the first woman to chair the board. Throughout her life, Sue was also honored with many awards, including the 1999 President's Award for outstanding contribution to community in economic development by the Roseburg Chamber of Commerce, 2000 Female Citizen of the Year award for "unselfish devotion and distinguished service" by the Roseburg Area Chamber of Commerce, and the Eleanor Roosevelt Award in 2003. She was inducted into the Hall of Fame at Umpqua Community College in June 1999 in recognition of the 17 years she served on the UCC board of trustees.

Sue Shaffer was a dear friend, always known for being fair and never one to hesitate to "tell it like it is." I will

greatly miss Sue's friendship and good counsel. She was a true dynamo whose eloquent and powerful advocacy helped right the long, tragic history of wrongs inflicted on the Cow Creek and other Tribes in Oregon. Sue gladly led on so many fronts to improve life for the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe, create a better Douglas County and a better place for all of Oregon to enjoy. Her indelible legacy of achievement for our State and our Nation will live on to benefit generations to come.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018—PM 8

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying reports and papers; which was referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986; to the Committees on the Budget; and Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

On February 28, I spoke to a joint session of the Congress about what we need to do to begin a new chapter of American Greatness. I asked the Nation to look forward nine years and imagine the wonders we could achieve by America's 250th anniversary of our Independence if we set free the dreams of our people by removing the barriers holding back our economic growth.

This Budget's defining ambition is to unleash the dreams of the American people. This requires laying a new foundation for American Greatness.

Through streamlined Government, we will drive an economic boom that raises incomes and expands job opportunities for all Americans. Faster economic growth, coupled with fiscal restraint, will enable us to fully fund our national priorities, balance our budget, and start to pay down our national debt.

Our moral commitment to replacing our current economic stagnation with faster economic growth rests on the following eight pillars of reform:

Health Reform. We need to enable Americans to buy the healthcare they need at a price they can afford. To this end, we must repeal Obamacare and its burdensome regulations and mandates, and replace it with a framework that restores choice and competition. This will lower the cost of care so that more Americans can get the medical attention they need. Additionally, Medicaid,

which inadequately serves enrollees and taxpayers, must be reformed to allow States to manage their own programs, with continued financial support from the Federal Government.

Tax Reform and Simplification. We must reduce the tax burden on American workers and businesses, so that we can maximize incomes and economic growth. We must also simplify our tax system, so that individuals and businesses do not waste countless hours and resources simply paying their taxes.

Immigration Reform. We must reform immigration policy so that it serves our national interest. We will adopt commonsense proposals that protect American workers, reduce burdens on taxpayers and public resources, and focus Federal funds on underserved and disadvantaged citizens.

Reductions in Federal Spending. We must scrutinize every dollar the Federal Government spends. Just as families decide how to manage limited budgets, we must ensure the Federal Government spends precious taxpayer dollars only on our highest national priorities, and always in the most efficient, effective manner.

Regulatory Rollback. We must eliminate every outdated, unnecessary, or ineffective Federal regulation, and move aggressively to build regulatory frameworks that stimulate—rather than stagnate—job creation. Even for those regulations we must leave in place, we must strike every provision that is counterproductive, ineffective, or outdated.

American Energy Development. We must increase development of America's energy resources, strengthening our national security, lowering the price of electricity and transportation fuels, and driving down the cost of consumer goods so that every American individual and business has more money to save and invest. A consistent, long-term supply of lower-cost American energy brings with it a much larger economy, more jobs, and greater security for the American people.

Welfare Reform. We must reform our welfare system so that it does not discourage able-bodied adults from working, which takes away scarce resources from those in real need. Work must be the center of our social policy.

Education Reform. We need to return decisions regarding education back to the State and local levels, while advancing opportunities for parents and students to choose, from all available options, the school that best fits their needs to learn and succeed.

To unleash the power of American work and creativity—and drive opportunity and faster economic growth—we must reprioritize Federal spending so that it advances the safety and security of the American people.

This Budget, therefore, includes \$639 billion for the Department of Defense—

a \$52 billion increase from the 2017 annualized continuing resolution level. This increase will be offset by targeted reductions elsewhere. This defense funding is vital to rebuilding, modernizing, and preparing our Armed Forces for the future so that our military remains the world's preeminent fighting force and we can continue to ensure peace through strength. This Budget also increases funding to take care of our great veterans, who have served their country with such honor and distinction.

The Budget also meets the need to materially increase funding for border security, immigration enforcement, and law enforcement at the Departments of Homeland Security and Justice. These funding increases will provide additional resources for a southern border wall, expanded detention capacity, and initiatives to reduce violent crime, as well as more immigration judges, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers, and Border Patrol agents. The Budget also invests significant resources in efforts to combat opioid abuse.

In these dangerous times, our increased attention to public safety and national security sends a clear message to the world—a message of American strength and resolve. It follows through on my promise to focus on keeping Americans safe, keeping terrorists out of our Nation, and putting violent offenders behind bars.

As this Budget returns us to economic prosperity, it will also allow us to fund additional priorities, including infrastructure, student loan reform, and initiatives to help working families such as paid parental leave. We will champion the hardworking taxpayers who have been ignored for too long. Once we end our economic stagnation and return to robust growth, so many of our aspirations will be within reach.

It is now up to the Congress to act. I pledge my full cooperation in ending the economic malaise that has, for too long, crippled the dreams of our people. The time for small thinking is over. As we look forward to our 250th year, I am calling upon all Members of Congress to join me in striving to do big and bold and daring things for our Nation. We have it in our power to set free the dreams of our people. Let us begin.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 23, 2017.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:33 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 695. An act to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check

system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 883. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a certification process for the issuance of nondisclosure requirements accompanying certain administrative subpoenas, to provide for judicial review of such nondisclosure requirements, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1188. An act to reauthorize certain programs established by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1625. An act to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to include severe forms of trafficking in persons within the definition of transnational organized crime for purposes of the rewards program of the Department of State, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1842. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to include State crimes of violence as grounds for an enhanced penalty when sex offenders fail to register or report certain information as required by Federal law, to include prior military offenses for purposes of recidivist sentencing provisions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1862. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand the scope of certain definitions pertaining to unlawful sexual conduct, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 4003(e) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114-255), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Health Information Technology Advisory Committee: Mr. Patrick Soon-Shiong of Culver City, California.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 1 of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board Act (2 U.S.C. 154), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a 5-year term: Ambassador Richard Fredericks of San Francisco, California.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76h(a)), amended by Public Law 107-117, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: Mr. MACARTHUR of New Jersey.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 695. An act to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 883. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a certification process for the issuance of nondisclosure requirements accompanying certain administrative subpoenas, to provide for judicial review of such nondisclosure requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1188. An act to reauthorize certain programs established by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1625. An act to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to include severe forms of trafficking in persons within the definition of transnational organized crime for purposes of the rewards program of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1842. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to include State crimes of violence as grounds for an enhanced penalty when sex offenders fail to register or report certain information as required by Federal law, to include prior military offenses for purposes of recidivist sentencing provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1862. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand the scope of certain definitions pertaining to unlawful sexual conduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1637. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of a group as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Secretary of State (OSS-2017-0521); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1638. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to the United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, and Saudi Arabia to support the assembly, modification, testing, training, operation, maintenance, and integration of the Paveway II and II, Enhanced Paveway II and III, and Paveway IV Weapons Systems for the Royal Saudi Air Force, in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-043); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1639. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Saudi Arabia to support the integration, installation, operation, training, testing, maintenance, and repair of the FMU-152A/B Joint Program-mable Bomb (JPB) Fuze System in the amount of \$14,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-011); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1640. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of

State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Saudi Arabia to support the integration, installation, operation, training, testing, maintenance, and repair of the Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM) in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-132); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*David L. Norquist, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

*Elaine McCusker, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

*Kari A. Bingen, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

*Robert Daigle, of Virginia, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, Department of Defense.

*Robert Story Karem, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

*Kenneth P. Rapuano, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Sean L. Murphy, to be Major General.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. John A. Okon and ending with Capt. Michael W. Studeman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 21, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Edward L. Anderson and ending with Capt. James P. Waters III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 21, 2017. (minus 1 nominee: Capt. Peter G. Vasely)

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Bradford J. Shwedo, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Giovanni K. Tuck, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. James C. McConville, to be General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Stuart W. Risch, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Thomas C. Seamands, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Mark E. Black, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Matthew V. Baker, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Chris R. Gentry, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Robert A. Karmazin, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Marion Garcia, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Whitlock, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Col. Miguel A. Castellanos, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Windsor S. Buzza, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Randall V. Simons, Jr., to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Michael D. Wickman, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Carl A. Alex and ending with Brig. Gen. Brian E. Winski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 24, 2017.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Susan K. Arnold and ending with Col. Robert

P. Huston, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 8, 2017.

Army nomination of Col. Richard J. Lebel, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Todd W. Lewis, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Col. George N. Appenzeller and ending with Col. Telita Crosland, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 8, 2017.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Steven R. Rudder, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Laura J. Richardson, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Charles N. Pede, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Phillip G. Sawyer, to be Vice Admiral.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Brian D. Beaudreault, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nomination of James E. Thompson, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Johanna K. Ream, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Paul R. Aguirre and ending with Peter Lawrence Zalewski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Army nomination of Kalie K. Rott, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Norma A. Hill, to be Major.

Army nomination of Frank C. Pescatello, Jr., to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Basim M. Younis, to be Major.

Army nomination of Stanley F. Gould, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Scott W. Fisher, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Gary L. Beaty and ending with Michael A. M. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 24, 2017.

Army nominations beginning with Daniel J. Convey and ending with Philip A. Horton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 24, 2017.

Army nominations beginning with Sophia Dalce and ending with Burke Lenz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 24, 2017.

Army nomination of Dawn E. Elliott, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of D012528, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Benjamin W. Hillner, to be Major.

Army nomination of Celina S. Fargo, to be Major.

Army nomination of Paul R. Ambrose, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with James L. Dungca and ending with Nathan S.

Lanham, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 24, 2017.

Army nomination of Charles R. Burnett, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Pablo F. Diaz, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Craig A. Nazareth, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Brian C. McLean, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Raymond C. Casteline, to be Major.

Army nomination of Daniel J. Shank, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Christopher W. Degn, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Jason T. Kidder, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Tito M. Villanueva, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Philip J. Dacunto, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Stephen R. November, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Luisa Santiago, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Robert J. Bonner, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Mohamad El Samad, to be Major.

Army nomination of Lana J. Bernat, to be Major.

Army nomination of Patrick K. Sullivan, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Derek L. Adams and ending with James M. Yates, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Army nominations beginning with Rodney Abrams and ending with D010081, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Army nominations beginning with Christine N. Adams and ending with Charlette K. Woodward, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Mark S. Jimison and ending with Shawn P. Wonderlich, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 27, 2017.

Marine Corps nomination of Jason G. Laxis, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Kevin J. Goodwin, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Javier E. Vega, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Sergio L. Sandoval, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Michael S. Stevens, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Patrick J. Mullen, to be Major.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Raymond L. Adams and ending with Douglas S. Woodhams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nomination of Susan M. McGarvey, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Sheila I. Almendras-Flaherty, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Adrian D. Ragland, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Christopher R. Desena, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Kenneth L. Demick, Jr., to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Michael C. Bratley, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Evan M. Colbert, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Luciana Sung, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of William A. Schultz, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of William L. McCoy, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Chris F. White, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Karl M. Kingry, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Michael A. Polito, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Raymond J. Carlson, Jr., to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Christopher M. Allen, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Aaron L. Witherspoon, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of John E. Fritz, to be Captain.

By Mr. CRAPO for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

*Sigal Mandelker, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

*Heath P. Tarbert, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

*Mira Radielovic Ricardel, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Export Administration.

*Marshall Billingslea, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, Department of the Treasury.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1202. A bill to modify the boundary of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mrs. McCASKILL):

S. 1203. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program under which the Administrator shall defer the designation of an area as a nonattainment area for purposes of the 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standard if the area achieves and maintains certain standards under a voluntary early action compact plan; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. McCASKILL (for herself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1204. A bill to authorize the United States Postal Service to carry out emergency suspensions of post offices in accordance with certain procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1205. A bill to authorize the establishment of American Dream Accounts; to the

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1206. A bill to ensure fair treatment in licensing requirements for the export of certain echinoderms; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. RISC, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SASSE, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1207. A bill to amend the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 with respect to the application of the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule to certain farms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1208. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide for an option under the Secure Mail Initiative under which a person to whom a document is sent under that initiative may elect to have the United States Postal Service use the Hold for Pickup service or the Signature Confirmation service in delivering the document, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1209. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of special pension for Medal of Honor recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 58

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 58, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 59

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 59, a bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as long guns.

S. 196

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 196, a bill to provide for a Public Health Emergency Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency may not regulate vehicles used solely for competition, and for other purposes.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from

emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 374

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 374, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 379

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 379, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 407, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 470

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive co-insurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 602

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 602, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include automated fire sprinkler system retrofits as section 179 property and classify certain automated fire sprinkler system retrofits as 15-year property for purposes of depreciation.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to di-

rect the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

S. 778

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 778, a bill to require the use of prescription drug monitoring programs and to facilitate information sharing among States.

S. 782

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 782, a bill to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes.

S. 798

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 798, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the Yellow Ribbon G.I. Education Enhancement Program to apply to individuals pursuing programs of education while on active duty, to recipients of the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry scholarship, and to programs of education pursued on half-time basis or less, and for other purposes.

S. 829

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 829, a bill to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 912

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 912, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a free on-line tax preparation and filing service and programs that allow taxpayers to access third-party provided tax return information.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S.

926, a bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 976

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 976, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 989

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 989, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of pediatric subspecialists in the National Health Service Corps program, and for other purposes.

S. 1016

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1016, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 1073

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1073, a bill to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1094, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1113

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1113, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 1126

At the request of Mr. STRANGE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1126, a bill to prohibit certain Federal funds from being available to sanctuary jurisdictions that refuse to cooperate with the Federal Government on immigration matters or retaliate against border security contractors, and for other purposes.

S. 1136

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill to improve the structure of the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1182, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. RES. 106

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 106, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate to support the territorial integrity of Georgia.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1202. A bill to modify the boundary of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, September will mark the 60th anniversary of the Little Rock Nine, the nine African-American students who enrolled in the then-all-white Little Rock Central High School in 1957. Ask anyone who lived through the crisis, and they will tell you they remember it vividly. They may not have been there in person, but they remember the photos, those searing images of an angry mob, the stoic students, the bayoneted troops, all gathering in a high school, of all places.

Perhaps the most searing image is of Elizabeth Eckford, one of the nine who was then only 15 years old. She didn't get word that the other students were going as a group. She went alone in a simple black-and-white dress she had made just for the occasion. The mob baited her, menaced her, cursed her, some threatened to lynch her. She later said of her walk to the school's entrance: "It was the longest block I've ever walked in my whole life."

I think it is of the highest importance that we preserve their story and share it with our kids. It is a reminder

of pretty sad times in our history and, more important, of the courage shown by nine young Arkansans, who helped our State and our Nation overcome deep-seated prejudices by appealing to the better angels of our nature.

We preserve historic battlefields like Yorktown and Gettysburg because we want our children to know what it took to gain and keep our freedom—the sacrifices made, the hardships endured. Equally important is preserving historic sites like Central High, where our citizens began the long road to freedom from oppression and intolerance.

That is why we made Central High School a historic site years ago, though with one oversight. There are seven homes across the street from the school. Their exteriors were in many of the pictures that are now so famous. There has long been a movement to preserve those exteriors so future generations will be able to see Central High exactly as it looked when the Little Rock Nine arrived to school.

I am proud to say that today I am introducing a bill with three of my colleagues—the senior Senator of Vermont PAT LEAHY, Congressman FRENCH HILL of Little Rock, and civil rights legend Congressman JOHN LEWIS—that would do just that. It would extend the boundary of the Central High historical site to include these seven homes.

It would add about an acre and a half to the park, although I should say this bill would not authorize the Federal Government to take ownership of the homes and wouldn't allow the National Park Service to buy them in the future. Instead, it would simply encourage the homeowners and National Park Service to work together to preserve these homes so future generations could see them and learn from them. That is one reason our bill has the support of the homeowners, the Central High Neighborhood Association, and my State's historic preservation advocacy group, Preserve Arkansas. All three have written to me to express support for the bill. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have their letters printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL HIGH NEIGHBORHOOD, INC.

May 16, 2017.

U.S. Senator TOM COTTON,
ATTN: Lisa Harst,
Washington DC.

DEAR SENATOR COTTON: On behalf of the Central High Neighborhood, Inc. (CHNI), I would like to express support for your proposed legislation that would move the boundary of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site to include seven properties across the street from the high school.

CHNI is proud to support this initiative, which would recognize the historical significance of seven homes located on the 1400 and 1500 blocks of Park Street. The boundary adjustment encourages proper care and preser-

vation of these homes by allowing property owners, on a case by case basis, to enter into cooperative agreements with the National Park Service.

CHNI understands that property owners will maintain rightful ownership and that the Park Service has no intention to purchase the homes neither now, nor in the future.

CHNI would like to thank you for your work on this very important issue and hopes you will remain engaged with us as your bill advances through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

WHITNEY PATTERSON,
President, on behalf of
Central High Neighbor-
hood, Inc.

PRESERVE ARKANSAS,

May 4, 2017.

Ms. LISA B. HARST,
Legislative Assistant, U.S. Senator Tom Cotton,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HARST: My name is Rachel Patton, and I am the executive director of Preserve Arkansas, Arkansas's statewide historic preservation advocacy group. On behalf of our board of directors, I am writing to support the proposed expansion of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site boundary to include the seven homes across the street from the high school. This simple boundary adjustment will encourage the preservation of the seven historic homes in the 1400 and 1500 blocks of Park Street and allow homeowners, on a case by case basis, to enter cooperative agreements with the National Park Service while retaining private property ownership.

We feel that this is an important step in the right direction for the Central High School Neighborhood Historic District as a whole. Please let me know if I may provide further assistance with this initiative.

Sincerely,

RACHEL PATTON,
Executive Director.

From: Patricia McGraw.

Subject: Washington Heritage House.

To Whom It May Concern: City Officials

DEAR MS. HARST: We, the owners of the properties, addresses listed above, located directly across Park Street in front of the famous and renowned educational facility, Little Rock Central High School, wish to express our gratitude and appreciation of all that you do for our neighborhood, our city, and our state, particularly in learning that the National Park Service wishes to expand their boundaries to include our seven houses. It is our belief that our houses add to the beauty and dignity of the structural and environmental beauty, dignity, and grace to this area of Little Rock.

In that we are greatly interested in the continuous celebrated dignity of this site, we are very supportive of direction to expand upon this historic city development, and we appreciate our being included in this significant idea. Please continue to keep us abreast of new developments and ideas which we intend to implement as wished by the city officials, and intend to seek funding to make this dream of our foreparents to come true.

Thanks again for including us, and please take care of yourselves and our city. Love and Deep Appreciation For All That You Do:

Sincerely,

DR. PATRICIA WASHINGTON
MCGRAW,
MRS. GRACE BLAGDON,
OTHER CONCERNED OWNERS.

Mr. COTTON. There is widespread agreement in the community and in

our State that this site is not just a part of Arkansas' history, it is a part of our national heritage.

Central High stands as a reminder of an article Billy Graham published during the crisis, "No Color Line in Heaven." It was a hard-won lesson and one I think we should do everything we can to pass on to the next generation.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the majority and minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 23, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on worldwide threats.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 23, 2017, at 10 a.m., to conduct an executive session to vote on the following nominations: Ms. Sigal Mandelker, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, U.S. Department of the Treasury; Ms. Mira Radjelovic Ricardel, to be Under Secretary for Export Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce; Mr. Marshall Billingslea, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, U.S. Department of the Treasury; and Mr. Heath Tarbert, to be Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of the Treasury.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 23, 2017.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the Senate on Tuesday, May 23, 2017 from 2:15 p.m.-4 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed member briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOW

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 23, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in closed session, to receive a briefing on Navy readiness challenges, emerging threats, and the requirements underpinning the 355-Ship Force Structure Objective.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPACE, SCIENCE AND COMPETITIVENESS

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is author-

ized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 23, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a Subcommittee Hearing on "Reopening the American Frontier: Exploring How the Outer Space Treaty Will Impact American Commerce and Settlement in Space."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

The Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety of the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 23, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, "Making Implementation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ground-Level Ozone Attainable: Legislative Hearing on S. 263 and S. 452."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BORDER SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION

The Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Border Security and Immigration, is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 23, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Building America's Trust Through Border Security: Progress on the Southern Border."

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, May 24; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Sullivan nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator DURBIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Democratic whip.

MANCHESTER ATTACK

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say at the outset that I offer my condolences to the families and friends of

those who were killed or injured in last night's despicable attack at a concert in Manchester, England. Details are still coming in, but this looks like an act of terror in the heart of one of our key European allies. America is joining with the people of Great Britain in expressing our sorrow and sadness over the loss of these lives and the injuries that were sustained.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on a separate note, it has been more than 5 months since the intelligence agencies in the United States reached a solid consensus on a critical issue. The agencies presented to the American people 5 months ago their damning assessment that Russia actively tried to interfere in our last Presidential election to help elect someone they thought would be a better friend to the Russian interests.

I think it is important to recall some of the key findings by our own intelligence agencies on a virtually unanimous basis. They said:

Russian efforts to influence the 2016 U.S. presidential election represent the most recent expression of Moscow's longstanding desire to undermine the U.S.-led liberal democratic order, but these activities demonstrate a significant escalation in directness, level of activity, and scope of effort compared to previous operations.

We assess Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. presidential election.

Our intelligence agencies went on to say:

Russia's goals were to undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency. We further assess that Putin and the Russian government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump.

Moscow will apply lessons learned from its Putin-ordered campaign aimed at the U.S. presidential election to future influence efforts worldwide, including against U.S. allies and their election processes.

We have never seen anything like this in our history—nothing. What Vladimir Putin did—or tried to do—is staggering, momentous, and something we should not ignore. A foreign adversary intentionally manipulating America's democracy and election to try to get a result friendly to Russia but not consistent with American public opinion—that was his goal.

The dictionary defines an act of war as "an act of aggression by a country against another with which it is nominally at peace."

Was the Russia attack on our election an act of war? Is sure seems close to the definition. At a minimum, it was an act of cyber war against America and an attack on our democracy. It should not go unanswered. Troublingly, there have been few answers forthcoming from this President and this Congress.

What did the White House and the majority party in Congress do to respond to this act of cyber war to protect against any future attacks? Virtually nothing. As more and more questions have emerged about possible collusion between the Trump campaign and these Russian actions against our election, possible Russian money, and the President's business interests, and troubling ties between those close to Trump and the Russians, this President has instead been trying to endear himself to the Russians, incredibly.

That is right. On May 10, he had a closed meeting with the Russian Foreign Minister and Ambassador in which the President reportedly boasted about sensitive intelligence and—this is truly incredible—also boasted about firing our Nation's FBI Director to relieve the "great pressure" on him over the Russia investigation.

In fact, he reportedly told the Russians:

I just fired the head of the FBI. He was crazy, a real nut job . . . I faced great pressure because of Russia. That's taken off . . . I'm not under investigation.

That is the end of the attributed quote to the President of the United States.

Let that sink in for a moment. The President of the United States was bragging to the same people who attacked our election and democracy that he had fired the top law enforcement officer investigating that attack. That is incredible, both for its obvious appearance of obstruction of justice but also for what should have so obviously been said in that meeting instead.

President Trump, instead of a frivolous exchange with a dictatorial regime that attacked our Nation, should have had as his first message to the Russians the obvious: Do not ever interfere in our elections or those of our allies again or you will face serious consequences—end of meeting.

Then the President should have come out and related this conversation to the American press and to the American people.

Instead, the President let the Russians bring their own official photographer from the TASS Soviet news agency into the Oval Office and—get this—excluded all of the American press—just the friendly Russian cameras. Then, the Russians gleefully sent out victory tweets of the President's warm and friendly greeting.

This is totally upside down. Yet it only gets worse. Stunningly, it was just revealed Monday night that President Trump asked two of the Nation's top intelligence officials in March to help him push back against the FBI investigation into possible collusion between his campaign and the Russian Government.

The Washington Post reported that President Trump made separate ap-

peals to the Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, and the Director of the National Security Agency, Admiral Mike Rogers. Coats and Rogers both rightly refused to comply with President Trump's request, properly deemed as an inappropriate request from the President of the United States to leaders of our intelligence-gathering community. I applaud the respect of these two men for our democratic norms and system of government and the rejection of the President's reckless, selfish request.

This is breathtaking—an American President running from the Russians to our Nation's top law enforcement agency to our intelligence community, bizarrely pleading innocence on a matter of grave national security and trying to undermine ongoing investigations.

Former CIA General Counsel Jeffrey Smith said Trump's deeply troubling effort is an echo of President Nixon's "unsuccessful effort to use the CIA to shut down the FBI's investigation of the Watergate break-in on national security grounds" and, in his words, these actions were "an appalling abuse of power."

I had argued that Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein should either appoint a special counsel to look at the allegations of collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russians or tender his resignation. I said this after he was set up by the Trump administration to write a memo explaining the firing of James Comey as Director of the FBI and giving as his reason to protect the honor and integrity of Hillary Clinton during the campaign.

That was a laughable assertion.

Rosenstein wrote it. For at least 24 hours, that was the official line from the Trump White House. Then, there was the Lester Holt interview on NBC, and the President came out and said: I wanted to get rid of him months ago; I wanted to put an end to this Russian thing.

I am pleased that Mr. Rosenstein made the right decision when he appointed former FBI Director Robert Mueller to fill the special counsel role.

Back in the year 2001, that ominous year of 9/11, I first met Robert Mueller. He was the Director of the FBI. We worked together on some important issues relative to the FBI. I came to respect him very much. He is a decorated veteran of the Vietnam war, where he served as an officer in the Marine Corps, a former Federal judge, a man of the opposite political faith, but a man who clearly loves his country above party, whenever he is asked. He is a man who has not only risen to the challenge of public service but who has excelled to the point where his term as Director of the FBI was extended—a rarity around Washington and, certainly, on a bipartisan basis almost unthinkable these days. But it happened

with Robert Mueller. It happened because he is smart, he is principled, and he loves his country, and we know it. I don't think Rod Rosenstein could have chosen a better person.

I don't know if I will ultimately agree with his investigation of this critical issue, but I will respect his findings, whatever they may be, because I know that they are heartfelt, sincere, and principled.

While this special counsel investigation will be critical, it is not a substitute, however, for continued congressional action, as well, as some have suggested or perhaps hoped. I know the Senate Intelligence Committee is actively pursuing this matter, and I salute them for that effort, but I think we need to think about more. We need to think about an independent commission—a bipartisan, transparent commission—to deal with policy questions. For instance, what are we going to face from the Russians in the next election? What did we learn in the last election to protect ourselves?

The special counsel is going to focus on whether crimes were committed, but I am deeply concerned that there may be matters related to Russia's attack that may not involve crimes themselves but should be made public to the American people. It is Congress's responsibility, just as it was after the September 11 tragedy, to make sure the American people know as much as possible in a democracy. That is how it works.

Former Watergate investigator Scott Armstrong made this point in an op-ed in Sunday's New York Times. He pointed out how a select congressional committee and a special prosecutor overcame partisan and jurisdictional conflicts to get to the truth during Watergate. He noted:

A mature special prosecutor and a well-led congressional inquiry can coordinate over issues like witness immunity. Congress can creatively expand its witness list beyond prosecution targets and fill in critical details from satellite witnesses . . . If the committee is aggressive and truly bipartisan, it can not only educate and reassure the public, but also legislate solutions to prevent future abuses.

There are a lot of parallels between the Watergate era and what we face today, but, sadly, one major difference from the Nixon era to the Trump era is the willingness of members of the President's own party to stand up and speak out.

Back in Nixon's day, there came a moment when a handful of Senators from this Chamber changed history, and one of them was Barry Goldwater. He met with President Nixon and he said: There are only so many lies you can take, and now there has been one too many.

Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania joined him, as well as another Republican—John Rhodes, a Republican leader in the House. They made it clear to President Nixon that what he had done was

unacceptable by any standard and they would no longer stand by him. It took courage for them to do that. The President saw the writing on the wall, and he resigned.

We are looking for similar leadership today from both sides of the aisle—not just Democrats but Republicans as well—to stand up and defend our democracy from Putin's interference.

There have been months of relative inaction. It is clear that the President is not going to stand up to Russia. It is time for all of us—Democrats and Republicans in Congress—to act for the good of this Nation and get to the truth of what happened and make sure Russia can never do this to our democracy again.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the Trump administration released its fiscal year 2018 budget this morning. For all the talk on the campaign trail of standing up for the forgotten Americans in this country, the President's budget takes aim at the exact programs that many rely on. From healthcare and food stamps to student loans and disability, President Trump's budget is nothing less than an assault on seniors, low-income Americans, children, and the disabled.

The President's budget calls for more than \$3.6 trillion in cuts to Federal spending over the next 10 years, with more than \$1 trillion of these cuts coming from some of the most vital programs in our Nation's social safety net. Nothing is more essential to our Nation's low-income, disabled, and elderly Americans than Medicaid and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, known as SNAP. But the President's budget slashes more than \$600 billion from Medicaid, despite the President's repeated promises on the campaign trail to protect the program. More than 3 million people in my State—20 percent of the people who live there—currently depend on the Medicaid Program for healthcare, including 1.5 million children and more than 300,000 seniors and disabled people.

The budget cuts \$193 billion from SNAP by making it harder for people

to qualify for this assistance in putting food on the table. Forty-four million children, disabled, and low-income people around the country accessed food through the SNAP program last year.

Also weakened in the President's budget is the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant that helps States provide financial assistance to families who are literally struggling to survive. And the budget cuts about 20 percent of funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, providing health insurance for poor children. Isn't that incredible? The President doesn't believe that is a priority—health insurance for poor children.

It is often said that the President's budget reflects our values, and this budget shows that President Trump clearly values tax cuts for the upper income individuals in America over the lives of poor and middle-class Americans.

The President's budget also includes historic cuts in nondefense discretionary spending. Over the next 10 years, President Trump proposes to cut domestic spending so significantly that spending on defense would exceed spending on domestic priorities by almost \$300 billion. To pay for an increase in defense spending and to build his big, beautiful wall, the President would slash funding from programs essential to hard-working Americans—programs that support affordable housing, home heating bills, Meals on Wheels, student loans, clean drinking water, preserving the Great Lakes, early childhood education, and infrastructure.

Even medical research is on the Trump chopping block. President Trump has proposed cutting one-fifth of the budget for the National Institutes of Health, including \$1 billion from the National Cancer Institute. President Obama, with Vice President Biden, with strong bipartisan support, put together a moonshot—a Cancer Moonshot—to do something significant in cancer research. President Trump's budget virtually eliminates it.

NIH has helped cut U.S. cancer death rates by 11 percent in women and 19 percent in men. It has helped ensure HIV/AIDS is no longer a death sentence. It contributed to the near eradication of polio and smallpox, but make

no mistake, these changes didn't just happen. They occurred because of sustained Federal investment in medical research.

I salute my colleague on the other side of the aisle, ROY BLUNT, the Appropriations subcommittee chair when it comes to NIH. For 2 straight years now, 2 fiscal years, he has given more than 5 percent real growth in NIH spending. I have praised him on the floor and back home and publicly over and over again. That Republican Senator, and many Democratic Senators, stood together because we believe in medical research. The Trump budget does not.

We cannot afford these devastating cuts, and we can't afford to sit on our hands and face the millions of families across America who count on us to have the right priorities. Clearly, the President's budget is far from a new foundation for American greatness. This budget would have a devastating impact on Americans most in need of a helping hand, on everything from healthcare to food access, to quality education and affordable housing.

They always say the President's budget is dead on arrival. This budget, I hope, will be dead on arrival. It doesn't deserve the light of day or a breath of life.

We need to come together, as we did in this year's budget, on a bipartisan basis, order the priorities that America sent us to prioritize, and then work together to pass it. I hope it is done on a bipartisan basis. That is what America wants, both parties to work together. We can do it. We did it for this fiscal year. We can do it for the next, but our first step in reaching an agreement is to make sure there is a sound rejection of President Trump's budget. His budget will not make America great again.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:18 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 24, 2017, at 10 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 23, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DAVIDSON).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 23, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable WARREN DAVIDSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

SHIELD MEDICARE PATIENTS FROM FRAUD AND ABUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight a truly wonderful business in State College, Pennsylvania: KCF Technologies. I had the honor of visiting KCF yesterday as it hit the milestone of hiring its 50th employee.

KCF was founded in November 2000 by three Penn State researchers: Gary Koopmann, Weicheng Chen, and Jeremy Frank. It is a private company and is employee-owned.

This rapidly growing technology innovation company focuses on putting inventions to work in the industrial world.

Its staff develops and commercializes products and solutions for industry and

the military. KCF specializes in wireless sensors, energy harvesting, underwater navigation, and smart material devices. Its goal is to bring the latest technologies to life to make things we work and live with smarter.

KCF is not only expanding its workforce, but its revenues have grown at an average annual rate of more than 60 percent and over 500 percent since 2005.

It set a lofty goal for this year to save its customers \$100 million in 2017, and KCF is passionately working to achieve that goal. Outside of its State College headquarters there is a thermometer sign prominently displayed to track progress. Multiple department walls within the facility are also adorned with thermometer posters. As KCF saves customers money throughout the year, the thermometers reflect that progress by filling up.

KCF Technologies not only cares about giving back to its customers, but it gives back to the Centre County community, too.

To commemorate a record-breaking sales month in April, employees exchanged their workday to volunteer at CentrePeace.

CentrePeace was established in 1994 with the purpose of providing a wholesome working environment for Centre County inmates. It operates the largest used furniture recycling project in the county, which prevents tons of items from ending up in the landfills. Inmates repair and restore electronics and furniture, participate in classes to improve their life skills, and learn how to handle conflict.

KCF Technologies is also working to improve the lives of our wounded warriors thanks to research funded by the U.S. Army Telemedicine and Advanced Technology Research Center, and the National Science Foundation.

It is fully researching and developing energy harvesting, self-powered prosthetic devices and the innovative Kinetic Revolutions Adjustable Pylon for use with leg prostheses. These electromechanical devices make life better for amputees at every age and walk of life.

Today, with my colleague, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON of California, we will introduce a bill that will curb Medicare fraud when it comes to unlawful and unlicensed providers of orthotics and prosthetics. Our bill works to ensure that the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services stops allowing these unlicensed operations to apply for and collect Federal payments.

As a former certified therapist and licensed nursing home administrator, I know firsthand the importance of safe and reliable products for those who are in need.

When unlicensed and unaccredited providers deliver prosthetic and orthotic services, both Medicare beneficiaries and the American taxpayer are shortchanged.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan Medicare Orthotics and Prosthetics Improvement Act of 2017.

ECONOMIC DIGNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, Americans aren't asking for much: the ability to put in an honest day's work and provide for your family's basic needs; the chance to wake up in the morning without facing a series of impossible choices—food or medication, mortgage or car repair, a bus pass or school supplies.

In other words, the basic economic dignity that every single person in this country deserves.

The Trump administration claims that their budget is about dignity. Here is what this budget doesn't understand: dignity can be threatened by something beyond your control, by disability, by job loss, by illness, by accident, by automation, by a government that shames you for needing a little help when you are dealt a tough hand, by the pain of having to send your kid to school knowing that he is not going to have the lunch money that he needs.

Countless American families battle these daily heartbreaks and small injustices with their heads held high. For those families, this budget doesn't see them for their dignity, but views them with disgrace.

RECOGNIZING OMMEGANG AND ROSCOE BEER COMPANIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate two local businesses, craft breweries, within the 19th Congressional District in New York State. These two local breweries, Brewery Ommegang, located in Cooperstown, New York, and Roscoe Beer Company, located in Sullivan County, New York, tied for first place in the Taste of New

York Inaugural Craft Beer Challenge in Manhattan.

This competition was held on May 17 and was announced then in New York City. Seventy breweries from across the State participated in the Craft Beer Challenge. Beers were selected by such foodie favorites like Chef Mario Batali and many other notables in the New York food business.

New York has clearly established itself, as has the 19th Congressional District, as a craft beer destination.

We are especially proud of our local upstate craft breweries, which support our local economy, jobs, farms, and tourism.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce and to congratulate these two fine establishments within the 19th Congressional District.

HONORING CHRIS GIBSON

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased today to congratulate my predecessor in Congress, Congressman Chris Gibson, for his wonderful service to our country and to Congress.

Chris will soon be honored by the Columbia County Association in the city of New York as man of the year. I have known Chris for over 30 years, and I am blessed to call him and his family my neighbors in the Village of Kinderhook, where we both live.

He was truly a great Congressman and an all-around leader to upstate New York in so many ways. He exemplifies service in its many forms. Chris is a proud patriot. He served 24 years in the United States Army, rising to the rank of colonel. He is a highly decorated veteran who received not only the Bronze Star, but the Purple Heart during his combat deployments.

He was deployed seven times, including four combat tours in Iraq. He made great sacrifices, as did his family, and he fought for our freedom. As a United States Congressman, he continued to fight for the citizens of upstate New York. He served three terms in the 19th Congressional District, fulfilling his pledge to self-imposed term limits.

His legislative priorities were national security, our veteran community, and combating Lyme disease. He always had his fellow citizens' best interests at heart.

Chris Gibson was also a scholar. He graduated from Siena College in Loudonville, New York, where he earned his ROTC commission. He went on to receive not one, but two master's degrees, plus a Ph.D. in government from Cornell University. He was an assistant professor for 3 years teaching cadets at West Point at the United States Military Academy. Today he continues his love of teaching at Williams College as a Visiting Professor of Leadership Studies.

I am proud to call Chris Gibson my friend and colleague, and it is clear to anyone who knows him that he will be successful in all of his pursuits.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor former Congressman Christopher P. Gibson. I have known Chris for over 30 years, and I am blessed to call him, his wife, Mary Jo, and their three amazing children, my neighbors in the town of Kinderhook. Chris was truly a great Congressman and an all-around leader to Upstate New York. He has exemplified service in many forms.

Chris is a proud patriot. He served 24 years in the US Army, rising to the rank of Colonel. A highly decorated veteran, he was deployed seven times, including four combat tours in Iraq. He made great sacrifices, was injured in the line of duty, and fought for our freedom.

As a US Representative, he continued to fight diligently for the citizens of Upstate New York. Chris served three terms representing New York's 19th District, fulfilling his pledge to self-impose term limits. Among many legislative priorities, Chris acted to protect our national security, veterans, and those who suffer from Lyme Disease. Without question, he has always held his fellow citizens' best interests at heart.

Chris Gibson is also a scholar. He graduated from Siena college, where he achieved his ROTC Commission, and he went on to receive two Masters Degrees and a PhD from Cornell University. At West Point, Chris taught cadets for three years as an Assistant Professor. Today, he continues his love for teaching and sharing his experience in his role as the Visiting Professor of Leadership Studies at Williams College.

I am proud to call Chris Gibson my friend and colleague, and it is clear to anyone who knows him that he will be successful in all his pursuits.

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE AND APPRECIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express gratitude and appreciation to the many who have called. I rise to thank people for the kindness that they have shown. I rise to express my most deepest heartfelt appreciation for those who have had the courage to stand up to hatred, to stand up to bigotry. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to say thank you.

I want to especially thank those who are in leadership. I especially want to thank two persons: Representative CLYBURN and Representative BENNIE THOMPSON. They both called me to express concern and to give me advice as to how to proceed.

For those who may not know, some very ugly things have been said, but they are not in any way comparable to the many kind words that have been expressed.

So thank you to all on behalf of my staff, many of whom are young people who are having this as their first experience with Congress. Thank you on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to explain why some of these ugly things are oc-

curing, and the best way to do it, in my opinion, would be to use the words of J. Patrick Kinney. J. Patrick Kinney has written a poem styled "The Cold Within," and this poem speaks to the extreme cupidity in our world—not stupidity, cupidity. It speaks to the extreme religiosity. It speaks to the extreme prejudice that some have to endure. It speaks to the extreme wealth and the abuse of it.

J. Patrick Kinney talks about a cold night, possibly the coldest night ever on the planet Earth. These are his words:

Six humans trapped by happenstance
In bleak and bitter cold.
Each one possessed a stick of wood
Or so the story is told.
Their dying fire in need of logs
The first man held his back
For of the faces 'round the fire
He noticed one was Black.
The next man looking 'cross the way
Saw one not of his church
And he couldn't bring himself to give
The fire his stick of birch.
The third one sat in tattered clothes.
He gave his coat a hitch.
Why should his stick be put to use
To warm the idle rich?
The rich man just sat back and thought
Of the wealth he had in store
And how to keep what he had earned
From the lazy shiftless poor.
The Black man's face bespoke revenge
As the fire passed from his sight.
For all he saw in his stick of wood
Was a chance to spite the White.
The last man of this forlorn group
Did nought except for gain.
Giving only to those who gave
Was how he played the game.
Their logs held tight in death's still hands
Was proof of human sin.
They didn't die from the cold without
They died from the cold within.

□ 1015

STOP GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise because 3 short years ago, the Isla Vista community in my district was rocked by an act of tragic and senseless gun violence. A young man took the lives of 6 UCSB students and injured 14 others. That day families were torn apart by a kind of grief that no one should have to ever experience—the loss of a child.

The tragedy in Isla Vista we remember today is once again a reminder of the consequences of inaction by Congress regarding the epidemic of gun violence across our Nation. Far too often there are many red flags of someone intending to do harm, but no one can connect the dots.

Today I introduced legislation, with my colleagues Congresswoman ESTY and Congressman BEYER, that will allow families and loved ones who see disturbing warning signs the ability to

work with law enforcement and the courts so that they may intervene and better prevent acts of violence.

States like California and Connecticut have led the way on important measures to combat gun violence. This bill would encourage other States to adopt these proven preventative measures. The Gun Violence Restraining Order Act would help ensure that family members can go to court to seek a gun violence prevention order to temporarily stop someone who poses a threat to themselves or others from purchasing or possessing a gun.

When someone alerts law enforcement and members of their own family that they wish to do harm to themselves or members of the community, as was the case in Isla Vista, it is irresponsible of lawmakers not to give judges and police the ability to intervene.

I urge my colleagues to act and pass this commonsense legislation so that not one more family must live through the nightmare that parents experienced in Isla Vista on March 23, 2014.

SERVICE TO COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about national service. I am delighted, as you can see from these posters, to be standing next to President Kennedy and General McChrystal.

Many of you may know that this Monday, Memorial Day, May 29, would be the 100th birthday of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. What better way to remember his legacy than by a call to national service, a call that has been echoed by General McChrystal as well. I love the headline that says: You don't have to wear a military uniform to serve your country.

President Kennedy came up with the idea of the Peace Corps at a time when we faced nuclear threats and rising concern of proliferation of nuclear arms; at a time when Russia, as it still is today, was a very strong enemy of the United States. President Kennedy felt that the United States needed to put their best face on for the rest of the world, so he established a Peace Corps and sent the brightest and best all across the globe so that they could represent the values of this great country of ours. What better way to do that than through serving your country, by making sure you are not asking what your country can do for you but what you, in fact, can do for your country.

We are proposing a concept called ACTION for National Service, action so that we can encourage people throughout the country to participate in voluntary service. Whether you serve in the military voluntarily, the Guard or

the National Reserve, or whether it is the Peace Corps, AmeriCorps VISTA, or you are part of the Corporation for National and Community Service and one of the many agencies that work to provide a better world both here at home and abroad.

Our goal is very simple and direct. We want to make sure, as General McChrystal has outlined, that by 2026, which would be the 250th birthday of this Nation, that we have a million volunteers annually who are coming in to service. We will provide an incentive for people to do so, very clear and simple: If you serve your country, we will help you get through college. If you have been through college and you want to serve your country, if you serve your Nation, we will forgive your college debt.

We know that, in attracting a million people to public service, we can do great good across the globe. We want to make sure that we raise the Corporation for National and Community Service to a Cabinet-level position within the White House. We want to encourage people. More than 400,000 millennials were turned away from serving their country last year. Less than 1 percent of the Nation, including all of our military and the Peace Corps and AmeriCorps VISTA combined, account for less than 1 percent of the Nation. How can a nation long survive with a population of 330 million people and less than 1 percent of its countrymen serving this great Nation of ours?

This is a national crisis. At a time when we have to make sure that we are encouraging and nurturing our great democracy, we need our citizens to become more involved. That is why, on Thursday of this week, we are going to be rolling out a bill that will do just that and do so in a manner that will elevate the Corporation for National and Community Service to a Cabinet-level position, create the goal of establishing a million volunteers annually by 2026, incentivizing them to serve so that if you serve your country, we will forgive your debt; or if you serve your country, we will help you go to college or get the kind of training that you need to be a participant while also gaining the knowledge and expertise and the values that come from community service. Join us. We will be live on YouTube Thursday morning at 9 o'clock.

MAY IS AN IMPORTANT MONTH TO HOOSIERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, May is an important month for Hoosiers. We celebrate Indiana's great racing tradition, the Indianapolis 500, and our longstanding military tradition on Memorial Day and during Military Appreciation Month.

There are almost half a million veterans living in Indiana today in addition to the 30,000 Hoosiers currently serving in the armed services, Reserve, and the Guard. We are proud of our military men and women in Indiana. These honorable Hoosiers are our fathers, sons, mothers, daughters, neighbors, and friends. Service and patriotic duty is the Hoosier way. Actually, both of my grandfathers, my Grandpa Lathery and my Grandpa Rotzien, served our Nation in the armed services.

This May, as we gather together to celebrate our great Hoosier traditions, let's remember the reason that we get to celebrate. It is all thanks to the men and women who have put their lives on the line so that each of us can be free. On Memorial Day, we, of course, remember those who paid the ultimate sacrifice for our freedoms, but every day we can remember that we owe our military families and our vets a debt that can never be repaid. Let's all do everything we can to ensure they are honored every day.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 24 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of mercy, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We thank You once again that we can come before You and ask guidance for the men and women of this assembly. Send Your spirit of peace, honesty, and fairness during this week when the budget is being considered and the work of appropriations continues.

As violence and the threat of violence hang over our world, may we be continually thankful for and supportive of those whose life's work is keeping us safe. Send Your spirit of healing and comfort to those who are victims of these horrors in our world.

May we in America, and all men and women of good will, be committed to working for peace in our homes, neighborhoods, and throughout our land and the world.

Bless us this day and every day. May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HILL led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, May marks Military Appreciation Month, a special time to recognize the tremendous support and encouragement families offer their servicemembers. As the son of a Flying Tiger who served in India and China, and as the grateful father of four sons who have all served overseas, and as a 31-year veteran of the Army Reserve and Guard, I know firsthand the commitment of our troops, veterans, and military families.

Last week, I was honored to join Senator ROY BLUNT, Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, and Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS to introduce common-sense, bipartisan legislation, the Military Families Stability Act, which provides for greater flexibility by allowing military families a 6-month option of moving to the start of their next assignment.

The happiness and success of our military families is critical to overall troop readiness and retention. I am confident this legislation will greatly benefit families around the country.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. We offer our sympathy and solidarity for the victims of Manchester and our beloved allies in the United Kingdom. Together with members of the European Union Parliament, we will defeat the murderous losers.

OPPOSING PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, today the President put forward his budget proposal. It will be damaging to the people in our communities and the places that we call home.

It cuts Medicaid by over \$600 billion and cuts the food stamp program by over 25 percent, affecting the most needy within our communities. It slashes infrastructure programs, eliminates TIGER grants, cuts student loan and financial aid programs, and includes catastrophic cuts to the Environmental Protection Agency.

For my home State of Hawaii, this budget zeroes out Federal funding for the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grants, the Native Hawaiian Loan Guarantee program, and cuts Native Hawaiian education programs by nearly \$33 million, crippling the progress that has been made for over 30 years to strengthen Native Hawaiian early education, literacy, gifted and talented education programs, higher education, vocational programs, and more.

I strongly oppose this budget, and I look forward to working with my colleagues in Congress to pass a budget that actually serves the people and our planet.

VENEZUELA IS A FAILED STATE

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, all of us in the Western Hemisphere are in horror. Venezuela is a failed state and potentially on the brink of civil war. The Wall Street Journal reported earlier this week that thousands of Cuban intelligence agents are helping the Maduro regime maintain control over the army, while Maduro orders his soldiers to shoot his own people who are demonstrating in the streets.

We cannot let countries like China, Russia, Iran, and Cuba continue to play a role in propping up the Maduro regime. While I commend Treasury Secretary Mnuchin for issuing sanctions against individuals of the Venezuelan Supreme Court, I call on the administration to ratchet up the pressure on these outside forces and have them answer for their role in the emergency situation in Venezuela.

While we face many challenges across the globe, America must re-engage in the Western Hemisphere and not let the neighbors in our backyard slide back into tyranny.

PRESIDENTIAL BUDGET SHORTSIGHTED AND RECKLESS

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, well, the President's budget is shortsighted. It is reckless. Hopefully, it is dead on arrival when it lands here in the House.

President Trump and Republicans want to throw billions of dollars more on defense programs and drastically cut investments in job training, after-school programs, and lifesaving medical research.

Think about this:

It cuts Social Security disability benefits.

If you are a worker in Saginaw looking for your next job, you are out of luck. President Trump wants to cut worker training programs.

If you are a senior in Bay City, Michigan, and you depend on Meals on Wheels, too bad. President Trump wants to take away those meals, take away that contact that you have.

If you are a parent in Flint with a child in Head Start just trying to find a way forward, too bad. President Trump's budget will cut support for education and for early childhood education.

A budget is a statement of our values. What does this document say about the values of this President?

We must reject the President's proposed budget. It is bad for America.

MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to recognize Military Appreciation Month.

This month allows us the opportunity to educate Americans regarding the impact our military has had throughout history.

This month allows us to honor the important men and women who have served and who are serving in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, this month allows us to celebrate over 90 million patriots who chose to put our country before themselves.

As a Representative of the 25th Congressional District of Texas, it is my honor to represent Fort Hood Army Base. I am proud to speak on behalf of "The Great Place." Located in Killeen, Texas, this 340-square-mile installation is the gold standard for the Army.

My visits to Fort Hood have given me a deeper appreciation for our military and their families. This appreciation is why I would like to recognize Memorial Day, which we will all celebrate on Monday, May 29.

This day reminds us of the brave men and women who gave up their todays so we could have our tomorrows. It gives us a chance to say thank you to a soldier, sailor, airman, coastguardsman, or a marine. Please join me in paying tribute to military members who have given our country the ultimate sacrifice.

May God bless our troops. God bless The Great Place, and God bless the United States of America.

In God we trust.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AT AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS

(Mr. CONNOLLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the international students and the U.S. institutions of higher education they attend. They have been unfairly penalized by the Trump administration through unconstitutional and illegal immigration executive orders.

I urge my colleagues and the administration to recognize the vital contribution these international students make to our country. International students who spend time in the United States become ambassadors when they return home, sharing an appreciation of our values, counteracting stereotypes about Americans and the United States, and enhancing respect for cultural differences and democratic norms.

International students contribute to the economic well-being of the United States. According to the Association of International Educators, during the last academic year, international students and their families supported 400,000 jobs and contributed \$33 billion to our domestic economy. In my district alone, 4,978 international students and families contributed \$137 million to our local economy, supporting 1,725 jobs.

Actions taken by this administration and this President have generated a great deal of fear and uncertainty within academia. It hurts America. I urge us to support more international students to come to our country.

RECOGNIZING FLAT ROCK MIDDLE SCHOOL

(Mr. FERGUSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the hard work of the students and faculty at Flat Rock Middle School in Tyrone, Georgia.

Four years ago, Dr. Monica Reckley decided to found a STEM program at Flat Rock to give her students more than just a traditional classroom experience. She hoped to show them how science, technology, math, and engineering could lead to future careers.

Today, the program has 150 students spread over 6th, 7th, and 8th grades, and it is helping students develop an interest that could lead them to new professional opportunities. The program introduces students to STEM, brings in speakers from these fields, and allows students to participate in related competitions.

Last month, 10 students from the program participated in the Georgia Tech InVenture Challenge and had several inventions showcased. These inventions included a bulletproof vest de-

signed specifically for female police officers, a wireless vital signs monitoring device for elderly patients, a dental floss guard to make flossing easier, and an extension cord and power outlet combination that reduces the number of electrical outlets needed in a home.

I am so proud of these students and the opportunities this school district has provided to encourage young people to explore careers in the 21st century.

I am a proud supporter of career and technical education programs because they prepare students and young people for work and careers in the modern workforce.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET IS AWFUL

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the President's newly released budget request.

When I began reading this budget request, only one word came to mind, at least that I can say here—awful:

It is an awful budget for American families struggling to make ends meet who haven't had a raise in years.

It is an awful budget for older Americans who paid into Social Security with the promise that it would be there for them.

It is an awful budget for local businesses who can't get their products to consumers because of our crumbling roads and bridges.

It is an awful budget for common sense, with unnecessary spending on a border wall that the American people will pay for.

It is an awful budget because it sets the stage for even more waste, fraud, and abuse in government.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the only group that this budget isn't awful for is the President and his friends.

The President calls this an America First budget, so why is it leaving so many American families behind?

I urge my colleagues to completely reject this awful budget that doesn't create jobs, doesn't uplift families, and doesn't make any sense.

ROWLAND THEATRE CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a true gem in Philipsburg, Pennsylvania, the Rowland Theatre, which celebrates its 100th anniversary this year.

Rowland Theatre opened its doors on June 4, 1917. Its visionary was Congressman Charles Rowland, who was elected to the House of Representatives

in 1915 and represented the 21st Congressional District, which included Cameron, Centre, Clearfield, and McKean Counties.

The Rowland Theatre was actually one small part of Congressman Rowland's life, but it would be the project that would become his legacy. The theater not only showed the latest silent movies during its first few decades, it was also the location for the top traveling shows in the country.

Now the Rowland Theatre shows feature films and also hosts plays, as well as choir and orchestra performances. The 1,000-seat theater remains an anchor of downtown Philipsburg, and it is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Rowland Theatre is open 364 days a year, closing only on Christmas Eve.

Mr. Speaker, the Rowland Theatre is a real treasure. Here is to another 100 years.

Congratulations.

□ 1215

RAISING THE DIALOGUE ON MIDDLE NEIGHBORHOODS

(Mr. EVANS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's budget is officially live, and he plans to make massive cuts to programs that help our hardworking families get ahead.

What do we have to lose under President Trump's budget? What don't we have to lose? Education programs for our children, Medicare and Medicaid for the health and safety of our neighborhoods, affordable housing, SNAP benefits, veterans, seniors, and the hits keep coming. A budget is a moral document, and this one shortchanges Americans from the middle neighborhoods in Philadelphia to Beaver, Pennsylvania.

The President talks about putting the country first, yet the budget does no such thing.

There is a big difference between governing and campaigning. President Trump, our neighborhoods have a lot to lose when it comes to your budget. Over 40 percent of the populations of Philadelphia live in what you call middle neighborhoods. Middle neighborhoods are neighborhoods caught between bust and boom, neighborhoods that are doing well enough.

Our neighborhoods compete for people. My district has a poverty rate of 28 percent. Mr. President, now is not the time to make deep cuts to programs our neighbors rely on while calling for massive tax cuts for the rich.

Instead, we need to make investments in food policy, social safety net, education policy, and make access to capital and credit. Our communities have too much to lose. Together we will build stronger neighborhoods, block by block.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Members are reminded to address all comments to the Chair, not to other Members or to the President.

HONORING THOSE WHO DIED FOR OUR FREEDOM

(Mr. SMUCKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember those who fought and died for our freedom, to thank the brave men and women who today defend our freedom, and to recognize the sacrifice of all their families.

Pennsylvania has produced some of the greatest examples of valor and bravery the world has ever seen. It is home to pivotal moments in American history, like Gettysburg, Valley Forge, and the Battle of Lake Erie. Pennsylvania's sons have stormed the beaches of Normandy. They have liberated the oppressed from fascism and communism, and they have sought out terror in the depths of Afghanistan and Iraq in order to protect our way of life.

Memorial Day is coming up this weekend. We will all enjoy time with our families and friends, but we must always remember that is only possible because of the brave men and women who gave what Abraham Lincoln called the "last full measure of devotion," and those who protect us today.

THE UNAFFORDABLE HEALTHCARE BILL

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, currently a panel of Republican Senators are deciding the fate of millions of American women's healthcare. Tragically, their starting point is the House-passed bill that would force new moms on Medicaid to return to work right after birth, reduce women's access to copays for contraception, weaken protections for pre-existing conditions like pregnancy, and eliminate the guarantee of essential health benefits that provides services like mammograms and cervical cancer screenings, services that save lives.

All of these measures hurt women—and only women—and will do enormous harm to the health and well-being of women from childhood to old age. It is an outrage and a gross injustice when women are treated so unequally with such gross disparity and such total disregard for their lives and well-being.

It is one more powerful reason why this Congress should pass and send to the States to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment, declaring in no uncertain terms that women are entitled to equal rights, equal justice, equal treatment, equal protection under the law, and

that means equal treatment in healthcare. In this country, it is time, at long last, for equal to mean just that, equal.

TRIBUTE TO COMMANDER JO-ANN BURDIAN

(Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with much admiration and respect for Commander Jo-Ann Burdian of the United States Coast Guard.

Commander Burdian's tenure in the House of Representatives as a congressional liaison for the United States Coast Guard is coming to an end. She is on her second tour of duty, 3 years each, for a total of 6 years. During her tenure in the House of Representatives, we have seen unprecedented growth and change in the mission of the United States Coast Guard. It has become somewhat of a Swiss Army knife of an agency, of a command, covering everything from oil spills to homeland security, 9/11, alien interdiction, drug interdiction, defense missions, maritime security, and many other important missions around the world.

Commander Burdian has fostered incredible relationships with Members, staff, and oversight committees and done a fantastic job for both sides of the aisle, including assisting in the passage of two major Coast Guard authorization bills, three appropriations bills, full funding of the Offshore Patrol Cutter, the Fast Response Cutter, the National Security Cutter, and helping to secure \$150 million in the FY17 budget to progress polar icebreaker capabilities for the United States.

Commander Burdian's hard work and efforts for the House of Representatives were rewarded with her appointment to chief of response for Sector Puget Sound. I want to commend her and her family for incredible service to the United States.

MAY IS FOSTER CARE MONTH

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May as National Foster Care Month.

In Michigan, there are nearly 14,000 children in foster care and more than 400,000 children nationwide all in need of love and support. Studies have shown the majority of children in foster care are affected by mental health issues and often lack access to the help they need. We need to push for access to services to support these vulnerable children to avoid serious risks in the future.

I encourage my colleagues to continue working together in a bipartisan

manner to address the needs of our foster care system. I also want to thank KAREN BASS for raising awareness on the critical needs facing foster youth through the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth. During this month and beyond, let us celebrate foster parents and caregivers and recommit to ensuring every child has a permanent, safe, and loving family.

HONORING THE LIFE OF YODELL BILLAH

(Mr. O'HALLERAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to Yodell Billah, who passed away earlier this month at the age of 97. Mr. Billah was a Navajo code talker and World War II Army veteran, fighting against the Germans in Italy until their surrender in 1945. His heroic actions and the work of our code talkers saved the lives of innumerable soldiers and civilians.

For his service, he was awarded the American Defense Service Medal, American Campaign Medal, and the European African Middle East Campaign Medal.

We can never repay the debts that we owe Mr. Billah, code talkers from all our Tribal Nations, and our veterans, but I am proud and humbled to stand before you today to bring attention to his service and honor his legacy.

Mr. Billah will forever be remembered as an active member of his community, a loving father, a grandfather, and, above all, a hero.

WE MUST RESPOND TO THE GLOBAL CRISIS OF HUNGER AND FAMINE

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, 20 million people in South Sudan, Somalia, Yemen, and Nigeria are on the brink of famine. We saw this coming. The warning signs were there long before January of this year.

I am so proud that Republicans and Democrats joined together to include an additional \$1 billion in the FY 2017 omnibus bill to address these famines.

Our citizens and our farmers have always been generous in times of such grave need. They know that we have to protect children from hunger and the violence of war. They know that we need to support diplomacy and development to avoid future catastrophes.

Our united effort must continue in FY 2018, but the President's budget eliminates the Food for Peace and the McGovern-Dole programs, and reduces funding for disaster assistance. I only hope President Trump and Secretary Tillerson will come to their senses. We

must not stand by and watch millions of children and families literally starve to death. We must act, and we must lead.

BUDGETS ARE ABOUT PRIORITIES

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, today the President put forth his budget proposal. The budget includes roughly \$2.5 trillion in cuts to programs that help struggling families and elderly and disabled people afford the basics, like putting food on the table, keeping a roof over their heads, and affording healthcare.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, would be cut by \$192 billion over the next decade. Medicaid, the health program for the poor, would be cut by \$800 billion. TANF, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, would be cut by \$21 billion. In 2014, 20 percent of the population of my district, the Virgin Islands, received SNAP. SNAP feeds primarily poor children. In 2013, 19 percent of Virgin Islands' children were covered under Medicaid. Another 27 percent went without any health coverage at all.

Mr. Speaker, budgets are about priorities. Unfortunately, our President's priorities are clear: more tax cuts for the wealthy taking precedence over ensuring that poor children have enough to eat, that people with physical and mental disabilities can make ends meet, and that low- and moderate-income Americans have access to healthcare. The budget would make inequality and poverty significantly worse, while allowing deficits, when honestly measured, to soar. Mr. Speaker, we must reject this budget.

HONORING THE HEROES OF OUR ARMED FORCES

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today ahead of Memorial Day next week to honor the heroes of our Armed Forces who have made the ultimate sacrifice and service to our Nation and to thank their fellow soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who were blessed to make it back home to their loved ones.

From the Revolutionary War through the war on terror, more than 1.3 million Americans have given their lives protecting our freedoms. Today, Congress is honoring those lost by passing several bills to help protect our surviving veterans and ensure they are treated with the dignity and respect they have earned. Our bills will ensure that the VA medical centers are meeting compliance requirements, help vet-

erans have better access to nursing home care, increase the rates for veterans' compensation for service-connected disabilities, and more.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better way to celebrate Memorial Day and honor the memory of those lost than by helping our Nation's veterans, who have sacrificed so much to help keep America safe. I urge all of my colleagues to support these measures today and our veterans each and every day.

BIG TALK AND BROKEN PROMISES

(Mr. SOTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, today we have a new Trump budget and more broken promises. If you recall on May 7, 2015, the President said: "I was the first and only potential GOP candidate to state there will be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid."

Broken promise number one. His budget cuts Medicaid, it cuts Medicare, it cuts Social Security.

In *The Washington Post* on January 15, 2017, the President said: "We are going to have insurance for everybody. Much less expensive and much better."

This broken promise number two is that he cuts \$1.4 trillion out of healthcare and covers 24 million less people, jacking up insurance rates for countless others.

Broken promise number three to the Farm Bureau at *ag.com* on April 24, 2017: "I support a strong safety net for our Nation's farmers." Yet he cuts \$50 billion over 10 years from farm subsidies, including critical citrus greening research dollars for central Florida, where I represent.

Then on September 28, 2016, *The Washington Times*, he says: "I will be the greatest President for jobs that God's ever created." He is cutting the National Institutes of Health, critical research dollars by \$5.8 billion, cutting NASA by \$200 million, cutting National Science Foundation by \$776 million. We see big talk and broken promises.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 953, REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2017

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 348 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 348

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for

consideration of the bill (H.R. 953) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-21. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I found myself listening to the Reading Clerk as he read through the rule. It is a fairly straightforward rule, but it sounded pretty complicated as he was going through it. And I am reminded that

standing to your left is one of the gentlemen that helps us sort through those issues.

As every Member of this institution knows, who was listening to the colloquy last week, Brian Cooper is leaving this House after 35 years of public service, honorable service, showing up day in and day out. My friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, and I, working on the Rules Committee, sometimes go until 2, 3, or 4 in the morning. Well, folks like Mr. Cooper can't go home until the Rules Committee goes home.

So day in and day out, with absolutely no pomp or circumstance, just dedicated public service, Brian Cooper served this institution. I fear this will be the last time he and I are on the floor together while I have control of the microphone. And I did not want to yield control of that microphone without telling how much his assistance has meant to me.

You know, Mr. Speaker, standing in that chair is a powerful responsibility. The burden sometimes is a lot to bear. When you are surrounded by a team of excellence, as you are today, with Ethan to your right and Brian to your left, I know you do that with great confidence. I am grateful to folks who help us to succeed.

Thank you, Mr. Cooper, for all of that service.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 348 is a structured rule. It provides for consideration of H.R. 953, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017. It makes in order two amendments from my Democratic colleagues—one from Ms. ESTY and one from Mr. HUFFMAN.

As you might remember, the House passed a nearly identical version of this bill last year, Mr. Speaker, but, unfortunately, it did not get across the finish line in the Senate, so it did not make it to the President's desk. We are trying again this year. My sincere hope is that we will succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you hear from constituents, as I do, talking about regulatory burdens, and why can't we bring commonsense rules and regulations to Washington. H.R. 953, the bill that this rule would make in order, is an attempt to do that.

This bill prohibits the EPA from requiring unnecessary and duplicative pollution permits for certain pesticides. Now, so often when we start a sentence with "this prevents the EPA," folks think: Oh, there go those Republicans again going after the environment, waiving those regulations that protect friends and family.

Well, as you know, Mr. Speaker, that accusation is never accurate. But, in particular, it fails to address this situation.

For decade upon decade, the EPA has regulated pesticides in this country. If we pass H.R. 953 today, for decades and decades to come, the EPA will continue to regulate pesticides in this country.

As a result of litigation, Mr. Speaker, the courts are forcing the EPA not to regulate pesticides as pesticides, but to regulate pesticides as pollutant discharges, as if there is something else to do with pesticides other than to spray it.

They are saying that you can't just get a permit to use your pesticide, Mr. Speaker. You can't just read the label and the proper application and get a permit to apply, as indicated on the label. You must also get a permit to discharge a pollutant as if the pesticide is not already regulated as a pesticide itself.

Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense. The good news is I am surrounded by a team of excellence here in the United States House of Representatives and, in a bipartisan way, we have already agreed that it makes no sense.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, we brought a substantially similar measure to the floor, and we passed it under a process called suspension of the rules. It is a process we save for those bills that are relatively noncontroversial. It passed in a bipartisan way, but didn't make it across the Senate floor.

We brought it back again, Mr. Speaker, to this floor. We brought it under a rule, as we are doing today. It passed again in a bipartisan way. We sent it to the Senate, but couldn't make it across the Senate floor.

Mr. Speaker, we added it to the farm bill that we passed here in the House, which, again, passed in a bipartisan way. We sent it over to the Senate and it was stripped out on the Senate side.

Mr. Speaker, we have come together time and time again as a body to move this commonsense regulatory reform forward. It is my great hope that I will get support from both sides of the aisle again today not just on this rule, but on the underlying legislation, and that we will move forward in a bipartisan way again.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin as well and echo what Mr. WOODALL said in praising Brian Cooper for his many decades of service to this body. We appreciate all of his years of service. We appreciate all of the years he drove back and forth to work from Baltimore. And we appreciate the incredible patience that he has demonstrated over the years by having to listen to us time and time again.

One of the great joys of serving in this body is that you meet some remarkable people. Brian Cooper is certainly a remarkable person, and he will be missed. And I think on behalf of everybody here, we want to say: thank you.

Mr. Speaker, let me rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the underlying legislation.

My colleague, Mr. WOODALL, just referenced all of the times we passed it, it went over to the Senate, and it didn't go anywhere. Maybe we should take a hint from the Senate that it is not a good bill and we ought to kind of reconsider some of the aspects of this bill.

But here we are again on the House floor with yet another regulatory rollback. It is shameful that the leadership of this House continues to waste precious time on bills that seem to address the concerns of Big Industry over the needs of our constituents, especially as we have so much that needs to be accomplished.

By the way, whatever happened to regular order? Do you remember when committees held hearings and mark-ups?

The Agriculture Committee, on which I serve, did not hold a hearing. It held a markup, but it did not hold a hearing. And the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the committee with primary jurisdiction over this bill, held no hearing and did no markup.

And let's talk about amendments. The majority made in order less than half of the amendments submitted—two amendments—but they blocked through completely germane amendments. Members jumped through all of the hoops, they dotted all of the Is, and they crossed all of the Ts. These were properly drafted amendments, and they were blocked because the Republican majority was afraid to vote on them.

Now, what were these amendments?

Well, an amendment to prohibit the discharge of toxics in such circumstances where they would be harmful to pregnant women or harm fetal or early childhood development. The amendment protects pregnant women and children. Blocked.

An amendment to create an exception for communities that use a source of drinking water where a Federal or State emergency declaration has been issued due to a threat to public health, such as heightened exposure to an identified contaminant. Blocked.

An amendment to ensure existing Clean Water Act protections apply to waters that a State has already determined are polluted by pesticides. Blocked.

They were blocked because they would have passed.

Why are my colleagues afraid of protecting pregnant women, and ensuring clean drinking water?

That is what these amendments were about. They were germane. The only reason why they are not in order is because you chose to block them in the Rules Committee.

I would say to my Republican friends: You are not running this institution. You are ruining this institution. This is supposed to be a deliberative body. Let's start acting like it. And that means bringing germane amendments to the floor, letting us have a debate, letting Republicans and Democrats debate, and then vote on those amendments.

There is not a single reason at all other than the fact that the Republican leadership did not want these amendments to pass that they were not made in order. That is not the way this place is supposed to work.

And speaking of a bad process, late last week, Billy House at Bloomberg News broke the news that the House may need to vote again on this devastating TrumpCare bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the article by Billy House.

[From www.bloomberg.com, May 18, 2017]
HOUSE MAY NEED TO VOTE AGAIN ON GOP
OBAMACARE REPEAL BILL

(By Billy House)

House Republicans barely managed to pass their Obamacare repeal bill earlier this month, and they now face the possibility of having to vote again on their controversial health measure.

House Speaker Paul Ryan hasn't yet sent the bill to the Senate because there's a chance that parts of it may need to be redone, depending on how the Congressional Budget Office estimates its effects. House leaders want to make sure the bill conforms with Senate rules for reconciliation, a mechanism that allows Senate Republicans to pass the bill with a simple majority.

Republicans had rushed to vote on the health bill so the Senate could get a quick start on it, even before the CBO had finished analyzing a series of last-minute changes. The CBO is expected to release an updated estimate next week.

"Unaware," said Representative Jeff Denham of California, with noticeable surprise Thursday, when advised that his party leaders still hadn't sent the bill over to the Senate. Denham was one of the House Republicans who ended up voting for the measure, after earlier in the week opposing it.

"I am on the whip team and we have a lot of conversations, but we have not had that one. So I am going to look into it," said Denham, a member of the party's vote-counting team.

DOWNPLAYING CONCERN

One senior GOP aide downplayed any concern over the potential trouble from the CBO report, depicting it as hypothetical, and saying that leaders will cross that bridge if they need to.

According to several aides and other procedural experts, if Republicans send the bill to the Senate now and the CBO later concludes it doesn't save at least \$2 billion, it would doom the bill and Republicans would have to start their repeal effort all over with a new budget resolution. Congressional rules would likely prevent Republicans from fixing the bill after it's in the Senate, the aides said.

In the Senate, the bill must hit separate \$1 billion deficit reduction targets in the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee and the chamber's health committee. Republican aides said failing to meet those numbers would force the House to fix the bill even if

the legislation meets the overall cost-savings target.

If Republican leaders hold onto the bill until the CBO report is released, then Ryan and his team could still redo it if necessary. That would require at least one more House vote of some sort.

Ryan told conservative radio host Hugh Hewitt on Friday that he doesn't think the House will need to vote again on the health law. "We just want to, out of an abundance of caution, wait to send the bill over to the Senate when we get the final score," Ryan said.

That vote could be cloaked in some kind of arcane procedural move, but it would still be depicted as a proxy for yet another vote on the same bill—and reluctant Republicans will once again be forced to decide whether to back it. Only this time, they would also be saddled with the CBO's latest findings about the bill's costs and impacts.

Republicans had a sizable deficit reduction cushion—\$150 billion—before several amendments were added to the bill at the last minute, including changes allowing states to legalize much skimpier health insurance plans.

BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS

It's unclear what assumptions the CBO will make about what states will do with that newly created flexibility. If millions of people sign up for much cheaper, minimal insurance, that could trigger billions—and potentially even hundreds of billions—in costs over a decade because of the House bill's health insurance tax credits.

"We've got to wait for the CBO score," said Greg Walden of Oregon, chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, which authored much of the bill. "To prove that you meet the reconciliation test."

But other senior Republicans weren't aware that leaders had been holding onto the bill.

"I had no idea," Dennis Ross of Florida, another member of the vote-counting team, said Thursday, adding that the prospect of another vote "does concern me."

GOP leaders never said publicly they were planning to hold on to the bill for two weeks or longer.

DEMOCRATS' CRITICISM

"Every school child knows that when you pass a bill in the House, you send it to the Senate," said Louise Slaughter, the ranking Democrat on the House Rules Committee. "You don't hide it in a drawer somewhere for two weeks, while you wait for information that you should have had before you passed it."

The speaker and other Republicans urgently pushed their May 4 floor vote, despite a polarized Republican conference, using the frantic final hours to win over holdouts. Even so, 20 Republicans still voted against the bill. After the bill squeaked through, Ryan and other senior Republicans dashed to the White House for an unusual celebration of a one-chamber vote.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure everyone understands that. We thought we were through with it here in the House, but we may not be. After Republicans used emergency procedures on more than one occasion to rush their bill through the House of Representatives, we found out that Republican leaders had yet to send a bill over to the Senate for its consideration. Instead, they have been hiding the bill for nearly 3 weeks.

What happened to the urgency that my colleagues were talking about a few weeks ago?

We heard from our Republican friends that the sky would fall if we didn't act upon TrumpCare immediately. It had to be done right then and there. We couldn't slow down long enough to hear from the nonpartisan experts at the Congressional Budget Office. We couldn't slow down enough so that people could actually read what was in the bill. We couldn't slow down enough to do hearings or to get estimates on how this massive bill would impact the healthcare of millions of Americans.

I think it has become clear to all of us, Mr. Speaker, that the only reason to rush through this process was to trick their own Members into voting for this disastrous bill. It was to keep their Members from seeing the CBO score before they voted for the bill, because if they had seen it, many of them may not have voted for it. Republican leadership couldn't risk transparency, and they wouldn't let the facts get in the way of passing TrumpCare.

We expect CBO to release their final analysis tomorrow. Finally, we will know how many millions of Americans will be kicked off of their healthcare because of these reckless and heartless Republican policies. We will find out how devastating this bill will be for millions of Americans with preexisting conditions. And we will finally learn just how big that tax cut for wealthy Americans is going to be.

I guess my question to Republican leaders of this House is: What was the rush? If you were going to have to hold up the bill over here until the CBO score was released anyway, why couldn't we just have waited to receive this very important information before we asked the House to vote on this terrible bill?

Oh, wait. I know why the Republican leadership needed to move TrumpCare so fast, so that the bill's namesake—President Trump—didn't throw a temper tantrum. That is what this was all about. So he wouldn't call them out in one of his infamous Twitter rants.

□ 1245

But it wasn't about good legislating. It was a lousy process basically designed to prematurely shove a bill through that is bad for Americans, all for some headline or temporary political gain.

Now, if you have been watching the news lately, you will notice that our 45th President hasn't been generating the best headlines, what with "this Russia thing"—those are his words—constant leaks of information from his staff to the press, never mind the President's leaking of sensitive classified information on national security matters.

President Trump needed a win for himself, even if it is a loss for the

American people. As we all know, it is all about him.

Now, I remind my Republican colleagues that they work for the American people, that the ultimate boss for all of us is our constituents, not the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority has made a habit of completely skirting regular order and rushing through legislation crafted behind closed doors with no opportunity for meaningful debate and consideration, and this TrumpCare bill is a prime example.

We had emergency meetings, backroom deals, and fixes to the fixes to the fixes, and what we were left with is a lousy product that we may have to consider again. My Republican colleagues should be ashamed of themselves.

Process matters. We are on the Rules Committee. If you don't believe process matters, you ought to get on a different committee. It matters for the integrity of this institution, and it matters if we are to prevent lousy legislation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words about the Trump budget that was just released this morning.

We are still digging through the text and combing through the details, but from what we have already seen, it is devastating. Reports indicate that this budget makes the deepest cuts to Federal programs that help the most vulnerable, the poorest of the poor. Mr. Speaker, that is nothing to be proud of.

At a time when our crumbling infrastructure needs repair, our kids need access to affordable education, and our workers need training to move into high-tech jobs, we simply cannot afford to turn our back on these critical investments that will move our country forward. But this budget plan does just that.

Since we are on the floor to talk about an antienvironment bill today, I should note that the Environmental Protection Agency is among the agencies hardest hit by President Trump's ruthless proposal. Through massive cuts to the EPA, the Trump administration is paving the way toward dirtier air and more polluted water. But my Republican colleagues don't seem to be too concerned with that. They have been proposing cuts to EPA for years and years and years.

Mr. Speaker, of all the rotten provisions tucked into this document—and I could go on and on and on—I find the most troubling to be the radical assault on people living in poverty.

You know, it is easy to sit in an office at OMB and concoct plans to throw people off of SNAP and off of Medicaid and kick them out of their housing. This plan does just that. By any reading, by any measure, that is what it does. We are reading about a \$274 billion cut to our safety net, on top of the

over \$800 billion cut to Medicaid included in the TrumpCare bill.

These are real people, Mr. Speaker. They are our constituents. They are our neighbors and our friends. Our kids go to school together.

But given some of the proposals I have seen from this majority party, I have to wonder whether some of my colleagues might never have talked with anyone living in poverty. I would say to them, life is very different when you leave your country club. Life is very different. It is very hard for people struggling in poverty. Being poor in this country is hard work, and you ought to know that by now.

My Republican colleagues have made a habit of belittling the poor instead of trying to understand their struggles. They work hard, Mr. Speaker—often at more than one job—to put food on the table for their kids and to find a roof over their heads. They are exhausted from work and from worry.

We see them every day, serving tables, washing dishes, hauling away trash, cleaning offices, mowing lawns, stacking heavy loads, taking care of people's children, comforting the sick. Theirs are the faces in the bus windows going home from work at 2 in the morning. Theirs are the faces arriving at work at 5 in the morning the next day. They deserve our respect, not the disdain shown to them and to their families in this disgraceful budget.

I would like to remind my colleagues that poverty and hunger in rural areas is often as bad as, and sometimes even worse than, in cities. So I find it highly offensive that this budget slashes our safety net for the very people that President Trump promised to protect, the very people who put President Trump in office.

You know, I heard some of the rationale for this budget from the White House, saying: Well, you know, people who are on SNAP ought to work.

Well, let me just say for the RECORD so it is clear to everybody here that the majority of people on SNAP are children, are senior citizens, are people who are disabled. Of those who can work, a majority of them work. They work, but they earn so little that they are still stuck in poverty.

Why aren't we having a debate about increasing wages in this country? Why is the debate focused on how we make the lives of those in poverty even more miserable?

You know, budgets are moral documents, and this is the most heartless, reckless, and damaging plan I have ever seen. It is immoral.

The President's Budget Director talked yesterday about compassion for taxpayers and for Trump supporters. Well, give me a break. You know, I would tell Mr. Mulvaney I don't think that word means what he think it means.

Compassion, that is feeding starving children, helping a father get back on

his feet after a job loss, helping a mother get back on her feet after a job loss, cleaning up poisoned water, ensuring everyone has a chance at living a healthy life regardless of how much money they have. That is compassion, not turning our backs on these people.

Tax cuts for the wealthiest among us at the expense of the public safety net is cruel. It is coldhearted and, Mr. Speaker, I am sick of it. I assure you that is not compassionate.

So I hope my Republican colleagues will have the courage to stand up against this administration and do what is right for the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend from Massachusetts I do not have any speakers remaining, and I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Throughout his campaign, President Trump made promises that he would not cut Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security. Now we have come to find out that he has broken every one of those promises.

The Trump budget includes more than \$800 billion in Medicaid cuts in the GOP healthcare bill and then adds additional cuts on top of that, with total Medicaid cuts of over \$1 trillion over the next 10 years.

Furthermore, the Trump budget guts Social Security disability insurance which, as of 2015, covered 10 million recipients.

The Trump budget also slashes funding for SNAP, our Nation's first line of defense against hunger, by \$193 billion. That is a 25 percent cut. SNAP is the program that provides people food. That's it—food.

We have 42 million people in this country who are food insecure—42 million. We should all be ashamed of that. And the answer is to cut SNAP by 25 percent?

Oh, and by the way, the average SNAP benefit is \$1.40 per person per meal.

And let's not forget that the Republicans' healthcare disaster takes \$75 billion out of the Medicare trust fund, shortening the life of the trust fund.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I appreciate that. I would like to inquire of the Speaker: Is my friend from Massachusetts working on my yielded time or is he working on his time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is on his own time.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. If the gentleman wants to yield me some of his time, I am more than happy to go on for as long as you would like.

Mr. WOODALL. If my friend would yield, I was advised that I had yielded

an abundance of time. I just wanted to make sure that I was not being more generous than you and I would have intended.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So, Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing that, instead of protecting our most vulnerable, President Trump and the House Republicans continually insist on tax breaks for big corporations and the wealthiest Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we need to hold President Trump to his word. Therefore, I am asking that we defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would change the rules of the House to prevent any legislation from being considered if it would result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits under the Social Security Act, if it would increase either the early or full retirement age to receive Social Security benefits.

This would prevent any legislation from being considered if it would privatize Social Security. We would prevent any legislation from being considered that would result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits for individuals entitled to or enrolled for benefits under Medicare or result in a reduction of benefits or eligibility for individuals enrolled in or eligible to receive medical assistance through a State Medicaid plan or waiver.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just simply say to my colleagues that I urge everybody in this House to remember why we came to Congress and who sent us here. Our primary obligation is to the people of this country, and they did not send us here to make their lives more miserable.

When you look at the priorities in the President's budget, when you look at the impact that the healthcare bill, the TrumpCare bill that the House of Representatives passed, when you look at the impact it is going to have on tens of millions of Americans in this country, these bills will devastate people.

So we need to get back to what is important. It is not about propping up the President during his difficulties. It is not about playing to the cheap seats at the Heritage Foundation or some other rightwing think tank. Our primary obligation is to people of the United States. This budget and the priorities of this Republican majority and the priorities of this President undercut the security and the economic well-being of every single person in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" to defeat the previous question and a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to recognize that, if you locked my friend from Massachusetts and me in a room together, it would be over both of our objections, but we would be able to solve about 50 percent of the challenges that face this country.

There is something different that happens in conversation and dialogue when the cameras are turned off than happens when the cameras are on, and of course we are going to keep these cameras here on the floor of the House for as long as you and I are here because the American people have a right to see and a right to know.

But just like Mom and Dad don't want to have all their conversations in front of the kids, and the kids certainly don't want to have all of their conversations in front of Mom and Dad, there is a role to be played for folks to be able to close the door and sit down and visit with each other and try to make things better.

My friend from Massachusetts is absolutely right. The only job that we have is to make a difference for our constituency back home. Sometimes we legitimately disagree on how to do that. The budget is a good example.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, President Obama, in his 8 years as President of the United States, never once introduced a budget that balanced. He borrowed from our children and our grandchildren in every single budget.

And when I say he didn't introduce a budget that balanced, I don't mean that he didn't balance in year 1, I don't mean he didn't balance in year 10. I mean never, ever, ever looking forward in his budgets did he ever stop borrowing.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a man or woman in this institution who believes that you can run a country that way. There is not one. There is not a man or woman in this institution who doesn't understand that balancing budgets is going to mean hard decisions, and so it is absolutely the right place for the dialog about what those hard decisions should be.

But let us not be confused for one moment. There is no pathway to balance that isn't hard. Borrowing from your children and your grandchildren to pay for what you want today is always going to be easier, Mr. Speaker, than paying for it yourself. We are going to have to have that conversation.

I agree with my friend from Massachusetts. We do not work for the President of the United States in this institution. If anything, he works for us.

I sit on the House Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker, and I promise you, we are

promulgating our own House budget, a work product that is going to make this institution proud. I am particularly pleased to be working with Budget Committee Chairwoman DIANE BLACK on that budget, even as we speak.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, it will balance by making commonsense changes to Federal programs, one of which is included in this bill here today.

Take the EPA, for example. Mr. Speaker, I encourage you, if you have not read the comments of our new EPA Administrator, to get into those because what he would tell you, which is absolutely true, is that we have Superfund sites in this country that are so polluted they cannot be utilized for other purposes.

They have been on the Superfund list for decades through Republican Presidents and through Democratic Presidents. They have been sitting on that list. There is no plan to clean them up, no plan to make a difference in those communities, and no plan to serve those constituencies. That is wrong.

Instead of spending its time and resources making a difference for families, making a difference for the environment, what is the EPA having to do?

Respond to court cases that tell it to treat the reasonable and labeled application of pesticides; not as spraying pesticides in your field, but as if you were operating a factory and just having as an effluent, pesticide flowing out of your factory. That is just nonsense.

The reason we produced pesticides is to spray it in fields. We do not need an effluent discharge permit as if we are running a factory, pumping it into our streams. We are not. We are spraying it on our plants to do what?

Address the food needs of this Nation.

My friend from Massachusetts is absolutely right when he talks about hunger in this Nation, Mr. Speaker. He is absolutely right. I dare say that there is not a community in this country that is not affected by hunger. But the biggest advocate we have in the fight against hunger is the American farmer, Mr. Speaker.

There is nobody in the world who does it better; there is nobody in the world who produces it cheaper; there is nobody in the world that has the capability of producing the food to go on the grocery store shelves in America except the American farmer. And these pesticides and herbicides make a difference in getting that food out of the field and onto those store shelves.

We want to do it with strict EPA regulation. That is what is lost in this debate. There is not one Member of this body that wants to repeal EPA regulation. We want to keep that EPA regulation. It is called FIFRA, that regulation that pesticides are regulated

under. No one wants to change that at all.

All folks want to do is say: Wait a minute, this is not a factory discharge issue. This is a pesticide issue.

My friend from Massachusetts is absolutely right. I sit on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. Speaker. We did not have a hearing or a markup on this bill, and it was absolutely referred to our committee.

Why, Mr. Speaker?

It was referred to our committee because we have jurisdiction over the Clean Water Act, but this has never been a Clean Water Act issue, except the courts tried to make it one. This has never been a Clean Water Act issue, except the litigants tried to make it one. So when we tried to fix the problem, we didn't waste a moment in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee dealing with the Clean Water Act because this has never been a Clean Water Act issue. It is an ag issue, which is why it went through my friend of Massachusetts' Agriculture Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I don't begrudge anyone the job that they have to do in this institution. We have different constituencies. They ask different things of us. We all have to come and do our work. But I will tell you what, Mr. Speaker, everything doesn't have to be an us-against-them battle. Sometimes it is just about us. Sometimes there is more that unites this country than divides this country, and that is okay. Sometimes we are able to work together on commonsense solutions, and that is okay.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill came to the House under suspension of the rules, again, that process that we use for things that are noncontroversial, my friend from Massachusetts supported it at that time. He supported it because it is good legislation that is going to make a difference for folks back home. It is going to make a difference in combating hunger in every jurisdiction across this Nation.

When this bill went through the Agriculture Committee, Mr. Speaker, there were no amendments offered. The Agriculture Committee is composed of Republicans and Democrats. It is a place where discussion takes place. It was the markup of this bill, which is when you go and try to amend it and make it better. Not one amendment was offered from either side.

Why?

Because we have discussed this issue, we have litigated this issue, and we have worked together on this issue, and it is a collaborative work product.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman that a number of amendments that are ger-

mane were offered in the Rules Committee to protect the health and safety of women and children, and they were not made in order. So amendments were offered and they were blocked. I just point that out for the RECORD.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend. He is absolutely right. When the experts on the Agriculture Committee considered this, when the folks who spend their entire careers on Capitol Hill working on pesticide and pesticide safety considered this, they had absolutely no amendments to offer whatsoever.

When it came to the Rules Committee and the entire House could offer amendments, folks absolutely offered amendments. The Rules Committee, on which the gentleman from Massachusetts and I serve, made two of those amendments in order. We rejected others. You heard my friend's opening statement, Mr. Speaker, that one of the amendments we rejected was to protect pregnant women.

Well, Mr. Speaker, for Pete's sake, I have served with these men and women in here. I have been in this body for 6 years. There is not one Member of this institution who doesn't care about pregnant women. There is not one Member of this institution who doesn't care about children. There is not one Member of this institution who doesn't care. What we do in this institution is care. And when my friend from Massachusetts supported this bill, when he supported this bill, there were no amendments along those lines.

When the gentleman supported this bill without the amendment dealing particularly with pregnant women and children, I don't believe for a moment the gentleman forgot about those pregnant women and children. I don't believe for a moment he decided he was going to punish pregnant women and children. I believe that he thought those protections were inherent in the base text, and he was right when he thought it, and he was right when he supported it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I would just say that the bill has changed over the years, and I voted against it in committee.

I guess the question is: If we are all in agreement that we want to protect women and children, what was the harm in making in order an amendment that would have done that?

It was perfectly germane, and the Rules Committee decided not to make it in order. I think that is a question that the gentleman hasn't answered.

I appreciate that all the people on the Agriculture Committee are experts, but you know what?

There are other people who know a lot about science, pesticides, and agri-

culture who were not on the committee. And just because a committee takes action—I mean, if that is the new rule now: if you are on the committee, you can't offer amendments. Well, that is an unfortunate new approach that the Republicans are taking.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I will tell my friend two things that he already knows. Number one is we do accept amendments from the entire Congress. That is the purpose of the Rules Committee being in existence, and we have added two amendments to this bill for consideration.

When the gentleman supported it in the 112th Congress, we considered no other amendments. That is a change this time. We are going to do that. When it passed the last time we did a rule, no one offered any amendments. This is a change from that time. When we passed it in the Agriculture bill, no one offered any amendments. So it is a change this time. We absolutely are opening up the process more and more with every time the House considers this bill.

But I would also tell my friend something that we are going to have to grapple with as an institution, and that is that I don't need a Rules Committee if what we are going to do is make every amendment that comes to this institution in order.

The only reason we have a Rules Committee is to pick and choose. The only reason we have a Rules Committee is to set up a timetable on which we can debate and consider things in a reasonable manner. The only reason we have a Rules Committee is because we are not operating under unanimous consent as our friends in the Senate do, though we absolutely could. And I would refer him to my friend, DANIEL WEBSTER, who has some marvelous ideas about how we might do that.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is legitimate for folks back home to wonder what is going on in that United States House. They passed it in a bipartisan way once. They passed it in a bipartisan way twice. They passed it in a bipartisan way three times, and here it is on the floor today, and it is as if the sky is falling and going to open up and swallow everything that is good and decent about this land.

Why is that, Mr. Speaker? Why is that the conversation we are having today instead of the one we had not once, not twice, but three times about how we could use this legislation to improve the lives of citizens across this country?

Perhaps that is just the environment we are in. Perhaps that is just the cards we have been dealt in politics across America today, Mr. Speaker, but we have a chance together as an institution to stand up and say it does not have to be that way. We have a chance together to stand up and say

that we can do better than those partisan shenanigans. We can get together on things that are going to make a difference, and the first opportunity you are going to have after this speech, Mr. Speaker, to do that, is in supporting the rule for this bill. The first opportunity we are going to have to do that is in supporting this rule, and then supporting the underlying legislation and sending it back to the Senate one more time. It is the right thing to do, Mr. Speaker, and we have the opportunity to do that together.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for the rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO BE OFFERED TO H. RES.
348 BY MR. MCGOVERN

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

RESTRICTIONS ON CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION THAT WOULD BREAK DONALD TRUMP'S PROMISE NOT TO CUT SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, OR MEDICAID

13. (a) It shall not be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report which includes any provision described in paragraph (b)."

(b) A provision referred to in paragraph (a) is a provision which, if enacted into law, would result in any of the following:

(1) a reduction of guaranteed benefits scheduled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.);

(2) an increase in either the early or full retirement age for the benefits described in paragraph (1);

(3) a privatization of Social Security;

(4) a reduction of guaranteed benefits for individuals entitled to, or enrolled for, benefits under the Medicare program under title XVIII of 18 such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); or

(5) a reduction of benefits or eligibility for individuals enrolled in, or eligible to receive medical assistance through, a State Medicaid plan or waiver under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 5 et seq.).

(c) It shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a). As disposition of any point of order under paragraph (a) or this paragraph (except a point of order against an amendment pursuant to paragraph (a)), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the measure, order, conference report, or rule as applicable. The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), de-

scribes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Again, hearing the gentleman say that we all want to pro-

tect the lives of pregnant women and children, I just want to ask as an inquiry: Is the amendment by EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON that prohibits the discharge of toxins in such circumstances where they would be harmful to pregnant women, or could harm fetal, or early childhood development, which is perfectly germane, is that made in order? Is that part of the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is free to consult the Rules Committee report.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Well, I don't think it is. I would just simply say to the gentleman, if he wants more cooperation, then maybe we ought to open the process up, and actually listen to what the Democrats have to say too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 191, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 271]

YEAS—229

Abraham	Cramer	Hensarling
Aderholt	Crawford	Herrera Beutler
Allen	Culberson	Higgins (LA)
Amash	Curbelo (FL)	Hill
Amodei	Davidson	Holding
Arrington	Davis, Rodney	Hollingsworth
Babin	Denham	Hudson
Bacon	Dent	Hultgren
Banks (IN)	DeSantis	Hunter
Barletta	DesJarlais	Hurd
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Barton	Donovan	Jenkins (KS)
Bergman	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)
Biggs	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (LA)
Bilirakis	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (MI)	Dunn	Jordan
Bishop (UT)	Emmer	Joyce (OH)
Blackburn	Estes (KS)	Katko
Blum	Farenthold	Kelly (MS)
Bost	Faso	Kelly (PA)
Brady (TX)	Ferguson	King (IA)
Brat	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Bridenstine	Fleischmann	Kinzing
Brooks (AL)	Flores	Knight
Brooks (IN)	Fortenberry	Kustoff (TN)
Buchanan	Fox	Labrador
Buck	Franks (AZ)	LaHood
Bucshon	Frelinghuysen	LaMalfa
Budd	Gaetz	Lamborn
Burgess	Gallagher	Lance
Byrne	Garrett	Latta
Calvert	Gibbs	Lewis (MN)
Carter (GA)	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Carter (TX)	Goodlatte	Long
Chabot	Gosar	Loudermilk
Chaffetz	Gowdy	Love
Cheney	Granger	Lucas
Coffman	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Cole	Graves (LA)	MacArthur
Collins (GA)	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Collins (NY)	Griffith	Marino
Comer	Grothman	Marshall
Comstock	Guthrie	Massie
Conaway	Harper	Mast
Cook	Harris	McCarthy
Costello (PA)	Hartzler	McCauley

McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)

Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik

Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—191

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans

Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney

Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey

Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman

Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Black
Deutch
Hice, Jody B.
Huizenga

Johnson, Sam
Newhouse
Roybal-Allard
Simpson

Tiberi
Wasserman
Schultz

□ 1333

Mr. CRIST and Mrs. DINGELL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 271.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE TERRORIST ATTACK IN MANCHESTER, ENGLAND

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask that all present rise for a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in memory of the victims of the terrorist attack in Manchester, England.

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 189, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 272]

AYES—232

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)

Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold

Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson

Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers

McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise

Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—189

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Capuano
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)

DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)

Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan

Polis	Schrader	Titus
Price (NC)	Scott (VA)	Tonko
Quigley	Scott, David	Torres
Raskin	Serrano	Tsongas
Rice (NY)	Sewell (AL)	Vargas
Richmond	Shea-Porter	Veasey
Rosen	Sherman	Vela
Roybal-Allard	Sires	Velázquez
Ruiz	Slaughter	Visclosky
Ruppersberger	Smith (WA)	Walz
Rush	Soto	Waters, Maxine
Ryan (OH)	Speier	Watson Coleman
Sánchez	Suozzi	Welch
Sarbanes	Swalwell (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Schakowsky	Takano	Yarmuth
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	
Schneider	Thompson (MS)	

NOT VOTING—9

Black	Huizenga	Wasserman
Deutch	Johnson, Sam	Schultz
Gaetz	Newhouse	
Hice, Jody B.	Tiberi	

□ 1342

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-3)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On February 28, I spoke to a joint session of the Congress about what we need to do to begin a new chapter of American Greatness. I asked the Nation to look forward nine years and imagine the wonders we could achieve by America's 250th anniversary of our Independence if we set free the dreams of our people by removing the barriers holding back our economic growth.

This Budget's defining ambition is to unleash the dreams of the American people. This requires laying a new foundation for American Greatness.

Through streamlined Government, we will drive an economic boom that raises incomes and expands job opportunities for all Americans. Faster economic growth, coupled with fiscal restraint, will enable us to fully fund our national priorities, balance our budget, and start to pay down our national debt.

Our moral commitment to replacing our current economic stagnation with faster economic growth rests on the following eight pillars of reform:

Health Reform. We need to enable Americans to buy the healthcare they need at a price they can afford. To this end, we must repeal Obamacare and its burdensome regulations and mandates, and replace it with a framework that restores choice and competition. This will lower the cost of care so that more

Americans can get the medical attention they need. Additionally, Medicaid, which inadequately serves enrollees and taxpayers, must be reformed to allow States to manage their own programs, with continued financial support from the Federal Government.

Tax Reform and Simplification. We must reduce the tax burden on American workers and businesses, so that we can maximize incomes and economic growth. We must also simplify our tax system, so that individuals and businesses do not waste countless hours and resources simply paying their taxes.

Immigration Reform. We must reform immigration policy so that it serves our national interest. We will adopt commonsense proposals that protect American workers, reduce burdens on taxpayers and public resources, and focus Federal funds on underserved and disadvantaged citizens.

Reductions in Federal Spending. We must scrutinize every dollar the Federal Government spends. Just as families decide how to manage limited budgets, we must ensure the Federal Government spends precious taxpayer dollars only on our highest national priorities, and always in the most efficient, effective manner.

Regulatory Rollback. We must eliminate every outdated, unnecessary, or ineffective Federal regulation, and move aggressively to build regulatory frameworks that stimulate—rather than stagnate—job creation. Even for those regulations we must leave in place, we must strike every provision that is counterproductive, ineffective, or outdated.

American Energy Development. We must increase development of America's energy resources, strengthening our national security, lowering the price of electricity and transportation fuels, and driving down the cost of consumer goods so that every American individual and business has more money to save and invest. A consistent, long-term supply of lower-cost American energy brings with it a much larger economy, more jobs, and greater security for the American people.

Welfare Reform. We must reform our welfare system so that it does not discourage able-bodied adults from working, which takes away scarce resources from those in real need. Work must be the center of our social policy.

Education Reform. We need to return decisions regarding education back to the State and local levels, while advancing opportunities for parents and students to choose, from all available options, the school that best fits their needs to learn and succeed.

To unleash the power of American work and creativity—and drive opportunity and faster economic growth—we must reprioritize Federal spending so that it advances the safety and security of the American people.

This Budget, therefore, includes \$639 billion for the Department of Defense—a \$52 billion increase from the 2017 annualized continuing resolution level. This increase will be offset by targeted reductions elsewhere. This defense funding is vital to rebuilding, modernizing, and preparing our Armed Forces for the future so that our military remains the world's preeminent fighting force and we can continue to ensure peace through strength. This Budget also increases funding to take care of our great veterans, who have served their country with such honor and distinction.

The Budget also meets the need to materially increase funding for border security, immigration enforcement, and law enforcement at the Departments of Homeland Security and Justice. These funding increases will provide additional resources for a southern border wall, expanded detention capacity, and initiatives to reduce violent crime, as well as more immigration judges, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers, and Border Patrol agents. The Budget also invests significant resources in efforts to combat opioid abuse.

In these dangerous times, our increased attention to public safety and national security sends a clear message to the world—a message of American strength and resolve. It follows through on my promise to focus on keeping Americans safe, keeping terrorists out of our Nation, and putting violent offenders behind bars.

As this Budget returns us to economic prosperity, it will also allow us to fund additional priorities, including infrastructure, student loan reform, and initiatives to help working families such as paid parental leave. We will champion the hardworking taxpayers who have been ignored for too long. Once we end our economic stagnation and return to robust growth, so many of our aspirations will be within reach.

It is now up to the Congress to act. I pledge my full cooperation in ending the economic malaise that has, for too long, crippled the dreams of our people. The time for small thinking is over. As we look forward to our 250th year, I am calling upon all Members of Congress to join me in striving to do big and bold and daring things for our Nation. We have it in our power to set free the dreams of our people. Let us begin.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 23, 2017.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the

vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM ACT OF 2017

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1809) to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1809

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title.
- Sec. 2. Table of contents.
- Sec. 3. Application of amendments.

TITLE I—DECLARATION OF FINDINGS, PURPOSE, AND DEFINITIONS

- Sec. 101. Findings.
- Sec. 102. Purposes.
- Sec. 103. Definitions.

TITLE II—JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

- Sec. 201. Concentration of Federal efforts.
- Sec. 202. Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Sec. 203. Annual report.
- Sec. 204. Allocation of funds.
- Sec. 205. State plans.
- Sec. 206. Repeal of juvenile delinquency prevention block grant program.
- Sec. 207. Research and evaluation; statistical analyses; information dissemination.
- Sec. 208. Training and technical assistance.
- Sec. 209. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 210. Administrative authority.

- Sec. 208. Training and technical assistance.
- Sec. 209. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 210. Administrative authority.

TITLE III—INCENTIVE GRANTS FOR LOCAL DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAMS

- Sec. 301. Short Title.
- Sec. 302. Definitions.
- Sec. 303. Duties and functions of the administrator.
- Sec. 304. Grants for delinquency prevention programs.
- Sec. 305. Grants for tribal delinquency prevention and response programs.
- Sec. 306. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 307. Technical amendment.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- Sec. 401. Evaluation by Government Accountability Office.
- Sec. 402. Accountability and oversight.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.

The amendments made by this Act shall not apply with respect to funds appropriated for any fiscal year that begins before the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE I—DECLARATION OF FINDINGS, PURPOSE, AND DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

Section 101(a)(9) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42

U.S.C. 5601(a)(9)) is amended by inserting “, including offenders who enter the juvenile justice system as the result of sexual abuse, exploitation, and trauma,” after “young juvenile offenders”.

SEC. 102. PURPOSES.

Section 102 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5602) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, tribal,” after “State”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting “, tribal,” after “State”; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end;

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) to assist State, tribal, and local governments in addressing juvenile crime through the provision of technical assistance, research, training, evaluation, and the dissemination of current and relevant information on effective and evidence-based programs and practices for combating juvenile delinquency; and”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) to support a continuum of evidence-based or promising programs (including delinquency prevention, intervention, mental health, behavioral health and substance abuse treatment, family services, and services for children exposed to violence) that are trauma informed, reflect the science of adolescent development, and are designed to meet the needs of at-risk youth and youth who come into contact with the justice system.”.

SEC. 103. DEFINITIONS.

Section 103 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5603) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by adding “or” at the end;

(B) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C);

(2) in paragraph (18)—

(A) by inserting “for purposes of title II,” before “the term”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“that has a law enforcement function, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the Attorney General”.

(3) by amending paragraph (22) to read as follows:

“(22) the term ‘jail or lockup for adults’ means a secure facility that is used by a State, unit of local government, or law enforcement authority to detain or confine adult inmates”;

(4) by amending paragraph (25) to read as follows:

“(25) the term ‘sight or sound contact’ means any physical, clear visual, or verbal contact that is not brief and inadvertent”;

(5) by amending paragraph (26) to read as follows:

“(26) the term ‘adult inmate’—

“(A) means an individual who—

“(i) has reached the age of full criminal responsibility under applicable State law; and

“(ii) has been arrested and is in custody for or awaiting trial on a criminal charge, or is convicted of a criminal offense; and

“(B) does not include an individual who—

“(i) at the time of the time of the offense, was younger than the maximum age at which a youth can be held in a juvenile facility under applicable State law; and

“(ii) was committed to the care and custody or supervision, including post-place-

ment or parole supervision, of a juvenile correctional agency by a court of competent ju-

risdiction or by operation of applicable State law”;

(6) in paragraph (28), by striking “and” at the end;

(7) in paragraph (29), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(8) by adding at the end the following:

“(30) the term ‘core requirements’—

“(A) means the requirements described in paragraphs (11), (12), (13), and (15) of section 223(a); and

“(B) does not include the data collection requirements described in subparagraphs (A) through (K) of section 207(1);

“(31) the term ‘chemical agent’ means a spray or injection used to temporarily incapacitate a person, including oleoresin capicum spray, tear gas, and 2-chlorobenzalmalononitrile gas;

“(32) the term ‘isolation’—

“(A) means any instance in which a youth is confined alone for more than 10 minutes in a room or cell; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) confinement during regularly scheduled sleeping hours;

“(ii) separation based on a treatment program approved by a licensed medical or mental health professional;

“(iii) confinement or separation that is requested by the youth; or

“(iv) the separation of the youth from a group in a nonlocked setting for the limited purpose of calming;

“(33) the term ‘restraints’ has the meaning given that term in section 591 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 2901i);

“(34) the term ‘evidence-based’ means a program or practice that—

“(A) is demonstrated to be effective when implemented with fidelity;

“(B) is based on a clearly articulated and empirically supported theory;

“(C) has measurable outcomes relevant to juvenile justice, including a detailed description of the outcomes produced in a particular population, whether urban or rural; and

“(D) has been scientifically tested and proven effective through randomized control studies or comparison group studies and with the ability to replicate and scale;

“(35) the term ‘promising’ means a program or practice that—

“(A) is demonstrated to be effective based on positive outcomes relevant to juvenile justice from 1 or more objective, independent, and scientifically valid evaluations, as documented in writing to the Administrator; and

“(B) will be evaluated through a well-designed and rigorous study, as described in paragraph (34)(D);

“(36) the term ‘dangerous practice’ means an act, procedure, or program that creates an unreasonable risk of physical injury, pain, or psychological harm to a juvenile subjected to the act, procedure, or program;

“(37) the term ‘screening’ means a brief process—

“(A) designed to identify youth who may have mental health, behavioral health, substance abuse, or other needs requiring immediate attention, intervention, and further evaluation; and

“(B) the purpose of which is to quickly identify a youth with possible mental health, behavioral health, substance abuse, or other needs in need of further assessment;

“(38) the term ‘assessment’ includes, at a minimum, an interview and review of available records and other pertinent information—

“(A) by an appropriately trained professional who is licensed or certified by the applicable State in the mental health, behavioral health, or substance abuse fields; and

“(B) which is designed to identify significant mental health, behavioral health, or substance abuse treatment needs to be addressed during a youth’s confinement;

“(39) for purposes of section 223(a)(15), the term ‘contact’ means the points at which a youth and the juvenile justice system or criminal justice system officially intersect, including interactions with a juvenile justice, juvenile court, or law enforcement official;

“(40) the term ‘trauma-informed’ means—

“(A) understanding the impact that exposure to violence and trauma have on a youth’s physical, psychological, and psychosocial development;

“(B) recognizing when a youth has been exposed to violence and trauma and is in need of help to recover from the adverse impacts of trauma; and

“(C) responding in ways that resist re-traumatization;

“(41) the term ‘racial and ethnic disparity’ means minority youth populations are involved at a decision point in the juvenile justice system at higher rates, incrementally or cumulatively, than non-minority youth at that decision point;

“(42) the term ‘status offender’ means a juvenile who is charged with or who has committed an offense that would not be criminal if committed by an adult;

“(43) the term ‘rural’ means an area that is not located in a metropolitan statistical area, as defined by the Office of Management and Budget;

“(44) the term ‘internal controls’ means a process implemented to provide reasonable assurance regarding the achievement of objectives in—

“(A) effectiveness and efficiency of operations, such as grant management practices;

“(B) reliability of reporting for internal and external use; and

“(C) compliance with applicable laws and regulations, as well as recommendations of the Office of Inspector General and the Government Accountability Office; and

“(45) the term ‘tribal government’ means the governing body of an Indian tribe.”

TITLE II—JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

SEC. 201. CONCENTRATION OF FEDERAL EFFORTS.

Section 204 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5614) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “a long-term plan, and implement” and inserting the following: “a long-term plan to improve the juvenile justice system in the United States, taking into account scientific knowledge regarding adolescent development and behavior and regarding the effects of delinquency prevention programs and juvenile justice interventions on adolescents, and shall implement”; and

(ii) by striking “research, and improvement of the juvenile justice system in the United States” and inserting “and research”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “Federal Register” and all that follows and inserting “Federal Register during the 30-day period ending on October 1 of each year.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (7);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively;

(C) by inserting after paragraph (4), the following:

“(5) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017, in consultation with Indian tribes, develop a policy for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to collaborate with representatives of Indian tribes with a criminal justice function on the implementation of the provisions of this Act relating to Indian tribes.”;

(D) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated, by adding “and” at the end; and

(E) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking “monitoring”;

(ii) by striking “section 223(a)(15)” and inserting “section 223(a)(14)”;

(iii) by striking “to review the adequacy of such systems; and” and inserting “for monitoring compliance.”.

SEC. 202. COORDINATING COUNCIL ON JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION.

Section 206 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5616) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use, the Secretary of the Interior,” after “the Secretary of Health and Human Services.”; and

(ii) by striking “Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization” and inserting “Assistant Secretary for Immigration and Customs Enforcement”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “United States” and inserting “Federal Government”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraphs (12)(A), (13), and (14) of section 223(a) of this title” and inserting “the core requirements”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, on an annual basis” after “collectively”; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) not later than 120 days after the completion of the last meeting of the Council during any fiscal year, submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report that—

“(i) contains the recommendations described in subparagraph (A);

“(ii) includes a detailed account of the activities conducted by the Council during the fiscal year, including a complete detailed accounting of expenses incurred by the Council to conduct operations in accordance with this section;

“(iii) is published on the Web sites of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Council, and the Department of Justice; and

“(iv) is in addition to the annual report required under section 207.”.

SEC. 203. ANNUAL REPORT.

Section 207 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5617) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “a fiscal year” and inserting “each fiscal year”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and gender” and inserting “, gender, and ethnicity, as such term is defined by the Bureau of the Census.”;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (F)—

(i) by inserting “and other” before “disabilities.”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) a summary of data from 1 month of the applicable fiscal year of the use of restraints and isolation upon juveniles held in the custody of secure detention and correctional facilities operated by a State or unit of local government;

“(H) the number of status offense cases petitioned to court, number of status offenders held in secure detention, the findings used to justify the use of secure detention, and the average period of time a status offender was held in secure detention;

“(I) the number of juveniles released from custody and the type of living arrangement to which they are released;

“(J) the number of juveniles whose offense originated on school grounds, during school-sponsored off-campus activities, or due to a referral by a school official, as collected and reported by the Department of Education or similar State educational agency; and

“(K) the number of juveniles in the custody of secure detention and correctional facilities operated by a State or unit of local government who report being pregnant.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) A description of the criteria used to determine what programs qualify as evidence-based and promising programs under this title and title V and a comprehensive list of those programs the Administrator has determined meet such criteria in both rural and urban areas.

“(6) A description of funding provided to Indian tribes under this Act or for a juvenile delinquency or prevention program under the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-211; 124 Stat. 2261), including direct Federal grants and funding provided to Indian tribes through a State or unit of local government.

“(7) An analysis and evaluation of the internal controls at the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to determine if grantees are following the requirements of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention grant programs and what remedial action the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has taken to recover any grant funds that are expended in violation of the grant programs, including instances—

“(A) in which supporting documentation was not provided for cost reports;

“(B) where unauthorized expenditures occurred; or

“(C) where subrecipients of grant funds were not compliant with program requirements.

“(8) An analysis and evaluation of the total amount of payments made to grantees that the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention recouped from grantees that were found to be in violation of policies and procedures of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention grant programs, including—

“(A) the full name and location of the grantee;

“(B) the violation of the program found;

“(C) the amount of funds sought to be recouped by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; and

“(D) the actual amount recouped by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.”.

SEC. 204. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

(a) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—Section 221(b)(1) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5631(b)(1)) is amended by striking “2 percent” and inserting “5 percent”.

(b) **OTHER ALLOCATIONS.**—Section 222 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5632) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “age eighteen” and inserting “18 years of age, based on the most recent data available from the Bureau of the Census”; and

(B) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

“(2)(A) If the aggregate amount appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this title is less than \$75,000,000, then—

“(i) the amount allocated to each State other than a State described in clause (ii) for that fiscal year shall be not less than \$400,000; and

“(ii) the amount allocated to the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands for that fiscal year shall be not less than \$75,000.

“(B) If the aggregate amount appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this title is not less than \$75,000,000, then—

“(i) the amount allocated to each State other than a State described in clause (ii) for that fiscal year shall be not less than \$600,000; and

“(ii) the amount allocated to the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands for that fiscal year shall be not less than \$100,000.”;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “efficient administration, including monitoring, evaluation, and one full-time staff position” and inserting “effective and efficient administration of funds, including the designation of not less than 1 individual who shall coordinate efforts to achieve and sustain compliance with the core requirements and certify whether the State is in compliance with such requirements”; and

(3) in subsection (d), by striking “5 per centum of the minimum” and inserting “not more than 5 percent of the”.

SEC. 205. STATE PLANS.

Section 223 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5633) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “and shall describe the status of compliance with State plan requirements.” and inserting “and shall describe how the State plan is supported by or takes account of scientific knowledge regarding adolescent development and behavior and regarding the effects of delinquency prevention programs and juvenile justice interventions on adolescents. Not later than 60 days after the date on which a plan or amended plan submitted under this subsection is finalized, a State shall make the plan or amended plan publicly available by posting the plan or amended plan on the State’s publicly available website.”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “described in section 299(c)(1)” and inserting “as designated by the chief executive officer of the State”;

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (i), by inserting “adolescent development,” after “concerning”;

(II) in clause (ii)—

(aa) in subclause (II), by inserting “publicly supported court-appointed legal counsel

with experience representing juveniles in delinquency proceedings,” after “youth.”;

(bb) in subclause (III), by striking “mental health, education, special education” and inserting “child and adolescent mental health, education, child and adolescent substance abuse, special education, services for youth with disabilities”;

(cc) in subclause (V), by striking “delinquents or potential delinquents” and inserting “delinquent youth or youth at risk of delinquency”;

(dd) in subclause (VI), by striking “youth workers involved with” and inserting “representatives of”;

(ee) in subclause (VII), by striking “and” at the end;

(ff) by striking subclause (VIII) and inserting the following:

“(VIII) persons, licensed or certified by the applicable State, with expertise and competence in preventing and addressing mental health and substance abuse needs in delinquent youth and youth at risk of delinquency;

“(IX) representatives of victim or witness advocacy groups, including at least 1 individual with expertise in addressing the challenges of sexual abuse and exploitation and trauma, particularly the needs of youth who experience disproportionate levels of sexual abuse, exploitation, and trauma before entering the juvenile justice system; and

“(X) for a State in which 1 or more Indian tribes are located, an Indian tribal representative or other individual with significant expertise in tribal law enforcement and juvenile justice in Indian tribal communities.”;

(III) in clause (iv), by striking “24 at the time of appointment” and inserting “28 at the time of initial appointment”;

(IV) in clause (v) by inserting “or, if not feasible and in appropriate circumstances, who is the parent or guardian of someone who has been or is currently under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system” after “juvenile justice system”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “30 days” and inserting “45 days”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end; and

(II) in clause (ii), by striking “at least annually recommendations regarding State compliance with the requirements of paragraphs (11), (12), and (13)” and inserting “at least every 2 years a report and necessary recommendations regarding State compliance with the core requirements”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (E)—

(I) in clause (i), by adding “and” at the end; and

(II) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(D) in paragraph (5)(C), by striking “Indian tribes” and all that follows through “applicable to the detention and confinement of juveniles” and inserting “Indian tribes that agree to attempt to comply with the core requirements applicable to the detention and confinement of juveniles”;

(E) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “performs law enforcement functions” and inserting “has jurisdiction”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end; and

(II) by striking clause (iv) and inserting the following:

“(iv) a plan to provide alternatives to detention for status offenders, survivors of commercial sexual exploitation, and others, where appropriate, such as specialized or

problem-solving courts or diversion to home-based or community-based services or treatment for those youth in need of mental health, substance abuse, or co-occurring disorder services at the time such juveniles first come into contact with the juvenile justice system;

“(v) a plan to reduce the number of children housed in secure detention and corrections facilities who are awaiting placement in residential treatment programs;

“(vi) a plan to engage family members, where appropriate, in the design and delivery of juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment services, particularly post-placement;

“(vii) a plan to use community-based services to respond to the needs of at-risk youth or youth who have come into contact with the juvenile justice system;

“(viii) a plan to promote evidence-based and trauma-informed programs and practices; and

“(ix) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017, a plan, which shall be implemented not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017, to—

“(I) eliminate the use of restraints of known pregnant juveniles housed in secure juvenile detention and correction facilities, during labor, delivery, and post-partum recovery, unless credible, reasonable grounds exist to believe the detainee presents an immediate and serious threat of hurting herself, staff, or others; and

“(II) eliminate the use of abdominal restraints, leg and ankle restraints, wrist restraints behind the back, and four-point restraints on known pregnant juveniles, unless—

“(aa) credible, reasonable grounds exist to believe the detainee presents an immediate and serious threat of hurting herself, staff, or others; or

“(bb) reasonable grounds exist to believe the detainee presents an immediate and credible risk of escape that cannot be reasonably minimized through any other method.”;

(F) in paragraph (8), by striking “existing” and inserting “evidence-based and promising”;

(G) in paragraph (9)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, with priority in funding given to entities meeting the criteria for evidence-based or promising programs” after “used for”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (i)—

(aa) by inserting “status offenders and other” before “youth who need”; and

(bb) by striking “and” at the end;

(II) in clause (ii) by adding “and” at the end; and

(III) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) for youth who need specialized intensive and comprehensive services that address the unique issues encountered by youth when they become involved with gangs.”;

(iii) in subparagraph (B)(i)—

(I) by striking “parents and other family members” and inserting “status offenders, other youth, and the parents and other family members of such offenders and youth”; and

(II) by striking “be retained” and inserting “remain”;

(iv) in subparagraph (E)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “delinquent” and inserting “at-risk or delinquent youth”; and

(II) in clause (i), by inserting “, including for truancy prevention and reduction” before the semicolon;

(v) in subparagraph (F), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “expanding” and inserting “programs to expand”;

(vi) by redesignating subparagraphs (G) through (S) as subparagraphs (H) through (T), respectively;

(vii) by inserting after subparagraph (F), the following:

“(G) programs—

“(i) to ensure youth have access to appropriate legal representation; and

“(ii) to expand access to publicly supported, court-appointed legal counsel who are trained to represent juveniles in adjudication proceedings,

except that the State may not use more than 2 percent of the funds received under section 222 for these purposes;”;

(viii) in subparagraph (H), as so redesignated, by striking “State,” each place the term appears and inserting “State, tribal,”;

(ix) in subparagraph (M), as so redesignated—

(I) in clause (i)—

(aa) by inserting “pre-adjudication and” before “post-adjudication”;

(bb) by striking “restraints” and inserting “alternatives”; and

(cc) by inserting “specialized or problem-solving courts,” after “(including”; and

(II) in clause (ii)—

(aa) by striking “by the provision by the Administrator”; and

(bb) by striking “to States”;

(x) in subparagraph (N), as redesignated—

(I) by inserting “and reduce the risk of recidivism” after “families”; and

(II) by striking “so that such juveniles may be retained in their homes”;

(xi) in subparagraph (S), as so redesignated, by striking “and” at the end;

(xii) in subparagraph (T), as so redesignated—

(I) by inserting “or co-occurring disorder” after “mental health”;

(II) by inserting “court-involved or” before “incarcerated”;

(III) by striking “suspected to be”;

(IV) by striking “and discharge plans” and inserting “provision of treatment, and development of discharge plans”; and

(V) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(xiii) by inserting after subparagraph (T) the following:

“(U) programs and projects designed—

“(i) to inform juveniles of the opportunity and process for sealing and expunging juvenile records; and

“(ii) to assist juveniles in pursuing juvenile record sealing and expungements for both adjudications and arrests not followed by adjudications;

except that the State may not use more than 2 percent of the funds received under section 222 for these purposes;

“(V) programs that address the needs of girls in or at risk of entering the juvenile justice system, including pregnant girls, young mothers, victims of sexual abuse, survivors of commercial sexual exploitation or domestic child sex trafficking, girls with disabilities, and girls of color, including girls who are members of an Indian tribe; and

“(W) monitoring for compliance with the core requirements and providing training and technical assistance on the core requirements to secure facilities;”;

(H) by striking paragraph (11) and inserting the following:

“(11)(A) in accordance with rules issued by the Administrator, provide that a juvenile shall not be placed in a secure detention facility or a secure correctional facility, if—

“(i) the juvenile is charged with or has committed an offense that would not be criminal if committed by an adult, excluding—

“(I) a juvenile who is charged with or has committed a violation of section 922(x)(2) of title 18, United States Code, or of a similar State law;

“(II) a juvenile who is charged with or has committed a violation of a valid court order issued and reviewed in accordance with paragraph (23); and

“(III) a juvenile who is held in accordance with the Interstate Compact on Juveniles as enacted by the State; or

“(ii) the juvenile—

“(I) is not charged with any offense; and

“(II)(aa) is an alien; or

“(bb) is alleged to be dependent, neglected, or abused; and

“(B) require that—

“(i) not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017, unless a court finds, after a hearing and in writing, that it is in the interest of justice, juveniles awaiting trial or other legal process who are treated as adults for purposes of prosecution in criminal court and housed in a secure facility—

“(I) shall not have sight or sound contact with adult inmates; and

“(II) except as provided in paragraph (13), may not be held in any jail or lockup for adults;

“(ii) in determining under subparagraph (A) whether it is in the interest of justice to permit a juvenile to be held in any jail or lockup for adults, or have sight or sound contact with adult inmates, a court shall consider—

“(I) the age of the juvenile;

“(II) the physical and mental maturity of the juvenile;

“(III) the present mental state of the juvenile, including whether the juvenile presents an imminent risk of harm to the juvenile;

“(IV) the nature and circumstances of the alleged offense;

“(V) the juvenile’s history of prior delinquent acts;

“(VI) the relative ability of the available adult and juvenile detention facilities to not only meet the specific needs of the juvenile but also to protect the safety of the public as well as other detained youth; and

“(VII) any other relevant factor; and

“(iii) if a court determines under subparagraph (A) that it is in the interest of justice to permit a juvenile to be held in any jail or lockup for adults—

“(I) the court shall hold a hearing not less frequently than once every 30 days, or in the case of a rural jurisdiction, not less frequently than once every 45 days, to review whether it is still in the interest of justice to permit the juvenile to be so held or have such sight or sound contact; and

“(II) the juvenile shall not be held in any jail or lockup for adults, or permitted to have sight or sound contact with adult inmates, for more than 180 days, unless the court, in writing, determines there is good cause for an extension or the juvenile expressly waives this limitation;”.

(I) in paragraph (12)(A), by striking “contact” and inserting “sight or sound contact”;

(J) in paragraph (13), by striking “contact” each place it appears and inserting “sight or sound contact”;

(K) in paragraph (14)—

(i) by striking “adequate system” and inserting “effective system”;

(ii) by inserting “lock-ups,” after “monitoring jails,”;

(iii) by inserting “and” after “detention facilities,”;

(iv) by striking “, and non-secure facilities”;

(v) by striking “insure” and inserting “ensure”;

(vi) by striking “requirements of paragraphs (11), (12), and (13)” and inserting “core requirements”; and

(vii) by striking “, in the opinion of the Administrator,”;

(L) by striking paragraphs (22) and (27);

(M) by redesignating paragraph (28) as paragraph (27);

(N) by redesignating paragraphs (15) through (21) as paragraphs (16) through (22), respectively;

(O) by inserting after paragraph (14) the following:

“(15) implement policy, practice, and system improvement strategies at the State, territorial, local, and tribal levels, as applicable, to identify and reduce racial and ethnic disparities among youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas, by—

“(A) establishing or designating existing coordinating bodies, composed of juvenile justice stakeholders, (including representatives of the educational system) at the State, local, or tribal levels, to advise efforts by States, units of local government, and Indian tribes to reduce racial and ethnic disparities;

“(B) identifying and analyzing data on race and ethnicity at all decision points in State, local, or tribal juvenile justice systems to determine which key points create racial and ethnic disparities among youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system; and

“(C) developing and implementing a work plan that includes measurable objectives for policy, practice, or other system changes, based on the needs identified in the data collection and analysis under subparagraph (B);”;

(P) in paragraph (16), as so redesignated, by inserting “ethnicity,” after “race,”;

(Q) in paragraph (21), as so redesignated, by striking “local,” each place the term appears and inserting “local, tribal,”;

(R) in paragraph (23)—

(i) in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), by striking “juvenile” each place it appears and inserting “status offender”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(II) in clause (ii), by adding “and” at the end; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) if such court determines the status offender should be placed in a secure detention facility or correctional facility for violating such order—

“(I) the court shall issue a written order that—

“(aa) identifies the valid court order that has been violated;

“(bb) specifies the factual basis for determining that there is reasonable cause to believe that the status offender has violated such order;

“(cc) includes findings of fact to support a determination that there is no appropriate

less restrictive alternative available to placing the status offender in such a facility, with due consideration to the best interest of the juvenile;

“(dd) specifies the length of time, not to exceed 7 days, that the status offender may remain in a secure detention facility or correctional facility, and includes a plan for the status offender’s release from such facility; and

“(ee) may not be renewed or extended; and

“(II) the court may not issue a second or subsequent order described in subclause (I) relating to a status offender unless the status offender violates a valid court order after the date on which the court issues an order described in subclause (I);” and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) there are procedures in place to ensure that any status offender held in a secure detention facility or correctional facility pursuant to a court order described in this paragraph does not remain in custody longer than 7 days or the length of time authorized by the court, whichever is shorter; and

“(E) not later than September 30, 2020 (with a 1-year extension for each additional fiscal year that a State can demonstrate hardship, as determined by the State, and submits in writing evidence of such hardship to the Administrator which shall be considered approved unless the Administrator justifies to the State in writing that the hardship does not qualify for an exemption), the State will eliminate the use of valid court orders to provide secure confinement of status offenders, except that juveniles may be held in secure confinement in accordance with the Interstate Compact for Juveniles if the judge issues a written order that—

“(i) specifies the factual basis to believe that the State has the authority to detain the juvenile under the terms of the Interstate Compact for Juveniles;

“(ii) includes findings of fact to support a determination that there is no appropriate less restrictive alternative available to placing the juvenile in such a facility, with due consideration to the best interest of the juvenile;

“(iii) specifies the length of time a juvenile may remain in secure confinement, not to exceed 15 days, and includes a plan for the return of the juvenile to the home State of the juvenile; and

“(iv) may not be renewed or extended;”;

(S) in paragraph (26)—

(i) by inserting “and in accordance with confidentiality concerns,” after “maximum extent practicable.”; and

(ii) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting the following: “, as so to provide for—

“(A) data in child abuse or neglect reports relating to juveniles entering the juvenile justice system with a prior reported history of arrest, court intake, probation and parole, juvenile detention, and corrections; and

“(B) a plan to use the data described in subparagraph (A) to provide necessary services for the treatment of such victims of child abuse or neglect;”;

(T) in paragraph (27), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(U) by adding at the end the following:

“(28) provide for the coordinated use of funds provided under this title with other Federal and State funds directed at juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention programs;

“(29) describe the policies, procedures, and training in effect for the staff of juvenile State correctional facilities to eliminate the

use of dangerous practices, unreasonable restraints, and unreasonable isolation, including by developing effective behavior management techniques;

“(30) describe—

“(A) the evidence-based methods that will be used to conduct mental health and substance abuse screening, assessment, referral, and treatment for juveniles who—

“(i) request a screening;

“(ii) show signs of needing a screening; or

“(iii) are held for a period of more than 24 hours in a secure facility that provides for an initial screening; and

“(B) how the State will seek, to the extent practicable, to provide or arrange for mental health and substance abuse disorder treatment for juveniles determined to be in need of such treatment;

“(31) describe how reentry planning by the State for juveniles will include—

“(A) a written case plan based on an assessment of needs that includes—

“(i) the pre-release and post-release plans for the juveniles;

“(ii) the living arrangement to which the juveniles are to be discharged; and

“(iii) any other plans developed for the juveniles based on an individualized assessment; and

“(B) review processes;

“(32) provide an assurance that the agency of the State receiving funds under this title collaborates with the State educational agency receiving assistance under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) to develop and implement a plan to ensure that, in order to support educational progress—

“(A) the student records of adjudicated juveniles, including electronic records if available, are transferred in a timely manner from the educational program in the juvenile detention or secure treatment facility to the educational or training program into which the juveniles will enroll;

“(B) the credits of adjudicated juveniles are transferred; and

“(C) adjudicated juveniles receive full or partial credit toward high school graduation for secondary school coursework satisfactorily completed before and during the period of time during which the juveniles are held in custody, regardless of the local educational agency or entity from which the credits were earned; and

“(33) describe policies and procedures to—

“(A) screen for, identify, and document in records of the State the identification of victims of domestic human trafficking, or those at risk of such trafficking, upon intake; and

“(B) divert youth described in subparagraph (A) to appropriate programs or services, to the extent practicable.”;

(2) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c)(1) If a State fails to comply with any of the core requirements in any fiscal year, then—

“(A) subject to subparagraph (B), the amount allocated to such State under section 222 for the subsequent fiscal year shall be reduced by not less than 20 percent for each core requirement with respect to which the failure occurs; and

“(B) the State shall be ineligible to receive any allocation under such section for such fiscal year unless—

“(i) the State agrees to expend 50 percent of the amount allocated to the State for such fiscal year to achieve compliance with any such core requirement with respect to which the State is in noncompliance; or

“(ii) the Administrator determines that the State—

“(I) has achieved substantial compliance with such applicable requirements with respect to which the State was not in compliance; and

“(II) has made, through appropriate executive or legislative action, an unequivocal commitment to achieving full compliance with such applicable requirements within a reasonable time.

“(2) Of the total amount of funds not allocated for a fiscal year under paragraph (1)—

“(A) 50 percent of the unallocated funds shall be reallocated under section 222 to States that have not failed to comply with the core requirements; and

“(B) 50 percent of the unallocated funds shall be used by the Administrator to provide additional training and technical assistance to States for the purpose of promoting compliance with the core requirements.”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “described in paragraphs (11), (12), (13), and (22) of subsection (a)” and inserting “described in the core requirements”; and

(B) by striking “the requirements under paragraphs (11), (12), (13), and (22) of subsection (a)” and inserting “the core requirements”;

(4) in subsection (f)(2)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (E) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, the Administrator shall make a determination regarding whether each State receiving a grant under this title is in compliance or out of compliance with respect to each of the core requirements.

“(2) REPORTING.—The Administrator shall—

“(A) issue an annual public report—

“(i) describing any determination described in paragraph (1) made during the previous year, including a summary of the information on which the determination is based and the actions to be taken by the Administrator (including a description of any reduction imposed under subsection (c)); and

“(ii) for any such determination that a State is out of compliance with any of the core requirements, describing the basis for the determination; and

“(B) make the report described in subparagraph (A) available on a publicly available website.

“(3) DETERMINATIONS REQUIRED.—The Administrator may not—

“(A) determine that a State is ‘not out of compliance’, or issue any other determination not described in paragraph (1), with respect to any core requirement; or

“(B) otherwise fail to make the compliance determinations required under paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 206. REPEAL OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

Part C of title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5651 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 207. RESEARCH AND EVALUATION; STATISTICAL ANALYSES; INFORMATION DISSEMINATION.

Section 251 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5661) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “plan and identify” and inserting “annually publish a plan to identify”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

“(iii) successful efforts to prevent status offenders and first-time minor offenders from subsequent involvement with the juvenile justice and criminal justice systems;”;

(II) by striking clause (vii) and inserting the following:

“(vii) the prevalence and duration of behavioral health needs (including mental health, substance abuse, and co-occurring disorders) among juveniles pre-placement and post-placement in the juvenile justice system, including an examination of the effects of secure confinement;”;

(III) by redesignating clauses (ix), (x), and (xi) as clauses (xvi), (xvii), and (xviii), respectively; and

(IV) by inserting after clause (viii) the following:

“(ix) training efforts and reforms that have produced reductions in or elimination of the use of dangerous practices;

“(x) methods to improve the recruitment, selection, training, and retention of professional personnel who are focused on the prevention, identification, and treatment of delinquency;

“(xi) methods to improve the identification and response to victims of domestic child sex trafficking within the juvenile justice system;

“(xii) identifying positive outcome measures, such as attainment of employment and educational degrees, that States and units of local government should use to evaluate the success of programs aimed at reducing recidivism of youth who have come in contact with the juvenile justice system or criminal justice system;

“(xiii) evaluating the impact and outcomes of the prosecution and sentencing of juveniles as adults;

“(xiv) evaluating the impact of fines, fees, and other costs assessed by the juvenile justice system on the long-term disposition of status offenders and other juveniles;

“(xv) successful and cost-effective efforts by States and units of local government to reduce recidivism through policies that provide for consideration of appropriate alternative sanctions to incarceration of youth facing nonviolent charges, while ensuring that public safety is preserved;”;

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “date of enactment of this paragraph, the” and inserting “date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017, the”; and

(II) by inserting “in accordance with relevant confidentiality requirements” after “wards of the State”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “and Indian tribes” after “State”;;

(iii) in subparagraph (F), by striking “and” at the end;

(iv) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) a description of the best practices in discharge planning; and

“(I) an assessment of living arrangements for juveniles who, upon release from confinement in a State correctional facility, cannot return to the residence they occupied prior to such confinement.”;

(2) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) NATIONAL RECIDIVISM MEASURE.—The Administrator, in accordance with applicable confidentiality requirements and in consultation with experts in the field of juvenile justice research, recidivism, and data collection, shall—

“(1) establish a uniform method of data collection and technology that States may use to evaluate data on juvenile recidivism on an annual basis;

“(2) establish a common national juvenile recidivism measurement system; and

“(3) make cumulative juvenile recidivism data that is collected from States available to the public.”.

SEC. 208. TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 252 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5662) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may”;;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “shall” before “develop and carry out projects”; and

(ii) by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “may” before “make grants to and contracts with”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) shall provide periodic training for States regarding implementation of the core requirements, current protocols and best practices for achieving and monitoring compliance, and information sharing regarding relevant Office resources on evidence-based and promising programs or practices that promote the purposes of this Act.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may”;;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “shall” before “develop and implement projects”;;

(ii) by inserting “, including compliance with the core requirements” after “this title”; and

(iii) by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “may” before “make grants to and contracts with”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) shall provide technical assistance to States and units of local government on achieving compliance with the amendments to the core requirements and State Plans made by the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017, including training and technical assistance and, when appropriate, pilot or demonstration projects intended to develop and replicate best practices for achieving sight and sound separation in facilities or portions of facilities that are open and available to the general public and that may or may not contain a jail or a lock-up; and

“(4) shall provide technical assistance to States in support of efforts to establish partnerships between a State and a university, institution of higher education, or research center designed to improve the recruitment, selection, training, and retention of professional personnel in the fields of medicine, law enforcement, the judiciary, juvenile justice, social work and child protection, education, and other relevant fields who are en-

gaged in, or intend to work in, the field of prevention, identification, and treatment of delinquency.”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting “prosecutors,” after “public defenders.”; and

(B) by inserting “status offenders and” after “needs of”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) BEST PRACTICES REGARDING LEGAL REPRESENTATION OF CHILDREN.—In consultation with experts in the field of juvenile defense, the Administrator shall—

“(1) share best practices, which may include sharing standards of practice developed by recognized entities in the profession, for attorneys representing children; and

“(2) provide a State, if it so requests, technical assistance to implement any of the best practices shared under paragraph (1).

“(e) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR LOCAL AND STATE JUVENILE DETENTION AND CORRECTIONS PERSONNEL.—The Administrator shall coordinate training and technical assistance programs with juvenile detention and corrections personnel of States and units of local government—

“(1) to promote methods for improving conditions of juvenile confinement, including methods that are designed to minimize the use of dangerous practices, unreasonable restraints, and isolation and methods responsive to cultural differences; and

“(2) to encourage alternative behavior management techniques based on positive youth development approaches, which may include policies and procedures to train personnel to be culturally competent.

“(f) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT MENTAL HEALTH OR SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT INCLUDING HOME-BASED OR COMMUNITY-BASED CARE.—The Administrator shall provide training and technical assistance, in conjunction with the appropriate public agencies, to individuals involved in making decisions regarding the disposition and management of cases for youth who enter the juvenile justice system about the appropriate services and placement for youth with mental health or substance abuse needs, including—

“(1) juvenile justice intake personnel;

“(2) probation officers;

“(3) juvenile court judges and court services personnel;

“(4) prosecutors and court-appointed counsel; and

“(5) family members of juveniles and family advocates.

“(g) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT JUVENILE COURT JUDGES AND PERSONNEL.—The Attorney General, acting through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and the Office of Justice Programs, shall provide training and technical assistance, in conjunction with the appropriate public agencies, to enhance the capacity of State and local courts, judges, and related judicial personnel to—

“(1) improve the lives of children currently involved in or at risk of being involved in the juvenile court system; and

“(2) carry out the requirements of this Act.

“(h) FREE AND REDUCED PRICE SCHOOL LUNCHES FOR INCARCERATED JUVENILES.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall provide guidance to States relating to existing options for school food authorities in the States to apply for reimbursement for free or reduced price lunches under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) for juveniles who are incarcerated and would, if not incarcerated, be eligible for free or reduced price lunches under that Act.”.

SEC. 209. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 299 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5671) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (b) and (c), and redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (b);

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “(EXCLUDING PARTS C AND E)”;

(B) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title—

“(A) \$76,125,000 for fiscal year 2018;

“(B) \$76,125,000 for fiscal year 2019;

“(C) \$77,266,875 for fiscal year 2020;

“(D) \$78,425,878 for fiscal year 2021; and

“(E) \$79,602,266 for fiscal year 2022.”; and

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “(other than parts C and E)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “part D” and inserting “parts D and E”.

SEC. 210. ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY.

Section 299A of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5672) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” before “The Administrator”;

(B) by striking “, after appropriate consultation with representatives of States and units of local government.”;

(C) by inserting “guidance,” after “regulations.”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following: “In developing guidance and procedures, the Administrator shall consult with representatives of States and units of local government, including those individuals responsible for administration of this Act and compliance with the core requirements.”

“(2) The Administrator shall ensure that—

“(A) reporting, compliance reporting, State plan requirements, and other similar documentation as may be required from States is requested in a manner that respects confidentiality, encourages efficiency and reduces the duplication of reporting efforts; and

“(B) States meeting all the core requirements are encouraged to experiment with offering innovative, data-driven programs designed to further improve the juvenile justice system.”; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking “requirements described in paragraphs (11), (12), and (13) of section 223(a)” and inserting “core requirements”.

TITLE III—INCENTIVE GRANTS FOR LOCAL DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAMS**SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.**

Section 501 of the Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 5601 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting “Youth Promise” before “Incentive Grants”; and

(2) by striking “2002” and inserting “2017”.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

Section 502 of the Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 5781) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title—

“(1) the term ‘at-risk’ has the meaning given that term in section 1432 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6472);

“(2) the term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) a unit of local government that is in compliance with the requirements of part B of title II; or

“(B) a nonprofit organization in partnership with a unit of local government described in subparagraph (A);

“(3) the term ‘delinquency prevention program’ means a delinquency prevention program that is evidence-based or promising and that may include—

“(A) alcohol and substance abuse prevention or treatment services;

“(B) tutoring and remedial education, especially in reading and mathematics;

“(C) child and adolescent health and mental health services;

“(D) recreation services;

“(E) leadership and youth development activities;

“(F) the teaching that individuals are and should be held accountable for their actions;

“(G) assistance in the development of job training skills;

“(H) youth mentoring programs;

“(I) after-school programs;

“(J) coordination of a continuum of services, which may include—

“(i) early childhood development services;

“(ii) voluntary home visiting programs;

“(iii) nurse-family partnership programs;

“(iv) parenting skills training;

“(v) child abuse prevention programs;

“(vi) family stabilization programs;

“(vii) child welfare services;

“(viii) family violence intervention programs;

“(ix) adoption assistance programs;

“(x) emergency, transitional and permanent housing assistance;

“(xi) job placement and retention training;

“(xii) summer jobs programs;

“(xiii) alternative school resources for youth who have dropped out of school or demonstrate chronic truancy;

“(xiv) conflict resolution skill training;

“(xv) restorative justice programs;

“(xvi) mentoring programs;

“(xvii) targeted gang prevention, intervention and exit services;

“(xviii) training and education programs for pregnant teens and teen parents; and

“(xix) pre-release, post-release, and re-entry services to assist detained and incarcerated youth with transitioning back into and reentering the community; and

“(K) other data-driven evidence-based or promising prevention programs;

“(4) the term ‘local policy board’, when used with respect to an eligible entity, means a policy board that the eligible entity will engage in the development of the eligible entity’s plan described in section 504(e)(5), and that includes—

“(A) not fewer than 15 and not more than 21 members; and

“(B) a balanced representation of—

“(i) public agencies and private nonprofit organizations serving juveniles and their families; and

“(ii) business and industry;

“(C) at least one representative of the faith community, one adjudicated youth, and one parent of an adjudicated youth; and

“(D) in the case of an eligible entity described in paragraph (1)(B), a representative of the nonprofit organization of the eligible entity;

“(5) the term ‘mentoring’ means matching 1 adult with 1 or more youths for the purpose of providing guidance, support, and encouragement through regularly scheduled meetings for not less than 9 months;

“(6) the term ‘State advisory group’ means the advisory group appointed by the chief ex-

ecutive officer of a State under a plan described in section 223(a); and

“(7) the term ‘State entity’ means the State agency designated under section 223(a)(1) or the entity receiving funds under section 223(d).”.

SEC. 303. DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR.

Section 503 of the Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 5782) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively.

SEC. 304. GRANTS FOR DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAMS.

Section 504 of the Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 5781 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 504. GRANTS FOR LOCAL DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAMS.

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to enable local communities to address the unmet needs of at-risk or delinquent youth, including through a continuum of delinquency prevention programs for juveniles who have had contact with the juvenile justice system or who are likely to have contact with the juvenile justice system.

“(b) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Administrator shall—

“(1) for each fiscal year for which less than \$25,000,000 is appropriated under section 506, award grants to not fewer than 3 State entities, but not more than 5 State entities, that apply under subsection (c) and meet the requirements of subsection (d); or

“(2) for each fiscal year for which \$25,000,000 or more is appropriated under section 506, award grants to not fewer than 5 State entities that apply under subsection (c) and meet the requirements of subsection (d).

“(c) STATE APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a State entity shall submit an application to the Administrator, which includes the following:

“(1) An assurance the State entity will use—

“(A) not more than 10 percent of such grant, in the aggregate—

“(i) for the costs incurred by the State entity to carry out this section, except that not more than 3 percent of such grant may be used for such costs; and

“(ii) to provide technical assistance to eligible entities receiving a subgrant under subsection (e) in carrying out delinquency prevention programs under the subgrant; and

“(B) the remainder of such grant to award subgrants to eligible entities under subsection (e).

“(2) An assurance that such grant will supplement, and not supplant, State and local efforts to prevent juvenile delinquency.

“(3) An assurance the State entity will evaluate the capacity of eligible entities receiving a subgrant under subsection (e) to fulfill the requirements under such subsection.

“(4) An assurance that such application was prepared after consultation with, and participation by, the State advisory group, units of local government, community-based organizations, and organizations that carry out programs, projects, or activities to prevent juvenile delinquency in the local juvenile justice system served by the State entity.

“(d) APPROVAL OF STATE APPLICATIONS.—In awarding grants under this section for a fiscal year, the Administrator may not award a

grant to a State entity for a fiscal year unless—

“(1)(A) the State that will be served by the State entity submitted a plan under section 223 for such fiscal year; and

“(B) such plan is approved by the Administrator for such fiscal year; or

“(2) after finding good cause for a waiver, the Administrator waives the plan required under subparagraph (A) for such State for such fiscal year.

“(e) SUBGRANT PROGRAM.—

“(1) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each State entity receiving a grant under this section shall award subgrants to eligible entities in accordance with this subsection.

“(B) PRIORITY.—In awarding subgrants under this subsection, the State entity shall give priority to eligible entities that demonstrate ability in—

“(i) plans for service and agency coordination and collaboration including the collocation of services;

“(ii) innovative ways to involve the private nonprofit and business sector in delinquency prevention activities;

“(iii) developing data-driven prevention plans, employing evidence-based prevention strategies, and conducting program evaluations to determine impact and effectiveness;

“(iv) identifying under the plan submitted under paragraph (5) potential savings and efficiencies associated with successful implementation of such plan; and

“(v) describing how such savings and efficiencies may be used to carry out delinquency prevention programs and be reinvested in the continuing implementation of such programs after the end of the subgrant period.

“(C) SUBGRANT PROGRAM PERIOD AND DIVERSITY OF PROJECTS.—

“(i) PROGRAM PERIOD.—A subgrant awarded to an eligible entity by a State entity under this section shall be for a period of not more than 5 years, of which the eligible entity—

“(I) may use not more than 18 months for completing the plan submitted by the eligible entity under paragraph (5); and

“(II) shall use the remainder of the subgrant period, after planning period described in subclause (I), for the implementation of such plan.

“(ii) DIVERSITY OF PROJECTS.—In awarding subgrants under this subsection, a State entity shall ensure, to the extent practicable and applicable, that such subgrants are distributed throughout different areas, including urban, suburban, and rural areas.

“(2) LOCAL APPLICATION.—An eligible entity that desires a subgrant under this subsection shall submit an application to the State entity in the State of the eligible entity, at such time and in such manner as determined by the State entity, and that includes—

“(A) a description of—

“(i) the local policy board and local partners the eligible entity will engage in the development of the plan described in paragraph (5);

“(ii) the unmet needs of at-risk or delinquent youth in the community;

“(iii) available resources in the community to meet the unmet needs identified in the needs assessment described in paragraph (5)(A);

“(iv) potential costs to the community if the unmet needs are not addressed;

“(B) a specific time period for the planning and subsequent implementation of its continuum of local delinquency prevention programs;

“(C) the steps the eligible entity will take to implement the plan under subparagraph (A); and

“(D) a plan to continue the grant activity with non-Federal funds, if proven successful according to the performance evaluation process under paragraph (5)(D), after the grant period.

“(3) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—An eligible entity desiring a subgrant under this subsection shall agree to provide a 50 percent match of the amount of the subgrant, which may include the value of in-kind contributions.

“(4) SUBGRANT REVIEW.—

“(A) REVIEW.—Not later than the end of the second year of a subgrant period for a subgrant awarded to an eligible entity under this subsection and before awarding the remaining amount of the subgrant to the eligible entity, the State entity shall—

“(i) ensure that the eligible entity has completed the plan submitted under paragraph (2) and that the plan meets the requirements of such paragraph; and

“(ii) verify that the eligible entity will begin the implementation of its plan upon receiving the next installment of its subgrant award.

“(B) TERMINATION.—If the State entity finds through the review conducted under subparagraph (A) that the eligible entity has not met the requirements of clause (i) of such subparagraph, the State entity shall reallocate the amount remaining on the subgrant of the eligible entity to other eligible entities receiving a subgrant under this subsection or award the amount to an eligible entity during the next subgrant competition under this subsection.

“(5) LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that receives a subgrant under this subsection shall use the funds to implement a plan to carry out delinquency prevention programs in the community served by the eligible entity in a coordinated manner with other delinquency prevention programs or entities serving such community, which includes—

“(A) an analysis of the unmet needs of at-risk or delinquent youth in the community—

“(i) which shall include—

“(I) the available resources in the community to meet the unmet needs; and

“(II) factors present in the community that may contribute to delinquency, such as homelessness, food insecurity, teen pregnancy, youth unemployment, family instability, lack of educational opportunity; and

“(ii) may include an estimate—

“(I) for the most recent year for which reliable data is available, the amount expended by the community and other entities for delinquency adjudication for juveniles and the incarceration of adult offenders for offenses committed in such community; and

“(II) of potential savings and efficiencies that may be achieved through the implementation of the plan;

“(B) a minimum 3-year comprehensive strategy to address the unmet needs and an estimate of the amount or percentage of non-Federal funds that are available to carry out the strategy;

“(C) a description of how delinquency prevention programs under the plan will be coordinated;

“(D) a description of the performance evaluation process of the delinquency prevention programs to be implemented under the plan, which shall include performance measures to assess efforts to address the unmet needs of youth in the community analyzed under subparagraph (A);

“(E) the evidence or promising evaluation on which such delinquency prevention programs are based; and

“(F) if such delinquency prevention programs are proven successful according to the performance evaluation process under subparagraph (D), a strategy to continue such programs after the subgrant period with non-Federal funds, including a description of how any estimated savings or efficiencies created by the implementation of the plan may be used to continue such programs.”.

SEC. 305. GRANTS FOR TRIBAL DELINQUENCY PREVENTION AND RESPONSE PROGRAMS.

The Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 5781 et seq.) is amended by redesignating section 505 as section 506 and by inserting after section 504 the following:

“SEC. 505. GRANTS FOR TRIBAL DELINQUENCY PREVENTION AND RESPONSE PROGRAMS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall make grants under this section, on a competitive basis, to eligible Indian tribes (or consortia of Indian tribes) as described in subsection (b)—

“(1) to support and enhance—

“(A) tribal juvenile delinquency prevention services; and

“(B) the ability of Indian tribes to respond to, and care for, at-risk or delinquent youth upon release; and

“(2) to encourage accountability of Indian tribal governments with respect to preventing juvenile delinquency, and responding to, and caring for, juvenile offenders.

“(b) ELIGIBLE INDIAN TRIBES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an Indian tribe or consortium of Indian tribes shall submit to the Administrator an application in such form as the Administrator may require.

“(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—In providing grants under this section, the Administrator shall take into consideration, with respect to the Indian tribe to be served, the—

“(1) juvenile delinquency rates;

“(2) school dropout rates; and

“(3) number of youth at risk of delinquency.

“(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the amount available for a fiscal year to carry out this title, 11 percent shall be available to carry out this section.”.

SEC. 306. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 506, as redesignated by section 305, is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 506. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title—

“(1) \$91,857,500 for fiscal year 2018;

“(2) \$91,857,500 for fiscal year 2019;

“(3) \$93,235,362 for fiscal year 2020;

“(4) \$94,633,892 for fiscal year 2021; and

“(5) \$96,053,401 for fiscal year 2022.”.

SEC. 307. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

Title V of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 as enacted by Public Law 93-415 (88 Stat. 1133) (relating to miscellaneous and conforming amendments) is repealed.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. EVALUATION BY GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

(a) EVALUATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a comprehensive analysis and evaluation regarding the performance of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency

Prevention (referred to in this section as “the agency”), its functions, its programs, and its grants;

(2) conduct a comprehensive audit and evaluation of a selected, sample of grantees (as determined by the Comptroller General) that receive Federal funds under grant programs administered by the agency including a review of internal controls (as defined in section 103 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5603), as amended by this Act) to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse of funds by grantees; and

(3) submit a report in accordance with subsection (d).

(b) **CONSIDERATIONS FOR EVALUATION.**—In conducting the analysis and evaluation under subsection (a)(1), and in order to document the efficiency and public benefit of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.), excluding the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) and the Missing Children’s Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771 et seq.), the Comptroller General shall take into consideration—

(1) the outcome and results of the programs carried out by the agency and those programs administered through grants by the agency;

(2) the extent to which the agency has complied with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-62; 107 Stat. 285);

(3) the extent to which the jurisdiction of, and the programs administered by, the agency duplicate or conflict with the jurisdiction and programs of other agencies;

(4) the potential benefits of consolidating programs administered by the agency with similar or duplicative programs of other agencies, and the potential for consolidating those programs;

(5) whether less restrictive or alternative methods exist to carry out the functions of the agency and whether current functions or operations are impeded or enhanced by existing statutes, rules, and procedures;

(6) the number and types of beneficiaries or persons served by programs carried out by the agency;

(7) the manner with which the agency seeks public input and input from State and local governments on the performance of the functions of the agency;

(8) the extent to which the agency complies with section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act);

(9) whether greater oversight is needed of programs developed with grants made by the agency; and

(10) the extent to which changes are necessary in the authorizing statutes of the agency in order for the functions of the agency to be performed in a more efficient and effective manner.

(c) **CONSIDERATIONS FOR AUDITS.**—In conducting the audit and evaluation under subsection (a)(2), and in order to document the efficiency and public benefit of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.), excluding the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) and the Missing Children’s Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771 et seq.), the Comptroller General shall take into consideration—

(1) whether grantees timely file Financial Status Reports;

(2) whether grantees have sufficient internal controls to ensure adequate oversight of grant fund received;

(3) whether disbursements were accompanied with adequate supporting documentation (including invoices and receipts);

(4) whether expenditures were authorized;

(5) whether subrecipients of grant funds were complying with program requirements;

(6) whether salaries and fringe benefits of personnel were adequately supported by documentation;

(7) whether contracts were bid in accordance with program guidelines; and

(8) whether grant funds were spent in accordance with program goals and guidelines.

(d) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(A) submit a report regarding the evaluation conducted under subsection (a) and audit under subsection (b), to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate; and

(B) make the report described in subparagraph (A) available to the public.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report submitted in accordance with paragraph (1) shall include all audit findings determined by the selected, statistically significant sample of grantees as required by subsection (a)(2) and shall include the name and location of any selected grantee as well as any findings required by subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 402. ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE VI—ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT

“SEC. 601. ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT.

“(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that, in order to ensure that at-risk youth, and youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system or the criminal justice system, are treated fairly and that the outcome of that contact is beneficial to the Nation—

“(1) the Department of Justice, through its Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, must restore meaningful enforcement of the core requirements in title II; and

“(2) States, which are entrusted with a fiscal stewardship role if they accept funds under title II must exercise vigilant oversight to ensure full compliance with the core requirements for juveniles provided for in title II.

“(b) **ACCOUNTABILITY.**—

“(1) **AGENCY PROGRAM REVIEW.**—

“(A) **PROGRAMMATIC AND FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017, the Director of the Office of Audit, Assessment, and Management of the Office of Justice Programs at the Department of Justice (referred to in this section as the “Director”) shall—

“(I) conduct a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of the internal controls of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (referred to in this section as the “agency”) to determine if States and Indian tribes receiving grants are following the requirements of the agency grant programs and what remedial action the agency has taken to recover any grant funds that are expended in violation of grant programs, including instances where—

“(aa) supporting documentation was not provided for cost reports;

“(bb) unauthorized expenditures occurred; and

“(cc) subrecipients of grant funds were not in compliance with program requirements;

“(II) conduct a comprehensive audit and evaluation of a selected statistically significant sample of States and Indian tribes (as determined by the Director) that have received Federal funds under title II, including a review of internal controls to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse of funds by grantees; and

“(III) submit a report in accordance with clause (iv).

“(ii) **CONSIDERATIONS FOR EVALUATIONS.**—In conducting the analysis and evaluation under clause (i)(I), and in order to document the efficiency and public benefit of titles II and V, the Director shall take into consideration the extent to which—

“(I) greater oversight is needed of programs developed with grants made by the agency;

“(II) changes are necessary in the authorizing statutes of the agency in order that the functions of the agency can be performed in a more efficient and effective manner; and

“(III) the agency has implemented recommendations issued by the Comptroller General or Office of Inspector General relating to the grant making and grant monitoring responsibilities of the agency.

“(iii) **CONSIDERATIONS FOR AUDITS.**—In conducting the audit and evaluation under clause (i)(II), and in order to document the efficiency and public benefit of titles II and V, the Director shall take into consideration—

“(I) whether grantees timely file Financial Status Reports;

“(II) whether grantees have sufficient internal controls to ensure adequate oversight of grant funds received;

“(III) whether grantees’ assertions of compliance with the core requirements were accompanied with adequate supporting documentation;

“(IV) whether expenditures were authorized;

“(V) whether subrecipients of grant funds were complying with program requirements; and

“(VI) whether grant funds were spent in accordance with the program goals and guidelines.

“(iv) **REPORT.**—The Director shall—

“(I) submit to the Congress a report outlining the results of the analysis, evaluation, and audit conducted under clause (i), including supporting materials, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate; and

“(II) shall make such report available to the public online, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section.

“(B) **ANALYSIS OF INTERNAL CONTROLS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017, the Administrator shall initiate a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of the internal controls of the agency to determine whether, and to what extent, States and Indian tribes that receive grants under titles II and V are following the requirements of the grant programs authorized under titles II and V.

“(ii) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report containing—

“(I) the findings of the analysis and evaluation conducted under clause (i);

“(II) a description of remedial actions, if any, that will be taken by the Administrator

to enhance the internal controls of the agency and recoup funds that may have been expended in violation of law, regulations, or program requirements issued under titles II and V; and

“(III) a description of—

“(aa) the analysis conducted under clause (i);

“(bb) whether the funds awarded under titles II and V have been used in accordance with law, regulations, program guidance, and applicable plans; and

“(cc) the extent to which funds awarded to States and Indian tribes under titles II and V enhanced the ability of grantees to fulfill the core requirements.

“(C) REPORT BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017, the Attorney General shall submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a report on the estimated amount of formula grant funds disbursed by the agency since fiscal year 2010 that did not meet the requirements for awards of formula grants to States under title II.

“(2) OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL PERFORMANCE AUDITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to ensure the effective and appropriate use of grants administered under this Act (excluding title III) and to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall periodically conduct audits of grantees that receive grants under this Act covering each grant recipient at least once every 3 years.

“(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY ON WEBSITE.—The Attorney General shall make the summary of each review conducted under this section available on the website of the Department of Justice, subject to redaction as the Attorney General determines necessary to protect classified and other sensitive information.

“(C) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this Act (excluding titles II and III) that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this Act (excluding title III) during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the 12-month period beginning on the date on which the audit report is issued.

“(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this Act (excluding title III), the Administrator shall give priority to an eligible entity that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years prior to the date on which the eligible entity submits an application for the grant involved.

“(E) REIMBURSEMENT.—If a grant recipient under this Act (excluding title III) is awarded such funds under this Act during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the recipient is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

“(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the general fund of the Treasury; and

“(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the general fund under clause (i) from the grantee that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

“(F) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘unresolved audit finding’ means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General—

“(i) that the audited recipient has used grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost; and

“(ii) that is not closed or resolved during the 12-month period beginning on the date on which the final audit report is issued.

“(3) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

“(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this Act may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or organization awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this Act, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in funds made available to the Department of Justice, unless the Deputy Attorney General or such Assistant Attorney Generals, Directors, or principal deputies as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a conference.

“(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audiovisual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

“(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

“(4) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act may not be utilized by any recipient of a grant made using such amounts—

“(i) to lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding; or

“(ii) to lobby any representative of a Federal, State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

“(B) PENALTY.—If the Attorney General determines that any recipient of a grant made using amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall—

“(i) require the recipient to repay the grant in full; and

“(ii) prohibit the recipient to receive another grant under this Act for not less than 5 years.

“(C) CLARIFICATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, submitting an application for a grant under this Act shall not be considered lobbying activity in violation of subparagraph (A).

“(c) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this Act, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded under this Act to determine if duplicate grant awards are awarded for the same purpose.

“(2) REPORT.—If the Attorney General awards duplicate grants to the same applicant for the same purpose the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

“(A) a list of all duplicate grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any duplicate grants awarded; and

“(B) the reason the Attorney General awarded the duplicative grant.

“(d) COMPLIANCE WITH AUDITING STANDARDS.—The Administrator shall comply with the Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards, published by the General Accountability Office (commonly known as the ‘Yellow Book’), in the conduct of fiscal, compliance, and programmatic audits of States.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 is amended by striking paragraphs (6) and (7) of section 407 (42 U.S.C. 5776a).

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the 1st day of the 1st fiscal year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—In the case of an entity that is barred from receiving grant funds under paragraph (7)(B)(ii) of section 407 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5776a), the amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not affect the applicability to the entity, or to the Attorney General with respect to the entity, of paragraph (7) of such section 407, as in effect on the day before the effective date of the amendment made by paragraph (1).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) TITLE III.—Section 388(a) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5751(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “140,000,000” and all that follows through “2013”, and inserting “101,980,000 for each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022” before the period;

(B) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “There” and all that follows through “2013”, and inserting “Of the amount made available for a fiscal year to carry out this title, not more than 1 percent may be used to carry out section 345” before the period; and

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking “\$25,000,000” and all that follows through “2013”, and inserting “\$17,141,000 for each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022”.

(2) TITLE IV.—Section 408 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5777) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2022”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1809.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1809, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, more than one million kids are currently involved in the juvenile justice system, a startling fact that carries devastating consequences. Kids who have been incarcerated are 26 percent less likely to graduate from high school, and up to 26 percent more likely to return to jail as adults.

There are many kids experiencing grim and challenging circumstances. As a result, some make bad decisions with costly consequences. The reality is we don't live in a perfect society, and sometimes mistakes are made. But

regardless of the circumstances surrounding a bad decision, every kid deserves the opportunity of a better path forward. That is why we are here today, to help State and local leaders provide kids with that better path forward.

In 1974, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act was signed into law with the goal of helping State and local leaders improve their juvenile justice systems. These systems can play an important role in helping young people turn their lives around and gain the skills they need to be successful.

Unfortunately, it has been 15 years since the Federal law aimed at supporting State and local juvenile justice systems has been reformed. We must update this law to develop more effective support services for vulnerable youth and to equip State and local leaders with the tools they need.

I, along with my colleague across the aisle, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), have put forward the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017, a bipartisan bill that helps set kids up for long-term success.

The reforms in this bill will provide local communities the flexibility they need to help at-risk youth turn their lives around and improve public safety. H.R. 1809 prioritizes what works by using evidence-based strategies and current reliable data to help reduce juvenile delinquency.

By strengthening the core protections for youth in the justice system, this bill makes sensible reforms to enhance their safety and keep more kids from being unnecessarily incarcerated. The bill also improves accountability and enhances the oversight of taxpayer dollars to ensure they are being used responsibly. Perhaps most importantly, this bill improves support for prevention services, especially among at-risk youth.

There is no doubt we want to help kids get their lives back on track. But it is also important to do everything we can to ensure more kids don't experience the same pitfalls.

H.R. 1809 is a strong bipartisan bill that will improve the lives of many young Americans, enabling them to get their lives back on track and achieve success.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS) for working with this side of the aisle on bipartisan comprehensive reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.

Juvenile courts were established by States in the first half of the 20th century based on the emerging legal theory that children should not be held as fully responsible for their actions as adults, a theory borne out over time by scientific research on impulse control and brain development.

The opportunity to rehabilitate children became the focus of the system rather than punishment of offenders. Congress first articulated national standards for juvenile justice in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, or JJDP. Long overdue for reauthorization, the bill creates important core protections for our children in the juvenile justice system in each State.

In the 15 years since Congress last reauthorized the program, there have been advancements in research and expansion of evidence when it comes to the prevention of youth incarceration and delinquency.

The bill we will consider today includes necessary improvements to Federal policy grounded in facts proving that the public investments in a continuum of trauma-informed care and alternatives to incarceration and secure detention produce positive results for at-risk youth. These results, in turn, will reduce crime and create long-term savings.

H.R. 1809 requires, for the first time, that State juvenile justice plans have to take into account the latest scientific research on adolescent development and behavior, recognizing the importance of prevention and early intervention in juvenile crime policy.

We shouldn't have to legislate this, but we have seen too often that slogans and sound bites have dictated our national approach to crime policy, particularly juvenile crime. These slogans and soundbites often do nothing to decrease crime. In fact, some have been actually shown to increase the crime rate.

H.R. 1809 encourages States to consider promising practices such as programming to ensure that youth have access to public defenders with juvenile court experience, the use of problem-solving courts as an alternative to probation and confinement, efforts to inform and aid juveniles in the process of sealing and expunging their juvenile records, and programming to address the needs of girls in or at risk of entering the system when developing State plans.

Finally, the bill retools the current title V Local Delinquency Prevention Grant programs retitled as the Youth Promise Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Program to support communities in the planning and implementation of evidence-based prevention and intervention programs specifically designed to reduce juvenile delinquency and gang involvement.

Grant recipients would be required to analyze the unmet delinquency needs

of the youth in the community and then develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to address those unmet needs with an emphasis on program coordination.

Research shows that a community-wide coordinated approach to delinquency prevention that utilizes a continuum of services can actually save the community money and improve efficiencies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to especially thank my colleagues for working with me on the title V provisions which are modeled after a bill I have been working on for nearly 10 years, the Youth PROMISE Act. I am confident that, if enacted, this incentive grant program will vastly improve the lives of and long-term economic opportunity for at-risk youth across the country. The collaborative work of this committee gives me hope that we can get full JJDP reauthorization over the finish line this year.

Senators GRASSLEY and WHITEHOUSE have introduced a bill in the Senate already. I am optimistic that we will be able to produce a bill together that builds on the knowledge and experience of the last 15 years and makes its way to the President's desk for signature.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in opportunity. I believe that, given tools, anyone can change their situation for the better. Too often at-risk youth end up in the school-to-prison pipeline. When designed effectively, juvenile justice programs can help reset a troubled youth's path to successful adulthood. That is why I support the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017. This legislation will help youth in the juvenile justice system get on the right path by focusing programs on approaches that work using evidence-based strategies and proven track records. It strengthens accountability and oversight to deliver positive outcomes.

It also provides communities with greater flexibility to deliver services that meet the specific needs of youth in their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor this legislation to help youth break from their troubled pasts and turn their lives around and become an asset in their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

□ 1400

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON), a strong supporter of at-risk youth.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the House today

will vote to pass a bipartisan reauthorization of H.R. 1809, the Juvenile Justice Reform Act. I strongly believe that this measure will not only help our Nation's at-risk youth, but it will also vastly improve the juvenile justice system in each State.

One area I was particularly interested in addressing in this bill is finding ways in which State-based practices that have been developed to end the school-to-prison pipeline can be expanded. I strongly believe that youth-based mentoring programs are key to achieving this goal. For that reason, I added language to the bill that expands the definition of juvenile delinquency programs to include youth mentoring programs so those programs will have greater access to Federal grant funding.

One of my life's missions has been to help build a permanent roadblock on the destructive and demoralizing path that has entrapped so many boys and young men of color and other at-risk youth. In fact, there are 50 ninth grade boys from the 5000 Role Models of Excellence Project visiting Washington today. If you see them in their red ties, give them a hug and tell them you love them.

My experience as a teacher and principal has taught me the very real benefits of reaching children as early as possible and how, with proper encouragement, support, and resources, young lives can be transformed so that they will make positive and productive choices.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on the Committee on Education and the Workforce for working very closely together in a bipartisan manner to vote to reauthorize the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. I think we can all agree that this bill's passage will go a long way toward assisting at-risk youth by giving them a second chance at success as well as opportunities to be able to learn from their mistakes and move beyond those mistakes to get an education, build a successful career, and contribute to society.

I especially commend Chairman FOXX and Ranking Member SCOTT, who I know care so much about this issue. I also applaud Representative JASON LEWIS of Minnesota for his spirit.

I encourage a "yes" vote on this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), who has been working on juvenile justice issues since he was in the California Legislature and Los Angeles City Council.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I also want to take the opportunity to thank my colleague for all of his diligence and incredible effort to make sure that we are here today with the successful passage of this important legislation.

The bill we are considering today, the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017, is a bill that puts Congress back in the driver's seat of evidence-based reform of our Nation's juvenile justice system. For far too long, Congress has failed to reauthorize the landmark Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act passed in 1974. The most important Federal juvenile justice statute has been expired for almost a decade.

I came to Congress to effect change at a national level and to serve the people of my district and all of the people across this great country. Congress has fallen behind the leadership and the progress of Democratic and Republican States alike and cities, as well, across the Nation who have had to take the lead without us. Passing this bill is a step in the right direction and will demonstrate to States and cities across this great country that Congress is listening and acting.

This bill addresses many of the issues that I have been working on in my career as a State legislator, as a city councilman, and now as a Federal elected public servant. For instance, it helps cities and local organizations fund community-based gang prevention and intervention programs.

When I was on the Los Angeles City Council, I made sure that organizations receiving taxpayer dollars from our city were actually achieving the results that they had promised. I am pleased that this bill includes a strong emphasis on research and science and making sure that evidence-based programs are prioritized. It ensures that we are supporting programs and organizations that work, which will save the taxpayers billions of dollars in the short run, hundreds of billions of dollars in the long run, and also make our communities much, much safer.

This bill supports programs that ensure youth have access to appropriate legal representation and programs to expand access. This bill supports programs designed to educate kids and their families about how they can go about sealing and expunging their juvenile records and to help them do that along the way.

This bill supports programs focused on girls in the juvenile justice system. Equally important, this bill makes sure that all ethnicity is recorded so we can get a better understanding of who is in our juvenile justice system and address any disparities if we find them.

This bill will put us on a path to ensuring kids are not detained for an offense that would not be a crime if committed as an adult, such as skipping school or running away from home. It is high time we reauthorize the JJDP, and I hope my colleagues in the House and Senate can come together to advance this critical update to our juvenile justice laws.

It is our responsibility to lead. I urge my colleagues to be leaders by voting for the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017. Once again, it is long, long overdue.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman LEWIS for his work on this important legislation. I also thank the ranking member, Mr. SCOTT, whom I had the pleasure of working with on this same cause last year. This year, of course, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill.

As a former member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, this was and remains one of my priorities, as I believe that this reauthorization can help us achieve our antipoverty goals here in the U.S. House.

The Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017 will help set kids up for success that is long term, so they are not caught up in a system that puts them on a path where failure is inevitable. This bill includes reforms that will help juveniles transition out of the system through community-based services and education.

It also ensures that stakeholders can offer their expertise in order to best serve this population while also supporting prevention services to keep kids on the right track. Another important thing to note is that this bill prioritizes evidence-based strategies to reduce juvenile delinquency, directing necessary resources to what actually works.

Everyone deserves the chance to improve their circumstances. Many kids who end up in the juvenile justice system are the most vulnerable in our communities. These kids and the stakeholders and policymakers who support them need the flexibility and tools to effectively serve them. I believe this legislation is a step in the right direction, and I encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

I appreciate the work that the Committee on Education and the Workforce has done to help at-risk youth get on a path to a brighter future.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank, again, the gentleman from Minnesota for his leadership. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Ensuring kids experiencing difficult life circumstances avoid a life of crime is a collaborative effort. I find it a privilege to stand with parents, teachers, and law enforcement officers to ensure at-risk youth are able to get back on track and grow into productive members of society.

The Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017 makes commonsense reforms that

move us in a positive direction by providing support to kids who need help the most. I am pleased to help lead this bipartisan effort.

I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for the work he has done on this legislation.

By working together here in Congress, we can ensure young people have the opportunities they need to turn their lives around and earn a lifetime of success. I thank my colleagues for their support of H.R. 1809.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pledge my support for the Juvenile Justice Reform Act (H.R. 1809).

As a former deputy probation officer with the Boston Juvenile Court, I have seen firsthand the benefits of providing core protections for the treatment of children, youth, and families in the justice system. When I was a Contra Costa County Supervisor in California, I saw the benefits from another perspective when our county received one of the first SafeFutures grants awarded by the federal government. The SafeFutures initiative encouraged communities to tailor prevention, intervention, and treatment strategies to local needs. It was through this program that I had the opportunity to witness first-hand the positive effects that supportive disciplinary practices have on the at-risk population.

I am pleased that the Juvenile Justice Reform Act, like SafeFutures, brings together stakeholders to identify gaps in the continuum of services. Not only will these gaps be filled, but it also encourages finding cost-savings and efficiencies to keep initiatives schools establish with the help of JJRA grants running after that funding is exhausted.

I appreciate the work done by Chairwoman FOXX and Ranking Member SCOTT to make the Juvenile Justice Reform Act comprehensive and bipartisan. I strongly support this bill, which will help equip professionals with the supports they need to contribute positively to the lives of our youth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1809, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVING SUPPORT FOR MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN ACT OF 2017

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1808) to amend and improve the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1808

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Improving Support for Missing and Exploited Children Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Section 402 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) each year tens of thousands of children run away, or are abducted or removed, from the control of a parent having legal custody without such parent's consent, under circumstances which immediately place the child in grave danger;"

(2) by striking paragraphs (4) and (5),

(3) in paragraph (6) by inserting "including child sex trafficking and sextortion" after "exploitation",

(4) in paragraph (8) by adding "and" at the end,

(5) by striking paragraph (9),

(6) by amending paragraph (10) to read as follows:

"(10) a key component of such programs is the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children that—

"(A) serves as a nonprofit, national resource center and clearinghouse to provide assistance to victims, families, child-serving professionals, and the general public;

"(B) works with the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the United States Marshals Service, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of State, the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the United States Secret Service, the United States Postal Inspection Service, other agencies, and nongovernmental organizations in the effort to find missing children and to prevent child victimization; and

"(C) coordinates with each of the missing children clearinghouses operated by the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and international organizations to transmit images and information regarding missing and exploited children to law enforcement, nongovernmental organizations, and corporate partners across the United States and around the world instantly.";

(7) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (7), (8), and (10) as paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

Section 403 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5772) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "legal custodian" each place it appears and inserting "parent";

(B) in subparagraph (A) by striking "custodian's" and inserting "parent's"; and

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking the period and the end and inserting a semicolon,

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking "and" at the end,

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) the term 'parent' includes a legal guardian or other individual standing in loco parentis (such as a grandparent or stepparent with whom the child lives, or an individual who is legally responsible for the child's welfare)."

SEC. 4. DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR.

Section 404 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (3) by striking "telephone line" and inserting "hotline"; and

(B) in paragraph (6)(E)—

(i) by striking "telephone line" and inserting "hotline";

(ii) by striking "(b)(1)(A) and" and inserting "(b)(1)(A)."; and

(iii) by inserting "and the number and types of reports to the tipline established under subsection (b)(1)(K)(i)" before the semicolon at the end,

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "telephone line" each place it appears and inserting "hotline"; and

(ii) by striking "legal custodian" and inserting "parent";

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking "restaurant" and inserting "food"; and

(II) by striking "and" at the end,

(ii) in clause (ii) by adding "and" at the end, and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(iii) innovative and model programs, services, and legislation that benefit missing and exploited children;"

(C) by striking subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G),

(D) by amending subparagraph (H) to read as follows:

"(H) provide technical assistance and training to families, law enforcement agencies, State and local governments, elements of the criminal justice system, nongovernmental agencies, local educational agencies, and the general public—

"(i) in the prevention, investigation, prosecution, and treatment of cases involving missing and exploited children;

"(ii) to respond to foster children missing from the State child welfare system in coordination with child welfare agencies and courts handling juvenile justice and dependency matters; and

"(iii) in the identification, location, and recovery of victims of, and children at risk for, child sex trafficking;"

(E) by amending subparagraphs (I), (J), and (K) to read as follows:

"(I) provide assistance to families, law enforcement agencies, State and local governments, nongovernmental agencies, child-serving professionals, and other individuals involved in the location and recovery of missing and abducted children, both nationally, and in cooperation with the Department of State, internationally;

"(J) provide support and technical assistance to child-serving professionals involved in helping to recover missing and exploited children by searching public records databases to help in the identification, location, and recovery of such children, and help in the location and identification of potential abductors and offenders;

"(K) provide forensic and direct on-site technical assistance and consultation to families, law enforcement agencies, child-serving professionals, and nongovernmental organizations in child abduction and exploitation cases, including facial reconstruction of skeletal remains and similar techniques to assist in the identification of unidentified deceased children;"

(F) by striking subparagraphs (L) and (M),

(G) by amending subparagraph (N) to read as follows:

"(N) provide training, technical assistance, and information to nongovernmental organizations relating to non-compliant sex offenders and to law enforcement agencies in identifying and locating such individuals;"

(H) by striking subparagraph (P),

(I) by amending subparagraph (Q) to read as follows:

"(Q) work with families, law enforcement agencies, electronic service providers, electronic payment service providers, technology companies, nongovernmental organizations, and others on methods to reduce the existence and distribution of online images and videos of sexually exploited children—

“(i) by operating a tipline to provide to individuals and electronic service providers an effective means of reporting Internet-related and other instances of child sexual exploitation in the areas of—

“(I) possession, manufacture, and distribution of child pornography;

“(II) online enticement of children for sexual acts;

“(III) child sex trafficking;

“(IV) sex tourism involving children;

“(V) extra familial child sexual molestation;

“(VI) unsolicited obscene material sent to a child;

“(VII) misleading domain names; and

“(VIII) misleading words or digital images on the Internet;

and subsequently to make such reports available to the appropriate law enforcement agency for its review and potential investigation;

“(ii) by operating a child victim identification program to assist law enforcement agencies in identifying victims of child pornography and other sexual crimes to support the recovery of children from sexually exploitative situations; and

“(iii) by utilizing emerging technologies to provide additional outreach and educational materials to parents and families;”

(J) by striking subparagraph (R),

(K) by amending subparagraphs (S) and (T) to read as follows:

“(S) develop and disseminate programs and information to families, child-serving professionals, law enforcement agencies, State and local governments, nongovernmental organizations, schools, local educational agencies, child-serving organizations, and the general public on—

“(i) the prevention of child abduction and sexual exploitation;

“(ii) Internet safety, including tips for social media and cyberbullying; and

“(iii) sexting and sextortion; and

“(T) provide technical assistance and training to local educational agencies, schools, State and local law enforcement agencies, individuals, and other nongovernmental organizations that assist with finding missing and abducted children in identifying and recovering such children.”, and

(L) by redesignating subparagraphs (H), (I), (J), (K), (N), (O), (Q), (S), (T), (U), and (V) as subparagraphs (E) through (O), respectively.

SEC. 5. GRANTS.

Section 405 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5775) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (7) by striking “(as defined in section 403(1)(A))”, and

(B) in paragraph (8)—

(i) by striking “legal custodians” and inserting “parents”, and

(ii) by striking “custodians” and inserting “parents”, and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A) by striking “legal custodians” and inserting “parents”.

SEC. 6. REPORTING.

The Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 407 and 408 as section 408 and 409, respectively, and

(2) by inserting after section 406 the following:

“SEC. 407. REPORTING.

“(a) **REQUIRED REPORTING.**—As a condition of receiving funds under section 404(b), the grant recipient shall, based solely on reports received by the grantee and not involving any data collection by the grantee other than those reports, annually provide to the Administrator and make available to the general public, as appropriate—

“(1) the number of children nationwide who are reported to the grantee as missing;

“(2) the number of children nationwide who are reported to the grantee as victims of non-family abductions;

“(3) the number of children nationwide who are reported to the grantee as victims of family abductions; and

“(4) the number of missing children recovered nationwide whose recovery was reported to the grantee.

“(b) **INCIDENCE OF ATTEMPTED CHILD ABDUCTIONS.**—As a condition of receiving funds under section 404(b), the grant recipient shall—

“(1) track the incidence of attempted child abductions in order to identify links and patterns;

“(2) provide such information to law enforcement agencies; and

“(3) make such information available to the general public, as appropriate.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1808.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1808, the Improving Support for Missing and Exploited Children Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, as a father, I cannot imagine the horror moms and dads in this country experience when they discover one of their children has been taken, abused, or exploited. Sadly, that is a nightmare for hundreds of thousands of parents in this country. Last year alone, there were more than 465,000 reports of missing children, and those are just the cases that were reported.

The well-being of America's children has long been a national priority. In 1984, Congress established the Missing and Exploited Children's Program to help coordinate State and local efforts to recover children who are missing and better protect and support kids who are victims of abuse and exploitation. As part of that program, we provide a grant that is used to support the work of the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, known as NCMEC.

For more than 30 years, NCMEC has worked to provide help to people across the country, partnering with parents, law enforcement, nonprofits, and other public and private entities in an effort to recover, protect, and support missing and exploited children and their families. We are here today to ensure this supportive work continues.

H.R. 1808 updates and streamlines the Missing Children's Assistance Act, making positive changes that will enable us to strengthen our efforts. This includes reforms that encourage and increase public awareness of new and

innovative ways to recover and protect missing and exploited children.

The bill better protects the growing number of children who go missing from State care or are victims of sex trafficking, while also providing transparency surrounding recovery and prevention efforts. In recent years, some of the advances in technology have, unfortunately, made it easier for kids to be victimized and exploited. H.R. 1808 ensures the law aimed at recovering and protecting exploited children is able to effectively identify and locate today's abductors and criminal offenders, many of whom are turning to more modern techniques to commit their disturbing crimes.

The Improving Support for Missing and Exploited Children Act of 2017 delivers important reforms that will provide the tools needed to effectively serve vulnerable youth, help bring perpetrators to justice, and ensure taxpayer dollars are spent responsibly. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1808.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 1808 to amend and improve the Missing Children's Assistance Act.

Mr. Speaker, again, it is an honor to stand with my friend, Mr. GUTHRIE, in bipartisan support of this legislation which, again, makes some important changes to the existing law for the Center for Missing & Exploited Children, as my friend said, a program which was created in 1984. Sadly, it has not finished its mission.

Again, the FBI reports every year there are about 460,000 reports of missing children, and despite the best efforts of programs which NCMEC has operated over the many years, which include hotlines and public information campaigns, again, this is still a scourge which afflicts many families all across the country in Republican, Democratic, rural, suburban, and urban areas.

Again, this bill will basically update and modernize the language of the act to recognize that there are new forms of threats and risks to minor children, such as human trafficking and online predators.

□ 1415

So it does three essential things:

Number one, it incorporates new terminology to align the law with these new threats, which I mentioned above, and strengthens protections for children at risk.

Number two, it clarifies that NCMEC is a nonprofit entity, which is an issue that has been ensnared in the courts. And, again, Congress' passage and enactment of this bill will clarify this critical issue.

And, lastly, it clarifies that NCMEC is a resource that provides technical

assistance not just to law enforcement, but to families, community groups, schools, and the public at large.

Mr. Speaker, this last aspect of the bill is critically important. Last year, Congress passed Public Law 114-184, which President Obama signed into law, the Recovering Missing Children's Act. It was a measure which I cosponsored with Mr. PAULSEN from Minnesota.

This bill actually gave State and local police another tool in terms of recovering missing children. Incredibly, the Tax Code prevented State and local law enforcement from getting access to tax returns from adults who actually had abducted children.

So, incredibly, those adults were claiming these children, who were in their illegal custody, as a tax credit and a tax exemption, but State and local officials were barred by privacy provisions in the IRS code from actually accessing that information. So, on the one hand, you had one arm of government out looking for children and you had another arm of government who knew exactly where they were based on the tax returns which were filed.

Again, NCMEC is in the process of trying to disseminate this new tool, which an audit of the IRS demonstrated that there are roughly 2,000 tax returns a year where adult individuals are actually claiming children as a tax deduction, obviously, with their residence and identity included.

So, again, that is just another example of why we need to update and modernize the law.

I would just indicate on a personal level, my wife, Audrey, is a pediatric nurse practitioner. She works at the Children's Medical Center in Hartford, Connecticut. She is involved in a specialty clinic that helps children of sex abuse and human trafficking. She said that NCMEC is a frequent flier in their office. In the really important work that she and her colleagues do, they constantly use NCMEC as a way of trying to assist law enforcement in terms of helping children who are in these situations of human trafficking and who have been victims of online use of images, which is about as low a depraved activity that is out there right now. So, again, the work of this center, I can attest to from a personal level, is extremely important.

This legislation will update, modernize, and give tools to make sure that all of the good guys out there—the local State police and the folks in the healthcare sector—can really do everything they can to help families in this really terrible, horrific situation.

So, again, I applaud my colleague from Kentucky for his great work, as well as Chairwoman Foxx and Ranking Member SCOTT for bringing this legislation forward. It passed unanimously in committee.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues in the House to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I echo my support, and I enjoy working with my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to speak on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1808, the Improving Support for Missing and Exploited Children Act of 2017.

For more than 30 years, the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, or NCMEC, has operated a unique public-private partnership in order to build a national response to crimes affecting those we cherish most: our children.

I am grateful that the bill maintains language that I supported, which grants NCMEC the authority to provide technical assistance to law enforcement agencies and first responders in identifying and recovering victims of child sex trafficking.

During the committee's hearing in March, we heard from NCMEC's director on how their ability to provide technical assistance has allowed them to work in tandem with law enforcement to recover numerous child sex trafficking victims.

Mr. Speaker, we all look forward to the day when no children are ever taken and abused, and this bill helps ensure NCMEC has the tools to get us one step closer to that goal.

I appreciate the bipartisan effort on this, and I urge all my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), a city which has been really challenged with this issue. I know she has been doing great work and has very powerful thoughts and arguments to make today regarding this legislation.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me this time, and I am pleased to support this bipartisan bill, the Improving Support for Missing and Exploited Children Act.

I support it because it does exactly what its title says. It fills the gaps in our prior legislation on missing and exploited children. We need to look at such legislation very often because of what we are learning about missing and exploited children.

There are many parts of this bill I support, but I particularly support a provision that we didn't have nearly as much knowledge of during the passage of the last bill: to improve the protection of children in State care. These are often foster children or children

without parents. These are the children who may be most susceptible to trafficking and other exploitation.

I certainly would appreciate the efforts of the committee in making sure that provisions of my bill that, I believe, got to you too late, are included in the final House and Senate bill because they are entirely consistent with the bill on the floor today. They come from recent experience of the District of Columbia.

The D.C. police began to do something, which I urge all of you to do, and that is to use social media to let people know when there are missing children. It unnerved residents of the District of Columbia until they recognized that the city didn't have any more missing children than any other jurisdiction. Still, I support what the District did in using social media. Still, we simply don't know enough.

My provisions would have the government collect subsets of data that it does not collect today. For example, we found in the District that there were more missing girls of color than boys. We ought to have known that from national statistics. You don't know it because there are no national statistics on the subsets of children.

My bill would collect and publish demographic characteristics that simply are not published today on race, gender, sexual orientation, and gender identity. If you think of those categories, you will understand why these may be the children in particular need of protection.

In addition, there is no current comprehensive count of missing children in the United States. So, we need more work on this bill. We need to break down to these subsets so that jurisdictions, like my own, will know where to focus when we are focusing on missing children.

Again, I am pleased that the District turned out not to have any more missing children than the average jurisdiction, but I am also pleased that it got a rise out of people who never would have paid attention to this issue until the police department decided to go on social media.

We want to make sure that we cover all of our children and that we do what this bill does.

What are the gaps? Where do we need to fill in?

Mr. Speaker, this is the first bill on missing children in a number of years. We must make sure no children are left behind.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1808, the Improving Support for Missing and Exploited Children Act, which improves the Missing Children's Assistance Act.

Mr. Speaker, this Thursday is National Missing Children's Day. I can't imagine the pain and suffering that occurs when a child goes missing. I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation, and I am proud of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for its work on this important issue.

This legislation strengthens existing efforts to help recover missing children and prevents more children from being victims of abuse and exploitation.

This bill also includes a provision to incorporate developing technologies related to the reporting of child exploitation. This provision was a result of an idea shared by a constituent of mine, Michael Reed. His wife was a victim of abuse as a child, and he has devoted his life to making sure other children have a voice and the ability to report the abuse that they are experiencing. I am committed to ensuring that Congress is working to protect these children.

Mr. Speaker, I thank both sides of the aisle on the Education and the Workforce Committee, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, and a strong proponent of this legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1808, the Improving Support for Missing and Exploited Children Act. This bill will strengthen recovery and prevention efforts of missing and exploited children by renewing and updating support for the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, or NCMEC.

The terror experienced by parents of a missing child is unfathomable. Both the child and the parents experience pain, trauma, fear, and uncertainty. This is why affected families need the full support of law enforcement, schools, businesses, and other entities that may be able to assist in locating and recovering missing or exploited children.

In 2013, Congress reauthorized the Missing Children's Assistance Act and updated the role of NCMEC. The organization was required, at that time, to coordinate with the Interagency Council on Homelessness in order to address the high number of sex trafficking victims who were homeless youth.

Now, in 2017, Congress is including several additional improvements. As this bill heads to the Senate, I will work with my colleagues in both Chambers to improve the reporting of characteristics of children trafficked as it relates to the Office of Juvenile Justice's triennial incidence of missing children study.

Mr. Speaker, despite the best efforts of NCMEC, more than 10,000 children go

missing each year, and scores of children are forced into sexual exploitation and trafficking. I am hopeful that the enactment of these initiatives will assist in the efforts to end exploitation and trafficking. I am also hopeful that Congress will empower the work of NCMEC by appropriate funding in fiscal year 2018 and above.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), my friend and a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Improving Support for Missing and Exploited Children Act.

My wife and I have six children. Our youngest is just 7 years old. We would do anything to protect them. I can't even imagine the pain of having a child go missing, or to learn that they have been hurt or abused in any manner.

Tragically, this is a reality for far too many children and too many families in America. Last year, there were more than 465,000 reports of missing children in the United States. To put that number in perspective, about 700,000 people live in Michigan's 10th Congressional District, my home.

Even one child going missing or being abused is too many. We must recognize the seriousness of this problem and we must do everything we can to protect our children.

This important bill will assist NCMEC in locating missing children and in identifying abductors. It will help prevent children from becoming the victims of exploitation online and increase awareness about how to recover missing children.

Mr. Speaker, today we come together to support America's children. I am proud to be a sponsor of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), an outstanding member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I proudly stand today in support of H.R. 1808, the Improving Support for Missing and Exploited Children Act.

This bipartisan legislation reflects both Democrats' and Republicans' desire to protect and care for our greatest resource: our children.

In my home State of North Carolina, the trafficking of young women has become an epidemic. There were 181 human trafficking cases reported in North Carolina in 2016, and Charlotte was home to more of them than anywhere else.

□ 1430

That figure gave us the dishonor of being ranked among the top 10 States

in the Nation in the number of trafficking reports, and that doesn't even account for those children who have not yet been identified as victims of this shameful practice.

In North Carolina, lawmakers have sponsored efforts to establish pilot programs to help victims and train law enforcement to recognize the signs of trafficking. It is time Congress does its part and passes H.R. 1808 to support States in their efforts.

This bill would improve efforts by both law enforcement and the general public to combat trafficking, and it would enhance the identification and location of missing children and their abductors.

It would protect children from being victims to online predators and keep a promise that was made 33 years ago, when Congress first passed the Missing Children's Assistance Act and we vowed to assist the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children in protecting and recovering our missing and vulnerable youth.

I am a parent, I am a grandparent, Mr. Speaker, and I am a concerned member of my community; and my district and my State have been torn apart by human trafficking.

This is an opportunity for us to come together as Americans and support an initiative that could save lives. I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 1808 and prove that we can all put politics aside when it comes to protecting our children.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the distinguished chairwoman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. GUTHRIE, for his great work on handling this bill today and on the bill itself.

No child should live in fear, Mr. Speaker, and yet every year hundreds of thousands of children across the country are abducted, abused, or exploited. The safety of America's children has long been a national priority. That is why I stand here today in strong support of H.R. 1808, the Improving Support for Missing and Exploited Children Act.

In 1984, Congress passed the Missing Children's Assistance Act and established a grant to enhance our country's efforts to find missing children and prevent child exploitation. For more than 30 years, the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, also known as NCMEC, has used the grant to coordinate a national response to crises and crimes affecting America's most vulnerable children.

Through unique public-private partnerships, NCMEC works with families, law enforcement, schools, community leaders, and nonprofits in its efforts to find children who are missing and protect youth who are victims of sexual exploitation.

The reforms in the Improving Support for Missing and Exploited Children Act will ensure the vital work of recovering and supporting vulnerable youth is able to continue, reuniting more families with their loved ones and helping victims receive the support they desperately need. This is a bill that delivers the reforms needed to save lives.

I am also proud to say it is a bill with strong bipartisan support. At the opening of NCMEC, former President Ronald Reagan said:

"No single sector of our Nation can solve the problem of missing and exploited children alone. But by working together, pooling our resources, and building on our strengths, we can accomplish great things."

"Together we can turn the tide on these hateful crimes. . . ."

Together we can turn the tide. The work our colleagues, Representatives GUTHRIE and COURTNEY, have done to get this important bill to the House floor demonstrates the type of collaboration President Reagan spoke of on that day at the opening of the NCMEC. And the Improving Support for Missing and Exploited Children Act isn't the only bill we have been able to reach across the aisle on and deliver reforms that will help vulnerable youth.

Working together, we are also advancing positive bipartisan solutions in H.R. 1809, the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017. This bill aims at assisting a different kind of vulnerable youth, ensuring kids who find themselves in the juvenile justice system have an opportunity to turn their lives around and achieve success.

Every child deserves an opportunity to make a change for the better, if that child has made a mistake. By working together to develop the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2017, my colleagues, Representatives LEWIS and SCOTT, have put forward a bill that will help ensure at-risk youth are afforded an opportunity to do just that.

Both of these bills renew the commitment we have made to help and protect our Nation's most vulnerable children. All of these reforms will make a real difference in the lives of countless children, young adults, parents, and families across the country. I am proud of the bipartisan work we have been able to accomplish.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank Representative SCOTT, as well as Representatives LEWIS, GUTHRIE, and COURTNEY for their leadership on these issues. I urge our fellow colleagues to support the Improving Support for Missing and Exploited Children Act.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a good friend of mine who, in his work on the Ways and Means Committee, has been focused on and dedicated to this issue.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his work on this on a bipartisan basis with Mr. COURTNEY.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1808, the Improving Support for Missing and Exploited Children Act. This important initiative, it builds on the bipartisan work we have already accomplished to combat sex trafficking and child exploitation.

Since its creation in 1984, the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children has worked tirelessly to protect children from being exploited, to reunite missing children with their families, and to provide resources and training to our law enforcement community to help assist in this effort.

This legislation today will assist the Center in strengthening its prevention and its recovery programs. One of those programs is the CyberTipline which, since being launched in 1998, has received 12.7 million reports of suspected child sexual exploitation. It is programs like this, Mr. Speaker, that go a long way to helping us save lives and put an end to sexual exploitation and trafficking of children.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In summary, we have heard again a very broad-based bipartisan chorus of voices in support of this legislation. Again, like in committee, hopefully, all of us will stand together to support this really important update to making sure that families get all the help, and law enforcement get all the help, that they need to eliminate the scourge of this problem.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I had the opportunity to visit the Center, and the building that I got to go visit was full of men and women who show up every day, who do exceptional work dealing with the disturbing issues, and so my hat is off to them. They deal with stuff that is just unimaginable to most of us, and they do it in a way that is dignified and in a way that is well worthy of the effort that we are giving them to give more transparency and empower them to help more.

I really appreciate working with my friend, Mr. COURTNEY. H.R. 1808 is a bipartisan proposal, and I urge my colleagues to support the Improving Support for Missing and Exploited Children Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr.

GUTHRIE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1808, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS APPEALS IMPROVEMENT AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2288) to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2288

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REFORM OF RIGHTS AND PROCESSES RELATING TO APPEALS OF DECISIONS REGARDING CLAIMS FOR BENEFITS UNDER LAWS ADMINISTERED BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(34) The term 'agency of original jurisdiction' means the activity which entered the original determination with regard to a claim for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary.

"(35) The term 'relevant evidence' means evidence that tends to prove or disprove a matter in issue.

"(36) The term 'supplemental claim' means any claim for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary filed by a claimant who had previously filed a claim for the same or similar benefits on the same or similar basis."

(b) NOTICE REGARDING CLAIMS.—Section 5103(a) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the first sentence, by striking "The" and inserting "Except as provided in paragraph (3), the";

(2) in paragraph (2)(B)(i) by striking ", a claim for reopening a prior decision on a claim, or a claim for an increase in benefits;" and inserting "or a supplemental claim;" and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) The requirement to provide notice under paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to a supplemental claim that is filed within the timeframe set forth in subparagraphs (B) and (D) of section 5110(a)(2) of this title."

(c) MODIFICATION OF RULE REGARDING DISALLOWED CLAIMS.—Section 5103A(f) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking "reopen" and inserting "re-adjudicate"; and

(2) by striking "material" and inserting "relevant";

(d) MODIFICATION OF DUTY TO ASSIST CLAIMANTS.—Section 5103A of such title is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) through (g) as subsections (g) through (i), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsections:

“(e) **APPLICABILITY OF DUTY TO ASSIST.**—(1) The Secretary’s duty to assist under this section shall apply only to a claim, or supplemental claim, for a benefit under a law administered by the Secretary until the time that a claimant is provided notice of the agency of original jurisdiction’s decision with respect to such claim, or supplemental claim, under section 5104 of this title.

“(2) The Secretary’s duty to assist under this section shall not apply to higher level review by the agency of original jurisdiction, pursuant to section 5104B of this title, or to review on appeal by the Board of Veterans’ Appeals.

“(f) **CORRECTION OF DUTY TO ASSIST ERRORS.**—(1) If, during review of the agency of original jurisdiction decision under section 5104B of this title, the higher level adjudicator identifies or learns of an error on the part of the agency of original jurisdiction to satisfy its duties under this section, and that error occurred prior to the agency of original jurisdiction decision being reviewed, unless the claim can be granted in full, the higher level adjudicator shall return the claim for correction of such error and readjudication.

“(2)(A) If the Board of Veterans’ Appeals, during review on appeal of an agency of original jurisdiction decision, identifies or learns of an error on the part of the agency of original jurisdiction to satisfy its duties under this section, and that error occurred prior to the agency of original jurisdiction decision on appeal, unless the claim can be granted in full, the Board shall remand the claim to the agency of original jurisdiction for correction of such error and readjudication.

“(B) Remand for correction of such error may include directing the agency of original jurisdiction to obtain an advisory medical opinion under section 5109 of this title.

“(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to imply that the Secretary, during the consideration of a claim, does not have a duty to correct an error described in paragraph (1) or (2) that was erroneously not identified during higher level review or during review on appeal with respect to the claim.”.

(e) **DECISIONS AND NOTICES OF DECISIONS.**—Subsection (b) of section 5104 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“(b) Each notice provided under subsection (a) shall also include all of the following:

“(1) Identification of the issues adjudicated.

“(2) A summary of the evidence considered by the Secretary.

“(3) A summary of the applicable laws and regulations.

“(4) Identification of findings favorable to the claimant.

“(5) In the case of a denial of a claim, identification of elements not satisfied leading to the denial.

“(6) An explanation of how to obtain or access evidence used in making the decision.

“(7) If applicable, identification of the criteria that must be satisfied to grant service connection or the next higher level of compensation.”.

(f) **BINDING NATURE OF FAVORABLE FINDINGS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 51 of such title is amended by inserting after section 5104 the following new section:

“§ 5104A. Binding nature of favorable findings

“Any finding favorable to the claimant as described in section 5104(b)(4) of this title

shall be binding on all subsequent adjudicators within the Department, unless clear and convincing evidence is shown to the contrary to rebut such favorable finding.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 51 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5104 the following new item:

“5104A. Binding nature of favorable findings.”.

(g) **HIGHER LEVEL REVIEW BY AGENCY OF ORIGINAL JURISDICTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 51 of such title, as amended by subsection (f), is further amended by inserting after section 5104A, as added by such subsection, the following new section:

“§ 5104B. Higher level review by the agency of original jurisdiction

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—(1) A claimant may request a review of the decision of the agency of original jurisdiction by a higher level adjudicator within the agency of original jurisdiction.

“(2) The Secretary shall approve each request for review under paragraph (1).

“(b) **TIME AND MANNER OF REQUEST.**—(1) A request for higher level review by the agency of original jurisdiction shall be—

“(A) in writing in such form as the Secretary may prescribe; and

“(B) made within one year of the notice of the agency of original jurisdiction’s decision.

“(2) Such request may specifically indicate whether such review is requested by a higher level adjudicator at the same office within the agency of original jurisdiction or by an adjudicator at a different office of the agency of original jurisdiction. The Secretary shall not deny such a request for review by an adjudicator at a different office of the agency of original jurisdiction without good cause.

“(c) **DECISION.**—Notice of a higher level review decision under this section shall be provided in writing and shall include a general statement—

“(1) reflecting whether evidence was not considered pursuant to subsection (d); and

“(2) noting the options available to the claimant to have the evidence described in paragraph (1), if any, considered by the Department.

“(d) **EVIDENTIARY RECORD FOR REVIEW.**—The evidentiary record before the higher level adjudicator shall be limited to the evidence of record in the agency of original jurisdiction decision being reviewed.

“(e) **DE NOVO REVIEW.**—A review of the decision of the agency of original jurisdiction by a higher level adjudicator within the agency of original jurisdiction shall be de novo.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 51 of such title, as amended by subsection (f), is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5104A, as added by such subsection, the following new item:

“5104B. Higher level review by the agency of original jurisdiction.”.

(h) **OPTIONS FOLLOWING DECISION BY AGENCY OF ORIGINAL JURISDICTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 51 of such title, as amended by subsection (g), is further amended by inserting after section 5104B, as added by such subsection, the following new section:

“§ 5104C. Options following decision by agency of original jurisdiction

“(a) **WITHIN ONE YEAR OF DECISION.**—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), in any case in

which the Secretary renders a decision on a claim, the claimant may take any of the following actions on or before the date that is one year after the date on which the agency of original jurisdiction issues a decision with respect to that claim:

“(A) File a request for higher level review under section 5104B of this title.

“(B) File a supplemental claim under section 5108 of this title.

“(C) File a notice of disagreement under section 7105 of this title.

“(2)(A) Once a claimant takes an action set forth in paragraph (1), the claimant may not take another action set forth in that paragraph with respect to such claim until—

“(i) the higher level review, supplemental claim, or notice of disagreement is adjudicated; or

“(ii) the request for higher level review, supplemental claim, or notice of disagreement is withdrawn.

“(B) Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit a claimant from taking any of the actions set forth in paragraph (1) in succession with respect to different issues contained within a claim.

“(C) Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit a claimant from taking different actions set forth in paragraph (1) with respect to different claims.

“(D) The Secretary may, as the Secretary considers appropriate, develop and implement a policy for claimants who—

“(i) take an action under paragraph (1);

“(ii) wish to withdraw the action before the higher level review, supplemental claim, or notice of disagreement is adjudicated; and

“(iii) in lieu of such action take a different action under paragraph (1).

“(b) **MORE THAN ONE YEAR AFTER DECISION.**—In any case in which the Secretary renders a decision on a claim and more than one year has passed since the date on which the agency of original jurisdiction issues a decision with respect to that claim, the claimant may file a supplemental claim under section 5108 of this title.

“(c) **BOARD OF VETERANS’ APPEALS AND COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS.**—Nothing in subsection (a) or (b) may be construed to limit the options available to a claimant pursuant to chapter 71 or 72 of this title.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 51 of such title, as amended by subsection (g), is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5104B, as added by such subsection, the following new item:

“5104C. Options following decision by agency of original jurisdiction.”.

(i) **SUPPLEMENTAL CLAIMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5108 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“§ 5108. Supplemental claims

“If new and relevant evidence is presented or secured with respect to a supplemental claim, the Secretary shall readjudicate the claim taking into consideration any evidence added to the record after the former disposition of the claim.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 51 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 5108 and inserting the following new item:

“5108. Supplemental claims.”.

(j) **REMAND TO OBTAIN ADVISORY MEDICAL OPINION.**—Section 5109 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d)(1) The Board of Veterans’ Appeals shall remand a claim to direct the agency of

original jurisdiction to obtain an advisory medical opinion from an independent medical expert under this section if the Board finds that the Veterans Benefits Administration should have exercised its discretion to obtain such an opinion.

“(2) The Board’s remand instructions shall include the questions to be posed to the independent medical expert providing the advisory medical opinion.”.

(k) RESTATEMENT OF REQUIREMENT FOR EXPEDITED TREATMENT OF REMANDED CLAIMS.—Section 5109B of such title is amended to read as follows:

“§ 5109B. Expedited treatment of remanded claims

“The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to provide for the expeditious treatment by the Veterans Benefits Administration of any claim that is returned by a higher level adjudicator under section 5104B of this title or remanded by the Board of Veterans’ Appeals.”.

(l) EFFECTIVE DATES OF AWARDS.—Section 5110 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a)(1) Unless specifically provided otherwise in this chapter, the effective date of an award based on an initial claim, or a supplemental claim, of compensation, dependency and indemnity compensation, or pension, shall be fixed in accordance with the facts found, but shall not be earlier than the date of receipt of application therefor.

“(2) For purposes of determining the effective date of an award under this section, the date of application shall be considered the date of the filing of the initial application for a benefit if the claim is continuously pursued by filing any of the following, either alone or in succession:

“(A) A request for higher level review under section 5104B of this title on or before the date that is one year after the date on which the agency of original jurisdiction issues a decision.

“(B) A supplemental claim under section 5108 of this title on or before the date that is one year after the date on which the agency of original jurisdiction issues a decision.

“(C) A notice of disagreement on or before the date that is one year after the date on which the agency of original jurisdiction issues a decision.

“(D) A supplemental claim under section 5108 of this title on or before the date that is one year after the date on which the Board of Veterans’ Appeals issues a decision.

“(E) A supplemental claim under section 5108 of this title on or before the date that is one year after the date on which the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims issues a decision.

“(3) Except as otherwise provided in this section, for supplemental claims received more than one year after the date on which the agency of original jurisdiction issued a decision or the Board of Veterans’ Appeals issued a decision, the effective date shall be fixed in accordance with the facts found, but shall not be earlier than the date of receipt of the supplemental claim.”; and

(2) in subsection (i), in the first sentence—

(A) by striking “reopened” and inserting “readjudicated”;

(B) by striking “material” and inserting “relevant”;

(C) by striking “reopening” and inserting “readjudication”.

(m) DEFINITION OF AWARD OR INCREASED AWARD FOR PURPOSES OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO COMMENCEMENT OF PERIOD OF PAY-

MENT.—Section 5111(d)(1) of such title is amended by striking “or reopened award” and inserting “award or award based on a supplemental claim”.

(n) MODIFICATION ON LIMITATION ON FEES ALLOWABLE FOR REPRESENTATION.—Section 5904(c) of such title is amended, in paragraphs (1) and (2), by striking “notice of disagreement is filed” both places it appears and inserting “claimant is provided notice of the agency of original jurisdiction’s initial decision under section 5104 of this title”.

(o) CLARIFICATION OF BOARD OF VETERANS’ APPEALS REFERRAL REQUIREMENTS AFTER ORDER FOR RECONSIDERATION OF DECISIONS.—Section 7103(b)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “heard” both places it appears and inserting “decided”.

(p) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO READJUDICATION.—Section 7104(b) of such title is amended by striking “reopened” and inserting “readjudicated”.

(q) MODIFICATION OF PROCEDURES FOR APPEALS TO BOARD OF VETERANS’ APPEALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7105 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking the first sentence and inserting “Appellate review shall be initiated by the filing of a notice of disagreement in the form prescribed by the Secretary.”; and

(B) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b)(1)(A) Except in the case of simultaneously contested claims, notice of disagreement shall be filed within one year from the date of the mailing of notice of the decision of the agency of original jurisdiction pursuant to section 5104, 5104B, or 5108 of this title.

“(B) A notice of disagreement postmarked before the expiration of the 1-year period shall be accepted as timely filed.

“(C) A question as to timeliness or adequacy of the notice of disagreement shall be decided by the Board.

“(2)(A) Notices of disagreement shall be in writing, shall identify the specific determination with which the claimant disagrees, and may be filed by the claimant, the claimant’s legal guardian, or such accredited representative, attorney, or authorized agent as may be selected by the claimant or legal guardian.

“(B) Not more than one recognized organization, attorney, or agent may be recognized at any one time in the prosecution of a claim.

“(C) Notices of disagreement shall be filed with the Board.

“(3) The notice of disagreement shall indicate whether the claimant requests—

“(A) a hearing before the Board, which shall include an opportunity to submit evidence in accordance with section 7113(b) of this title;

“(B) an opportunity to submit additional evidence without a hearing before the Board, which shall include an opportunity to submit evidence in accordance with section 7113(c) of this title; or

“(C) a review by the Board without a hearing or the submittal of additional evidence.

“(4) The Secretary may develop a policy to permit a claimant to modify the information identified in the notice of disagreement after the notice of disagreement has been filed under this section pursuant to such requirements as the Secretary may prescribe.”;

(C) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) If no notice of disagreement is filed in accordance with this chapter within the prescribed period, the action or decision of the agency of original jurisdiction shall become

final and the claim shall not thereafter be readjudicated or allowed, except as may otherwise be provided by section 5104B or 5108 of this title or such regulations as are consistent with this title.”;

(D) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following new subsection (d):

“(d) The Board of Veterans’ Appeals may dismiss any appeal which fails to identify the specific determination with which the claimant disagrees.”;

(E) by striking subsection (e); and

(F) in the section heading, by striking “**notice of disagreement and**”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 7105 and inserting the following new item:

“7105. Filing of appeal.”.

(r) MODIFICATION OF PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS FOR SIMULTANEOUSLY CONTESTED CLAIMS.—Subsection (b) of section 7105A of such title is amended to read as follows:

“(b)(1) The substance of the notice of disagreement shall be communicated to the other party or parties in interest and a period of thirty days shall be allowed for filing a brief or argument in response thereto.

“(2) Such notice shall be forwarded to the last known address of record of the parties concerned, and such action shall constitute sufficient evidence of notice.”.

(s) REPEAL OF PROCEDURES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 71 of such title is amended by striking section 7106.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 7106.

(t) MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO APPEALS: DOCKETS; HEARINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7107 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“§ 7107. Appeals: dockets; hearings

“(a) DOCKETS.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Board shall maintain at least two separate dockets.

“(2) The Board may not maintain more than two separate dockets unless the Board notifies the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives of any additional docket, including a justification for maintaining such additional docket.

“(3)(A) The Board may assign to each docket maintained under paragraph (1) such cases as the Board considers appropriate, except that cases described in clause (i) of subparagraph (B) may not be assigned to any docket to which cases described in clause (ii) of such paragraph are assigned.

“(B) Cases described in this subparagraph are the following:

“(i) Cases in which no Board hearing is requested and no additional evidence will be submitted.

“(ii) Cases in which a Board hearing is requested in the notice of disagreement.

“(4) Except as provided in subsection (b), each case before the Board will be decided in regular order according to its respective place on the docket to which it is assigned by the Board.

“(b) ADVANCEMENT ON THE DOCKET.—(1) A case on one of the dockets of the Board maintained under subsection (a) may, for cause shown, be advanced on motion for earlier consideration and determination.

“(2) Any such motion shall set forth succinctly the grounds upon which the motion is based.

“(3) Such a motion may be granted only—

“(A) if the case involves interpretation of law of general application affecting other claims;

“(B) if the appellant is seriously ill or is under severe financial hardship; or

“(C) for other sufficient cause shown.

“(c) MANNER AND SCHEDULING OF HEARINGS FOR CASES ON DOCKET THAT MAY INCLUDE HEARING.—(1) For cases on a docket maintained by the Board under subsection (a) that may include a hearing, in which a hearing is requested in the notice of disagreement, the Board shall notify the appellant whether a Board hearing will be held—

“(A) at its principal location; or

“(B) by picture and voice transmission at a facility of the Department where the Secretary has provided suitable facilities and equipment to conduct such hearings.

“(2)(A) Upon notification of a Board hearing at the Board’s principal location as described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), the appellant may alternatively request a hearing as described in subparagraph (B) of such paragraph. If so requested, the Board shall grant such request.

“(B) Upon notification of a Board hearing by picture and voice transmission as described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), the appellant may alternatively request a hearing as described in subparagraph (A) of such paragraph. If so requested, the Board shall grant such request.

“(d) SCREENING OF CASES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the screening of cases for purposes of—

“(1) determining the adequacy of the record for decisional purposes; or

“(2) the development, or attempted development, of a record found to be inadequate for decisional purposes.

“(e) POLICY ON CHANGING DOCKETS.—The Secretary may develop and implement a policy allowing a claimant to move the claimant’s case from one docket to another docket.”

(2) REPORT.—Not later than the date that is 90 days before the date set forth in subsection (x), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives a report setting forth a description of the docket that will be maintained under section 7107 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (1), for cases in which no hearing before the Board of Veterans’ Appeals is requested in the notice of disagreement but the appellant requests, in the notice of disagreement, an opportunity to submit additional evidence.

(u) REPEAL OF CERTAIN AUTHORITY FOR INDEPENDENT MEDICAL OPINIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7109 of such title is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5701(b)(1) of such title is amended by striking “or 7109”.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 7109.

(v) CLARIFICATION OF PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF DECISIONS ON GROUNDS OF CLEAR AND UNMISTAKABLE ERROR.—Section 7111(e) of such title is amended by striking “, without referral to any adjudicative or hearing official acting on behalf of the Secretary”.

(w) EVIDENTIARY RECORD BEFORE BOARD OF VETERANS’ APPEALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 71 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 7113. Evidentiary record before the Board of Veterans’ Appeals

“(a) CASES WITH NO REQUEST FOR A HEARING OR ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE.—For cases in which a hearing before the Board of Veterans’ Appeals is not requested in the notice of disagreement and no request was made to submit evidence, the evidentiary record before the Board shall be limited to the evidence of record at the time of the decision of the agency of original jurisdiction on appeal.

“(b) CASES WITH A REQUEST FOR HEARING.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), for cases in which a hearing is requested in the notice of disagreement, the evidentiary record before the Board shall be limited to the evidence of record at the time of the decision of the agency of original jurisdiction on appeal.

“(2) The evidentiary record before the Board for cases described in paragraph (1) shall include each of the following, which the Board shall consider in the first instance:

“(A) Evidence submitted by the appellant and the representative of the appellant, if any, at the Board hearing.

“(B) Evidence submitted by the appellant and the representative of the appellant, if any, within 90 days following the Board hearing.

“(c) CASES WITH NO REQUEST FOR A HEARING AND WITH A REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), for cases in which a hearing is not requested in the notice of disagreement but an opportunity to submit evidence is requested, the evidentiary record before the Board shall be limited to the evidence considered by the agency of original jurisdiction in the decision on appeal.

“(2) The evidentiary record before the Board for cases described in paragraph (1) shall include each of the following, which the Board shall consider in the first instance:

“(A) Evidence submitted by the appellant and the representative of the appellant, if any, with the notice of disagreement.

“(B) Evidence submitted by the appellant and the representative of the appellant, if any, within 90 days following receipt of the notice of disagreement.”

(2) NOTIFICATION WHEN EVIDENCE NOT CONSIDERED.—Section 7104(d) of such title is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) a general statement—

“(A) reflecting whether evidence was not considered in making the decision because the evidence was received at a time when not permitted under section 7113 of this title; and

“(B) noting such options as may be available for having the evidence considered by the Department; and”.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7112 the following new item:

“7113. Evidentiary record before the Board of Veterans’ Appeals.”

(x) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to all claims for which notice of a decision under section 5104 of title 38, United States Code, is provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on or after the later of—

(A) the date that is 540 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs submits to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives—

(i) a certification that the Secretary confirms, without delegation, that the Department of Veterans Affairs has the resources, personnel, office space, procedures, and information technology required—

(I) to carry out the modernized appeals system; and

(II) to timely address both appeals of decisions on legacy claims and appeals under the modernized appeals system; and

(ii) a description of the collaboration conducted under paragraph (2) in making such certification, including the views of the organizations and stakeholders specified in such paragraph.

(2) COLLABORATION.—In determining whether and when to make a certification under paragraph (1)(B)(i), the Secretary shall collaborate with, partner with, and give weight to the advice of the three veterans service organizations with the most members and such other stakeholders as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) EARLY APPLICABILITY.—The Secretary may apply the modernized appeals system to a claim with respect to which the claimant—

(A) receives a notice of a decision under section 5104 of such title after the date of the enactment of this Act and before the applicability date set forth in paragraph (1); and

(B) elects to subject the claim to the modernized appeals system.

(4) PHASED ROLLOUT.—The Secretary may begin implementation of the modernized appeals system in phases, with the first phase of such phased implementation beginning on the applicability date set forth in paragraph (1).

(5) LEGACY CLAIMS.—With respect to legacy claims, upon the issuance to a claimant of a statement of the case or a supplemental statement of the case occurring on or after the applicability date specified in paragraph (1), a claimant may elect to participate in the modernized appeals system.

(6) PUBLICATION OF APPLICABILITY DATE.—Not later than the date on which the modernized appeals system goes into effect (or the first phase of the modernized appeals system goes into effect under paragraph (4), as the case may be), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register such date.

SEC. 3. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND REPORTS FOR PROCESSING OF LEGACY APPEALS AND IMPLEMENTING MODERNIZED APPEALS SYSTEM.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States a comprehensive plan for—

(1) the number of resolutions for appeals of decisions on legacy claims that the Secretary considers pending;

(2) implementing the modernized appeals system; and

(3) timely processing, under the modernized appeals system, of—

(A) supplemental claims under section 5108 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by section 2(i);

(B) requests for higher level review under section 5104B of such title, as added by section 2(g); and

(C) appeals on any docket maintained under section 7107 of such title, as amended by section 2(t).

(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) An estimate (including a detailed description of the bases the Secretary uses to develop such estimate) of the—

(A) numbers of appeals and the timeliness of deciding appeals under the modernized appeals system, including such number under each docket described in section 7107 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by section 2; and

(B) numbers of appeals of decisions on legacy claims and the timeliness of deciding such appeals.

(2) Delineation of the total resource requirements of the Veterans Benefits Administration and the Board of Veterans' Appeals, disaggregated by resources required to implement and administer the modernized appeals system and resources required to address the appeals of decisions on legacy claims.

(3) Delineation of the personnel requirements of the Administration and the Board, including staffing levels during the—

(A) period in which the Administration and the Board are concurrently processing—

(i) appeals of decisions on legacy claims; and

(ii) appeals of decisions on nonlegacy claims under the modernized appeals system; and

(B) the period during which the Administration and the Board are no longer processing any appeals of decisions on legacy claims.

(4) Identification of the legal authorities under which the Administration or the Board may—

(A) hire additional employees to conduct the concurrent processing described in paragraph (2)(A); and

(B) remove employees who are no longer required by the Administration or the Board once the Administration and the Board are no longer processing any appeals of decisions on legacy claims.

(5) An estimate of the amount of time the Administration and the Board will require to hire additional employees as described in paragraph (3)(A) once funding has been made available for such purpose, including a comparison of such estimate and the historical average time required by the Administration and the Board to hire additional employees.

(6) A description of the modifications to the information technology systems of the Administration and the Board that the Administration and the Board require to carry out the modernized appeals system, including cost estimates and a timeline for making the modifications.

(7) An estimate of the office space the Administration and the Board will require during each of the periods described in paragraph (2), including—

(A) an estimate of the amount of time the Administration and the Board will require to acquire any additional office space to carry out processing of appeals of decisions on legacy claims and processing of appeals under the modernized appeals system;

(B) a comparison of the estimate under subparagraph (A) and the historical average time required by the Administration and the Board to acquire new office space; and

(C) a plan for using telework to accommodate staff exceeding available office space, including how the Administration and the Board will provide training and oversight with respect to such teleworking.

(8) Projections for the productivity of individual employees at the Administration and the Board in carrying out tasks relating to the processing of appeals of decisions on legacy claims and appeals under the modernized appeals system, taking into account the experience level of new employees and the enhanced notice requirements under section 5104(b) of title 38, United States Code, as amended by section 2(e).

(9) An outline of the outreach the Secretary expects to conduct to inform veterans, families of veterans, survivors of veterans, veterans service organizations, military service organizations, congressional caseworkers, advocates for veterans, and such other stakeholders as the Secretary considers appropriate about the modernized appeals system, including—

(A) a description of the resources required to conduct such outreach; and

(B) timelines for such outreach.

(10) Identification of and a timeline for—

(A) any training that may be required as a result of hiring new employees to carry out the modernized appeals system or to process appeals of decisions on legacy claims; and

(B) any retraining of existing employees that may be required to carry out such system or to process such claims.

(11) Identification of—

(A) the costs to the Department of the training identified under paragraph (10) and any additional training staff and any additional training facilities that will be required to provide such training; and

(B) any issues relating to how the hiring and training procedures of the Department may change because of unplanned circumstances (including with respect to delays in developing an information technology system to process appeals under the modernized appeals system) relating to carrying out the modernized appeals system or to process appeals of decisions on legacy claims.

(12) Estimated timelines for updating any policy guidance, internet websites, and official forms that may be necessary to carry out the modernized appeals system, including—

(A) identification of which offices and entities will be involved in efforts relating to such updating; and

(B) historical information about how long similar update efforts have taken.

(13) A timeline, including interim milestones, for promulgating such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the modernized appeals system and a comparison with historical averages for time required to promulgate regulations of similar complexity and scope.

(14) An outline of the circumstances under which claimants with pending appeals of decisions on legacy claims would be authorized to have their appeals reviewed under the modernized appeals system.

(15) A delineation of the key goals and milestones for reducing the number of pending appeals that are not processed under the modernized appeals system, including the expected number for each of appeals, remands, and hearing requests at the Administration and the Board each year, beginning with the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, until there are no longer any appeals pending before the Administration or the Board for a decision on a legacy claim.

(16) The metrics and goals used by the Secretary to monitor the implementation of the modernized appeals system, including with respect to—

(A) tracking progress of such implementation;

(B) evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of such implementation; and

(C) identifying potential issues with respect to such implementation.

(17) A description of each risk factor associated with each element of the plan and a contingency plan to minimize each such risk.

(18) A detailed description of which employees of the Department will conduct higher level reviews under section 5104B of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 2(g).

(c) REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the Comptroller General of the United States receives the plan required by subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall—

(A) assess such plan in writing; and

(B) submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives the findings of the Comptroller General with respect to the assessment conducted under subparagraph (A).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The assessment conducted under paragraph (1)(A) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of whether the plan comports with sound planning practices.

(B) Identification of any improvements the Comptroller General considers appropriate for the plan.

(C) Formulation of such recommendations as the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

(d) PERIODIC REPORTS.—On a quarterly basis during the period beginning 90 days after the date on which the Secretary submits the plan under subsection (a) and ending on the date that the Secretary implements the modernized appeals system, and on a semiannual basis during the seven-year period following such date of implementation, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General a report on the modernized appeals system. Each such report shall include, with respect to the period covered by the report, the following:

(1) Any updates to the plan under subsection (a).

(2) As applicable, the number of appeals considered under the modernized appeals system, including—

(A) the number of such appeals, both with respect to pending appeals and completed appeals, under each docket described in section 7107 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by section 2;

(B) the average wait time for each such docket and the extent to which such wait times compare with the established goals of the Secretary for such wait times; and

(C) the average age of such appeals.

(3) The number of appeals considered with respect to legacy claims, including—

(A) the number of pending appeals and the number of completed appeals;

(B) the average wait time and the extent to which such wait times compare with the established goals of the Secretary for such wait times; and

(C) the average age of such appeals.

(4) The efficacy of the information systems of the Department of Veterans Affairs to implement the modernized appeals system.

(5) With respect to the Veterans Benefits Administration and the Board of Veterans' Appeals—

(A) the number of supplemental claims under section 5108 of such title, as added by

section 2(i), that were denied because the supplemental claims did not include new and relevant evidence;

(B) the number of higher level reviews filed under section 5104B of such title, as added by section 2(g), that did not include new and relevant evidence, listed by the disposition of the higher level review; and

(C) the number of appeals filed that did not include new and relevant evidence, listed by each docket described in section 7107 of such title, as amended by section 2, and the determination of the Board.

(6) With respect to any average wait time relating to appeals not otherwise specified in this subsection—

(A) whether the Secretary is meeting any established wait-time goals of the Secretary; and

(B) if so, the percentage of appeals meeting such goals.

(7) An identification of any changes that are necessary to improve the modernized appeals system.

SEC. 4. PROGRAMS TO TEST ASSUMPTIONS RELIED ON IN DEVELOPMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR PROCESSING OF LEGACY APPEALS AND SUPPORTING MODERNIZED APPEALS SYSTEM.

(A) AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out such programs as the Secretary considers appropriate to test any assumptions relied upon in developing the comprehensive plan required by section 3(a) and to test the feasibility and advisability of any facet of the modernized appeals system. The Secretary may not carry out such a program until the Secretary notifies the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives of the program, including the reasons for carrying out the program.

(2) REPORTING REQUIRED.—Whenever the Secretary determines, based on the conduct of a program under paragraph (1), that legislative changes to the modernized appeals system are necessary, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives notice of such determination.

(B) DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PROGRAM ON FULLY DEVELOPED APPEALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may, under subsection (a)(1), carry out a program to provide the option of an alternative appeals process that shall more quickly determine such appeals in accordance with this subsection.

(2) ELECTION.—

(A) FILING.—In accordance with subparagraph (B), a claimant may elect to file a fully developed appeal under the program by filing with the Secretary all of the following:

(i) The notice of disagreement under chapter 71 of title 38, United States Code, along with the written election of the claimant to have the appeal determined under the program.

(ii) All evidence that the claimant believes is needed for the appeal as of the date of the filing.

(iii) A statement of the argument in support of the claim, if any.

(B) TIMING.—A claimant shall make an election under subparagraph (A) as part of the notice of disagreement filed by the claimant in accordance with subparagraph (A)(i).

(C) TRIAGE.—The Secretary shall, upon expiration of the period specified in paragraph (3)(C)(iii), ensure that an assessment is un-

dertaken of whether an appeal filed under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph satisfies the requirements for appeal under the program and provide appropriate notification to the claimant of the results of that assessment.

(D) REVERSION.—

(i) ELECTED REVERSION.—At any time, a claimant who makes an election under subparagraph (A) may elect to revert to the standard appeals process. Such a reversion shall be final.

(ii) AUTOMATIC REVERSION.—A claimant described in clause (i), or a claimant who makes an election under subparagraph (A) but is later determined to be ineligible for the program under paragraph (1), shall revert to the standard appeals process without any penalty to the claimant other than the loss of the docket number associated with the fully developed appeal.

(E) OUTREACH.—In providing claimants with notices of the determination of a claim during the period in which the program under paragraph (1) is carried out, the Secretary shall conduct outreach as follows:

(i) The Secretary shall provide to the claimant (and to the representative of record of the claimant, if any) information regarding—

(I) the program, including the advantages and disadvantages of the program;

(II) how to make an election under subparagraph (A);

(III) the limitation on the use of new evidence described in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (3) and the development of information under subparagraph (D) of such paragraph;

(IV) the ability of the claimant to seek advice and education regarding such process from veterans service organizations, attorneys, and claims agents recognized under chapter 59 of title 38, United States Code; and

(V) the circumstances under which the appeal will automatically revert to the standard appeals process, including by making a request for a hearing.

(ii) The Secretary shall collaborate, partner with, and give weight to the advice of the three veterans service organizations with the most members and such other stakeholders as the Secretary considers appropriate to publish on the internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs an online tutorial explaining the advantages and disadvantages of the program.

(3) TREATMENT BY DEPARTMENT AND BOARD.—

(A) PROCESS.—Upon the election of a claimant to file a fully developed appeal pursuant to paragraph (2)(A), the Secretary shall—

(i) not provide the claimant with a statement of the case nor require the claimant to file a substantive appeal; and

(ii) transfer jurisdiction over the fully developed appeal directly to the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

(B) DOCKET.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Board of Veterans' Appeals shall—

(I) maintain fully developed appeals on a separate docket than standard appeals;

(II) decide fully developed appeals in the order that the fully developed appeals are received on the fully developed appeal docket;

(III) except as provided by clause (ii), decide not more than one fully developed appeal for each four standard appeals decided; and

(IV) to the extent practicable, decide each fully developed appeal by the date that is one year following the date on which the claimant files the notice of disagreement.

(ii) ADJUSTMENT.—Beginning one year after the date on which the program commences, the Board may adjust the number of standard appeals decided for each fully developed appeal under clause (i)(III) if the Board determines that such adjustment is fair for both standard appeals and fully developed appeals.

(C) LIMITATION ON USE OF NEW EVIDENCE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by clauses (ii) and (iii)—

(I) a claimant may not submit or identify to the Board of Veterans' Appeals any new evidence relating to a fully developed appeal after filing such appeal unless the claimant reverts to the standard appeals process pursuant to paragraph (2)(D); and

(II) if a claimant submits or identifies any such new evidence, such submission or identification shall be deemed to be an election to make such a reversion pursuant to paragraph (2)(D).

(ii) EVIDENCE GATHERED BY BOARD.—Clause (i) shall not apply to evidence developed pursuant to subparagraphs (D) and (E). The Board shall consider such evidence in the first instance without consideration by the Veterans Benefits Administration.

(iii) REPRESENTATIVE OF RECORD.—The representative of record of a claimant for appeals purposes, if any, shall be provided an opportunity to review the fully developed appeal of the claimant and submit any additional arguments or evidence that the representative determines necessary during a period specified by the Board for purposes of this subparagraph.

(D) PROHIBITION ON REMAND FOR ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT.—If the Board of Veterans' Appeals determines that a fully developed appeal requires Federal records, independent medical opinions, or new medical examinations, the Board shall—

(i) in accordance with subparagraph (E), take such actions as may be necessary to develop such records, opinions, or examinations in accordance with section 5103A of title 38, United States Code;

(ii) retain jurisdiction of the fully developed appeal without requiring a determination by the Veterans Benefits Administration based on such records, opinions, or examinations;

(iii) ensure the claimant, and the representative of record of a claimant, if any, receives a copy of such records, opinions, or examinations; and

(iv) provide the claimant a period of 90 days after the date of mailing such records, opinions, or examinations during which the claimant may provide the Board any additional evidence without requiring the claimant to make a reversion pursuant to paragraph (2)(D).

(E) DEVELOPMENT UNIT.—

(i) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Board of Veterans' Appeals shall establish an office to develop Federal records, independent medical opinions, and new medical examinations pursuant to subparagraph (D)(i) that the Board determines necessary to decide a fully developed appeal.

(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall—

(I) ensure that the Veterans Benefits Administration cooperates with the Board of Veterans' Appeals in carrying out clause (i); and

(II) transfer employees of the Veterans Benefits Administration who, prior to the enactment of this Act, were responsible for processing claims remanded by the Board of Veterans' Appeals to positions within the office of the Board established under clause (i) in a number the Secretary determines sufficient to carry out such subparagraph.

(F) **HEARINGS.**—Notwithstanding section 7107 of title 38, United States Code, the Secretary may not provide hearings with respect to fully developed appeals under the program. If a claimant requests to hold a hearing pursuant to such section 7107, such request shall be deemed to be an election to revert to the standard appeals process pursuant to paragraph (2)(D).

(4) **DURATION; APPLICABILITY.**—

(A) **DURATION.**—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary may carry out the program during such period as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(B) **APPLICABILITY.**—This section shall apply only to fully developed appeals that are filed during the period in which the program is carried out pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(5) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **COMPENSATION.**—The term “compensation” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

(B) **FULLY DEVELOPED APPEAL.**—The term “fully developed appeal” means an appeal of a claim for disability compensation that is—
(i) filed by a claimant in accordance with paragraph (2)(A); and
(ii) considered in accordance with this subsection.

(C) **STANDARD APPEAL.**—The term “standard appeal” means an appeal of a claim for disability compensation that is not a fully developed appeal.

(C) **TERMINATION.**—The Secretary may not carry out any program under this section after the date on which the Secretary implements the modernized appeals system.

SEC. 5. PERIODIC PUBLICATION OF METRICS RELATING TO PROCESSING OF APPEALS BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

On the first business day of each month the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish on an internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs the following:

(1) As applicable, with respect to the processing by the Secretary of appeals under the modernized appeals system of decisions regarding claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary:

(A) For the Veterans Benefits Administration, the number of—

(i) supplemental claims under section 5108 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by section 2(i), that are pending; and

(ii) requests for higher level review under section 5104B of such title, as added by section 2(g), that are pending.

(B) The number of appeals on any docket maintained under section 7107 of such title, as amended by section 2(t), that are pending.

(C) The average duration for processing claims and supplemental claims, disaggregated by regional office.

(D) The average duration for processing requests for higher level review under section 5104B of such title, as added by section 2(g), disaggregated by regional office.

(E) The average number of days that appeals are pending on the nonhearing, no-additional evidence option docket of the Board of Veterans' Appeals maintained pursuant to section 7107 of such title, as amended by section 2(t), and any other docket maintained by the Board under such section that prohibits the submittal of additional evidence.

(F) The average number of days that appeals are pending on dockets maintained under such section in which hearings are requested or submittal of additional evidence is allowed.

(G) The average number of days that an appeal is pending on any other docket maintained by the Board under such section.

(H) In the case that the Secretary develops and implements a policy under section 7107(e) of such title, as amended by section 2(t)—

(i) the number of cases moved from one docket to another pursuant to such policy;

(ii) the average time cases were pending prior to moving from one docket to another; and

(iii) the average time to adjudicate the cases after so moving.

(I) The total number of remands to obtain advisory medical opinions under section 5109(d) of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 2(i)(1).

(J) The average number of days between the date on which the Board remands a claim to obtain an advisory medical opinion under section 5109(d) of such title, as so added, and the date on which the advisory medical opinion is obtained.

(K) The average number of days between the date on which the Board remands a claim to obtain an advisory medical opinion under section 5109(d) of such title, as so added, and the date on which the agency of original jurisdiction issues a decision taking that advisory opinion into account.

(L) The number of appeals that are granted, the number of appeals that are remanded, and the number of appeals that are denied by the Board disaggregated by docket.

(M) The number of claimants each year that take action within the period set forth in section 5110(a)(2) of such title, as added by section 2(l), to protect their effective date under such section 5110(a)(2), disaggregated by the status of the claimants taking the actions, such as whether the claimant is represented by a veterans service organization, the claimant is represented by an attorney or accredited agent, or the claimant is taking such action pro se.

(N) The total number of times on average each claimant files under section 5110(a)(2) of such title, as so added, to protect their effective date under such section, disaggregated by the subparagraph of such section under which they file.

(O) The average duration, from the filing of an initial claim until the claim is resolved and claimants no longer take any action to protect their effective date under section 5110(a)(2) of such title, as so added—

(i) of claims under the modernized appeals system, excluding legacy claims that opt in to the modernized appeals system; and

(ii) of legacy claims that opt in to the modernized appeals system.

(P) How frequently an action taken within one year to protect an effective date under section 5110(a)(2) of such title, as so added, leads to additional grant of benefits, disaggregated by action taken.

(Q) The average of how long it takes to complete each segment of the claims process while claimants are protecting the effective date under such section, disaggregated by the time waiting for the claimant to take an action and the time waiting for the Secretary to take an action.

(R) The number and the average amount of retroactive awards of benefits from the Secretary as a result of protected effective dates under such section, disaggregated by action taken.

(S) The average number of times claimants submit to the Secretary different claims with respect to same condition, such as an initial claim and a supplemental claim.

(T) The number of cases each year in which a claimant inappropriately tried to take simultaneous actions, such as filing a supplemental claim while a higher level review is

pending, what actions the Secretary took in response, and how long it took on average to take those actions.

(U) In the case that the Secretary develops and implements a policy under section 5104C(a)(2)(D) of such title, as amended by section 2(h)(1), the number of actions withdrawn and new actions taken pursuant to such policy.

(V) The number of times the Secretary received evidence relating to an appeal or higher level review at a time not authorized under the modernized appeals system, disaggregated by actions taken by the Secretary to deal with the evidence and how long on average it took to take those actions.

(W) The number of errors committed by the Secretary in carrying out the Secretary's duty to assist under section 5103A of title 38, United States Code, that were identified by higher level review and by the Board, disaggregated by type of error, such as errors relating to private records and inadequate examinations, and a comparison with errors committed by the Secretary in carrying out such duty with respect to appeals of decisions on legacy claims.

(X) An assessment of the productivity of employees at the regional offices and at the Board, disaggregated by level of experience of the employees.

(2) With respect to the processing by the Secretary of appeals of decisions on legacy claims, the following:

(A) The average duration of each segment of the appeals process, disaggregated by periods in which the Secretary is waiting for a claimant to take an action and periods in which the claimant is waiting for the Secretary to take an action.

(B) The frequency by which appeals lead to additional grant of benefits by the Secretary, disaggregated by whether the additional benefits are a result of additional evidence added after the initial decision.

(C) The number and average amount of retroactive awards of benefits resulting from an appeal.

(D) The average duration from filing the appeal with the Secretary until all appeals and remands relating to such appeals are completed.

(E) The average number of times claimants submit to the Secretary different claims with respect to same condition, such as an initial claim, new and material evidence, or a claim for an increase in benefits.

(F) An assessment of the productivity of employees at the regional offices and at the Board, disaggregated by level of experience of the employees.

(G) The average number of days the duration of an appeal is extended because the Secretary secured or attempted to secure an advisory medical opinion under section 5109 of title 38, United States Code, or section 7109 of such title (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act).

(3) With respect to the processing by the Secretary of appeals of decisions on legacy claims that opt in to the modernized appeals system, the following:

(A) The cumulative number of such legacy claims.

(B) The portion of work in the modernized appeals system attributable to appeals of decisions on such legacy claims.

(C) The average period such legacy claims were pending before opting in to the modernized appeals system and the average period required to adjudicate such legacy claims on average after opting in—

(i) with respect to claims at a regional office of the Department of Veterans Affairs, disaggregated by—

(I) supplemental claims under section 5108 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by section 2(i); and

(II) requests for higher level review under section 5104B of such title, as added by section 2(g); and

(ii) with respect to appeals, disaggregated by docket of the Board maintained under section 7107 of such title, as amended by section 2(t).

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The term “claimant” has the meaning given such term in section 5100 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term “legacy claim” means a claim—

(A) that was submitted to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for a benefit under a law administered by the Secretary; and

(B) for which notice of a decision under section 5104 of title 38, United States Code, was provided by the Secretary before the date set forth in section 2(x)(1).

(3) The term “opt in” means, with respect to a legacy claim of a claimant, that the claimant elects to subject the claim to the modernized appeals system pursuant to—

(A) section 2(x)(3); or

(B) such other mechanism as the Secretary may prescribe for purposes of carrying out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(4) The term “modernized appeals system” means the set of processes and mechanisms by which the Secretary processes, pursuant to the authorities and requirements modified by section 2, claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 2288, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2288, as amended.

First, I want to thank the Disabilities Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee Chairman BOST and Ranking Member ESTRY for their hard work in bringing H.R. 2288 to the floor. I also want to thank every member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, both Republican and Democrat, who all are original cosponsors of this bill.

The committee has been working on overhauling the VA's appeals process, which was established back in 1933. The

problem is that the current system is slow, cumbersome, frustrating, and full of bureaucratic red tape. As a result, there are currently 470,000 veterans, many of whom may have been injured in the line of duty, who are waiting for a decision on their appeal. Many of these folks have been waiting for more than 5 years, and veterans are filing more appeals every day.

Last year, VA Deputy Secretary Sloan Gibson testified that if Congress doesn't pass reform soon, by 2027, veterans may have to wait as long as 10 years to get a decision on their appeal. Think about that. In 2027, men and women who served our Nation may have to wait a decade to get a decision on their appeal.

These veterans have bills to pay and families to support. Even worse, they may need medical treatments that they can't get from the VA because their appeal hasn't been decided.

Mr. Speaker, one of the dearest friends I have had in my life died a little over 2 years ago, waiting on a decision on an appeal.

H.R. 2288 would help streamline the VA's appeals process, while giving veterans more options and protecting their due process rights. This legislation includes a compromise agreement that was reached between VA and the veterans service organizations which passed the House last Congress as part of H.R. 5620.

We have added a few improvements since last year. For example, we have expanded the bill to allow some veterans who are currently having pending appeals to opt in to the new system. I really believe that the changes in this bill will make a difference and help expedite the process so that veterans can get a decision on their appeal and then get on with their lives.

I am going to pull out all the stops to get this bill on the President's desk as soon as possible. We are talking with our colleagues in the Senate, including Chairman ISAKSON, Ranking Member TESTER, and Senator BLUMENTHAL, to resolve a few minor differences between the House version and the Senate version.

The sooner we get this bill passed, the sooner our Nation's veterans will be able to get their decisions on appeal in a timely manner. Veterans deserve no less.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2288, as amended, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the manager's amendment to H.R. 2288, the Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act of 2017. This has truly proven to be a once-in-a-generation opportunity to reform the disability claims process for the benefit of our Nation's veterans.

I want to specifically thank Chairman ROE for bringing this bill to the

floor today and for ensuring that the entire process that got us here was open, fair, bipartisan, and followed regular order. It is gratefully appreciated, and I think we end up with a good piece of legislation because of his leadership.

I also want to recognize the efforts of our colleagues, the chairman of the Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee, Mr. BOST. He has been an incredible addition to the VA committee and dug his heels in on this one and got us this far, so I thank him; and to his counterpart on our side of the aisle, Ranking Member ESTRY, for exceptional work that they have done together to get this bill to the floor.

I would also like to thank our veterans service organizations. This is how I think the American people think legislation should be brought; on issues at hand, experts are brought in, Representatives talk. The expertise that was brought by the VSOs helped us work out some of the kinks. It is not perfect, but the coalition got us to a point where I think many of us are comfortable moving forward.

The bill is complicated. To those who still have concerns in the process, let us know. There is still work to be done. It is still working in the Senate, but there is an openness that has been expressed through the entire process.

Secretary Shulkin and the VA leadership have been vital in this effort. They helped pull the stakeholders together, providing the technical expertise to help us understand what it takes over the past several years.

I want to recognize our former colleague on the committee, DINA TITUS. She is going to be speaking a little bit later, but I think what is so important on veterans issues, members come and go from the committee, but their commitment to getting this right stays. And her tenaciousness in the 114th Congress laid the groundwork for this.

So in short, Mr. Speaker, as you heard the chairman say, there are 470,000 veterans. Each one of them is an individual. Each one of them is someone's friend, father, mother, sister, brother. It is time we peel back the layers of the complicated rules governing the process, modernize it with new technology, and get the benefits delivered in a timely manner to those who have earned them. I support the manager's amendment to H.R. 2288 and encourage all my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST), chairman of the DAMA Subcommittee.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bipartisan legislation, H.R. 2288,

the Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act of 2017, as amended. The legislation is a product of hard work between the Department of Veterans Affairs, veterans service organizations, committee staff, and committee members.

This bill gives veterans more options when pursuing the appeals claim by creating three pathways or lanes: Lane one allows for the veteran to request that a new individual review their case without a hearing, which will allow a faster response time from the VA on their appeal; lane two allows a veteran to request a hearing; and lane three sends the appeal directly to the Board of Veterans Appeals. These three lanes, working together, will speed up the process for our Nation's veterans and ensure that the appeals system works for them.

An important compromise in this legislation also allows for veterans to keep the original effective date of their claim as long as they filed the necessary paperwork within 1 year of a VA's decision. This is another way to ensure that the appeals system is working for the veterans. It is important that we do not leave any veteran behind.

My colleagues and I have worked to ensure that some of the more than 470,000 veterans with a current appeal in the system will have the opportunity at certain points to opt into the new system. This will help the veterans who have been waiting for years to hear from the VA.

This bill also ensures transparency in the VA implementation. This new system, by requiring rigorous reports from the Department, ensures that all veterans are treated fairly.

In closing, I especially want to recognize and thank the Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs ranking member, Ms. ESTRY, for her hard work and help in crafting this legislation.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2288, as amended.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTRY), my good friend, ranking member of the Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee.

Ms. ESTRY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2288, the Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act of 2017, as amended.

First, I want to thank our excellent chairman, Dr. ROE, and ranking member, Mr. WALZ, for their dedication and hard work. It has been a pleasure to work on this important legislation during my first term as ranking member of the Veterans Affairs' Committee Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee.

I want to give special thanks to my new friend, our subcommittee chairman, Mr. BOST, for his leadership on this issue and for ensuring that the leg-

islative process was bipartisan at every turn.

I want to acknowledge and thank Congresswoman DINA TITUS for her leadership on this issue, as she helped pass similar legislation that formed the basis for our work here in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, claims appeals are backing up. Veterans in Connecticut and across the country are waiting for far too long for the benefits they have earned through their hard service to this country.

When a veteran asks my office for help appealing their claim, it is frustrating and embarrassing to have to explain that the process could take more than 5 years. The backlog will only get worse if we do not reform the process. Some veterans could be waiting as long as 10 years, as we have heard from Chairman ROE and from Ranking Member WALZ, if we don't reform things now.

With the new process created under this bill, if it is properly implemented, many veterans would see a clearer, definitive appeals decision in as little as a year. I have seen in Connecticut that, when an appeal is granted, it can change the way a veteran lives. But it is also proof to that veteran that their service is being honored.

That is why it is so unacceptable that the current process is failing so many veterans. It forces them to navigate layers of red tape and duplicative review. The slow grinding of the appeals process chips away at our veterans' faith that they will ever be fairly compensated for injuries that they sustained in service to our country.

Our goal with this bill is to establish a new process that is simple, fair, transparent, and, wherever possible, speedy.

As we have heard, there are 470,000—yes, 470,000—veterans with disability appeals pending right now, and that is something we should be able to address, Democrats and Republicans, without regard to party. We owe a faster, better appeals process not only to our veterans who have served, but to those who wear the uniform right now.

Our men and women in uniform deserve to know that the benefits that they have been promised when they signed up will be there for them if, God forbid, something happens to them and they are injured in serving our country.

I would like to thank all of the veterans and veterans service organizations who shared their ideas and their concerns with us as we worked hard to craft this legislation. Voices from the veterans community were invaluable as we developed this bill and will be essential as we move forward to ensure that the new process works well.

I also want to thank the VA itself for having been such a good partner in this effort. It is important to remember

that this is just the first step towards reforming the appeals process. If this bill is going to be successful, it will require a lot of work from our committee, from the VA, oversight by Congress, and we must take care to ensure that legacy appeals do not get lost in the process. Congress must also provide the resources necessary for the new appeals system to work well for our veterans.

I want to thank, again, Chairman ROE and Ranking Member WALZ for making reforming the appeals system a top priority of the committee for this year and for their dedication working together in a bipartisan way.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation and to commit to keep working together to get the job done.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN), an active member on the committee and a veteran.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2288, the Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act of 2017.

This important legislation will update and streamline the bureaucratic nightmare that is the disability appeals process. This bill breaks appeals down into three lanes to expedite decisionmaking and improves the ability of veterans to offer new information about their condition. The bill requires Secretary Shulkin to provide a comprehensive plan of how he plans to implement the crucial changes which are supported by both the VFW and the American Legion.

Our men and women in uniform served with the assurance that they would be well treated when they came home. They earned and they deserve timely service from their government. Instead, veterans wait years to hear from an out-of-date, backlogged appeals system. Sometimes that process takes 5 years—5 years. That is an insult to their service, and it is an insult that we cannot tolerate.

Our veterans fought for their country abroad. Now it is our job to ensure that they don't have another fight when they come home. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), my friend and the vice ranking member of the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my ranking member, Mr. WALZ, for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2288 the Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act of 2017.

Over the past 5 years, the number of pending appeals at the VA has skyrocketed by 40 percent and now sits at nearly half a million cases. The average processing time for an appeal is 3

years. Republicans and Democrats agree, the VA agrees, veterans service organizations agree, and, most importantly, veterans agree that we need to fix this broken process.

I am pleased that my colleagues on the committee have come together to develop a bipartisan solution that reduces the overly complicated appeals process, shortens the time a veteran will wait for a decision, and preserves a veteran's full length of benefits if their appeal is decided favorably.

This legislation has taken a lot of time and effort. I applaud my colleagues Ms. TITUS and Mr. Miller for laying the groundwork in the last Congress, and Ms. ESTY and Mr. BOST for carrying this legislation into the 115th Congress.

I am very, very proud of all the work done by the committee staff to bring this together, and I am grateful to the dedicated VSOs and the VA for their input. This is a great example of how we can put aside our partisan differences and make our veterans' lives better.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill and urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN), a new member of our committee and the only representative from Puerto Rico.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, today I must first thank Chairman ROE for all of his leadership and work on behalf of our veterans. I also thank Representative BOST and all of our committee members for allowing me to contribute to this effort.

Today I rise to support H.R. 2288, the Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act. This bill will provide timely justice to the brave Americans who gave their best in the name of democracy, freedom, and the continuing greatness of our Nation.

As the sole representative of more than 93,000 registered veterans in Puerto Rico, I established a Veterans Affairs Task Force, and one of the main complaints they have is about the Veterans Administration's and Board of Veterans Appeals' slow processing of their claims.

I believe every veterans service organization hears similar complaints. The most recent statistics reveal a 5,000-case backlog for claims originally filed by Puerto Rican veterans. One such Puerto Rican claim has gone on for over 12 years, other claims for over 5 years. As of this date, the veterans are still waiting for the Board of Veterans Appeals' decisions. This is not the justice system our veterans deserve.

I am a proud sponsor of this bill, and this bill will provide heroic veterans a system that is adjusted to their needs.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Cali-

fornia (Mr. CORREA), my good friend and, more importantly, a friend to all veterans, a new member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member WALZ.

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank Chairman ROE and Ranking Member WALZ for giving me the opportunity to share my enthusiastic support for this bill, H.R. 2288. I also want to thank Mr. BOST and Ms. ESTY for their remarkable leadership in guiding this legislation to the floor and for taking the steps to finally fix the appeals process.

I stand here today to support the Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act. This legislation reforms the VA appeals process so that our veterans can begin to receive the benefits they have earned through their dedication to our country.

Veterans in California and all across America, including those in my district, currently face a backlog of sometimes more than 5 years to get their benefits. This is not acceptable, and that is why I am pleased to support this bipartisan legislation.

A veteran who files a disability claim for an injury that they sustained during their military service is issued a VA rating decision, which either grants or denies a claim. If a veteran disagrees with the outcome, they may appeal the VA's decision and then wait and wait and wait. This bill will improve the process by creating a multiple appeal streams, which will accelerate the process.

Our veterans who suffered injury during their time in service can now be assured that they will be one step closer to having their appeals cases reviewed and decided in a timely manner.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), a former member of our committee.

□ 1500

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this bill will improve the appeals process at the Department of Veterans Affairs, which is currently operating under a significant backlog.

Last session, when I served on the VA Committee, a major focus was reforming the appeals process to better serve veterans' appeals rights. My office has assisted hundreds of veterans, many of whom have struggled with the appeals process and several of whom have struggled with getting the care they need in a timely manner.

One individual my office worked with estimated the entire process, from when he first began seeking benefits until the recent favorable decision from the Board of Veterans Appeals, lasted 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear a solution is needed.

This legislation would set out to improve the claims process by providing

veterans with three lanes—or three choices—as to how they would like to proceed with an appeal.

These choices include: one, having the original evidence reviewed again; or, two, introducing new evidence and having another hearing; or, three, sending the decision directly to the Board of Veterans Appeals.

The VA's current 5-year appeal wait time is simply not acceptable for our veterans.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, which is an appropriate solution to this problem. It will streamline many claims and also enable a more efficient administrative handling of those claims.

I thank the leadership of Chairman ROE and those on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2288.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), a good friend and former ranking member of the Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee, and someone who has worked on this almost longer than anyone in the House.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member WALZ for his leadership, for bringing this bill, and for allowing me to stay involved even though I am no longer on the committee. Likewise, I thank Dr. ROE for all that he has done for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 2288, the Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act.

Fixing this outdated system was one of my top priorities while I served as ranking member of the VA Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee. When I assumed that position, much of the focus was on the VA disability claims backlog, which had ballooned, causing many veterans to wait almost 2 years just for their initial claim decision. After that backlog was addressed and reduced, the problem shifted to the appeals process, where today, as you have heard, almost 470,000 veterans are currently waiting in an overburdened and overcomplicated system that was first developed in the 1930s and last updated in the 1980s.

I regularly hear from my veteran constituents who are stuck in this appeals process about the need for reform. One veteran we are helping in Las Vegas has been working since August of 2013 to have his appeal adjudicated; and another Nevada veteran who, out of desperation, came to my office, took 4 years to complete his process.

So, obviously, the current system is just unacceptable. If we don't act, it is only going to get worse. We have heard statistics that soon veterans may be waiting for more than a decade just to have their appeals adjudicated.

Last year, working closely with the VA, with the committee, and with many of our partners in the VSO community, I introduced legislation to address this outdated process. I am very proud that my proposal is the basis for the legislation we are considering today.

The changes that were made to that legislation are positive additions, and I appreciate the work that Chairman BOST and Ranking Member ESTY have done to improve the bill and bring it to the floor.

I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together to recognize, to help, to assist our veterans, and support this bill. I want us to tell our friends in the Senate: You have got to act quickly, too. We have got to get this done.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, I applaud all the work that was done on behalf of our veterans and those that are waiting. I thank the professional staff on both sides of the aisle for doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank this House for proving to the American people that we can work together for a common good. We can make improvements and we can move things along as they are meant to be.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I, too, want to echo what Mr. WALZ has said. It has been a pleasure to work on this and what has been done in the previous Congress. I think this is one of the most important bills that we voted on in the Veterans' Affairs Committee since I have been in Congress. It is the thing we hear about back home, Mr. Speaker, which is disability claims. I think this actually will speed up that process and adjudicate those claims.

I, too, thank all the staff and both subcommittee chairs and ranking members for their hard work.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge all Members to support H.R. 2288, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2288, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

VA SCHEDULING ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 467) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that each medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs complies with requirements relating to scheduling veterans for health care appointments, to improve the uniform application of directives of the Department, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 467

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "VA Scheduling Accountability Act".

SEC. 2. COMPLIANCE WITH SCHEDULING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the director of each medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs annually certifies to the Secretary that the medical facility is in full compliance with all provisions of law and regulations relating to scheduling appointments for veterans to receive hospital care and medical services, including pursuant to Veterans Health Administration Directive 2010-027, or any successor directive.

(2) PROHIBITION ON WAIVER.—The Secretary may not waive any provision of the laws or regulations described in paragraph (1) for a medical facility of the Department if such provision otherwise applies to the medical facility.

(b) EXPLANATION OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—If a director of a medical facility of the Department does not make a certification under subsection (a)(1) for any year, the director shall submit to the Secretary a report containing—

(1) an explanation of why the director is unable to make such certification; and

(2) a description of the actions the director is taking to ensure full compliance with the laws and regulations described in such subsection.

(c) PROHIBITION ON BONUSES BASED ON NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a director of a medical facility of the Department does not make a certification under subsection (a)(1) for any year, each covered official described in paragraph (2) may not receive an award or bonus under chapter 45 or 53 of title 5, United States Code, or any other award or bonus authorized under such title or title 38, United States Code, during the year following the year in which the certification was not made.

(2) COVERED OFFICIAL.—A covered official described in this paragraph is each official who serves in the following positions at a medical facility of the Department during a year, or portion thereof, for which the director does not make a certification under subsection (a)(1):

(A) The director.

(B) The chief of staff.

(C) The associate director.

(D) The associate director for patient care.

(E) The deputy chief of staff.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall annually submit to the Committees on Vet-

erans' Affairs of the House of Representative and the Senate a report containing, with respect to the year covered by the report—

(1) a list of each medical facility of the Department for which a certification was made under subsection (a)(1); and

(2) a list of each medical facility of the Department for which such a certification was not made, including a copy of each report submitted to the Secretary under subsection (b).

SEC. 3. STANDARDIZED APPLICATION OF DIRECTIVES AND POLICIES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the directives and policies of the Department of Veterans Affairs apply to, and are implemented by, each office or facility of the Department in a standardized manner, including such offices and facilities at the local level.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—If the Secretary does not apply and implement the directives and policies of the Department in a standardized manner pursuant to subsection (a), including by waiving such a directive or policy with respect to an office or facility of the Department, the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate of such non-standardized application or implementation, including an explanation for the non-standardized application or implementation, as the case may be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 467, a bill that would codify the VA's own directives for outpatient scheduling into law.

In June of 2010, the Veterans Health Administration issued VHA Directive 2010-27, VHA Outpatient Scheduling Processes and Procedures. This directive requires VHA facility directors to annually certify that their facility is in full compliance with the scheduling procedures outlined within the directive.

It is important to note that this directive was issued 4 years before the scheduling scandal at the Phoenix VA broke, with no less than 40 veterans dying while being kept on secret lists, waiting for an appointment. I believe this directive was a responsible way for the VA to ensure that veterans were receiving the care that they came to the VA for and were not slipping through the cracks.

Unfortunately, in May of 2013, then-Deputy Under Secretary for Health at the VA waived this requirement for the VA medical facility directors to adhere to the directive. As we now know, this waiver helped cover a practice of malfeasance within scheduling departments at VA medical facilities across the Nation.

As I mentioned before, in 2014, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with my friend, former Chairman Jeff Miller at the helm, discovered secret waiting lists at the Phoenix VA, as well as many other medical centers across the country. Had this directive still been in place, I honestly believe the scandal could have been prevented.

Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon us to ensure that these scheduling processes do not and cannot be dismissed by VA bureaucrats ever again.

I thank my good friend and former committee member, Representative JACKIE WALORSKI from Indiana, for sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 467, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the comments of Chairman ROE and I support H.R. 467. I also thank the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) for crafting this. She was, and still remains, a staunch supporter of veterans, always advocating for them. She taught me much, including, I think, the definition of Hoosier. I am still a little confused on that one, but we are working on it.

By holding the VA leadership accountable, we can ensure that the VA is accessible to all veterans. While the VA has made progress to shorten wait times, we cannot rest on our laurels. If one veteran's health is compromised because she or he was unable to receive timely care, then the VA has failed in its mission.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I ask my colleagues to stand in support of Mrs. WALORSKI's bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the vice chair and one of the most active members of the committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mrs. WALORSKI doing an outstanding job with this bill. The chairman and the ranking member are champions of veterans.

Again, I rise today in support of H.R. 467, the VA Scheduling Accountability Act, because all veterans deserve timely access to quality health care.

In 2014, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee uncovered the use of unauthorized waiting lists at the Phoenix VA healthcare system in Phoenix, Arizona. As a result of these waiting lists,

no less than 40 veterans died while waiting for care.

This is unacceptable. It is heart-breaking and completely, as I said, unacceptable. These are true American heroes, and we cannot allow something like this to ever happen again.

Our investigations found that non-compliance with the VA's scheduling policies was a widespread and systematic problem. This bill today requires that all VA medical center directors certify each year that their facility is in compliance with the scheduling directive. If a VA medical center is found noncompliant, H.R. 476 will hold those leaders accountable.

Our bill makes certain that those who fail in their duty to serve our veterans will not be receiving bonuses or awards anytime soon. Lack of oversight, lack of accountability, and lack of transparency led to the 2014 wait-times crisis. The VA Scheduling Accountability Act will help ensure those mistakes are not repeated, and improve access to timely care for our Nation's heroes.

Again, I thank the sponsor of the bill, Mrs. WALORSKI. It is one of the most important bills that we will pass this year, in my opinion, and I urge its passage.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), the sponsor of the bill and a former member of the committee.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROE and Ranking Member WALZ. What an honor it is to work with these two gentlemen on veterans' issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 467, the VA Scheduling Accountability Act.

This commonsense legislation codifies an important measure of oversight and accountability of VA facilities to prevent scheduling manipulation or, in the vernacular, "cooking the books," that has harmed veterans for so long.

Hearings held by the House VA Committee and investigations by the VA inspector general and the GAO have, unfortunately, confirmed many of the allegations of cooking books and falsified wait-time data at facilities around the country.

The VA has a procedure for scheduling veterans' medical appointments, which includes 19 different items, such as ensuring that a patient's desired appointment date is not altered and that staff are fully trained. Importantly, the directive requires each facility to certify compliance with all of these 19 items every year.

However, an August 2014 VA inspector general report uncovered that, in May 2013, a senior VA official waived the certification requirement that year, essentially putting the facility on

an honor system, allowing them to self-certify.

Without this crucial accountability mechanism, bad actors were given free rein to manipulate wait-time data and ignore the VA's required scheduling practices. Meanwhile, veterans faced significant delays in getting the care they needed while, in some extreme cases, veterans died.

Since that time, the VA has reinstated the certification requirements. However, serious problems remain, as evidenced by a recent VA investigation of a clinic in my own district that I requested after some brave individuals came forward with allegations of wrongdoing.

□ 1515

The VA found that the clinic scheduled appointments for veterans without the veterans' knowledge and canceled them on the day of the appointment in order to fill their schedule for that day. If the VA had conducted proper audits of that facility's scheduling practices last year, this misconduct could have been prevented. The VA's report recommended a review of scheduling compliance for all medical facilities in the region.

The VA's continued inability to reform itself from within is the reason we need to pass this bill. This bill will require each facility director to annually certify compliance with the current scheduling directive or any successive directive that replaces it, and, most importantly, it will prohibit any future waivers. The bill also provides accountability by making a director ineligible for salary bonuses if their facility fails to certify compliance, and it requires the VA to report to Congress a list of these facilities that are not in compliance. This will provide more oversight of the VA, ensure that Congress is aware of noncompliant facilities, and end the reckless practice of self-certification.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans risked life and limb for our freedom, but too often the VA has let them down. It is time to put an end to this scheduling manipulation—the cooking of the books—and the false wait-time data.

Holding every VA facility accountable for following scheduling rules is an important, commonsense step as we work to fix the VA so it works for the veterans in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 467, the VA Scheduling Accountability Act.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for her passion and for the chairman to bring this commonsense accountability piece to the floor.

I encourage my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, once again, I encourage all Members to

support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 467.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

IMPROVING THE PROVISION OF ADULT DAY HEALTH CARE SERVICES FOR VETERANS

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1005) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1005

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PROVISION OF ADULT DAY HEALTH CARE SERVICES FOR VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1745 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d)(1) The Secretary shall enter into an agreement under section 1720(c)(1) of this title or a contract with each State home for payment by the Secretary for adult day health care provided to a veteran who is eligible for, but does not receive, nursing home care pursuant to subsection (a).

“(2) Payment under each agreement or contract between the Secretary and a State home under paragraph (1) for each veteran who receives care under such paragraph shall be made at a rate that is equal to 65 percent of the payment that the Secretary would pay to the State home pursuant to subsection (a)(2) if the veteran received nursing home care under subsection (a) rather than under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

“(3) Payment by the Secretary under paragraph (1) to a State home for adult day health care provided to a veteran described in that paragraph constitutes payment in full to the State home for such care furnished to that veteran.”; and

(2) in the heading, by inserting “, adult day health care,” after “home care”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 17 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 1745 and inserting the following new item:

“1745. Nursing home care, adult day health care, and medications for veterans with service-connected disabilities.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 1005, a bill to improve the provision of adult day healthcare services for veterans.

Last year, the Department of Veterans Affairs testified that 9.8 million veterans, or 46 percent of the veteran population, will be 65 years of age or older in 2017. Given that, the need to ensure that veterans have ready access to a variety of geriatric and long-term care services and supports is an increasingly important component of the VA's mission.

Current law requires the VA to cover the cost of nursing home care in a State Veterans Home for any veteran in need of such care due to a service-connected disability or with a service-connected disability rating of 70 percent or more. That authority is incredibly important and has helped thousands of our veterans get the nursing home care they need.

However, there is an increasing demand for VA to offer geriatric and long-term care programs in noninstitutional settings that would allow aging veterans to receive needed services and supports while remaining in their homes surrounded by their loved ones.

To that end, H.R. 1005 would require VA to enter into an agreement or a contract with State Veterans Homes to pay for adult day healthcare for a veteran who is eligible for but not receiving nursing home care.

Adult day healthcare programs are a popular alternative to nursing home care that provide veterans in need of case management, assistance with activities of daily living, or other supportive services with companionship, peer support, recreation, and certain healthcare services. They also provide needed respite for caregivers.

By requiring VA to cover the cost of adult day healthcare programs at State Veterans Homes for veterans who would otherwise qualify for VA-paid nursing home care, H.R. 1005 would expand access to this type of care, which has been shown to maximize a veteran's independence and quality of life and to extend an aging veteran's ability to remain at home, which I think we would all want to do.

This bill has the support of the National Association of State Veterans Homes, The American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

I am grateful to my friend and former committee member, LEE ZELDIN from New York, for sponsoring this legislation and for shepherding it to the House floor. I look forward to working with him and our colleagues in the

Senate to secure a quick passage over there as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1005, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Congressman ZELDIN's bill, H.R. 1005. This legislation is a timely solution to a problem that affects many of our aging veteran populations. Nursing homes are often a family's last resort, and I believe that is the way it should remain. By allowing veterans to receive daily care and assistance at a nursing home and then return to their homes at night, veterans will receive the care, medical support, and attention they need without sacrificing the community family support and independence they want.

For that reason, I ask my colleagues to support this really smart piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) who is a former member of our committee and sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1005, a bill which would provide no-cost medical model adult day healthcare at State Veterans Homes to veterans who are 70 percent or more service-connected disabled.

This bill is an extension to the Veterans Benefits, Healthcare, and Information Technology Act of 2006, which currently provides no-cost nursing home care at any State Veterans Home to veterans who are 70 percent or more service-connected disabled.

Medical model adult day healthcare provides comprehensive medical, nursing, and personal care services combined with engaging social activities for physically or cognitively impaired adults. Medical model adult day healthcare offers a complete array of rehabilitative therapies, including physical, occupational, and speech therapies, hospice and palliative care, social work, spiritual, nutritional counseling, and therapeutic recreation.

The program is designed to promote socialization and stimulation and maximize the participant's independence while enhancing their quality of life. The program is staffed by a team of multidisciplinary healthcare professionals who evaluate each participant and customize an individualized plan of care specific to their health and social needs.

Adult day healthcare is an alternative care setting that can allow some veterans who require long-term care services to remain in their homes rather than be institutionalized in a nursing home. Such veterans typically require support for some, but not all, activities of daily living—ADLs—such as

bathing, dressing, or feeding. In many cases, a spouse or other family member may provide the veteran with much of their care, but they require additional support for some of the veteran's ADLs. By filling these gaps, adult day healthcare can allow these veterans to remain in their homes and communities for additional months or even years and thereby lower the financial cost of caring for these heroes.

Adult day healthcare also provides family caregivers support and relief. Adult day healthcare programs can help caregivers to meet their other professional and family obligations or provide a well-deserved respite while their loved ones are participating in the program.

I would like to thank Chairman ROE and Ranking Member WALZ for their leadership and support on this issue. Also, I would like to thank the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and the great staff for recognizing the need for this critical legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a piece of legislation I would encourage all of our colleagues to support.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO) who is a former member of our committee.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation that would assist veterans in Pennsylvania's Sixth Congressional District who suffer from a service-connected disability.

H.R. 1005 would allow the Department of Veterans Affairs to work with State Veterans Homes, such as the Southeastern Veterans Center in my district in East Vincent Township in Chester County, Pennsylvania, to fund adult day healthcare for veterans who have a disability rating of 70 percent or more from the line of duty.

Making this program available to more veterans who need assistance with daily tasks, such as bathing, dressing, or eating, would help improve the lives of those who have sacrificed so much, as well as their families.

Our veterans and their loved ones deserve to receive high-quality health services with the freedom and flexibility to live independently and at home.

I commend Congressman ZELDIN for his leadership and all those on the Veterans' Affairs Committee for passing this out of committee. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 1005, and I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to

revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1005.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Once again, I urge all Members to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1005.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NO HERO LEFT UNTREATED ACT

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1162) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy to veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1162

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "No Hero Left Untreated Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy has successfully treated more than 400 veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, military sexual trauma, chronic pain, and opiate addiction.

(2) Recent clinical trials and randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind studies have produced promising measurable outcomes in the evolution of magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy.

(3) The outcomes described in paragraph (2) have resulted in escalating demand from returning members of the Armed Forces and veterans who are seeking access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy.

(4) Congress recognizes the importance of initiating innovative pilot programs that demonstrate the use and effectiveness of new treatment options for post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, military sexual trauma, chronic pain, and opiate addiction.

SEC. 3. MAGNETIC EEG/EKG-GUIDED RESONANCE THERAPY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—Commencing not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out a pilot program to provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy to treat veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, military sexual trauma, chronic pain, or opiate addiction.

(b) LOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program under subsection (a) at not more than two facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) PARTICIPANTS.—In carrying out the pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy to not more than 50 veterans.

(d) DURATION.—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program under subsection (a) for a one-year period.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the termination of the pilot program under subsection (d), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program.

(f) NO AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—No additional amounts are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the requirements of this section. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts authorized under provisions of law other than this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1162, a bill to expand the use of EEG/EKG-guided magnetic resonance therapy to treat veterans with PTSD, traumatic brain injury, military sexual trauma, chronic pain, and opiate addiction at VA medical centers.

A 2016 VA report found that mental health conditions and substance abuse among veterans is alarmingly high and steadily on the rise, up from 27 percent in 2001 to over 40 percent in 2014. Perhaps even more alarming, the same report showed that VA has increased its use of prescription opioids by 259 percent over the same period to treat these invisible wounds.

Magnetic resonance therapy, or MRT, is an emerging technology that has been used to treat over 400 veterans with symptoms of their mental conditions. MRT uses quantitative electroencephalogram, electrocardiogram technology to target the affected areas of the brain and apply repetitive magnetic stimulation to return normal function to those areas.

MRT has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration to treat depression, and a 2015 study found that veterans who underwent 2 weeks of treatment for PTSD reported an average of 47.4 percent reduction in symptom severity. After 4 weeks of treatment, veteran participants saw a 64

percent reduction in symptom severity on average. The same study showed zero reports of worsening symptoms or adverse effects from the treatment.

H.R. 1162 would create a 1-year pilot at two VA facilities during which 50 veterans would be provided MRT treatment for PTSD, traumatic brain injury, military sexual trauma, chronic pain, and opioid addiction.

□ 1530

Ninety days after the end of the pilot, the Secretary of the VA would issue a report to Congress on the efficacy of the pilot.

Mr. Speaker, with such promising results from preliminary tests of MRT technology, I believe that we must act quickly to make this emerging technology available to more veterans suffering from the invisible wounds of war.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), my good friend and fellow Army veteran, for sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1162, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1162. With all of the things that you heard the chairman talk about and substance abuse disorder on the rise, the VA should continue to explore the benefits of alternative treatments and how best to provide care to our veterans.

Medical providers must think outside of the box and find effective ways to treat the symptoms a veteran is experiencing, and do so in a way that does not compromise a veteran's health, relationships, and progress towards a successful transition home.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason, I would ask my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation and start moving in a direction that serves our veterans with the best treatment for them.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on all veteran issues.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 1162, the No Hero Left Untreated Act. I rise today to stand with our Nation's veterans for whom the trauma from the battlefield does not always appear. Whether it is PTS, TBI, MST, chronic pain, or opioid drugs addiction, the pilot program established by this bill would provide an innovative individualized treatment for all-too-common diagnoses that our veterans face today.

Using a suite of FDA-approved medical tools, the magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy, or MeRT, is a nonpharmaceutical and noninvasive procedure that has already shown great promise. This bill requires the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish the pilot program, treat 50 veterans using MeRT at two different VA locations, and then come back with a report at the end of that.

Already at the Brain Treatment Center in California, 98 percent of veterans in recent trials have experienced at least a 10-point change in their military PTSD checklist, or PCL-M, which ranges from 17 to 80.

The Active-Duty military has already begun clinical trials using the MeRT procedure at Tinker Air Force Base, concluding that "transcranial MeRT is a promising adjuvant treatment modality to help veterans suffering from PTSD." In fact, after 4 weeks of active treatment, MeRT reduced the average PCL-M score from 66 to 37.

U.S. Special Operations Command has also funded their own trials using the Brain Treatment Center's treatment modality and is conducting research at MacDill Air Force Base in Florida and Naval Special Warfare Command in my home State of California.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support for H.R. 1162 from AMVETS, the Veterans Health Council, the Association of the United States Navy, Veterans Advantage, The Patriot Project, Lines for Life, the National Foundation for Women Legislators, the PsychArmor Institute, STEADFAST Leadership, and the WestCare Foundation.

AMVETS,

Lanham, MD, April 5, 2017.

Hon. STEVE KNIGHT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KNIGHT: AMVETS (American Veterans) is pleased to support your bill, H.R. 1162, the No Hero Left Untreated Act, which seeks to establish a pilot program for two Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) medical centers to treat fifty veterans using magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy.

Magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy has successfully treated more than 400 veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, military sexual trauma, chronic pain, and opiate addiction. This small pilot would be instructive to VA in understanding the benefits and deciding whether to offer this promising therapy to those receiving VA health care.

If it were fully understood how to treat these nuanced disorders and health issues, VA would already be doing so—and suffice it to say—the veteran suicide rate would most assuredly be lower than it is now. It is imperative that we, as a nation, look at new ways to help those who have stood up and walked the walk, and suffer the consequences day after day.

AMVETS is in full support of this measure and appreciates your leadership in intro-

ducing this important legislation and in striving to improve the lives of all veterans.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH R. CHENELLY,
Executive Director.

VETERANS HEALTH COUNCIL,
Silver Spring, MD, February 21, 2017.

Hon. STEVE KNIGHT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KNIGHT: I am writing in support of the H.R. No Heroes Left Untreated Act. This important piece of legislation will bring to America's Veterans a significant contribution toward health solutions for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), Military Sexual Trauma (MST), chronic pain and opiate drug addiction through MeRT (Magnetic EEG/EKG-guided Resonance Therapy).

As of early 2015, the effects of collective failure to adequately address the emotional and physical effects of combat; particularly Traumatic Brain Injuries (TBI), mild Traumatic Brain Injuries (mTBI), and PTSD have left the Veteran community paying a disproportionate toll for their service to the Nation. Current treatment modalities clearly have limited utility. The urgency of understanding and responding to this national issue becomes more obvious, when one sees the growing scope, impact and prevalence of PTSD, both in Veteran suicides and in related societal indicators. While some may view this as a societal cost that cannot be averted, that is not the view of the doctors at the Newport Brain Research Lab/Brain Treatment Center (NBRL/BTC). MeRT brings a novel neuromodulation approach achieving unprecedented success rates in both open-label trial and randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind studies. To date, over 98% of Veteran PTSD/TBI patients have responded positively averaging a 61% reduction in symptom severity as measured by the PCL-M (PTSD Check List—Military) and demonstrated by measurable EEG/EKG changes.

We applaud your continued interest in exploring effective, science-based and proven medical technologies to help our Veterans. Like you, we believe it is our obligation and duty to ensure Veterans receive the treatment they need to have their lives and livelihoods restored.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. BERGER, PH.D.,
Executive Director.

ASSOCIATION OF THE
UNITED STATES NAVY,
Alexandria, VA, March 21, 2017.

Hon. STEPHEN KNIGHT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

On behalf of the Association of the United States Navy, we would like to pledge our support for H.R. 1162, the No Hero Left Untreated Act. This bill directs the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG guided resonance therapy to veterans.

Magnetic EEG/EKG guided resonance therapy has successfully treated more than 400 veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, military sexual trauma, chronic pain, and opiate addiction. Recent clinical trials and randomized, placebo-controlled, double blind studies have produced promising measurable outcomes in the evolution of this type of therapy.

The pilot program, as laid out in the bill, will allow the Secretary of Veterans Affairs

to provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG guided resonance therapy to treat suffering veterans. The program will be located at no more than two facilities and test no more than fifty veterans. The program will be carried out for one year, and no more than 90 days after the termination of the program, the Secretary will submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House a report on the pilot program.

Thank you for taking an active role in such an important issue to the Military and Veteran community by working to improve the lives and careers of those who served our great nation. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concern.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. LITTLE,
Director of Legislative Affairs.

VETERANS ADVANTAGE,
Greenwich, CT, February 17, 2017.

Hon. STEVE KNIGHT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KNIGHT: On behalf of Veterans Advantage, PBC, the leading private-sector benefit company that advocates for greater respect, recognition and rewards for U.S. military, veterans and their family members, I am writing in support of the No Hero Left Untreated Act, HR1162.

I am a Vietnam Veteran who has first-hand experience with the effects of Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) and Post Traumatic Stress (PTS). My son, who has sustained multiple concussions and suffers from PTS, has undergone treatment at the Brain Treatment Center (BTC) over the last year and continues to do so. As a result of this treatment, we have seen significant progress in addressing the symptoms associated with his condition, in particular his depression and anxiety have lessened. No other therapies have any effect on his condition. He has made steady progress and is now on the road to restoring his health.

The current state of treatment for TBI, mild Traumatic Brain Injury (mTBI), and PTS, is woefully inadequate. While hundreds of thousands of servicemembers suffer from these conditions when they return from war zones and multiple tours while serving our nation, there is a systemic failure to address the emotional and physical effects of combat. This is a national crisis and one we must address immediately.

The legislation you are advocating is a significant step to provide the treatment our servicemen and women so desperately need and deserve. I have reviewed the double blind studies with Dr. Jin and the staff of the BTC. The use of Magnetic EEG/EKG-guided Resonance Therapy (MeRT, a non-invasive treatment) under the direction of the BTC has achieved unprecedented success rates in both open-label trials and randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind studies. To date, over 98% of veteran PTSD/TBI patients have responded positively to this treatment option—averaging a 61% reduction in symptom severity as measured by the PTSD Check List—Military (PCL-M) and demonstrated by measurable EEG/EKG changes.

Thank you for your initiative in sponsoring this important legislation and your support of America's heroes through the No Hero Left Behind Act.

Respectfully yours,

H. SCOTT HIGGINS,
Vietnam War Veteran,
CEO/Veterans Advantage, PBC.

THE PATRIOT PROJECT,
March 2, 2017.

Hon. STEVE KNIGHT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KNIGHT: On behalf of the Patriot Project, a grassroots movement to provide Military Service Members, Families, Gold Star Dependents and Wounded Warriors with vital Chiropractic care to which they have little access, despite its inclusion in Veteran benefits; I am writing in support of H.R. 1162, the No Hero Left Untreated Act. This important piece of legislation offers America's Veterans a timely non-drug health solution for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), Military Sexual Trauma (MST), chronic pain, and opiate drug addiction through Magnetic EEG/EKG-guided Resonance Therapy technology (MeRT technology).

Consisting of over 5000 Chiropractors, nationwide, the Patriot Project has witnessed the invisible and visible life-altering injuries of war these Veterans suffer, with little access to solutions except for drugs, and surgeries. The Patriot Project Board, made up of more than half a dozen Congressional Medal of Honor Recipients, has taken on the challenge of restoring hope to our returning warriors by pursuing non-drug interventions with vigor.

As tens of thousands of Veterans return home each year, they encounter a systemic failure to adequately address the emotional and physical effects of combat. Current treatments for PTSD, TBI and even mild Traumatic Brain Injuries (mTBI) have limited utility to sufficiently heal our Veterans. The urgency of understanding and responding to this national crisis becomes even more compelling when one sees the growing scope, impact and prevalence of PTSD particularly in Veteran suicide rates. The doctors at the Newport Brain Research Lab/Brain Treatment Center (NBRL/BTC), believe it is their obligation and duty to ensure Veterans receive the treatment they need to have their lives and livelihoods restored.

H.R. 1162 is a significant step forward in providing Veterans with the treatment they desperately need and clearly deserve. MeRT technology brings a novel neuromodulation approach, achieving unprecedented success rates in both open-label trials and randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind studies with over 98% of Veteran PTSD/TBI patients responding positively to this treatment option. Without investment in such innovative treatment, our nation's Veterans will continue to pay a disproportionate toll for their service.

We applaud Congressman Knight and his attentive staff for their commitment to explore effective, science-based, and proven medical technologies and their unwavering support to helping America's heroes.

Sincerely,

DR. CAROL ANN MALIZIA,
CAM Integrative Consulting, Patriot
Project Board Member.

LINES FOR LIFE,
March 9, 2017.

Hon. STEVE KNIGHT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KNIGHT: Thank you for your ongoing efforts to support our veterans, particularly through HR 1162, the No Hero Left Untreated Act. Lines for Life supports this important piece of legislation that will expand promising neurological treatment for

veterans coping with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), traumatic brain injury (TBI), military sexual trauma, chronic pain, and opiate addiction.

Lines for Life operates a regional Military Helpline that offers free, anonymous help to active-duty service members, veterans, and their families. We also serve as the sole backup center for the Department of Veterans Affairs' Veterans Crisis Line. In 2016, we received over 31,500 military-related calls from individuals who are struggling to cope with mental health issues including anger, substance abuse, post-traumatic stress, and thoughts of suicide.

Veterans comprise 9% of the United States population, but account for 18% of suicides. Our nation's inadequate attention to the emotional and physical effects of combat, particularly TBI and PTSD, have left our veteran community paying a disproportionate toll for their service. Treatment methods to date have had limited utility. We must respond to the growing scope, impact, and prevalence of PTSD by enhancing our understanding and response to this critical issue.

We applaud your continued interest in exploring effective, science-based, and proven medical technologies to help our veterans. We believe it is our obligation and duty to ensure veterans receive the treatment they need to have their lives and livelihoods restored.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT HOLTON,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR
WOMEN LEGISLATORS,
March 6, 2017.

Hon. STEVE KNIGHT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KNIGHT: We are writing in support of HR 1162 the No Hero Left Untreated Act, for which your efforts should be highly commended on behalf of Veterans. This important piece of legislation will bring America's Veterans a significant contribution to their health solutions for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), Military Sexual Trauma (MST), chronic pain and opiate drug addiction through MeRT (Magnetic EEG/EKG-guided Resonance Therapy).

As of early 2015, the effects of our nation's collective failure to adequately address the emotional and physical effects of combat, particularly Traumatic Brain Injuries (TBI), mild Traumatic Brain Injuries (mTBI), and PTSD have left our Veteran community paying a disproportionate toll for their service to the Nation. Treatment modalities to date, clearly, have had limited utility. The urgency of understanding and responding to this national issue becomes more obvious when one sees the growing scope, impact, and prevalence of PTSD, evident both in Veteran suicides and related societal indicators. While some may view this as a societal cost that cannot be averted, that is not our view.

We applaud your continued interest in exploring effective, science-based and proven medical technologies to help our Veterans. Like you, we believe it is our obligation and duty to ensure Veterans receive the treatment they need to have their lives and livelihoods restored.

Sincerely,

MINNESOTA STATE SENATOR
CARRIE RUUD,
2017 NFWL Chair, On
behalf of the Board

*of Directors of the
National Founda-
tion for Women Leg-
islators.*

PSYCHARMOR INSTITUTE,
March 8, 2017.

Hon. STEVE KNIGHT,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KNIGHT: I am writing in support of HR 1162 the No Hero Left Untreated Act, for which your efforts should be highly commended on behalf of Veterans. This important piece of legislation will allow for a neurological treatment option for Veterans who suffer from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), Military Sexual Trauma (MST), chronic pain and opiate drug addiction.

This non-pharmaceutical and non-invasive treatment has helped hundreds of Veterans and their families who are supporting and caring for these Veterans. There is no one treatment for every individual, and it is important to give Veterans options so that they have the power to choose which treatment is best for them and their situation. Veterans have sacrificed so much for our nation; it is our obligation to provide for them and their families.

We applaud your continued interest in exploring effective, science-based and proven medical technologies to help our Veterans. Like you, we believe it is our obligation and duty to ensure Veterans receive the treatment they need to have their lives and livelihoods restored.

Sincerely,

MARJORIE MORRISON,
PsychArmor Institute, CEO & Founder.

FEBRUARY 17, 2017.

Hon. STEVE KNIGHT,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KNIGHT: Recent elections have focused us, once again, on the "here and now." And rightly so. With the elections behind us, we have a shared sense of relief. But for combat veterans, the "here and now" is also often defined by "there and then." They carry courage into battle, serve with honor and come home—often finding they need new courage to confront a new foe. Veterans who confront post-traumatic stress, traumatic brain injury, and related symptoms also deserve relief—and this Veterans' Day, Congress is poised to give it to them.

Truth can be compelling when it meets you up close and personal. You know that for many Veterans, there is new truth afoot, and it is compelling—and hopeful. In recent years, the specialized, little-publicized brain treatment program for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) known as Magnetic EEG/EKG-guided Resonance Therapy (MeRT technology) has emerged. The unique treatment, much studied and now widely corroborated, is powerful. It changes lives.

Just as the election was an inflection point, you have recognized that Congress is in a position to change lives in America for the better. If Congress can move beyond words and intentions, beyond political jousting, America's veterans will be forever grateful—and lives will be saved by the thousands, and you are doing just that.

The chance to give life back to those on the edge, who wrestle daily with PTSD and related life-stresses and opiate addiction, is at our finger-tips. The Washington Post and veteran publications have aptly described it,

and time is now for action. I cannot say this with more conviction: We must act to save the precious lives, and every one at risk is precious. We lose more than 20 young men and women daily to PTSD, and we can stop this in a single congressional vote for your bill.

The No Hero Left Untreated Act H.R. 1162 can help to change everything. Through pilot programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), veterans will turn a critical corner. It will help to restore their mental health, saving countless lives and those touched by those lives. Without this act, our veterans will continue to languish without access to this help. Seeing you, in a first post-election act bringing fifty Members together to unify around what matters, can only be applauded. Politics aside, Congress acting now to pass H.R. 1162 and a Senate companion bill following immediately will begin immediately saving the veterans most at risk. As your action clearly demonstrates, there can no longer be any excuse.

As first reported by the Washington Post, this is an inflection point—a show stopper, a real chance for meaningful change. Tested through double-blind studies, 98 percent of MeRT-treated veterans experienced at least a 10-point improvement in their PTSD Check List-Military (PCL-M) score, and saw significant reduction in symptom severity, after only 4 weeks of treatment. These results have been mirrored in additional open label trials as well. Nothing else I know of has come close to this success rate.

Congressman Knight, all this brings me to today and my offering of my support for your efforts on behalf of my brothers and sisters who have so ably served. I thank you for making their futures your first priority in the 115th Congress.

Sincerely,

REBECCA HALSTEAD,
Brigadier General Retired, (USA retired).

WESTCARE FOUNDATION,
February 22, 2017.

Hon. STEVE KNIGHT,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KNIGHT: The purpose of this letter is to show full support from WestCare Foundation, Inc. for H.R. 1162, the No Hero Left Untreated Act. This progressive piece of legislation brings a critical health solution for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), Military Sexual Trauma (MST), chronic pain, and opiate drug addiction to our nation's Veterans through Magnetic EEG/EKG-guided Resonance Therapy (MeRT technology).

The doctors of the Newport Brain Research Lab/Brain Treatment Center (NBRL/BTC) have introduced a game-changer addressing seemingly intractable behavioral health conditions through their development of MeRT technology. The data from both open label and double-blind studies of MeRT technology are compelling. This protocol, offered as a first line treatment of the physical brain through neuromodulation, can improve the behavioral health outcomes for all of us who subsequently provide evidence-based therapies that will further benefit Veteran patients and clients as, together, we create a more effective comprehensive continuum of care.

As a Veteran of the Vietnam War, myself, I am especially interested in seeing the VA bring this work into their practice of medicine. For over forty years later, we continue to see the negative life impact of war on our

men and women who served without the advent of practice and protocols sufficient for their full recovery. MeRT technology is producing results that are saving lives and increasing the potential for follow-on therapies to change the future trajectory of the lives of our Veterans and their families as well.

We owe our warriors the very best treatment available in America. MeRT technology is clearly making a difference. I commend you for offering this important legislation and urge its passage as soon as possible! Every day without it can be measured in loss of life, in loss of positive contribution to our communities from our American heroes, and in loss of our fathers and mothers, sons and daughters, friends and neighbors.

Sincerely,

RICHARD STEINBERG,
President/CEO.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, in a time when the Defense Department maintains technological superiority over our adversaries in combat, our Veterans Affairs Department must continue to push the technological limit to treating our selfless servicemembers once their duty is done.

I am optimistic that this pilot program for our veteran population will be the first of many that improves our ability to heal wounded veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I will leave my colleagues with one last quote. As the AMVETS' executive director stated in his letter of support for this bill: "It is imperative that we, as a nation, look at new ways to help those who have stood up and walked the walk, and suffer the consequences day after day."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT) for his innovative approach in trying to get services to our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join us in passing H.R. 1162.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I, too, encourage all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1162.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VA PRESCRIPTION DATA ACCOUNTABILITY ACT 2017

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1545) to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Veterans

Affairs to disclose certain patient information to State controlled substance monitoring programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1545

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “VA Prescription Data Accountability Act 2017”.

SEC. 2. SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS DISCLOSURE OF PATIENT INFORMATION TO STATE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE MONITORING PROGRAMS.

Section 5701(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “Under”;

(2) by striking “a veteran or the dependent of a veteran” and inserting “a covered individual”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) In this subsection, a ‘covered individual’ is an individual who is dispensed medication prescribed by an employee of the Department or by a non-Department provider authorized to prescribe such medication by the Department.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1545, the VA Prescription Data Accountability Act of 2017. H.R. 1545 would require the Department of Veterans Affairs to disclose information about any individual prescribed medication by a VA employee or a provider authorized by the VA to a State Prescription Drug Monitoring Program to the extent necessary to prevent misuse and diversion of prescription medication.

Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs are Statewide electronic databases that collect and distribute information on prescription medication to certain authorized individuals or entities. They are used to identify and address prescription drug abuse, addiction, and diversion.

While 90 percent of the VA's patient population are veterans, the VA treats certain nonveterans, including Active-Duty servicemembers who receive VA care through sharing agreements with

the Department of Defense, dependents, caregivers of veterans, and VA staff, to name a few.

Current law authorizes the VA to disclose information to Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs for veterans and dependents of veterans only. The VA is not authorized to disclose information for other patients.

Moreover, technological barriers prevent the VA from transmitting dependent data to Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs. That means that prescription drug information for non-veterans—10 percent of the VA's patient population, which translates to more than 700,000 veterans this fiscal year—is not being shared with Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs today.

In light of ongoing concerns about the potential for misuse or diversion of prescription medication, particularly opioid medications, it is imperative that the VA share information about all VA patients, veteran and non-veteran, to State Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs. It is a matter of public safety.

H.R. 1545 is supported by the American Legion, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and by the VA, who testified before the Subcommittee on Health earlier this year that this authority would “ensure that VA is able to fulfill its public health role in sharing vital clinical information to help guide treatment decisions.”

Mr. Speaker, this bill is sponsored by the gentlewoman of New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, who is joined by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations; and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Health. I am grateful to all of them for sponsoring this legislation. It has my full support, and I urge all of our colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1545 offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), who is the ranking member of our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, and, as importantly, a champion of policies that make sure the scourge of opioid addiction is addressed in this Congress, and is a leading expert on it.

This legislation would make significant progress towards curbing substance abuse disorders and diversion of prescription medication in our veteran population.

As you heard, currently, a veteran's dependent can receive a prescription for a controlled substance from a provider in the community, and then they receive the same prescription for the same controlled substance from a VA provider without either provider's knowledge of what happened.

Congress, in the past, has attempted to remedy this problem but, due to confusion within the VA, was unsuccessful. I believe that Congresswoman KUSTER's legislation would clear up this confusion and allow the VA to better serve both veterans and their dependents by allowing the VA and community providers to recognize and treat substance abuse disorders instead of contributing to them by unintentionally overprescribing.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support this legislation. I would encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the VA Prescription Data Accountability Act. We face a serious opioid epidemic in our communities across the Nation. As we work to put forth solutions to this crisis, it is critical that we incorporate the Veterans Health Administration into existing, effective controlled substance monitoring programs.

To ensure effective, accurate oversight of who is being prescribed controlled substances, this legislation would require the VA to disclose information about all individuals, veteran or dependent, who receive such prescriptions from the VHA.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, we have an established comprehensive and effective Prescription Drug Monitoring Program. Incorporating additional data from the VA is an appropriate step to utilize proven existing networks to fight back against the opioid epidemic.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), my good friend and the ranking member of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, and a critical partner in serving our veterans.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) for their support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak on my bill, H.R. 1545, the VA Prescription Accountability Act. This bill demonstrates the power of bipartisanship in this Congress, especially on the House VA Committee.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) for his willingness to co-lead this bill with me, and also the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) for cosponsoring this commonsense legislation.

This bill is common sense because it improves upon the Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs, also known as PDMPs across this country. PDMPs are proven resources in combating our Nation's opioid epidemic. PDMPs improve the public health and our general well-being.

In 2012, the VA was finally authorized to connect its patient population to State PDMPs. But, unfortunately, an issue with the VA's antiquated computer systems meant that literally hundreds of thousands of nonveteran patients at the VA were left excluded from the data reported to PDMPs by the VA.

As the ranking member of the House Veterans' Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, I am all too familiar with the continued issues with computer systems across the entirety of the VA. This issue underscores the need for the VA and this Congress to ensure effective and rapid reform to the VA's computer systems. When those systemic shortcomings potentially exacerbate the Nation's opioid epidemic, I saw the importance to take action.

Through my Bipartisan Heroin Task Force, we in Congress have learned the importance of ensuring prescription opioids are not misused. The consequences are truly dire. Over 30,000 Americans die in opioid-related overdoses every year. That number just continues to rise.

This bill represents a small but practical step forward in addressing this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this low-cost bill. It will help ensure these important programs work as intended by closing the gap in prescription information. I urge my Senate colleagues to quickly take up the bill and pass it in the Senate as well.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), our vice ranking member of the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs and a true champion of veterans.

□ 1545

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my colleague from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) and her bill to improve information sharing between providers to ensure that they are able to follow safe prescribing practices.

The VA Prescription Data Accountability Act helps to close a loophole in statute that limits the data that the

VA can share with Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs, or PDMPs. These databases track the prescribing and dispensing of controlled substances to help find suspected fraud and intervene with patients who are at high risk for prescription drug abuse. These databases are only as useful as the information they collect.

Since 2011, the VA has been able to share prescription data with PDMPs, but only for the veteran patients it sees. Statutory and technical challenges have prevented the Department from sharing data from nonveteran patients with PDMPs. Approximately 10 percent of the VA's patients are nonveterans. We are talking about 700,000 patients each year.

Now, Ms. KUSTER's bill expands the authority of the VA to share all patient data with PDMPs. This will allow us to better monitor the use of prescription drugs and help combat a growing opioid epidemic.

On average, 650,000 opioid prescriptions are dispensed daily in the United States, and 78 people die from opioid-related overdoses. Properly tracking prescription drugs is one of the first steps to turn the tide on this epidemic.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us in passing H.R. 1545.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

In over 31 years of the practice of medicine, I have seen great changes, many of them to the good. One of the things that has disturbed me greatly is the opioid epidemic that we have in this great country at this time. I am an obstetrician. I have delivered a lot of babies in my career, and it was a rare event when we saw a baby that was addicted to opioids—as a matter of fact, almost never until, literally, about 20 years ago, and 10 years ago a full-fledged epidemic.

In our hospital at home, we have a neonatal intensive care unit that cares for nothing but opioid-addicted babies. In our State of Tennessee, Mr. Speaker, we have had more people who died of prescription drug overdose deaths than died in car wrecks. It now exceeds many cancer deaths in the country.

This bill has my 100 percent support, and I certainly want to thank Ms. KUSTER for her great work on this bill. We have shared a trip to Afghanistan together, as we did with Mr. TAKANO, and had a chance to talk about these things in great detail. I want to thank her and also the ranking member for their support in this.

I once again encourage all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1545.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVING THE TREATMENT OF MEDICAL EVIDENCE PROVIDED BY NON-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1725) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the treatment of medical evidence provided by non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals in support of claims for disability compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1725

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPORT ON PROGRESS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCEPTABLE CLINICAL EVIDENCE INITIATIVE.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the progress of the Acceptable Clinical Evidence initiative of the Department of Veterans Affairs in reducing the necessity for in-person disability examinations and other efforts to comply with the provisions of section 5125 of title 38, United States Code.

(b) *CONTENTS OF REPORT.*—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) *The number of claims eligible for the Acceptable Clinical Evidence initiative during the period beginning on the date of the commencement of the initiative and ending on the date of the submittal of the report, disaggregated by fiscal year.*

(2) *The total number of claims eligible for the Acceptable Clinical Evidence initiative that required a medical examiner of the Department to supplement the evidence with information obtained during a telephone interview with a claimant.*

(3) *Information on any other initiatives or efforts of the Department to further encourage the use of private medical evidence and reliance upon reports of a medical examination administered by a private physician if the report is sufficiently complete to be adequate for the purposes of adjudicating a claim.*

(4) *The anticipated impact on the timeline and accuracy of a decision on a claim for benefits under chapter 11 or 15 of title 38, United States Code, if the Secretary were prohibited from requesting a medical examination in the case of a claim in support of which a claimant submits*

medical evidence and a medical opinion provided by a private physician that is competent, credible, probative, and otherwise adequate for the purpose of making a decision on that claim.

(5) Recommendations on how the Department can measure, track, and prevent the ordering of unnecessary medical examinations when the provision by a claimant of a medical examination administered by a private physician in support of a claim for benefits under chapter 11 or 15 of title 38, United States Code, is adequate for the purpose of making a decision on that claim.

SEC. 2. ANNUAL REPORT ON SUBMITTAL OF PRIVATE MEDICAL EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF CLAIMS FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS BENEFITS.

Not later than March 1 of fiscal years 2018 through 2024, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a report that includes, for the calendar year preceding the year in which the report is submitted, the following for each regional office of the Department of Veterans Affairs:

(1) The number of times a veteran who submitted private medical evidence in support of a claim for compensation or pension under the laws administered by the Secretary was scheduled for an examination performed by Department personnel because the private medical evidence submitted was determined to be unacceptable.

(2) The most common reasons why private medical evidence submitted in support of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary was determined to be unacceptable.

(3) The types of disabilities for which claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary were mostly commonly denied when private medical evidence was submitted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 1725, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1725, as amended, was introduced by my good friend Mr. WALZ, the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

This bill addresses a very serious issue. When a veteran files a claim for disability benefits, VA may need a medical opinion regarding whether the injury or illness is service connected and, if it is, the extent of the veteran's disability. The problem is that the VA often schedules a medical disability examination when one might not be needed.

Many times, a veteran will submit medical evidence from a private doctor with enough information for VA to decide the claim, but we hear about cases

where VA still requires a VA examination. Ordering unnecessary disability examinations is a waste of time and resources. It takes doctors away from taking care of their patients and conducting other disability examinations.

H.R. 1725, as amended, would require VA to provide reports to Congress about its use of private medical evidence. This information will be used to help us find ways to make the disability examination more efficient for veterans.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1725, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this piece of legislation.

I want to thank the chairman personally for bringing this forward and for being very eloquent in his words on what this does. It is appropriate that it is part of this block of legislation dealing with appeals reform also.

I thank the folks who have worked on this for years: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Ms. SHEA-POR-TER.

As originally introduced, this bill sought to change a current requirement stipulating that initial physical examinations of those seeking to file disability claims must be conducted by the VA. It was to allow veterans to see a local doctor.

Again, as the chairman so clearly pointed out, it was to relieve some of the pressure on the VA, while recognizing we have quality, ethically trustworthy physicians in the private sector who can deliver some of these services. The idea was that requiring the VA to accept private medical evidence from a qualified physician would ease the benefit process in rural communities, expedite diagnosis of disabilities, and reduce the wait times and the backlogs.

This is a problem that we have been working on for many years. We introduced similar language in 2013, 2014, and 2015.

I would like to thank all my fellow members, both on and off the committee, and those who are no longer in Congress for working toward this. I am especially thankful to Chairman BOST and Ms. ESTY for having worked with me to tighten the scope of this bill to address the cost that the Congressional Budget Office scored it to.

As it is now, the bill requires an annual report on how veterans obtain private medical evidence in support of their claim, how often it is rejected, and why. It is my hope that this data will help build our case for mandating that the VA accept all credible private medical evidence. We cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good and need to get started gathering this data as soon as possible.

As we also work to improve the appeals process today, making it more convenient for veterans to get and submit medical evidence, this component will be important. By continuing our work on this issue, veterans will be able to complete their claims faster; start receiving the benefits that they have earned faster; and make sure that the stress you heard about with 20 years of waiting, much of that time seeing private physicians and gathering evidence to support the very claim that is being denied, this piece of legislation should make sense with that.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank everyone involved with this. I urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation, H.R. 1725.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly endorse this bill.

Mr. WALZ, Sergeant Major Walz, speaks with great passion about it. He has the Mayo Clinic in his district. I can't imagine an evaluation at the Mayo Clinic by physicians there wouldn't be adequate for the VA.

I wholeheartedly support this bill, H.R. 1725, as amended. I urge all Members to also support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1725, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit certain reports relating to medical evidence submitted in support of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1329) to increase, effective as of December 1, 2017, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, to improve the processing of claims by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1329

Be enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Veterans’ Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) **RATE ADJUSTMENT.**—Effective on December 1, 2017, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall increase, in accordance with subsection (c), the dollar amounts in effect on November 30, 2017, for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation under the provisions specified in subsection (b).

(b) **AMOUNTS TO BE INCREASED.**—The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to subsection (a) are the following:

(1) **WARTIME DISABILITY COMPENSATION.**—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) **ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.**—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1115(1) of such title.

(3) **CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.**—The dollar amount under section 1162 of such title.

(4) **DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO SURVIVING SPOUSE.**—Each of the dollar amounts under subsections (a) through (d) of section 1311 of such title.

(5) **DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO CHILDREN.**—Each of the dollar amounts under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF INCREASE.**—Each dollar amount described in subsection (b) shall be increased by the same percentage as the percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 2017, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(d) **SPECIAL RULE.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons under section 10 of Public Law 85–857 (72 Stat. 1263) who have not received compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 3. PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in section 2(b), as increased under that section, not later than the date on which the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 1329, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1329, as amended, is one of the most important bills the House will take up this year. This bill will help ensure that the benefits paid to veterans who are disabled as a result of their military service do not lose value because of inflation. H.R. 1329, as amended, authorizes a cost-of-living increase for veterans and their families next year as long as Social Security recipients receive an increase.

We pass this bill every year, and it has always enjoyed wide, bipartisan support. This year’s bill was introduced by the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Chairman BOST and Ranking Member ESTY.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1329, as amended, and help disabled veterans and their families keep up with the rate of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to support H.R. 1329, as amended. The Veterans’ Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act provides a 1-year cost-of-living adjustment for the rate of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities as well as the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors.

As most of us know, this adjustment is tied directly to the rates of increase in Social Security benefits. Disability payments are vital to the economic well-being of most veterans, and that support should never be eroded by inflation. This bill ensures that does not happen.

I thank Chairman ROE for bringing the bill to us in a totally bipartisan process, and the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, as always.

The names of Chairman BOST and Ranking Member ESTY have been brought up a lot today. It says something about it. They are tackling issues that have lasted years. They are bringing up important issues that are going to impact the well-being of veterans. You heard them both say it. They did so in a bipartisan manner that I think serves the reputation of this House well. We sorely need more true bipartisan problem solving like this.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, Chairman BOST.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1329, the Veterans’ Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2017. This bill should be a top priority for all of us this year. H.R. 1329 should ensure that the veterans receive a cost-of-living increase next year if Social Security recipients get one.

We all know that the price keeps going up and that if veterans’ benefits don’t keep pace, veterans and their families may have a hard time paying for basic necessities like food, shelter, and clothing. This bill is extremely important to our Nation’s veterans. I ask all Members to support it.

I want to thank the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, Ms. ESTY, for her support of this legislation. I urge my colleagues, all, also to support H.R. 1329.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the vice chairman of our committee.

□ 1600

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, this truly is a bipartisan committee under the able leadership of Chairman ROE and Ranking Member WALZ.

Again, I am proud to serve on this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1329, the Veterans’ Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act. Passage of this bill gives our Nation’s veterans the same cost-of-living adjustment as those receiving benefits through Social Security.

These brave men and women have sacrificed so much for the freedoms and liberties we enjoy on a daily basis. As a grateful nation, we must ensure that those who put themselves in harm’s way are able to receive the benefits they have earned and deserve. Providing for our Nation’s true American heroes is not a partisan issue, but simply the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, approximately 1.6 million veterans reside in the great State of Florida, where so many veterans call home after serving in the military. As vice chairman of the House Veterans’ Affairs Committee, I am so very proud that Florida is considered one of the most veteran friendly States across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Representative MIKE BOST from Indiana, for introducing this very important piece of legislation.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 1329, I urge all of my colleagues to support our Nation’s heroes and pass the Veterans’ Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), my good friend and a member of our committee.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much for this opportunity to speak on behalf of H.R. 1329, and I salute Congressman BOST from Illinois and Congresswoman ESTY from the great State of Connecticut for their

great work in a bipartisan fashion to help our heroes.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it was our first Commander in Chief, George Washington, who said, in effect, that we can never expect our young men and women to step forward and serve our country in uniform unless and until we make sure we take care of those who have already returned from the battlefield.

Now, in the State of Maine, Mr. Speaker, we love our veterans. We have about 125,000 of our heroes in our State of Maine, more than half of whom are in the rural part of our State, the Second Congressional District of Maine, that I am honored to represent.

I think it is a great idea and about time that we make sure that we come before the American people, Republicans and Democrats together, to make sure that our veterans receive a cost-of-living adjustment—those who have been disabled—as a result of their service for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Republicans and Democrats on this committee and in this body to please support H.R. 1329. It is the right thing to do, to give a cost-of-living increase to our veterans.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1329. But as we get ready to close on the final piece of seven pieces of legislation, some that have taken years, that have included diverse groups coming together to try to find solutions, you are seeing today all seven of these bills are going to pass this House. They are going to pass with overwhelmingly, if not unanimous, bipartisan support.

I have stood on this floor and have expressed my displeasure and my discomfort when we don't work together. Today it is one of those pleasures to stand here and say this is what the American people expect, and this is the hard work that needs to be done. That kind of thing does not happen by chance. It usually takes one person standing at the middle of that in leadership to make it happen.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague, our chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), for ensuring that veterans come before politics, veterans come before partisan differences, and that veterans legislation can be done together in a bipartisan manner. So, I thank him for that and encourage support of all of these pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my good friend, Sergeant Major WALZ for his kind words.

Certainly, what we try to do on the Veterans' Affairs Committee is leave Republican and Democrat at the door of the committee room and go and do

the work of the veterans for what is best for them. It is a true pleasure and honor, if you have ever attended one of our meetings, to see that and to see the effort of all Members. And you can see here today, with seven important pieces of legislation passed, it will help improve the lives of our veterans.

I know, for me, that this time of the year—and I feel sure that my friends on the other side of the aisle feel the same way—is one of the most difficult times of the year. It is Memorial Day. And I don't think we need to forget, this coming Monday, what that means. It is for all of those who didn't make it home who protected this great country.

I know, myself, I get some guilt this time of year. I was a drafted soldier, as many of us were. I served my time in 1973 and 1974 in Korea, just south of the DMZ. Many of my friends didn't make it home from Vietnam. I still feel for them and their families.

I know every Memorial Day, when I attend a service for veterans, it is difficult for me to get through that day because I got to come home, as all of us here who are serving did. We got to raise our children and see our grandchildren be born. These men and women who died in Vietnam and other wars didn't get to do that, as young people are doing today. So I can't thank, enough, the veterans of this great Nation who serve us every day and keep us free.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support H.R. 1329, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1329, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2017, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS AGAINST TECHNOLOGICAL EXPLOITATION ACT

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2052) to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to prohibit the wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2052

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting the Rights of Individuals Against Technological Exploitation Act" or the "PRIVATE Act".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON WRONGFUL BROADCAST OR DISTRIBUTION OF INTIMATE VISUAL IMAGES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Subchapter X of chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 917 (article 117 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) the following new section (article):

"§ 917a. Art. 117a. Wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images

"(a) PROHIBITION.—Any person subject to this chapter who—

"(1) knowingly and wrongfully broadcasts or distributes an intimate visual image of a private area of another person who—

"(A) is at least 18 years of age at the time the intimate visual image was created;

"(B) is identifiable from the image itself or from information displayed in connection with the image; and

"(C) does not explicitly consent to the broadcast or distribution of the intimate visual image;

"(2) knows or reasonably should have known that the intimate visual image was made under circumstances in which the person depicted in the intimate visual image retained a reasonable expectation of privacy regarding any broadcast or distribution of the intimate visual image; and

"(3) knows or reasonably should have known that the broadcast or distribution of the intimate visual image is likely—

"(A) to cause harm, harassment, intimidation, emotional distress, or financial loss for the person depicted in the intimate visual image; or

"(B) to harm substantially the depicted person with respect to that person's health, safety, business, calling, career, financial condition, reputation, or personal relationships,

is guilty of wrongful distribution of intimate visual images and shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section (article):

"(1) BROADCAST.—The term 'broadcast' means to electronically transmit a visual image with the intent that it be viewed by a person or persons.

"(2) DISTRIBUTE.—The term 'distribute' means to deliver to the actual or constructive possession of another person, including transmission by mail or electronic means.

"(3) INTIMATE VISUAL IMAGE.—The term 'intimate visual image' means a photograph, video, film, or recording made by any means that depicts a private area of a person.

"(4) PRIVATE AREA.—The term 'private area' means the naked or underwear-clad genitalia, anus, buttocks, or female areola or nipple.

"(5) REASONABLE EXPECTATION OF PRIVACY.—The term 'reasonable expectation of privacy' refers to circumstances in which a reasonable person would believe that an intimate visual image of a private area of the person would not be broadcast or distributed to another person."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter X of chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended by inserting after the item relating to

section 917 (article 117) the following new item:

“917a. 117a. Wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2052, the Protecting the Rights of Individuals Against Technological Exploitation Act, or the PRIVATE Act. This act would amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to prohibit the wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images.

Recent revelations that nude photographs of servicemembers were nonconsensually posted to social media websites like Marines United is abhorrent. This repugnant behavior is unacceptable, and we must work to prevent this deplorable behavior from occurring again.

The Neanderthals who committed these acts are not emblematic of the vast majority of decent and honorable servicemembers who serve our Nation. However, the notion that any servicemember would think it is acceptable to upload, view, or comment on nude photos of their fellow servicemembers is a serious problem that must be fixed.

This bill will help hold perpetrators of these types of crimes accountable. It will strengthen the Uniform Code of Military Justice by establishing an enumerated, punitive article that clearly prohibits the wrongful, nonconsensual sharing of intimate visual images, even when those images were initially given with consent.

While the Uniform Code of Military Justice currently contains two general articles under which these crimes can already be prosecuted, this new provision will give commanders an additional specific tool and send a clear message to servicemembers that this behavior is unacceptable and is, in fact, a crime.

The PRIVATE Act is designed to protect our servicemen and -women and is supported by 26 different military and veterans organizations.

While there are many divisive issues facing Congress today, as a retired colonel and 26-year combat veteran of

the Air Force, I am heartened that this bill enjoys such significant bipartisan support.

I wish to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, including Ms. SPEIER for her leadership, for her co-sponsorship, and for her devotion to our servicemembers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Four years ago, I stood on the House floor and condemned the online bullying of U.S. Marine Corps servicewomen on Facebook. These web pages contained obscene and abusive pictures, and implied that women only advanced professionally by performing sexual favors.

I sent a letter to the Secretary of Defense and the Commandant of the Marine Corps asking them to take action. I got a letter back from the Commandant which said, “I share your indignation.” I didn’t want him to share my indignation. I wanted him to do something about it. Neither he nor the Department of Defense inspector general did anything.

Lack of consequences caused this cultural rot to spread further. The Marines United page, through which hundreds of Active-Duty and veteran marines viewed thousands of nonconsensually distributed intimate images, damaged the lives and the careers of more servicemembers than I can imagine. In fact, many of these servicemembers were identified by name and the bases at which they served.

Despite reports of this vile site, new versions continue to crop up and spread more destruction, unchecked by military leadership. Until now, the leadership failures that allowed this to go on for 4 years also extended to Congress. We did nothing except hold a subcommittee hearing on—wait, let me indicate what it was on—social media policy, without a single survivor brought to testify.

This is not about social media policy. This is about abhorrent behavior by servicemembers against other servicemembers.

Two months ago, a bipartisan group of Members held a hearing on this very issue, and we had victims who testified. One of those members, who was Active Duty, said that her Marine Corps drill instructor said to her and the other women during their training, “The only women that serve in the marines are sluts, lesbians . . .” or a word that starts with a B that I won’t mention on the House floor.

How destructive can that be?

Today, that ends. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle are taking a stand. Today, I am honored and proud to support H.R. 2052 with my colleague, Ms. MCSALLY.

This bill will ensure that nonconsensual pornography is made illegal by ex-

plicitly forbidding the sharing of intimate images without the consent of the subject.

Right now, the reprehensible acts of nonconsensually distributed and consensually obtained photographs is not clearly defined as illegal under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. That is why this bill is a critical step in ensuring that our female servicemembers aren’t distracted from protecting the country by having to also protect themselves against online abusers and colleagues within the services.

But let me be clear. Our work is not done. If the chain of command continues to see nonconsensual pornography as a “boys will be boys” joke instead of sexual violence, nothing will change. Such conduct must result in severe and immediate consequences for the perpetrators. The PRIVATE Act must pass, and it must be enforced.

I also want to note that the passage of the PRIVATE Act does not apply to the civilian people in our country. Although 34 States have passed laws to address nonconsensual pornography, their approaches vary widely, and some are very flawed. That is why a Federal law is needed to provide a single, clear articulation of the elements of this crime to ensure that Americans in every part of the country—civilian and military—are protected if they are subjected to this heinous abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2052. We have come a long way in 4 years since I found those vile Facebook pages. Four years from now, I hope I am standing here commending us all for stamping out the scourge of nonconsensual pornography.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2052, the Protecting the Rights of Individuals Against Technological Exploitation Act, also known as the PRIVATE Act. This act will amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to prohibit the wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images.

As technology evolves, so, too, must our judicial systems; and it is clear, especially after the Marines United scandal, that there is a gap in the UCMJ. This bill addresses that gap and gives commanders the tools they need to address this horrific crime of posting or sharing intimate images that were previously privately shared.

The bill clearly states that distributing or broadcasting intimate visual images without consent would result in punishment. This change in the UCMJ will send a strong message to any bad

actors in our military and remind them that honor, trust, and respect are paramount whether you are deployed or back home. Servicemembers will know that sharing, broadcasting, or posting intimate images are illegal and will be punished under the UCMJ.

I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona, Representative MCSALLY, for introducing this important legislation and diligently working it through the legislative process. I am also pleased to see such bipartisan support. Although the circumstances that led this bill to be written are appalling, it is heartening to see so many colleagues coming together today to make the necessary changes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2052. This amendment to the UCMJ is very necessary and very timely.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, many of us heard of the Marines United Facebook page for the first time. On this page, women marines found that their intimate photos were posted without their knowledge and without their consent. Some had no idea these photos had ever been taken.

Beneath the photos, marine members of the Facebook group wrote obscene and abusive comments about their comrades. This betrayal of marines by marines disgracefully disrespects fellow members, sows the seeds of distrust, and undermines the unit cohesion so essential to military readiness, putting our national security at risk.

Today we bring a bill to the floor to make sure military members who have broadcasted or distributed certain private images are held accountable. H.R. 2052 creates a separate article under the Uniform Code of Military Justice that specifically criminalizes the wrongful sharing of intimate photos without explicit consent to do so.

H.R. 2052 sends a clear message to all servicemembers and to our military leadership that this kind of abusive behavior will not and must not be tolerated. Members from both sides of the aisle have come together, and I thank Representatives McSally and Speier for their leadership in support of this commonsense legislation, and I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for it.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), my good friend and colleague, and the co-chair of the bipartisan Women's Caucus.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my great colleague from

California and I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their leadership on a subject of urgency.

Mr. Speaker, in the strongest terms possible, I urge support of this bipartisan legislation called the PRIVATE Act that makes it illegal for military members to share explicit photos without consent.

Our Democratic Working Women's Group recently held a bipartisan hearing regarding the Marine United Facebook page where male marines posted thousands of nude photos of female servicemembers and veterans without their consent.

At this hearing, we heard the testimony of two courageous female marines whose privacy was violated with the nonconsensual posting of intimate photographs. They described their embarrassment, their anger, and the vitriolic harassment by their marine brothers that followed, with threats of rape and violence, and stomach-sickening posts like: "We should throw female Marines into a tub of acid and rip off their eyelashes."

Mr. Speaker, I am the proud mother of a United States Marine veteran, so I can tell you, I understand firsthand the selfless sacrifice a marine makes when he or she puts on their uniform.

So I say to those warriors whose honor was violated: We stand with you today to declare that you were targets of behavior that we will not tolerate; and we will seek to punish those who offended and prevent similar conduct in the future because that conduct is not only degrading to brave patriots, it threatens the safety and security of our Nation.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), the chair of the Bipartisan Task Force to End Sexual Violence.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative MCSALLY and Representative JACKIE SPEIER for bringing us to the floor today.

I speak on behalf of H.R. 2052, the PRIVATE Act. I was deeply disturbed by the Marine United photo-sharing scandal, as were many of my colleagues, both men and women, Republican and Democrat.

Our Armed Forces are the greatest fighting forces the world has ever seen. It is unacceptable that members of the Marines sought out intimate photographs of their fellow soldiers and distributed them purposely online. Not only were the actions by the participants in the Marines United scandal morally repugnant, but they jeopardized our national security and endangered the security of both male and female marines. Women in the Armed Forces put their lives on the line every

single day to defend our country, and they should not have their safety risked by their fellow marines.

I am proud to support H.R. 2052, the PRIVATE Act, which will update the Uniform Code of Military Justice to ensure that the type of explicit image sharing we saw in the Marines United scandal is expressly prohibited.

As the cofounder, with my colleague, JACKIE SPEIER, of the Bipartisan Task Force to End Sexual Violence, I understand the persistent challenges that the culture of sexual violence poses on our society.

The conversation around sexual violence is beginning to change, thanks in no small part to Members of this Congress on both sides of the aisle. This legislation will support broader cultural reform and improve the lives of our brave servicemembers.

This is an issue that transcends politics, and I am encouraged by the bipartisan support for the PRIVATE Act. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from California (Mrs. DAVIS), the ranking member on the Democratic side of the Armed Services Committee.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for bringing this forward.

The Marines United website was a disgusting breach of trust, and I immediately called for the perpetrators to be prosecuted. I appreciate General Neller coming to Congress earlier this year, taking ownership of the problem, immediately establishing a task force, and conducting multimedia and personal engagements across the Marine Corps.

He said he would deal with this immediately and decisively, and we demand nothing less. I take him at his word, and he was clear in asking to be held accountable.

While the Navy and Marine Corps have updated policies regarding social media and established no-tolerance policies for nonconsensual pornography, these still need to apply across all the services and must be codified into law. For this reason, I support the PRIVATE Act, and I hope that we continue to work together with my colleagues to ensure that this bill becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, as the scandal unfolded, it became clear to me that, even from initial recruitment, servicemembers must be held to the highest ethical standard online, and prevented from joining the military should their behavior fail to meet that standard.

Our children live their lives online, and the laws need to be updated to reflect that. The issue of nonconsensual pornography, unfortunately, is prevalent across our society. It has no place

anywhere, but especially not in our military ranks.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. If the gentlewoman from California has no further speakers, I am prepared to close once the gentlewoman does.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and, in so doing, I also want to make the point that our commitment to making sure that our armed services have the cohesion and readiness to serve requires us to take action on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a 26-year combat veteran, I am deeply disturbed, but not surprised by the scandal.

As a former commander, I know that you need to give commanders all the tools they need to hold perpetrators accountable. This is not just about good order and discipline. This is about the military mission. This bill gives commanders an additional tool in order to address this culture and to hold people accountable for their abhorrent behavior.

I want to say that I appreciate the strong support across the aisle and our side of the aisle. This is strong, bipartisan support. I would urge all of my colleagues to support the PRIVATE Act.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MCSALLY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I want to add my support for this legislation, and I thank the gentlewoman from California and the gentlewoman from Arizona for their longstanding service.

We have been dealing with bills dealing with sexual assault in the Judiciary Committee. Having listened to the young female soldiers who were impacted by Marines United, I know that this legislation that gives the military leadership additional tools to ensure that the depiction of women and others in the United States military, against their will, on social media, will not be tolerated and will not be viewed as an honorable act under the U.S. Military Code. Giving these tools will show that you will be punished and that men and women will be respected in the United States military. I ask colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for his leadership on this issue.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2052.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1630

DHS STOP ASSET AND VEHICLE EXCESS ACT

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 366) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's vehicle fleet, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:
Senate amendments:

- (1) On page 6, line 17, insert *shall* after *heads*.
(2) On page 12, strike line 16 through page 14, and insert:

SEC. 3. INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW.

The Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall—

(1) conduct a review of the implementation of subsection (c)(4) of section 701 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341), as added by section 2 of this Act, for fiscal year 2019, which shall include analysis of the effectiveness of such subsection (c)(4) with respect to cost avoidance, savings realized, and component operations; and

(2) provide, upon request, to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives information regarding the review required under paragraph (1).

Mr. MCCAUL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BLUE CAMPAIGN AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1370) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Sec-

retary of Homeland Security to issue Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance and develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1370

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. ENHANCED DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY COORDINATION THROUGH THE BLUE CAMPAIGN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 434. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BLUE CAMPAIGN.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized in the Department a unified, anti-human trafficking campaign to be known as the 'Blue Campaign'. As part of the Blue Campaign, the Secretary shall—

"(1) issue Department-wide guidance to appropriate personnel of the Department;

"(2) develop training programs for such personnel; and

"(3) coordinate departmental efforts, including training for such personnel.

"(b) GUIDANCE AND TRAINING.—The Blue Campaign shall provide guidance and training to appropriate personnel of the Department regarding the following:

"(1) Programs for such personnel, as well as Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement entities, to help identify instances of human trafficking and potential connections to terrorist activities, including along the borders of the United States.

"(2) Systematic and routine information sharing between and among the components of the Department and the National Network of Fusion Centers regarding individuals suspected or convicted of human trafficking and patterns and practices of human trafficking and potential connections to terrorist activities, including along the borders of the United States.

"(3) Techniques to identify suspected victims of trafficking along the borders of the United States.

"(4) Techniques specifically for Transportation Security Administration personnel to—

"(A) identify suspected victims of trafficking at airport security; and

"(B) serve as a liaison and resource to aviation workers and the traveling public.

"(5) Utilizing resources to educate partners and stakeholders and increase public awareness of human trafficking, such as indicator cards, fact sheets, pamphlets, posters, brochures, and radio and television campaigns.

"(6) Leveraging partnerships with governmental, non-governmental, and private sector organizations at the State and local levels to raise public awareness of human trafficking and potential connections to terrorist activities, including along the borders of the United States.

"(7) Any other activities determined necessary by the Secretary as part of the Blue Campaign.

"(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'human trafficking' means an act or practice

described in paragraph (9) or (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)."

(b) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that, consistent with the Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance required under subsection (a) of section 434 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as added by subsection (a) of this section), information technology systems utilized within the Department to record and track information regarding individuals suspected or convicted of human trafficking (as such term is defined in such section 434) are capable of systematic and routine information sharing.

(c) OVERSIGHT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate on the status and effectiveness of the Blue Campaign.

(d) AUTHORIZATION.—For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, \$819,000 is authorized to carry out section 434 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by subsection (a) of this section.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 433 the following new item:

"Sec. 434. Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VELA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 1370, to combat human trafficking. According to the FBI, human trafficking, which includes forced labor, domestic servitude, and commercial sex trafficking, is the third largest criminal activity in the world. It is a multibillion-dollar industry that enslaves 20 million innocent victims around the world.

We need a collaborative multiagency approach to combat this criminal activity. My bill recognizes and supports the work of the Department of Homeland Security to join these partners to combat this scourge on our society. This bill authorizes a vital lifesaving campaign at the Department to prevent human trafficking.

This campaign is called the Blue Campaign. It is a Department-wide effort to conduct outreach and raise awareness of trafficking. It provides

training and materials to those in the best position to identify trafficking victims. This campaign works in collaboration with law enforcement, governmental and private organizations to identify and save those victims.

The Blue Campaign has entered into agreements to provide training, raise awareness, and combat human trafficking. Currently, it enlists the help of numerous organizations who have witnessed trafficking such as airlines, hotels, truck stops, convenient stores, and package delivery services.

The Department uses the resources and expertise of the CBP, ICE, USCIS, and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers to help with this effort. Of note, my bill adds the Transportation Security Administration to this fight by training its personnel to recognize the victims of trafficking and pull these victims out of its vicious cycle.

My bill also requires the Department to share information on patterns of trafficking and possible connections with terrorist activity, both internally and with the National Network of Fusion Centers.

In 2014, I held a field hearing in Houston, Texas, to address the issue of human trafficking in our major cities, and we heard personally from the victims their stories of sexual abuse and human trafficking. That hearing highlighted the importance of collaboration and community involvement in combating this terrible crime. This DHS campaign furthers these collaboration efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this legislation and the efforts of the Department to address human trafficking.

I thank Chairman GOODLATTE of the Judiciary Committee for his cooperation in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 5, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL T. McCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN McCAUL: I write with respect to H.R. 1370, the "Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act." As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions within H.R. 1370 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I forego any further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1370 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-

Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1370 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included your committee report and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1370.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1370, the "Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act of 2017." I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Judiciary will forego further consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of this bill at this time, the Judiciary does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Judiciary represented on the conference committee.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the report and the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. McCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1370, the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, human trafficking is a \$32 billion-per-year global industry, making it one of the most profitable forms of transnational crime with more than 20 million victims worldwide. Each year an estimated 17,500 innocent people are trafficked into the United States; almost half of those individuals are children.

Trafficking victims can be of any age, race, gender, or nationality, and are largely found in workplaces within the manufacturing, agriculture, hospitality, and domestic service industries. Since 2010, the mission of the Department of Homeland Security's Blue Campaign has been to bring DHS components together with Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies, private industry, and other nongovernmental entities to combat human trafficking.

The Blue Campaign has provided the Department with the necessary structure to uniformly train personnel in its components to identify and investigate these criminal activities. The Blue

Campaign has proven an effective mechanism through which DHS and its law enforcement partners collaborate to dismantle human trafficking networks across the country and bring perpetrators to justice.

The public awareness and outreach efforts launched through the Blue Campaign provide the general public, non-governmental organizations, and private sector entities with tools to be active partners in the Federal Government's efforts to assist victims of human trafficking and prevent others from being exploited.

Earlier this year, DHS recognized its partners in the transportation and hospitality industries for training their employees and customers about how they can help combat human trafficking by identifying the signs and reporting suspected incidents.

Over the years, the program has proven to be an important, multifaceted tool that leverages both government and private sector resources with the goal of ending the exploitation of vulnerable people. H.R. 1370 codifies the important program and emphasizes the importance of clear guidance and training for all Blue Campaign partners.

This bill also underscores the importance of timely and routine information sharing amongst DHS components to ensure unity of effort in preventing and disrupting human trafficking. As a cosponsor of H.R. 1370, I believe that it is our responsibility as Members of Congress to do whatever it takes to stop the illegal and immoral smuggling of innocent people into the United States by transnational criminal organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my House colleagues to support H.R. 1370, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman also for bringing up this important issue today.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 1370, the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act. A few years ago, law enforcement officers in South Dakota placed undercover ads on the internet, and they weren't pretending to sell illegal drugs. What they were pretending to sell was young girls.

In less than 2 days, over 100 individuals responded to that ad. Many of them were hoping to buy children for sex. Similar operations were conducted across the State in following months, and they had similar results. Many times, when folks think of human trafficking, they often picture a place far away overseas, but the fact is that it is happening right here—in our backyards many times.

Those being targeted are often children, 12 or 14 years old, sometimes even

younger. They are forced to turn tricks up to 50 times a day while their pimps work hard to get them addicted to alcohol and drugs so that they can further control them and their lives. It also deepens their dependence on their trafficker.

Last Congress, we passed significant antitrafficking legislation, which I am incredibly proud of, but there is still more that needs to be done. Time and again, South Dakota advocates tell me that awareness remains a challenge, but a challenge that we can work together to overcome. That is ultimately the purpose of this legislation that we are considering today.

Through the enhanced Blue Campaign, we can offer Americans from all walks of life the information that they need to spot trafficking in their backyards. If more people are aware of distress signals and how to respond, we can move faster towards ending human trafficking together.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1370.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing up this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this past February, in my hometown of Houston, Texas, we hosted the 51st Super Bowl. For most Americans, the Super Bowl is a fun-filled day spent with friends, family, and cheering on our favorite team. But for human traffickers, the Super Bowl has become an annual opportunity to expand their evil, criminal empire.

Studies show that big events like the Super Bowl create large upticks in the trafficking and purchasing of sex trafficking victims. In order to counteract this, the Department of Homeland Security, as a part of its Blue Campaign initiative, began preparing months in advance before the Super Bowl in Houston.

Through the Blue Campaign, the Department of Homeland Security raises public awareness, it forges antitrafficking partnerships, and brings suspected human traffickers to justice. Most importantly, it rescues victims of the sex trafficking trade.

In advance of the last Super Bowl, the Blue Campaign worked with local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies on the ground, as well as participating in several congressional briefings. One such briefing I hosted here in Washington.

Everybody working together, all different law enforcement agencies, State, local, and Federal, had a great result in what occurred in Houston. Over 750 people were arrested, and 86 victims were rescued. Many more were likely spared being forced into the trafficking industry.

Having worked closely with the Blue Campaign on this, and many other operations, I have seen firsthand the important role the Department of Homeland Security has in fighting the scourge of human trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, trafficking is second only to the drug trade in the amount of money, criminal money, it brings in. And the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act will ensure that the critically important program continues to provide safety to victims and gets some justice to the traffickers and those would-be buyers of little children.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman for this legislation.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1370 was unanimously approved by the Committee on Homeland Security earlier this year. The partnerships that DHS has established through the Blue Campaign are critical to stopping criminal activity that comes with a tragically high human cost.

By leading the charge and identifying and closing all possible avenues through which human traffickers smuggle people into the United States, DHS plays a critical role in ensuring the safety of children and other innocent people. Joint, concerted efforts that bring together law enforcement, nongovernmental entities, and private industry, and raise public awareness of this criminal activity, are important to ending the practice altogether.

We must continue to support this unity of effort in order to aid and protect victims of human trafficking, and bring those who exploit them to justice.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman McCAUL for his leadership in this effort, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1370, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1645

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me also thank my colleague, Mr. VELA, for his steadfast support of this legislation, as well as the entire Homeland Security Committee, which has worked in a very bipartisan fashion on this very important issue.

This is not a matter of politics. It is a matter of saving our children from trafficking and sex abuse. We have all heard the stories. We have heard some of those here today, but I think there is nothing more criminal, other than perhaps what ISIS did yesterday, than the exploitation of children. Of course, that is what ISIS did yesterday in killing innocent children and teenagers outside a concert hall.

The issue of human trafficking brings it to full bear: bringing children into

this country and exploiting them, selling them on the black market, and sexually abusing them for a very long time.

This bill is important and necessary. It really supports, codifies, and gives congressional backing and support to a very important program within the Department, and that is the Blue Campaign.

I also want to thank Secretary Kelly of Homeland Security for showing the leadership to come forward with this campaign to address this horrible crime against our children and those moving into adulthood.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1370, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1773, PROTECTING YOUNG VICTIMS FROM SEXUAL ABUSE ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1761, PROTECTING AGAINST CHILD EXPLOITATION ACT OF 2017; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 26, 2017, THROUGH JUNE 5, 2017

Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–152) on the resolution (H. Res. 352) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1773) to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1761) to amend title 18, United States Code, to criminalize the knowing consent of the visual depiction, or live transmission, of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from May 26, 2017, through June 5, 2017, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

VETERANS APPEALS IMPROVEMENT AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2288) to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals

of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 273]

YEAS—418

Abraham	Comer	Gosar
Adams	Comstock	Gottheimer
Aderholt	Conaway	Gowdy
Aguilar	Connolly	Granger
Allen	Conyers	Graves (GA)
Amash	Cook	Graves (LA)
Amodei	Cooper	Graves (MO)
Arrington	Correa	Green, Al
Babin	Costa	Green, Gene
Bacon	Costello (PA)	Griffith
Banks (IN)	Courtney	Grijalva
Barletta	Cramer	Grothman
Barr	Crawford	Guthrie
Barragán	Crist	Gutiérrez
Barton	Crowley	Hanabusa
Bass	Cuellar	Harper
Beatty	Culberson	Harris
Bera	Cummings	Hartzer
Bergman	Curbelo (FL)	Hastings
Beyer	Davidson	Heck
Biggs	Davis (CA)	Hensarling
Billirakis	Davis, Danny	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Higgins (LA)
Bishop (MI)	DeFazio	Higgins (NY)
Bishop (UT)	DeGette	Hill
Black	Delaney	Himes
Blackburn	DeLauro	Holding
Blum	DeBene	Hollingsworth
Blumenauer	Demings	Hoyer
Blunt Rochester	Denham	Hudson
Bonamici	Dent	Huffman
Bost	DeSantis	Hultgren
Boyle, Brendan	DeSaulnier	Hunter
F.	DesJarlais	Hurd
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Brady (TX)	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Brat	Doggett	Jayapal
Bridenstine	Donovan	Jeffries
Brooks (AL)	Doyle, Michael	Jenkins (KS)
Brooks (IN)	F.	Jenkins (WV)
Brown (MD)	Duffy	Johnson (GA)
Brownley (CA)	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (LA)
Buchanan	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (OH)
Buck	Dunn	Johnson, E. B.
Bucshon	Ellison	Jones
Budd	Emmer	Jordan
Burgess	Engel	Joyce (OH)
Bustos	Eshoo	Kaptur
Butterfield	Españat	Katko
Byrne	Estes (KS)	Keating
Calvert	Esty (CT)	Kelly (IL)
Capuano	Evans	Kelly (MS)
Carbajal	Farenthold	Kelly (PA)
Cárdenas	Faso	Kennedy
Carson (IN)	Ferguson	Khanna
Carter (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Kihuen
Carter (TX)	Fleischmann	Kildee
Cartwright	Flores	Kilmer
Castor (FL)	Fortenberry	Kind
Castro (TX)	Foster	King (IA)
Chabot	Fox	King (NY)
Chaffetz	Frankel (FL)	Kinzie
Cheney	Franks (AZ)	Knight
Chu, Judy	Frelinghuysen	Krishnamoorthi
Cicilline	Gabbard	Kuster (NH)
Clark (MA)	Gaetz	Kustoff (TN)
Clarke (NY)	Gallagher	Labrador
Clay	Gallo	LaHood
Clyburn	Garamendi	LaMalfa
Coffman	Garrett	Lamborn
Cohen	Gibbs	Lance
Cole	Gohmert	Langevin
Collins (GA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Larsen (WA)
Collins (NY)	Goodlatte	Larson (CT)

Latta	Pallone	Sherman
Lawrence	Palmer	Shimkus
Lawson (FL)	Panetta	Shuster
Lee	Pascarella	Simpson
Levin	Paulsen	Sinema
Lewis (GA)	Payne	Sires
Lewis (MN)	Pearce	Slaughter
Lipinski	Pelosi	Smith (MO)
LoBiondo	Perlmutter	Smith (NE)
Loebach	Perry	Smith (NJ)
Lofgren	Peters	Smith (TX)
Long	Peterson	Smith (WA)
Loudermilk	Pingree	Smucker
Love	Pittenger	Soto
Lowenthal	Pocan	Speier
Lowe	Poe (TX)	Stefanik
Lucas	Poliquin	Stewart
Luetkemeyer	Polis	Stivers
Lujan Grisham,	Posey	Suzuki
M.	Price (NC)	Takano
Luján, Ben Ray	Quigley	Taylor
Lynch	Raskin	Tenney
MacArthur	Ratcliffe	Thompson (CA)
Maloney,	Reed	Thompson (MS)
Carolyn B.	Reichert	Thompson (PA)
Maloney, Sean	Renacci	Thornberry
Marchant	Rice (SC)	Tipton
Marino	Richmond	Titus
Marshall	Roby	Tonko
Massie	Roe (TN)	Torres
Mast	Rogers (AL)	Trott
Matsui	Rogers (KY)	Tsongas
McCarthy	Rohrabacher	Turner
McCaul	Rokita	Upton
McClintock	Rooney, Francis	Valadao
McCollum	Rooney, Thomas	Vargas
McEachin	J.	Veasey
McGovern	Ros-Lehtinen	Vela
McHenry	Rosen	Velázquez
McKinley	Roskam	Visclosky
McMorris	Ross	Wagner
Rodgers	Rothfus	Walberg
McNerney	Rouzer	Walsh
McSally	Roybal-Allard	Walden
Meadows	Royce (CA)	Walker
Meehan	Ruiz	Walorski
Meeks	Ruppersberger	Walters, Mimi
Meng	Rush	Walz
Messer	Russell	Waters, Maxine
Mitchell	Rutherford	Watson Coleman
Moolenaar	Ryan (OH)	Weber (TX)
Mooney (WV)	Sánchez	Webster (FL)
Moore	Sanford	Welch
Moulton	Sarbanes	Wenstrup
Mullin	Scalise	Westerman
Murphy (FL)	Schakowsky	Williams
Murphy (PA)	Schiff	Wilson (FL)
Nadler	Schneider	Wilson (SC)
Napolitano	Schraeder	Wittman
Neal	Schweikert	Womack
Noem	Scott (VA)	Woodall
Nolan	Scott, Austin	Yarmuth
Norcross	Scott, David	Yoder
Nunes	Sensenbrenner	Yoho
O'Halleran	Serrano	Young (AK)
O'Rourke	Sessions	Young (IA)
Olson	Sewell (AL)	Zeldin
Palazzo	Shea-Porter	

NOT VOTING—12

Cleaver	Johnson, Sam	Tiberi
Deutch	Lieu, Ted	Wasserman
Fudge	Newhouse	Schultz
Hice, Jody B.	Rice (NY)	
Huizenga	Swalwell (CA)	

□ 1710

Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 13

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor of H.J. Res. 13.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BERGMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately release his tax return information to Congress and the American people.

Whereas, in the United States' system of checks and balances, Congress has a responsibility to hold the executive branch of government to a fair and equal standard of transparency ensuring the public interest is placed first;

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed their tax return information to the public;

Whereas, tax returns provide an important baseline of reasonable information including whether the President paid taxes, ownership interests, charitable donations made, and whether tax deductions have been exploited;

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns could help those investigating Russian influence in the 2016 election understand the President's financial ties to the Russian Federation and Russian citizens, including debts owed and whether he shares any partnership interests, equity interests, joint ventures, licensing agreements with Russia or Russians;

Whereas, the President recently fired Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, under whose leadership the FBI was investigating whether the Trump campaign colluded with Russia to influence the 2016 election;

Whereas, President Trump reportedly stated to Russian officials during a White House meeting that he fired Director Comey to ease pressure on the ongoing investigation of Russia's influence in the 2016 election;

Whereas, Senate Russia investigators have requested information from the Treasury Department's criminal investigation division, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, or FinCEN, which handles cases of money laundering, for information related to President Trump, his top officials, and campaign aides. FinCEN has been investigating allegations of foreign money-laundering through purchases of U.S. real estate;

Whereas, the President's tax returns would show us whether he has foreign bank accounts and how much profit he receives from his ownership in myriad partnerships;

Whereas, Donald Trump, Jr., said The Trump Organization saw money "pouring in from Russia" and that "Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets";

Whereas, the White House will not confirm whether the President has filed a 2016 tax return;

Whereas, Congress gave itself the authority to review an individual's tax returns to investigate and reveal possible conflicts of interest of executive branch officials involved dating back to the Teapot Dome scandal;

Whereas, it has been reported that federal prosecutors have issued grand jury subpoenas to associates of former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn seeking business records as part of the ongoing probe into Russian involvement in the 2016 election;

Whereas, according to his 2016 candidate filing with the Federal Election Commission, the President has 564 financial positions in companies located in the United States and around the world;

Whereas, against the advice of ethics attorneys and the Office of Government Ethics, the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his businesses and can still withdraw funds at any time from the trust of which he is the sole beneficiary;

Whereas, the Emoluments Clause was included in the U.S. Constitution for the express purpose of preventing federal officials from accepting any "present, Emolument, Office, or Title . . . from any King, Prince, or foreign state";

Whereas, the Chairmen of the Ways and Means Committee, Joint Committee on Taxation and Senate Finance Committee have the authority to request the President's tax returns under section 6103 of the tax code;

Whereas, the Joint Committee on Taxation reviewed the tax returns of President Richard Nixon in 1974 and made the information public;

Whereas, the Ways and Means Committee used IRC 6103 authority in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas, Director Comey has testified that tax returns are a common tool in investigations because they can show income and motives;

Whereas, the American people have the right to know whether or not their President is operating under conflicts of interest related to international affairs, tax reform, government contracts, or otherwise;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the House of Representatives shall, one, immediately request the tax return information of Donald J. Trump

for tax years 2006 through 2015 for review in closed executive session by the Committee on Ways and Means, as provided under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code and vote to report the information therein to the full House of Representatives;

Two, support transparency in government and the longstanding tradition of Presidents and candidates disclosing their tax returns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ) will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, does the Chair have a designated time for the debate on the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker will inform the gentlewoman of the time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken at a later time.

PUT TRAFFICKING VICTIMS FIRST ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2473) to ensure compliance with the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, to make strides toward eradicating human trafficking, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2473

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Put Trafficking Victims First Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REPORT ON SAFE HARBOR LAWS.

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Office for Victims of Crime, shall issue a report to be

posted on a publicly available website that includes—

(1) the impact of State safe harbor laws and associated services on the re-victimization of victims of trafficking (as such term is defined in section 103(15) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(15))), the recovery of victims, victim outcomes, and prosecutions of traffickers; and

(2) best practices and recommendations on the development and implementation of effective State safe harbor laws that promote full recovery of victims of trafficking and do not interfere with prosecutions of traffickers.

SEC. 3. TRAINING FOR PROSECUTIONS OF TRAFFICKERS AND SUPPORT FOR STATE SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 107(b)(2)(B)(ii) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(2)(B)(ii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(ii) 5 percent for training and technical assistance, to be provided in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, including with respect to—

“(I) increasing capacity and expertise on security for and protection of service providers from intimidation or retaliation for their activities;

“(II) investigating, prosecuting, and preventing human trafficking through a trauma-informed and victim-centered approach that provides services and protections for victims of trafficking;

“(III) facilitating the provision of evidence-based, trauma-informed care and mental health services to victims of trafficking;

“(IV) ensuring that all victims of trafficking, including United States citizens, lawful permanent residents, and foreign nationals, are eligible for services;

“(V) ensuring that law enforcement officers and prosecutors make every attempt to determine whether an individual’s participation in human trafficking is free from force, fraud, or coercion of any means before arresting them for, or charging them with, an offense;

“(VI) effectively prosecuting traffickers and individuals who patronize or solicit children for sex, and facilitating access for child victims of trafficking to the same type of court procedures and legal protections accessible to child victims of sexual assault, rape, child sexual abuse, or incest, and clarifying the right of child victims of trafficking to not be treated as criminals as a result of their victimization; and

“(VII) encouraging States to identify the locations of victims of trafficking and serve those victims, including through efforts that utilize internet outreach, through methods informed by survivors of human trafficking, and by offering help and services that are responsive to victims’ needs in their communities.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2017.

SEC. 4. WORKING TO DEVELOP METHODOLOGIES TO ASSESS PREVALENCE OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

(a) WORKING GROUP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Institute of Justice, in consultation with the Director of the Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center, shall establish an expert working group, which shall include survivors of human trafficking, experts on sex and labor trafficking, representatives from organizations col-

lecting data on human trafficking, and law enforcement officers. The working group shall, utilizing, to the extent practicable, existing efforts of agencies, task forces, States, cities, research institutions, and organizations—

(A) identify the methodological and practical barriers hampering data collection on sex and labor trafficking;

(B) identify the information that should be collected, and how that information should be collected; and

(C) recommend practices that could be standardized as replicable best practices to promote better data comparison, aggregation, and analysis.

(2) PILOT TESTING.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall implement a series of pilot studies to test promising methodologies studied under paragraph (1).

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Institute of Justice, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of the Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center, shall submit to Congress a report, which includes—

(A) the efforts made in developing robust, comprehensive methodologies to estimate the prevalence of human trafficking at the national and regional levels;

(B) best practices for determining the trends of human trafficking in the United States;

(C) evaluations of the effectiveness of current policies and procedures to address the needs of victims of trafficking, including appropriate housing and services from trained trauma-informed care service providers; and

(D) an analysis of the varying characteristics of victims of trafficking in different regions, including age, gender, race or ethnicity, involvement in the child welfare system, involvement in the juvenile or criminal justice system, the number of foster care placements, the number of congregate care placements, and whether an individual is a victim of sex trafficking or labor trafficking, and recommendations for how to address the unique vulnerabilities of different victims.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF REPORT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be made publicly available on the website of the Department of Justice.

(3) INPUT FROM RELEVANT PARTIES.—In developing the report under paragraph (1), the Director shall seek input from the United States Advisory Council on Human Trafficking, victims of trafficking, human trafficking survivor advocates, service providers for victims of sex and labor trafficking, and the President’s Interagency Task Force on Human Trafficking.

(c) SURVEY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Institute of Justice, in coordination with Federal, State, local, and tribal governments, and private organizations, including victim service providers and expert researchers, shall develop and execute a survey of survivors seeking and receiving services through a model agreed upon by service providers for victims of trafficking, government entities, and research experts to better understand where and how victims of trafficking are accessing services, how they are referred to services, including referrals by first responders, how assessment tools work to identify victims of trafficking,

and to help estimate the prevalence of human trafficking and victim identification in the United States. Survey results shall be made publicly available on the website of the Department of Justice.

(d) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—No additional funds are authorized to carry out this section.

SEC. 5. REPORT ON PROSECUTORS SEEKING MANDATORY RESTITUTION IN TRAFFICKING CASES.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall submit to Congress a report on efforts to increase mandatory restitution orders and use of asset forfeiture to provide restitution to victims of trafficking that shall be posted on a publicly available website, which shall include the following:

(1) Information on the Department of Justice’s training programs on mandatory restitution and the use of asset forfeiture to provide restitution to victims of trafficking, and recommendations of necessary additional training to ensure mandatory restitution is ordered in all relevant human trafficking cases.

(2) An assessment of obstacles that continue to prevent Federal prosecutors and Federal courts from ordering restitution.

(3) An assessment of whether the asset forfeiture provisions in the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 and the amendments made by that Act have helped increase requests to transfer forfeited proceeds for restitution, including how many requests have been made and how many of those requests have been approved, and whether United States Attorneys’ offices are properly informed about requesting transfers.

(4) An assessment of how establishing trauma-informed, victim-centered investigative and prosecutorial procedures can help improve mandatory restitution orders, including by encouraging victims of trafficking to cooperate in criminal cases, equipping victims of trafficking with proper assistance during criminal proceedings, and helping victims of trafficking secure mandatory restitution.

(5) The annual number and percentage of Federal cases related to human trafficking, separating sex trafficking and labor trafficking, during the period beginning on June 1, 2015, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act, in which restitution was ordered, and the amount of restitution ordered in each case.

(6) Data on the participation and non-participation of victims of trafficking in criminal proceedings, data on the participation and nonparticipation of victims of trafficking in witness protection programs and services, and recommendations for encouraging the participation of victims of trafficking in such proceedings.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS ENCOURAGING STATES TO ADOPT PROTECTIONS FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

Congress recognizes and applauds the State legislative bodies that have taken tremendous steps to adopt protections and services for victims of trafficking. Congress encourages States to do the following:

(1) Uphold the basic rights and dignity of human trafficking survivors.

(2) Adopt a survivor-centered approach to addressing human trafficking that ensures the safety, confidentiality, and well-being of victims of trafficking, while recognizing symptoms of trauma and coping mechanisms that may impact victims’ interactions with

law enforcement, the justice system, and service providers.

(3) Implement screening mechanisms for all children entering child welfare services, the juvenile justice system, or the criminal justice system to identify child victims of trafficking and connect them with appropriate services, including appropriate housing and services from trained trauma-informed care service providers, and to try to identify foreign nationals who may be victims of trafficking.

(4) Ensure that child victims of trafficking are provided with a range of protections, including access to child welfare services, trauma-informed programming, and the same legal rights afforded to other children who experience sexual abuse, rape, or incest, including ensuring that—

(A) criminals who exploit child victims of sex trafficking, including offenders who purchase, solicit, or obtain a child for purposes of engaging in a commercial sex act, face serious penalties and sentences under sex trafficking laws, and are not given lesser sentences; and

(B) child victims of trafficking are never referred to as “child prostitutes” or “underage sex workers” in law or official documents and proceedings.

(5) Develop a 24-hour emergency response plan to provide victims trafficking with immediate protection and support when they are first identified, which may include physically moving victims of trafficking to a place of safety, attending to the immediate medical and emotional needs of survivors, assessing whether survivors are under risk for harm, retaliation, or intimidation, and directly connecting survivors with victim advocates, housing, and service providers.

(6) Adopt protections for victims of trafficking that include the right—

(A) to be treated as a victim of crime and afforded justice, respect, and dignity;

(B) to protection if the victim’s safety is at risk or if there is danger of harm, retaliation, or recapture by the trafficker;

(C) to comprehensive trauma-informed, long-term, culturally competent care and healing services oriented toward emotional, psychological, and family healing;

(D) to evidence-based screening and assessment tools, treatment plans, and therapy to address traumatic stress and associated mental health symptoms;

(E) to safe and effective emergency and long-term housing; education, vocational, and job assistance and training; mentoring programs; language assistance; drug and substance abuse services; and legal services;

(F) for child sex trafficking victims to be treated as children in need of child protective services and to be served through the child welfare system, where appropriate, in place of the juvenile justice system;

(G) for all victims of trafficking, including United States citizens, lawful permanent residents, and foreign nationals, to be eligible for services;

(H) to have convictions and adjudications related to prostitution and nonviolent offenses vacated and such records cleared and expunged if offenses were committed as a direct result of the victim being trafficked, and protection for foreign nationals from being removed, being determined to be inadmissible, or losing any immigration benefit because of such conviction or arrests;

(I) to the same type of court procedures and legal protections accessible to victims of sexual assault, rape, child sexual abuse, or incest, including the right to not be treated as a criminal; and

(J) to retain all rights regardless of whether the crime has been reported to law enforcement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 2473, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2473, the Put Trafficking Victims First Act of 2017, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Human trafficking has plagued communities and neighborhoods across America. Victims have endured horrific trauma, violence, and reoccurring abuse. As a result, there is a tremendous need for expanded victim services, improved data on the prevalence and trends of human trafficking, and effective mechanisms to identify and rescue trafficking victims.

H.R. 2473 takes reasonable steps to increase victim services while improving upon the tools already available to combat human trafficking. The bill directs the Attorney General to provide a report on the effectiveness of State safe harbor laws to ensure these laws are based upon a survivor-centered approach.

In addition to the report, the bill instructs States to recognize coping mechanisms and the symptoms of trauma as local law enforcement interacts with victims of human trafficking.

Furthermore, the legislation provides for increased training and technical assistance for State and Federal agencies, prosecutors, and law enforcement on how to take a victim-centered approach to preventing human trafficking. This provision promotes evidence-based training in order to improve the physical and mental health services provided to victims.

The bill’s focus on supporting victims continues as H.R. 2473 instructs the National Institute of Justice to establish detailed methodologies to review the modern trends and detail the prevalence of human trafficking throughout the United States. The survey will not only assess how victims of trafficking are accessing services, but, in addition, help estimate the prevalence of human trafficking in the United States.

Moreover, H.R. 2473 will provide assistance to trafficking victims seeking

restitution, many of whom still face many obstacles in Federal court. The bill directs the Attorney General to report on efforts to increase mandatory restitution for victims by providing Congress with data involving the number of Federal cases related to human trafficking in which restitution was ordered, as well as the participation rate of victims in trafficking criminal proceedings.

Finally, the bill expresses the sense of Congress that States should implement trauma-informed, victim-centered care for all trafficking victims.

Mr. Speaker, Congress’ intent is clear: Protecting victims from the heinous crime of human trafficking is of utmost concern. I commend the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for introducing this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,

Washington, DC, May 23, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to H.R. 2473, Put Trafficking Victims First Act of 2017. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 2473 on those matters within my committee’s jurisdiction and agreeing to make improvements to the legislation to address concerns.

The Committee on Education and the Workforce will not delay further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my committee’s jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the committee report and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA FOXX,
Chairwoman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 23, 2017.

Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Chair, Committee on Education & the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN FOXX: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on the Judiciary and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2473, the “Enforcing Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act,” so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in

the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 2473 in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2473, the Put Trafficking Victims First Act of 2017.

I congratulate the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) for the introduction of this legislation.

This bill is intended to improve the implementation of the Justice for Victims Trafficking Act of 2015. The 2015 act expanded the Federal response to trafficking concerning services and benefits for victims, criminal justice, domestic sex trafficking of children, and interagency coordination and training.

I support H.R. 2473 for several reasons. To begin with, this measure will strengthen the effectiveness of the 2015 act in various ways. For example, H.R. 2473 requires that training be provided for prosecutions of traffickers. When children fall prey to the sex trade and then are treated as criminals rather than victims, their injuries are compounded.

We had the first human trafficking hearing of any committee in Houston, Texas, just a few years ago under the auspices of the Homeland Security Committee. Our committee determined this very point: that children fall prey and then become victims of the criminal justice system.

That is not the way to deal with our children who are victims, innocent children who have been turned into human traffic products by the heinous traffickers. As such, this training is critical to ensure that human trafficking victims are treated as victims and afforded justice, respect, and dignity.

Second, H.R. 2473 establishes a working group to develop best practices or best methods to assess the prevalence of human trafficking. We know that there is a growing epidemic of abhorrent practices of sex trafficking, and we must consider all methods to help law enforcement stop these crimes.

The working group will identify barriers that hamper human trafficking data collection and identify what information should be collected, as well as ascertain current practices being used by different agencies and organizations that can be standardized into best practices. As a result, H.R. 2473 will

help ensure the most effective prevention practices are standardized so that perpetrators of sex trafficking are ultimately brought to justice.

Lastly, the legislation encourages States to adopt protections for sex trafficking victims. These victims are often very afraid to seek help, particularly from law enforcement because of the risk that they will be treated as criminals again rather than victims. H.R. 2473 recognizes the critical fact that children involved in sex trafficking are victims and not criminals. They absolutely should not be treated as criminals.

In acknowledgement of this fact, the bill identifies a broad range of important initiatives that States should undertake that would provide meaningful assistance to these victims: upholding basic rights, facilitating ways to identify child trafficking, providing emergency long-term housing. Each of these initiatives should help ensure that these victims are not revictimized and help enable them to be guided back to a normalized life.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I am pleased to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for his leadership on this area of human trafficking, along with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), my good friend, for all of her support on this human trafficking issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present the Put Trafficking Victims First Act to the House of Representatives. I am thrilled to have the opportunity to address the concerns of victims of human trafficking across our country.

Too often, victims of trafficking are overlooked and underserved. This must stop. America needs to afford trafficking victims the same justice, protections, and dignity that other victims of crime receive.

In my home State of Missouri, I have met with countless survivors, along with survivors across this country, and I have listened to their painful stories. They need help to rebuild their lives, and that is exactly what my bill will do.

□ 1730

One important place to start is in the courtroom, where we need victim-centered practices oriented toward justice and recovery. For example, victims technically have access to mandatory restitution in Federal courts, but the sad reality is that, according to one estimate, sex trafficking victims get restitution in only 14 percent of Federal

sex trafficking cases. This, Mr. Speaker, is unacceptable. My bill will direct the Attorney General to make mandatory restitution mandatory and implement victim-friendly procedures in Federal criminal cases.

Another big problem is that we just don't have good data on how to identify and rescue victims and put them on a path toward success. We don't really know where to find victims, what portions may be coming from foster care, or what their age, ethnicity, or other characteristics are. We can't help them if we can't find them. So we desperately need good data and reporting in order to improve victim outreach.

To answer this need, my bill establishes a national working group to develop robust methodologies to determine the prevalence and trends of tracking and evaluating how to best identify victims and address their needs. My bill will establish a national survey of survivors so we can better understand how victims are accessing help.

Yet another problem is that we are failing to provide trauma-informed care to victims, care that would help victims recover and cooperate with criminal investigations so we can put pimps and buyers behind bars. Lack of help for victims in the justice system can lead to revictimization, or even result in victims being criminalized for offenses they were forced to commit.

That is why we will train agencies, law enforcement, and prosecutors across the country to implement victim-centered approaches to investigating and preventing trafficking. We encourage law enforcement and prosecutors to make every attempt to determine whether an individual's participation in trafficking is, in fact, free from fraud, force, or coercion before arresting or charging them.

Finally, victims of trafficking are mostly served at the State level, so it is critical that States improve how they respond to victims. My bill encourages States to improve outreach, screen children entering child welfare services and the justice system, screen foreign nationals who may be labor trafficked, create safe harbor laws, and develop emergency response plans.

Mr. Speaker, together we can get victims of trafficking out of dangerous and abusive situations and create better, more accessible trauma-informed services. I urge my colleagues to put trafficking victims first and to support this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), the original cosponsor of this legislation and one of the champions of protecting children and a leader of the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2473, the Put Trafficking

Victims First Act of 2017. I thank Ranking Member JACKSON LEE, Chairman GOODLATTE, and also Representative ANN WAGNER of Missouri for her leadership in combating trafficking in America. The importance of a bipartisan approach cannot be overstated or diminished.

Over the years, we have made tremendous progress, but the work is far from over. The Put Trafficking Victims First Act is a great first step forward in addressing the perilous deficiencies in sex trafficking policies and services in America.

As an original cosponsor of this bill, I am grateful for the inclusion of my amendments that serve to further support and strengthen this important legislation by providing necessary language and focus on young victims in the child welfare system.

In drafting legislation that calls for data collection assessments to help identify and implement effective and responsive models of justice and relief services, we must always be cognizant of the need to draw awareness and find solutions to eradicate the devastating epidemic of young children who are in the U.S. child welfare system from becoming victims of sex trafficking.

In particular, it is imperative that we better identify and screen the characteristics of children and youth involved in the child welfare and justice systems and that we provide greater access to appropriate housing and services from trained trauma-informed care service providers. Far too often, we hear stories about victims who cannot access housing, shelter, or mental healthcare and are unable to expunge or seal their criminal records and are treated like criminals rather than victims.

As the cofounder of the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth, I am particularly concerned about what we are doing to combat the devastating epidemic of young girls in the foster care system falling prey to child exploitation and sex trafficking. I hear horrific stories of foster girls who have been trafficked far too often, and I hear that the average age of a girl being involved in trafficking is 12 years old.

Mr. Speaker, this week we have over 100 youth here from 98 different congressional districts who will be shadowing their Members of Congress tomorrow. We met with the youth yesterday, and a number of them stepped forward and talked about being involved in the trafficking system and how they fell through the cracks in child welfare.

It is important that we remember that the purpose of the child welfare system is to protect children who are abused or neglected. When we take custody of these children, then we—meaning the local, State, or Federal Government—in effect become their parents. So if your own child showed up missing

and you don't do anything about it, then obviously you are considered responsible. This is exactly what is happening with child sex trafficking in the United States.

H.R. 2473 further encourages States to implement screening mechanisms for all children entering the child welfare system and criminal and juvenile justice systems to better identify child trafficking and connect them with appropriate services. I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2473.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for the time and also his work on this issue of human sex trafficking in the United States. I support this legislation.

I also compliment Congresswoman WAGNER, Congresswoman BASS, Congresswoman MALONEY, and Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE and other women. I mention that because when we presented the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act 2 years ago and worked on that massive legislation that is excellent legislation, I am convinced that it was the women in the United States House of Representatives who got it done. They made sure that this legislation passed, and then they trotted down the hallway to the Senate and—I will use the word—“encouraged” our Senators to take the bill up, and it passed there, and President Obama did sign the legislation. I am convinced there is nothing more powerful than a woman who has made up her mind, and the women in this House made up their mind about human sex trafficking. I just wanted to point that out.

This legislation is important. There are many stories. I am going to talk about a 9-year-old girl who lived not far from where we are today here in the United States Capitol. When Ashley's mother died, she was left alone. Like any lost and lonely child, she sought the comfort that she needed of love and safety. A woman came in to Ashley's life, offering her the care that Ashley was looking for as a 9-year-old: comfort and love. Ashley felt like she was safe for the first time since she had lost her mother. She was an orphan in Washington, D.C. Little did she know that the woman who was being nice to her was faking it all because she was grooming Ashley to be a sex slave here in Washington.

You see, traffickers exploit the vulnerabilities of victims, destroying their self-worth and their hope for a better life. In some cases, traffickers steal the soul of young children. They have no hope and they have no self-worth.

That happened to Ashley, this 9-year-old girl. She was trafficked on the streets of Washington, D.C., and online

for 5 years. At 16, a peace officer here in Washington, D.C., arrested her for prostitution. She was brought before a judge, and the judge recognized that she was not a criminal, she was not guilty of prostitution. Children cannot commit the crime of prostitution. He recognized her plight and he ordered her into a treatment program to help her recover from being a trafficking victim. It is my opinion that that judge saved Ashley's life.

As was mentioned here on the House floor by Congresswoman BASS, the average age of a trafficking victim here in the United States of America is between 12 and 13. That means some girls are younger, like Ashley. She was 9. What a statistic. And, yes, it is mostly young minor females. Boys are trafficked. Adult females are trafficked as well, but the scourge is the biggest when it is our children.

Like the laws of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, they have increased judge and prosecutor training, giving them tools to deal with the scourge of human trafficking. It is nothing more than modern sex slavery. That is what human trafficking is.

Congresswoman WAGNER's Put Trafficking Victims First Act continues to improve the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act and improve the process by encouraging more training and a focus on victim-centered approaches in the courtroom. I was a judge for 22 years in Houston. We had none of this legislation to help rescue and restore victims of trafficking, and now we do.

We should remember that in our country we treat trafficking victims, like Ashley, like victims and make survivors out of them. Gone are the days that we are going to treat them like criminals. They are not criminals. They are victims of crime. We must stop the sale of children on the marketplace of sex slavery. This legislation helps do that. Victims like Ashley deserve treatment and care, and I support the work that has been done in the Put Trafficking Victims First Act, and I support the fact that it will help victims.

As co-chair of the Victims' Rights Caucus, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), we understand the importance of victims and we understand the importance of this legislation. No more, Mr. Speaker. Not in our city, not in our States, and not in our country.

And that is just the way it is.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

What an appropriate time so that I can add my appreciation to the chairman and the ranking member, Mr. CONYERS, the ranking member of the subcommittee that I am on, and to the chairman of the subcommittee. We have enjoyed working together on this legislation. To the cosponsors of this

legislation, Mrs. WAGNER and Ms. BASS. And then to the potent statement of my friend and fellow Texan, Congressman TED POE, who modestly indicated that we, as women, helped drive this, frankly, he beat us to the finish line riding his horse, but I want to thank him very much for his great leadership and interest in this very important area.

□ 1745

This bill is a wonderful complement to the igniting of understanding about the vileness of human trafficking.

I think it is important to take note that the Homeland Security Department has trained airline stewards to recognize human trafficking victims on airplanes. Many of them are children, camouflaged as an adult and their special child—niece or nephew—traveling together.

This legislation is all about pointing out, finding, saving the victims, making sure they get treatment, and making sure that human trafficking is identified.

So I am also pleased that this measure, as amended, requires a report on State safe harbor laws. As we all know, safe harbors play a critical role in preventing youth, forced into the sex trade, from being revictimized again and stigmatized a second time by the criminal justice system, almost similar to the little girl who was looking for love. Instead, she got victimized and turned into a human trafficking product.

H.R. 2473 also fosters better collaboration among the Federal, State, and local law enforcement in the fight against sex trafficking and encourages States to adopt protections for trafficking victims by providing rehabilitation and recovery services for victims of human trafficking.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this measure and, as well, to be reminded of all those children who will be helped and saved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this fine legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2473, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Attorney General to study issues relating to human trafficking, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING MICHAEL WELGE

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of a lifelong resident of my hometown of Taylorville, Illinois, my good friend, Michael Welge. Mike was a veteran, public servant, devoted husband to his wife, Judy, father, grandfather, and, again, my friend.

Mike passed away on May 4, but he left a long legacy of dedication to his family, his country, and his community. As an Army veteran who served his country, Mike continued his service to military members as the commander of American Legion Post 73.

Mike worked at Peabody Mine No. 10 for years before beginning a 22-year career at the Illinois Department of Corrections. Mike served as a member of the Taylorville Planning and Zoning Committee for 25 years and was a member of many groups like the Taylorville FFA Association, the American Farm Heritage Museum in Greenville, ABATE, and Moose Lodge 1516.

Mike is survived by his wife, Judy, son, grandson, and brother. He will be truly missed by all who knew him, and I consider myself blessed to have known Mike Welge as a friend.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S BUDGET PROPOSAL

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, budgets are about values. And President Trump's budget breaks his promises to the American people. His 2018 budget is a disgrace.

The plan cuts people's access to basic necessities and retards decent standards of living. The American people want to create jobs, raise wages, invest in education, protect their pensions, and give people a chance at a better future.

What does the Trump budget do for the heartland that voted for him? Great Lakes clean up? Zeroed out. Social Security Disability insurance? Slashed. Medicaid? Slashed. Public education? Slashed.

We have seen this supply side economic shell game before. It ends with a massive tax cut for millionaires and billionaires, while leaving Americans living on the brink paycheck to paycheck, leaving them behind.

Let's recap. The Trump budget hurts working families, it weakens Social Security and Medicaid, it hurts students seeking to better themselves, it hurts seniors trying to pay for their medicine and insurance and who depend on programs like Meals on Wheels.

I would encourage every heartland family with an elderly parent, an in-

debted graduate, or a trusting toddler to look at this budget and match it against the promises they heard versus what is being delivered. What a shame for our country.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of millions of people worldwide, whose lives have been irreparably harmed by the scourge of human trafficking.

Tragically, human trafficking is a \$32 billion industry. This horrific practice is often difficult to detect, yet there are nearly 21 million victims of human trafficking throughout the world each year. It is estimated that 55 percent of these victims are women and young girls.

Sadly, most incidents of human trafficking go unreported, while the victims suffer in silent pain. It is for these reasons that we must raise awareness of this terrible practice and work to combat the growing threat against these vulnerable people.

As a member of the State assembly, I championed bipartisan measures to combat this modern-day form of slavery, including the Trafficking Victims Protection and Justice Act.

Yesterday, to continue this fight, I worked alongside my colleagues in the House to pass bipartisan measures to eliminate the scourge on humanity at the Federal level, and also today.

Millions of men, women, and children are suffering at the hands of human traffickers and sex abusers. Thus, it is our duty to hold those who commit these vile acts accountable and to ensure justice for all.

MEMORIAL DAY

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this Monday, America honors its war dead. We call it Memorial Day.

Many Americans do not realize that there are 25 United States cemeteries overseas for America's war dead. The one in Luxembourg is one that I have visited and I find quite unique.

During World War II, in 1944, the Germans crushed through the American lines in a surprise attack. It was called the Battle of the Bulge. My 92-year-old father fought in that battle when he was 18.

The German advance was eventually halted. One reason was because General George Patton and his army helped halt the attack by quickly advancing through and saving Luxembourg.

After the war, the nation of Luxembourg agreed to a memorial there. The

memorial is unique because the cemetery is a burial place for mostly Americans who were killed in the Battle of the Bulge. There are 5,076 Americans buried there—22 sets of brothers. And the average age of the soldier buried in Luxembourg is 19.

This Memorial Day, let us remember all who have served and have given their lives and are buried all over the world, because, Mr. Speaker, the worst casualty of war is to be forgotten.

And that is just the way it is.

REDUCING IMPACT ON DISEASE CONTROL

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 953, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act, which eliminates the need to apply for additional permits for using pesticides already approved for widespread use under current law.

The permitting process places an unnecessary compliance burden on farmers who simply want to protect their crops using already available pesticides that have been determined to have minimal or no environmental impact in their original testing process.

But of greater concern is the impact on disease control. This bureaucratic red tape can have the severe unintended consequence of raising the difficulty for local mosquito control districts, and others, and increase the likelihood that mosquito-transmitted diseases can spread.

The Zika virus, which reached epidemic levels last year, remains a serious threat in the United States, with 119 cases still in place and over 400 cases in U.S. territories. We are not out of the woods yet.

This duplicative process hamstringing health officials and agencies who are responsible for suppressing these viruses and maintaining public safety.

This legislation provides critical protections of our Nation's food supply, as well as increasing our ability to combat public health crises, such as the Zika virus.

H.R. 953 passed the House last year with bipartisan support, and I encourage my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to do so once again.

RECOGNIZING BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, tonight, Members of Congress who are Eagle Scouts are taking to the floor of the House of Representatives to say thank you not only to the Boy Scouts of America but to recognize and to highlight our opportunity while in Boy Scouts, and now, as Members of Congress, to talk about how important the Boy Scouts of America is to the youth, the young men and young women of this country, and, also, to highlight the leadership that takes place every single day in this country: men and women who volunteer their time to make sure that the Boy Scouts of America are prepared and ready to meet not only the times that we live in but the advances of young people and the challenges that they have.

Tonight, as an Eagle Scout of the Eagle class of 1970, it is my opportunity to introduce Members of Congress and then to follow up at the end as we talk about how important Scouting is.

Today, there are 1,262,311 boys in Scouting from ages 6 to 10 in Cub Scouts. There are 822,999 boys aged 11 to 17 in Boy Scouts of America and Varsity Scouts. There are 119,268 young men and young women between the ages of 10 to 20 who are engaged in exploring based upon programs that may be STEM or other Scouting programs.

As you see, Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts of America is important to the youth of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS), who is the head of our Scouting Caucus, and the Eagle class of 1963.

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank Eagle Scout PETE SESSIONS for yielding. I am very honored to be standing with him today as the co-chair of the Scouting Caucus, along with Eagle Scout JIM COOPER from Tennessee.

There are, in fact, 33 Eagle Scouts—23 from the House of Representatives and 10 from the Senate—currently serving in the United States Congress. But just as importantly, there are 150 Members of Congress who experienced Scouting, whether as a youth, and, perhaps, in the case of 33 progressing to the rank of Eagle Scout, or, currently as myself does, serving as an adult Scout leader.

Scouting was important to many of us growing up. I think when a lot of us look back on our lives and say what was one of the larger impacts we had, I can tell you, in my case, it was Scouting.

And the same is true for my 24-year-old Eagle Scout son. I can't tell you

how many different camping trips my son and I enjoyed together—what a great bonding experience for a father and a son coming right up through Cub Scouts.

So for all of those Scouts today, as Eagle Scout PETE SESSIONS indicated, who are currently involved in Cub Scouts and Boy Scouts and Explorers, Scouting is changing their lives, and it is changing their lives for the better.

We have all heard the 12 points of the Scout law. That is a compass for the youth of America today, when they are faced with tough decisions, to look at those 12 points and remind themselves that a Scout is trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent. Those 12 points of the Scout law are a compass for them to live their life and make the right decisions.

□ 1800

Many cases I referred to the first three words of the Scout Oath, and we can't talk about them enough, those first three words, "on my honor." That is so important today for our youth to have a compass, to understand what honor is, and Scouting introduces them to that.

But I will also tell you what Scouting is. It is young men, young boys having fun outdoors. Some say today the problem with youth in America is they have and they suffer from nature deficit disorder: They don't get outside enough; they don't know how to play outdoors; they are stuck with their electronic devices.

Well, Scouting gets the youth of America outside. It is healthy. They get to enjoy themselves, learn all kinds of skills, but just the friendships that they get within Scouting that, over a lifetime, will help them as they become the future leaders of America.

There are a disproportionate number of leaders in America today who were Scouts and, in fact, Eagle Scouts. Today, in President Trump's Cabinet, we are honored as a country to have four Eagle Scouts: Eagle Scout Rex Tillerson, Secretary of State; Eagle Scout Rick Perry, Secretary of Energy; Eagle Scout Jeff Sessions, our current Attorney General; and Eagle Scout, Ryan Zinke, our Secretary of the Interior.

I will tell you, in most of their cases, they would identify Scouting as a major part of them growing up and, maybe they didn't know it at the time, but giving them the life skills that have served them to the point today they are serving our Nation.

We have 27 Members in the bipartisan Scouting Caucus; many, but not all, are Eagle Scouts. I think all of us are proud to talk about our past as an Eagle Scout, but we also remind people, to this day, we are Eagle Scouts.

Once a year, our Chief Scout Executive, Mike Surbaugh, comes to Washington, D.C., to present a report on the

status of Scouting in the Nation today. We have a great reception for our Chief Scout Executive once a year to welcome him and Scouts from around the country as they present to us the status of Scouting in America today.

I would be remiss if I didn't recognize the last four presidents of the Boy Scouts of America. Our current president, Randall Stephenson, is the current CEO of AT&T. He followed Bob Gates, who was our Secretary of Defense; Wayne Perry, the vice chairman of AT&T; and our own Secretary of State, Rex Tillerson, when he was CEO of Exxon, was the president of the Boy Scouts of America.

So I think all of us today understand the importance of Scouting in our lives and, in many cases, just reflect back on the fun that we had as young kids and young adults.

Once every 4 years, all the Scouts in America gather, with some from around the world as well, at our national Scout jamboree. We currently have a permanent Scout High Adventure site in West Virginia at the Summit.

Eagle Scout PETE SESSIONS and I, as well as others, 4 years ago, went to the Summit. And you know what? We just had fun. We went down the zip line. We went on some of the other obstacle courses. Even as adults, it was reliving our youth. And we intend to go back later in July for, every 4 years, as I said, they have the national Scout jamboree. Somewhere in the neighborhood of 40,000 Scouts from around the United States will gather for approximately 1 week and just have a lot of fun, get to meet others from around the country.

So that is what Scouting is. I can't think of a more healthy activity for young men to be involved in, and, I think, in many cases, certainly, the moms of this world understand the important values that their sons are getting, as well as the dads.

I can just tell you, I am happy to stay involved in Scouting. As the co-chair of the Eagle Scout Caucus, I am proud to remind people I am today an Eagle Scout. And we also have fun shaking hands with our left hand. That's how Scouts do it, the hand closest to our heart.

I was with our Secretary of State in Alaska a week ago and went to introduce myself. He put out his right hand to shake hands, as adults do, and I said: "No, sir, Mr. Secretary. As one Eagle Scout to another, we are going to shake hands the right way, with our left hands." He got a big smile on his face because he knew exactly what I was talking about.

So Eagle Scout PETE SESSIONS, I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to talk a little bit about Scouting today in our Congress. Thank you for your leadership in our Special Order tonight, and I look forward to hearing from our other Members of

Congress, fellow Eagle Scouts. I know it impacted their life.

Thank you again for your leadership tonight.

Mr. SESSIONS. Eagle Scout CHRIS COLLINS, thank you very much.

By the way, one of those presidents of the Boy Scouts of America was Ed Whitacre. When I was at AT&T, Mr. Whitacre led the Boy Scouts of America, understanding how important it is.

Ladies and gentlemen, the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the House Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Dallas, Texas, is also an Eagle Scout. JEB HENSARLING not only is a bright, young, thoughtful, articulate leader in the United States Congress, he is Eagle Class of 1971.

Chairman HENSARLING, as an Eagle Scout, not only distinguished himself to Scouting, but also, that led him to Texas A&M University and then, further, to the University of Texas Law School. He is a young man who not only deeply believes in his country and his God, but he believes in the things that have brought him forward to become a leader in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Eagle Scout JEB HENSARLING.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have had many opportunities in my career to come to this House floor and speak about topics of great importance, but few are as near and dear to my heart as is Scouting.

So, one, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership and the gentleman from Texas for his leadership and keeping Scouting alive not only in their hearts, but in the heart of the House and in the hearts of so many young men in America today.

Mr. Speaker, as I think about my own life, I think how terribly blessed I have been. I think about the molders of my character, and, certainly, I thank the Lord for the blessing of being able to worship Him in the land of the free. And I think about the impact my church has had upon my life.

I think how blessed I am to have parents like Charles and Ann Hensarling, who raised me in College Station, Texas, and how proud I am to be my mother's son and how proud I was to be my late father's son. But I also think about what Scouting meant as a molder of my character.

Mr. Speaker, that is not what originally drew me to Scouting. I was originally drawn to the fun of it, to the high adventure, to the camping trips, to those Capture the Flag games that went on to the wee hours of the morning. Little did I know how long one could actually hunt for a snipe back in the early days of my Scouting career. And so I was drawn to Indian lore and canoeing and camping, and that was so exciting to me.

So when I think about my Scouting career, Mr. Speaker, I think about, you know, the fun I had. I think about the friendships. There are people I haven't seen for decades, but, you know, I think about a friend by the name of Dennis Gary, whom I haven't seen in decades. But if I saw him tomorrow, I would know him because I would know him through his heart, because we experienced Scouting together, and so many others.

I think about the many practical things I learned in my Scouting career. I hope I never fall into a hole and break an arm, but if I did, even today at my ripe old age, I could still tie a one-handed bowline. I still know how to do that.

I hope I am never lost in the forest for days on end, but, you know, Mr. Speaker, I know that, as distasteful as it would be, I could survive off of cat-tail root and dandelion leaves because that is what Scouting taught me.

So Scouting is about fun; it is about friendship; but it was about practical things that I learned. Mr. Speaker, there is even a far more important aspect to Scouting, and that is values, the values that we learned.

So even today, as a Member of Congress, I know how important it is to be prepared, to be prepared before I come to this House floor and try to convince fellow Members of this august body on actions that we should take in the life of a great nation.

As we deal with so many issues about the lives of a great nation, I also remember, for example, somebody who wasn't in the Boy Scouts—my wife. I know back in Dallas, Texas, almost every week of her life she is driving some indigent cancer patient to their treatments.

I reflected that, although as Members of Congress we deal with matters of great importance that impact millions and millions of people, I have got to tell you, my wife, back in Dallas, Texas, does a good turn daily. It reminds me that I learned in Scouting how important it is to help one human life at a time and to do a good turn daily.

When I look upon my colleagues here in Congress today, I think about a certain colleague, and I am not going to mention his name, but a colleague who at one time wasn't quite keeping up with his diet. He wasn't quite keeping up with his exercise. Although he had young children, he had a heart attack, and we almost lost this colleague, but he came back. It is a reminder how important it is to keep ourselves physically strong for our children, for our parents, for our colleagues, and for our friends. That is something I learned in Scouting, Mr. Speaker.

I think about another friend whose wife almost was lost when she was diagnosed with a very serious form of cancer, stage IV. But there was an

oncologist here in this area, in the Washington area, who was on the cutting edge of cancer research that saved her life, and she was—the percentages against her, there was a 99 percent chance she wouldn't make it, but she did because somebody decided to be mentally awake. That is something else I learned in Scouting, Mr. Speaker, how important it is to be mentally awake.

And one day, when I leave this institution, some of the finest people I have ever met in life I know will have served in the United States of House of Representatives, but, unfortunately, a couple of them represent the worst. A couple of them have turned in their pin stripes for prison stripes because somehow they lost their way.

In Scouting, we are taught to orient a map with a physical compass, but we are also taught to orient the map of life with a moral compass. So I learned in Scouting how important it was to be morally straight, to have that internal compass to guide us at all times.

So I will admit, I am not proud of the fact, Mr. Speaker, but you know what? The words, over the years, occasionally they are a little rusty to me. I don't quite recite them as I once did. I don't always recite the words: "On my honor, I will do my best to do my duty to my God and my country, to obey the Scout Law, to help others at all times, to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight."

So, yes, Mr. Speaker, occasionally the words are a little rusty, but the principles are as alive to me today as they were almost half a century ago when I first entered Scouting and followed that career all the way up to Eagle Scout, something I am so, so very proud of today.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope anybody who is watching the proceedings at this time will, again, understand how valuable Scouting is to all of us. It is not just important to my own personal life. It is important to the life of a great nation.

Our first President, the Father of our Country, said that you cannot have a free society which is not a moral society. Scouting helps make certain we have a moral society.

□ 1815

So I think of the fun, I think of the friendship, I think of the lessons, but, most importantly, I think about that moral compass for the map of life that has guided me and, with Scouting to come in the future, will guide the life of this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Dallas for his leadership, I thank him for his friendship, I thank him for all he means for Scouting, and I thank him for yielding to me.

Mr. SESSIONS. Chairman HENSARLING, Eagle Scout, class of 1971, thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I hold a Scoutbook, something I call the second good book. Of course, we know in Scouting, the good book is the Bible; but to Scouters, also the second good book is the Boy Scout Handbook. This was given to me in 2010 by Bob Mazzuca, who is our chief Scout executive, and he gave it to me with really a guide to my life to continue down that pathway of talking about Scouting in great ways. And that is what we are doing tonight.

I acknowledge that we not only have JOHN GARAMENDI, who is an Eagle Scout, class of 1960, who will be speaking in a bit, but on a bipartisan basis, this body has young people, young men who understood why they got into Scouting. They understood about their life. They certainly understand it now.

At this time I would like to bring forth Eagle Scout FRENCH HILL, 1972, from Arkansas, a relatively new Member of Congress, not only a mature man, but a man who comes with the proxy of knowledge of what Boy Scouting has helped provide him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), an Eagle Scout.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SESSIONS for holding this Special Order. It means, I think, a lot not only to the Scouts that are here in the House of Representatives and the Senate to recognize the importance of Scouting to our country, but to all the mothers, fathers, and Scouts that are seeing this proceeding on C-SPAN or will hear about it to realize that they are participating in something that is very special.

I mean, I think of Scouting, really, Mr. Speaker, as a gift to the country for all of the reasons that the previous speakers have noted. I can't think about Scouting without thinking about what it has meant to me, Chairman SESSIONS, and influencing on my young life. Role models is the first thing that comes to mind with Scouting.

I think about my dad—who was not an Eagle Scout. He was a Sea Scout—and he ended up being basically a Life Scout for life, as people say in Scouting. But nobody was more influential to me in my youth than my dad—currently 91 years old—a Scout still at heart, and all the experiences we had together, how we bonded as father and son, and how, when I went off to college, Mr. Speaker, he continued to be a role model and adult leader for young men for years to come.

That is the kind of person that is in every one of our communities all over this country, helping mold our young people through the Scouting program.

Mr. Speaker, Scouting was my first paid job. I worked at a Scout camp. I earned, I believe, something like \$10 a week, plus room and board, of course. It is when I first learned who FICA was because, at \$10 a week, I wanted to know who took this \$2 out of my \$10

check. So I learned my first lesson about Federal economic policy and who FICA was as a Boy Scout working at the end of a very dusty parking lot for 7 weeks in the hot summer of Arkansas, teaching, pioneering, cooking, and camping merit badges.

But I think of other adults besides my dad. I think about Angelo Coppola and Fred Bean, both constituents of mine now that I serve in the people's House who were camp directors at that camp where I was a very happy employee and Scout for those summers in the early 1970s.

So Scouting is about role models. Scouting is about character building, and that starts that relationship, I think, between our moms and our dads that are involved in the Scouting program, and what we give to kids today. And, boy, do we need that character development.

The Boy Scouts of America was formed in 1910 and was inspired by British war hero Robert S.S. Baden-Powell of the Scouting program started back in the U.K. A lot of people today who are involved in Scouting, even at this moment, Mr. Speaker, don't know that the U.S. Congress presented a law to Woodrow Wilson, who signed it in 1916, chartering the Boy Scouts of America.

We are chartered by the United States Congress, and what a special feeling it is for all of us who are Scouts in Congress today to recognize that something that was so important to our youth was, in fact, chartered by the body that we serve in today.

In the early 20th century, Baden-Powell was thinking about how to expand army youth training with a place for all boys to dedicate their efforts to peace, not war, and he wanted Scouting to improve boys' lives by building their character, physical fitness, and outdoor skills.

He put a premium on bringing boys together from all walks of life, mixing boys from the elite prep schools and boarding schools with those in working class homes. And we do that today, Mr. Speaker. We bring boys from all backgrounds into the character-building exercises of Scouting.

Mr. COLLINS, a few minutes ago, talked about the importance of outdoor recreation, and that was certainly what brought me in. My interest in Scouting was outdoor recreation. When you think about it, in 1910, people were moving off the farm. People were urbanizing. We were passing laws on child labor. We were trying to make sure our boys coming off the farm away from home would have a good set of role models. So Scouting was so important to that urban youth that they get character and that outdoor experience.

And while that was a big deal back in 1910, I would argue, as CHRIS COLLINS did today, that it is a big deal now. He talked about a nature deficit. There is

no doubt that we have that today, just as we did in some people's views back in 1910.

In 2005, Leonard Sax wrote a seminal book that I urge not only all of our Members to read, but people watching these proceedings to read, "Boys Adrift," where he argued that the lack of experiential learning and free playtime—particularly outdoors—in our childhood is diminishing our effectiveness in learning as managers and our interpersonal relationships.

In 2008, Richard Louv wrote a book called "Last Child in the Woods," where he argued that unstructured outdoor playtime is critical to childhood development.

Well, that is exactly what Scouting does. It provides outdoor recreation, something I think is essential to childhood development; something that we have lost because of not only urbanization, but our changing behavior.

One recent nature conservancy poll found that only 10 percent of American teens spend time outside every day. I can't imagine on a day where the sun was shining when I was a teenager that I ever spent any time indoors. My parents were always on the hunt: Where is he? He is outside somewhere.

According to research by the Harvard School of Public Health, American adults spend less time outdoors than they do inside vehicles; less than 5 percent of their day.

So I think the scientific research says our boys and our girls need outdoor recreation. They need experiential learning. This is what is the core of the Scouting program. Like air and water, our wild places, our National Parks are essential to the education of our children and have greatly benefited the Boy Scouts and the Scouting experience. I can't imagine what my life would be like without that Scouting experience in terms of my love of the outdoors.

The second thing that attracted me to Scouting was the leadership opportunities. Baden-Powell said he wanted to be boy-driven. And here, 101 years after President Wilson signed the Boy Scouts of America into law, Scouting prides itself, Mr. Speaker, on being boy-driven, kid-driven. That is how we teach responsibility, character, and leadership.

I like this famous list, Mr. SESSIONS, that we use at so many Eagle Scout ceremonies called "100 Scouts."

Mr. Speaker, of 100 Scouts, people who participate in Scouting:

Thirty will drop out their first year, but they will remember the program fondly.

Twelve will be from a family that has no religious organization or religious membership, and many will begin their first contact with the need to be morally straight and have, at their heart, a belief in God; 12 will be touched by the Scouting program.

Five will go on to earn their religious award from whatever faith tradition they have.

One will use their Scouting skills to save a life.

One will credit Scouting skills for saving their own life.

Eighteen will develop a lifelong hobby.

Eight will find their vocation through the exploration of the merit badge work they did as a Scout.

Seventeen will later become Scout leaders, like all of our Members here on this floor tonight.

Four will become an Eagle Scout.

Four out of that 100, Mr. Speaker, will earn the rank of Eagle Scout, and at least one will say they value earning that Eagle award more than their college degree.

When it comes to the role that Scouting plays, it is something that I am so proud of because I have a Scout in Troop 30 in St. Paul's Methodist Church in Little Rock, and I am so proud of the work that he has done on that trail toward Eagle. He is in the middle of planning his project now to combine his love of golf and Scouting. It is a service project at The First Tee of Central Arkansas in Little Rock, and I reflect it on the value of these Eagle projects across our communities in all 50 of our States and around the world.

Just in America, using 2014 data, about 150–140 people earn their Eagle rank a day in the United States. And in 2014, they spent 8.1 million hours, Mr. Speaker, on their Eagle Scout project, benefiting our towns, our communities, all over this country.

In the nonprofit world, if you applied a typical pay rate to that, a project rate that the independent sector uses of about \$23 an hour, that is \$188 million in public service value our Eagle Scouts have contributed across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell Mr. SESSIONS how much I appreciate his taking time to highlight Scouting, and the value of Scouting to our town and our communities, but, more importantly, to our families at creating that sense of character that we have talked about tonight.

I am one of those people that values my Eagle Scout award, dating back to 1972, from Troop 27, at Our Lady of the Holy Souls Catholic Church in Little Rock. And I am so proud that this many years later I still have the ability to support my son who is on that Eagle trail, and have the support of my dad that many long years after 1972 and my Eagle award because, in our family, we believe in a good turn daily. We believe in the Scout law. We believe in the Scout oath. And if there is one thing you need to do to survive in Congress, you have got to be prepared.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. SESSIONS for the opportunity to share

these comments in support of Scouting. I thank the gentleman for his service to the National Eagle Scout Association and his long service to Circle Ten Council in Dallas, Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, Eagle Scout Congressman FRENCH HILL, Eagle class of '72, thank you very much.

It is with great distinction now that I recognize Congressman Eagle Scout JIM BRIDENSTINE, 1991. It was about a week ago that Eagle Scout Bridenstine came up to me and said: Pete, I want you to know that my son is involved in Scouting, and I deeply believe in it, but I think we ought to get together here.

So it actually is Eagle Scout JIM BRIDENSTINE who said: Let's get together our Eagle Scouts and talk about it.

And I hope that the gentleman will have a chance to come on July 24 or so, as Eagle Scout Members of Congress, along with Senator MIKE ENZI, and perhaps others—my Down syndrome son, Eagle Scout Alexander Gregory Sessions, Troop 890, Lake Highlands, Texas, will join me—that you, too, with your son, may be able to go with us to the reserve and do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), a distinguished Eagle Scout.

□ 1830

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman Eagle Scout Chairman PETE SESSIONS for his great introduction. It is an absolute honor to be here.

About a week ago, I said I would like to get the Eagle Scouts together on the floor of the House of Representatives and talk about what it means to us to be Eagle Scouts, reflect on our history and our tradition and how great this institution has been for the United States of America for all of these years and how we must make sure that this institution stays strong for the years to come. When I brought that to the gentleman's attention, he said, absolutely, we will do it. I didn't talk to him again, and today we are doing it. I didn't have to ask twice.

As chairman of the Scouting Caucus here in the House of Representatives, the gentleman has led in a tremendous way. We have seen so many Eagle Scouts come to the Capitol, and he always gets all of us together and always has us talk face-to-face with the Scouts—not just Eagle Scouts—and encourage them from the earliest days of their Scouting careers.

I want to thank him for his leadership, because a lot of people could chair this committee, but he hasn't just chaired it; he has led it, and that reflects greatly on him.

When I think about my days as a Scout, I go all the way back to my Cub Scout days. In fact, it was even before I was a Scout. My brother was a year

older than me, so he got to be a Cub Scout before I was a Cub Scout.

He got to participate in this new thing that was going on in the lives of the Bridenstines called the pinewood derby. He had this little car—a block of wood with some nails and some wheels—and we watched that car streak from the very top of the track and come to a screeching halt where the track leveled out. In fact, this little blue car didn't even make it to the end of the track.

Of course, all of these other Scouts had all their fancy cars that had their rounded wheels and graphite on the nails and all of the weights put in the car. We didn't know to do any of that.

So my brother, John Bridenstine, who was a Cub Scout before I was a Cub Scout, had to endure the pain of being a Scout and wanting to have the fastest car, and his didn't even make it to the end of the track.

Well, I will tell you this. There was a Life Scout named Wayne Bridenstine, who was our dad. He was not going to allow any of our cars to ever again not make it to the end of the track. So we went to work trying to learn everything we could about this pinewood derby.

We engineered a couple of what I think are the greatest cars in American Scouting history. The next year, the Bridenstine boys won first place and second place going forward. We won first place and second place in—I don't remember which—but we reversed it going backwards. So we went from having a car that didn't even reach the end of the track to winning the pinewood derby.

Many years later, now I have my own son. He is in Cub Scouts and he does the pinewood derby. I committed to him the same thing my dad committed to us back in those days: We are going to win the pinewood derby.

The first year we did it, we had great success. The second year, Dad got a little, maybe, overaggressive in his engineering. Maybe we put the weights a little too far back. As that car came down, it got really unstable and it wobbled. There were a couple of times it barely made it to the end of the track.

But I will tell you this. The relationship that I had with my dad and that my brother had with our dad and that was necessary to pull us from not even finishing the race to winning the race and now the relationship with my son, Walker Bridenstine, are things that are important in our family and will be for many years to come.

So those are some of my first ideas.

Of course, Cub Scouts led to the Arrow of Light. The very next progression is to become a Boy Scout. So we searched a number of different troops across Arlington, Texas, and Fort Worth, Texas. We were in the Longhorn Council at the time. We eventually settled on Troop 83.

I remember some of the leaders of the troop. Coach Wasden was a football coach at Hutcheson Junior High. That was somebody who was intense. He was serious about Scouts. Boy, if you were going to move up in rank, you were going to prove to him that you have done what was required.

Of course, earning merit badges was important to all of us who were trying to move up the ranks. I will never forget the first summer camp that we went on. My brother and I were not able to go to the summer camp that our troop went on. So we went to this thing called the Maverick Camp, where we went with a bunch of Scouts we didn't even know, but we had a great time.

I am not going to lie to you; it was a challenge. I was in fifth grade. My brother was in sixth grade. It was the middle of August in Texas. We will just say the middle of August in Texas. It was just as hot at midnight as it was at the noon hour.

We sweat a lot. We worked hard. We got seven merit badges that summer. That was intense. We didn't know you weren't supposed to get that many. We showed up back at our troop for the court of honor and people were shocked that we got seven. No wonder it was so hard. Nobody told us not to get seven merit badges in one summer camp.

These are some of the memories I had. My brother and I were really challenged and we got that done. The next summer, we did three or four merit badges and had a lot more fun. These are some of the memories.

I was the chaplain's aid. As the chaplain's aid, one of the things that I prayed for most was that the chaplain would show up on the campout so I wouldn't have to do the public speaking in front of everybody. And here I am now as a Member of Congress who publicly speaks as a living. That is one of the things the Boy Scouts of America gave me: the ability to stand before an audience and tell people what was on my mind.

My leadership experience was as the chaplain's aid. My brother was the senior patrol leader for Troop 83. I was in the Arrow of Light patrol. He was in the Bison Patrol. He was the senior patrol leader.

Summer camp after summer camp and all the things we heard, here is, I think, one of the important things that people need to remember: The Boy Scouts of America is an institution that trains leaders. You might not recognize it when you are in it because you believe you are just having fun, but then there come those moments in life when you really need to lean on the things that you learned as a Boy Scout, and it doesn't even dawn on you until later that you actually learned these things as a Boy Scout.

After I graduated from college, I joined the United States Navy. I be-

came a pilot. Of course, one of the things we have to do is survival, evasion, resistance, and escape. In this process, we have to live in the woods for a period of time. We have to figure out how we are going to survive and evade for a week. During this time, you have to live based on the things that you see around you. You have to be able to start a fire.

Some of these basic things I was able to do that all the peers around me had no ability to do because they did not have the life experiences in the Boy Scouts of America.

We had to be able to cook a rabbit, something that I had done before and something that my peers, also Navy pilots, had not done. We had to be able to land navigate with a map and a compass, which, to me, was second nature because I had done it for years trying to get to my rank of Eagle. But for so many people, it was a foreign concept to use a map and a compass to land navigate from point A to point B.

I remember one group navigated point to point. Our group said: We don't want to go point to point because if we miss the point, we won't know we missed the point. So we are going to intentionally offset, hit the river, and then we are going to know exactly where we are. Of course, we didn't miss the point. We knew where we were going.

But some of my peers who did not have the experiences I had went well beyond the point and didn't know they had gone down the point, then they had to come back. I could have told you that was going to happen because it had happened to me previously as somebody who was in the Boy Scouts of America.

These are very real-life experiences that you look back on and say: Why was I able to do this? I was able to do it because I was in the Boy Scouts of America.

You also look back and say there are things that are intangible, things that are not specific. I heard Eagle Scout JEB HENSARLING today—chairman, Congressman, Eagle Scout—talk about tying a bowline in one hand and how he doesn't anticipate finding himself at the bottom of a cliff with a broken arm, but if he did, he would be able to tie a one-handed bowline and somebody would be able to pull him out. Certainly, that is exactly the same kind of thing that I learned when I was going through the same program.

Just a couple of weeks ago, Walker Bridenstine, my son, had to learn how to tie a bowline. I was trying to teach him how to tie a bowline the old-fashioned way. I simply couldn't do it. When I tried to tie it as a one-handed bowline, I was able to do it. It just stuck with me all of these years.

So, again, these are specific skills. But the leadership, the ability to lead people are things that the Boy Scouts

teach you. You apply these things every day in your life, and you don't even know you are doing it.

I will also say that, as employers, we look for leaders when we are trying to find whom we are going to hire. We see over and over again employers looking to hire Eagle Scouts from the Boy Scouts of America.

So there might be somebody today who is watching this maybe on C-SPAN, maybe on the internet; and maybe you are a Boy Scout, maybe you are a Cub Scout, maybe you are not sure if you are going to stick it out. I will tell you this. Every interview I have ever gone on, I had a resume. On that resume was included the fact that I was an Eagle Scout. Even when I was applying for college, I put on my resume and in all of my extracurricular classes that I was an Eagle Scout. I would highly encourage anybody that is maybe at a lower rank but working hard to attain that Eagle, finish your Eagle Scout.

My dad was a Life Scout. He moved when he was a Life Scout. He never finished his Eagle. His brother, JIM BRIDENSTINE, my uncle, did finish his Eagle Scout. Of course, my brother and I both finished our Eagle Scout, and now our kids are in Scouts, and we are going to do everything we can to help them finish their Eagle Scout.

Not only did I put it on every resume, not only on all of my college applications, I will tell you, I also ran for Federal office. The first thing I did in my campaign commercials is tell people: My name is JIM BRIDENSTINE, and I am an Eagle Scout. Before I told them that I went to college or before I told them that I was a Navy pilot, I told them that I was an Eagle Scout.

I think it is important for people to understand that some folks have a desire from an early age to achieve. When employers look at a resume, when voters look at somebody running for office, they want to see that.

I will tell you, there was somebody who came into my office not too long ago wanting a job. I had a number of great candidates. It was nearly impossible for me to pick which one. We all know this: When you get to be a Member of Congress, you get hundreds of resumes the next day.

I was getting down to the end, and I was trying to figure out which one. I got down to three. When they left my office, one of the three said this: One other thing I need to let you know; I am an Eagle Scout.

That did it for me. I knew at that point that this young man had committed himself to something much bigger than himself from an early age. That person now works in my office.

I look for that. I know employers across this country look for that. It speaks volumes to the character and the training of the individual. That will continue.

I will tell you, when you think about all of the astronauts in the United States of America, the 316 or so of them in the history of the United States of America, 40 of them were Eagle Scouts. That is not by accident. I will tell you that is a much higher percentage than the number of Eagle Scouts who are produced in the Boy Scouts of America, and it is certainly a much higher percentage than the number of Eagle Scouts that exist in the population of the United States of America. So this is something that employers look for.

I took my 11-year-old son to the Air Force Academy just about a month ago. I took some brochures about what it takes to get into the Air Force Academy. There is all kinds of stuff in there about being an athlete and being a great student, but one of the six criteria that they look for is: Are you an Eagle Scout at the Air Force Academy of the United States of America?

I would also argue they probably look for the same thing at West Point and the Naval Academy. These are things that employers look for, that schools look for, that the military looks for. These are the character issues that are important.

So if you are in Scouting today, my encouragement to you is to finish, get your Eagle Scout. If you are below the age of 18 and you have still got time, I would encourage you to join and get your Eagle Scout. It has been important for me. It has been important for my brother. It has been important for my family.

□ 1845

My uncle Jim's son, Shane, my cousin, is also an Eagle Scout. This is a tradition of the Bridenstine family, and I would encourage you to make it a tradition in yours.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say thank you for your leadership and thank you for leading this effort.

Mr. SESSIONS. Eagle Scout JIM BRIDENSTINE, Member of Congress from Oklahoma, Eagle Class 1991, thank you very much.

The Scouting stories of leadership, of character, and of opportunity began in my life with my father, who was an Eagle Scout. His father, Dr. Will A. Sessions, in 1947 wrote the original God and Country Award Handbook. I wanted to be an Eagle Scout because of my dad. I have two young sons: William Steele Sessions II, who is an Eagle Scout, age 27; and Alexander Gregory Sessions, a Down syndrome young man, an Eagle Scout, who is 23. Scouting is in our blood, we believe it, but it is also in family blood. JIM BRIDENSTINE spoke about it, and CHRIS COLLINS spoke about the Eagle Class of '63.

This other next young man who is here will talk about Scouting and what a difference it makes. I wish we had

hours, Mr. Speaker, but the rules allow 1 hour. He is a young man from Pennsylvania, Eagle Scout GLENN "GT" THOMPSON. I had an opportunity to go to Pennsylvania with the Chief Scout Executive and give GT THOMPSON his National and Distinguished Eagle Scout Award and pin him.

GLENN's wife is a Scouting widow. She is proud of her Eagle Scout sons, but she knows that the weekends are made for Scouting.

GT THOMPSON is a man who will be with me again at the Summit Bechtel Reserve this year for the Scouting Jamboree.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank you so much for this opportunity. It is great to have a distinguished brother Eagle Scout like yourself.

Mr. Speaker, Scouting has been a part of my family—or I have been part of the Scouting family, actually, since I was 11 years old. When I was 11 years old, my mom and dad did an amazing thing; they did what today I would call a good turn. It was really an amazing turn. They actually opened their home up—and this was appropriate since we are talking about a lot of foster youth this week, kids that grew up in foster families. They opened our family up to a boy that was just 2 years older than I, Bob. Bob came as a foster brother, and he is still my brother today.

Bob has some special needs. Bob had been bouncing around foster care homes his whole life, but when he came to our house, he didn't bounce anymore. He stuck. Like I said, he became my brother and is my brother today.

My mom and dad made a promise to him. One of the positive things that happened to Bob in the home he had been living in prior to coming to our home was that he got involved in a Boy Scout Troop. That Boy Scout Troop experience did amazing things for Bob. It really did. It was life changing for him because it allowed Bob to have success experiences, to enjoy the outdoors, and to flourish with things that he really developed a passion for.

As an 11-year-old younger brother, I lucked out. When mom and dad took Bob back over a couple of valleys to the Scout Troop where he was associated with—there was no Scout Troop in my hometown at the time—I got to tag along. I was 11 years old, and I never looked back.

I have been involved in Scouting since I have been 11 years old. I went on to achieve and earn my Eagle Scout Award. I have served as a Chapter Chief and a Juniata Lodge Chief in the Monocan Lodge in the Juniata Valley Council with the Order of the Arrow. I went on to be a Scout Master for 30 years.

One of the hardest parts about coming to Congress was the fact that I

wasn't going to be home to be able to work with those youth leaders who were leading the troop for Scout meetings, campouts, and events on the weekend. That was the hardest part about taking this job because I had been a Scout Master for almost 30 years. I had trained Scout Masters, I was a course director, and I had served my council as a council president.

I am still involved with Scouting. I was back at my old stomping ground at the Seven Mountains Scout Camp in Spring Mills, Pennsylvania, on Sunday for an Eagle Scout court of honor. Here is the cool part of that: at that site over 70 years ago, my father-in-law received his Eagle Scout Award. Now, I am not saying it should be a prerequisite for picking out a wife that her dad is an Eagle Scout, but it worked out okay for me. It wasn't a bad thing.

So Scouting has been a big part of our family. My wife, Penny, has been a Cub Scout leader and a committee member, and, yes, a Scouting widow when our three sons and I, at different times, would pack up and go off to camp and High Adventure. Sometimes she would come along, actually. A lot of times she was left at home. Unfortunately, she was there to accept all the dirty laundry at the end of the weekend or the week, but she is just as much a Scouting leader. When I think about a great Scouting leader, my wife, Penny, comes to mind with what she has done.

I enjoy the opportunities to go out to Eagle Scout courts of honor. It really is a great opportunity to reconnect and to be a part of Scouting. I enjoy going to Girl Scout Gold Awards as well. So when I go there, normally I will look at the new Eagle Scout. I will talk about how we are there to celebrate all the merit badges they have earned, the citizenship that has been reflected in their actions, the character that we have seen, and the service that they have provided that now entitles them to be able to have that red, white, and blue piece of ribbon with a piece of metal in the shape of an eagle hang from their chest.

I also tell them they are ready for one last test question. I will look them in the eye and say: It has been over 100 years since Scouting came to these shores from England, where Scouting was first originated. So the question I give them is: Over 100 years, how many Eagle Scout Awards have been given away?

These kids are really smart. Somehow they are trying to do the math in their head. I stop them, and I say: Whoa. Stop. This is a trick question. The answer is zero. They have all been earned. None of them has ever been given away.

I talk about how now, as new Eagle Scouts, they have this tool chest that they carry with them. They don't carry

it physically in their hands; they carry it in here. And it really is the principles of Scouting, because we stop and we start our meetings, we start our meetings, we end our meetings, we do our campouts and our Scouts' own worship services. We are always using and repeating the 12 points of the Scout law and three parts of the Scout promise. We do that because we want these boys who start out as young boys and become men to have muscle memory.

Muscle memory is not just on the good days where it is easy things, where things are going well and we are all celebrating and high-fiving each other and life is good, but on the bad days. Bad days do come. Life will be hard at times. We want them, especially in those times, to be able to rely on that muscle memory of those principles of Scouting.

I talk about how in this Chamber we are here voting. The chairman knows this. There are 435 of us. It is kind of interesting if you watch how people make up their mind to vote. It is pretty diverse sometimes. But for people like myself—I will take the liberty. I know this man well. This gentleman right here, Mr. SESSIONS, is an Eagle Scout. I fall back on the principles of Scouting.

I ask myself four questions when it comes time to vote. The first question is: In the decision I am about to make, what is my duty to God? Is the decision righteous according to God's Word and my faith?

Now, I said there are four questions. But if the answer is "no" on the first one, I don't go on to two, three, and four. I stop right there. If the answer is "yes," then the next question is: In the decision I am about to make, what is my duty to country? What does the Constitution have to say about this decision that is before us?

The third question I ask is: In the decision I am about to make, what is my duty to others?

Now, that one is a little harder because that is like: How does this impact more than 730,000 citizens that I have the privilege and honor to represent—16 counties, 24 percent of the landmass of Pennsylvania?

Finally, the last question is: What is my duty to self?

Now, for those who maybe it has been awhile since you have been involved in the Scouting family or maybe you just never had that opportunity, there is still time for everybody to get involved and support Scouting. There are a lot of volunteer jobs out there that can be filled. What we mean when we say duty to self, it is not self-serving. We define that by in every action we take and every decision we make, we are prepared to do our best. That is a reflection of the Scout motto and the Scout slogans. So those are principles as Eagle Scouts I really do believe that, by that point, it becomes muscle memory.

Any youth, for whatever period of time they have the opportunity to serve in Scouting, we know based on the research division of the Boy Scouts of America that it makes a difference in their lives.

I will finish up with this. I have said that, as a Scout Master for 30 years, I have seen this work its way out countless times, but let me take a personal privilege and just mention three particular Eagle Scouts: Parker, Logan, and Kale Thompson, my three sons. They are all three Eagle Scouts. They are all adults now. They are scattered—if anything, maybe one flaw is we made them too independent. They are now flourishing, one in Elgin, Illinois; one in San Antonio, Texas; and one in Trenton, New Jersey. Independent—I guess Scouting will do that. You learn to fly as an Eagle Scout.

I will tell you what I have seen. Parker today is a great dad. What he does with his two little guys, I see the lessons he learned in Scouting that just come through in how he nourishes.

Logan, my second son, is a soldier. Although I worried about him, I didn't worry as much when he was deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan because I knew that, as an Eagle Scout, he could handle whatever came to him.

My youngest, Kale, is a music teacher today who nourishes and just serves youth, kids in middle school, and makes such a difference in their lives.

In the lives of my three sons, I see how being a Boy Scout and an Eagle Scout has made them better men and made them better in all the roles that they serve.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Eagle Scout GLENN THOMPSON, Eagle Scout 1977. On behalf of Chief Scout Executive Mike Surbaugh and Members of Congress who gathered together this evening to tell another story, I intend to do it again next month. I intend to get JOHN GARAMENDI, who is one of our dear friends from California, Eagle Class of 1960.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Eagle Scouts of Congress who had time to come tonight, myself, CHRIS COLLINS, JEB HENSARLING, FRENCH HILL, JIM BRIDENSTINE, GT THOMPSON, I am thankful for the hour you have allowed us to tell the story about the Boy Scouts of America, about exceptionalism, about the Order of the Arrow, and about the opportunity for character to lead a great nation.

Mr. Speaker, we are thankful for the time. We will be back. We hope that we leave our campsite better than the way we found it. That is what we try to do every day.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FASO). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues who, for the last hour, have talked about an extremely important part of America's social fabric: the Scouting programs of America. I thank them for bringing to Congress and to the American people the importance of Scouting at all levels. And for those of us who have achieved the rank of Eagle Scout, much was discussed.

Equally important are the men that enter and only spend a couple of weeks and do not pass beyond the Tenderfoot level because they, too, have achieved, at least in part, the opportunities that Scouting presents.

I will talk about that more in the future, and I will look forward to that discussion. In the meantime, let's see if we can now talk about other things that are before Congress and the American public.

Mr. Speaker, almost unnoticed as a result of all of the issues—all of the controversies surrounding the President here in the United States, the controversies of Russia and Russia's involvement in the election, the firing of Comey and the investigations now conducted by a new special counsel, and, of course, the President's foreign travels, with all of that, we have basically not heard much about another extremely important and quite possibly a much longer lasting thing that has happened.

Today the President presented his budget. A budget presented by the President is often just waved aside by the Congress and considered to be dead on arrival, and surely this one should be. But I want to back up for a moment and I want us all to ponder exactly what it is that the President has proposed.

□ 1900

Because, you see, the budget, whether it is a Democratic budget or a Republican budget, an Obama budget or a Trump budget or a George H.W. Bush budget, those budgets are a statement of priorities. They are a statement of the value, the values that is what it is that the President thinks is important and how that fits into the American society.

We need to really understand and value the statement that the President, President Trump, has made in presenting to us his priorities. We ought not just wave it aside and say it is of no consequence because, after all, we are going to rewrite it and we are going to write our own, which is the tradition. However, it would be a gross mistake not to analyze what it is that the President of the United States of America, the strongest, the wealthiest country in the world, has proposed.

Take a careful look, America. Don't just brush it aside. This is what the

President wants. This is what he wants us to be. This is his vision of America.

I must tell you, it is awful—not my words only, but the words of many Republican leaders, of, obviously, the Democrats.

Take a look, America, at what it is he is proposing.

I am going to run through some of this because we need to understand, Members of Congress, we Americans need to understand what it is that this President wants us to be, what it is he sees as America. I am going to go through just some things very, very quickly, and then we want to go into it perhaps in a little more detail.

Medicaid is a program that has been in existence for some 60-plus years. It is a program that provides healthcare to the poor. It is a program that provides care to seniors. It is a program that is relied upon all across this country by families so that the children and adults can get medical care.

The President has proposed, in his budget, a \$610 billion reduction in Medicare on top of, in addition to, an \$800 billion cut in what we know now as Trump and RyanCare, the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. A \$1.5 trillion reduction in medical services to the poor. And they are not all kids. They are not all families. More than half of that money goes to seniors in nursing homes.

This is the vision of the President of the United States: \$1.5 trillion reduction in medical services over the next 10 years to working men and women just above the poverty level, to seniors who are in nursing homes, and to women and children who are below the poverty level. This is his vision of healthcare in America.

And that is not all. That is not the end of the story.

In the 1990s, we knew that children not covered by Medicaid or, in California, Medi-Cal were not getting medical services; and so the American people, through their representatives in Congress and the Senate, created what we now know as the Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP—Children's Health Insurance Program.

And so what is the vision? What is the value? What is the moral purpose of our President?

He would cut \$3.2 billion out of that program and effectively deny medical services for the 6 million children that are currently covered by the Children's Health Insurance Program.

For the aged, blind, and disabled—the aged, blind, and disabled Americans—that receive supplemental Social Security programs, \$64 billion would be cut from those aged, blind, and disabled who receive supplemental Social Security insurance.

Students? How many times on this floor of the House of Representatives have we heard Democrats and Republicans talk about the terrible problem

of student loans, the huge cost of providing educational services? So what is in this budget?

Student loans, financial aid, and repayment, \$143 billion reduction. How does that help our educational program? How does that help students who are suffering under the cost of higher education? I don't know what the answer is except it does not.

For men and women who are working at minimum wage or below minimum wage across the United States, there is a program that was established by Richard Nixon called the earned income tax credit to encourage people to work. Men and women that are out there working but at a low wage, minimum wage, the earned income tax credit was established to lift them up to a liveable amount of money and encourage them to continue to work.

What does the President propose? Well, let's cut, by \$40 billion, the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit.

It goes on and on. This is President Trump's statement of what he values in America.

I think it is immoral. I think it is terrible public policy, and, when coupled with the rest of the story, it becomes an abomination.

The rest of the story, the rest of the story is the most massive tax cut ever for the wealthy in the United States. You take that tax cut that has been proposed in the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, and you couple it with the tax cuts that are embedded in the President's budget, and we are talking somewhere north of \$3.5 trillion tax cuts, 80 percent of which goes to the top 20 percent of America's income earners.

All the discussion last year about income inequality from President Trump, from Hillary Clinton, from everybody else about income inequality and the problem it presents to America was somehow forgotten. Because, when you take the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, which some call the American Health Care Act now, and you couple it with this budget, the tax cuts that are embedded in both of them amount to the largest transfer of wealth ever in tax policy from the poor, from the working Americans, to the top earners in America, to the superwealthy.

If you are concerned about income inequality, this is exactly backwards. It is from the working men and women, the middle class of America and the poor to the wealthy. That is exactly what is happening here.

Is that a rational vision of America? Is this a sense of value of what America is all about: more for the wealthy, less for the working men and women, the middle class, for the families that presumably—presumably—were at the heart of last year's election?

Yes, we heard Mr. Trump and we heard Ms. Clinton go around the Nation talking about how we need to

raise up the middle class, how we need to deal with this income inequality, what a problem it was for our society and our economy, months and months of political rhetoric. And now we see what is actually—actually—taking place: the greatest transfer of wealth from the middle class and the poor to the wealthy that has ever been found in any piece of legislation proposed.

God help us if it is enacted. Watch carefully, America. This budget, the repeal of the Affordable Care Act together with the proposed tax cuts, will devastate, seriously harm, personal lives in America by taking away their health insurance, by taking away their money that they depend upon to pay their rent, to put food on the table, to care for their children.

This is not the America that I want to see, and I don't think this is the America that the American public voted for. Whether they were a Democrat or a Republican, whether they voted for Trump or Hillary, they did not envision an America that would take \$1.5 trillion out of the Medicaid program, of which 50 percent of that money goes to seniors in nursing homes.

I don't think that is what they had in mind when they voted last November. That is not what they were promised. That is not what either of the two candidates promised. They promised to deal with this income inequality issue. They promised, both of them, to provide more healthcare, not less. That is just on this one side of it.

Neither promised massive tax cuts for the superwealthy. In fact, both railed against the way in which we have seen those at the top of the heap benefit while the rest were stagnated. Both candidates did that. And yet the proposal that has been put before this Congress in the last 127 days has been quite the opposite.

The repeal of the Affordable Care Act, ripping away healthcare benefits for 24 million Americans, and now on top of it, this budget proposal that the President has given to us.

□ 1915

I want to take just another moment because this one ought to be close to every American. In the President's budget proposal, there is a \$7 billion reduction for research in the National Institutes of Health. What does the National Institutes of Health do? It does research. It does research on disease. Over the years, Democrats, Republicans, both sides of the aisle have put forth proposals to advance and increase the research in healthcare.

And the result? The result of that is this. I have used this many times on the floor. As I looked at the President's proposal to cut \$7 billion out of the National Institutes of Health, I thought we ought to come back to this. Deaths from major diseases over the years. Be-

cause we have invested in research, we have seen breast cancer deaths decline by 2 percent, prostate cancer decline by 11 percent, heart disease decline by 14 percent, stroke by 23 percent, HIV/AIDS by 52 percent. That is what happens when you invest in research. That is what happens when we take the taxpayer money and we put it into research on healthcare and medical issues.

Today, the National Institutes of Health has \$5 billion of valuable research projects that cannot be funded, research projects on all of these. Instead of adding an additional \$5 billion, the President proposes to give that \$5 billion to the wealthiest of Americans. The top 40 families in America, under his proposals, would receive a \$7 million reduction in their taxes. And I daresay that four or five of those families are either the President's family or in the Cabinet.

This purple line here, this one, over the last year, we have increased the funding for Alzheimer's from just over \$500 million to just under \$1 billion. This one is out of control. Every family in America is experiencing the effects of dementia and Alzheimer's. My family. My mother-in-law spent her last 3 years in our home and died of Alzheimer's. It is not unusual. In fact, it is common.

Incidentally, cancer is some \$6 billion a year for research; heart disease, \$5 billion; HIV/AIDS, about \$3 billion; Alzheimer's about \$900 million. We know that if we were to spend the money, we could delay the onset, dramatically improve the lives not only of the individuals but of the families.

So what does the President propose? Not adding \$5 billion for research that we know would provide benefits, extend the lives of Americans. He proposed to cut by \$7 billion. Is this a statement of his values, of what he thinks is important, of his morality, of his administration? On the floor of the House, in the cloakrooms, what is argued and often said is that each and every bill that passes here, each and every proposal that we introduce, is a statement of our own personal sense of morality of what is right and what is wrong, of values.

Today, I looked at the Hill papers, what we fondly call the Hill rags, three of them. The top story is not the President's budget. The top story is the President's scandals. But I will tell you this: This budget is the real story because this is going to live on. This is what we will be fighting about. All the issues of the scandal in Russia and everything else will be dealt with by others and some of our committees, but this is what is going to affect the American public in their homes, in their lives, in their healthcare, in their education, and in their jobs. The President proposed a budget, and it is a reflection of what he believes to be important. That is a scandal.

I can go on and on here, and I suppose I promised some that I wouldn't. There is much that we can do. There is much that we need to do. We have great needs in the United States. We need an infrastructure program. We need a healthcare system that provides benefits to all in which the costs are controlled. We have a military and we have national security, and we will debate these things, but I cannot let a day go by without contemplating what it is that the President has proposed to America. Not to us but to America. And it is not good.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE DETERIORATING SITUATION IN VENEZUELA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 30 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful to Mr. ALBIO SIREs, my good friend from New Jersey, the ranking member of our Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere in the Committee on Foreign Affairs for joining me tonight for this Special Order regarding the deteriorating situation in Venezuela, demonstrating not only the bipartisan nature of this issue, Mr. Speaker, but also the need for the United States, and specifically the Congress, to be even more engaged.

As Mr. SIREs knows—and we will hear from him in just a few minutes—the situation in Venezuela, as you can see here, is becoming more desperate by the day. The humanitarian situation is getting worse, if one can imagine that. The Maduro regime continues its flagrant human rights violations, and, despite the latest round of sanctions against human rights violators imposed by our excellent Treasury Department, the United States needs to take more decisive steps in support of the people of Venezuela.

Mr. Speaker, at least 48 Venezuelans have been killed in almost 2 months of protests, nonstop protests, against the dictatorship responsible for a litany of crimes. You cannot enumerate them. Horrific human rights abuses, drug trafficking, a rapidly worsening humanitarian situation. The list goes on and on, Mr. Speaker.

Venezuelans do not have access to even the most basic of necessities, which means water, food, and medicine. None of that exists in Venezuela. Venezuelan humanitarian shortages of food and medicine. People are standing in lines to get nothing. The Venezuelan Pharmaceutical Federation estimates that the country is running shortages on nearly every necessary medical item. For those few Venezuelans who could afford to purchase medicine, they are forced to pay exorbitant prices for

supplies like gauze, pain relievers, Band-Aids, and that is only if they are available in the first place, Mr. Speaker. Hospital workers have told us that the supplies are being raided, and they are being sold on the black market.

The situation is no better when it comes to food. Last week, a 46-year-old man was killed by soldiers as he was on his way home from buying diapers for his baby. Killed while buying diapers for his baby. Why? Because diapers are a scarce commodity. They have been a scarce commodity for over a year now in Venezuela, a country that was abundant in natural resources. Earlier this week, this very week, a 15-year-old boy was shot and killed for the crime of buying flour.

One study reports that 75 percent of the population of Venezuela—this is unbelievable—has lost an average of 19 pounds due to food shortages. Even obtaining water can be an expensive proposition for those without running water at home. The shortage of basic goods has led to massive lines, has led to violence, has led to looting as people have become increasingly desperate for the basic, meager means to survive. We are just talking about basic necessities, Mr. Speaker.

This tragic humanitarian situation could have been prevented, Mr. Speaker, and no one is more responsible than the thug who rules Venezuela with an iron fist, Nicolas Maduro, and his despotic regime. The Maduro dictatorship presides over the world's largest oil reserves yet has managed to run the state oil company and the entire economy into the ground.

Socialism does not work. Communism does not work. One need only look at Venezuela. Instead of allowing humanitarian relief, the regime has nationalized the food and medical supply chain and put corrupt officials in charge. What could go wrong?

Earlier this month, I wrote a letter, along with my good friend ALBIO SIREs, as well as ELIOT ENGEL, the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and 12 other congressional colleagues joined Mr. SIREs, Mr. ENGEL, and myself, urging the administration to use its voice, to use our vote, to use our influence at the United Nations Security Council to demand that Venezuelan authorities allow the delivery and the distribution of humanitarian aid. We were giving them what they need. Maduro would have none of it.

But I applaud our U.S. Ambassador at the U.N., Nikki Haley, for organizing a Security Council meeting on Venezuela last week. But more needs to be done, Mr. Speaker. As Ambassador Haley bravely said, Venezuela is on the edge of a humanitarian crisis, right here in our hemisphere. Humanitarian agencies must be allowed to operate independently in Venezuela, without interference from the thuggish Maduro regime, and deliver the aid

that the people so desperately need. The world is ready to help Venezuela. Nicolas Maduro refuses this help.

Humanitarian agencies must say to Maduro, if they are hindered in any way, then those responsible must be held to account. Before I continue, Mr. Speaker, to address the Maduro regime's abuse of human rights in greater detail and how the United States can be a force for good in Venezuela, I yield to ALBIO SIREs, my good friend from New Jersey.

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida. I want to commend her for her passion and her commitment to helping the people of Venezuela. I thank her for making me part of this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the ongoing crisis in Venezuela. With every week that passes, we see the situation in Venezuela becoming more critical.

□ 1930

A country with the world's largest known oil reserves is spiraling into a collapsed state where people are struggling just to survive. Journalists and citizens risk their lives every day to report what is happening inside Caracas and around the country. We see that tensions are growing, and government security forces shoot first and don't even bother to ask questions later.

Maduro continues to keep political prisoners like Leopoldo Lopez under lock and key to send a strong message to those trying to question his actions. Just yesterday, we saw reports that government buildings in western Venezuela are being set ablaze. Make no mistake: It is the failed Chavismo policies and the authoritarian actions of Nicolas Maduro that have brought all of this pain and suffering upon the Venezuelan people.

Press reports show that of 800,000 businesses that opened during the Chavez regime, nearly 600,000 have shut down. Both the Obama and Trump administrations have sanctioned senior officials in the Venezuelan Government for their associations with narcotraficking, money laundering, and other illicit activities.

Just today, Reuters released an exclusive report that the Venezuelan Government is in possession of 5,000 shoulder-launched surface-to-air missiles that are typically used to shoot down low-flying planes and helicopters.

Last week, Spanish authorities interdicted a shipment of 6 tons of cocaine from Venezuela en route to their shores. With the recent sanctions of Vice President Tareck El Aissami, under the Kingpin Act, it has become clear that Venezuela's Government is acting as a narco-state and facilitating the shipment of narcotics throughout the region. These sanctions are not against the Venezuelan people but are carefully crafted and targeted towards

the individuals who are committed to destroying the lives of millions of innocent civilians in exchange for money and power.

Last week, the U.S. Department of the Treasury sanctioned members of Venezuela's Supreme Court for their rulings that stripped power away from the National Assembly, further consolidating Maduro's authoritarian regime. Maduro and his cronies continue to get rich as they traffic money and drugs while doing nothing to help the millions of suffering people in Venezuela. They continue to loot the country as reports regarding the worsening situation continue to make front-page news throughout the region. Maduro's tactics are making it impossible to survive.

Multiple news reports confirm a growing health crisis as people lack access to basic medicines, and infant mortality rates and preventable diseases such as diphtheria, malaria, and the Zika virus are all on the rise. In addition, nearly every day we hear of young children whose lives are cut short, whether it is from a bullet from Maduro's thugs or the lack of access to food, water, and basic services.

That is why I am grateful for the efforts of my colleagues here tonight who have supported several initiatives in Congress that work to hold these thugs accountable. My colleagues and I have held hearings, sent letters, and met with our allies in the region to work together to try to bring sound relief to the Venezuelan people.

Meanwhile, instead of focusing on the economy, Maduro is staging mock military exercises and stoking fears by spreading propaganda of U.S.-led invasion.

The truth about Maduro is clear, and the international community is starting to unify against him. The OAS Secretary General Luis Almagro has wisely called for Venezuela's suspension from the OAS unless it frees its political prisoners, accepts humanitarian aid, and holds elections without delay.

I believe we need to work together with our allies around the world and continue to insist Maduro abide by international norms and give the Venezuelan people the freedom they deserve.

I thank my dear friend from Florida, LEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and the other Members here tonight for their relentless commitment to these important issues.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SIREs for such an eloquent statement on behalf of the beleaguered and embattled Venezuelan people.

Before I yield so proudly to Mr. CASTRO of Texas, another member of our Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, I would like to say just a few words about the continuing human rights abuses and the deteriorating situation in Venezuela.

As we have heard from Mr. SIREs, we are dealing with a corrupt dictatorship, and we are dealing with a brutal dictatorship. At least 42 are dead and 90 arrested since protests began in March of 2017, you can see on this poster.

This is a dictatorship that will go to all lengths to maintain its tight grip on power and silence the opposition by tear gas, by real bullets, by jailing, and by intimidation. The people of Venezuela are literally dying, Mr. Speaker, on the streets from the violence of the Maduro regime. They are dying on the streets from starvation, and they are dying from the lack of medical supplies, yet they still risk their lives.

This goes on each and every day in Venezuela. They go out into the streets. They demonstrate to the world that they will not be silenced, and what they desire is freedom, and what they desire is democracy, and what they desire is nothing less and nothing more than their God-given human rights, the very same intangibles that many in America here take for granted because we live in the greatest country in the world. We take for granted that we have our freedom.

But the ideals that we proudly espouse and defend around the world are alive and well in the streets of Venezuela. Venezuelans are protesting against the regime's continual assaults on Venezuela's constitutional and democratic order.

Like Chavez before him, Nicolas Maduro has a horrific human rights record, including restrictions on freedom of expression, restrictions on the press, widespread arbitrary detentions, extrajudicial killings, torture, and the list goes on and on.

In its human rights reports on Venezuela last year, our own State Department noted how the Maduro regime has misused the judiciary to undermine the National Assembly, a body overwhelmingly manipulated by the opposition since December of 2015. This opposition has risen to power thanks to the vote of the people.

So what did Nicolas Maduro say? Well, his supreme court nullified almost every action taken by the National Assembly, including refusing to allow lawmakers to take their seats in the legislature and overturning laws to free political prisoners and grow the economy.

I am so pleased to see that we have been joined by the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Mr. DUNCAN, tonight.

But things have only gotten worse since that time. In March, the regime controlled the Supreme Tribunal of Justice—a sad name for what it does—and ruled that it would resume the responsibilities of the National Assembly. It said: We are the state. Who needs the National Assembly that is manipulated and controlled by the opposition? We nullify its actions. We will assume the responsibility.

And although what the Tribunal said, they had to backtrack almost immediately because the condemnation internationally was so loud. It partially reversed its decision just a few days later, but the damage was already done, Mr. Speaker. Venezuelans had further proof of a break in the constitutional order.

Anti-regime protests have been going on, as we can see here, day after day, day after day, as hundreds of thousands of Venezuelans have taken to the streets to demand relief from the Maduro repression. According to *The New York Times*, before these protests even began, Mr. Speaker, the Maduro regime had arrested 6,893 people, jailed 433 for political reasons just in the past few years, and there are at least 175 political prisoners behind bars today, including Leopoldo Lopez and Daniel Ceballos.

Joshua Holt, a United States citizen, Mr. Speaker, is being unjustly held for nearly a year. In September, I wrote a letter, joined by my colleagues here, to the State Department about Joshua's case. Joshua Holt's health has deteriorated over the last month. I urged the State Department to secure his unconditional release on humanitarian grounds. We all were humbled to meet with Joshua Holt's mom, who is so anxious to see his release, just last month.

So, Mr. Speaker, despite all of the Maduro regime's human rights abuses, the beatings, the violence, the murders, the repression, and the political prisoners, despite all of this, the Venezuelan people are refusing to be silenced. They are rising up, and they are protesting in even greater numbers. This is just amazing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), my good friend from the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN and Congressman ALBIO SIREs for their incredible work on this issue and all of their passion. I also thank the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee chairman, Congressman DUNCAN. I know how much he has worked on the issue of Venezuela, and Latin America also.

The people of Venezuela are in dire need of humanitarian assistance to endure critical food and medicine shortages. The desperation, oppression, and violence in Venezuela really are reaching a breaking point.

Three out of four Venezuelans have lost significant weight during the last year due to food shortages.

In 2016, the nation suffered a homicide rate of 91.8 per 100,000 people, making Venezuela the second most violent country in the world outside of a war zone.

We have reason to believe more than half of Venezuelans want to leave their home country.

Last year, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees said Colom-

bia should expect an "avalanche" of Venezuelan refugees, an influx that could complicate this critical time for Colombia's own peace agreement. Meanwhile, President Maduro's government is taking increasingly antidemocratic actions in violation of Venezuela's own constitution.

Since Venezuela's supreme court attempted to dissolve the country's legislature in March, the Venezuelan people have sustained massive protests, leading to a brutal crackdown from government security forces. The best outcome for this political crisis is a Venezuelan solution: a peaceful return to free and fair elections.

At the same time, the United States has a responsibility to work alongside our allies at the Organization of American States and the United Nations to hold Maduro's government accountable and to provide humanitarian assistance to the people of Venezuela.

Last week, President Trump authorized sanctions against the members of Venezuela's supreme court who attempted to shut down the legislature. While U.S. sanctions against individuals in the Maduro regime are justified, sanctions work best when implemented multilaterally. More importantly, unilateral actions are no substitute for collective, coordinated pressure.

The OAS has scheduled a meeting of foreign ministers on the situation in Venezuela to take place on May 31 here in Washington, D.C. This meeting presents an opportunity to work with our partners and Venezuela's neighbors to support a return to democracy and respect for human rights. I hope Secretary Tillerson will represent the United States at this meeting and demonstrate our Nation's support for the Venezuelan people.

One of the reasons that I chose to join the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee when I was already part of the Foreign Affairs Committee is because I believe that there are many things that happen in Latin America that don't get the attention that they deserve here in the United States.

□ 1945

It is amazing to think that there is a human rights crisis going on right now in our own Western Hemisphere. Of course, there are many challenges around the world. We know that because of the war in Syria and the unrest in the region, Europe, over the last few years, has faced its largest migration crisis since World War II.

There are challenges with human rights and freedom in every continent just about. But we have to make sure that we attend to the things that are happening in our own backyard, so to speak.

So I thank each of you for being here tonight to speak up on this issue of human rights in Venezuela and the crisis that they are going through.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we are so pleased that Mr. CASTRO has, once again, joined us in this battle for human rights, for democracy, for justice, for the rule of law, in our hemisphere. His voice is a valiant one that needs to be heard and is always present whenever the struggle for human rights is mentioned.

So thank you, Mr. CASTRO, for this stance today and for the stance that you have taken on behalf of beleaguered people in our hemisphere every day.

Now, Mr. SIRES and I are so thankful that our subcommittee chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), has joined us.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, Mr. SIRES is the ranking member of that subcommittee, and Mr. DUNCAN is the chairman of that subcommittee, a valiant voice for freedom that must be heard.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairwoman, former chairwoman of the full committee when I first came to Congress, and a real leader on foreign affairs issues, focused on Cuba and Venezuela. She has been a real mentor to me, and I want to thank her for her work on this, giving us the opportunity to speak tonight.

Again, Ranking Member SIRES has been a champion on our subcommittee. I want to echo the words about Mr. CASTRO as well. We have got a great Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere focusing on freedom and democracy in the Western Hemisphere.

What we see in Venezuela is alarming, as well as it is saddening, when we hear about Venezuelans who are scrounging for food in the dumpsters, eating domesticated animals, even flamingos; people who are hungry because the socialistic policies of the Maduro and the previous Chavez regime has not worked in Venezuela. A country that has bountiful natural resources, more oil than Saudi Arabia, should be leading this hemisphere in economics.

Yet because of the policies of the Chavez and Maduro governments, the people of Venezuela are continuing to be oppressed. This weekend, more than 2,000 Venezuelans took to the streets, marking, I think, the 50th day of protests against this regime. I can't think of any other way to describe this faux democracy in Venezuela, other than a regime.

The Venezuelan people are standing up and calling for a new government. They are calling for more democracy, true democracy, representation in their own government, freedoms that we take for granted here in this country, freedoms of speech, and the right to peacefully assemble, the right to

participate in their government and have accountability, the right to petition their government for grievances. And they have got some grievances against the Maduro regime.

Yet Maduro continues to oppress the Venezuelan people. It is not unlike what we have seen in Cuba. Folks, socialism doesn't work, and it is not working in Venezuela, and they are a prime example. But Maduro doesn't want to listen to his own people in Venezuela and call for new democratic elections, where the people elect their representatives to congress and to the Presidency.

But he has called for elections, and he said just recently: "Votes or bullets. What do the people want?" Maduro asked a crowd of red-shirted supporters waving Venezuela flags at the Miraflores presidential palace."

Votes or bullets? Is that how we talk about the democratic process in a true democracy? I say no, and I tell the Venezuelan people, America stands with you as you approach democracy.

It is time for more people in this hemisphere and the Organization of American States, all the member countries, to stand with the Venezuelan people, and let's change the government in Venezuela through peaceful means, democratic means, that their Constitution calls for.

But yet, Maduro is ignoring the Constitution. In fact, he got the Supreme Court to go along with him to discount the National Assembly there, and, luckily, they reversed course on that because they realized the world was watching and the world was saying that is not how democracies operate.

The Venezuelan people need the support of the world, and I call on the world today to come to the backs, standing with, watching the backs of the Venezuelan people, because Maduro has told his snipers to get ready; told his snipers to get ready to attack the protesters that are protesting a supposed democrat government. Wow.

So I want to thank the chairwoman. I want to thank Ambassador Nikki Haley, former Governor of South Carolina, who has stood strong in the U.N. as Ambassador to the U.N. for the Trump administration. I want to thank her for standing with the Venezuelan people for democratic principles.

I want to thank all those in this Chamber, including my ranking member, for having stern and direct conversations with the OAS about Venezuela.

I want to thank Argentina for what they have done, stepping up to the plate. These are countries that understand the democratic process.

I want to thank Brazil for actually allowing the democratic process to work in the country of Brazil through an impeachment of their President, and allowing the democratic forces to work to return that to a representative government.

It is time for America to stand with our friends about democratic principles here. Snipers? That is not how we operate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

THE DETERIORATING SITUATION IN VENEZUELA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this moment to thank my colleague and my chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee for always being present on all the important issues, human rights issues in the Western Hemisphere.

And of course, I want to thank my colleague from Florida, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for her passion and determination to bring democracy to Venezuela.

Before I recognize my good friend from Florida, MARIO DIAZ-BALART, I would just like to say that Venezuela basically has taken a page out of the Castro brothers. This is how the process in Cuba started. Fifty-five years later, there is nothing but oppression, no freedom of expression, no election, and, quite frankly, there are approximately about 30,000 Cubans in Venezuela running the security apparatus.

But I want the Venezuelan people to know that we are fighting along with them, that we are talking to all the Presidents, all the leaders in the Western Hemisphere, to put pressure on Venezuela to develop the democracy and stop the abuse of human rights in Venezuela.

At this time, I yield to my good friend from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), who is also a fighter for human rights and who has been always in the forefront of human rights in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, let me first start by thanking the leadership, the steadfast, never confused leadership of Congressman ALBIO SIRES. He is a man who I have had the privilege of traveling with to Eastern Europe, where he is known there, as he is in the United States, for one who is always fighting for those who are repressed, oppressed around the world; which is why the people of Venezuela know that they can count on Congressman ALBIO SIRES for his leadership.

Thank you, sir, for never giving up, never fighting, never forgetting those who are struggling under repression. You mentioned Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN. She is a giant, a giant in the Halls of Congress, a giant for not only things that obviously affect us here domestically, because she is fighting for those, particularly those who are the least fortunate in our society.

But if there is somebody who is known internationally as a fighter for those who, again, are struggling for freedom, it is ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN.

I thank you also, Mr. SIREs, for mentioning the chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee. We just heard from him, a person who, again, is on the same track of always making sure that the—he makes the United States look good by never forgetting human rights as a fundamental pillar of our foreign policy.

The people of Venezuela are demonstrating that they are, in fact, the heirs of Simon Bolivar. They are showing now, with 50 days of consecutive demonstrations in the streets, that they are not willing to accept repression. They are not willing to accept any more of this dictatorship; that they are not willing to accept, as Mr. SIREs mentioned, in essence, a takeover from the Cuban regime of their beautiful country of Venezuela.

And they are suffering because of that activism, that bravery of hitting the streets. About almost 50 of them have been murdered since this last number of demonstrations have taken place, not to mention the dozens upon dozens of political prisoners, whether it is political leaders, mayors, et cetera, who are in prison just because they are not willing to stand by while their country has been taken over by this horrendous, narco-terrorist, murderous dictatorship.

Frankly, I am here to commend the Venezuelan people and, as Mr. SIREs said, to let them know that they are not alone, that we stand with them, that the United States Congress stands with them.

But I would be remiss if I didn't end as I started, Mr. Speaker, by thanking these individuals who have spoken already: the giant of human rights in the House of Representatives, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, the chairman of the subcommittee, who never gets confused, and who is always fighting for those who are struggling to regain or gain their freedom; and yes, ALBIO SIREs, who I have had the privilege of seeing, not only who he is recognized here in this Congress by his colleagues as a true freedom fighter for human rights, but I have been able to travel with him and see that whenever you go anywhere with ALBIO SIREs, he is also recognized around the world as that champion for freedom.

So what a privilege to be part of and to be able to spend this time with you. Thanks to each and every one of you for not forgetting the struggle of Venezuela. I know that you have done it in your committee, you have done it in your subcommittee, and this Congress is grateful, and this Member of Congress is grateful for your leadership.

And I know that the Venezuelan people who are showing incredible bravery know, and history will record that, in

their toughest moments, when they were putting their lives on the line, all of you, and this Congress, stood with them.

So with that, thank you, Mr. SIREs, for yielding to me.

Mr. SIREs. Thank you, Congressman. Thank you for all your passion and all your effort on behalf of those people who need it the most, the people in Venezuela.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to end by saying, you know, I remember years ago when Spain went through 39 years of dictatorships in the Franco era. And one of the things that happened that was able to develop democracy in Spain was the fact that all the European countries got together and helped and assisted in developing a democracy in Spain. I think the same thing needs to happen in this region.

□ 2000

The countries of our Venezuela have to demand that Venezuela release its political prisoners, that it has free elections, and stop the human rights abuses. After all, it is in their best interest that a stable Venezuela is good for a stable region.

Mr. Speaker, I thank very much my colleague, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, always for her passion on this issue. She is the little giant of human rights in this Congress. I thank her and my colleague, MARIO DIAZ-BALART.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 24, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1410. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's Major final priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria — Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) Program [CFDA Number: 84.371C.] [Docket ID: ED-2015-OESE-0129] (RIN: 1810-AB25) received May 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1411. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-011, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1412. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, De-

partment of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-043, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1413. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 15-132, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1414. A letter from the Acting Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's FY 2016 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1415. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule to List 6 Foreign Species of Elasmobranchs Under the Endangered Species Act [Docket No.: 150909839-7369-02] (RIN: 0648-XE184) received May 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1416. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; U.S. Navy Training Activities in the Gulf of Alaska Temporary Maritime Activities Area [Docket No.: 141125997-7365-02] (RIN: 0648-BE67) received May 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1417. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act Report to Congress for May 2017, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 14165b(f); Public Law 114-12, Sec. 4(f); (129 Stat. 196); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1418. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Computation of Annual Liability Insurance (Including Self-Insurance), No-Fault Insurance, and Workers' Compensation Settlement Recovery Threshold", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395y(b)(9)(D); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1862(b)(9)(D) (as added by Public Law 112-242, Sec. 202(a)(2)); (126 Stat. 2379); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

1419. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the fiscal year 2016 report of the Federal Coordinated Health Care Office (Medicare-Medicaid Coordination Office), pursuant to Sec. 2602(e) of the Affordable Care Act, as revised by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROE of Tennessee: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1461. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to limit the instances in which official time may be granted for certain purposes to employees of the Department, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-146, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy to veterans (Rept. 115-147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1005. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans (Rept. 115-148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 467. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that each medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs complies with requirements relating to scheduling veterans for health care appointments, to improve the uniform application of directives of the Department, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-149, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1848. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on the use of medical scribes in Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers (Rept. 115-151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUCK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 352. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1973) to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1761) to amend title 18, United States Code, to criminalize the knowing consent of the visual depiction, or live transmission, of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from May 26, 2017, through June 5, 2017 (Rept. 115-152). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 467 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 624 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1461 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 2 of rule XII, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 624. A bill to restrict the inclusion of social security account numbers on documents sent by mail by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-50, Pt. 1); referred to the Committee on Ways and Means for a period ending not later than May 23, 2017, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(t) of rule X.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 2593. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal years 2018 and 2019, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. KNIGHT):

H.R. 2594. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide interim partial payment to small business contractors that request an equitable adjustment due to a change in the terms of a construction contract, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 2595. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide for an option under the Secure Mail Initiative under which a person to whom a document is sent under that initiative may elect to have the United States Postal Service use the Hold for Pickup service or the Signature Confirmation service in delivering the document, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 2596. A bill to designate the Castner Range in the State of Texas, to establish the Castner Range National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 2597. A bill to extend temporary protected status for certain nationals of Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea until Novem-

ber 21, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Mr. BEYER): H.R. 2598. A bill to provide family members of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others new tools to prevent gun violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2599. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to refine how Medicare pays for orthotics and prosthetics and to improve beneficiary experience and outcomes with orthotic and prosthetic care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 2600. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Iowa of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain land in Pottawattamie County, Iowa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DUNN (for himself, Mr. CORREA,

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BOST, Mr. BACON, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. SABLON, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. ARRINGTON):

H.R. 2601. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to improve the access of veterans to organ transplants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 2602. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to include training for certain employees of air carriers to combat human trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr.

BABIN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 2603. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that nonnative species in the United States shall not be treated as endangered species or threatened species for purposes of that Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for him-

self, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 2604. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the procedure to designate a foreign state, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr.

CONYERS, Mr. GOWDY, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 2605. A bill to provide for additional resources for the Secret Service, and to improve protections for restricted areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. RUSSELL):

H.R. 2606. A bill to amend the Act of August 4, 1947 (commonly known as the Stigler Act), with respect to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 2607. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to authorize grants for frequent and chronic coastal flooding mitigation and adaptation infrastructure projects; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 2608. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to apportionments to States for certain highway programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2609. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to revise certain authorized purposes described in the Missouri River Mainstem Reservoir System Master Water Control Manual; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 2610. A bill to require reimbursement from certain public officials whose travel results in unusual costs relating to protection of those officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 2611. A bill to modify the boundary of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 2612. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to encourage the placement of released Federal prisoners in residential re-entry centers near their homes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2613. A bill to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from timber sales conducted on National Forest System land, to reduce payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 to reflect such counties' receipt of timber sale revenues, to strengthen stewardship end result contracting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2614. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish metrics and standards to determine the effectiveness in the programs of the Department of Justice in combating gangs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 2615. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain land located in Gulf Islands National Seashore, Jackson County, Mississippi, between the National Park Service and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER):

H.R. 2616. A bill to provide for statutes of limitations for certain civil actions under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution recognizing the September 11th National Memorial Trail as an important trail and greenway to be enjoyed by all in honor of the heroes of September 11th; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. DENT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COOK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SIREN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H. Res. 351. A resolution condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 2593.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2594.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2595.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 2596.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution of the United States, which states that Congress shall have the power to "establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization."

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 2598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate commerce, as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and including, but not solely limited to Article I, Section 8, Clause 14.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 2600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 2601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional Authority on which this Bill rests is the power of Congress to make all law which are necessary and proper pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 2602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XIII

Section 1, "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

Section 2, "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 2603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 2604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2605.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 2606.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with the Indian Tribes.

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 in order the enforce treaties made between the United States and several Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 2607.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 2608.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2609.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

“Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes”

The management of the Missouri river by the Army Corps of Engineers directly impacts commerce. The river is a source of barge traffic carrying a variety of goods.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 2610.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Article I Section 8

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 2611.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 2612.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2613.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2614.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 2615.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Sec. 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.)

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 2616.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 12;

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 14;

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 16;

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 10: Mrs. LOVE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MACARTHUR, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 36: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 37: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 179: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 242: Mr. SHERMAN and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 350: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 390: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 411: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 468: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 490: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 519: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 535: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 564: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 592: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 624: Mr. FASO and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 649: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 671: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 676: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 681: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 712: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 738: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 747: Mr. COHEN, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOST, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 750: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 757: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 770: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 799: Mr. COHEN, Mr. HURD, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 807: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 821: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 849: Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. HOLDING, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 943: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 1006: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1017: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. REICHERT, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 1057: Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GIBBS, and Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 1098: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1104: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1144: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1155: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1164: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BACON, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1167: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1173: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1203: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 1222: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1226: Mr. LEVIN and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1245: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1270: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1289: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1314: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 1315: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1316: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1358: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1361: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 1406: Mr. YODER and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1422: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1429: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1447: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1456: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 1562: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1566: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1584: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1587: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1614: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1624: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1626: Mr. BACON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1661: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1684: Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 1697: Mr. GAETZ, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 1711: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1727: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 1730: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1731: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 1733: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1784: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1811: Mr. BERGMAN and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1820: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 1840: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1853: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1854: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 1895: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 1904: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1909: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1911: Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ZELDIN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1974: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1989: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. KNIGHT, and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1993: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1997: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2013: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 2029: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 2045: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2052: Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2079: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2083: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2134: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 2147: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2150: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2164: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2181: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 2215: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 2240: Mr. BOST, Mr. REED, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 2272: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2285: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2299: Mr. TONKO and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 2327: Mr. POSEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KATKO, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2331: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2335: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2340: Ms. MCSALLY and Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 2353: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2358: Mr. PETERS and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2360: Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2372: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2392: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 2413: Mr. BEYER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2414: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LEE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2472: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 2473: Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 2482: Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 2491: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H.R. 2498: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 2500: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. O'HALLERAN.
 H.R. 2509: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 2512: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 2515: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 2519: Mr. SOTO, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. DELANEY.
 H.R. 2527: Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 2532: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 2545: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 2547: Mr. MASSIE.
 H.R. 2556: Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 2561: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
 H.R. 2581: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2583: Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
 H.R. 2586: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 2587: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
 H.J. Res. 53: Mr. HOYER.
 H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. HARPER, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. FLORES.
 H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. PETERS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. BYRNE.
 H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H. Res. 15: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H. Res. 30: Ms. PLASKETT.
 H. Res. 31: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H. Res. 188: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H. Res. 201: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H. Res. 218: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
 H. Res. 220: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. CLAY.
 H. Res. 239: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. POE of Texas, and Ms. GABBARD.
 H. Res. 259: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HILL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H. Res. 276: Mr. ZELDIN.
 H. Res. 285: Mr. TURNER.
 H. Res. 314: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CRIST, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H. Res. 330: Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H. Res. 336: Ms. TITUS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. VELA, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DONOVAN, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H. Res. 346: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment offered by Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE or a designee, to H.R. 1761 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits, as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Chairman GOODLATTE, or a designee, to H.R. 1973, the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. BLUM.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FORT MYERS HIGH SOFTBALL TEAM—FIRST STATE TITLE

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Fort Myers High School's softball team and their first state championship in program history. The Green Wave struck a decisive victory over the Niceville Eagles by a margin of 7–1. This triumph merely closes an already excellent year for the high school's athletic program where they collectively won two team state titles and six individual championships. All this was done while maintaining excellent academic standards.

I congratulate the Fort Myers Green Wave and Head Coach Johnny Manetta for this most cherished win. We look forward to seeing what this young team will accomplish in the years to come.

HONORING THE PHILADELPHIA ORCHESTRA

HON. BRENDAN F. BOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and proud Philadelphian.

Today, the world famous Philadelphia Orchestra departs for a three country tour of Asia. In these uncertain times as my colleagues and I focus on East Asia, I think we can all agree that the Philadelphia Orchestra is a critical tool in the diplomatic toolbox.

Working with our diplomats at the Department of State and with Pennsylvania Governor Tom Wolf's Department of Community and Economic Development, over 150 Pennsylvania musicians, non-profit and business leaders will travel to China, Mongolia and Korea.

In China, they will celebrate 45 years since President Richard Nixon and Secretary Henry Kissinger personally requested that they open bilateral relations for our two countries. They will engage in innovative people to people diplomacy.

In Mongolia, they will celebrate 30 years of U.S.–Mongolia bilateral relations. They are the first western orchestra to visit this proud democracy who often labels the United States its "third neighbor." I was honored when the President of Mongolia visited Philadelphia in September 2016.

The trip to Korea has taken on added importance this year. The delegation will include proud Korean Americans who are constituents

of mine. Philadelphia and Incheon are Sister Cities. My district is home to a vibrant Korean-American community that has made successful contributions to the area. Large public concerts and events in Korea will demonstrate for the world to see the unbreakable bond between our two countries.

As we focus our attention on the geopolitics of East Asia, I think we can all agree that this tour could not come at a more important time.

16TH DISTRICT CONGRESSIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AWARDS

HON. VERN BUCHANAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to law enforcement men and women who have provided distinctive service to the people of Florida's 16th Congressional District.

Law enforcement is a demanding profession that requires sacrifice, courage and a dedication to serve others. Every day, brave men and women put themselves in harm's way to enforce the laws of our society and protect public safety. They deserve our gratitude and respect.

Six years ago, I established the 16th District Congressional Law Enforcement Awards, CLEA, to give special recognition to law enforcement officers, departments, or units for exceptional achievement. This year, I will present congressional law enforcement awards to the following winners chosen by an independent panel comprised of current and retired law enforcement personnel representing a cross-section of the district's law enforcement community:

Officer Jason Nuttall of the Bradenton Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Captain John Walsh, Captain Debra Kaspar, Lieutenant Jon Varley, Community Affairs Director Kaitlyn Perez, Deputy Phillip Mockler, Detective Tim Speth and Investigator Lynn Thomson of the Sarasota County Sheriff's Office will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Detective Richard Wilson of the Palmetto Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Officer Alan Bores of the Holmes Beach Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Detective James Warren of the Manatee County Sheriff's Office will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Sergeant Robert Armstrong of the Sarasota Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Deputy Kevin Smetana of the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Master Sergeant George Taunton of the Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Career Service Award.

Troopers Caleb Kerr and Brett Fitzpatrick of the Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Preservation of Life Award.

Sergeant Patrick Roberts of the Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Above and Beyond the Call of Duty Award.

Pastor Patrick Miller, Pastor Vincent Smith, Doctor Harriet Moore, Geoffrey Gilot and Al-Muta Hawks all affiliated with the Boys and Girls Club of Sarasota will receive the Associate Service Award.

The Manatee County Special Investigations Division will receive the Unit Citation Award. The members of this unit are: Major William Jordan, Captain Todd Shear, Lieutenant Anthony Carr, Division Secretary Toni Burton, Administrative Assistant Cindy Hoffman, Sergeant Jason Powell, Detective James Parrish, Detective Kim Zink, Detective Greg Dunlap, Detective Mike Diaz, Bruce Benjamin (Crime Stoppers), Amber Hoffman (Manager), Erica Chenard (UCR Coordinator), Criminal Analyst Ashley Eannarino, Criminal Analyst Elicia Main, Intel Analyst Don Brown, Criminal Analyst John Ferrito, Intel Analyst Elizabeth Thomas, Sergeant Evelio Perez, Detective Joseph Petta, Detective Justin Warren, Detective Derek Pollock, Detective Eric Davis, Detective Ray Richter, Detective Patrick Thames, Detective Scott Williamson, Sergeant Gary Combee, Detective William Freel, Detective Maria Gillum, Detective Bryce Wilhelm, Detective Jonathan Kruse, Sergeant Steve Barron, Detective Randall Walker, Detective Brian Beck, Detective Shayne Rousseau, Detective Jeremy Martin, Detective Robert Brigham, Sergeant Isaac Redmond, Detective Rafael Ortegon, Detective Christopher Gallagher, Detective Joel Taylor, Detective David Bocchino, and Detective Lourdes Santiago.

CLIFFS NATURAL RESOURCES—170 YEARS OF MINING

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a significant milestone achieved by a great American company and one of the largest employers in my district, Cliffs Natural Resources Inc. In 2017, Cliffs is celebrating its 170th year as an independent mining company specializing in the extraction and processing of iron ore—or taconite as it is known on Minnesota's Mesabi Iron Range.

Cliffs Natural Resources was founded in 1847 in Cleveland, Ohio and first began operating on the Mesabi Iron Range in 1905 at the former Crosby Mine located near Nashwauk, Minnesota. Today, Cliffs is the oldest metals

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

and mining company traded on the New York Stock Exchange and the largest independent producer of iron ore pellets in the United States. As a company that was founded prior to the industrial revolution, Cliffs has weathered the ups and downs of the American economy and the cyclical nature of the steel business for 170 years. This achievement is nothing short of remarkable.

Throughout its long history, Cliffs has been an integral supplier of raw materials to the domestic steel industry, providing the iron ore used in the production of steel that supports our American way of life and provides for the defense of this great country. Cliffs stands at the very foundation of our steel industry and America's manufacturing economy.

Just as notable is Cliffs' commitment to Northeastern Minnesota. Overall Cliffs employs approximately 2,900 people in the United States, with over 1,700 family-sustaining jobs across its three Minnesota iron ore operations—United Taconite, Northshore Mining Company and Hibbing Taconite. In 2016, Cliffs' economic impact in the state of Minnesota was nearly \$900 million. Furthermore, Cliffs has shown itself to be a tremendous supporter of its home communities, with the company and its employees contributing over \$575,000 to charitable organizations in Minnesota last year alone.

The domestic iron ore and steel industries have confronted grave challenges in recent years as historic levels of illegally-dumped steel flooded U.S. shores. These trade law violations led to the idling of iron ore mines, steel mills and the lay-off of thousands of workers, including 2,000 Minnesota iron ore miners. In 2015, at the height of the steel import crisis, I found a friend and partner in Cliffs' Chairman, President and CEO, Mr. Lourenco Goncalves. This was not the first trade-induced steel disaster that Cliffs had endured and Mr. Goncalves understood that it would take the support and engagement of the White House to fully address and remedy the threat posed by record levels of illegal steel imports. Lourenco pledged to me that, if the federal government would commit to prosecuting the trade cases to the full extent of our U.S. trade laws, he would bring back workers at Cliffs' idled Minnesota mines. In conjunction with Minnesota's other elected officials, we were able to capture the attention of President Obama's Administration, resulting in tariffs and duties assessed in excess of 500 percent on steel products from certain countries, namely China. Mr. Goncalves followed through on his commitment to put nearly 1,000 Minnesota miners back to work and it was my pleasure to join Cliffs in August of 2016 as the company broke ground on a \$75 million capital investment in new pellet-making capabilities at United Taconite in Forbes, Minnesota.

I commend Cliffs Natural Resources, Mr. Goncalves and all of Cliffs' employees for stewarding Cliffs through the latest challenging chapter in your company's long and storied history. This 170-year anniversary stands as a testament to the hard work and dedication of past and present Cliffs' employees, from haul truck drivers and millwrights to the company's most senior executives. I am pleased to recognize the monumental contributions of this great company, both to the communities of

Minnesota's Iron Range as well as to the prosperity and defense of the United States. In closing, I extend my best wishes for the continued success of Cliffs Natural Resources.

IN HONOR OF COLONEL JONATHAN HOWERTON

HON. ROB BISHOP

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Colonel Jonathan "Jon" Howerton, United States Army, for his extraordinary dedication to duty and selfless service to the United States of America. Colonel Howerton will be moving on from his present assignment as the Chief of the Army's Liaison Division to the United States House of Representatives where he served from April 1st, 2016 to June 1st, 2017 to become the Deputy Commander for Maneuver of the 2nd Infantry Division (Republic of Korea-United States Combined Division), Camp Casey, Republic of Korea.

The son of a career Army officer, Colonel Howerton grew up on posts, camps, and stations across the continental United States and in Europe. He was commissioned through the Reserve Officer Training Corps into the Field Artillery upon graduation from Texas Christian University in 1990. After his first assignment as a lieutenant, he commanded Field Artillery units at the Battery, Battalion and Brigade levels and has served in a variety of tactical, operational, and strategic level leadership and staff positions. He has extensive experience overseas including a previous assignment to Korea and one to Germany along with operational deployments to Bosnia-Herzegovina supporting Operation Joint Guard, and three to Iraq supporting both Operations Iraqi Freedom and New Dawn. He has also been stationed at numerous military installations in the United States to include Fort Sill, Oklahoma; Fort Leavenworth, Kansas; Fort Polk, Louisiana; Fort Hood, Texas; Fort Carson, Colorado; Schofield Barracks, Fort Shafter and Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii; and Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to recognize Colonel Howerton's long and decorated career. On behalf of a grateful Nation, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing and commending Colonel Howerton for a lifetime of service to his country, and for all he and his family have given and continue to give to our country. We are in their debt. We wish him, his wife Tricia, his daughter Baylor, and his son Cooper all the best as they continue their Army journey to the Republic of Korea.

CONGRATULATING THE CENTRAL CAROLINA HOMESCHOOLERS MOCK TRIAL TEAM

HON. MARK WALKER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Central Carolina Homeschoolers

(CCH) high school mock trial team. On May 13, 2017, the CCH mock trial team won the 2017 National High School Mock Trial Championship in Hartford, Connecticut. I, along with the rest of the Sixth District, express my sincere congratulations to this team.

Based in Randolph County, the CCH team is the first North Carolina school to win the National Championship in this annual competition. I am pleased to recognize Caitlin Kelly, Joshua Way, Jonah Moss, Heather Pennington, Allyn Sims, Madysen Bailey, Emily Polson and David Bainbridge Jr. for their diligence in accomplishing this exceptional feat. I would also like to acknowledge the team's coaches, Maria Bailey and Darren Allen, for their dedication to these students.

Once again, I congratulate the CCH mock trial team for this momentous accomplishment and wish these students much success in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Nos. 269 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 1862), 270 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 1842), and 273 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 2288) I did not cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on all of these votes.

JOSEPH CARDENAS EARNS BOY SCOUT EAGLE RANK AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Joseph Cardenas of Pearland, TX, for earning his Boy Scout Eagle Rank Award.

Eagle Rank is the highest rank among Boy Scouts, requiring them to develop leadership, service and outdoor skills. To earn this distinguished award, Joseph had to achieve the Life Scout rank, earn 21 merit badges, and complete a service project. Joseph's service project was developing a brick memorial for veterans of all branches of the military. Individual and personalized bricks were laid at the VFW Pearland Memorial Post 7109 in Pearland.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Joseph Cardenas for earning his Boy Scout Eagle Rank Award. We are confident he will have continued success in his future endeavors. We are very proud.

COMMEMORATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY COLLEGE

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate San Joaquin Valley College (SJVC) on the occasion of their 40th anniversary. SJVC has educated over 25,000 students and started them on the path of successful careers. It is both fitting and appropriate that we honor SJVC's dedication and service to the community.

Founded on April 14, 1977, SJVC began with three students studying to become medical assistants. Shirley Perry, founder of SJVC, began as a medical assistant herself, in pursuit of certification. Through diligent studying on her own she became the first person to pass the certification test without schooling. Her impressive success was admired by many other medical assistants, seeking help from Shirley on their exams. This tutoring led to a teaching position at a community college. After three years, Shirley became unsatisfied with the schooling options and was inspired to establish the San Joaquin Valley College.

Robert Perry, Shirley's husband, left his job to handle the business aspects of the college. In 1995, the institution was accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges/Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. This accreditation allowed for SJVC to offer Associate of Science Degrees. The college now has 15 campuses located all over California, from Sacramento to San Diego.

San Joaquin Valley College offers 22 programs and will soon open its newest campus in downtown Porterville, CA. The institution has been passed down to Mike and Mark Perry, the sons of Shirley and Robert, and continues to provide education to students across California.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating San Joaquin Valley College's 40th Anniversary, along with the Perry family, for all of their hard work and accomplishments within the past forty years.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK PECHACEK, JR.

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Frank Pechacek, Jr. of Council Bluffs, Iowa. Frank recently retired from the Board of Directors of the Pottawattamie County Community Foundation after nine years of service.

Frank has been instrumental in his role with the Southwest Iowa Education Foundation, an affiliate of the Pottawattamie County Community Foundation. Under his leadership, the Pottawattamie County Community Foundation has seen substantial growth within the com-

munity. When Frank is not volunteering his time with the Foundation, he is a successful attorney at the Willson & Pechacek Law Firm.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Frank on his many years of dedicated and devoted service to the Pottawattamie County Community Foundation and Pottawattamie County. I am proud to represent him in the United States Congress and I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in congratulating Frank on his many accomplishments and in wishing him nothing but continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on Monday, May 22, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 269, H.R. 1862; and YEA on Roll Call No. 270, H.R. 1842.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding missed votes due to family matters. Had I been present for roll call vote number 269, H.R. 1862, The Global Child Protection Act of 2017, I would have voted Yea. Had I been present for roll call vote number 270, H.R. 1842, The Strengthening Children's Safety Act of 2017, I would have voted Yea.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 22, 2017, I missed votes due to unavoidable flight delays. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on roll call votes No. 269 and 270.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHRIS COLLINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from votes May 22, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 269, and YEA on Roll Call No. 270.

IN RECOGNITION OF SAFE BOATING WEEK

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, today I stand to recognize Safe Boating Week beginning on May 20th and ending on May 27. I ask my colleagues to join me in drawing attention to this important issue and making water-based recreational activities safer and more enjoyable for all.

I would like to thank the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 3-5 for hosting a Safe Boating and Water Safety Day in Sacramento on May 20. They will be holding demonstrations and presenting safety displays along the river water fronts for all families and residents in attendance. I believe that efforts such as these are crucial to reducing the number of boating-related deaths and injuries that occur each year.

Most boating accidents are preventable and occur because of human error, not because of environmental factors. In 2016, 266 boating accidents resulted in 150 injuries and 36 fatalities in Northern California alone. Many of these fatalities can be attributed to the victim not wearing a life jacket. We must make it explicitly known to the general public that today's life jackets are more affordable, more comfortable, and truly key to avoiding accidental drownings. Together, we must encourage all boaters to practice safe boating, attend safe boating classes, and live by the slogan "Wear It California!"

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in recognizing Safe Boating Week activities in West Sacramento.

IN SUPPORT OF TAIWAN'S PARTICIPATION IN THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support for Taiwan's participation in the World Health Organization (WHO).

For nearly a decade, Taiwan has participated as an invited observer at the World Health Assembly, the annual forum for the WHO. This invitation arrived late last year, due to political opposition to democratically-elected President Tsai Ing-wen. This year, no invitation was sent at all. Public health should be a politics-free issue and the WHO, a leading actor in reacting to global health crises, should remain a neutral, independent body which does not only serve the interest of any specific country.

As our world becomes increasingly connected and travel times to places around the globe are decreasing, communicable diseases have spread at an ever increasing pace. With its modern, world-class health system, Taiwan has been a leader in disease prevention, surveillance, quarantine, and treatment. It has

been a key ally in the fights against many diseases, including SARS, avian flu, and Zika. Taiwan has shared its expertise and resources with people in South East Asia, and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, the World Health Assembly is an important event with worldwide attendance where global health policy is determined. Taiwan's medical expertise should be well represented. I encourage the administration to continue to help Taiwan's inclusion in the World Health Assembly and work together with their Taiwanese counterparts to strengthen the bilateral cooperation on health.

SIBYL WESTENHAVER NAMED
KATY, TX, SENIOR OF THE YEAR

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sibyl Westenhaver for being named as the 2017 City of Katy Senior of the Year.

Members of the Senior Citizens Center Advisory Board nominated two people to be named Katy's Senior of the Year and Mayor Fabol Hughes choose Sibyl. Sibyl began volunteering in her church's home delivered meals program in 2006. She helped transition the program to Interfaith Ministries' meals on wheels program. She moved to Katy from Oklahoma after losing her husband to be closer to her children and grandchildren. Not wanting to be a "sit-at-home elderly person," Sibyl is known throughout the community and has created an extended family through her fellow volunteers and meal recipients. She's truly an inspiration.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Sibyl for being named the 2017 City of Katy Senior of the Year. She's helped countless people and we thank her for her help.

RECOGNIZING INTERNATIONAL
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

HON. MARK POCAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of international students, scholars, and the U.S. institutions of higher education they attend who have been unfairly penalized by the administration's efforts to limit travel to our country. I urge my colleagues and the administration to recognize the vital contribution international students, scholars, and their families make when we welcome them to this great country.

International Education programs are incredibly important to the higher education experiences of students across the country. In particular, Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs enable American undergraduate and graduate students to develop capabilities and proficiencies in languages and areas of the world that

greatly benefit national security. At its core, Title VI strengthens the international teaching and curricula of students, introduces students to a wider, diverse world, and fosters their likelihood of pursuing an internationally focused profession. Similarly, the Fulbright-Hays program is an internationally focused program that awards grants to individual U.S. teachers, post-doctoral students, post-doctoral faculty, and U.S. institutions in order to support research and training efforts overseas focused on non-Western languages and areas of studies. The Title VI and the Fulbright-Hays programs form the vital infrastructure of the Federal government's investment in the international service pipeline. The contributions these programs make to diplomacy and international education must be protected and prioritized.

These programs broaden all students' horizons, benefit our country's workforce, and strengthen diplomatic ties. In turn, when we welcome international students to our universities, they strengthen our communities and enrich discourse through diverse perspectives. The Trump Administration's rhetoric surrounding immigrants has been harmful to international students and the academic community. Following the Administration's proposed travel ban, many immigrant students at our universities have experienced tremendous uncertainty about their status. Additionally, schools across the country have seen their applicant rates of international students decline.

At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, international students and scholars apply the lessons they have learned abroad to make a positive impact on our state's economy. The University of Wisconsin Madison is one of the nation's top producers of Fulbright students and scholars, with 21 students accepted into the prestigious program. In Wisconsin's 2nd District, we have welcomed nearly 7,000 international students and their families to our area and are profoundly grateful for the contributions they have made. I am incredibly proud of the students and faculty who continue to lead in the field of international education and strongly encourage my colleagues to support these vital education programs.

CONGRATULATING COLUMBIA
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE SARAH
COMBS WHO WILL ATTEND THE
COLLEGE OF IDAHO ON ATH-
LETIC SCHOLARSHIP

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to an outstanding young student from the State of Idaho. Her name is Sarah Combs. Sarah is a graduate of the Columbia High School Class of 2017. Looking at her scholastic accomplishments and athletic talents, it's easy to predict Sarah is on a fast track to success.

Sarah's parents enrolled her in the Bogus Basin Ski Education Foundation (BBSEF) in Boise at the age of seven. The foundation was

established to provide training and competition programs for aspiring young ski racers. She is an avid skier and enjoys participating in BBSEF events.

Sarah's love of sport extends to engaging people of all abilities. She is organizing a weekend event for children with disabilities. While the service project puts her on course to earn the Girls Scouts of the USA highest achievement, the Gold Award, she is most excited about helping the participants learn gymnastics. She kicked off the effort by asking her ski coach, Doug Sato, to serve as her mentor. He was happy to oblige. "Sarah is very curious about the world and is able to make keen observations about her environment. She seeks to make significant changes and overcomes any obstacles."

Sarah has been a patient confidante to other skiers on the team. "She is kind to everyone. You can go to her with any question, and she figures it out," says one teammate. "She shows her appreciation when you lend a hand. She is an all-around nice person," adds another.

"I appreciate the friends that I have made in BBSEF," says Sarah, "I thank my parents especially for supporting me so that I could continue to race, and I thank the coaches as well." When the ski season ends you can find Sarah on the track where she runs the 400 meter and the 2-mile race.

Sarah took her academic responsibilities seriously. Ever since Sarah started high school she was the yearly recipient of the All-Academic Southern Idaho Conference. This is quite an accomplishment given her demanding training schedule.

The College of Idaho took notice of Sarah's accomplishments on the slopes when she had the opportunity to train with the College of Idaho Ski Team. While training with the ski team, the college also learned that Sarah ran cross country and track as well. The College of Idaho realized that she is the caliber of a student-athlete desired for enrollment. On National Letter of Intent Signing Day, Sarah signed for all three sports and was offered a scholarship for all three sports.

So Sarah will be a member of the Yotes Women's Alpine Ski Team, the Yotes Women's Cross Country Team, and the Yotes Women's Track and Field Team.

Sarah intends to enroll in the Pre-Physical Therapy program and take advantage of an elective that will prepare her to work with disabled athletes. There is no doubt Sarah will be a very busy freshman, and we wish her all the best in the classroom; on the track; on the ski slopes; or any other endeavors she attempts.

May your time at the College of Idaho be a rewarding experience. Your family, friends, and Bogus Basin Ski Education Foundation are proud of you. Go Yotes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DIANE BLACK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, at the time of votes yesterday, I was unavoidably detained in

my district. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on both H.R. 1862 and H.R. 1842.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 269, and YEA on Roll Call No. 270

HONORING PROFESSOR DOUG
KRESSE

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions and service of Professor Doug Kresse as Director of Forensics at Fullerton College in Fullerton, California. After a decade of dedication to the speech and debate team, Doug will pass on the torch to his colleagues, but remain a devoted professor and mentor at Fullerton College.

Doug Kresse was born and raised in the Pacific Northwest where he graduated from Eastern Washington University with a Bachelor's degree in English and a minor in Speech Communication. He received a Master's degree in Speech Communication from California State University, Fullerton. He taught as Director of Forensics and Speech and Communications at Seattle Pacific University in Seattle, Washington, Tiffin University and Heidelberg University in Tiffin, Ohio, and finally, Fullerton College in Fullerton, California. Doug developed the intercollegiate speech & debate program at Fullerton College and served as Director of Forensics for ten years. He coached hundreds of students into polished speakers and well-argued debaters, helping them to move forward confidently in their studies, careers, and lives. Doug was presented with the "President's Award" by the National Education Debate Association in March 2016 for his commitment to collegiate debate and support of his students.

A life-long learner, Doug is well known for his regular interest in news and reading. He actively participated in C-SPAN's Classroom programs for educators and was a national prize winner for C-SPAN's American Presidents series, designing a chessboard of the George H. W. Bush presidency. He continues to show C-SPAN and other news clips in the classroom as examples in his speech and debate courses, well known for his office full of VHS tapes.

In his free time, Doug can be found keeping up with the local concert scene in Los Angeles, running, and spending time with his family. He has been married to his wife, Marti, for 37 years and is the proud father to two daughters, Kristin and Carol, father-in-law to Raymond, and grandpa to Mitchell Paige Coates.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Doug Kresse for his dedication to his community and students, creating the leaders and speakers of tomorrow.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE
JACKALYNE
PFANNENSTIEL

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to the life of the Honorable Ms. Jackalyn Pfannenstiel, a lifelong trailblazer dedicated to energy efficiency, who passed away on April 26, 2017, at the age of 69.

Ms. Pfannenstiel was born on September 7, 1947 in Norwich, Connecticut. She attended Clark University in Massachusetts, where she earned a Bachelor's degree in Economics and went on to get her Master's degree in Economics from the University of Hartford in Connecticut.

Ms. Pfannenstiel began her career working as an economist at the Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control. With an interest in energy efficiency, Ms. Pfannenstiel moved to California in 1978 to start a new path after being hired by California's Public Utilities Commission. After two years, she went to work for Pacific Gas & Electric Company and parent company, Pacific Gas & Electric Corporation for twenty years. During her twenty years at Pacific Gas & Electric, Ms. Pfannenstiel served in various roles, most notably as Vice President of Planning and Strategic Initiatives. Through her leadership and collaboration, Ms. Pfannenstiel helped write California energy policy throughout the 1980's designed to enhance conservation.

In 2004, Ms. Pfannenstiel became a voice for energy conservation in California when she was appointed to the Energy Commission by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, and in 2006 was named as the commission's first female chairwoman. Her leadership did not stop at the state level. In 2010, President Barack Obama appointed her as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Energy, Installations and the Environment. Her continued dedication towards energy conservation can be seen through her work on the Great Green Fleet, a squadron of 10 ships and 70 aircrafts, which run 50 percent on biofuel.

In addition to her time as Assistant Secretary, in 2013 Ms. Pfannenstiel co-founded a San Francisco start up called Advanced Microgrid Solutions aimed to enhance utility usage. Her legacy will be remembered through her accomplishments and the progress towards improved energy conservation over the years.

Ms. Jackalyn Pfannenstiel is survived by her husband Daniel, two sons Matthew and Steven Deutsch, grandson Wesley Deutsch, sister Kathleen Pratt, and brother Richard Pfannenstiel. As a mother of two sons, she never missed their games, no matter how busy of a schedule she had. It is my honor to join Ms. Jackalyn Pfannenstiel's family in celebration of the life of this inspirational woman. She truly led by example and encouraged teamwork throughout her life.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the life, remarkable career, and achievements

of Ms. Jackalyn Pfannenstiel. Her dedication towards energy conservation will be remembered for years to come.

INTRODUCING THE TAXPAYERS
REQUIRE URGENT MANDATORY
PROTECTION FROM EGREGIOUS
DEBT ACT OF 2017

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Taxpayers Require Urgent Mandatory Protection from Egregious Debt Act of 2017, also known as the TRUMPED Act.

Those of us representing south Florida have received numerous calls and letters since the election of Mr. Trump noting the burden on the budgets of local governments and small business owners as he has used his Mar-a-lago property as an almost weekly retreat—I am sure my friends from New York have fielded similar complaints.

Mr. Speaker, our primary law enforcement agencies are proud to provide protection for any number of dignitaries who visit our great state. However, their budgets have not, and cannot, sustain the weight of Mr. Trump's weekly in season trips to Mar-a-lago—nor should they have to as Mr. Trump is provided very nice accommodations here in Washington, D.C. and Camp David in Maryland, at the taxpayer's considerable expense.

Over just one holiday alone, the Palm Beach Sheriff's Office was forced to absorb \$250,000 in unforeseen expenses—this is an untenable budgetary posture for our local Sheriff's Office as that number represents a \$60,000 per day bill. They must cover overtime for their officers and deploy multiple units including their Motor Unit, Strategic Intelligence Unit, Marine Unit, Aviation Unit, as well as numerous other teams that provide the fabric for a secure trip to South Florida for Mr. Trump.

Mr. Speaker, the TRUMPED Act is based on a simple premise—if Mr. Trump wants to make continual use of his properties then he may do so, but he may not do so at the taxpayer's expense. And let us be clear about something else: Mr. Trump, while burning through taxpayer dollars during these trips, actually makes financial gains when he visits his properties as the U.S. Government must rent space from him during such visits.

Mr. Speaker, it is offensive that Mr. Trump insists on a budget that unequivocally, and without mercy, attacks hardworking Americans, and then has the audacity to turn around and insist that our local police officers, first responders and small businesses suffer under his insistence that he be allowed to enjoy a lavish lifestyle at taxpayer expense. I look forward to the support of my colleagues on this important bill.

HONORING MAINE VETERAN TOM ALLEN FOR HIS SERVICE DURING WORLD WAR II AND HIS MANY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent, Tom Allen, a proud World War II veteran from Augusta, Maine. At 94 years young, Tom continues to impress those who know him with his commitment to out-ski, and out-kayak the grips of old age and the passing of time.

When the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, Tom was a student at Harvard University in Boston, Massachusetts. He, like so many other brave men from his generation, felt the need to serve his country. In June of 1942, seven months after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, Tom willingly left Harvard and joined the United States Marine Corps. Recognizing his academic strengths, the Marines sent Tom to language school where he became proficient in Japanese. Upon the completion of his training, and with the war in full swing, Tom was sent to the Pacific Theatre where he first served in Saipan. In 1945, just months after the atomic bomb destroyed the city, Tom was reassigned to an intelligence position with the Second Marine Division and sent to Nagasaki, Japan. Among his many duties as an interpreter, Tom was tasked with working directly with the Japanese to uncover where they held their war materials in hopes of demilitarizing the Japanese War Machine. A year later Tom was honorably discharged from the Marines and chose to return to Harvard to complete his undergraduate education.

At a relatively young age, Tom had accomplished more than most people do in their lifetime. His resumé of resilience and his sense of determination are some of the many positive qualities Tom has maintained into his later years. Two years ago, at the age of 92, Tom was seen skiing in the mountains of western Maine. Less than a year later, at the age of 93, Tom slipped into a kayak for a paddle around Boothbay Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, I truly admire Tom for his willingness to interrupt his Harvard education to answer our nation's call to serve. Lastly, I would like to thank him for reminding us all that age is simply a state of mind and that nothing is out of one's reach.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on May 22, 2017, I missed a series of Roll Call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on No. 269 and No. 270

HEATHER WILLIAMS NAMED PRINCIPAL OF NEW KATY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Heather Williams of Richmond, TX, for being named the principal of Kathleen Joerger Lindsey Elementary School.

Opening in August 2017, Lindsey Elementary School is the newest addition to the Lamar Consolidated Independent School District (ISD), the first Lamar Consolidated ISD school in Katy. This will be Heather's first time opening a new school, she said "it's an honor." This year she celebrates her 20th year in education. She has held several roles, from fifth grade teacher to assistant principal to principal.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Heather for being named the principal of Lindsey Elementary School. We're confident she'll be a great role-model for the children starting school there.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes Monday, May 22, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted Nay on Roll Call votes 269 and 270.

CONGRATULATING THE JUNIOR LEAGUE OF INDIANAPOLIS ON ITS 95TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and celebrate the Junior League of Indianapolis on the occasion of its 95th Anniversary. JLI's primary mission is to promote voluntarism, to develop the leadership potential of women, and to improve the community through the effective action and leadership of trained volunteers. For an astounding 95 years, JLI has worked diligently to promote these ideals and to enrich the lives of its members and the community in which they reside. The people of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District are forever grateful for the contributions to our Hoosier community, and as a formerly active member and current sustaining member, it is my distinct privilege to honor the Junior League of Indianapolis.

Ten Indianapolis women founded the JLI in the fall of 1921 to promote voluntarism throughout the city. In 1922, their first major project put JLI to the test. They successfully

opened an Occupational Therapy Clinic for Riley Children's Hospital, which served Indianapolis over two and a half decades until 1948. Since then, the lasting impact of JLI's community involvement has been felt constantly throughout the city. Committed to preserving Indianapolis' rich history, the League held its headquarters in the historic French Romanesque Schnull-Rauch House from 1979 to 2009, and maintained the historic monument during their residence. Several projects like Kids in the Kitchen, Susan G. Komen Race for the Cure, and the Ronald McDonald House have endured through the years and even through a few decades. The women of the Junior League choose to take on our most pressing and difficult issues, notably in their project regarding Early Prevention of School Failure in Indianapolis Public Schools from 1984 to 1990. Today, education remains a priority, with members volunteering at Stephen Foster School, IPS 67. Through a three-year partnership, the Junior League in their Signature project, "Partners Advancing Student Success", will work on tutoring, stocking the food pantry, and more at IPS 67. JLI also holds annually their service event, "Around the Community—Around the Clock", an event in which members perform 95 hours of continuous community service.

The League has nearly 1,000 members today dedicating over 16,000 hours of uncompensated service each year. Through grant making, roughly \$200,000 was invested into Indianapolis last year alone. In education, more than \$500,000 has been invested since 2011. This year's projects are as charitable as ever. Tutors in Action provides program funding and volunteers for one on one or small group tutoring for families in transitional housing. The Kids in the Kitchen program provides nutritional information and healthy cooking techniques for families to combat childhood obesity.

The Junior League of Indianapolis has proven time and time again that it is committed and vital to the wellbeing of our city. It serves as a role model for all charitable organizations like it. The focus on developing the potential of women in our community has served as an invaluable training ground for the next generation of amazingly, talented and generous leaders. JLI states that it seeks to be a catalyst for lasting change in the lives of children and families in our community, and it has exceeded this role for 95 years and counting. These selfless women and the families that support them, deserve our gratitude. On behalf of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District, I would like to congratulate this wonderful organization on 95 years of exemplary work within our community, and wish the JLI, and all their members, the best on their journey to another 95 remarkable years.

HONORING DR. CHRIS RODRIGUEZ

HON. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Chris Rodriguez, and

to commemorate his service to the people our state as Director of the New Jersey Office of Homeland Security. Director Rodriguez is a dedicated public servant who has worked tirelessly in the intelligence field to protect and serve New Jersey and the American people.

Director Chris Rodriguez has served in multiple capacities in the U.S. Federal Government including serving more than a decade in the Central Intelligence Agency and the U.S. Department of State. He was a crucial member of the Counterterrorism Center following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 where he collaborated with federal, state, and local levels to identify and counter potential threats to the United States.

Director Chris Rodriguez began working for the people of New Jersey in 2011 where he oversaw the Department of Law and Public Safety, the Department of Military and Veterans' Affairs, the Department of Transportation, and the Department of Homeland Security and Preparedness.

Director Chris Rodriguez honorably served our country both at home and abroad. We owe a tremendous debt to our Veterans who have served in defense of our great nation, for their sacrifices have allowed the United States of America to serve as a beacon for the promise of liberty.

I thank Director Christopher Rodriguez for his many years of service to the people of New Jersey and I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING GUAM DEPARTMENT
OF EDUCATION NURSES IN
HONOR OF NATIONAL SCHOOL
NURSES DAY

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and congratulate nurses and school nurse support staff of the Guam Department of Education (GDOE) in honor of National Nurses Week and National School Nurses Day. There are currently 44 Registered Nurses and 3 Licensed Practical Nurses serving the students of the Guam Department of Education. These nurses take on the daunting task of caring for the Guam Department of Education's more than 30,000 students and nearly 4,000 employees of the Guam Department of Education. These school nurses work day in and day out to ensure the health of our island's children so they can continue their education in the classroom.

Guam Department of Education nurses join the National Association of School Nurses in celebrating the theme of this year's School Nurses Day: Healthy Nurse. Healthy Students. They also join the American Nurses Association in celebrating the 2017 Nurses Week: The Balance of Mind, Body, and Spirit! GDOE nurses have chosen to celebrate National School Nurses Day by teaching students how to conduct hands only CPR or heart health activities.

Every year the GDOE nurses serve a critical role in providing a safe and healthy learning

environment for students throughout Guam's public elementary, middle, and high schools. GDOE nurses provide frontline, critical care for the most fragile children in our community and are members of health teams that support both educational and response initiatives dedicated to improving public health. Additionally, school nurses are liaisons to the school administrators, parents and healthcare providers when it comes to attending to the physical health of our island's students.

Every school year is different and challenging for the GDOE nurses. In April 2016, the school nurses received a call from the Department of Public Health and Social Services asking them to administer 5,000 doses of TB skin test solution to GDOE students and staff who need updates. The school nurses embraced the challenge and were able to host TB clinics in almost every GDOE school for students and staff. Despite these challenges, our island's school nurses have responded to these needs with professionalism and passion for the school communities they serve.

I commend and congratulate nurses and school nurse support staff of the Guam Department of Education (GDOE) as they celebrate the 2017 National School Nurses Day and On a successful school year. I join the people of Guam in expressing our appreciation for their contributions to Guam's school communities.

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH
AWARENESS MONTH

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to May being National Mental Health Awareness month, a nationwide initiative that aims to raise awareness and fight the stigmas associated with mental health illnesses.

Nearly 44 million American adults, and millions of children experience mental health conditions each year, including depression, bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, and post-traumatic stress.

Although we have made great progress expanding access to mental health treatment with the passage of the Affordable Health Care Act, too many people still do not get the help they need.

Despite the availability of treatment, the stigma associated with mental illness continues to keep millions of Americans from getting the treatment they need.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to turn a blind eye to our citizen's mental health needs, because according to a study by the National Alliance on Mental Illness, mental illnesses cost America over \$193.2 billion in lost earnings every year.

Congress must work together to ensure people living with mental illness know that they are not alone, that hope exists, and that the possibility of healing and thriving is achievable.

We should be sure that our budget, which we will be debating in the coming weeks, includes adequate funding to help.

RECOGNIZING INTERNATIONAL
STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of international students, scholars, and the U.S. institutions of higher education they attend who have been unfairly penalized by the Trump Administration's unlawful efforts to limit travel to our country from several Muslim-majority countries.

Among many faults, the President's travel ban fails to take into account the vital contribution international students, scholars and their families make when we welcome them to this great country. This, and the many other efforts undertaken by this administration to restrict access to visas, does not make our country safer, but undermines the valuable diplomatic, economic and cultural benefits that come from creating a more welcoming and diverse nation.

International students contribute to the economic well-being of the United States. According to NAFSA: Association of International Educators, during the 2015–2016 academic year, international students and their families supported 400,000 jobs and contributed nearly \$33 billion to the U.S. economy. In my district alone, during the 2015–2016 academic year, 3,724 international students and their families contributed \$120.3 million, supporting 797 jobs.

But this is just the immediate impact—the long-term effect of bringing talented minds from all over the world to our universities, many of whom go on to live and work and contribute to the United States, is immeasurable. When we close doors to immigrants, students, scholars, and travelers from all over the world, we close doors to our future. And when we particularly target individuals based on race or ethnicity, we not only show ourselves to be afraid of the world, we weaken our own security by cultivating enemies rather than friends.

We should not back away from maintaining an open and welcoming nation and we will continue to stand for the universal principles that bring students and scholars from all over the world to study in this great nation.

A TRIBUTE TO KELLY SUMMY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Kelly Summy of Council Bluffs, Iowa. Kelly recently retired from the Board of Directors of the Pottawattamie County Community Foundation. He helped create the Foundation in 2007 and has served as Chairman since its establishment.

Kelly's commitment to the Pottawattamie County Community Foundation from its early years to its legacy of today will stand out for generations to come. His leadership will have a lasting impact on the Foundation and the

Pottawattamie County community. When Kelly is not volunteering his time in his community, he serves as President of Midwest Ag Services of Council Bluffs.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Kelly for his many years of dedicated service to the Pottawattamie County Community Foundation and Pottawattamie County, Iowa. I am proud to represent him in the United States Congress and I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in congratulating Kelly on his many accomplishments and in wishing him nothing but continued success.

RECOGNIZING LAVERA ETHRIDGE-WILLIAMS IN CELEBRATION OF HER 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Mrs. LaVera Ethridge-Williams' 90th birthday. Ms. Ethridge-Williams is a celebrated entrepreneur and community advocate, who has been a staple in the West Fresno community for more than fifty years.

LaVera Ethridge-Williams was born in Boley, Oklahoma to John and Alberta Ethridge. She was raised in Wewoke, Oklahoma where she received her early education. In 1945, Mrs. Ethridge-Williams moved to Fresno and continued her education at Fresno City College and California State University, Fresno.

Mrs. Ethridge-Williams married Lonzell Williams and together they were parents to three children. They've also been blessed with five grandchildren and six great-grandchildren.

Mrs. Ethridge-Williams made child care her life's passion and lifelong career. She often cared for her younger siblings growing up and cared for her own children, in addition to those of family members and friends. In 1968, she attempted to open her first child care center in Fresno. Although the banks turned her loan requests down numerous times, she continued her persistence. Eventually through private funding, Mrs. Ethridge-Williams secured funding to open her first infant child care center. After four years of working with the California State Department of Social Welfare and Department of Health and Welfare, Mrs. LaVera Ethridge-Williams' dream became a reality, with the opening of her first childcare center in West Fresno. Not stopping there, Mrs. La Vera Ethridge-Williams opened a chain of daycare centers for infants and young children in Fresno. LaVera's Infant Nursery and LaVera's Educational Center provided desperately needed childcare for working parents in the area.

Mrs. Ethridge-Williams has been rightfully honored by numerous local officials and organizations throughout her career. These include, the city of Fresno, Fresno Unified School District and the Phi Lambda Society.

Outside of her work, Mrs. Ethridge-Williams enjoys spending time with her family and several hobbies. These include traveling, fishing

and attending church, where she is an active member.

She has always believed that personal success comes with a responsibility to touch the lives of others through good deeds. Today, she works to provide shelter for the homeless.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. LaVera Ethridge-Williams as she celebrates her 90th birthday. She is an inspiration for us all, having lived her life to serve others. I ask that you join me in wishing her and her family continued happiness.

SUGAR LAND REALTOR NAMED PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE WOMEN'S COUNCIL OF REALTORS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jo Ann Stevens of Sugar Land, TX, for being named the 2017 President-elect of the Women's Council of Realtors, an affiliate of the National Association of Realtors.

The Women's Council is a network of realtors working to advance women as professionals and leaders in their businesses, industries and communities. Jo Ann has been a licensed realtor for over 30 years and joined the Women's Council in 1986. She's held several leadership roles in the Women's Council, such as: Local Network President, District Vice President, Governor, President of the Texas Network, and Regional Vice President for Region 9. Jo Ann has been named "Member of the Year" twice for Texas and will be sworn in as president on November 4, 2017. She's currently working for the Lane Real Estate Team.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Jo Ann for being named President-elect of the Women's Council of Realtors. This is an amazing accomplishment and we know she will be a great leader.

WELCOMING INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

HON. JAMES A. HIMES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a globally-engaged and welcoming United States. Historically, hosting international students and scholars at our colleges and universities has been one of the most important ways America reinforces those values. I urge my colleagues and the administration to recognize the vital contribution international students, scholars, and their families make to the United States.

The cross-cultural partnerships formed through international education and exchanges offer widespread benefits for the United States. Students and their families supported 400,000 jobs in the 2015-2016 year, contrib-

uting nearly \$33 billion to our national economy. Their financial and academic contributions allow universities to offer more advanced courses—often in STEM subjects—to American students. These students, the vast majority of whom do not study abroad, gain invaluable knowledge towards succeeding as global citizens through cooperation and interaction with their international peers.

As co-Chair of the Congressional Caucus on International Exchange and Study and as a student who studied abroad, I recognize the enormous benefits offered by a cross-cultural education. May is a critical month on the college calendar, a time when college seniors graduate and enter the global world while high school seniors finalize their choice on where to study in the fall. The new administration's immigration policies, specifically the Travel Ban Executive Order, harvest uncertainty for students making these decisions.

Our nation's security must remain our top priority, but we must balance that with the need to remain open, welcoming and committed to driving future economic growth and opportunity. We must reassure international scholars who may be unsure about coming that their contributions are valued and that they are welcome here.

HONORING SPECIAL AGENT BILL BATES

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 2017

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished career of Special Agent William Bates of the U.S. Department of Defense, Office of Inspector General, Defense Criminal Investigative Service, after 32 years of dedicated government service.

Special Agent Bates' grew up in Buffalo, New York, and attended the SUNY Fredonia. Upon graduating, he served in the U.S. Army as a Veterinary Food Inspector and then worked as a Treasury Agent for the Internal Revenue Service.

In 1989, Mr. Bates joined the Defense Criminal Investigative Service where he has served as a Control Tactics Instructor and Health and Wellness Coordinator for the Syracuse, Buffalo, and Pittsburgh offices.

Throughout his esteemed career, Special Agent Bates' work includes assistance in the recovery efforts in New York City immediately following the terrorist attacks on our country on September 11, 2001 as well as the investigation of Lynx Machine Total Corporation which brought to light false testing certifications on U.S. military products. He has received several commendations during his esteemed career, and is a member of the DCIS's prestigious Million Dollar Club.

It is my honor to recognize Special Agent Bates and to congratulate him on his retirement after 32 years of devoted service to keeping our great nation safe. I wish him the very best in his retirement.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, May 24, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 24, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TREY HOLLINGSWORTH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

TRUMP BUDGET CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Trump released the most reckless and heartless budget I have ever seen in my life. It slashes virtually every worthwhile program: programs that help the middle class, seniors, and veterans. But what I find particularly offensive and troubling is that his budget is a radical assault on people living in poverty or right on the edge. It guts Medicaid, housing assistance, and Social Security disability insurance benefits.

The Trump budget also decimates the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, known as SNAP, our Nation's first line of defense against hunger. It cuts the program by \$193 billion over 10 years. That is a 25 percent reduction. President Trump makes these ruthless cuts by cutting eligibility and reducing benefits. He also adds a new requirement that States pay 25 percent of the cost of the benefits.

It may be a nice sound bite to suggest that States should share the cost

of providing SNAP benefits to their residents, but the reality is that State budgets are already stretched incredibly thin, and communities are already suffering from a decrease in Federal investment in States. The Trump budget compounds this problem by eliminating dozens of programs that families in States across the country rely on. This will only exacerbate the stress on State budgets to deliver basic services to their residents.

If that isn't bad enough, President Trump would allow States to cut benefit levels to manage the costs they would incur under this cruel budget. This means that families living in certain States would see their already too-modest benefits drop through no fault of their own.

At the same time, President Trump is proposing new fees on retail stores applying to accept SNAP benefits. We know access to food is a huge concern, especially in rural areas and in cities, and such a wrongheaded approach will further limit the ability of families on SNAP to shop for nutritious food.

In addition, President Trump's budget makes it even more difficult for able-bodied adults without dependents to receive modest food benefits. Current law allows States to waive the time limits imposed on these vulnerable adults, which include veterans, by the way, but President Trump wants to severely limit the ability of States to request these waivers. Estimates suggest that in any given month, this proposal would restrict access to SNAP for up to 1 million Americans struggling to find work. Mr. Speaker, kicking people off of SNAP doesn't help them find a job. It only makes them hungrier, weaker, and even less likely to qualify for work. It is simply a rotten thing to do.

Now, quite frankly, I was a little surprised by the magnitude of these cuts given the fact that President Trump's Secretary of Agriculture, Sonny Perdue, testified before the House Committee on Agriculture last week in strong defense of SNAP. He said: "... we have no proposed changes. You don't try to fix things that aren't broken."

How are we to trust this administration's promises on anything when they tell us one thing on Wednesday and release a budget that does the exact opposite not even a week later?

During the past 2 years, the House Committee on Agriculture has held 21 hearings on SNAP. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Nutri-

tion, I have participated in each one of them. What we have learned from our witnesses, both Democrats and Republicans, is that SNAP works. It is one of the most effective and efficient programs run by the Federal Government. It expands in times of economic hardship and contracts as our economy recovers.

With a modest food assistance benefit of about \$1.40 per person per meal, SNAP alleviates hunger and reduces poverty. It supplements the food budgets of families and helps them make ends meet. Innovations in the program have helped to spur the consumption of healthier food. I would like to remind my colleagues that two-thirds of the people on SNAP are children, seniors, or disabled. The majority of people on the program who are able to work do work.

If you want to talk about reforming the program and how do we look to the future, we need to focus on how to make the program even better. We need to make sure that anyone who needs this benefit has access to it. We need to support and expand innovative programs that help increase the purchasing power of SNAP. We need to increase SNAP benefits so that families that are helped by the program can actually access more nutritious food that lasts through the month.

Mr. Speaker, Donald Trump is used to dining with billionaires at Mar-a-Lago and Trump Tower, so I am not at all shocked by his lack of knowledge about our antihunger safety net or by his lack of interest in helping the most vulnerable in our society. It is clear from his budget that he does not have a clue.

I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this reckless and heartless proposal that will devastate so many families that we represent. We must, instead, support efforts to strengthen SNAP and end hunger now. We are supposed to end hunger now, not make it worse.

CELEBRATING 100 YEARS OF THE LIONS CLUB INTERNATIONAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about an organization that is near and dear to my heart, the Lions Clubs International. I am a member of my hometown organization, the Howard

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Area Lions Club. I am proud that for many years it has been the largest Lions Club in Pennsylvania, despite being in a very rural area. Last year marked our club's 40th anniversary.

The Howard Area Lions Club has consistently earned the recognition as the largest Lions Club in Pennsylvania. There are probably many factors that have led them to this title, but none more significant than their commitment to the Lions Club motto: We serve. The members of this club have served as the chartering organization for the Howard Scout Troop 353. I have been honored to serve as a Scoutmaster of that troop since they first assumed this responsibility.

The idea of the Lions Club began 100 years ago in Chicago. A 38-year-old businessman named Melvin Jones told members of the local business club that they should reach beyond their business issues and address the betterment of their communities and the world, and they agreed. Three years later, the Lions Club became an international organization. Melvin Jones inspired generations of people to become civic-minded individuals dedicated to using their talents and their ambition to improve their communities without financial reward. Melvin Jones had a personal code: "You can't get very far until you start doing something for somebody else."

Well, the Lions Club redoubled its commitment to help others when a young advocate for the disabled spoke at the 1925 Lions Clubs International convention. This woman challenged the Lions to become "knights of the blind in the crusade against darkness." Of course, this woman was Helen Keller.

Helen Keller developed a fever at 18 months of age that left her blind and deaf. After working with an exceptional teacher, Helen Keller learned sign language and braille, and a few years later she learned to speak.

The Lions accepted Helen Keller's challenge and ever since have worked on several projects to prevent blindness, restore eyesight, and improve eye care for folks all around the world. Sight became one of the Lions' defining causes. Many are familiar with its eyeglasses recycling program where individuals can donate reading glasses they no longer need.

Mr. Speaker, service to others is what makes Lions Clubs International such a powerful force of good in the world. I am grateful that Lions Clubs around the globe serve millions annually. I am so proud to be a member of an organization that not only lives up to its remarkable ideals but exceeds them time and time again.

Congratulations to the Lions Clubs International on their centennial anniversary.

BROKEN PROMISES OF THE TRUMP BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Trump laid out his budget request for next year. It represents the most draconian disinvestment in our country by any President in modern history, and it is littered with broken promises and fundamental errors in simple math.

It is a budget that makes very clear that this President is not fighting for working Americans and their families, and, in fact, he is breaking his promises to make their lives better. It is shockingly devoid of the basic policy details necessary to back up its deficit-cutting bravado. It includes an accounting discrepancy so large—over \$2 trillion—that it can only be characterized as willfully hiding the ball from the American public, an exercise in extreme incompetence, or both.

The purpose of a budget is to lay out the most complete description of a President's governing vision for the country. By that measure and many others, this budget is an embarrassment. It is no wonder that it has already been panned by Members on both sides of the aisle in this House. My Republican friend, Representative MIKE SIMPSON, was absolutely right when he said of proposals like this one that the House can't pass this budget. Nor will it. It is dead on arrival in Congress because Democrats and Republicans both understand that we can't provide economic security to the American people and keep them safe from threats if we gut our investments in doing both. That is what the President's budget would do.

As The Washington Post eloquently pointed out, the Trump budget "is fundamentally at odds with what Trump told voters." President Trump promised middle class American workers he would fight for them and their families. If implemented, his budget would make it harder for them to send their kids to college, access job training to get ahead, or even just stay in the middle class, and devastate seniors' long-term care. The dramatic cuts he makes to nutrition assistance, elimination of heating assistance during the winter months and Meals on Wheels will hit low-income Americans and seniors hard, particularly in rural communities.

And those, Mr. Speaker, are just a selection. He is breaking his campaign promise not to cut Medicaid and Social Security, taking \$1.4 trillion out of Medicaid over the next 10 years, without offering a policy to achieve those cuts, and slashing funds for the Social Security disability insurance programs that serve 10 million Americans. Frankly, the President made fun of those with disabilities during the

course of the campaign, and now he cuts billions of dollars from the ability of the disabled to maintain some degree of dignity and health.

President Trump also pledged that the American taxpayer would not pay—would not pay—for the border wall he wants to build. Of course, his budget asks the U.S. taxpayer to pay for that wall. When it comes to keeping Americans safe from threats overseas, President Trump's budget fails miserably as well, cutting the budgets for diplomacy and foreign aid that complement the work of our military in combating ISIS and other terror groups. Additionally, it punishes middle class Federal employees in every congressional district in our country for choosing to serve their country by cutting their pay and retirement benefits.

One after another, the budget breaks the President's promises. At every turn, it undermines our long-term security and prosperity by ignoring the critical lessons from past Republican administrations when it comes to basic economics. Like past Republican budgets, the Trump budget relies on discredited theories of how economic growth would result from tax policies. Unlike past attempts, however, the Trump budget double counts its fantasy supply side boost in an accounting error so large it could pay for the Pentagon 3 years over.

Mr. Speaker, we know this budget will go nowhere in Congress. I believe there will not be a Republican in the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, who will offer this budget on the floor of this House. It does tell us, however, a lot about this President and his priorities. Former Vice President Biden has been known to say: "Don't tell me what you value. Show me your budget."

President Trump has now shown us his budget, and none of us should be surprised. So now it is up to Democrats and Republicans in this House and in the Senate to work together to agree on a budget resolution and move appropriations bills through regular order. Let us hope we can do that. The American public would expect us to do that, and our country needs us to do that.

We must not disinvest in those things that have made America great and will enable us to lay the groundwork for another century of American leadership.

□ 1015

REMEMBERING U.S. MARINE
CORPS LANCE CORPORAL MARC
LUCAS TUCKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am humbled to rise today in

the memory of United States Marine Corps Lance Corporal Mark Lucas Tucker, who was killed on June 8, 2005, in a nonhostile vehicle accident on Alternating Supply Route Uranium in Iraq.

Lance Corporal Tucker, a Pontotoc, Mississippi, native, was assigned to the 9th Engineer Support Battalion, 3rd Force Service Support Group, III Marine Expeditionary Force, Okinawa, Japan, attached to the 2nd Force Service Support Group, II Marine Expeditionary Force, Forward.

Lance Corporal Tucker's mother, Donna Bagwell, is seated in the gallery today. She said her son wanted to be a marine from the time he was a little boy. He wanted to follow in the footsteps of his grandfather, who also served in the Marine Corps.

In 2003, Lance Corporal Tucker enlisted in the United States Marine Corps. In 2005, he volunteered to go to Iraq to protect our Nation in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Mrs. Bagwell said her son planned to stay in the United States Marine Corps until retirement and make it a career. "He loved America," Mrs. Bagwell said, "He loved the Marine Corps and everything about it."

Lance Corporal Tucker is survived by his parents, Kelly and Donna Bagwell, and Mark Tucker; and siblings, Christy Irby, Pam Bolen, and Terry Bagwell.

Lance Corporal Tucker demonstrated the characteristics that make us all proud to be Americans, and we honor his service and his life.

Semper fi, Lance Corporal Tucker.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise, as we enter this Memorial Day weekend, to recognize all of those great Americans who have given their lives for the freedoms that we enjoy.

This Nation can never forget those who preserved our Nation and died way too soon. God bless all those who have died in defense of this great Nation, and God bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that it is not in order to refer to an occupant in the gallery.

REMEMBERING SENATOR RALPH A. HUNT, SR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and work of a dear friend, a North Carolina giant, the Honorable Ralph A. Hunt, Sr.: a community leader, businessman, educator, former North Carolina State Senator; and a devoted husband, father, grandfather, and friend.

Mr. Speaker, Ralph Hunt was a resident of Durham County, North Carolina, a county that Congressman DAVID

PRICE and I proudly represent. He was my constituent.

Mr. Speaker, Ralph Hunt was also a native of my congressional district, having grown up in an adjoining county called Granville County, North Carolina. He was the seventh of eight children born in 1932 to Johnnie and Amanda Harris Hunt.

As a young student at Mary Potter High School in Oxford, North Carolina, which was the only high school for African Americans during those days, Ralph grew up during the period of legal and forced segregation in the South, which helped lay the foundation for Ralph and others like him to get an education. Mary Potter High School was a nationally renowned high school for African Americans.

Ralph Hunt, Sr., went on to further his education at Johnson C. Smith University in Charlotte, North Carolina, which is a Presbyterian school. He was drafted into the United States Army during his junior year in school, but he was honorably discharged 2 years later from the United States Army.

He then returned to North Carolina to complete his college education, earning a degree in mathematics in 1956. After spending many years as an educator at Mary Potter High School and Hillside High School, Ralph was elected to the Durham City Council. He was one of only two African Americans serving on the city council at that time. His fellow council members selected him to serve as mayor pro tempore.

Ralph was then elected to the North Carolina State Senate in 1985 and served many years. During his tenure, Senator Hunt was a true statesman who led with conviction. He served as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, served as majority whip, and a member of the Joint Legislative Commission on Government Operations. He introduced the legislation that changed the election law in North Carolina to allow a 40 percent threshold to avoid a runoff in a primary.

In 1993, Senator Hunt was appointed by then-Governor Jim Hunt to the prestigious North Carolina Utilities Commission, where he would serve as its chair. Ralph Hunt, Sr., retired from the North Carolina Utilities Commission in 2001 and returned to the State Senate very briefly from 2004 to 2005.

Ralph's career in public service should serve as a marker we can all strive to meet. He was a visionary who helped bring the Durham community to be the economic leader that it is today.

Ralph Hunt, Sr., achieved many great things in his life, but his greatest achievement, Mr. Speaker, was his loving family: his dear wife of more than 50 years, Rebecca; and his three children, Ralph, Jr., Reginald, and Regina.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Durham, the county of Durham, and the State of

North Carolina all shine brighter because of the life and work of Senator Ralph Hunt, Sr. We will miss him dearly, but his legacy lives on.

Everything God gave to Ralph, he gave it back to his family and to his community. I said those words at his memorial service the other day, and I say it now from the well of the U.S. House of Representatives: Everything that God gave to Ralph Hunt, Sr., he gave it back to his family and to his community.

Mr. Speaker, in just a few moments, after the next Republican speaker, my dear friend and colleague, Congressman DAVID PRICE, who was also a dear friend of Ralph Hunt, Sr., will give additional remarks in tribute to this great leader.

HONORING CAPTAIN AMY LYNN SVOBODA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Captain Amy Lynn Svoboda, my friend, A-10 squadron mate, and pioneer.

Amy grew up in Illinois and graduated from the Air Force Academy in 1989, serving as a co-captain of the volleyball team. She attended pilot training, then served as a T-37 instructor pilot before coming to Davis-Monthan Air Force Base to become an A-10 pilot in 1996.

Amy was 1 of only 14 female fighter pilots in the Air Force at the time, and I got to know her when she joined me in the 354th Fighter Squadron Bulldogs as the second female pilot ever in that unit.

Amy was quickly well-respected as a pilot and an officer, and well liked by so many. Her positive personality was infectious, and her dedication to excellence was a model to us all. She specifically inspired me as an example of how to be a woman warrior without losing herself in the tough environment of a fighter squadron. It was a relief and a blessing to finally have a wing woman.

On the dark, moonless night of May 27, 1997, during a tactical training mission with night vision goggles on the Barry Goldwater Air Force Range, Amy paid the ultimate sacrifice while serving her country. I was on the range that night, and I remember like it was yesterday the deafening silence when I called her repeatedly on the radio in the hopes that she ejected before her A-10 crashed. Our hopes were dashed, and Amy's extraordinary life was snuffed out with so much potential ahead.

Her service and sacrifice is not forgotten. After the tragic accident, the Air Force finally invested in changing the lighting in all A-10 cockpits to be fully NVG compatible, likely saving lives. Those of us who served with her

continue to be inspired by her example and her legacy. Generations of young girls will fly in the jet stream that she forged as a pioneering aviator.

I cannot believe that it has been 20 years since that night. On Saturday, we will honor Captain Svoboda's service, bravery, and sacrifice with her family and friends, just 2 days before Memorial Day.

Thank you, Amy, for your willingness to fight for our freedoms. We will never forget the price that you paid.

REMEMBERING SENATOR RALPH A. HUNT, SR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleague, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, in honoring the life of a towering figure in North Carolina politics, Senator Ralph Hunt, Sr., of Durham.

I first got to know Senator Hunt early in my political career when I was chairman of the North Carolina Democratic Party. Ralph was already a business and community leader in Durham, having served in the U.S. Army, taught in Durham city schools, started a career in business, and served as one of the first African-American members of the city council, where he served from 1975 to 1985, including 3 years as mayor pro tempore.

Ralph was a genial, energetic, and beloved leader. He was also a tireless advocate for the needs of the people of Durham—all of the people. It is no coincidence that the city has undergone a renaissance over the course of Ralph's long career. He served as executive director of the Durham Business and Professional Chain for over a decade. He provided leadership to the Mutual Savings and Loan Association, which provided vital access to capital for many Durham residents; and to the Downtown Durham Revitalization Foundation board, which helped pave the way for the thriving downtown we see today.

Ralph, of course, is best known, as my colleague has noted, for his service in the North Carolina Senate from 1985 to 1993, and again from 2004 to 2005. He held various leadership positions in our caucus, and he mentored a new generation of progressive elected officials. The North Carolina Senate still bears the mark of his leadership.

In the intervening years, between those years of service in the Senate, he served with distinction on the North Carolina Utilities Commission. More recently—and I respect the fact that Ralph took this on late in his life—he assumed the challenge of chairing the Durham Committee on the Affairs of Black People at a critical juncture for that organization. In fact, Ralph al-

ways stepped up to the plate and always took on challenges when he was needed. He was an exemplary citizen. He was also a devoted husband, a loving father and grandfather, and a community leader who will long be remembered in Durham and throughout our State.

As we mourn his passing, we give thanks for his life of strong citizenship and service.

CREATING AWARENESS ON POSTPARTUM DEPRESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight a problem that impacts one in every nine women in our Nation today: postpartum depression.

As you can see on this poster, the condition can impact any mother, regardless of background or regardless of circumstance. Warning signs often include: feeling overwhelmed, changes in sleep patterns, unexplained anger, weeping or sadness, difficulty concentrating, unexplained changes in appetite, and feeling anxious or nervous.

Fortunately, if you are a new mother—and you don't have to go through this alone, remember this—there are great organizations in my community in south Florida, like Postpartum Support International. They have dedicated staff and volunteers who are ready to listen, to help, and to provide you with the resources and the referrals that you need to overcome this condition and get back to enjoying your family.

I would like to encourage every new mom in south Florida who may be experiencing any of these conditions to please get the help that you need now by calling 1-844-642-6667. Together, we can end postpartum depression in south Florida and, indeed, around our Nation.

□ 1030

HONORING PEPE BADIA

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Joseph "Pepe" Badia for his commitment to expand educational opportunities for our south Florida students.

Pepe's latest philanthropic venture allowed for the establishment of a scholarship at my alma mater, Miami Dade College, in the name of its president, Eduardo Padron.

Pepe Badia came to Miami at a young age, just like I did and so many others at that time, fleeing the regime of Castro. His father began a new business in a small storefront in Miami, where he and Pepe, by themselves, packaged spices by hand and distributed them to local bodegas around the city. Today, that small storefront has

grown into an international giant known as Badia Spices.

Pepe Badia has used his success to truly make a difference in our community, regularly donating portions of sales to many local and national charities and scholarships.

I join with the Miami Dade College familia, but, truly, all of south Florida, in thanking Pepe Badia for making our paradise an even groovier place in which to live.

WISHING JAY KISLAK A HAPPY 95TH BIRTHDAY

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor and wish a happy 95th birthday to Jay Kislak, a valued member of our south Florida community who has dedicated himself to preserving the history of our great Nation.

Jay Kislak began his career as a real estate agent at the young age of 18, a trade he learned from his father who instilled within him the value of hard work, persistence, and attention to detail.

Jay left his hometown of Hoboken, New Jersey, to pursue higher education at the University of Pennsylvania Wharton School of Finance. Jay Kislak graduated early to enlist in the United States Navy, serving as a naval aviator for 3 years of Active Duty, followed by 10 years of service in the Naval Reserve.

The great State of Florida welcomed Jay Kislak and his family in 1953 with a promise of a better future, and it beckoned the young entrepreneur to seek our new business ventures. It was in south Florida that Jay grew his father's humble business into the national real estate giant that it is today, with residential and industrial properties spanning from Florida to Nevada.

Jay Kislak's immense success allowed him the opportunity to explore his true passion: the history and culture of the early Americas. Jay, along with his wife, Jean, established the Jay I. Kislak Foundation to advance knowledge and understanding of world cultures and history. The Kislak Foundation's impressive collections include one-of-a-kind maps, books, letters, paintings, and many other artifacts.

In the 50 years that Jay dedicated to collecting these rare treasures, he assembled one of the world's best and most significant private collections of documents and artifacts related to the early Americas. Recognizing the significance of his impressive collection, Jay made an extraordinary gift in the year 2004 to our Library of Congress and to the American people with a contribution of 4,000 items, which are now on display permanently. The Library of Congress estimates that over 3 million visitors have visited this magnificent exhibit made possible by the generous donation of the Jay I. Kislak Foundation.

Because of Jay's extensive background in and knowledge of our great

Nation's history, he has served on numerous boards and has held many leadership posts in our community.

Throughout all of his success, Jay Kislak never ceases to give back to our local institutions. His latest contribution to south Florida is the establishment of two new permanent exhibits at the University of Miami's Otto Richter Library and at Miami Dade College's Freedom Tower.

I join with many in saying thank you to Jay Kislak and his family for his decades of hard work and dedication that he has given to bring the world these magnificent historical artifacts.

Thank you, Jay Kislak, and many more years.

ASIAN PACIFIC HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about Asian Pacific Heritage Month.

In May of each year, we come together to celebrate the Asian and Pacific heritage cultures that have made up America for generations. It is time to recognize those important significant roles that Asian Americans play in our American story.

We are very lucky in the San Joaquin Valley to have a community rich with culture and ethnic diversity. Our Asian-American and Pacific Islander neighbors are an integral part of that richness.

From the Chinese Americans, who helped build the transcontinental railroad in the 1860s, to the Japanese American farmers, who cultivated our valley in the early 1900s, to the Hmong and Vietnamese Americans who joined our community beginning in the late 1970s and 1980s after the Vietnam War, these Asian communities all have an important story that have added value to our country.

As we reflect upon Asian Pacific Heritage Month, I am proud to join all Asian Americans and the Pacific Islanders in my district and across our country in celebration. So let me thank all of our Asian Americans for their contributions to our country.

CELEBRATING MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the significance of Memorial Day this coming weekend, which we will celebrate across our Nation.

This weekend, I will have the honor and the privilege to participate in three Memorial Day ceremonies in my district. We will pause to memorialize and thank those American servicemen and -women who have made the ultimate sacrifice and to mourn the loss with their families.

Words, for me, never seem adequate to express a profound thank-you, having members of families and my own family that have served and that have

made those sacrifices, for these men and women are our heroes. They gave America the most precious thing they had: the last full measure of devotion to country. Because they did, we are who we are today: a free and prosperous nation that is reflected around the world in most positive ways.

Our valley and our Nation owe an immeasurable debt of gratitude to these individuals and their families who so selflessly answered the call of duty, and our Nation can never, ever say thank you enough.

Their sacrifice, bravery, therefore, must never, ever be forgotten. We must continue to work on behalf of veterans and their families. Whether it is cutting through red tape with their veterans' claims or helping with assistance programs or educational benefits, we can always and should do more.

As President John F. Kennedy said: "As we express our gratitude, we must never forget that the highest appreciation is not to utter words, but to live by them." So each day, not just on Memorial Day, we must work to ensure that our veterans and soldiers who today are on Active Duty in harm's way all around the world and their families receive the benefits that they have earned.

On Monday, we will honor and we will remember and we will pledge never to forget, and we will say, in our most humble way, thank you.

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate May as National Foster Care Month. I also welcome those currently in and alumni of our foster care system, along with our supporters, who are visiting Capitol Hill today.

Foster Care Month is a very small way to acknowledge the youth that are a part of the system, along with all of those who make an enormous difference in their lives. This month is about improving the foster care system and providing support to the individuals who selflessly make this system work.

The success of our country depends upon the well-being of our youth today. We know, through much social research, that family stability is directly linked to less behavioral and academic problems. We have the duty as a nation to empower all children so they can have the same sense of promise and possibility as any other, regardless of their circumstances.

National Foster Care Month is a time to celebrate the selfless men and women who embrace children in the foster care system and recommit to helping more youth find permanent families so they can, too, experience stability and the freedom to fulfill their limitless potential.

Mr. Speaker, the foster care system has always and will always be near and dear to my heart. My wife, Angie, and I adopted two children, Austin and Jessica, then 8 and 9, respectively, through the foster care system.

The idea that children belong in stable families is not only one of the most bipartisan issues I have the privilege of working on, but it is one that is important to me and dear to me. Nothing is more important to a child's upbringing and long-term success than a loving and stable home.

The bedrock of the American story is a strong and supportive family. We must do everything we can to care for all of our youth so they can be free from harm and set up for success so that they might pen our country's unwritten future.

Today I have the honor of being shadowed for the day by Kimberly Grosse of Omaha, Nebraska. Kim was in foster care for 8 years. Starting off in a group home, she was later placed at Boys Town, where she graduated from high school.

Kim currently works as a communications specialist, dispatching medical EMS helicopters. She also volunteers her time as a court-appointed special advocate for kids currently in the foster care system. Kim, like so many other alumni of the system, pays it forward with her dedicated support. She is a shining example of determination and perseverance in all aspects of her life. I know that this young lady has an extremely bright future ahead.

I also appreciate my colleagues from both sides of the aisle—Representatives KAREN BASS, DIANE BLACK, TRENT FRANKS, JIM LANGEVIN, BRENDA LAWRENCE, and TOM MARINO—for their leadership in the Foster Care Caucus. I am grateful to fellow Members who help advocate for this important cause.

Now, let's continue to embrace the spirit that every child matters and continue to work toward providing all of our sons and daughters an equal opportunity to lead productive and fulfilling lives, not limited to anything but their hopes, dreams, imagination, and perseverance. I salute all of those who are supporters of the foster care system.

I also just want to add, I know, firsthand, when you see your foster children grow to be healthy, successful, independent, and loving adults that you gain a tremendous sense of satisfaction and thankfulness.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S BUDGET IS A SHORTSIGHTED PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LAWSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, President Trump's budget calls for extreme cuts to vital programs that are funding for the Nation's poor, for healthcare, food

stamps, student loans, and disability payments. It is a very shortsighted plan that seeks to break the situation that exists for those who can least afford it, while giving tax breaks to the wealthy in our country.

In my district, one in every four Floridians have been on food stamps for some point over the last 12 months. This is twice the national average. It is really unconscionable for the President to propose cutting nutrition benefit programs by \$192 billion because that would mean less to those in north Florida who need it the most.

SNAP programs that benefit the needy are so important. We have kids in north Florida, which I have had the personal opportunity to witness, in school programs, and probably the only meal that they are going to get is at school where they come and don't have an opportunity to get another meal at home.

We put hardworking Floridians in a no-win position, having to choose between paying their light bills or affordable healthcare. This is totally unacceptable in America.

This budget calls for slashing \$800 billion from Medicaid over the next decade and \$72 billion for disability benefits, which are so important. There is no way that we should be encouraging people who are disabled to go out and work to earn their benefits.

Did you know, Mr. Speaker, that almost 40 percent of low-income women in America who are between the age of 15 and 49 years use Medicaid to pay for their healthcare needs?

And in my home State, Florida, 50 percent of those pregnancies are paid for by Medicaid. Who will make up the difference? The need will not magically disappear, as most people think.

This is a shortsighted budget and one that eliminates programs that particularly are geared toward protecting the poor. That is what our job should be in government: to make sure that we protect those and speak for those who cannot speak for themselves.

At this time, when we need to be working to make college more affordable and accessible in order to prepare the next generation of tomorrow's leaders, this is counterproductive to be cutting financial assistance to these students.

□ 1045

The President is proposing deep cuts to our Nation's poorest urban and rural communities, which would shrink the supply of affordable housing and increase homelessness and other hardships across this country.

I personally have been touring areas in my district where HUD has failed these communities. The budget continues corporate welfare to Wall Street, and what is so amazing is that Wall Street doesn't receive those cuts. The people who receive the cuts are the ones who need it the most.

An inspiring and most hopeful past President once said that the defining challenge of our time is making sure that our economy works for every working American.

This budget cut does not put us on the path of tackling these challenges. I believe that our Nation's budget should reflect our own values as a society, but it does not align with the values of the Fifth Congressional District, and, therefore, I intend to strongly oppose this budget.

We need to remember that all of the issues we debate on this floor, from healthcare to the President's budget, to America's role in the Middle East, and our borders, foreign policies, those issues have an effect on all of our constituents. While some of our colleagues seem to only want to have political perks, sound bites in the media back home, I implore them to remember this simple fact: The work we do here matters to every person in America, not to just those who vote for us.

It is important that as we approach this budget, Mr. Speaker, that we think about those who are less fortunate.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the statistics of human trafficking, and they are shocking: an estimated 21 million victims globally, a quarter of them children, and the majority of them women, resulting in a \$150 billion criminal industry predicated on the destruction of lives.

This criminal conduct may seem a world away, but it is not. It exists right here in our own backyards. Just last year, the human trafficking hotline reported 151 cases of human trafficking in our State of Pennsylvania. This week the House can—and must—act in a bipartisan fashion to support and bolster antihuman trafficking programs, upgrading our Nation's response to this crime.

By empowering nonprofits like NOVA and the Bucks Coalition Against Trafficking, and ensuring our local law enforcement's ability to identify and prosecute those cases, these bills will provide services to victims of human trafficking and aid in apprehending the world's worst offenders.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SHERIFF'S DEPUTY KEITH CLYMER

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Bucks County Sheriff's Deputy Keith Clymer of Kintnersville, who our community lost last week when his motorcycle was struck by another vehicle.

Deputy Clymer joined the Bucks County Sheriff's Office in 2013, and he

was assigned to the domestic relations warrant unit. He also served as a self-defense tactics instructor. As the sheriff's office noted in the announcement of his tragedy, Keith was liked by all who met and worked with him and will be sorely missed by all.

Mr. Speaker, the loss of any member of our law enforcement community is heartbreaking, but the loss of Deputy Clymer, as we recognize National Police Week, both here in our Nation's Capital and around my district, draws special focus to those who serve and protect our communities.

My thoughts and prayers are with his sons, his family, and all those who Keith impacted, both personally and professionally. He lived his life serving and protecting us. For that, Mr. Speaker, we are eternally grateful.

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Foster Care Month, and I am pleased to welcome Yves Luma and Anabel Sanchez-Senofonte for the Sixth Annual Congressional Foster Youth Shadow Day.

I would also salute Congresswoman KAREN BASS, who is the most outspoken, energized advocate for foster youth anywhere in America. I am very proud of Yves and Anabel. They are an inspiration for all of us.

Yves has persisted in the face of true adversity and is now a first-generation college student at Florida State University. She was born in Haiti, faced challenges at a young age that most of us will never understand. Not being able to count on a stable home environment in Haiti, Yves, with her younger siblings, moved around between extended family and friends before moving to the United States.

Once in the United States, Yves did not have a consistent home. Yet through everything, she persevered, working to provide for her younger siblings while continuing her high school education at Plant High School and Blake High School in Tampa. She carried a heavy burden without parents that no child should have to endure. Due to the hard work and help of her school social workers, Yves was referred to Starting Right, Now, a Tampa-based group home for homeless youth who value and desire a higher education. It was this support system and the help of a lot of others that enabled Yves' talent and drive to catapult her to a promising future.

Anabel is 21 years old, also a student at Florida State University, getting a BA in economics and sociology. Anabel grew up in Miami, where she spent most of her life in foster care. She was taken from her mother three times before permanently being removed from

her custody. At that point, she entered a group home at about 5 years old. She went to a number of group homes before moving in with her parents who adopted her.

Foster care was hard because she was separated from her brothers, but she had her sister. But sometimes having that sister around made it tough as well because the sister didn't know how to read and had severe temper tantrums around her foster care parents, and they were usually taken away because of something her little sister did.

So Anabel liked to slide under the radar and focus on school, but she is resilient as well. Now at FSU and working in Tallahassee, she is an Unconquered Scholar. And Unconquered Scholars either have to have experienced homelessness, foster care, or group homes, but now she is on the path to graduate school. And as a lesson for all of us, she advises that: "I believe that to get the results you want, you must insert yourself into the conversation." That is right around here, Anabel, and we look forward to learning a lot from you here today and in the future.

Yves and Anabel are just two of more than 400,000 youth in foster care in America. It is important to recognize the programs, initiatives, and people who contribute to the success of children in the foster care system, but it is tough when they age out.

It is really an honor to have these young people here to shadow us on the Hill today, to share their life experiences directly with Congress, to help inform policy that will help them succeed. Their firsthand knowledge experience, and ultimate success, is a great resource, and the best evidence of our Nation's commitment to providing basic protections to make this the great country that it is.

Every child deserves a safe, supportive family, but when that doesn't happen, it is incumbent upon all of us to help them succeed. And I can't help but think, the day after President Trump submitted a budget, that really will take us backwards, in this case, and we are not going to let that happen. We are going to stand up and support our foster care kids and all children across America, but that budget is not going to be helpful.

In any event, I want to thank Yves and Anabel for joining us today and for having the strength to share their perspectives and insights. Their resiliency is moving, and I hope my colleagues can mirror their bravery and find the will to support capable, bright, young people like Yves and Anabel, and provide them with the tools they need to be successful.

RECOGNIZING 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF THE CORAL SEA AND LIEUTENANT WILLIAM E. HALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 75th anniversary of the Battle of the Coral Sea, which took place in May 1942, and the heroic actions of sailors and naval aviators like William E. Hall. The Battle of the Coral Sea was the world's first battle in which aircraft carriers engaged each other; the first sea battle in which neither side could see each other; and the battle that paved the way for the American victory at the Battle of Midway.

With the Japanese fleet moving to strengthen its position in the South Pacific and capture Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, the United States, using intercepted signal intelligence, moved to block the Japanese ships as they crossed the Coral Sea. U.S. Admiral Nimitz ordered two aircraft carriers, the USS *Yorktown* and the USS *Lexington* and a number of smaller warships into the area. For 4 days, the opposing navies deployed aircraft on bombing runs against enemy ships.

On May 7, 1942, Lieutenant Hall flew a SBD Dauntless dive bomber and attacked the Japanese aircraft carrier *Shoho* until it sank. On May 8, Lieutenant Hall defended the USS *Lexington* against a Japanese air force attack. Despite piloting a bomber ill-equipped for aerial combat, and dealing with numerous bullet wounds and shrapnel in his skull, Lieutenant Hall shot down three Japanese planes before landing safely back on the deck of the *Lady Lex*.

When the smoke lifted, more than 650 brave American sailors had died. The enemy destroyed 69 U.S. aircraft. The *Yorktown* was severely disabled, and the USS *Lexington* had to be scuttled after taking critical damage. However, the U.S. forces critically damaged many Japanese ships, forcing them to turn back without capturing Port Moresby.

Furthermore, the loss of two Japanese ships led to a smaller Japanese force at the Battle of Midway, which is considered a key factor for the United States' victory there, and turning the tide of World War II. It is considered by historians to be "the most stunning and decisive blow in the history of naval warfare."

For his "extreme courage, and conspicuous heroism in combat, above and beyond the call of duty as a pilot," Lieutenant Hall was presented the United States military's highest honor, the Medal of Honor.

While the original USS *Lexington* ended up on the ocean floor, its legacy lived on in a new aircraft carrier, also named the *Lexington*, which served the

U.S. Navy from 1943 to 1991. The new *Lexington* now serves as a floating museum in Corpus Christi Bay where visitors can explore and learn about its storied past in conflict zones across the world.

Additionally, Lieutenant Hall's daughter Gwen, a Navy veteran herself, serves as a volunteer on the ship to share the history of its namesake in the Battle of the Coral Sea and her father's action. Now, 75 years later, we remember the historic battle and, more importantly, those who served on the original *Lexington*, fought in the Battle of the Coral Sea, and helped ensure that the Japanese and Axis powers would never overtake the South Pacific.

CONGRATULATIONS TO CALALLEN HIGH SCHOOL'S
PHIL DANAHER

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the incredible career of the winningest Texas high school football coach in history, Calallen High School's Phil Danaher.

Coach Danaher was born in Missouri, but his family quickly moved to south Texas. He played football at Harlingen High School before receiving a scholarship to play at Angelo State University.

After graduating in 1971, Coach Danaher became an assistant coach in San Antonio. In 1974, he landed his first head-coaching job in Dilley, Texas, and 4 years later, he moved on to become the head coach at Hamshire-Fannett High School.

In 1984, Coach Danaher took on the challenge of turning around the football program at Calallen High School, which had not reached the playoffs in 28 years. Thirty-three years later, Coach Danaher has led the Wildcats to 32 straight playoff appearances; 19 district championships; 11 trips to the State semifinals; and 2 State championships.

In Coach Danaher's 43 seasons of coaching, his overall record stands at 432 wins, 108 losses, and 4 ties. Coach Danaher's record-breaking success is a testament to his hard work and the thousands of lives he has touched while coaching the Wildcats.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations to Coach Danaher, his family, and everyone at Calallen High School.

□ 1100

NATIONAL FOSTER YOUTH MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, May is the month when people come together across the country to acknowledge the half million young people in the Nation's child welfare system. This is National Foster Youth Month.

The child welfare system is designed to protect children whose parents or

caretakers have abused or neglected them.

I am proud to say that Members of the bipartisan Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth are hosting over 100 young adults from 98 different congressional districts from the National Foster Youth Institute. I thank all of the Members of Congress who are allowing a young adult to shadow them this morning. They are here today on the Hill shadowing Members of Congress to share their stories, their challenges, their successes, and to help us understand how to improve the child welfare system.

On Monday evening, the National Foster Youth Institute had a forum in which we were able to hear from many of the youth. They raised several issues. The young adults have already accomplished a lot in their life, and many are here to learn about the Capitol, their Members of Congress, the legislative process, but also to teach us.

Here are several of the issues that the young folks raised on Monday:

One individual raised the challenge of being raised in the system and being separated from his siblings. He said that he had six siblings, and even had a twin. It was very sad and upsetting to him when his twin was sent to one city and he had to live in another city. It took him many months to reestablish a relationship with his siblings.

Another individual told us about her parents having a drug problem. She didn't understand why she was removed and why her parents weren't helped. In fact, she felt as though the court system used her as leverage over her parents in a way, to tell her parents that they should sober up if they wanted to retain custody. She then told us that the result was both of her parents passed away. She believed that they passed away from their addiction, and that one of the things that made their addiction worse was the fact that she had to be removed from the parents.

Another individual raised the issue of sex trafficking. We have been discussing legislation in the House. We have passed several bills related to sex trafficking. But one of the things that many Members of Congress have grown to be aware of over the last few years is that a large percentage of underage girls, and some boys, who get caught up in sex trafficking are actually foster youth that have fallen through the cracks.

Any time a foster youth falls through the cracks, the government is responsible. When we remove children from their parents, we, meaning the government, become the parents and we are responsible for them. So we are working on legislation to improve that.

Another individual raised the issue that she was adopted, but the adoption didn't work out. She asked: Why don't

social workers follow up after a child has been adopted, just to make sure that everything is okay? That adoption didn't work out, and she had a lot of challenges afterwards.

Another individual told us, in no uncertain terms, that, although many young people come to the Capitol and volunteer in internships, foster youth would love to be here and participate in internships as well, but when foster youth turn 18 and become an adult, we—essentially meaning the government again—wash our hands of them and put them out on the street. How can a young person volunteer? They need to be paid. She raised the issue that we should have interns at the Capitol, but they should be paid.

Those were very important issues and they all raise areas of policy that need to be addressed.

I am very honored and fortunate to have three outstanding young individuals with me. I want to tell you about them.

Doniesha Thomas is from Los Angeles. She was in foster care for 20 years. She aged out of the system, but during the time she was in foster care, she was moved seven different times.

She grew up in Los Angeles. She was in a foster home with her sister and brother. She was fortunate that her siblings were able to be kept together. She described her experience in the foster home wasn't the best. She said that, sadly, her foster mother was abusive mentally, physically, and emotionally.

She eventually left the home and then had to move from place to place, but she persevered and is currently a college student at Los Angeles Trade Tech. She is majoring in the administration of justice and minoring in paralegal studies. It is her dream to be a probation officer for juveniles. She also hopes to one day open up a group home so that, growing up in the system and knowing what the problems are, she can start a program where she addresses those problems.

The second individual, Leonardo Jimenez, is 21 years old. He is also from Los Angeles. He was recently aged out of foster care. He decided to participate in the program because, as he gets older, he wants to learn to be a part in helping foster youth in his community.

The last individual is Michael Rogalski. He is from Ohio. He was in foster care for 5 years and had 13 different placements, but he is succeeding in Ohio, working in the area of child support.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we remember the foster youth in our country this month.

HONORING DR. TOD BURNETT ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Dr. Tod Burnett, who is retiring as president of Saddleback College in Mission Viejo, California.

Since 2008, when Dr. Burnett was named the ninth president of Saddleback, he has transformed the college into one of the top higher education institutions in California and the country.

Over the last 9 years, Dr. Burnett established partnerships with local school districts, supported adult education programs, and pioneered the development of comprehensive support services for veterans, Active-Duty military, and their families.

Prior to his time at Saddleback, Dr. Burnett was appointed to several government positions, serving in the administrations of a U.S. President, a Governor, and mayor. He also served as vice chancellor of the California Community Colleges, the largest higher education system in the Nation.

More importantly, Dr. Burnett's involvement in the community outside of work has left a lasting impression on those who know him. He has mentored veterans, personally funded student trips to Washington, and dedicated resources to various programs throughout the region.

Dr. Burnett's generosity and commitment to his community and career has transformed the lives of countless individuals at Saddleback College and throughout Orange County.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. Burnett for his decades of work and dedication to service of the people of California, and I wish him well during his much-deserved retirement.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to announce that my foster shadow, Shaderra Riddick, who is a Rutgers student studying anthropology, is with me today in the gallery. I am delighted to have her with me, and I offer these remarks on her behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask a simple question to my colleagues here who support President Trump's budget proposal: What kind of America do you envision?

What kind of America do you envision when you support proposed tax plans that line the pockets of Wall Street investors, yet raise taxes for the working men and women struggling to make ends meet.

What kind of America do you envision when you support rewarding corporations that willfully and admittedly

evade American tax laws by stashing profits overseas and, even with proposed tax amenities, still punish their rank-and-file employees that can't save because they are paid below a living wage?

What kind of America do you envision when you proudly support the elimination of Federal agencies that protect our workers from discrimination or subject our children to an environment that is unhealthy and harmful to their health?

The President's budget proposal released yesterday is built on heartless cuts to Medicaid; SNAP; Social Security disability insurance benefits; additional income for poor seniors, disabled adults, and children; and public assistance for needy families.

It threatens regular Americans' ability to buy a home and the ability for that home to even be an investment worth the risk.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, this budget is the latest in a series of actions that begs the question: What kind of America do my Republican colleagues and the President envision for our future? One where the investor class thrives, but the majority of working-class Americans suffer? One where our environment provides temporary profits, but irreparable harm? One where we make a promise to seniors while they work hard to build and sustain our economy, but, upon retirement, snatch away their investments, along with any safety net?

Mr. Speaker, I envision a different America. I envision an America where an honest day's work, no matter where you clock in, deserves a living wage. I envision an America where my granddaughter, Kamryn, will make the same amount as your grandson for the same work. I envision an America where we double down on our investment in public education, and where we double down on our investment in this country's future. I envision a country where commonsense gun legislation limits the opportunity for tragedy to strike in our schools and churches at the hands of hatred and bigotry.

The America I am working toward is an America that celebrates the richness of our diversity, seeks to right past wrongs, an America to be envied.

Mr. Speaker, I refuse to concede that we were too divided along this aisle that we can't create new, good-paying jobs, educate our kids, train our workers, create jobs for those workers, and create an America ripe with new opportunity for all.

Mr. Speaker, the America I envision, the America I believe in, the America that we deserve is within our reach. Unfortunately, that America is threatened, ignored, and displaced with this President's budget proposal.

So, again, I ask this question of the President and of my Republican colleagues who will support this callous

and shameful budget proposal: What kind of America do you envision, and when will you stand up and fight for the America we all deserve?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and that it is not in order to introduce occupants in the gallery to the House.

BIG BANK BAILOUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, in my 29 years in Congress, the issue on which I heard the most from constituents in the shortest time was on the big bank bailouts of several years ago.

When that was before us, I received 6,600 emails in one weekend just in my Washington office from Friday, when the office closed, until Monday, when we opened back up. This, of course, was in addition to the many thousands of phone calls, letters, and emails that came in during the week before and the week after.

I opposed that big bank bailout, but, of course, extremely big business won again and the Congress voted for the bailout.

Three years ago, in 2014, I wrote the following in a newsletter to my 760,000 constituents:

"A few weeks ago, George Mason University released a report saying that 'since the financial crisis, U.S. banking assets and deposits have continued to consolidate in a handful of large banks.' The five largest banks now hold 44 percent of U.S. banking assets compared to 23.5 percent in early 2000. Liberals in Congress passed the Dodd-Frank law, which I opposed, supposedly to get back at the banks that caused our most recent financial troubles. The George Mason report also said the Dodd-Frank law is 'disproportionately burdensome to small banks' and 'creates a market expectation that designated firms are too big to fail.' Columnist Veronique de Rugy wrote that 'the number of small banks has dropped dramatically over the years,' and this has been 'driven by regulatory burdens that make it hard and expensive for small banks to survive.' I have been told by several east Tennessee bankers that, unfortunately, their fastest-growing departments have been their regulatory compliance sections. The more any business or industry comes under Federal regulation, the more it ends up being dominated by extremely big business."

Now, to update what I wrote in 2014. According to the Congressional Research Service, 1,744 banks have ceased to exist since the passage of Dodd-Frank. Many of those have been forced to merge with a bigger bank because

they simply were not able to keep up with all the rules, regulations, and red tape of Dodd-Frank and the resulting compliance costs.

□ 1115

Even worse, 203 small banks have failed—been forced out of business by Big Government—with a resulting huge loss of jobs and lost investment by stockholders. In addition, nationally, 160 credit unions have closed. Either they failed or were forced to consolidate with a bigger credit union. Thus, Dodd-Frank, as most Federal regulatory legislation, ended up helping the big giants and hurting the little guys—the smallest banks and credit unions.

In a study by Hester Peirce and Robert Greene, the authors wrote: "Regulatory compliance can be a particular challenge for small banks with limited compliance expertise. Regulatory expenses absorb a larger percentage of small banks' budgets than of their larger counterparts' budgets. As financial regulation has increased, so has banking concentration. The Dodd-Frank Act, passed in 2010, imposes a new set of regulations that are disproportionately burdensome to small banks. Moreover, by designating the largest financial institutions as 'systemically important,' Dodd-Frank creates a market expectation that designated firms are too big to fail and generates funding and other competitive advantages for the largest U.S. banks."

Liberals, Madam Speaker, often claim that they are for the little guys, and most Federal laws are well intended. But there is a saying to "beware of the tyranny of good intentions." Every industry that is highly federally regulated almost ends up in the hands of a few big giants.

Federal regulators should start trying to help out the smallest business instead of always ending up helping extremely big business. That is something that happens in almost every business and industry in this country, and it needs to be reversed.

REMEMBERING RICHARD WILBUR COLLINS III

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Speaker, Richard Wilbur Collins III was ready to graduate from Bowie State University yesterday. He just finished Army ROTC, was airborne qualified, and was just commissioned a second lieutenant in the United States Army's intelligence branch. His father is a Navy veteran, and Richard wanted to follow in his footsteps and commit his life to serving our Nation. He was ambitious and driven. His calling was to protect our country and to do what is right and just.

He loved soccer and lacrosse. He was the top runner in his ROTC unit. His Facebook page was filled with selfies with his friends. He was active in his church. His friends and family said that he had a loving and giving heart and would go out of his way to try and help others.

On Saturday morning, while waiting for an Uber ride with two friends at the University of Maryland, he was approached by another student who demanded that he “Step left. Step left if you know what is best for you.” Richard simply replied, “no.” The other student stabbed him in the chest and fled. Richard died in the hospital. His bright future was stolen. His parents were robbed of their son. Our hearts are broken.

This tragedy exposes a dangerous rising tide. This incident was not some random act of violence. It was a heinous, despicable, and unprovoked crime of hate.

Richard Collins’ murderer—who was from a middle class family, who hung out at the student union and library—was a member of a racist neo-Nazi group called Alt-Reich Nation. He was not some outsider. He was a home-grown terrorist who was radicalized on the university campus.

What is most troubling is this isn’t the first incident of hate at the University of Maryland. This academic year alone, there have been anti-immigrant chalkings, racist fliers, threats, and, less than a month ago, there was a noose found inside a campus fraternity house.

But this isn’t just a troubling trend at the University of Maryland. There has been an unprecedented spike in racist and hate activity on campuses since November. Posters at the University of Texas implored students to report any and all illegal aliens, that America is a White nation. Another flier, with swastikas, at UCLA read, in part: “the hordes of our enemies from the Blacks to the Jews are deserving of fates of violence.”

Hate watch groups have tracked 150 racist incidents on college campuses in 33 States since the fall. Just a year ago, it was such a rarity that no one was even counting.

Peddlers of hate are specifically targeting college campuses, declaring that their time has come, and trying to lure students with slogans like “serve your people” and “our destiny is ours.” They are working to translate their online activism to real-world action, and young people are prime targets, in part, because they are still figuring out who they are and what they believe.

One would have to be purposefully obtuse to not see a direct line from the recent elections to the emboldening of these perpetrators across the country. Longtime White supremacist Jared Taylor described the November election result as a “sign of rising White

consciousness” and that “now is the time to press our advantage in every way possible.”

So, today, I am calling on the administration—that has repeatedly failed to denounce the hate crimes directed at Jews, members of the LGBT community, or immigrants—to denounce the hate-fueled killing of a Black soldier, Second Lieutenant Richard Collins.

The reaction to Collins’ murder is often formulaic. We extend our condolences and sympathies, call the killing a senseless tragedy, and proclaim that we won’t tolerate these incidents. That is not good enough. If this escalation of hate is going to end in Maryland and across the country, it will be because all of us take a stand not only against the hard right and hate festering on campus, but to leaders who have been too content to remain silent and look the other way.

Hate speech is not protected. Encouraging open academic debate cannot lead to inaction that creates a breeding ground for prejudice, discrimination, and violent hatred on our college campuses or anywhere.

Campuses should adopt successful strategies:

Consider zero-tolerance policies for hateful speech and acts of racism. Maybe if students know that they will be expelled for spreading racial slurs online, they will think twice;

Replicate the University of Massachusetts. They have a hate SWAT team that counters hateful messages through an early alert system, a counter-messaging response team, and counselors on call;

Or promote more diverse voices in the faculty and staff.

Pretending that the murder of Richard Collins in cold blood is an isolated incident will only make the situation worse. Diversity and unity—that American melting pot that is the foundation of our Nation—can only happen when the country does a better job confronting hate in all forms. We cannot simply start when students arrive on campus.

In the absence of real change, we take to the streets; we protest; we hold vigils. But Richard Collins deserves better. Our children deserve better. Let us work together, and let’s not wait for another tragedy.

Farewell and Godspeed, Lieutenant Collins.

A CALL TO NATIONAL SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, while I put up a couple of charts here, the most noticeable one is I want to make everybody aware that tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. we will unveil ACTION, a call to national serv-

ice. It will be carried live streaming on YouTube tomorrow morning, May 25, at 9 a.m.

The first poster that I have up here is of General McChrystal. Tomorrow morning, JOHN LEWIS, DORIS MATSUI, JOE KENNEDY, our Senate lead Senator JACK REED from Rhode Island, and General McChrystal, among others, will be at our bill introduction and rollout.

General McChrystal has said that we need to create a culture of service, where we are all vested in our Nation’s future and feel a shared sense of responsibility not only to our Nation, but to each other.

General McChrystal also said, as was outlined in *The Atlantic Monthly*, that you don’t have to wear a military uniform to serve your country. But certainly wearing a military uniform in serving your country is an honor, and we commend those men and women who serve for what they do for our country. But many among them, including reservists and the National Guard, are not often eligible for the GI Bill, yet they have done tours of duty and served their Nation extraordinarily well.

This Monday, Memorial Day, would be the 100th birthday of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. It is hard to believe that so youthful, so vital, so gracious, so eloquent, and so charismatic a leader was taken from us at such a young age. Yet it was he who gave us this great vision when, in his inaugural address, he said to the citizens of this country: “In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround this globe.

“Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, ‘rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation’—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.”

Kennedy was speaking of the Nation when he said: “Can we forge against these enemies a grand and global alliance, North and South, East and West, that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind?”

Then he said to all Americans: “Will you join in that historic effort?”

“And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.”

What we propose in this legislation tomorrow we are rolling out is that what you can do for your country is serve it. Whether in the military, the Reserves, or the National Guard, or

whether in the Peace Corps, AmeriCorps, or VISTA, you can serve your country; and what your country can do for you in return is to help you get through college and pay off your debt that you have incurred.

Rise with us, America, and join us tomorrow as we go on the march and make sure that, in the legacy of President Kennedy, we continue to move this Nation forward.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 29 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Pastor Becky Tirabassi, Viewpoint Church, Newport Beach, California, offered the following prayer:

Father, I pray for the immediate outpouring of Your Holy Spirit on our Nation and leaders.

I pray that not one of us will miss hearing Your voice today.

I pray that we would not neglect to ask for Your wisdom.

I pray that we would not make decisions without asking Your guidance.

Will You go before and behind us?

Will You give us our marching orders?

In this hour of our great need, begin again to help us, as You have in years gone by.

Father, You are the God who does immeasurably more than all we could ask or imagine.

Today, give us the humility to ask for Your help, and the grand moral courage to be agents of change for the good of others and the honor of Your name.

In Your powerful name we ask these things.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) come

forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CONNOLLY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING PASTOR BECKY TIRABASSI

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor today to introduce to the House our guest chaplain, Becky Tirabassi, co-pastor of the Viewpoint Church in Newport Beach, California.

Becky became a licensed pastor in 2014, when she and her husband, Dr. Roger Tirabassi, founded the Viewpoint Church. Today, she and her husband give spiritual guidance and personal counseling to members of the Viewpoint Church, but also to people throughout Orange County needing personal and spiritual encouragement.

Becky was helping others even before she became a pastor. She is best known as an author of over 15 books, including the best-selling books, "Change Your Life" and "Little Changes Big Results for Crazy, Busy Couples." She has appeared many times on national television and radio, and for over three decades has spoken before groups in nearly all 50 States, as well as internationally. In addition to her co-pastorate, she is president of the Becky Tirabassi Change Your Life, Incorporated.

Becky and Roger have one married son, who is a grown man, and he has just completed a tour as a missionary in Uganda. For that safe return, we are all grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Pastor Becky Tirabassi, and thank her for offering today's opening prayer in the U.S. House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING DR. DAVID RAINES

(Mr. ABRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today alongside my good friend, Congressman MIKE JOHNSON, to recognize Dr. David Raines, a Louisiana legend in the field of gastroenterology.

Dr. Raines has worked with patients across the United States, including a

gastroenterology fellowship serving our Nation's veterans at Walter Reed Army Medical Center here in Washington.

Dr. Raines is a pioneer in the field of gastroenterology, and is almost single-handedly responsible for bringing free-standing endoscopy centers to Louisiana. Because of him, patients can get these important lifesaving procedures in cost-efficient and convenient outpatient facilities.

Dr. Raines is admired among his peers, me being one of those and Congressman JOHNSON being another, not only for his professional accomplishments, but also for the way he has cared for others, including mentoring new doctors attending and entering his field.

Congressman JOHNSON and I wanted to take a moment today to thank Dr. Raines for his career of service to patients throughout Louisiana. He has saved many lives, and our State is a better place because of him.

TRUMP BUDGET AND RURAL AMERICA

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Trump released his budget. And what he has shown is that rural America is just about at the bottom of his list.

His budget is a killer for the Department of Agriculture. The cuts to the rural development program would mean fewer jobs in small towns that are already struggling.

While he promised to "end the war on the family farmer," President Trump slashes funding for the crop insurance program. And in Peoria, his budget would even close the Nation's largest agricultural research lab, a place for ag innovation that is part of the solution for renewed ag economy.

Time and time again, President Trump made a great big promise spelled out on his red ball cap. Now I am left wondering how a budget that would devastate Main Street and our family farmers would make anything great again.

Mr. President, middle America is not just flyover country. We value those who look us in the eye, tell us the truth, and then do what they say they are going to do.

So, President Trump, I ask you: Does your budget live up to what you spelled out on your ball cap?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

CONGRATULATING ANNIE RICHARDSON

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to express appreciation for Annie Richardson, press assistant of South Carolina's Second Congressional District.

A native of Alexandria, Virginia, Annie has called South Carolina's Second Congressional District home since 2004. A distinguished graduate of Hammond School and Presbyterian College, Annie has faithfully served on the staff of the Second Congressional District. Her expertise in photography, graphic design, and videography has made a positive difference, and her sunny disposition is always recognized by constituents visiting the office.

It is with mixed blessings, but great happiness, that I bid Annie farewell. She is moving on next week to serve as the digital assistant for the House Republican Conference; fortunately, to be working with conference chair CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS. I know she will do a remarkable job supporting the conference.

I know her father, Phil, and brother, Emmett, join me in recognizing her achievements. She has served with distinction in the tradition of her late beloved mother, Holly Richardson, who will always be cherished as a devoted staff member of Senate President pro tempore Strom Thurmond.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

We are grateful for the visit today in Washington of Medal of Honor recipient James Livingston, a Marine general from Mount Pleasant, South Carolina.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

(Mr. CONNOLLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to demand that Congress get serious about the Russia investigation.

In December, along with Mr. ENGEL of New York, I introduced the SECURE Our Democracy Act that would sanction any foreign individual or entity found to have unlawfully interfered with our election process. That shouldn't be a partisan issue, yet all of the bill's 88 cosponsors are Democrats.

I am also a cosponsor of the Protecting Our Democracy Act to establish an independent commission to get to the bottom of the Russia investigation.

A recent NBC-Wall Street Journal poll conducted in April found that 73 percent of our fellow Americans want such an independent commission. They want to get at the truth. So do I. So should all of us. I have signed a discharge petition to get that bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support these two measures, and to

bring them to the floor for consideration. It is our constitutional duty to provide oversight of any executive in any executive branch.

The American people demand answers and accountability, not obstruction and intimidation. Appointing a special counsel, independent of the White House and the Attorney General, was one way to begin to restore credibility that has been badly tarnished. I urge us to proceed with the Russia investigation with all dispatch.

FOSTER YOUTH SHADOW DAY

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the struggles that foster youth encounter, and to celebrate their perseverance and fortitude as they attempt to navigate this complicated system and transition to adulthood.

In Arkansas, we have over 5,000 children currently in the State's foster care system.

I am proud to work with my colleagues on the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth to shed light on the perpetuation of poverty and dysfunction our current system enables. And I stand proudly in support of House Resolution 314, recognizing May as National Foster Care Month.

For the past 2 years, I have had the opportunity to have a former foster youth personally shadow me for a day. What a rewarding experience.

This year, I am honored to host Starr Wilson, a former foster youth from my district. After spending 10 years in foster care, Starr, who is full of drive and passion, graduated with honors from the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff.

Unlike Starr's story, though, when many youth across America age out of the system, they find themselves with no place to call home, and they lack the encouragement and structure they need to pursue happiness.

Therefore, I am proud to stand with the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth in praise of the Sixth Annual Foster Youth Shadow Day here on Capitol Hill, which allows these youth to come across our country and share time with Members of Congress, and aspire to be the leaders of generations to come.

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am going to follow up on the prior speaker. I rise in support of National Foster Care Month. This month, we renew our

commitment to ensuring that the 420,000 youth who are in our Nation's foster care system have a caring family and the opportunities they deserve.

I am proud to be a member of the Foster Youth Caucus, which is devoted to highlighting the efforts of all those involved with improving our Nation's foster care system.

I also rise to celebrate Congressional Foster Youth Shadow Day. Today, more than 100 former foster youth from across the country are in D.C., paired with Members of Congress as we conduct the Nation's business.

I am privileged to host Shantell House and Jeremiah McWright from California. Shantell is currently a student at Mills College and is passionate about current and former foster youth. Jeremiah joins me from San Diego, where he is studying public policy and has the potential to become a great business leader, or even a politician.

It gives me great pleasure to welcome Shantell and Jeremiah, along with all of the participants of the Congressional Youth Shadow Day, to our Nation's capital.

RECOGNIZING BRITNI BURLINGHAM

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud member of the Foster Youth Caucus, and also as part of a family that was involved in the foster care system.

Today I have the opportunity to spend time with Britni Burlingham as part of the Annual Foster Youth Shadow Day.

Britni is a social work major at Edinboro University in Pennsylvania. She is also a case aide for the Bair Foundation, a nonprofit organization that focuses on foster care and adoption.

This profession is rewarding for Britni because she has a firsthand experience. She entered the foster care system when she was just 7 years old.

Britni has said that being able to work with children who have had similar experiences to hers is life-changing. She and her husband also provide a loving home to their two foster daughters.

I am grateful that I can spend time today with Britni and hear about her positive experience with foster care. Her adoptive family built a strong foundation for her to achieve success in her own life.

Mr. Speaker, this is what foster care is all about.

I thank Britni for being here today, sharing her story and helping so many children overcome similar obstacles.

Congratulations, Britni. We are all very proud of your success.

□ 1215

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL BAHAR

(Mr. SCHIFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Michael Bahar, who will be leaving the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, where he has served as general counsel since September 2012, and as staff director and general counsel since early 2015.

Because of Michael's commitment to always finding a way to "yes," he has helped guide HPSCI to a run of remarkable legislative success over the past 2 years. In a city of tacticians, Michael's great gift is his ability to look at things strategically, even while reacting in real time to emerging matters at hand.

Under Michael's leadership of the HPSCI Democratic staff, we have passed two successive bipartisan intelligence authorization acts, both of which received multiple and successively larger vote tallies each time they came to the floor.

In June 2015, we passed the USA FREEDOM Act that ended bulk collection of telephony metadata under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, replacing it with a new regime more protective of Americans' privacy.

And later in 2015, the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 was included as part of the 2016 omnibus spending bill. CISA, which encourages businesses and the Federal Government to share cyber threat information in the interest of national security, could not have been timelier.

Neither bill would have been possible without Michael's tireless efforts. He worked on a broad range of issues with a broad range of stakeholders, in and out of government, and these measures were necessary and effective in securing our liberties.

Prior to joining the committee, Michael served with dedication in the Obama White House as Deputy Legal Adviser to the National Security Council staff. He is a Naval reservist supporting U.S. Special Operations Command.

After a well-deserved vacation, Michael will embark on a new career as a lawyer here in D.C. On behalf of the entire HPSCI family, I want to wish Michael, his wife, Hannah, and their daughter, Rose, the very best, and thank him for his years of service to the Nation.

CONGRATULATING AND HONORING
MIKE FREMONT

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and honor a

great Cincinnati and avid marathoner, Mike Fremont, for accomplishing something pretty amazing. A little over a week ago, Mike set the world record for his age group at Cincinnati's Flying Pig Half-Marathon.

By the way, he is 95 years old. Thirteen miles at the age of 95. And he had previously held the world record for a 90-year-old marathoner, which he set 5 years ago in Huntington, West Virginia.

Mike's passion for running and a healthy lifestyle kicked in when he was only 70 years old and given only 3 months to live after being diagnosed with an advanced form of cancer.

I have known Mike since my time on the Cincinnati City Council back 30 years ago, including involvement with the Mill Creek Restoration Project. He is an amazing Cincinnati and ought to be an inspiration to all who hear of his accomplishments.

Congratulations, Mike. You have made all Cincinnatians proud.

DISCLOSURE OF SENSITIVE
INFORMATION

(Mrs. MURPHY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the President recently disclosed highly sensitive information to Russian officials, information that had been entrusted to the United States by an ally. This incident has generated concern among national security professionals.

Under current law, the President must keep the congressional intelligence committees informed of U.S. intelligence activities. Building on this general mandate, I am filing a bill that would require the President to notify the intelligence committees when a U.S. official, including the President, intentionally or inadvertently discloses top-secret information to a nation that sponsors terrorism or, like Russia, is subject to U.S. sanctions.

My bill would deter unjustified disclosure of sensitive information to adversaries. It would also give the congressional intelligence committees an opportunity to examine the rationale for the disclosure, to assess any fallout, and to take appropriate action.

My bill would simply provide Congress with the same information that was made available to other nations. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this bill.

REFLECTIONS ON MEMORIAL DAY

(Mr. DESJARLAIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reflect on what Memorial Day means to our country. Memorial Day

truly is a special occasion in which we honor the brave men and women in uniform who made the ultimate sacrifice.

Many from the Volunteer State died on the battlefield to defend our Nation. Because of them, and so many others from across our Nation, we enjoy our freedoms and many blessings. The debt we owe them is immeasurable.

But we can honor their memory and make life easier for families of fallen heroes like Lance Corporal Andrew P. Carpenter, from Columbia, Tennessee, who died fighting in Afghanistan. Although his loan provider forgave his student loan debt, Andrew's family owed taxes on the discharged amount. I introduced the Tax Relief for Our Nation's Heroes Act to resolve this IRS oversight.

Military families should have more peace of mind, which is part of my job on the House Armed Services Committee.

I would like to thank all those who have worn the uniform of the U.S. military, and offer my prayers for the safety of thousands now serving in harm's way.

SALUTING FALLEN VETERANS ON
MEMORIAL DAY

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my family and staff, I want to salute and commemorate the fallen veterans of the United States Virgin Islands and throughout the United States as we prepare to celebrate or participate in this Memorial Day observance.

Memorial Day is the day our Nation gathers to honor the many men and women who have selflessly defended this country and have paid the ultimate sacrifice in defense of the public and our democratic principles.

The Virgin Islands proudly served and sacrificed its sons and daughters to American freedom, even before it was a part of this Nation. Our service history is rich and will continue. After becoming a part of this country 100 years ago this year, we lobbied, petitioned, for the responsibility to be a part of the draft. We shirk not from our duty.

The Virgin Islands, along with the other territories, send more men and women per capita to serve in the U.S. military than anywhere in the United States, and have more fallen veterans per capita than anywhere else.

I take this opportunity to thank and extend condolences to these men and women, their families, for their bravery, strength, sacrifice, and courage. We as citizens, and as a community, are forever indebted to our servicemen and -women. Our resolve is that their sacrifice is not in vain as we continue

to fight for liberty and justice for all, both home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, just as we vow to leave no soldier behind on the battlefield, we here in Congress will not forget any veterans when they return home.

MEMORIAL DAY

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, America pauses to honor the patriotic men and women who sacrificed their lives in support of our liberty.

For many, perhaps, Memorial Day has become just another reason for a cookout. But for more than 11,000 families in North Carolina, Memorial Day is very real. Their son or daughter or spouse or parent is among the 11,000 North Carolinians who died during World War II, Korea, Vietnam, Iraq, or Afghanistan.

Remembering the price of freedom makes me all the more grateful for the 17 students from my district who this year received appointments to West Point, the U.S. Air Force Academy, and the U.S. Naval Academy. These students, many of them at or near the top of their class, are volunteering to dedicate at least 9 years to defend America. They know the potential risks and the ultimate sacrifice required by many.

To the families of those who died in service to our Nation, we extend our deepest sympathy and gratitude. May God bless you.

HONORING REVEREND DR. WILLIAM J. BARBER II

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, Walter Lippmann once said that "The final test of a leader is that he leaves behind him in other men the conviction and the will carry on."

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great leader, the Reverend Dr. William J. Barber II. As the president of North Carolina's chapter of the NAACP, Reverend Barber has become a national icon and a champion of moral leadership. He is the founder of Moral Mondays. He has traveled to more than 20 States to train others on tactics in civil disobedience.

And under his leadership, the NAACP fiercely fought against discriminatory legislation such as North Carolina's HB2 and voter suppression tactics like voter ID laws.

After 12 years as president of the North Carolina NAACP, Reverend Barber is retiring to lead a new campaign—a national call for a moral re-

vival. This new coalition of spiritual leaders will push beyond politics to guide our Nation toward a path of increased equality and social justice.

Reverend Barber's leadership of the NAACP will be sorely missed, but I look forward to witnessing the many ways in which he will continue to impact lives and make America a more just and fair place.

Thank you, Reverend Barber. Godspeed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DAVE SHAUL

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of one of Illinois' great journalists, Dave Shaul, who passed away this month at age 75.

For decades, Dave provided countless central Illinois residents with their local news as an anchor, producer, and news director at WCIA in Champaign, Illinois. During his storied television and radio broadcast career, Dave covered the biggest local, State, and national news, including covering every Presidential election from 1964 through 2016. Dave was known for his honest and trustworthy coverage of local and national politics.

Dave won a number of awards during his career as a journalist. In 1980, he won the UPI Best Television Sports Play-by-Play Award for his coverage of Illinois basketball. And in 1999, he was honored with the Associated Press Mark Twain Lifetime Achievement Award, was named to the Eastern Illinois University Hall of Fame, and was designated a lifetime member of the Illinois News Broadcasters Association. Dave also received an Emmy Award for his career accomplishments in 2011.

Dave leaves a long legacy as a trusted figure on the news and in the Champaign-Urbana community. His family and friends continue to be in my thoughts and prayers.

MEDIA TARGET PRESIDENT TRUMP

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, from a recent Investor's Business Daily editorial, a Harvard University study found that "During the first 100 days of Trump's Presidency, TV networks CNN, NBC, and CBS provided negative coverage 93 percent, 93 percent, and 91 percent of the time."

Meanwhile, "The New York Times delivered 87 percent negative coverage, while The Washington Post 83 percent and The Wall Street Journal 70 percent were only a bit less negative."

"Trump's overall score of 80 percent negative coverage during the start of his Presidency compares with Obama's 41 percent, Bush's 57 percent, and Bill Clinton's 60 percent."

"Both the Post and the Times, for instance, have used unnamed sources and even the supposed content of documents that they have never viewed as the basis for major revelations about Trump in recent days. They have let their raw hatred get the better of them."

"Such a media environment is dangerous for American democracy."

Expecting basic professionalism from the media, sadly, seems to be too much.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 24, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 24, 2017, at 9:04 a.m.:

Appointments:
Election Assistance Board of Advisors.
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1973, PROTECTING YOUNG VICTIMS FROM SEXUAL ABUSE ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1761, PROTECTING AGAINST CHILD EXPLOITATION ACT OF 2017; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 26, 2017, THROUGH JUNE 5, 2017

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 352 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 352

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1973) to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair

and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-20. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1761) to amend title 18, United States Code, to criminalize the knowing consent of the visual depiction, or live transmission, of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-19 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from May 26, 2017, through June 5, 2017—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. This rule provides a structured process for debate. I want to highlight that this rule makes in order all amendments submitted to the Rules Committee, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in this Chamber today support the goals of this legislation. We can and we must do more to protect children from the plague of sexual assault and the prevalence of child pornography permeating society today.

I am particularly glad to see such bipartisan support for H.R. 1973. The young athletes that represent the United States on the world's stage at the Olympics must not be taken advantage of by predatory coaches and doctors who should be mentoring them. In fact, no child anywhere should be taken advantage of; but this bill makes some commonsense changes that strengthen the reporting of abuse and puts in place policies that prevent future violations, and I am hopeful it will become law.

It staggers the mind to believe that this assault on those children had gone on for 20 years, and some 400 children were victimized for it, and not a single adult anywhere around ever brought attention to it. In fact, we owe a great newspaper in Indiana for telling us about it, so be sure to read a good newspaper every day.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of agreement about the goals of the bills before us today, but that wasn't the case 20 days ago when the majority rushed through its partisan, slapdash healthcare bill repeal to rip away healthcare from millions of people. They passed the bill without holding a single hearing, listening to any experts, or, most importantly, waiting for a score from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

The Congressional Budget Office tells us what the bill will cost, how many people it will help, how many people it would hurt, something that, with healthcare, would have been vitally important.

But while the lack of a score didn't prohibit them from holding a vote, it did, apparently, prevent the majority from sending the bill over to the Senate. Mr. Speaker, this process is completely backwards and a major breakdown of the integrity of the legislative process.

Most schoolchildren know that, when a bill passes the House, you send it to the Senate. You don't hide it in a drawer for weeks until you finally get the information from the Congressional Budget Office that you should have had before you brought the bill to the floor for a vote.

This is no way to develop a plan that will impact one-sixth of the Nation's gross domestic product, and the process has finally laid bare one of the biggest political hoaxes in recent memory: that notion of repeal and replace. How often did we hear that over the last 7 years?

For the last 7 years, the majority voted more than 60 times to undermine the Affordable Care Act without having a thing in the world to replace it with, and now they are pushing the false notion that the Affordable Care Act is collapsing. The reality is that some States dealing with limited insurers never implemented the full benefits of the law or enacted the exchange under the Affordable Care Act, which would have cut their costs.

Mr. Speaker, one of my proudest moments as a Member of Congress was chairing the House Rules Committee and bringing the Affordable Care Act to the House floor. Almost every President since Theodore Roosevelt had attempted to give healthcare to the American people. Millions of people are now waking up to the benefits of this healthcare, and our Nation's uninsured rate is at its lowest level in more than 50 years. Why would you rip that away?

For the first time in a generation, we are actually slowing the yearly growth of healthcare costs. A poll released just this last month found that 61 percent of the public supports keeping and improving the Affordable Care Act. That is in stark contrast to the 17 percent approval rating for the repeal bill that was voted on here several weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the majority would stop turning a deaf ear to the people it represents. The American people have been marching and calling and writing against this bill in numbers none of us have ever seen before. A bad process led to a bad product.

Mr. Speaker, none of us believe that the ACA was perfect. I urge the majority to take the bill out of the drawer and shred it. Let's get together, strengthen our healthcare system and the Affordable Care Act. It is exactly what our constituents deserve.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time, and I am grateful to be here with the gentleman. I want to speak to both of these bills rather than speaking to a different bill that was considered in this body.

With regard to H.R. 1761, this bill became necessary because of the court-imposed misinterpretation of a congressional statute with regard to the visual depiction, or live transmission, of a victim of child abuse, or sexually explicit conduct. This is important because it closes a loophole that otherwise would allow a perpetrator to walk free because of a lack of specific intent when recording images of the victim that they are victimizing.

This bill is important because it closes the loophole and gets back to what the intent of Congress was when they passed legislation intended to protect children and criminalized the production of images of child sexual abuse. This bill does all we can at this point to protect our children from sexual predators.

It is a moral necessity that we close this shameful loophole, created by a judicial opinion, to provide the appropriate punishment to those who look to harm minors. It won't protect all of our children, but it will provide a significant deterrent to protect more of our children, and that makes this bill important, crucial, and necessary.

With regard to H.R. 1973, Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act of 2017, this broadens the coverage of current laws that require reporting of child abuse, specifically with regard to those children who are participating in organizations that are organized for the purpose of helping—ostensibly helping—young athletes train for international competition.

When you are a parent of an athlete, just like your child, you trust these coaches who are mentoring and working and interacting with your children not just for training these children and preparing them to be the best athlete they possibly can be, but you also entrust, many times, your children's keeping to them.

Gone are the days where kids were playing in Little League and saw their

coaches for brief periods of time. In many instances, the children that will be protected by this bill are those elite young athletes who spend quite a bit of time actually away from their parents and in the care and custody of coaches, trainers, and other people associated with the program.

As a father of athletes, it is important that I be able to trust that, if someone has been convicted or has had to report that, that information is available. And due to this particular legislation, the government will now be able to pursue cases that it would not otherwise be able to prosecute.

This legislation specifies that national governing bodies are authorized to develop training oversight practices, policies, and procedures to prevent sexual abuse of amateur athletes. And then what is critical, it requires that it is necessary to assure child abuse is being reported by those who work with amateur athletes. Those reporting requirements are essential protective deterrents and provide assurances to all surrounding that young child and that athlete that they have the opportunity for safekeeping.

Organizations must be taking action against coaches or other members when allegations are made against them to assure young athletes are kept safe. The safety of these young athletes must trump, in many cases, perhaps, their ability to develop their unique gifts and talents.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that these bills are brought forward, and I support them.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Nearly 30 years ago, I held my son, Cody, for the first time. A couple of years later, I held my daughter, Kaitlin. I knew right then that these two children were the most important and cherished things in my life. They deserve the happiest childhood and the brightest future and the safest world.

I imagine anyone who holds their child for the first time has the same thought. Until you become a parent, it is hard to describe the love you have for your children.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, that someone would hurt a child simply perplexes me. Children are the most vulnerable, the most innocent in our society. They, most of all, don't deserve the trauma and pain that accompany abuse. They don't deserve to have their trust in adults or their trust in the world shattered at such a young age. They don't deserve the ghosts of suffering that accompany abuse victims for the rest of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, to commit a crime against children is to engage in the greatest of evils. It is to violate our moral order in the most egregious of

ways. Our job in Congress is to debate and maintain that moral order. Thankfully, everyone in this Chamber can agree on the moral imperative to protect children.

Our job today is to uphold our values through well-crafted legislation. We are here today to pass laws that uphold our belief in the sanctity of innocence. We are here today for our children.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1973, the first bill in this rule resolution, strengthens the laws protecting child athletes. The bill requires coaches and adults involved with amateur sports organizations overseen by the U.S. Olympic Committee to report suspected child abuse to local and Federal authorities.

Unfortunately, reporting isn't always the standard under current law. Over the past 20 years, around 368 individuals affiliated with USA Gymnastics faced sexual abuse by adults affiliated with the organization, according to *The Indianapolis Star*. Sadly, some of the victims never saw justice. Their allegations remained unresolved, sometimes because coaches moved from State to State to avoid investigation.

H.R. 1973 pulls additional adults into the mandatory reporting category, ensuring that those adults working with minors under the U.S. Olympic Committee's jurisdiction must report instances of child abuse to local and Federal authorities.

It further clarifies the sexual abuse reporting duties of national governing bodies, or NGBs. These organizations, supervised by the U.S. Olympic Committee, manage amateur athletic competitions.

We need to promote a culture of reporting sexual assault among youth athletes. That culture needs to overflow into all parts of our society.

We are not suggesting we toss out due process for the accused. The legislation at hand only requires the reporting and investigation of sexual abuse of children. Additionally, H.R. 1973 makes stronger the civil remedies that victims of sexual abuse may pursue.

Mr. Speaker, the other legislation under this rule, H.R. 1761, goes after those who create child pornography. Just to utter those words is unbearable, but our job in Congress is to stop the unbearable.

Under current law and due to the impact of the court ruling in *United States v. Palomino-Coronado*, perpetrators of child pornography can sometimes evade prosecution for child pornography under a loophole. Under the precedent set in the case, even if perpetrators memorialize the sexual abuse of a child through images and video, they do not necessarily possess the intent or purpose to sexually abuse children in order to take a picture. In other words, they didn't intend to violate title 18 of the U.S. Code, section 2251, which prohibits child pornography.

We need to close this loophole. If evildoers are sexually abusing our children and photographing or filming it, they should be going to prison for a long time. This loophole was carved out by the judicial branch. It is time for the legislative branch to step in and tighten the statutory language to prevent the exploitation of this loophole and to prevent the exploitation of our children.

The bills under consideration today serve two purposes. First and foremost, they provide a deterrent to criminals who would consider harming a child.

We can't preemptively stop everyone who plans to commit a crime against a child, which is why we must deter them with the threat of discovery, conviction, and jail time.

These bills very practically make the exploitation of a child harder to get away with. They commission more well-meaning adults to be on guard against the occurrence of sexual abuse. They allow victims to pursue even stronger civil penalties that will, hopefully, deter future criminals, and they strengthen the law itself to ensure that child pornographers face prosecution and appropriate punishment for their heinous crimes.

The second purpose achieved today is to send a message. These bills signal to all of America that our society is serious about protecting children and that we are serious about catching child predators.

H.R. 1973 specifically directs coaches and others to report sexual abuse. But these bills send a broader message: everyone in this Nation should join the fight against child exploitation.

We have too many examples of well-meaning adults remaining silent in the face of child abuse. This legislation is meant to push Americans to do what is right, even if it is not easy.

We are all the guardians of our Nation's youth. We all are responsible for their childhood. We are all proponents of their future. These are our children, our pride and joy. We must offer them the same vigilance and protection we offer our own children. The rule before us gives this House a chance to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of Americans want us to work together to improve upon the successes of the Affordable Care Act. We should be expanding access to care and implementing the kind of reforms that will keep American families healthy, not kicking millions of Americans off their insurance to fulfill a deceptive campaign promise, as the Republican healthcare repeal bill will do. Expanding paid sick leave to the 45 percent of American

workers who don't have access to it would be a great start.

Each week, up to 3 million employees go to work sick, infecting their co-workers and customers and delaying their own recovery. The benefits of allowing working Americans to earn paid sick leave are undeniable. It slows the spread of disease, lowers healthcare costs, and increases productivity.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would allow us to also bring up Representative DELAURO's bill, H.R. 1516, which would allow Americans to have paid sick time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, it is clear after The Indianapolis Star uncovered the widespread abuse scandal that Congress must act to implement consistent, stricter laws governing the reporting of abuses to our Nation's athletes and to all our children. Once again, The Indianapolis Star has shown us the importance of investigative journalism and a free press.

Many of these athletes are too young and are not empowered to speak out against authority figures when they are hurt or abused by them. But each of us as Members of Congress is in a position to do something about it, and we must.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to listen to the voices of the American people before hurling our Nation further toward disaster with this dangerous healthcare bill.

The majority hasn't held any hearings or gotten input from experts, advocates, or patients. They are ignoring the opposition from groups like AARP, American Medical Association, March of Dimes, and American Hospital Association.

The score later today from the Congressional Budget Office won't change the underlying facts of this bill. It will gut protections for people with pre-existing conditions. It will gut essential health benefits, kick millions of people off of health insurance, and place a crushing age tax on those aged 50 to 64 whose premiums will go up. It will also cut billions from Medicaid to pay for a major tax cut for the wealthy. That is \$880 billion that they want to take away from Medicaid to give to the rich and corporations. This is so unAmerican, I stumbled over saying it.

Mr. Speaker, a bad process has led to a bad bill. We should be doing what the American people want and improving the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today for the children.

In voting for the bill and the underlying bills, we are sending a message to the abuser of children: If you harm one of these little ones, you will be met with the full fury of the American justice system. You will be discovered and reported by your peers. You will face the threat of appropriately harsh demands. You will face the full force of the law if you visually depict child exploitation.

We are sending a message to the bystanders: You have a solemn duty to protect these children. You have a duty to be their hope and happiness and their future when you step in and stop abuse. You have a duty to report the heinous acts committed by monsters.

Lately, we don't have many moments in Washington where both political parties can come together and reach a consensus, but the legislation we are considering today provides the perfect opportunity.

These bills should not be controversial. They should draw the support of both sides, because protecting our children is a moral necessity for every American. That is, after all, the message these bills send.

I thank Representative BROOKS and Representative JOHNSON for the hard work they have done on these bills, and I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for shepherding these bills through the Judiciary Committee and spending so much time in committee working on legislation to protect our children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members to vote "yes" on the resolution, vote "yes" on the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 352 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1516) to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to

recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1516.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment

or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer a resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately release his tax return information to Congress and the American people.

Whereas, in the United States' system of checks and balances, Congress has a responsibility to hold the Executive Branch of government to a fair and equal standard of transparency ensuring the public interest is placed first;

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed their tax return information to the public;

Whereas, tax returns provide an important baseline of reasonable information including whether the President paid taxes, ownership interests, charitable donations made, and whether tax deductions have been exploited;

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns could help those investigating Russian influence in the 2016 election understand the President's financial ties to the Russian Federation and Russian citizens, including debts owed and whether he shares any partnership interests, equity interests, joint ventures or licensing agreements with Russia or Russians;

Whereas, the President recently fired Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, under whose leadership the FBI was investigating whether the Trump campaign colluded with Russia to influence the 2016 election;

Whereas, President Trump reportedly stated to Russian officials during a White House meeting that he fired Director Comey to ease pressure on the ongoing investigation of Russia's influence in the 2016 election;

Whereas, Senate Russia investigators have requested information from the Treasury Department's criminal investigation division, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, or FinCEN, which handles cases of money

laundering, for information related to President Trump, his top officials and campaign aides. FinCEN has been investigating allegations of foreign money-laundering through purchases of U.S. real estate;

Whereas, the President's tax returns would show us whether he has foreign bank accounts and how much profit he receives from his ownership in myriad partnerships;

Whereas, Donald Trump Jr. said the Trump Organization saw money "pouring in from Russia" and that "Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets."

Whereas, the White House will not confirm whether the President has filed a 2016 tax return;

Whereas, Congress gave itself the authority to review an individual's tax returns to investigate and reveal possible conflicts of interest of executive branch officials involved dating back to the Teapot Dome scandal.

Whereas, it has been reported that federal prosecutors have issued grand jury subpoenas to associates of former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn seeking business records as part of the ongoing probe into Russian involvement in the 2016 election;

Whereas, according to his 2016 candidate filing with the Federal Election Commission, the President has 564 financial positions in companies located in the United States and around the world;

Whereas, against the advice of ethics attorneys and the Office of Government Ethics, the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his businesses; and can still withdraw funds at any time from the trust of which he is the sole beneficiary;

Whereas, the Emoluments Clause was included in the U.S. Constitution for the express purpose of preventing federal officials from accepting any "present, Emolument, Office, or Title . . . from any King, Prince, or foreign state";

Whereas, the Chairmen of the Ways and Means Committee, Joint Committee on Taxation, and Senate Finance Committee have the authority to request the President's tax returns under Section 6103 of the tax code;

Whereas, the Joint Committee on Taxation reviewed the tax returns of President Richard Nixon in 1974 and made the information public;

Whereas, the Ways and Means Committee used IRC 6103 authority in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas Director Comey has testified that tax returns are a common tool in investigations because they can show income and motives;

Whereas, the American people have the right to know whether or not their President is operating under conflicts of interest related to international affairs, tax reform, government contracts, or otherwise: Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives shall—

1. Immediately request the tax return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015 for review in closed executive session by the Committee on Ways and Means, as provided under Section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code, and vote to report the information therein to the full House of Representatives.

2. Support transparency in government and the longstanding tradition of Presidents and Presidential candidates disclosing their tax returns.

□ 1300

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from California wish to present argument on the parliamentary question of whether the resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House?

Ms. SANCHEZ. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, under clause 1 of rule IX, questions of the privileges of the House are those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings. I believe that the dignity of this institution is at risk each day that passes without this body exercising its statutory authority and constitutional duty to operate as a coequal branch of government.

The legislative branch of government has the responsibility and authority to keep a proper check on the executive branch under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code. Specifically, three committees have jurisdiction to request tax returns: the Committee on Ways and Means, the Senate Finance Committee, and the Joint Committee on Taxation. This provision has been part of our Federal Tax Code since 1924 to facilitate full and complete investigations into scandals that rise to the level of national importance.

Nothing could rise to the level of national importance like the possible financial entanglements our President may have with Russian entities and individuals. This situation is truly unprecedented. It is our sworn duty to uphold the integrity of this institution and examine all the relevant details related to this issue.

Each week we see yet another fact in the growing case of entanglements between our President, his campaign and closest advisers, and Russian officials. The most recent troubling report occurred just last week when we learned that the President himself reportedly made statements directly to Russian officials during an Oval Office meeting regarding the FBI investigation into his campaign ties with Russia. This is the same meeting where the President took it upon himself to reveal highly classified information to Russian officials.

How long can this body allow these types of actions to go unchecked?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is reminded the remarks must be confined to the question of order.

Ms. SANCHEZ. I understand, Mr. Speaker. I promise that they relate to the question at issue.

Mr. Speaker, further, the American people deserve to know if President Trump has exploited the Federal Tax Code for improper personal gain.

The personal business endeavors of the leader of the free world should be

exercised to the highest possible standard. Specifically, the President's business dealings around the world make him more prone to potential conflicts of interest than any President in history. However, the President did not take adequate steps to mitigate any potential issues. He was advised by the Office of Government Ethics to divest himself of his business entanglements. The President chose to ignore this sound advice.

It is now the duty of this body to restore integrity to the oversight process. Our democracy should be an example to the world. Today we have the opportunity to ensure that it is achieved through taking up this overdue investigation. It is only then we can restore the dignity and integrity of the House through exercise of our constitutional duty.

For these reasons, this resolution raises a question of the privileges of the House and should be allowed a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California seeks to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

As the Chair most recently ruled on May 17, 2017, the resolution directs the Committee on Ways and Means to meet and consider an item of business under the procedures set forth in 26 U.S.C. 6103 and, therefore, does not qualify as a question of the privileges of the House.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Buck moves that the appeal be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 352;

Adopting House Resolution 352, if ordered;

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2052; and

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 467.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays

187, answered “present” 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

YEAS—225

Abraham	Gohmert	Palmer
Aderholt	Goodlatte	Paulsen
Allen	Gosar	Pearce
Amash	Gowdy	Perry
Amodei	Granger	Pittenger
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Poe (TX)
Babin	Graves (MO)	Poliquin
Bacon	Griffith	Posey
Banks (IN)	Grothman	Ratcliffe
Barletta	Guthrie	Reed
Barr	Harper	Reichert
Barton	Harris	Renacci
Bergman	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Biggs	Hensarling	Roby
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Roe (TN)
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Rogers (AL)
Bishop (UT)	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Blackburn	Hill	Rohrabacher
Blum	Holding	Rokita
Bost	Hollingsworth	Rooney, Francis
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Rooney, Thomas
Brat	Huizenga	J.
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Roskam
Buchanan	Hurd	Ross
Buck	Issa	Rothfus
Bucshon	Jenkins (KS)	Rouzer
Budd	Jenkins (WV)	Royce (CA)
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Russell
Calvert	Jordan	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Katko	Schweikert
Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Cheney	King (IA)	Sessions
Coffman	King (NY)	Shimkus
Cole	Kinzinger	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Knight	Simpson
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (MO)
Comer	Labrador	Smith (NE)
Comstock	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Smith (TX)
Cook	Lamborn	Smucker
Costello (PA)	Lance	Stefanik
Cramer	Latta	Stewart
Crawford	Lewis (MN)	Stivers
Culberson	LoBiondo	Taylor
Curbelo (FL)	Long	Tenney
Davidson	Love	Thornberry
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Tiberi
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Tipton
Dent	MacArthur	Trott
DeSantis	Marchant	Turner
DesJarlais	Marino	Upton
Diaz-Balart	Marshall	Valadao
Donovan	Masse	Wagner
Duffy	Mast	Walberg
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Walden
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Walker
Dunn	McClintock	Walorski
Emmer	McHenry	Walters, Mimi
Estes (KS)	McKinley	Weber (TX)
Farenthold	McMorris	Webster (FL)
Faso	Rodgers	Wenstrup
Ferguson	Meadows	Westerman
Fitzpatrick	Meehan	Williams
Fleischmann	Messer	Wilson (SC)
Flores	Mitchell	Wittman
Fortenberry	Moolenaar	Womack
Fox	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Yoder
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Yoho
Gaetz	Noem	Young (AK)
Gallagher	Nunes	Young (IA)
Garrett	Olson	Zeldin
Gibbs	Palazzo	

NAYS—187

Adams	Brady (PA)	Chu, Judy
Aguilar	Brown (MD)	Cicilline
Barragán	Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)
Bass	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Beatty	Butterfield	Clay
Bera	Capuano	Cleaver
Beyer	Carbajal	Clyburn
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Cohen
Blunt Rochester	Carson (IN)	Connolly
Bonamici	Cartwright	Conyers
Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)	Cooper
F.	Castro (TX)	Correa

Costa	Kennedy	Pingree
Courtney	Khanna	Pocan
Crist	Kihuen	Polis
Crowley	Kildee	Price (NC)
Cuellar	Kilmer	Quigley
Davis (CA)	Kind	Raskin
Davis, Danny	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
DeFazio	Kuster (NH)	Richmond
DeGette	Langevin	Rosen
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
DelBene	Lawrence	Ruppersberger
Demings	Lawson (FL)	Rush
DeSaulnier	Lee	Ryan (OH)
Deutch	Levin	Sánchez
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
Doyle, Michael	Lipinski	Schiff
F.	Loeb sack	Schneider
Engel	Lofgren	Schrader
Eshoo	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)
Espallat	Lowey	Scott, David
Esty (CT)	Lujan Grisham,	Serrano
Evans	M.	Sewell (AL)
Foster	Luján, Ben Ray	Shea-Porter
Frankel (FL)	Lynch	Sherman
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Sires
Gabbard	Matsui	Slaughter
Galleo	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Garamendi	McEachin	Soto
Gonzalez (TX)	McGovern	Speier
Gottheimer	McNerney	Suoizzi
Green, Al	Meeks	Takano
Green, Gene	Meng	Thompson (CA)
Grijalva	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Gutiérrez	Moulton	Titus
Hanabusa	Murphy (FL)	Tonko
Hastings	Nadler	Torres
Heck	Napolitano	Tsongas
Higgins (NY)	Neal	Vargas
Himes	Nolan	Veasey
Hoyer	Norcross	Vela
Huffman	O'Halleran	Visclosky
Jackson Lee	O'Rourke	Walz
Jayapal	Pallone	Wasserman
Jeffries	Panetta	Schultz
Johnson (GA)	Pascarella	Waters, Maxine
Johnson, E. B.	Payne	Watson Coleman
Jones	Pelosi	Welch
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Wilson (FL)
Keating	Peters	Yarmuth
Kelly (IL)	Peterson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Sanford

NOT VOTING—17

Bishop (GA)	Graves (LA)	McSally
Black	Johnson (OH)	Newhouse
Brooks (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Sinema
Burgess	Loudermilk	Swailwell (CA)
Cummings	Maloney,	Thompson (PA)
Ellison	Carolyn B.	Velázquez

□ 1331

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SHUSTER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 274.

Stated against:

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 274.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1973, PROTECTING YOUNG VICTIMS FROM SEXUAL ABUSE ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1761, PROTECTING AGAINST CHILD EXPLOITATION ACT OF 2017; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 26, 2017, THROUGH JUNE 5, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 352) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1973) to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1761) to amend title 18, United States Code, to criminalize the knowing consent of the visual depiction, or live transmission, of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from May 26, 2017, through June 5, 2017, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 188, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

YEAS—231

Abraham	Comstock	Graves (GA)
Aderholt	Conaway	Graves (MO)
Allen	Cook	Griffith
Amash	Costa	Grothman
Amodei	Costello (PA)	Guthrie
Arrington	Cramer	Harper
Babin	Crawford	Harris
Bacon	Culberson	Hartzer
Banks (IN)	Curbelo (FL)	Hensarling
Barletta	Davidson	Herrera Beutler
Barr	Davis, Rodney	Hice, Jody B.
Barton	Denham	Higgins (LA)
Bergman	Dent	Hill
Biggs	DeSantis	Holding
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Hollingsworth
Bishop (MI)	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Bishop (UT)	Donovan	Huizenga
Blackburn	Duffy	Hultgren
Blum	Duncan (SC)	Hunter
Bost	Duncan (TN)	Hurd
Brady (TX)	Dunn	Issa
Brat	Emmer	Jenkins (KS)
Bridenstine	Estes (KS)	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (AL)	Farenthold	Johnson (LA)
Brooks (IN)	Faso	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Ferguson	Jordan
Buck	Fitzpatrick	Joyce (OH)
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Katko
Budd	Flores	Kelly (MS)
Burgess	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Byrne	Fox	King (IA)
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Carter (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Kinzing
Carter (TX)	Gaetz	Knight
Chabot	Gallagher	Kustoff (TN)
Chaffetz	Garrett	Labrador
Cheney	Gibbs	LaHood
Coffman	Gohmert	LaMalfa
Cole	Goodlatte	Lamborn
Collins (GA)	Gosar	Lance
Collins (NY)	Gowdy	Latta
Comer	Granger	Lewis (MN)

LoBiondo	Poliquin	Smith (TX)
Long	Posey	Smucker
Love	Ratcliffe	Stefanik
Lucas	Reed	Stewart
Luetkemeyer	Reichert	Stivers
MacArthur	Renacci	Taylor
Marchant	Rice (SC)	Tenney
Marino	Roby	Thompson (PA)
Marshall	Roe (TN)	Thornberry
Massie	Rogers (AL)	Tiberi
Mast	Rogers (KY)	Tipton
McCarthy	Rohrabacher	Trott
McCaul	Rokita	Turner
McClintock	Rooney, Francis	Upton
McHenry	Rooney, Thomas	Valadao
McKinley	J.	Wagner
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg
Rodgers	Roskam	Walden
Meadows	Ross	Walker
Meehan	Rothfus	Walorski
Messer	Rouzer	Walters, Mimi
Mitchell	Royce (CA)	Weber (TX)
Moolenaar	Russell	Webster (FL)
Mooney (WV)	Rutherford	Wenstrup
Mullin	Sanford	Westerman
Murphy (PA)	Scalise	Williams
Noem	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)
Nunes	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Olson	Sensenbrenner	Womack
Palazzo	Sessions	Woodall
Palmer	Shimkus	Yoder
Paulsen	Shuster	Yoho
Pearce	Simpson	Young (AK)
Perry	Smith (MO)	Young (IA)
Pittenger	Smith (NE)	Zeldin
Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)	

NAYS—188

Adams	Espallat	Maloney, Sean
Aguilar	Esty (CT)	Matsui
Barragan	Evans	McCollum
Bass	Foster	McEachin
Beatty	Frankel (FL)	McGovern
Bera	Fudge	McNerney
Beyer	Gabbard	Meeks
Blumenauer	Galleo	Meng
Blunt Rochester	Garamendi	Moore
Bonamici	Gonzalez (TX)	Moulton
Boyle, Brendan	Gottheimer	Murphy (FL)
F.	Green, Al	Nadler
Brady (PA)	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Brown (MD)	Grijalva	Neal
Brownley (CA)	Gutiérrez	Nolan
Bustos	Hanabusa	Norcross
Butterfield	Hastings	O'Halleran
Capuano	Heck	O'Rourke
Carbajal	Higgins (NY)	Pallone
Cárdenas	Himes	Panetta
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Pascarella
Cartwright	Huffman	Payne
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Castro (TX)	Jayapal	Perlmutter
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Peters
Ciilline	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Clark (MA)	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree
Clarke (NY)	Jones	Pocan
Clay	Kaptur	Polis
Cleaver	Keating	Price (NC)
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Cohen	Kennedy	Raskin
Connolly	Khanna	Rice (NY)
Conyers	Kihuen	Richmond
Cooper	Kildee	Rosen
Correa	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Courtney	Kind	Ruiz
Crist	Krishnamoorthi	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Kuster (NH)	Rush
Cuellar	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Lawrence	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lawson (FL)	Schiff
Delaney	Lee	Schneider
DeLauro	Levin	Schrader
DelBene	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
Demings	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David
DeSaulnier	Lipinski	Serrano
Deutch	Loeb sack	Sewell (AL)
Dingell	Lofgren	Shea-Porter
Doggett	Lowenthal	Sherman
Doyle, Michael	Lowey	Sinema
F.	Lujan Grisham,	Sires
Ellison	M.	Slaughter
Engel	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (WA)
Eshoo	Lynch	Soto

Speier
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko

NOT VOTING—11

Bishop (GA)
Black
Cummings
Graves (LA)

Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor

Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Black
Cummings
Garrett
Graves (LA)
Hollingsworth

Johnson, Sam
Loudermilk
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
McSally

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1346

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 276.

PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS AGAINST TECHNOLOGICAL EXPLOITATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2052) to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to prohibit the wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

YEAS—418

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford

[Roll No. 276]

YEAS—239

Crist
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownlee (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Ciocline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)

NAYS—179

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallo
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Aguilar
Schneider
Allen
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat

Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carpenter
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Ciocline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole

Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch

Diaz-Balart	Kihuen	Pittenger	Wagner	Watson Coleman	Womack	Chaffetz	Griffith	Matsui
Dingell	Kildee	Pocan	Walberg	Weber (TX)	Woodall	Cheney	Grijalva	McCarthy
Doggett	Kilmer	Poe (TX)	Walden	Webster (FL)	Yarmuth	Chu, Judy	Grothman	McCaul
Donovan	Kind	Poliquin	Walker	Welch	Yoder	Cicilline	Guthrie	McClintock
Doyle, Michael F.	King (IA)	Polis	Walorski	Wenstrup	Yoho	Clark (MA)	Gutiérrez	McCollum
Duffy	King (NY)	Posey	Walters, Mimi	Westerman	Young (AK)	Clarke (NY)	Hanabusa	McEachin
Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger	Price (NC)	Walz	Williams	Young (IA)	Clay	Harper	McGovern
Duncan (TN)	Knight	Quigley	Wasserman	Wilson (FL)	Zeldin	Cleaver	Harris	McHenry
Ellison	Krishnamoorthi	Raskin	Schultz	Wilson (SC)		Clyburn	Hartzler	McKinley
Emmer	Kuster (NH)	Ratcliffe	Waters, Maxine	Wittman		Coffman	Hastings	McMorris
Engel	Kustoff (TN)	Reed				Cohen	Heck	Rodgers
Eshoo	Labrador	Reichert				Cole	Hensarling	McNerney
Espallat	LaHood	Renacci	Black	Loudermilk	Newhouse	Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Meadows
Estes (KS)	LaMalfa	Rice (NY)	Cummings	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)	Collins (NY)	Hice, Jody B.	Meehan
Esty (CT)	Lamborn	Rice (SC)	Dunn	Carolyn B.	Velázquez	Comer	Higgins (LA)	Meeks
Evans	Lance	Richmond	Graves (LA)	McEachin		Comstock	Higgins (NY)	Meng
Farenthold	Langevin	Roby	Johnson, Sam	McSally		Conaway	Hill	Messer
Faso	Larsen (WA)	Roe (TN)				Connolly	Himes	Mitchell
Ferguson	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)				Conyers	Holding	Moolenaar
Fitzpatrick	Latta	Rogers (KY)				Cook	Hollingsworth	Mooney (WV)
Fleischmann	Lawrence	Rohrabacher				Cooper	Hoyer	Moore
Flores	Lawson (FL)	Rokita				Correa	Hudson	Moulton
Fortenberry	Lee	Rooney, Francis				Costa	Huffman	Mullin
Foster	Levin	Rooney, Thomas J.				Costello (PA)	Huizenga	Murphy (FL)
Fox	Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen				Courtney	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)
Fox	Lewis (MN)	Rosen				Cramer	Hunter	Nadler
Frankel (FL)	Lieu, Ted	Roskam				Crawford	Hurd	Napolitano
Franks (AZ)	Lipinski	Ross				Crist	Issa	Neal
Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Rothfus				Crowley	Jackson Lee	Noem
Fudge	Loeb	Rouzer				Cuellar	Jayapal	Nolan
Gabbard	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard				Culberson	Jeffries	Norcross
Gaetz	Long	Royce (CA)				Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	Nunes
Gallagher	Love	Ruiz				Davidson	Jenkins (WV)	O'Halleran
Galleo	Lowenthal	Ruppersberger				Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke
Garamendi	Lowey	Rush				Davis, Danny	Johnson (LA)	Olson
Garrett	Lucas	Russell				Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Palazzo
Gibbs	Luetkemeyer	Rutherford				DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Gohmert	Lujan Grisham, M.	Ryan (OH)				DeGette	Jones	Palmer
Gonzalez (TX)	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez				Delaney	Jordan	Panetta
Goodlatte	Gosar	Sanford				DeLauro	Joyce (OH)	Pascarell
Gosar	MacArthur	Sarbanes				DelBene	Kaptur	Paulsen
Gottheimer	Maloney, Sean	Scalise				Demings	Katko	Payne
Granger	Marchant	Schakowsky				Denham	Keating	Pearce
Graves (GA)	Marino	Schiff				Dent	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi
Graves (MO)	Marshall	Schneider				DeSantis	Kelly (MS)	Perlmutter
Green, Al	Massie	Schrader				DeSaulnier	Kelly (PA)	Perry
Green, Gene	Mast	Schweikert				Deutch	Kennedy	Peters
Griffith	Matsui	Scott (VA)				Diaz-Balart	Khanna	Peterson
Grijalva	McCarthy	Scott, Austin				Dingell	Kihuen	Pingree
Grothman	McCaul	Scott, David				Doggett	Kildee	Pittenger
Guthrie	McClintock	Sensenbrenner				Donovan	Kilmer	Pocan
Gutiérrez	McCollum	Sessions				Doyle, Michael F.	Kind	Poe (TX)
Hanabusa	McGovern	Sewell (AL)				Duffy	King (IA)	Poliquin
Harper	McHenry	Shea-Porter				Duncan (SC)	King (NY)	Polis
Harris	McKinley	Sherman				Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger	Posey
Hartzler	McMorris	Shimkus				Dunn	Knight	Price (NC)
Hastings	Rodgers	Shuster				Ellison	Krishnamoorthi	Quigley
Heck	McNerney	Simpson				Emmer	Kuster (NH)	Raskin
Hensarling	Meehan	Sinema				Engel	Kustoff (TN)	Ratcliffe
Herrera Beutler	Meeks	Sires				Labrador	Reed	
Hice, Jody B.	Meng	Slaughter				Eshoo	Reichert	
Higgins (LA)	Messer	Smith (MO)				Espallat	Renacci	
Higgins (NY)	Mitchell	Smith (NE)				Esty (CT)	Rice (NY)	
Hill	Moolenaar	Smith (NJ)				Evans	Rice (SC)	
Himes	Mooney (WV)	Smith (TX)				Farenthold	Richmond	
Holding	Moore	Smith (WA)				Faso	Roby	
Hollingsworth	Moulton	Smucker				Ferguson	Roe (TN)	
Hoyer	Mullin	Soto				Fitzpatrick	Rogers (AL)	
Hudson	Murphy (FL)	Speier				Fleischmann	Rogers (KY)	
Huffman	Murphy (PA)	Stefanik				Flores	Rohrabacher	
Huizenga	Nadler	Stewart				Fortenberry	Rokita	
Hultgren	Napolitano	Stivers				Foster	Rooney, Francis	
Hunter	Neal	Suozi				Fox	Rooney, Thomas J.	
Hurd	Noem	Takano				Frankel (FL)	J.	
Issa	Nolan	Tenney				Franks (AZ)	Ros-Lehtinen	
Jackson Lee	Nunes	Thompson (CA)				Frelinghuysen	Rosen	
Jayapal	O'Halleran	Thompson (MS)				Fudge	Roskam	
Jeffries	O'Rourke	Thornberry				Gabbard	Ross	
Jenkins (KS)	Olson	Tiberi				Gaetz	Rothfus	
Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo	Tipton				Gallagher	Rouzer	
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Titus				Galleo	Roybal-Allard	
Johnson (LA)	Palmer	Tonko				Garamendi	Royce (CA)	
Johnson (OH)	Panetta	Torres				Garrett	Ruiz	
Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell	Trott				Gibbs	Ruppersberger	
Jones	Paulsen	Tsongas				Goodlatte	Rush	
Jordan	Payne	Turner				Gosar	Russell	
Joyce (OH)	Pearce	Upton				Gottheimer	Rutherford	
Kaptur	Pelosi	Valadao				Granger	Ryan (OH)	
Katko	Perlmutter	Vargas				Graves (GA)	Sánchez	
Keating	Perry	Veasey				Green (LA)	Sanford	
Kelly (IL)	Peters	Vela				Green (MO)	Sarbanes	
Kelly (PA)	Peterson	Visclosky				Green, Al	Scalise	
Kennedy	Pingree					Green, Gene	Schakowsky	
Khanna							Schneider	
							Schrader	

NOT VOTING—12

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1353

Mrs. DEMINGS changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

VA SCHEDULING ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 467) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that each medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs complies with requirements relating to scheduling veterans for health care appointments, to improve the uniform application of directives of the Department, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

YEAS—419

Abraham	Biggs	Brownley (CA)
Adams	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Aderholt	Bishop (GA)	Buck
Aguilar	Bishop (MI)	Bucshon
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Budd
Amash	Blackburn	Burgess
Amodei	Blum	Bustos
Arrington	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Babin	Blunt Rochester	Byrne
Bacon	Bonamici	Calvert
Banks (IN)	Bost	Capuano
Barletta	Boyle, Brendan F.	Carbajal
Barr	Brady (PA)	Cárdenas
Barragán	Brady (TX)	Carson (IN)
Barton	Brat	Carter (GA)
Bass	Bridenstine	Carter (TX)
Beatty	Brooks (AL)	Cartwright
Bera	Brooks (IN)	Castor (FL)
Bergman	Brown (MD)	Castro (TX)
Beyer		Chabot

Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart

Stivers
Suozzi
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trotter
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden

Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—11

Black
Cummings
DesJarlais
Graves (LA)
Johnson, Sam
Loudermilk
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
McSally
Newhouse
Swalwell (CA)
Velázquez

□ 1400

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from votes today on account of traveling with the Vice President on official business to Louisiana. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Roll Call No. 274, "yea" on Roll Call No. 275, "yea" on Roll Call No. 276, "yea" on Roll Call No. 277, and "yea" on Roll Call No. 278.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 375. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 719 Church Street in Nashville, Tennessee, as the "Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

REQUIRING AN ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS RELATING TO THE USE OF OFFICIAL TIME BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1293) to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that the Office of Personnel Management submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1293

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7131 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e)(1)(A) Not later than March 31 of each calendar year, the Office of Personnel Management, in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget, shall submit to each House of Congress a report on the operation of this section during the fiscal year last ending before the start of such calendar year.

"(B) Not later than December 31 of each calendar year, each agency (as defined by section 7103(a)(3)) shall furnish to the Office of Personnel Management the information which such Office requires, with respect to such agency, for purposes of the report which is next due under subparagraph (A).

"(2) Each report by the Office of Personnel Management under this subsection shall include, with respect to the fiscal year described in paragraph (1)(A), at least the following information:

"(A) The total amount of official time granted to employees.

"(B) The average amount of official time expended per bargaining unit employee.

"(C) The specific types of activities or purposes for which official time was granted, and the impact which the granting of such official time for such activities or purposes had on agency operations.

"(D) The total number of employees to whom official time was granted, and, of that total, the number who were not engaged in any activities or purposes except activities or purposes involving the use of official time.

"(E) The total amount of compensation (including fringe benefits) afforded to employees in connection with activities or purposes for which they were granted official time.

"(F) The total amount of official time spent by employees representing Federal employees who are not union members in matters authorized by this chapter.

"(G) A description of any room or space designated at the agency (or its subcomponent) where official time activities will be conducted, including the square footage of any such room or space.

"(3) All information included in a report by the Office of Personnel Management under this subsection with respect to a fiscal year—

"(A) shall be shown both agency-by-agency and for all agencies; and

"(B) shall be accompanied by the corresponding information (submitted by the Office in its report under this subsection) for the fiscal year before the fiscal year to which such report pertains, together with appropriate comparisons and analyses.

"(4) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'official time' means any period of time, regardless of agency nomenclature—

"(A) which may be granted to an employee under this chapter (including a collective bargaining agreement entered into under this chapter) to perform representational or consultative functions; and

"(B) during which the employee would otherwise be in a duty status."

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective beginning with the report which, under the provisions of such amendment, is first required to be submitted by the Office of Personnel Management to each House of Congress by a date which occurs at least 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 1293, to amend title 5 of the United States Code to require the Office of Personnel Management to submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to talk about a bill that would provide taxpayers with greater transparency of official time. "Official time" is that term that describes when Federal employees do union work on the taxpayers' dime.

The only standard provided by the statute authorizing official time is that the employees perform union work on official time in a manner that is "reasonable, necessary, and in the public interest." Currently, Federal law does not require agencies to report, annually, on the amount of official time their employees perform.

Until March of this year, the Office of Personnel Management had not reported on official time since fiscal year 2012. When the report was released in March, the data was out of date, containing information from fiscal year 2014.

While the Office of Personnel Management may request that agencies provide data related to official time, OPM does not have any set of standards or procedures prescribing the collection of official time data. Considering the burden that official time puts on the taxpayer, more stringent reporting is necessary.

The latest data provided by OPM shows that taxpayers paid \$162 million

for salary and benefits related to work done in official time in fiscal year 2014, up from \$157 million 2 years earlier in fiscal year 2012.

Agencies reported that bargaining unit employees spent a total of 3.5 million hours performing representational activities on official time.

The current lack of stringent reporting requirements, as well as the broad interpretation of the statute's sole requirement that official time be carried out in a way that is reasonable, necessary, and in the public interest, have clearly opened the door to abuse.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform identified several cases where employees on official time engaged in all sorts of inappropriate activities while on taxpayer-funded time, including everything from leisure to criminal activities. With greater transparency, employees will be less likely to abuse the system, which will result in less waste of taxpayer dollars.

It is by far time we require agencies to provide this information to Congress and to the public. Taxpayers deserve clear, reliable data on how many employees are performing union work on official time in lieu of their regularly assigned government duties.

To accomplish this, H.R. 1293 requires agencies to provide more detailed information to OPM regarding what their employees are doing related to official time. Specifically, the bill requires agencies to report the total amount of official time granted to employees, the average amount of time each employee spends on official time, the specific types of activities for which official time was granted, and the impact official time had on agency operations.

H.R. 1293 requires agencies to report the amount of compensation employees received in connection with the time they spent on activities in connection with official time.

Finally, the bill requires agencies to report a description of rooms and spaces agencies use to conduct official time.

H.R. 1293 will provide taxpayers with the transparency they deserve when it comes to official time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, I originally rose in support of what I thought was a simple reporting bill. In listening to my friend from Florida, this is part and parcel of the negative narrative that is sent in all too frequently on the other side of the aisle about hardworking civil servants and Federal employees. They are not all somehow committing crime on official time. Official time, in fact, has been used to the benefit of the workforce and to the benefit of management.

If this bill, H.R. 1293, is nothing but a precursor to further encroachment on the rights of Federal workers, then I will oppose this bill, and I will urge my Members on this side of the aisle to oppose this bill because, by voting for it, we are enabling something much worse to follow and have this thrown in our faces.

So, Mr. Speaker, I regret that, under the circumstances, and with the message I have just heard, I can no longer support this bill. I can no longer urge my colleagues to support this bill, and we will, in fact, urge a negative vote on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I might just suggest to my good friend from Virginia that this is a reporting bill, that this is the same bill, as amended by their amendment, that was passed out of committee overwhelmingly, that I believe the gentleman from Virginia voted for. So there has not been any change. It is still a transparency reporting bill to make sure that we account for all the time spent in official time on the taxpayer dime. That is it.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding this time.

I agree with this great reporting bill. The American people have a right to at least have a reasonable expectation that the Federal Government knows what its employees are doing. Unfortunately, we all know that doesn't always happen, particularly when it comes to the practice of official time. It is amazing to me how little information there is, particularly as it relates to the reporting aspect, as to what is happening under official time.

For those who don't know what it is, Mr. ROSS mentioned it well. Established under the Carter administration, official time allows Federal employee union members to conduct union activities during their work-hours of the agency for which they were hired even if the union activity has nothing to do with their job description. Surprisingly, the Federal agencies are not required to report to Congress the amount of time that employees are spending conducting union business.

Some of my colleagues may disagree about the value of official time. I get that. The gentleman from Virginia and I see differently on this. I certainly oppose the abuse of official time, so we see differently on this.

But I think we can all agree that the American people at least have the right to know the extent to which official time is being used. So, although we may disagree somewhat on policy, I think we can certainly find common ground to promote accountability and transparency within the Federal Government.

As Mr. ROSS mentioned a while ago, the OPM has come out with a study: 3.5 million work-hours spent on official time. That is a lot if it was just dollars, but when you take 3.5 million work-hours multiplied by dollars involved, this is a significant issue that needs to be addressed.

This bill, H.R. 1293, grants the OPM the ability to get necessary information from Federal agencies so that we have a more comprehensive understanding of the official time usage. Currently, there are no standards for OPM to find that kind of information.

So this bill does not eliminate, nor does it restrict, official time usage; it simply shines light on the practice. Again, I believe we can find common ground that the American people deserve to know how their tax dollars are spent.

This is common sense. It is good governance. It is a bill that I believe we should all be able to get behind. I am pleased to support this bill. I am honored and pleased to do so in the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. I urge all our colleagues to support it now.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Florida is my friend and he knows I respect him, but when you give an opening statement on a bill that goes far beyond a reporting requirement that we thought we were supporting and you use the occasion to disparage Federal workers and to characterize them in a decidedly negative way as if that somehow really described the average civil servant and what they are up to, then on this side of the aisle, we take exception. Then it is no longer a simple reporting bill; it is a precursor of bad things to come, and we are not going to be party to it. We are not going to enable that. That is why, reluctantly, I must now oppose this bill and urge my Democratic colleagues and those on the other side of the aisle who want to protect Federal employees and honor them and give them the dignity and respect they deserve also to oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I now am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), my dear friend.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Virginia for yielding to me.

You haven't heard any discussion of abuse of official time because there is no record of abuse of official time. My colleagues on the other side simply want to get rid of official time, as they have wanted to do for decades.

A little background: Federal employees have no right to strike, as they do in the private sector. In return, though, the time-honored right to organize and represent employees in their official capacity on matters relating to the workplace has always been in place under Republicans and Democrats alike.

Remember, there is also no requirement to join a union in the first place; yet unions must represent all workers, regardless of their membership or not.

The bill on the House floor, H.R. 1293, is unnecessary. Official time reports are already required. This is a redundant bill.

If my friend is worried that these reports haven't been timely, as he implied then he can do that administratively or do it in this bill. The reason he doesn't do it in this bill is this bill is a cover. It is a cover for two pending bills which are already out of committee. I expect them on the floor any minute now, although, notice the sequence.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, this seemingly vanilla bill, is going to be followed by the real bills that my colleagues are after. They are parallel bills. They essentially eliminate official time to represent workers.

Now, why is official time important? They are important for the operation of the Federal Government itself. And why is that? Because there are always going to be disputes and contention between management and labor. Official takes away time that would otherwise be wasted and allows the parties to go to the table and work matters out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, these two bills are a frontal attack on official time, but they actually stab federal employees in the back. One bill would make it virtually impossible for union members to volunteer their time unless they wanted to give up parts of their retirement benefits.

What kind of quid pro quo is that? What do you want to do next? Reduce pay if a union rep uses official time?

The next bill designates employees who cannot represent other employees. This bill looks like something you would expect from countries where there is no right to organize.

This bill reduces the amount of dues unions can collect, even though they are collecting dues on their own time and not official time. This is a brazen attempt to eliminate the fair-share fee, non-union workers pay for being represented equally with union members, and allow free riders to be served free of charge. This is the beginning of an out-and-out assault on the freedom of workers to organize.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to be clear here, because I want to make sure that we are talking about the same bill.

This bill doesn't do anything about union dues. This bill doesn't do anything other than require the trans-

parency of reporting official time. And I would be delighted to engage my good friend from Virginia, whom I have a great deal of respect for, and I have worked very diligently on this committee with for some time, and inquire as to what transpired since this bill left committee until today that would cause him and others who were supportive of it in committee to now say that it is not?

I don't mean to misrepresent anything. While I might have opinions of what I believe, I can tell you factually that this bill is merely, and solely, and exclusively a reporting bill. If I were managing a company and I wanted to know where my resources were, I would want to make sure I managed those resources—including my human resources—so I would like to know where the time of my employees is spent.

There is no prohibition of time being spent. There is no restriction of time being spent. It is merely a reporting bill. It is requiring reporting. It is something the OPM has done before. It was started under President Carter's administration.

Mr. Speaker, I inquire of my good friend if there is anything that has changed to make his opposition now come to the floor?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend because I am going to run out of time. I must say to my friend, my prepared remarks were designed to support this bill.

Mr. ROSS. And I appreciate that.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I must say, the gentleman from Florida, who is an honorable man and a friend, and we have collaborated, but his own words transformed what this really was. They persuaded us that by voting for this, we are not voting for a reporting bill. That is just the beginning.

My friend from Florida is the one who characterized criminal activity on official time, and unsavory things going on on official time, and allows that to dangle out there as if that characterizes Federal employees generally.

I say to any friend—and I thank him for yielding—that has transformed our perception of this bill. This is no longer a simple reporting bill—although technically that is what it is. It is a precursor, apparently, to an assault of Federal employees—and on official time, specifically—and we cannot be partners to that. We cannot be enablers to that.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, we must oppose this bill, in light of the context my friend from Florida himself said.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, while I understand where my colleague from Virginia is taking my comments from, I must submit that at

no time did I allege that the Federal employees, all Federal employees, are committing crimes on official time.

I think just the opposite. A vast majority of our Federal employees are probably some of the best workforce that we have out there. I think that, in any workforce, you are going to have some people that don't live up to the standards of their employment. So what I merely do in my opening statement is to say that there has been a need for transparency that includes the abuse of time by some, not by all.

Again, the vast majority of Federal employees are exceptional employees, hardworking, and absolutely necessary to run this great country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my good friend from Virginia to please reconsider, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly gratified for the clarification of my friend.

It now gives me great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), my good friend and a senior member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding, and I join him in opposition to this bill.

While originally my remarks would have been much kinder to the bill, and I may have considered supporting it, I did not consider it favorably in committee. I know we had a voice vote on that. But in light of the unfortunate remarks that imply that there was illegal activity going on by Federal employees, and that is why we need this bill that is before us right now, I do have to agree with the ranking member, the gentleman from Virginia, that this bill is, indeed, a part of the vanguard of legislation to severely restrict and eliminate the use of official time.

Under the bipartisan Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, a Federal employee who serves as a union steward or union representative may be granted official time to perform activities that—and this is the important standard that is in the bill—the gentleman from Georgia indicated that we need this bill because there is no standard.

The standard in the Civil Service Reform Act requires a number of things: It requires both labor and management to agree on the use of official time, and that official time be "reasonable, necessary, and in the public interest."

That is the standard today, and every single Federal workplace—management and labor—have to agree that the use of official time is reasonable, that it is necessary, and that it is in the public interest. That is a great standard, and that is what has been going on so far.

While there are those who seek to curb or repeal the statutory right and may claim that it amounts to misuse

of government resources, let me offer you another concrete example of why official time is critical to the Federal workplace and serves the interests of the American people and taxpayer.

In the wake of the devastating terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, the Nation also endured a series of anthrax attacks perpetuated through the United States mail system against media offices in Florida, New York, and also Federal offices here in the Nation's Capital. The affected facilities included the Brentwood Mail Processing and Distribution Center here in D.C., that is now named after two dedicated postal employees, Thomas Morris and Joseph Curseen, who lost their lives to anthrax exposure at that facility.

This is immediately after September 11. They were postal workers. They died of inhalation of anthrax poisoning because of the jobs they were doing on behalf of this country. The risk of further anthrax attacks threatened the safety of our postal workforce. I had two sisters with young children at the time working at the post office, and I knew of this well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. It jeopardized the safety of our postal workforce and customers, as well as the free flow of information and commerce that the constitutional responsibility of the United States Postal Service requires.

But rather than refusing to go to work in a dangerous workplace, by the use of official time, the management of the United States Postal Service, and the union representatives of the United States Postal Service sat down and worked out a measure where the union agreed to send their workers in, the mail kept running to every home and business in America, but the postal workers absorbed that danger on their own because they knew that steps were being taken to keep them and their families—because the threat was that anthrax would get on their clothes and they would bring that back to their own homes. We worked that out.

That agreement would not have been worked out but for the use of official time—and a lot of official time that was used in that crisis. That is the responsibility that those union representatives had to the workers. They have to guarantee a safe workplace for those workers, and that is why we should vote against this bill. This is a wolf in sheep's clothing, and we ought to vote this down.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. If I might just, again, clarify for the record, this is a reporting bill. It is a transparency bill. The standard that my good friend from Massachusetts

discusses, and that I agreed with, is not affected at all by this bill.

I would have no doubt whatsoever that in similar circumstances that happened after 9/11 in those post offices, that those same employees, regardless of the risk, would do exactly what they did, because that is how valuable they are to the system. That is how valuable they are to this country.

What I can't understand is what has transpired between voting this out of committee to today that has changed the opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), my dear friend.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman CONNOLLY.

I rise today coming in saying I would support this bill. Many people know I served 30 years as a Federal employee working in HR, understanding labor relations, safety issues, environmental issues, diversity issues, and knowing clear well that the official time that is allotted to employees to sit down with their representative of the union to talk about if they feel like they are being sexually harassed, if they feel like they are in an environment that is not safe for them, official time is extremely necessary.

What happens in official time? It allows a lot of grievances to be processed and resolved through communication between union and management.

There have been several legislative reform proposals introduced to address the way union representatives are allowed to utilize official time.

Now, I was taken back when my colleague said "criminal activities." Mr. Speaker, criminal activity is something that is in a whole different venue. If you are a Federal employee and you create an illegal activity, you do not need official time to do that. I have never known, in the time that I served in HR, in labor relations, and served in all of the different capacities, have I seen someone doing criminal activity on official time.

It would be a different thing if we were clear that this bill was about reporting the time, which I would not oppose. But when you present this scenario about official time, as it being something that is negative, something that is being used in a criminal capacity, that is totally something I would be opposed to.

Let me tell you some examples of what representatives can use it for: If there is a whistleblower accusation, an employee would go to their union steward and ask for official time.

If it was a grievance on behalf of the employee, they can use it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, union representatives can also assist if it is an OSHA issue, if it is racial discrimination, or sexual harassment.

Instead of allowing employees to complete nonpolitical activities, some of my colleagues seem more interested in preventing employees from doing their jobs by using official time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleague to defeat senseless attacks against Federal employees' official time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN), my friend.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to discuss this bill, and I want to thank the colleague from across the aisle here who has illuminated the future as it relates to undertaking this whole issue.

It is with that in mind that I want to speak to the value of the use of official time.

□ 1430

While I am not concerned so much about the collection of the information as to what is happening, I am concerned with how it is being translated and will be used in the future.

For decades, both Republicans and Democrats alike have strongly supported the use of official time because it streamlines the efficiency and quality of government. We should be thanking our union representatives who use official time to address workplace problems and operational issues within our government.

Within our Federal Government, official time leads to swift conflict resolutions that would otherwise require costly litigation, improves the relationship between labor and management, and protects whistleblowers who have exposed government waste and abuse. In some cases, it has even saved lives, as in the issue of AFGE local president Kathleen Dahl, when there was a breakout of Legionnaires' disease.

Furthermore, official time costs one-tenth of 1 percent of the cost of salaries and benefits for all Federal employees. That is a fraction of employee compensation. Ultimately, it saves taxpayers dollars and ensures transparency.

So while we may be discussing today simply a bill that will record the time that is spent in such a noble and important function, it is simply a precursor to the disparaging of union workers and Federal workers as we

move forward. Mr. Speaker, I oppose any movement in that direction.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor today expecting to support H.R. 1293, which has to do with the reporting of official time, but based on the negative commentary we are getting generally about official time and the knock against Federal employees we have heard here today, I am anxious now about supporting this bill because it appears that what is happening is our colleagues on the other side are setting the table for bringing other legislation eventually to the floor that is actually going to attack and undermine official time.

My colleague earlier referred to a wolf in sheep's clothing represented by this bill. You can look at it as the camel's nose under the tent. Whatever it is, I am worried now that the agenda here is to undermine official time.

Let's remind ourselves of the various benefits of official time. It helps to resolve workplace disputes, which is really important. It helps to improve efficiency within the workplace. It is what leads to negotiating positive agreements between labor and management. It is how official time, when it is used wisely—and there is no evidence that it is not used wisely; there is no evidence of abuse or misuse of official time—and when it is used the way it has been used, it helps our Federal agencies help the American people. It helps these agencies function well.

I hope that we can reject whatever is coming down the pipeline. I was cautiously optimistic when I came to support this bill that these other efforts that seem to be underway were maybe being put to bed, but now I am concerned that there is an agenda coming. So we will just have to see how it goes.

I want to reiterate my strong support for the use of official time the way it is used by our Federal employees, which is in a very positive fashion, and I urge my colleagues on the other side to protect official time and all of its benefits.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my friend from Maryland. Official time is a very useful tool in the Federal workplace, both for management and for labor, and has proved its worth over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended to support H.R. 1293, but after hearing the remarks from the chairman on the floor this morning, I am afraid that this bill is just a precursor for what the majority will try to do to our dedicated Federal employees.

The sentiments expressed by the chairman are in line with the legislation that appeared before the Veterans' Affairs Committee just this past week, legislation that would have undermined the use of official time for employees at the VA. So there are attacks happening in other parts of the House.

The committee marked up H.R. 1461, the misnamed VET Protection Act. This bill would limit the amount of time VA employees can use for official time to improve working conditions for themselves and for their colleagues and, in turn, improve services for veterans.

We considered this bill, despite the fact we didn't have clear data on the impact of the bill on the VA's HR capability. I realize this bill we are considering on the floor today is about that data, but the spirit in which it is being moved forward is not about trying to illuminate how official time has helped our veterans.

There are 49,386 vacant positions at the VA. Rolling back the use of official time will only increase the demands on the VA's human resources staff, making it harder to fill positions and recruit and retain quality providers.

Official time benefits our veterans. In Pittsburgh, as was mentioned before by my colleague from New Jersey, an AFGE president used official time to press the VA to address a Legionnaires' disease outbreak that killed 6 veterans and made 16 others sick. Her actions helped save veterans' lives, and she used official time to do it.

At the Phoenix VA there was a 29 percent turnover rate for licensed practical nurses. Union representatives used official time to improve working conditions and cut the turnover rate in half. Less turnover means better care for veterans.

I warn my colleagues against this bill and future misguided legislation to undermine official time and the function of our Federal agencies.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In attempting to summarize, Mr. Speaker, I do want to reiterate that my friend from Florida is an honorable man. When he says this is about one thing, I believe him. Perhaps in the introduction to this bill there was a characterization that was not intended, and I accept that explanation.

Federal workers are hardworking civil servants. They serve the American people. I know my friend from Florida agrees. The overwhelming majority of them are dedicated. They seize a mission every day, whether it be at the VA, the Social Security Administration, or our Nation's parks. They are dedicated to the proposition that they are there to serve the American people. It is important to honor their service, to respect their service, to not allow even the inference to be drawn that a negative example some-

how could be construed as characteristic of the whole, for that is false.

That is the narrative we Democrats and, hopefully, a number of Republicans want to change, because it is not true. We want to honor those civil servants.

All too often, our civil servants have become pin cushions. Again, I know my friend from Florida does not intend that, but there are others who have intended that. That sparks something, certainly, on this side of the aisle and with this Member, who represents a lot of Federal employees and cherishes their service. For us, it is a very personal matter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the comments from my friend from Virginia, and I will reiterate my comments made earlier here on this floor that we are very grateful for the Federal workforce that we do have and that they are, by far, one of the best human resources in employment in the world. We are grateful for their service.

As in any case, there might be some bad ones, but, more importantly, all this bill requests is that we just report the transparency of their services and official time. It is neither an indictment nor restriction on Federal time whatsoever, and, in fact, can be used as a tool for Federal employees to justify some of the official time they are doing for the benefit of not only their colleagues, but also this great country.

Mr. Speaker, I would again request that Members of this House support my bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1293, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER FRAUD PREVENTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 624) to restrict the inclusion of social security account numbers on documents sent by mail by the Federal Government, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 624

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. RESTRICTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS ON DOCUMENTS SENT BY MAIL.

(a) **RESTRICTION.**—An agency may not include the social security account number of an individual on any document sent by mail unless the head of the agency determines that the inclusion of the social security account number on the document is necessary.

(b) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the head of each CFO Act agency shall issue regulations specifying the circumstances under which inclusion of a social security account number on a document sent by mail is necessary. Such regulations shall include—

(1) instructions for the partial redaction of social security account numbers where feasible; and

(2) a requirement that social security account numbers not be visible on the outside of any package sent by mail.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth-year anniversary of such date of enactment, the head of each CFO Act agency shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and any other appropriate authorizing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, a report on the implementation of subsection (a) that includes the following:

(1) The title and identification number of any document used by the CFO Act agency during the previous year that includes the complete social security account number of an individual.

(2) For the first report submitted, a plan that describes how the CFO Act agency will comply with the requirements of subsection (a).

(3) For the final report submitted, the title and identification number of each document used by the CFO Act agency for which the head of the agency has determined, in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to subsection (b), that the inclusion of a social security account number on such document is necessary, and the rationale for such determination.

(4) For any other report that is not the first or final report submitted, an update on the implementation of the plan described under paragraph (2).

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AGENCY.**—The term “agency” has the meaning given that term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code, but includes an establishment in the legislative or judicial branch of the Government (except the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol, and any activities under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol).

(2) **CFO ACT AGENCY.**—The term “CFO Act agency” means the agencies listed in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any document sent by mail on or after the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 624, the Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act of 2017, introduced by my good friend from California, Representative DAVID VALADAO.

I want to start by thanking Chairman BRADY and Subcommittee Chairman JOHNSON from the Ways and Means Committee for their assistance in getting this bill to the floor. Their work on addressing the unnecessary use of Social Security numbers is well appreciated by all Americans across the country and especially Members in this body.

Mr. Speaker, we live in an interconnected world. Personal identifiers, such as Social Security numbers, are used for much more than just Social Security benefits. Social Security numbers are widely used to receive government services and to apply for services in the private sector, like opening bank accounts, credit cards, and even applying for college.

The extent to which Social Security numbers are a de facto national identifier has heightened concerns about identity theft. In the wrong hands, a stolen Social Security number can be used for devastating effects.

This bill helps move the government closer to the goal of minimizing unnecessary use of Social Security numbers. All entities in the Federal Government will be prohibited from sending a Social Security account number by mail, unless the head of the entity deems it necessary.

The 24 major CFO Act agencies will also have to issue regulations specifying the circumstances under which inclusion of a Social Security number is deemed necessary. They will have to ensure numbers are redacted partially, where feasible, and to ensure no numbers are visible from the outside of a mail piece.

Finally, agencies will be required to report to Congress on their progress in implementing the requirements of the law.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is very important. The Social Security Administration alone sends 223 million notices containing a full Social Security number every year. We must take care to properly safeguard the personally identifiable information of American citizens. The consequences of failure can be dire.

In 2015, the Office of Personnel Management experienced a major data

breach where the personally identifiable information for 22 million Americans was compromised.

The Oversight Committee majority staff report recommended Federal agencies reduce the collection of Social Security numbers and other personally identifiable information.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 624, the Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act of 2017, as amended.

Introduced by our colleague, Mr. VALADAO from California, this bill is a commonsense step to addressing an enormously growing problem of identity theft and protecting the personal information of every American.

Each year, 18 million Americans become victims of identity theft. That is 18 million. A leading cause of this problem is the unauthorized acquisition of Social Security numbers by criminals.

H.R. 624 would address this issue by restricting the instances in which agencies may include the full Social Security numbers on documents sent through the mail. The bill would prohibit agencies from including those numbers on mailed correspondence unless the head of an agency himself or herself determines that inclusion is absolutely essential.

Agencies would be required to issue regulations delineating the situations in which Social Security numbers are necessary, and would be instructed to partially redact numbers wherever feasible.

□ 1445

Agencies would also be expressly prohibited from making Social Security numbers visible on the outside of any mailed packages.

In recent years, many agencies have taken steps to reduce their use of Social Security numbers, and this bill would simply codify some of those practices agencies have already adopted. For instance, the Social Security Administration itself no longer prints Social Security numbers on its annual cost-of-living adjustment notices or benefit checks, and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services is in the process of removing Social Security numbers from the Medicare cards issued to beneficiaries.

These steps are critical to ensuring that the Federal Government adequately safeguards the personally identifiable information of individuals and does everything it can to protect Americans from identity theft.

Although this bill helps provide a lot of protection, reducing the threat of identity theft by removing Social Security numbers from mailed items is

not always as easy as it seems. Many agencies confront high costs when reprogramming outdated legacy information technology systems to allow mailings to be printed differently.

Agencies across the Federal Government have been reluctant to retire those legacy IT systems because of funding constraints that limit IT investments, slow modernization, and force agencies to defer needed IT upgrades in favor of some more pressing, urgent problems.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the important responsibility Congress has to fund these IT modernization efforts as it considers this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act is a good, bipartisan bill that is necessary to protect the American public. I urge my colleagues to support its passage, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), who is the author of this bill.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bill, H.R. 624, the Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act, legislation to protect Americans—especially children, veterans, and the elderly—from identity theft.

Not long ago, I was approached by a constituent in my district who showed me a letter she had received from the Social Security Administration. The document she showed me contained the full Social Security number, name, and address clearly printed.

Upon further investigation, we found that the Social Security Administration had also printed postcards which contained the full Social Security number of the intended recipient clearly visible on the exterior of the mailing. Even more concerning, the practice of printing Social Security numbers on government documents is not exclusive to the Social Security Administration, but occurs throughout every department of the Federal Government.

In today's digital age, we hear more and more about the importance of protecting our identity. Identity theft is one of the fastest growing crimes in the United States. It threatens the financial security of millions of Americans as well as the economic stability of the United States as a whole. In fact, every 2 seconds, another American becomes the victim of identity fraud. Even worse, these crimes tend to impact vulnerable populations, such as children, the elderly, and veterans, the most.

Despite these alarming statistics, there is a high prevalence of needlessly printed Social Security numbers on documents issued by the Federal Government. My legislation puts an end to this unacceptable practice and limits when the Federal Government can mail

documents that contain an individual's full Social Security number.

Social Security was established to provide older Americans financial security during their retirement years, not to jeopardize that security by negligently handling someone's personal information.

My bill, the Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act, would prevent the Federal Government from mailing documents that contain full Social Security numbers unless absolutely necessary. This requires Federal agencies to partially redact Social Security numbers on the documents whenever possible.

Please join me in supporting this commonsense legislation that will help all Americans avoid falling victim to one of the fastest growing crimes in the United States.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding, and I also want to take this time to thank the gentleman from Florida and my colleague and good friend, Congressman VALADAO, for the introduction of this legislation, H.R. 624, which I support.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, identity theft throughout the country is a very significant problem. It becomes even more compounded in this day of the internet when we have to deal with a whole host of issues that make the ability to steal one's identity even more easily done. This measure attempts to try to address a part of that challenge by dealing with the issue of Social Security numbers.

We all know Social Security numbers are key information used to identify ourselves, and we know that if they fall into the wrong hands, they can be used to commit identity theft.

I think all of us remember when, at some point in our age, we got our Social Security number and we memorized it, and it is something that is very important in our society today. But many thieves find these numbers are incredibly valuable because they are a link that can connect a person's information across a whole host of agencies, systems, and databases in this age of the internet.

Criminals can use stolen Social Security numbers to file fraudulent tax returns, obtain loans, and commit other kinds of crimes. An estimated 13 million Americans experienced financial identity theft in 2014 alone, resulting in over \$16 billion—with a B—\$16 billion lost to fraud.

In 2007, to combat these issues, there was an Identity Theft Task Force that made recommendations to the administration on ways to eliminate the unnecessary collection, use, and display—the display, which this legislation attempts to address—of Social Security numbers.

Yesterday, the Government Accountability Office released testimony on these efforts by the Federal Government to reduce the collection, use, and display of Social Security numbers. In conclusion, the GAO testified that, until the Office of Management and Budget adopts more effective practices for guiding agency Social Security number reduction efforts, overall governmentwide reduction will likely remain limited and difficult to measure, and the risk of Social Security numbers being exposed and used to commit identity theft will remain greater than it need be. Again, this legislation attempts to help address that.

The Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act would enact measures to help protect American citizens, especially children, veterans, and senior citizens, from identity theft and fraud. It does so by reducing the number of mailed documents the Federal Government sends to individuals that include full Social Security numbers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

In addition, it also takes steps to ensure that, if inclusion is necessary, the number is not visible from the outside of a mailing. I think, probably, many of us have received mail that, in fact, had our Social Security number there and identified.

As I said at the outset, this is no silver bullet to stopping identity theft; it is a commonsense measure to reducing it.

Social Security, as we all know, is a promise made to those who have worked hard throughout their lives to contribute to the system, to contribute to the American way of life. It also provides those seniors who are living on their Social Security the ability to have dignity and additional security during their golden years. As a result, Congress must do what it can to reduce the strains on the program, particularly from fraud and theft.

For all of those reasons, I support this legislation, and I support Congressman VALADAO's efforts and my good friends from Florida and Virginia for bringing this commonsense measure to the floor.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida, and I thank my colleague from Virginia for supporting this piece of legislation put forth by our friend and colleague from California, Congressman DAVID VALADAO.

The Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act is a bill that should gain unanimous support in this institution. According to the Justice Department, identity theft affects nearly 18

million people, costing more than \$15 billion in 2014 alone. This represents roughly 7 percent of all Americans age 16 or older. In my home State of Illinois alone, in 2014, it was recognized that the FTC saw a 65 percent increase in identity theft. More than 14 percent of the victims are elderly.

We all know that Social Security numbers are the link to a key piece of information criminals use to steal people's identities. This commonsense piece of legislation takes a very important step to ensure that our Federal agencies, our government, funded by the hardworking taxpayers of this country, are not making this problem even worse.

This bill, as you have heard today, would restrict the use of Social Security numbers on documents sent via mail by the Federal Government unless the head of a department or agency determines the inclusion of such number is necessary—which I can't think of a single instance where that would be necessary, but I guess we have to put that in there anyway. This seems like a no-brainer, but we in this institution have to pass a bill to make sure that it happens, which is why I am a proud cosponsor of this bill.

I want to thank Congressman VALADAO again. I also want to thank Congress' newest father, our colleague from California, ERIC SWALWELL, for being a cosponsor of this legislation, too. This bill will have a real impact on reducing identity theft in this country, and I want to commend, once again, everybody on the floor today for their support.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an important piece of legislation. This is one of the fastest growing crimes in our country: the diversion of Social Security checks and rebates. It is almost without any kind of corrective action. There are few prosecutions and even fewer convictions. So, if you are a criminal and you are looking for something that is relatively cost-free for you, this is the way to do it.

This bill would provide some important protections to the American public. I would hope that we build on this.

My friend from Florida and I serve on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, and we have heard testimony about this crime as it has grown exponentially over the last 5 or 6 years. It is my hope that U.S. attorneys all across America will put more emphasis on this crime and use their resources to go after people who are predators of American taxpayers, especially many of our seniors who rely on these checks or these rebates to augment and supplement their income. So there are victims of this crime, and they are the American taxpayer.

I think it is an important first step. I support the legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we here have an obligation to provide for the common defense, and I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that includes that we provide to defend our citizenry from such crimes as identity theft. This bill is a step in the right direction.

I want to thank my good friend from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for his efforts. I want to thank Mr. VALADAO from California for sponsoring this bill.

This is a bipartisan measure that will allow us to address the concerns of modern-day crimes of identity and of modern-day crimes of privacy. It is a bill that moves in the right direction. While it is not the panacea, it is a good first step to protecting our citizenry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption by my colleagues, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 624, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to restrict the inclusion of social security account numbers on Federal documents sent by mail, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOHIO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 348 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 953.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1500

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 953) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to

clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes, with Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Today we are considering H.R. 953, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017, introduced to clarify congressional intent regarding pesticide use in or near navigable waters.

The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, otherwise known as FIFRA, is the appropriate Federal statute to govern safety and the use of pesticides.

FIFRA first passed in 1910, 62 years before the Clean Water Act was passed. In 2009, the Sixth Circuit Court decision, the National Cotton Council v. EPA, changed how this all works. For years before the Clean Water Act, pesticide use was regulated by the EPA under FIFRA. Under FIFRA, the EPA regulates and approves pesticides for safe use under the label, and they have full jurisdiction under FIFRA.

The EPA previously ruled that using pesticides under FIFRA-approved use does not require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, otherwise known as NPDES, permit under the Clean Water Act.

Because of this court decision in 2009, those who have been safely applying products to control pest populations now must comply with additional NPDES permitting.

Some of my colleagues across the aisle have called this Groundhog Day in the past. I agree. Time after time, they have supported increasing the regulations just for regulation's sake. They are even willing to risk public health and outbreaks of Zika and West Nile virus.

The Sixth Circuit Court decision ignored the congressional intent when the FIFRA and the Clean Water Act were passed. The court ignored sensible agency interpretation, it ignored years of regulatory precedent, it expanded the clean water jurisdiction beyond the scope set by Congress and over areas already appropriately regulated. The court decision placed burden on the EPA, requiring a new and expanded NPDES permitting process for products already regulated.

The EPA says there are about 365,000 pesticide applicators affected by this ruling. They would include State agencies, cities and counties, mosquito control districts, water districts, pesticide applicators, farmers and ranchers, forest managers, scientists, and even everyday citizens or homeowners.

The EPA estimates \$50 million in paperwork to comply alone every year with this new regulation. Federal, State, and local agencies are forced to spend taxpayer dollars in permitting, paperwork, and compliance. Private applicators, like farmers and ranchers, also face increased costs. This adds compliance costs, adds permitting costs, and it adds time and hurts productivity and efficiency. It does not add any new environmental protections.

This bad court decision affecting the budgetary decisions from local agencies, I will give you some examples here: the Benton County, Washington, Mosquito Control District preserves 20 percent of its annual budget in case it is sued under the Clean Water Act. I think it is important to mention when the Clean Water Act was passed in 1972, it was set up with severe penalties to go after the polluters we had—I like to say the polluters of the 1960s—to clean up our waters, that we had severe problems. And when it did that, it also opened it up for citizens' lawsuits and opens up the door for more litigation.

The Benton County, Washington, Mosquito Control District, \$37,000 in permit costs and paperwork they have spent. Benton County could have treated almost 2,600 acres for mosquito abatement or 400 lab tests for West Nile virus, or paid for three seasonal workers.

In Gem County, Idaho, the Mosquito Abatement District's staff spends 3 weeks a year tabulating and documenting seasonal pesticide applications related to permit oversight.

California vector control districts have estimated that it costs them \$3 million to conduct administration of the NPDES permits. They also have to spend 20 percent of their annual operating budget just to maintain the computer software related to the unnecessary NPDES permit.

As a result of this court ruling, mosquito districts, State and local agencies, are now vulnerable to frivolous lawsuits for things like simple paperwork violations under the Clean Water Act. Fines for these paperwork violations, which obviously don't have any effect on the environment, can be as much as \$50,000 a day.

For example, the Gem County, Idaho, Mosquito Abatement District was forced to spend \$450,000 to resolve a lawsuit.

In my home State of Ohio, the Mosquito Control District for Toledo is currently embroiled in a citizen's lawsuit from a simple paperwork violation.

The 2012 West Nile outbreak is proof NPDES permits and association costs are hindering the ability to protect the public.

In 2012, the first year of the permitting requirement from the court case, West Nile cases jumped from 712 cases

to almost to over 5,600 cases. That is nearly an 800 percent increase because of the unnecessary permit requirements.

The States and communities affected by West Nile had to wait until after a public health emergency was declared. Only then could relief from the NPDES permit be approved. Only after the West Nile had spread could local agencies use lifesaving pesticides to kill mosquitoes carrying the virus. Keep in mind, when the local entity, municipality, declares an emergency, they don't need to get a permit. They can spray. I like to say it is after the fact when the mosquitoes are out of control, then we do aerial spraying. Maybe we could have prevented it with surface spraying and be less harm to the environment. We shouldn't have to wait until it becomes an emergency.

H.R. 953 gets rid of the unnecessary red tape so communities can prevent outbreaks of diseases like Zika and West Nile.

Cities that need to conduct the routine preventative mosquito abatement should not have to do it with one hand tied behind their back. H.R. 953 provides a narrow, limited exception from NPDES permit requirements for those pesticides already approved under FIFRA law and used in compliance under the label which is approved by the EPA.

I think this is an important point to keep in mind: EPA already regulates these pesticides and approves them under FIFRA. It goes through rigorous testing and reporting requirements, and they set the label and make the determination. They approve how it is going to be used. If it is a restricted pesticide, they can also put more restrictions on the applicators and who the applicators are.

Therefore, removing this redundant NPDES permit is appropriate because the EPA already has full control and can handle the situation like they did for over 60 years before this court case.

The EPA has assisted in drafting H.R. 953, which does not roll back any environmental protections. It fixes the regulatory problem caused by the Sixth Circuit Court's decision and maintains the EPA's jurisdiction through FIFRA.

Similar legislation has passed the House every Congress since the court's decision, and I look forward to passing it again today, and then passing it in the Senate and have the President sign it into law.

A list of organizations—this is a snapshot of the many organizations because I don't have enough time to list all the organizations, but the American Mosquito Control Association supports it; the American Farm Bureau Federation; the National Farmers Union; the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture; the National Association of Wheat Growers; National

Corn Growers Association; and United Fresh Produce Association. Those are just a few groups representing thousands of Americans who depend on commonsense EPA regulations for their livelihood.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD—and I want to talk about it here for a minute—I have a letter from former Secretary of Agriculture Vilsack. In 2009, he was Secretary of Agriculture in the Obama administration. When this court case happened, he sent out a letter to Lisa Jackson, the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency. In his letter, he urges the EPA to consider the significant adverse effect of the Sixth Circuit Court's 2009 decision, the National Cotton Council and EPA will have on American farmers and USDA agencies. He said in the letter:

"By broadening the Act's reach, the court burdens American agriculture with a newly minted NPDES permit requirement. . . ."

"The Sixth Circuit's decision encumbers the American farmers' and the agencies' ability to do business, while reaping little or no environmental benefit in exchange."

I want to repeat that. The Secretary of Agriculture in the Obama administration said that this court case has little environmental benefit, and it hampers American farmers to do their job to produce the most wholesome, safe, affordable food in the world.

"Subjecting FIFRA-compliant pesticides to the additional regulatory regime"—he goes on to say—"of the CWA is duplicative and will not help protect the environment."

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD this letter, dated March 6, 2009, from Secretary of Agriculture Vilsack and his opposition to the court case and, in his opinion, what this bill does.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2009.

Hon. LISA P. JACKSON,
Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,
Washington, DC.

Subject: The National Cotton Council of America, et al., v. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Nos. 06-4630; 07-3180/3181/3182/3183/3184/3185/3186/3187/3191/3236 (6th Cir. Jan. 7, 2009).

DEAR MS. JACKSON: The United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit recently invalidated the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) Final Rule entitled, "Application of Pesticides to Waters of the United States in Compliance With FIFRA." 71 Fed. Reg. 68,483 (Nov. 27, 2006) (Final Rule). A petition for rehearing or for rehearing en banc before the Sixth Circuit is due on April 9, 2009. I would very much appreciate your taking into consideration the significant adverse effect that the court's decision will have on American farmers, as well as on U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) agencies, and therefore request that you seek further review of this decision by the Sixth Circuit.

In its Final Rule, the EPA reasonably interpreted the term "pollutant" in the Clean

Water Act (CWA) as generally excluding pesticides that are applied in compliance with the relevant requirements of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). The Final Rule established that the application of pesticides in compliance with FIFRA would not require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit when they are applied directly into waters of the United States in order to control pests, or when they are applied to control pests that are present over waters of the United States, including near those waters, when a portion of the pesticides unavoidably will be deposited into the water in order to target the pests effectively. The EPA specifically concluded that the terms “chemical wastes” and “biological materials” in the CWA’s definition of pollutants do not encompass the types of pesticide applications addressed in the Final Rule. 71 Fed. Reg. 68,486.

The Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit concluded that the Final Rule was contrary to the plain language of the CWA. Although the court agreed with the EPA that chemical pesticides applied directly to water to perform a useful purpose are not chemical wastes, it held that excess pesticides and pesticide residue meet the common definition of waste, and therefore are pollutants under the CWA. The court held that the EPA is required to regulate the residue of chemical pesticides when the pesticide is applied to land or air, and the residue finds its way into the navigable waters of the United States, and when the pesticide is applied directly to the water and the residue has a lasting effect beyond its intended purpose. The court also found that Congress intended for “biological materials” to encompass more than “biological wastes.” The court held that all biological pesticides are biological materials, and therefore pollutants under the CWA.

The court’s adverse decision will have profound implications for American farmers. The panel’s ruling effectively broadens the potential application of the CWA to reach agricultural activities that the EPA has never regulated under the provisions of the CWA. By broadening the Act’s reach, the court burdens American agriculture with a newly minted NPDES permit requirement for the application of all FIFRA-compliant biological pesticides whenever those pesticides might find their way into waters of the United States, and for all FIFRA-compliant chemical pesticides whenever the residues of those pesticides find their way into waters of the United States. The permit requirement could reach almost any pesticide application, requiring farmers to navigate a permitting system that is ill-suited to the demands of agricultural production. Failure to obtain a timely permit for pesticide application could cripple American farmers’ emergency pest management efforts and hamper their ability to respond quickly to new pest infestations or threats of infestations, thus increasing the risk of crop losses.

Additionally, several USDA agencies engage in the ground and aerial application of pesticides, and would be adversely affected by the panel’s decision. The Forest Service (FS) and the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) now will be required to obtain NPDES permits, which could compromise the agencies’ ability to respond with efficiency and flexibility to emerging threats and emergency situations. The delay and expense associated with complying with the NPDES permitting requirement could substantially curtail the agen-

cies’ use of pesticides. For the FS, this could result in diminished efforts to protect the National Forests from pest infestation and could potentially increase the risk and severity of wildfires. It could also significantly hamper aerial spraying programs such as APHIS’s Mormon Cricket and Grasshopper Program, undertaken in cooperation with western states. Additionally, research programs involving both the conventional and the experimental applications of pesticides undertaken by the Agricultural Research Service (ARS) also will be detrimentally affected by the panel’s decision. The time-consuming and costly process of negotiating the NPDES permit application process will diminish the efficiency with which the ARS will be able to undertake its initiatives, and may, in some instances, curtail the agency’s projects entirely.

The Sixth Circuit’s decision encumbers the American farmers’ and the agencies’ ability to do business, while reaping little or no environmental benefit in exchange. Subjecting FIFRA-compliant pesticides to the additional regulatory regime of the CWA is duplicative and will not help protect the environment. FIFRA mandates that the EPA approve and issue a registration for a pesticide product only after the EPA has determined that the product will not cause “unreasonable adverse effects on the environment.” The pesticide registration and re-registration process under FIFRA considers the effects of pesticides on both human health and aquatic resources. If the EPA has concluded that a pesticide satisfies FIFRA and will not have an “unreasonable adverse effect on the environment,” then it is reasonable to exclude the application of that pesticide from the permitting requirements of the CWA.

In short, I am concerned that the court’s decision will compromise American farmers’ and USDA agencies’ ability to respond efficiently and effectively to emergency threats, while providing little or no additional environmental protection in return. Thank you for taking these issues into account as you consider seeking further review of this case.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. VILSACK,

Secretary.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chair, I have nearly 120 organizations that support H.R. 953, representing a wide variety of public and private entities and thousands of stakeholders. I have a letter from the nearly 120. I listed some of those. Some of the additional names are Agricultural Retailers Association; American Farm Bureau Federation; American Mosquito Control Association; the Association of Equipment Manufacturers; CropLife America; Family Farm Alliance; National Agricultural Aviation Association; the National Alliance of Forest Owners; National Association of State Departments of Agriculture; National Farmers Union; National Pest Management Association; and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. I include that letter in the RECORD.

MAY 3, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the over one hundred undersigned organizations, we urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 953, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017.

For almost forty years, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and pesticide ap-

plicators including public health agencies charged with mosquito control operated exclusively under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). In fact, EPA has testified to the adequacy of FIFRA’s comprehensive regulatory requirements including substantial enforcement mechanisms in pursuit of that goal.

However, a 2009 activist-inspired lawsuit resulted in a federal court decision identifying a technicality in the law that Congress had not properly clarified its intent that FIFRA should have preeminence over the Clean Water Act (CWA). This decision resulted in pesticide users being required to obtain a CWA National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. These permits were originally created to address the discharge of waste by major industrial polluters, but now are mandated for mosquito control districts and others who are applying pesticides approved by EPA for use in the environment for their beneficial purposes of trying to prevent or control the spread of public health disease in the U.S.

Though the NPDES permit burden lacks any additional environmental benefit under these circumstances, it does force substantial costs on thousands of small application businesses and farms, as well as the municipal, county, state and federal agencies responsible for protecting natural resources and public health. Further, and most menacing, the permit exposes all pesticide users—regardless of permit eligibility—to the liability of CWA-based citizen law suits. In a number of instances, applicators—that once conducted mosquito abatement applications for local governments and homeowner associations—can’t afford the costs or risk of frivolous litigation that accompanies NPDES PGPs and have refrained from conducting public health applications.

H.R. 953 would clarify Congressional intent that federal law does not require this redundant permit for already regulated pesticide applications.

In the 112th Congress, similar legislation (H.R. 872) passed the House Committee on Agriculture and went on to pass the House of Representatives on suspension. In the 113th Congress, the legislation (H.R. 935) passed both the House Committees on Agriculture and Transportation & Infrastructure by voice vote, and again, the House of Representatives. In the 114th Congress, the Zika Vector Control Act (H.R. 897) passed the House of Representatives yet again. With your help and support, H.R. 953 will also pass the House and hopefully become law.

Since H.R. 897 passed the House last year, there has been yet another costly lawsuit against a mosquito control district, forcing the district to spend its funds fighting in court instead of protecting public health.

Under these circumstances, NPDES permit requirements impact the use of critical pesticides in protecting human health and the food supply from destructive and disease-carrying pests, and in managing invasive weeds to keep open waterways and shipping lanes, to maintain rights of way for transportation and power generation, and in preventing damage to forests and recreation areas. The time and funds expended on redundant permit compliance drains public and private resources. All this for no measurable benefit to the environment. We urge you to eliminate this unnecessary, expensive, and duplicative

regulation by ensuring the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017 passes the House on Wednesday.

Sincerely,

Agribusiness Council of Indiana; Agribusiness & Water Council of Arizona; Agricultural Alliance of North Carolina; Agricultural Council of Arkansas; Agricultural Retailers Association; Alabama Agribusiness Council; American Farm Bureau Federation; Alabama Farmers Federation; American Mosquito Control Association; American Soybean Association; AmericanHort; Aquatic Plant Management Society; Arkansas Forestry Association; Association of Equipment Manufacturers; Biopesticide Industry Alliance; California Agricultural Aircraft Association; California Association of Winegrape Growers; California Specialty Crops Council; Cape Cod Cranberry Growers Association.

Colorado Agricultural Aviation Association; The Cranberry Institute; Crop Protection Association of North Carolina; CropLife America; Council of Producers & Distributors of Agrotechnology; Family Farm Alliance; Far West Agribusiness Association; Florida Farm Bureau Federation Florida; Fruit & Vegetable Association; Georgia Agribusiness Council; Golf Course Superintendents Association of America; Hawaii Cattlemen's Council; Hawaii Farm Bureau Federation; Idaho Grower Shippers Association; Idaho Potato Commission; Idaho Water Users Association; Illinois Farm Bureau; Illinois Fertilizer & Chemical Association; Iowa Agricultural Aviation Association.

Kansas Agribusiness Retailers Association; Louisiana Cotton and Grain Association; Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation; Maine Potato Board; Michigan Agribusiness Association; Minnesota Agricultural Aircraft Association; Minnesota AgriGrowth Council; Minnesota Crop Production Retailers; Minnesota Pesticide Information & Education; Minor Crops Farmer Alliance; Missouri Agribusiness Association; Missouri Farm Bureau Federation; Montana Agricultural Business Association; National Agricultural Aviation Association; National Alliance of Forest Owners; National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants; National Association of Landscape Professionals; National Association of State Departments of Agriculture.

National Association of Wheat Growers; National Corn Growers Association; National Cotton Council; National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; National Farmers Union; National Onion Association; National Pest Management Association; National Potato Council; National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; National Water Resources Association; Nebraska Agri-Business Association; North Carolina Agricultural Consultants Association; North Carolina Cotton Producers Association; North Central Weed Science Society; North Dakota Agricultural Association; Northeast Agribusiness and Feed Alliance; Northeastern Weed Science Society; Northern Plains Potato Growers Association; Northwest Horticultural Council; Ohio Professional Applicators for Responsible Regulation.

Oregon Association of Nurseries; Oregon Farm Bureau; Oregon Forest and Industries Council; Oregon Potato Commission; Oregon Seed Council; Oregon Water Resources Congress; Oregon Wheat Growers League; Oregonians for Food & Shelter; Pesticide Policy Coalition; Plains Cotton Growers, Inc.; Professional Landcare Network; Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment; Rocky Mountain Agribusiness Association; SC Fertilizer Agrichemicals Association; South Dakota Agri-Business Association; South Texas

Cotton and Grain Association; Southern Cotton Growers, Inc.; Southern Crop Production Association; Southern Rolling Plains Cotton Growers; Southern Weed Science Society.

Sugar Cane League; Texas Ag Industries Association; Texas Vegetation Management Association; United Fresh Produce Association; U.S. Apple Association; USA Rice Federation; Virginia Agribusiness Council; Virginia Forestry Association; Washington Friends of Farm & Forests; Washington State Potato Commission; Weed Science Society of America; Western Growers; Western Plant Health Association; Western Society of Weed Science; Wild Blueberry Commission of Maine; Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation; Wisconsin Potato and Vegetable Growers Association; Wisconsin State Cranberry Growers Association; Wyoming Ag Business Association; Wyoming Crop Improvement Association; Wyoming Wheat Growers Association.

AMERICAN MOSQUITO CONTROL ASSOCIATION STATEMENT ON NPDES BURDEN

THE AMERICAN MOSQUITO CONTROL ASSOCIATION
URGES CONGRESS TO VOTE "YES" ON H.R. 953,
THE REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF
2017

From the perspective of the agencies charged with suppressing mosquitoes and other vectors of public health consequence, the NPDES burden is directly related to combatting Zika and other mosquito-transmitted diseases.

For over forty years and through both Democratic and Republican administrations, the EPA and states held that these permits did not apply to public health pesticide applications. However, activist lawsuits forced the EPA to require such permits even for the application of EPA-registered pesticides including mosquito control.

AMCA has testified numerous times to establish the burden created by this court ruling. The threat to the public health mission of America's mosquito control districts comes in two costly parts:

ONGOING COMPLIANCE COSTS

Though the activists contend that the NPDES permit has "modest notification and monitoring requirements" the actual experience of mosquito control districts is much different.

Initially obtaining and maintaining an NPDES permit comes at considerable expense. California mosquito control districts estimate the NPDES compliance costs for their 64 districts to be approximately \$4 million dollars over six years. These costs include;

Initial amount spent by Districts determining waters subject to reporting.

Total amount spent by Districts tracking treatments to Waters of the US

Water Testing Consultants

NPDES Administration/Regulatory Consultants

Legal fees related to NPDES

Physical monitoring of larvicides—not completed by consultants

Completing annual reports

In Wyoming, there are several issues that have impacted the mosquito districts;

Record keeping requirements has redirected 2-5 % of District funds annually to permit fees and administrative costs.

The cost for acre applications of both adulticide and larvicides has increased 5 to 10-fold for some Districts. This is due primarily to the fear that local aerial applicators have regarding the citizen lawsuits. The local ag pilots have declined to fly for some of the mosquito districts in Wyoming, re-

quiring them to go out of state to professional application companies. The City of Laramie which was able to treat for an estimated \$1 per acre now pays an estimated \$5-\$10 per acre. This has greatly reduced the acres that can be treated with larvicide and adulticides.

In Durango, CO, the Animas Mosquito Control District reported spending over \$50,000 in GPS/GIS system, maintenance and upgrades purchased to comply with an unknown annual report requirement. They spent numerous hours conducting meetings, phone calls and on the computer to clarify the annual reporting requirements, the detail necessary in annual reports, and even where to send the information.

The fact that the existence of the permit over the last 6 years has no additional environmental benefit (since pesticide applications are already governed by FIFRA) makes these taxpayer diversions from vector control unconscionable.

In a survey of mosquito control programs, 71 reported (out of 734 nationwide) that their multiyear period expenses incurred due to the NPDES permitting including operational, permitting, reporting, monitoring and other administrative costs totaled over \$4 million. (This survey does not include all of the 6-year California estimate mentioned previously).

HOW COULD \$4 MILLION IN NPDES COSTS BE BETTER SPENT

Seasonal field workers (\$11,000 for starter), 377 employees.

Bti larvicide (\$1.44/lb), 2,879,738 pounds.

Acres of water larvicided aerially (10 lbs/acre + \$5.25 applicator cost = \$19.65), 211,034 acres.

Acres of water treated by ground crews (10 lbs./acre), 287,973 acres.

West Nile virus—in house testing of adult mosquitoes (RAMP) \$19.36, 214,195 tests.

30 second radio ads for public education (\$40-\$200), 103,671-20,734.

Acres of aerial adult mosquito control (\$.89 applicator fee + \$.95 chemical), 2,253,708 acres.

Evening ground spraying hours (\$396/hr. for vehicle, employee, adulticide), 10,472 hrs.

Every dollar spent on duplicative regulations is a dollar that could have been used towards Integrated Pest Management (IPM) activities that control mosquitoes and prevent mosquito-borne illness.

Resources must not be diverted from these mosquito control activities in order to protect public health:

Disease surveillance—trapping and testing adult mosquitoes, monitoring dead birds.

Larvicides and adult mosquito control—reduce mosquito populations through targeted applications

Habitat modification/source reduction—ditching/dredgers to permanently reduce mosquito oviposition habitats to reduce the need for chemical control measures.

Monitoring invasive species of mosquitoes.

Public education—publications on reducing backyard sources of mosquitoes, information on repellent and personal protective measures.

Employees, training, and certifications.

Programs that are most affected:

Poorer, rural mosquito control districts

Programs associated with small municipalities

In the Western US, those associated with private aerial contractors concerned with taking on the added liability.

Municipalities in the south looking to start Zika virus control efforts. Why would Congress approve \$1.1 Billion to fight and explore Zika virus and then burden us with

regulations that hinder our ability to control the vector of the disease?

So, why would the activist organizations be so adamant that these permits be mandatory for public health pesticide applications . . . ?

EXPOSURE TO ACTIVIST LITIGATION

Municipal mosquito control programs are vulnerable to CWA citizen lawsuits where fines to mosquito control districts may exceed \$37,500/day. Under FIFRA, the activists would need to demonstrate that the pesticides were misapplied, that the product labels were not followed. Additionally, this is not a question of the applications causing harm to public health. The pesticides we use are specific to mosquitoes and are generally used in very low doses by qualified applicators).

However, the CWA 3rd Party Citizen Suit Provision allows for any third party to sue for alleged violations of NPDES program requirements. Additionally, the CWA does not require actual evidence of a misapplication of a pesticide or harm to the environment, but rather simple paperwork violations or merely allegations in permit oversight.

The Toledo Area Sanitary District is currently involved in a lawsuit that has already initially cost the mosquito control program more than \$40,000 in legal fees, and the case has yet to go to court. This could lead to an injunction on the spray program and end up costing taxpayers \$100,000+ dollars, even though the case has nothing to do with substantive water quality issues, but rather focuses on alleged administrative paperwork violations.

Gem County Mosquito Abatement District (ID) was the subject of one of these activist lawsuits utilizing the 3rd Party Citizen Suit Provision. It took ten years and the grand total of an entire year's annual operating budget (\$450,000) to resolve that litigation against that public health entity.

These ongoing compliance costs and threat of crushing litigation directly impact mosquito control districts. The existence of this unnecessary requirement for mosquito control activities is directly related to our ability to combat the vectors related to Zika. It diverts precious resources away from finding and suppressing mosquito populations.

The American Mosquito Control Association urges Congress to vote "YES" on H.R. 953, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, May 24, 2017.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. BOB GIBBS,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GARRET GRAVES,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPS. SHUSTER, GIBBS, CONAWAY AND GRAVES: Later this week, the House is expected to vote on H.R. 953, "The Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017." This legislation has previously passed the House of Representatives with strong bipartisan support, and the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF) urges all members of Congress to vote in favor of the bill.

H.R. 953 is narrowly crafted to clarify that lawful use of pesticides in or near navigable waters is not excessively covered under two statutes, the Clean Water Act and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act. In doing so, the measure simply codifies EPA's longstanding interpretation of the law

before it was thrown into confusion by a 2009 court ruling, which imposed an additional layer of needless red tape on pesticide applicators. H.R. 953 corrects the duplicative requirements associated with EPA's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) pesticide permit by specifying that NPDES permits are not needed for the lawful application of EPA-labeled pesticides. This is an important fix that will reduce red tape and legal liabilities associated with the lawful use of pesticides in protecting public health and food security.

We urge all members to vote in favor of the "Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017."

Thank you very much for your support.

Sincerely,

ZIPPY DUVALL,
President.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chair, I also include in the RECORD a letter from the National Association of Counties. NACo recommends that Congress address some of challenges posed by the EPA's Clean Water Act permit for pesticides to allow counties to more quickly respond to the mosquito-based public health threats. Counties have reported either significantly scaled back or discontinued mosquito abatement programs due to the additional, duplicative, and expensive paperwork and monitoring obligations required by the program.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: As the U.S. House of Representatives moves forward with the "Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017" (H.R. 953), we would like to highlight the impact that U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Pesticide General Permit (PGP) program has on county governments' ability to respond promptly and effectively to emerging public health threats.

As the summer months approach and we enter mosquito season, counties are concerned about the health and safety impacts of mosquito-borne illnesses such as Zika. The Zika virus is an emerging mosquito-borne illness, primarily stemming from the bite of infected Aedes mosquitoes, and there is no vaccine. Since mosquitoes and their breeding habitats pose the largest threat to public safety, counties can play a major role in minimizing the potential spread of the virus and other mosquito-borne illnesses through public education and mosquito eradication.

However, since EPA's PGP program was instituted in 2011, counties have reported that they have either significantly scaled back or discontinued mosquito abatement programs due to additional, duplicative and expensive paperwork and monitoring obligations required under the permit. We recommend that Congress address some of the challenges posed by EPA's PGP permit to allow counties to more quickly respond to mosquito-based public health threats.

We thank you for your leadership on this issue. We look forward to continuing to work with you on issues important to counties.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW D. CHASE,
Executive Director,
National Association of Counties.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chair, I thank the Agriculture Committee chairman, MIKE CONAWAY; and the Transportation and Infrastructure chairman, BILL SHUSTER, who are the leadership on this issue. I want to thank the Agriculture Committee ranking member, COLLIN PETERSON, as well.

Mr. Chair, I urge all Members to support this commonsense effort to reform this duplicative EPA regulation.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 953, Reducing the Regulatory Burdens Act. As I have noted before on similar bills in the past, I remain concerned that this bill would mean that no Clean Water Act protections would be required for pesticide application to water bodies that are already impaired by pesticides.

The Clean Water Act in no way hinders, delays, or prevents the use of approved pesticides for pest control operations. In fact, the Clean Water Act permit provides a specific emergency provision to prevent outbreaks of diseases such as Zika virus.

Under the terms of the permit, pesticide applicators are covered automatically under the permit and any spraying may be performed immediately for any declared pest emergency situations. In most instances, sprayers are only required to notify EPA of their spraying operations 30 days after the beginning of a spraying operation.

Most pesticide applications in the United States are done in accordance with FIFRA, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act which only requires proper labeling on pesticide products regarding usage.

However, FIFRA labeling is no substitute for ensuring that we understand the volumes of pesticide we seem to apply to our rivers, our lakes, our streams on an annual basis.

□ 1515

According to a 2006 USGS report on pesticides, commonly used pesticides frequently are present in streams and groundwater at levels that exceed human health benchmarks and occur in many streams at levels that may affect aquatic or fish-eating wildlife and also human life.

In the data that the States provide the EPA, more than 16,000 miles of rivers and streams, 1,380 of bays and estuaries, and 370,000 acres of lakes in the United States are currently impaired or threatened by pesticides.

The EPA suggests that these estimates may be low because many of these States do not test for or monitor all the different pesticides that are currently being used. I am very concerned of the effect these pesticides have on the health of our rivers, our streams, and especially the drinking water supplies for all our citizens, especially the most vulnerable, the young, the elderly, and the poor and disenfranchised people who have no representation. We have much cancer appearing, and we have no idea what it is. Adding pesticides is not helping.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a Federal report on how pesticides in California are the leading cause of impairments to water quality.

U.S. EPA REPORT ON CALIFORNIA WATER
QUALITY ASSESSMENT
CALIFORNIA CAUSES OF IMPAIRMENT FOR
REPORTING YEAR 2012

Pesticides are the Cause of water impairment in California for 4,534 miles of rivers and streams, 235,765 acres of lakes, ponds, and reservoirs, 829 square miles of bays and estuaries, 35 miles of coastal shoreline, 42 square miles of ocean and near coastal waters, and 43 acres of wetlands.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Currently in California there are over 4,500 miles of rivers and streams, 235,000 acres of lakes and reservoirs, and 829 square miles of bays and estuaries in my State that are impaired by pesticides. This is a significant concern in my home State, where every drop of water has to be cleaned and needs to be conserved, reused, and cherished.

We hear that pesticide application is already regulated under FIFRA and that the Clean Water Act review is not needed. I understand the concerns about the duplication of effort and the need to minimize the impacts that regulations have on small business or business at large. All the supporters are mostly farmers and other business entities.

However, I am still very concerned that these pesticides are having a very significant impact on water quality and that, with this bill, we are creating the exemption from water quality protection requirements without considering the impacts to the waters that are already impacted by pesticides, as they are in California.

This, in turn, costs our water users, our ratepayers hundreds of millions of dollars to filter these pollutants out of water before it is potable. This is something I deal with on an ongoing basis as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment. We currently have aquifers that are contaminated by the continued use of pesticides and fertilizers. Millions of dollars have been spent on the 20-plus-year-long cleanup effort of a Superfund site in my area that has pesticides as one of the contaminants.

We cannot, and should not, take away one of the only tools available to

monitor for adverse impacts of pesticides in our rivers, our streams, and our reservoirs. Over the past 6 years, this tool has been reasonable, has been workable to pest control operators and agricultural interests alike, and needs to be retained. I urge my colleagues on both sides to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today also in support of H.R. 953, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017. The House Committee on Agriculture, which I serve on, as does Chairman GIBBS, passed this bill out of committee every Congress since the 112th Congress. The bill language was likewise included in the 2012 farm bill, reported out of the committee, as well as in the 2013 farm bill the House sent to conference. It was also included in the committee-reported text of the FY 2012 Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations bill. But it has never reached the President's desk.

For more than 100 years, the Federal Government has administered its responsibilities under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, FIFRA, to review and register pesticides in a responsible way that protects human health and the environment.

Under the Clean Water Act, the EPA or a State authority issues a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit, NPDES permit, and that regulates the discharge of pollutants. NPDES permits specify limits on what pollutants may be discharged from point sources and in what amounts. Since the passage of the Clean Water Act in 1972, the EPA has interpreted its responsibilities related to pesticide use such that compliance with FIFRA would mitigate the need for duplicative permitting under the Clean Water Act.

As litigation in the early part of this decade began to challenge this interpretation, the EPA ultimately responded with the promulgation of a regulation on November 27, 2006, to clarify how these two laws operated. Under the EPA's final rule, the Agency codified its earlier interpretation that permits for pesticide application under the Clean Water Act were unnecessary where pesticides were used in accordance with their regulation under FIFRA.

Following the finalization of this regulation, the rule was challenged in numerous jurisdictions. The case was ultimately heard in the Sixth Circuit wherein the government's interpretation of the interaction of these two laws was not given the deference we would normally expect. The final court order nullified the EPA's regulation and imposed what is viewed as a bur-

densome, costly, and duplicative permitting process under the Clean Water Act for literally millions of pesticide applications.

This order has imposed a burden on the EPA, State regulatory agencies, and pesticide applicators, costing our economy in terms of jobs as well as severely threatening the already critical budgetary situation facing governments at all levels. It is particularly unfortunate that this court order imposed a new requirement that has imperiled our water resource boards, our mosquito control boards, and our forestry and agricultural sectors, yet has provided no additional environmental or public health protection. On the contrary, by imposing this costly burden on public health pesticide users, it has jeopardized public health as it relates to protection against insect-borne diseases such as the Zika virus, West Nile virus, various forms of encephalitis, and Lyme disease.

I recently heard from the Macon County Mosquito Abatement District in my district based in and around Decatur, Illinois. They can attest that the price of complying with NPDES permitting is very high. Though they had in place a reliable system of tracking chemical usage and treatment areas for years, the added burden of the NPDES requirements have caused them to spend a large portion of the district's annual budget on software strictly just for compliance and reporting processes. The recurring yearly fees associated with the software are a never-ending burden needlessly placed on abatement districts. The fear of litigation dictates the detailed tracking of EPA-approved products and diverts those funds from their actual purpose of controlling mosquitoes.

The EPA has provided technical assistance to draft this very narrow legislation. The goal of this legislation has been to address only those problems created by the decision of the Sixth Circuit and to be entirely consistent with the policy of the EPA, as stated in their November 27, 2006, final rule governing application of pesticides to waters of the United States in compliance with FIFRA.

I urge all Members to vote for this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 953, Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017. This legislation eliminates the requirement to acquire two permits for the same pesticide application under two separate laws and, I might add, if you live in California, there is a separate requirement under the California Clean Water Act that requires an additional permit. That would still apply regardless if this legislation is passed.

In order to be permitted to use a pesticide, that pesticide must be approved under FIFRA, which includes an analysis that must be performed that finds it will not generally cause unreasonable adverse effects to the environment or to the health. However, current law requires another permit to be acquired for the same action under the Clean Water Act if you happen to be close to a water body, and that is where the duplication occurs.

Not only are these requirements redundant, they are expensive, and the cost of the individual Clean Water Act permit ranges from \$150,000 to \$270,000 and can take up to 2 years. No one wants to risk human health, not I, not anyone, but in my opinion this would not do so. We have Zika, we have West Nile, and we have a host of spreading of these diseases by mosquitoes in which this, in fact, can address those issues.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill in order to remove this unnecessary, unneeded regulatory burden and expense.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, we agree that no one thinks this bill is going to harm anyone. We are trying to look for commonsense provisions, and I am thankful to my colleague for making this a bipartisan solution.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH0).

Mr. YOH0. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me just a moment to speak on the absolute necessity of passing the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act. The Sixth Circuit Court blatantly overstepped its authority in directing the EPA to establish a duplicative permitting process for pesticide use. The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, known as FIFRA, already requires the EPA to review the data and evaluate risks and exposures associated with the use of certain insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and rodenticides.

After the EPA evaluates the risk associated with the use of a given pesticide, FIFRA prohibits its use for any purpose not already approved by the EPA. Approved uses are clearly labeled. Requiring additional reviews under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System is simply unnecessary and burdensome.

Furthermore, unless the body sets the record straight and overturns the Sixth Circuit decision, we will be opening a tried-and-true permitting process to numerous citizen lawsuits that will be bad for agriculture and, as all such bad decisions, result in increased costs paid for by the American consumers.

I urge my colleagues to stand behind Mr. GIBBS and this bill, stand behind the science, and help him pass this. When he came, he started to work on this in 2010, his hair was brown. Now it is gray. So let's help him get this bill passed.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017. This bill would restore congressional intent regarding the relationship between FIFRA and the Clean Water Act.

Historically, Congress has viewed FIFRA as sufficient to protect human health and the environment. Until the early part of the past decade, even the EPA interpreted its responsibilities related to pesticide use as compliance with FIFRA would reduce the need for duplicative permitting under the Clean Water Act. If pesticides were used according to their regulation under FIFRA, then permits for pesticide application under the Clean Water Act were unnecessary.

Unfortunately, this historic interpretation has been overturned by activist litigation. In 2009, a decision by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals upended the historic interpretation of the space between these two laws. The Sixth Circuit order created a new permitting requirement that provides no additional environmental or public health protection.

The goal of this legislation has been to address only those problems created by the Sixth Circuit decision and to be consistent with congressional intent and the EPA's long-held interpretation. It is a commonsense solution to a court-imposed regulatory burden that Congress never intended to be applied. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague and friend from Minnesota for his bipartisan support of H.R. 953.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to first thank my colleague from Ohio for his leadership on bringing forth this important legislation to actually help us focus more resources on killing mosquitoes, especially as the mosquito season starts, as we see so many threats with Zika, with West Nile, just the damage that we see happening around our country from mosquitoes. We have decided we are going to put resources into killing mosquitoes, and then we come about and find out about these regulations that were imposed by the courts in a way that actually makes it harder for us to kill mosquitoes.

□ 1530

What you hear so often from people around the country is: Why is it that you have got things happening out of Washington that make no sense?

Congressman GIBBS identified one of those areas and said it really doesn't make sense. We tried to work through

a different remedy to try to get the administration to fix it, and they pointed to a court case that keeps them from fixing it.

It is one of the big frustrations you have that it actually takes an act of Congress to bring common sense into the process of killing mosquitoes, for goodness sake. But here we are doing it. At least we are spending the people's business doing something that actually injects common sense back into the things that people do in their daily lives.

All across our community and across this country, you have local governments that are really the ones that focus on killing mosquitoes, and we started hearing about this problem. Of course, Mr. Chairman, we asked the EPA to identify just how much this is actually costing.

So as everybody scrambles and fights and you hear agencies saying "I need more money to do this," "I need more money to do that," we need to be more responsible with the taxpayers' money, and people are saying, "Live within your means."

And we have asked the EPA. The EPA, Mr. Chairman, told us that the cost of implementing these EPA regulations is an extra \$50 million a year. Think of how ludicrous that is. Because of the way the EPA is implementing the law, as we are trying to kill more mosquitoes, it is costing \$50 million a year to comply with burdensome, duplicative regulations—rather than killing mosquitoes. We should be spending that money, \$50 million, killing more mosquitoes, not killing trees to comply with ridiculous regulations.

So I want to commend my colleague from Ohio for bringing this back. The House passed this in a very bipartisan way last Congress. We didn't get it all the way to the President's desk. So this year, hopefully, we will get this bill not only passed through the House, but through the Senate and to President Trump's desk, where he will sign a bill that injects common sense back into the process of killing mosquitoes.

Let's spend our money killing mosquitoes, not killing trees and having to comply with ridiculous regulations that come out of Washington and make no sense. Let's pass this bill.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this is the fifth time the United States House of Representatives has considered this bill.

Now, we have heard a lot of alternative facts today. Let's have some real facts.

Killing trees, well, first off, here is the extensive application. It is slightly over three pages long and it can be filed electronically, so we don't need to kill any trees.

Allegations that somehow this slows down control of mosquito abatement or Zika virus are absolutely false. Anybody can apply a pesticide in a public health situation. They have 30 days to file the paperwork online afterwards. It takes about 5 minutes. It has such technical things as your name and address, your pesticide applicator license verified with a certain State, where you are going to use the pesticide or herbicide.

Now, why would we want to know that? Or maybe, why wouldn't we want not to know that? Because that is what they are saying on that side of the aisle.

There is nothing registered with the Department of Agriculture. Yes, we have FIFRA. These pesticides and herbicides have been registered. They have labels—it can't be applied over water; it can't be applied here; it can't be applied there—and we trust the applicators to follow those rules. But when they actually use the herbicides and pesticides absent this form, this burdensome 3½-page form, we won't know.

Now, why would we care? Well, this is essentially the 20th anniversary of a massive fish kill in Jackson County, Oregon. In that incident, an operator applied an aquatic herbicide in an irrigation canal that, when it leaked into the nearby creek, killed 92,000 steelhead. Now, we kind of care about our steelhead in the Northwest, so that was a problem.

So then the Federal agency said, Well, this is kind of a problem when someone does that, 92,000 steelhead. Plus, anybody who drank the water was poisoned, et cetera, et cetera. But we don't want to know about that on that side of the aisle because Dow Chemical doesn't like it because maybe it inhibits sales of some of these chemicals that cause these sorts of problems.

Now, we have data now because of these forms, and we know about areas that are impaired. In my State, which is like the clean, green State, 825 miles of rivers and streams and 10,000 acres of lakes and ponds in the State of Oregon are impaired by pesticide contamination. That is something we should do something about. People are drinking that water; they are swimming in that water; their kids are bathing in that water. I think that is a problem.

But we don't want to know about that. This is just a horrible restraint on pesticide applications.

Now, we heard a lot of other hooey here. It is like: This is so difficult; it is so difficult to do. I was talking to the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee. He said, well, farmers don't want to file those forms. If they hired a pesticide applicator, that person could file the form for them.

Or, yeah, maybe they are going to have to file the 3-page form if it involves the waters of the United States

of America. If it doesn't involve the waters, you don't have to file it. So this is really an incredible thing.

Now, we have taken this up numerous times. It was the Pest Management and Fire Suppression Flexibility Act in the 109th Congress—the same bill, exactly the same bill.

Then in the 112th and the 113th Congresses, it was the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act. It still didn't work. It didn't become law then.

Well, wait a minute. Let's pass it on to public fears. Last Congress, it was called the Zika Vector Control Act in the 114th Congress. We just heard a lot of hooey about how this will inhibit killing mosquitoes, which, of course, is absolutely not true.

But now we are back to here. So the Zika Control Act and the Pest Management and Fire Suppression Flexibility Act are now back to the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act.

Now, in the past 6 years, since this paperwork was required, or electronic work, do you know how many pesticide applicators have faced significant impacts because of these protections? None. Zero.

Do you know how many applicators have raised problems with the Clean Water Act pesticide general permit to EPA? None. Zero.

In fact, I specifically asked this question of the EPA's head of water at a Transportation and Infrastructure subcommittee hearing. No specific instances where the clean water permit was causing problems or impacts on pesticide application. Yet here we are again, one more time, under the guise of reducing this horrible regulatory burden: name, address, phone number, what did you apply? Where are you registered to apply these sorts of permits? That is useful information.

I had a couple more instances in Oregon.

Tiller, Oregon, again, right in the same area where the steelhead were killed. That same creek was contaminated with atrazine in 2014. Local residents who drank the water complained, and they also complained of the overspray. Then, in 2013, a helicopter in Curry County, Oregon, oversprayed residents.

Now, if they didn't have to file these forms, we wouldn't know who did it, when they did it, and what the chemical was. I guess that is kind of what the Republicans want. If someone oversprays your property and sprays stuff on you: "Geez, I don't know. That was one of those black helicopters. We don't know where it came from, or who that was. We don't know what they dumped on you. Sorry." That is burdensome paperwork. We wouldn't want to require that kind of burdensome paperwork.

So that is why we are here again today for the fifth time with the fifth remaining rationale for what we are

doing here today, and it still fails the smell test.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio has 10 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to make a few remarks on what my friend, my colleague from Oregon said. I call it the rest of the story.

We talked about the fish kill in 1996 of the steelhead. I inquired of this tragic incident and came to the conclusion that NPDES permitting under the Clean Water Act would not have prevented the fish kill.

In 2003, the EPA Office of Pesticide Programs published a report which looked at this potential risk posed by the herbicide that was used in the 1996 fish kill. The report stated:

Where sufficient information has been provided, it appears that the fish incidents are as a result of misuse. The form of misuse is that water was released from the irrigation canals too early. In some cases, this was because the gate valves were not properly closed or that they leaked. In other cases, the applicator opened them intentionally, but too soon. In one case, boards that helped contain the irrigation canal water may have been removed by children playing.

The EPA goes on in the report to address each of the various species of salmon and steelhead analyzed and repeatedly states:

It is very unlikely the pesticide suspected to cause the Oregon fish kill would have affected the steelhead or salmon if it was used in accordance with the label requirements. Completing NPDES permit paperwork and paying a permit fee does not prevent fish kills, nor does it improve water quality. Pesticide applications in accordance with FIFRA pesticide labels will avoid adverse environmental impacts, including fish kills.

If a pesticide is improperly applied, there are enforcement mechanisms in place to address this violation. In the case of the 1996 Oregon fish kill, I understand the party was subject to more than \$400,000 in fines and reimbursements for the incident.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his work on this important legislation.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 953, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act. This legislation will bring much-needed relief to our American farmers. They put in a great deal of time and money to deal with duplicative regulations like the one we are addressing here today. This bill will take away needless provisions regarding pesticide regulations under the Clean Water Act.

Pesticide applications are already federally regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. This permitting was

unnecessary and duplicative, punishing American farmers due to a misguided court decision.

In my district in Georgia, farmers have to deal with a variety of environmental difficulties, like the devastating freeze just this last March. The Federal Government should not be adding redundant mandates to already overburdened farmers.

The Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act has been passed out of the House Agriculture Committee five times. It is time for Congress to correct this mistake and give farmers and pesticide applicators much-needed relief once and for all.

Mr. Chairman, as a proud cosponsor of this bill, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD the following letters to be made part of today's record: A letter from 46 national and State conservation and public health interest groups opposed to H.R. 953, and, secondly, a list of over 150 different organizations who oppose efforts to undermine the Clean Water Act protections for direct pesticide applications, including the Alabama Rivers, San Francisco, and the list goes on.

And the organizations: Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments; from Alaska, the Alaska Community Action on Toxics; From Arkansas, the Earth Cause Organization; from California, Audubon and many others; from Alabama, Alabama Rivers; from Colorado, Colorado Riverkeeper; from the District of Columbia, Potomac Riverkeeper; from Florida, Emerald Coastkeeper; from Georgia, Altamaha Riverkeeper and Altamaha Coastkeeper; from Idaho, the Idaho Conservation League; from Illinois, the Illinois Council of Trout Unlimited; and from Iowa, Quad Cities Riverkeeper. And the list goes on, Mr. Chairman.

MAY 22, 2017.

Re Oppose H.R. 953 (Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017).

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters nationwide, we urge you to oppose H.R. 953 ("Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017"). A more apt title for this damaging legislation is the "Poison Our Waters Act" because it would eliminate Clean Water Act safeguards that protect our waterways and communities from excessive pesticide pollution. The Pesticide General Permit targeted in this legislation has been in place for nearly six years now and alarmist predictions by pesticide manufacturers and others about the impacts of this permit have failed to bear any fruit.

This bill is the same legislation that pesticide manufacturers and other special interests have been pushing for years. It has been opposed not only by the Obama Administration, but also more than 150 public health, fishing, and conservation organizations (see attached list). Contrary to earlier claims

made by its proponents, this bill will not improve nor impact spraying to combat Zika virus and other human health threats. The Pesticide General Permit at issue already allows for spraying to combat vector-borne diseases such as Zika and the West Nile virus. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the permit "provides that pesticide applications are covered automatically under the permit and may be performed immediately for any declared emergency pest situations" (emphasis added).

Further, the Clean Water Act has no significant effect on farming practices. The Pesticide General Permit in no way affects land applications of pesticides for the purpose of controlling pests (that is, spraying that doesn't discharge into water bodies). Irrigation return flows and agricultural stormwater runoff do not require permits, even when they contain pesticides. Existing agricultural exemptions in the Clean Water Act remain.

Repealing the Pesticide General Permit—as this damaging legislation seeks to do—would allow pesticides to be discharged into water bodies without any meaningful oversight since the federal pesticide registration law (the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA)) does not require tracking of such applications.

Now that the Pesticide General Permit is in place, the public is finally getting information that they couldn't obtain before about the types of pesticides being sprayed or discharged into local bodies of water. All across the country, pesticide applicators are complying with the Pesticide General Permit to protect water quality without issue.

The Pesticide General Permit simply lays out commonsense practices for applying pesticides directly to waters that currently fall under the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act. Efforts to block this permit are highly controversial, as evidenced by the attached list of groups opposed.

Please protect the health of your state's citizens and all Americans by opposing H.R. 953.

Sincerely,

Earthjustice
League of Conservation Voters
Natural Resources Defense Council
Center for Biological Diversity
Sierra Club
Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments
American Sustainable Business Council
National Family Farm Coalition
Waterkeeper Alliance
Clean Water Action
Environment America
Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations
American Rivers
Southern Environmental Law Center
Defenders of Wildlife
Friends of the Earth U.S.
Environmental Working Group
Northwest Center for Alternatives to Pesticides
Alabama Rivers Alliance
Beyond Pesticides
Beyond Toxics
Cahaba River Society
Center for Food Safety
Defend H2O
Endangered Habitats League
Endangered Species Coalition
Environmental Protection Information Center
Gulf Restoration Network
Illinois Council of Trout Unlimited
Kentucky
Waterways Alliance

Klamath Forest Alliance
Laurie M. Tisch Center for Food, Education & Policy, Program in Nutrition, Teachers College Columbia University
Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition
Oregon Environmental Council
Prairie Rivers Network
Pesticide Action Network North America
PolicyLink
San Francisco Baykeeper
Save The River / Upper St. Lawrence Riverkeeper
The Environmental Justice Leadership Forum on Climate Change
The Good Food Institute
Toxic Free NC
Turtle Island Restoration Network
WE ACT for Environmental Justice
WildEarth Guardians.

WHO OPPOSES EFFORTS TO UNDERMINE CLEAN WATER ACT PERMITTING FOR DIRECT PESTICIDE APPLICATIONS?

The below organizations have signed letters opposing legislation that guts Clean Water Act safeguards protecting communities from toxic pesticide.

NATIONAL

Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments, American Bird Conservancy, American Rivers, American Sustainable Business Council, Beyond Pesticides, Center for Biological Diversity, Center for Food Safety, Center for Environmental Health, Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment, Clean Water Action, Clean Water Network, Defend H2O, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Endangered Habitats League, Endangered Species Coalition, Environment America, Environmental Working Group, Food & Water Watch, Friends of the Earth, Geos Institute, League of Conservation Voters, National Environmental Law Center, National Family Farm Coalition, Natural Resources Defense Council, Pesticide Action Network North America, Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility, Sierra Club, The Good Food Institute, WildEarth Guardians.

ALABAMA

Alabama Rivers Alliance, Black Warrior Riverkeeper, Cahaba River Society, Hurricane Creekkeeper/Friends of Hurricane Creek.

ALASKA

Alaska Community Action on Toxics, Cook Inletkeeper, Inc.

ARKANSAS

The Earth Cause Organization.

CALIFORNIA

Audubon California, Better Urban Green Strategies, Butte Environmental Council, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, Californians for Pesticide Reform, Coast Action Group, Dolphin Swimming and Boating Club, Environment California, Environmental Protection Information Center, Friends of Five Creeks, Friends of Gualala River, Friends of the Petaluma River, Golden Gate Audubon Society, Humboldt Baykeeper, Inland Empire Waterkeeper, Klamath Forest Alliance, Klamath Riverkeeper, L.A. Waterkeeper, Lawyers for Clean Water, Madrone Audubon Society, Northern California River Watch, Orange County Coastkeeper, Pesticide Watch, Pesticide-Free Sacramento, Pesticide-Free Zone, Planning and Conservation League, Russian River Watershed Protection Committee, Russian Riverkeeper, Sacramento Audubon Society, Inc., Safe Alternatives for Our Forest Environment, Safety Without Added Toxins, San Diego

Coastkeeper, San Francisco Baykeeper, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters, San Francisco Tomorrow, Stop the Spray East Bay, The Bay Institute, Turtle Island Restoration Network.

COLORADO

Colorado Riverkeeper.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Potomac Riverkeeper.

FLORIDA

Emerald Coastkeeper, Indian Riverkeeper, Miami Waterkeeper, St. Johns Riverkeeper, Choctawhatchee Riverkeeper, Apalachicola Riverkeeper.

GEORGIA

Altamaha Riverkeeper and Altamaha Coastkeeper, Ogeechee Riverkeeper, Satilla Riverkeeper, Savannah Riverkeeper.

IDAHO

Idaho Conservation League, Lake Pend Oreille Waterkeeper, Saint John's Organic Farm, Silver Valley Waterkeeper.

ILLINOIS

Illinois Council of Trout Unlimited, Prairie Rivers Network.

IOWA

Quad Cities Riverkeeper.

KANSAS

Kansas Riverkeeper.

KENTUCKY

Kentucky Waterways Alliance.

LOUISIANA

Atchafalaya Basinkeeper, Louisiana Bayoukeeper, Ouachita Riverkeeper.

MAINE

Casoco Baykeeper.

MARYLAND

Gunpowder Riverkeeper, Patuxent Riverkeeper, West/Rhode Riverkeeper, Assateague Coastkeeper/Assateague Coastal Trust.

MICHIGAN

Detroit Riverkeeper, Flint Riverkeeper, Grand Traverse Baykeeper.

MISSOURI

Saint Louis Confluence Riverkeeper.

MONTANA

Big Blackfoot Riverkeeper.

NEBRASKA

Western Nebraska Resources Council.

NEW JERSEY

Hackensack Riverkeeper, Inc., Raritan Riverkeeper.

NEW YORK

Buffalo Niagara Riverkeeper, Environmental Advocates, Hudson Riverkeeper, Lake George Waterkeeper, Long Island Soundkeeper, Peconic Baykeeper, Save The River/Upper St. Lawrence Riverkeeper.

NORTH CAROLINA

Toxic Free NC, Watauga Riverkeeper.

OKLAHOMA

Grand Riverkeeper.

OREGON

Beyond Toxics, Forestland Dwellers, Northwest Environmental Defense Center, Oregon Environmental Council, Oregon Wild, Rogue Riverkeeper, Tualatin Riverkeepers.

PENNSYLVANIA

Lower Susquehanna Riverkeeper.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Charleston Waterkeeper, Santee Riverkeeper.

TENNESSEE

Tennessee Riverkeeper.

TEXAS

Galveston Baykeeper.

VIRGINIA

Blackwater Nottoway Riverkeeper Program, Shenandoah Riverkeeper.

WASHINGTON

Puget Soundkeeper Alliance, Spokane Riverkeeper.

WEST VIRGINIA

Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition.

INTERNATIONAL

Waterkeeper Alliance, Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Northcoast Environmental Center, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, Northwest Center for Alternatives for Pesticides, Save Our Wild Salmon Coalition.

SOUTH

Southern Environmental Law Center, Catawba Riverkeeper Foundation, Gulf Restoration Network.

NORTHEAST

Housatonic River Initiative, Toxics Action Center, New York/New Jersey Baykeeper.

MID-ATLANTIC

Assateague Coastkeeper/Assateague Coastal Trust.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, there is one other thing that I want to bring to the attention of this committee. One of the potential human health applications related to unregulated discharges to water is drinking water.

In May of 2017, the Natural Resources Defense Council released a report entitled, "Threats on Tap," that documented potentially harmful contaminants in tap water in every State of the Union. This report, based on information obtained from State and local public drinking water utilities, documented tens of thousands of drinking water violations related to chemicals and other contaminants currently found in our domestic water supply.

The report included a focus on synthetic organic compounds commonly found in a wide variety of products, from household cleaners to industrial, commercial, and agricultural products, including pesticides and herbicides regulated under FIFRA.

□ 1545

According to this report, human exposure to these contaminants can lead to cancers—I repeat, lead to cancers—developmental effects, central nervous system, and reproductive difficulties, endocrine issues, or liver and kidney problems.

According to an appendix of this report, which I include in today's RECORD, in 2015, there were 6,864 drinking water violations associated with synthetic organic compounds, potentially affecting as many as 2.6 million drinking water users. Of these, a number were for direct, health-related violations affecting more than 300,000 indi-

viduals. This report documented ongoing drinking water violations for the worst of the worst pesticides in terms of human health effects, including, atrazine, chlordane, endrin, and glyphosate.

Mr. Chairman, thanks to this report, we have more information on exactly where these drinking water violations are occurring and how increased use of pesticides on or near water increases the risk that humans will be exposed to these dangerous chemicals when they turn on the tap; which begs the question: Why the proponents of this bill want to reduce the public disclosure and monitoring requirements of the Clean Water Act relating to pesticide applications?

Do these proponents want to let these pesticide applications and chemical companies go back in the shadows where information on the release of pesticides is no longer known?

I include in the RECORD a list of chemicals and their potential health impact.

SYNTHETIC ORGANIC CHEMICALS REGULATED BY THE U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Chemical, Source, Potential Health Impact, MCL (PPB), MCLG (PPB), Number of Violations in 2015 are as follows: 2,3,7,8-TCDD (dioxin), Emissions from waste incineration and other combustion; discharge from chemical factories, Reproductive difficulties; increased risk of cancer, 0.00003, 0, 124; 2,4,5-TP, Residue of banned herbicide, Liver problems, 50, 50, 214; 2,4-D, Runoff from herbicide used on row crops, Kidney, liver, or adrenal gland problems; possible cancer risk, 70, 70, 232; Alachlor, Runoff from herbicide used on row crops, Eye, liver, kidney, or spleen problems; anemia; increased risk of cancer, 2, 0, 0; Aldicarb, Runoff/leaching from pesticides, Nausea, diarrhea, and relatively minor neurological symptoms, 3, 1, 32; Aldicarb sulfone, Runoff/leaching from pesticides, Nausea, diarrhea, and relatively minor neurological symptoms, 2, 1, 32; Aldicarb sulfoxide, Runoff/leaching from pesticides, Nausea, diarrhea, and relatively minor neurological symptoms, 4, 1, 32; Atrazine, Runoff from herbicide used on row crops, Cardiovascular system or reproductive problems; possible cancer risk, 3, 3, 263; Benzo(a)pyrene, Leaching from linings of water storage tanks and distribution lines, Reproductive difficulties; increased risk of cancer, 0.2, 0, 246; Carbofuran, Leaching of soil fumigant used on rice and alfalfa, Problems with blood, nervous system, or reproductive system, 40, =40, 255.

Chlordane, Residue of banned termiticide, Liver or nervous system problems; increased risk of cancer, 2, 0, 255; DBCP (1,2-dibromo-3-chloropropane), Runoff/leaching from soil fumigant used on soybeans, cotton, pineapples, and orchards, Reproductive difficulties, increased risk of cancer, 0.2, 0, 166; Dalapon, Runoff from herbicide used on rights-of-way, Minor kidney changes, 200, 200, 213; Di(ethylhexyl)-adipate, Discharge from chemical factories, Weight loss, liver problems, possible reproductive difficulties, 400, 400, 253; Di(ethylhexyl)-phthalate, Discharge from rubber and chemical factories, Reproductive difficulties; liver problems; increased risk of cancer, 6, 0, 286; Dinoseb, Runoff from herbicide used on soybeans and vegetables,

Reproductive difficulties, 7, 7, 215; Diquat, Runoff from herbicide use, Cataracts, 20, 20, 147; EDB (ethylene dibromide), Discharge from petroleum refineries, Problems with liver, stomach, reproductive system, or kidneys; increased risk of cancer, 0.05, 0, 177; Endothall, Runoff from herbicide use, Stomach and intestinal problems, 100, 100, 150; Endrin, Residue of banned insecticide, Liver problems, 2, 2, 230.

Glyphosate, Runoff from herbicide use, Kidney problems; reproductive difficulties, 700, 700, 150; Heptachlor, Residue of banned termiticide, Liver damage, increased risk of cancer, 0.4, 0, 258; Heptachlor epoxide, Breakdown of heptachlor, Liver damage; increased risk of cancer, 0.2, 0, 258; Hexachlorobenzene, Discharge from metal refineries and agricultural chemical factories, Liver or kidney problems; reproductive difficulties; increased risk of cancer, 1, 0, 224; Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Discharge from chemical factories, Kidney or stomach problems, 50, 50, 269; Lindane, Runoff/leaching from insecticide used on cattle, lumber, gardens, Liver or kidney problems, 0.2, 0.2, 0; Methoxychlor, Runoff/leaching from insecticide used on fruits, vegetables, alfalfa, livestock, Reproductive difficulties, 40, 40, 257; Oxamyl, Runoff/leaching from insecticide used on apples, potatoes, and tomatoes, Slight nervous system effects, 200, 200, 255; PCBs, Runoff from landfills; discharge of waste chemicals, Skin changes; thymus gland problems; immune deficiencies; reproductive or nervous system difficulties, increased risk of cancer, 0.5, 0, 214; Pentachlorophenol, Discharge from wood preserving factories, Liver or kidney problems; increased cancer risk, 1, 0, 220; Simazine, Herbicide runoff, Blood problems, 4, 4, 255; Toxaphene, Runoff/leaching from insecticide used on cotton and cattle, Kidney, liver, or thyroid problems, increased risk of cancer, 3, 0, 222.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I just implore all our colleagues to take a good look at what this can have an effect on our general populace, I mean, the human impact, and I trust that they will vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In my closing, I just want to really reemphasize the importance to pass this bill and get it signed into law because the environment is at risk, human safety is at risk, human health is at risk. We have over 100 Zika outbreaks currently in the United States. We have hundreds of West Nile outbreaks. And what this bill does is it puts a tool in the toolbox for our mosquito control districts, an additional tool to help eradicate or control the mosquito population to prevent and protect human health around our citizens.

There has been a lot of talk about pesticide chemicals in the water, and some of these chemicals that have been mentioned are what we call legacy chemicals that were used years ago. As a farmer, I can tell you some of the chemicals we used when I started farming in 1975 didn't break down. They weren't biodegradable.

The industry has changed a lot. We have new chemicals, better chemicals,

safer chemicals. Many of them are biodegradable. So these legacy issues are not—the contaminants in a lot of the water today isn't from chemicals being used in today's agricultural environment, but it is from past years because those chemicals last in the environment for many years.

I think it is also important that the former Secretary of Agriculture—I stated earlier—Tom Vilsack, was very concerned about this, and he sent a letter to the EPA Administrator at the time, Lisa Jackson, that this court case doesn't do anything to help protect the environment or protect water quality in the United States, and it adds additional costs and burdens to our agricultural producers in their efforts to produce the wholesome, safe, affordable food supply to feed the world.

This is commonsense legislation, and I urge people to vote for H.R. 953. As has been said earlier, this bill has been up several other times in previous Congresses; it has had strong bipartisan support. Unfortunately, the Senate did not move on it and take action. Hopefully this time we will see that, especially with the outbreaks of Zika and West Nile and seeing the cost.

It was mentioned earlier, too, about the cost of getting the permit. Obviously, doing the permit, actually applying it probably isn't much costly, but to get all the stuff lined up, the consultants and all the paperwork they have to do to get the information there is quite costly.

We had in previous committee hearings mosquito control districts coming in and talking about the cost. The thousands of dollars they are spending has blown their budget where they could be using that to spend on mosquito eradication.

So, obviously, we have hundreds of groups around the country that support this legislation. It is needed, and I urge my colleagues to support it so we can move on and protect the environment, enhance the environment, and also human health and safety.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-21. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 953

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.

Section 3(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5) USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.—Except as provided in section 402(s) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Administrator or a State may not require a permit under such Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under this Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide."

SEC. 3. DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.

Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(s) DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.—

"(1) NO PERMIT REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a permit shall not be required by the Administrator or a State under this Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.

"(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the following discharges of a pesticide or pesticide residue:

"(A) A discharge resulting from the application of a pesticide in violation of a provision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act that is relevant to protecting water quality, if—

"(i) the discharge would not have occurred but for the violation; or

"(ii) the amount of pesticide or pesticide residue in the discharge is greater than would have occurred without the violation.

"(B) Stormwater discharges subject to regulation under subsection (p).

"(C) The following discharges subject to regulation under this section:

"(i) Manufacturing or industrial effluent.

"(ii) Treatment works effluent.

"(iii) Discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, including a discharge resulting from ballasting operations or vessel biofouling prevention."

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115-145. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY OF CONNECTICUT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-145.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, after line 2, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent subparagraphs of the quoted matter accordingly):

“(B) A discharge that contains any active or inactive ingredient identified on the list of toxic pollutants established pursuant to section 307(a)(1) of this Act, the list of extremely hazardous substances established pursuant to section 302(a) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11002(a)), the list of toxic chemicals established pursuant to section 313(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 11023(c)), or the list of hazardous substances established pursuant to section 102 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9602).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 348, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 953, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017. The underlying bill is overly broad, and not only risks public health, but also endangers our agricultural lands by needlessly contaminating our water.

Let me be clear: I support eliminating unnecessary regulatory burdens. In fact, if you ask every Representative whether they support getting rid of duplicative or unnecessary regulations, you would probably get 435 yeas. However, the regulations here are far from unwarranted.

There is a compelling reason why the Environmental Protection Agency stepped in to protect the American public and our water from unnecessary harms from pesticides. Under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, FIFRA, the EPA is charged with registering all pesticides that are made and sold in the United States. But FIFRA does not take into account when, where, and how pesticides are applied.

Applying a pesticide to crop land has a dramatically different consequence to the environment than when it is sprayed directly into or over or on bodies of water. So that is why, under the Clean Water Act, pesticide general permits are now required for pesticide applications in, over, or on water.

Folks are only required to apply for a pesticide general permit when they want to release biological or chemical pesticides into, over, or on waters of the United States. A PGP is often required for control of the following pests: mosquitoes, vegetation and algae, animal pests, areawide pests, and forest-canopy pests.

Now, I would like to clarify some misconceptions that we have heard discussed here this afternoon. Claims that the pesticide general permits recklessly harms American agriculture are simply not true. For 6 years now, the pesticide general permit has been in place. Farmers and forestry operators have had successful growing seasons and have provided important products to the United States around the world.

Congressional testimony has revealed no report of a pesticide applicator being unable to apply pesticide in a timely manner. Assertions that the pesticide general permit prevents us from combating the Zika virus are also untrue.

When special circumstances arise, public health outbreaks like the Zika virus or West Nile, special exemptions allow applicators to spray pesticides and apply for permits after the fact. The post-pesticide application process is simple, and it works.

The bottom line is that limiting the amount of pesticides that are sprayed into our lakes, rivers, and streams, into our drinking water supplies, is common sense.

In my home State of Connecticut, pesticide contamination in residential drinking water has been a Statewide problem for a long time. Some of my constituents have gone for years living with stomach pain, hair loss, body numbness, skin rashes, not knowing the cause of their ailments. Test results have revealed pesticides were the cause.

That is why I stand here today to offer an amendment that would ensure that we keep existing clean water protections in place so that we can protect our waters and agricultural lands in the long run.

My amendment would retain existing Clean Water Act accountability for the most toxic chemicals and hazardous substances commonly used in pesticides today.

Should we would try to find a way to streamline the application process for a pesticide general permit?

Of course. But a blanket exemption with complete disregard for clean water, the ecosystem, and public health makes this underlying bill unwarranted and unwise.

We must work together in this Congress to protect our waterways, ensure a healthy food and water supply, while also protecting our public health.

Mr. Chair, I encourage all of my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chair, a couple of points I would like to make. When my colleague from Connecticut talked about spraying chemicals, pesticides over water, the EPA has full authority, full jurisdiction to restrict those pesticides, how they are used, when they are used, and also who is using them; and they can restrict it to a manner where the applicator has to have specific training. And there is nothing to stop the EPA to say that if you are going to spray over a body of water, you have to notify the EPA. The EPA has that authority. They have the jurisdiction to do that.

I think it is also interesting to mention when talking about spraying and getting a permit after the fact, yeah, that if the local entity declares an emergency, then they can go in. But my argument is that since this additional permitting requirement, this additional red tape bureaucracy is stopping the preventive programs, so we shouldn't have to get to an emergency situation where we just spray and do the permit after the fact.

But her amendment, H.R. 953 eliminates the duplicative, expansive, and unnecessary permit process, and helps free up resources for States, counties, and local governments to better combat the spread of diseases like Zika and West Nile virus. This amendment, in effect, undermines these efforts.

The amendment intends to make the bill's exemption from the Clean Water Act permitting ineffective by carving out from the bill those waters that may receive a discharge containing any one of several hundred listed chemical substances. The vast majority of substances referenced in this amendment are not even a pesticide and have nothing to do with the regulation of a pesticide.

Additionally, a discharge covered under this amendment does not have to be related in any way to the use or application of a pesticide. The net effect of this amendment is to undermine the bill based on circumstances that have nothing whatsoever to do with the use of a pesticide.

Further, the amendment would require a pesticide user to conduct extremely expensive and time-consuming monitoring. This defeats the bill's purpose of reducing the regulatory burdens. I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), the subcommittee ranking member.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY). The amendment would help ensure the protection of public health from discharges of toxic chemicals such as benzene, chlordane, and vinyl chloride.

In my view, the protection of our families and children from seemingly limitless exposure to toxic chemicals in our air and our water and our neighborhoods should be paramount, yet here we are today considering legislation to waive the simple requirement that a chemical pesticide sprayer fill out an application providing notice of

where he intends to spray known toxic chemicals, such as the ones I mentioned, all known to have toxic effects on humans.

The amendment under consideration says that we should, at a minimum, disclose and monitor the dangerous chemicals for potential toxic effects. These are chemicals that Congress has already designated as “toxic,” “hazardous substances,” or “extreme hazardous substances” in Federal statute.

As Congress, we should want to make sure that these dangerous chemicals do not wind up in our rivers and streams, potentially contaminating our local drinking water sources and leading to greater toxic exposure by our families and children.

□ 1600

The level of protection is worth 10 minutes of time by a commercial pesticide applicator.

Mr. Chair, I approve Ms. ESTY's amendment.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chair, I just urge the Members to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-145.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, after line 13, add the following:

SEC. 4. PROTECTION OF FISHERIES.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall prevent the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency or a State from requiring a permit under section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for any discharge (as defined in such Act) that would have a negative effect on commercial, recreational, or subsistence fisheries, or on fisheries protected by Tribal treaty rights, as determined by the Administrator or the State, as applicable, based on the best available science.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 348, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to offer this amendment and to speak against the underlying bill.

Unfortunately, I wasn't serving the House in 2011 when this bill was first brought to the floor. I was here in 2014, when the bill was brought up again, twice. I was here, also, in 2016, when it was brought up twice.

This bill has gone through a number of name changes, but its intent remains the same, and that is, to allow the irresponsible application of pesticides into our Nation's waterways. Undermining the Clean Water Act, as this bill does, means taking the EPA out of the picture, blocking them from weighing in on pesticides that are dumped into rivers, lakes, and streams, without regard to the impacts of human health, or to those who rely on recreational, commercial, and Tribal fisheries.

We know, unfortunately, that despite efforts to regulate pesticides for public health and safety, these dangerous chemicals continue to be detected in surface and groundwater bodies at dangerous levels. Impacts to fish and wildlife have been significant, and have already been devastating in some instances. Oysters, shrimp, sea trout, and redbfish—four of the most important species to food webs, fishermen, and the economy along the Southeast and Gulf Coasts—have shown effects ranging from impaired survival skills, to damaged DNA, to death as a result of exposure to pesticides that have been approved for agricultural use.

In 2006, USGS released its review on pesticide occurrence and concentrations in streams and groundwater. According to this report, at least one pesticide was detected in water from all streams tested throughout the Nation. In addition, chemicals such as DDT, which has been banned in the U.S. for decades, were still showing up, found in fish tissues sampled across watersheds nationwide.

We see a similar situation at the State level. In my State of California, pesticides are among the top sources of water quality impairments in the State. 437 waterbodies are impaired by 40 different categories of pesticides. That is why commercial fishing groups oppose the underlying bill.

My amendment will ensure that we don't deny either the EPA or a State their ability to require permits for pesticide use that could have negative effects on fisheries. Let's make sure that streams and rivers that support fish are clean. Let's make sure that the fish we catch, eat, and sell are free from toxic chemicals. America's fisheries are a backbone of both sport fishing and commercial fishing industries.

The recreational sector alone accounts for more than \$115 billion of our country's economy, and it employs more than 828,000 people. My amend-

ment would protect these recreational activities, not only for current generations but for future generations of anglers to come.

By accidentally contaminating our waterways, pesticides also exacerbate the precarious status of endangered and threatened species. In 1996, the death of over 90,000 steelhead fish, 100 coho salmon, and thousands of nongame fish resulted from an herbicide called acrolein that entered the waterways in Bear Creek, Oregon. Many wild salmon stocks are now on the brink of extinction on the West Coast, and losses in such sensitive populations make recovery efforts increasingly difficult.

Pesticides can pose a dangerous threat to commercial fisheries. In 1999, a massive lobster die-off devastated the lives and livelihoods of Connecticut and New York lobstermen along the Long Island Sound, producing a multimillion-dollar settlement with pesticide manufacturers mishandling the chemical malathion.

Similar concern has brought forth proposals to regulate methoprene and resmethrin in Maine in order to protect their commercial fishery, which is worth over \$700 million.

Mr. Chair, I have letters of support here for my amendment from the American Sportfishing Association, Trout Unlimited, the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, the Karuk Tribe, the Winnemem Wintu Tribe, the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, Seafood Harvesters of America, and other organizations who are very interested in this amendment, and support it.

MAY 24, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As the House considers H.R. 953, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017, we the undersigned groups representing millions of hunters and anglers across the nation, urge you to ensure that H.R. 953 does not negatively impact water quality, fish health and the recreational fishing industry by supporting Amendment #3, sponsored by Representative Jared Huffman.

The Huffman Amendment protects fisheries and water quality by ensuring any pesticide spraying into or over waterways that would negatively impact our nation's fisheries is properly monitored and permitted. The 47 million sportsmen and women that hunt and fish each year depend on strong Clean Water Act protections to ensure thriving fish populations that are safe to eat and the Huffman amendment would ensure it continues to do so.

America's hunters and anglers contribute more than \$200 billion to America's economy each year and this robust outdoor economy depends on healthy rivers, lakes, and streams. Nearly 2,000 waterways in the United States are known to be impaired because of pesticides, and, even at low levels, pesticides pose a particularly concerning threat to fish and wildlife populations. Without protective federal safeguards in place to regulate pesticides applied to our waterways, sportsmen and women will have access to fewer quality hunting and fishing opportunities.

On behalf of our millions of members and conservation-minded hunters, anglers, and wildlife enthusiasts, we urge you to support this common-sense measure to safeguard our water resources and outdoor heritage and support the Huffman amendment.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN BULIS,
*AFFTA President,
American Fly Fish-
ing Trade Associa-
tion.*

JOHN W. GALE,
*Conservation Director,
Backcountry Hunt-
ers & Anglers.*

ADAM KOLTON,
*Vice President, Na-
tional Advocacy,
National Wildlife
Federation.*

STEVE MOYER,
*Vice President, Gov-
ernment Affairs,
Trout Unlimited.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 23, 2017.
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of thousands of tribal, commercial, and recreational fishermen who depend on healthy fisheries for their subsistence, traditional cultural practices, businesses, and recreational enjoyment, we write to urge you to vote YES on the Huffman amendment to H.R. 953. The amendment would ensure that existing Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA) permitting requirements for point source polluters remain in place when science clearly indicates they are needed to protect fisheries.

Under §402 of the FWPCA, the Administrator of the EPA may issue permits for point source discharges of approved pesticides, herbicides, and fungicides into navigable waters, which are also inhabited by many important and valuable fish species that are worth billions of dollars to fishermen and anglers each year. H.R. 953 would eliminate the EPA's permitting authority for approved pesticides, herbicides, and fungicides discharged into navigable waters. Many of these chemicals, despite their approval for agricultural use, are known to be seriously harmful to iconic fish species including salmon and trout, jeopardizing their survival and posing a risk to the food supply.

Congressman Huffman's amendment to H.R. 953 would simply leave EPA permitting requirements in place for the dumping of pesticides, herbicides, and fungicides into our streams and rivers when they are known to pose a significant risk to fisheries. We ask that you support this amendment in order to keep America's fisheries and strong fishing traditions alive, safe, and prosperous. If you have any questions, please call Noah Oppenheim, Executive Director of the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations.

Sincerely,

Noah Oppenheim, Executive Director, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations; Leaf Hillman, Director, Department of Natural Resources, Karuk Tribe; Caleen Sisk, Chief, Winnemem Wintu Tribe; Robert Vandermark, Executive Director, Marine Fish Conservation Network; Kevin Wheeler, Executive Director, Seafood Harvesters of America; Roger Thomas, President, Golden Gate Salmon Association; Bob Rees, Executive Director, Association of Northwest Steelheaders;

Linda Behnken, Executive Director, Alaska Longline Fishermen's Association; Grant Putnam, President, Northwest Guides and Anglers Association; Benjamin Bulis, President, American Fly Fishing Trade Association; Lyf Gildersleeve, Owner, Flying Fish Company; Kevin Scribner, Chief Executive Officer, Forever Wild Seafood; Cynthia Sarthou, Executive Director, Gulf Restoration Network.

COLUMBIA RIVER INTER-TRIBAL
FISH COMMISSION,
Portland, OR, May 23, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Democratic Leader of the House of Representa-
tives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC) and our member tribes—the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, and the Nez Perce Tribe, I would like to share our support for the amendment offered by Mr. Huffman to H.R. 953—Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017. The amendment specifically preserves the ability of the EPA Administrator or a State to require permits necessary to protect fisheries including Tribal treaty fisheries from harmful discharges of FIFRA approved pesticides.

Tribal members are justifiably concerned about the impact of water quality on the natural resources of the Columbia River system. Our member tribes' right to abundant, healthy fish is guaranteed by the 1855 treaties with the United States. A century's worth of federal court decisions has established beyond dispute that these treaty fishing rights are permanent in nature, and that they secure for the tribes the right to take all species of fish found throughout their reserved fishing areas for subsistence, ceremonial and commercial purposes. Tribal treaties are the supreme law of the land, and federal agencies and States must interpret designated uses to include subsistence fishing and must protect fishable waters. Pesticides can wreak havoc on the health of the habitat and associated food webs that support our fisheries. They can disrupt water quality conditions and the availability of natural riparian and aquatic vegetation cover as well as the abundance of aquatic invertebrates and fishes that support the growth and maturation of salmonid species. Our tribes recognize that the health and future of our tribal fisheries require clean, cold water that is free of contaminants.

Regulations should be efficient, just, and effective, and necessarily must provide the EPA and States with the authority to protect the unique habitat and food web system that is essential to the health of our tribal fisheries. Thank you for your consideration of these comments. If you have any further questions please contact me or Dianne Barton, PhD.

Sincerely,

JAIME A. PINKHAM,
CRITFC Executive Director.

AMERICAN SPORTFISHING
ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, May 23, 2017.

Hon. JARED HUFFMAN,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUFFMAN: On behalf of the nation's recreational fishing industry, the American Sportfishing Association (ASA) would like to be on record as supporting your amendment to H.R. 953. This amendment leaves EPA permitting requirements in place for the dumping of pesticides, herbicides, and fungicides into our streams and rivers when they are known to pose a significant risk to fisheries.

America's fisheries are an economic powerhouse and the backbone of the sportfishing and commercial fishing industries. America's recreational anglers generate more than \$48 billion in retail sales with a \$115 billion impact on the nation's economy; creating employment for more than 828,000 people.

Our industry depends on clean water for continued healthy and abundant fisheries. There are certain chemicals used for various on-land industry operations that are known to be incredibly harmful to fish development and survival when released into waterways. The Administrator of the EPA currently enforces permitting requirements for the disposal of these chemicals into our streams and rivers. Your amendment would ensure that existing Federal Water Pollution Control Act permitting requirements for point-source polluters (§402) remain in place when science indicates they are needed to conserve fisheries.

"The Huffman amendment" is needed because the original legislation, H.R. 953, would eliminate this permitting authority for all approved pesticides, herbicides, and fungicides discharged into streams and rivers; even when they are known to pose a significant risk to fisheries.

We appreciate your leadership and understanding of the importance of clean water to fishing and the outdoor recreational economy.

Sincerely,

SCOTT GUDER,
Vice President of Government Affairs.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I prefer butter on my lobster rolls, not toxic pesticides. Let's make sure that States maintain their authority to prudently protect their economies and public health from pesticide impacts.

I urge an "aye" vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chair, well, that was a lot of drama. Let's not lose sight that what we are trying to do in H.R. 953 is to free up the resources so States, counties, local governments can fight the mosquito population, fight Zika, fight the West Nile virus, and let our agricultural producers have the most efficient way to protect the environment, and also produce a safe, wholesome food supply.

This amendment undermines the base bill. The amendment intends to carve out from the bill those waters that have a discharge of any type. That

means the way this amendment is written, any type of discharge—even if it is not a pesticide—any type of discharge, a nutrient discharge, anything would fall under this and undermines the bill. This amendment covers all types of discharges. I think that is important to mention.

In addition, most waterbodies in this country are fishable, and, therefore, subject to this amendment's carve-out. As a result, the types of discharges and waterbodies in question under this amendment do not need to be related at all to the actual regulation of a pesticide.

Further, the amendment would require that a pesticide user conduct extremely expensive and time-consuming monitoring. Moreover, the amendment's standard of any negative effect is vague and subjective and could include an effect that has nothing to do with a pesticide.

Registered pesticides already take into account aquatic species' and fisheries' health into consideration during the registration process. I think it is important that they go through a rigorous testing process, and more testing, and the EPA has full control. They can reject that. If they determine that a pesticide is environmentally harmful, or potentially harmful, they can pull that product off.

They can also restrict the product even more so, and restrict who the applicators are, and there is nothing to stop the EPA or the State EPAs to say: Before you apply a pesticide over a waterbody, you need to tell us first before you do it.

There is nothing to stop the EPA from doing that.

So all this amendment does, it defeats the bill's purpose, reducing the regulatory burdens, and I urge my Members to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I just want to point out that some States may want to put their efforts into protecting water quality and the health of their fisheries and their ecosystems, rather than just carpet-bombing waterways with pesticides.

This amendment says, those States have the authority to do that if they choose to.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I totally support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN). If this amendment is adopted, it would maintain the existing Clean Water Act

general permit requirements to protect commercial, recreational, and subsistence fisheries, and Tribal treaty obligations. I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chair, I will just say that the comment about this amendment would allow States to do it, I don't think there is anything to stop the States from doing it now. If States want to do more to protect water quality in their States, I think they have the right to do that.

Under the Clean Water Act, what it says is: The States will implement and enforce the Clean Water Act under the guidance of the Federal Government, but they have to be, at the least, a standard of the Federal Government. They can exceed that standard if they want, so I don't think there is anything stopping that.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and support the underlying bill.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-145 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. HUFFMAN of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY OF CONNECTICUT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 229, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

AYES—191

Adams	Fudge	Murphy (FL)
Aguilar	Gabbard	Nadler
Barragán	Gallego	Napolitano
Bass	Garamendi	Neal
Beatty	Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross
Bera	Gottheimer	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Al	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Panetta
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pascarell
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Payne
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Peters
Brady (PA)	Heck	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Polis
Bustos	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Huffman	Quigley
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Carbajal	Jayapal	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Rosen
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Roskam
Castor (FL)	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Ciçilline	Keating	Rush
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Sánchez
Clay	Khanna	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kilmer	Schiff
Cohen	Kind	Schneider
Connolly	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Kuster (NH)	Scott, David
Cooper	Lance	Serrano
Correa	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Costello (PA)	Larsen (WA)	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Crist	Lawrence	Sinema
Crowley	Lawson (FL)	Sires
Cuellar	Lee	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Levin	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Danny	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lieu, Ted	Soto
DeGette	Lipinski	Speier
Delaney	LoBiondo	Suozi
DeLauro	Loeb sack	Takano
DelBene	Lofgren	Thompson (CA)
Demings	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Lowe y	Titus
Deutch	Lujan Grisham,	Tonko
Dingell	M.	Torres
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael F.	Lynch	Vargas
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Engel	Matsui	Vela
Eshoo	McCollum	Velázquez
Espallat	McEachin	Visclosky
Esty (CT)	McGovern	Wasserman
Evans	McNerney	Schultz
Fitzpatrick	Meehan	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Meeks	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Welch
	Moore	Wilson (FL)
	Moulton	Yarmuth

NOES—229

Abraham	Buchanan	Davidson
Aderholt	Buck	Davis, Rodney
Allen	Bucshon	Denham
Amash	Budd	Dent
Amodei	Burgess	DeSantis
Arrington	Byrne	DesJarlais
Babin	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Bacon	Carter (GA)	Donovan
Banks (IN)	Carter (TX)	Duffy
Barletta	Chabot	Duncan (SC)
Barr	Chaffetz	Duncan (TN)
Barton	Cheney	Dunn
Bergman	Coffman	Emmer
Biggs	Cole	Estes (KS)
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Farenthold
Bishop (MI)	Collins (NY)	Faso
Bishop (UT)	Comer	Ferguson
Blackburn	Comstock	Fleischmann
Blum	Conaway	Flores
Bost	Cook	Fortenberry
Brady (TX)	Costa	Fox
Brat	Cramer	Franks (AZ)
Bridenstine	Crawford	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (AL)	Culberson	Gaetz
Brooks (IN)	Curbelo (FL)	Gallagher

Garrett	MacArthur	Rouzer
Gibbs	Marchant	Royce (CA)
Gohmert	Marino	Russell
Goodlatte	Marshall	Rutherford
Gosar	Massie	Sanford
Gowdy	Mast	Scalise
Granger	McCarthy	Schrader
Graves (GA)	McCaul	Schweikert
Graves (MO)	McClintock	Scott, Austin
Griffith	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Grothman	McKinley	Sessions
Guthrie	McMorris	Shimkus
Harper	Rodgers	Shuster
Harris	Meadows	Simpson
Hartzler	Messer	Smith (MO)
Hensarling	Mitchell	Smith (NE)
Herrera Beutler	Moolenaar	Smith (TX)
Hice, Jody B.	Mooney (WV)	Smucker
Higgins (LA)	Mullin	Stefanik
Hill	Murphy (PA)	Stewart
Holding	Noem	Stivers
Hollingsworth	Nolan	Taylor
Hudson	Nunes	Tenney
Huizenga	O'Halleran	Thompson (PA)
Hultgren	Olson	Thornberry
Hunter	Palazzo	Tiberi
Hurd	Palmer	Tipton
Issa	Paulsen	Trott
Jenkins (KS)	Pearce	Turner
Jenkins (WV)	Perry	Upton
Johnson (LA)	Peterson	Valadao
Johnson (OH)	Pittenger	Wagner
Jordan	Poe (TX)	Walberg
Katko	Poliquin	Walden
Kelly (MS)	Posey	Walker
Kelly (PA)	Ratcliffe	Walorski
King (IA)	Reed	Walters, Mimi
King (NY)	Reichert	Walz
Kinzinger	Renacci	Weber (TX)
Knight	Rice (SC)	Webster (FL)
Kustoff (TN)	Roby	Wenstrup
Labrador	Roe (TN)	Westerman
LaHood	Rogers (AL)	Williams
LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
Lamborn	Rohrabacher	Wittman
Latta	Rokita	Womack
Lewis (MN)	Rooney, Francis	Woodall
Long	Rooney, Thomas	Yoder
Loudermilk	J.	Yoho
Love	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
Lucas	Ross	Young (IA)
Luetkemeyer	Rothfus	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Black	Kihuen	Newhouse
Cummings	Maloney	Perlmutter
Graves (LA)	Carolyn B.	Swalwell (CA)
Johnson, Sam	McSally	

□ 1637

Messrs. WEBSTER of Florida, CHAFFETZ, WITTMAN, BANKS of Indiana, ESTES of Kansas, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Messrs. CURBELO of Florida and WOODALL changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CLAY, Ms. MOORE, Messrs. LANCE, MEEHAN, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. CASTOR of Florida was allowed to speak out of order.)

FIFTH ANNUAL CAPITAL SOCCER CLASSIC

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as the co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Soccer Caucus, along with my co-chairs, Representative DON BACON, DARIN LAHOOD, and ERIC SWALWELL, I am pleased to inform the House that last night a group of bipartisan Members came together to play in the fifth annual Capital Soccer Clas-

sic, a charity benefit for the U.S. Soccer Foundation and children in underserved areas across the country.

The U.S. Soccer Foundation transforms abandoned fields and vacant lots into state-of-the-art soccer fields to create safe places where kids can play. The U.S. Soccer Foundation also partners with our local communities back home for free afterschool programs to help kids establish healthy habits: put the cellphones aside, turn off the TV, get outside, and learn good sportsmanship.

The Republican team was very tough: Congressmen DON BACON, DARIN LAHOOD, GUS BILIRAKIS, STEVE KNIGHT, ERIK PAULSEN, and DAVID VALADAO, who scored for the Republican team. We had a number of outstanding congressional staff and former professional soccer stars as well, but they were not enough for the Democratic team. The Democratic team notched a 5-3 victory to deliver this trophy for America's blue team.

Great fun was had by all. We would like to invite you to join us next year because the real winners are the kids across the country and the opportunity to be healthy and well.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, it was an honor to be able to have a bipartisan game out there and have a good time.

Soccer keeps children in shape. Thousands and thousands of our kids get to play this every year. We also stay in shape. It also teaches them teamwork and how to follow the rules, and they become better citizens.

I had to do an ibuprofen this morning.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 230, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—189

Adams	Fudge	Neal
Aguilar	Gabbard	Norcross
Barragán	Gallego	O'Halleran
Bass	Garamendi	O'Rourke
Beatty	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Bera	Gottheimer	Panetta
Beyer	Green, Al	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Payne
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pelosi
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Peters
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Heck	Pocan
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Price (NC)
Bustos	Hoyer	Quigley
Butterfield	Huffman	Raskin
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Carbajal	Jayapal	Richmond
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rosen
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Jones	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Rush
Chu, Judy	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Ciçilline	Keating	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clay	Khanna	Schiff
Cleaver	Kildee	Schneider
Clyburn	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kind	Scott, David
Connolly	Krishnamoorthi	Serrano
Conyers	Kuster (NH)	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Langevin	Shea-Porter
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Costello (PA)	Larson (CT)	Sinema
Courtney	Lawrence	Sires
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Slaughter
Crowley	Lee	Smith (NJ)
Cuellar	Levin	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Soto
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Speier
DeFazio	Lipinski	Suozzi
DeGette	Loeb sack	Takano
Delaney	Lofgren	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Lowe	Titus
Demings	Lujan Grisham, M.	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Torres
Deutch	Lynch	Tsongas
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Doggett	Matsui	Veasey
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum	Vela
Ellison	McEachin	Velázquez
Engel	McGovern	Visclosky
Eshoo	McNerney	Wasserman
Espallat	Meeks	Schultz
Esty (CT)	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Moore	Watson Coleman
Fitzpatrick	Moulton	Welch
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Yarmuth
	Napolitano	

NOES—230

Abraham	Buck	Davis, Rodney
Aderholt	Bucshon	Denham
Allen	Budd	Dent
Amash	Burgess	DeSantis
Amodei	Byrne	DesJarlais
Arrington	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Babin	Carter (GA)	Donovan
Bacon	Carter (TX)	Duffy
Banks (IN)	Chabot	Duncan (SC)
Barletta	Chaffetz	Duncan (TN)
Barr	Cheney	Dunn
Barton	Coffman	Emmer
Bergman	Cole	Estes (KS)
Biggs	Collins (GA)	Farenthold
Bilirakis	Collins (NY)	Faso
Bishop (MI)	Comer	Ferguson
Bishop (UT)	Comstock	Fleischmann
Blackburn	Conaway	Flores
Blum	Cook	Fortenberry
Bost	Costa	Fox
Brat	Cramer	Franks (AZ)
Bridenstine	Crawford	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (AL)	Culberson	Gaetz
Brooks (IN)	Curbelo (FL)	Gallagher
Buchanan	Davidson	Garrett

Gibbs	MacArthur	Rouzer
Gohmert	Marchant	Royce (CA)
Goodlatte	Marino	Russell
Gosar	Marshall	Rutherford
Gowdy	Massie	Sanford
Granger	Mast	Scalise
Graves (GA)	McCarthy	Schrader
Graves (MO)	McCaul	Schweikert
Griffith	McClintock	Scott, Austin
Grothman	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Guthrie	McKinley	Sessions
Harper	McMorris	Shimkus
Harris	Rodgers	Shuster
Hartzler	Meadows	Simpson
Hensarling	Meehan	Smith (MO)
Herrera Beutler	Messer	Smith (NE)
Hice, Jody B.	Mitchell	Smith (TX)
Higgins (LA)	Moolenaar	Smucker
Hill	Mooney (WV)	Stefanik
Holding	Mullin	Stewart
Hollingsworth	Murphy (PA)	Stivers
Hudson	Noem	Taylor
Huizenga	Nolan	Tenney
Hultgren	Nunes	Thompson (PA)
Hunter	Olson	Thornberry
Hurd	Palazzo	Tiberi
Issa	Palmer	Tipton
Jenkins (KS)	Paulsen	Troott
Jenkins (WV)	Pearce	Turner
Johnson (LA)	Perry	Upton
Johnson (OH)	Peterson	Valadao
Jordan	Pittenger	Wagner
Katko	Poe (TX)	Walberg
Kelly (MS)	Poliquin	Walden
Kelly (PA)	Posey	Walker
King (IA)	Ratcliffe	Walorski
King (NY)	Reed	Walters, Mimi
Kinzinger	Reichert	Walz
Knight	Renacci	Weber (TX)
Kustoff (TN)	Rice (SC)	Webster (FL)
Labrador	Roby	Wenstrup
LaHood	Roe (TN)	Westerman
LaMalfa	Rogers (AL)	Williams
Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	Wittman
Lance	Rohrabacher	Womack
Latta	Rokita	Woodall
Lewis (MN)	Rooney, Francis	Yoder
LoBiondo	Rooney, Thomas	Yoho
Long	J.	Young (AK)
Loudermilk	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (IA)
Love	Roskam	Zeldin
Lucas	Ross	
Luetkemeyer	Rothfus	

NOT VOTING—11

Black	Johnson, Sam	McSally
Brady (TX)	Kihuen	Newhouse
Cummings	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)
Graves (LA)	Carolyn B.	Wilson (SC)

□ 1645

Mr. O'HALLERAN changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 953) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 348, he reported the bill back to

the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McGovern moves to recommit the bill H.R. 953 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. PROTECTING AMERICAN FAMILIES FROM SPECIAL INTERESTS SEEKING TO UNDERMINE PUBLIC HEALTH THROUGH POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

This Act, including the amendments made by this Act, shall not apply to the discharge of a pesticide if the manufacturer or distributor of the pesticide has made a political contribution to the President or to any Federal official charged with registration, regulation, or approval of the use of the pesticide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say the Republicans are again bending over backwards to help corporations and the wealthiest among us while ignoring science and leaving hardworking American families to suffer the consequences. This administration's decisions have placed special interests and their financial contributions ahead of the health and the safety of our citizens, and this Republican-led House has been complicit.

Earlier this year, a toxic chemical manufacturer convinced the Trump administration to discard decades of scientific research just so they could continue to profit off of chlorpyrifos, a pesticide that has been proven to be harmful to human beings, especially infants and children. The pesticide was well on its way to being banned by the EPA, which said, in 2015, that it could not be declared safe for human health and for the environment; but the pes-

ticide manufacturer wrote a check for \$1 million to President Trump's inaugural committee, and just weeks later, the proposed ban on the pesticide was magically reversed. It is amazing how that worked out.

What I am wondering is: Did President Trump and the Republicans in Congress think we wouldn't notice? Did they think the American people would be okay with them knowingly allowing a dangerous pesticide to be used on farms and affect our food supply? Republicans should be ashamed of this blatant disregard for the health of the families they were elected to represent.

In 2000, the EPA banned most home uses of the chemical, citing risks to children, yet it continues to be used in agriculture production across this country. Does this really sound like something that should be used on the food we feed our kids?

On the campaign trail into the White House, President Trump has made clear that he will always side with deep-pocketed polluters and corporations over the health and safety of families.

In January 2017, Dow Chemical was reported to have contributed \$1 million to President Trump's inaugural committee. The CEO of Dow Chemical was a frequent guest of President-elect Trump, including at an appearance at a postelection rally in Grand Rapids, Michigan. In March 2017, EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt signed an order reversing the ban on the pesticide.

Also in March 2017, Scott Pruitt signed an order reversing the ban on this pesticide suggesting, in a statement, that "by reversing the previous administration's step to ban one of the most widely used pesticides in the world, we are returning to using sound science and decisionmaking rather than predetermined results." Public health advocacy groups strongly disagreed, not to mention conservation organizations.

Mr. Speaker, you know what? I think I trust public health experts when it comes to protecting our families over Administrator Pruitt, who sued the EPA at least 14 times as Oklahoma's attorney general opposing important protections for our air and our water. Talk about the fox guarding the henhouse.

Mr. Speaker, we were not sent here to auction off the health and safety of millions of Americans to the highest bidder. Every day the Trump administration gets more brazen with their giveaways to special interests, raising serious questions about corruption and conflicts of interest.

Donald Trump promised to drain the swamp. He has created a cesspool. We are talking about people's lives here, Mr. Speaker. This pesticide has been shown to harm women, children, and families. It has no place on our farms or in our food system. Our health should not be for sale.

It isn't hard to connect the dots here. The EPA abruptly reversed its efforts to ban a toxic chemical just weeks after the chemical's manufacturer made a political contribution to the newly elected President. And we know their decision wasn't based on science. The former head of the EPA's Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention suggested that the Trump EPA is "ignoring the science that is pretty solid" and putting farmworkers and exposed children at unnecessary risk.

Now, I can see how people might start to wonder whether this administration is on the side of special interests or the American people. This amendment fights back against the corrupting influence of political contributions from pesticide companies. It would ensure that existing science-based protections for our families and our environment cannot be overturned by a well-timed contribution to President Trump or to those in his administration charged with implementing the law.

The American people deserve to know that their leaders will stand up to protect their health and their safety rather than protecting the bottom line of wealthy special interests. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do the right thing and adopt this amendment and show the American people that our government is not for sale.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is unnecessary and aims to undermine the purpose of the bill.

The underlying bill, H.R. 953, eliminates the duplicative, expensive, and unnecessary permit process that helps free up the resources for our States, counties, and local governments to better combat the Zika, West Nile virus, and other diseases; but this motion, in effect, aims to undermine the bill.

In this motion, the bill says it will not apply to anybody who makes a discharge of a pesticide if they made a political contribution to the President or to any Federal official charged with registration, regulation, or approval of the use of a pesticide. That is utterly absurd. You can't make political contributions to regulators at the EPA.

Let's keep in mind that the EPA has full authority to regulate these pesticides, pull pesticides off the market, and regulate who applies them, and they have full authority to protect our water and our human health.

This amendment simply aims to gut the bill. It is unclear how it ever would work. We need to stop creating unnecessary roadblocks to the use of products that stand to protect public health and feed the Nation.

H.R. 953 is a good bill that will help protect public health and the environment and stop mosquitoes from spreading Zika and the West Nile virus and other diseases to our vulnerable populations.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this motion and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 230, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—183

Adams	Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky	Soto	Vela
Aguilar	Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Schiff	Speier	Velázquez
Barragán	Engel	Lipinski	Schneider	Suozi	Visclosky
Bass	F.	Loeb	Scott (VA)	Takano	Walz
Beatty	Ellison	Lofgren	Scott, David	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman
Bera	Engel	Lowenthal	Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Beyer	Eshoo	Lowe	Sewell (AL)	Titus	Watson Coleman
Bishop (GA)	Espallat	Lujan Grisham,	Shea-Porter	Tonko	Welch
Blumenauer	Esty (CT)	M.	Sinema	Torres	Wilson (FL)
Blunt Rochester	Evans	Luján, Ben Ray	Sires	Tsongas	Yarmuth
Bonamici	Foster	Lynch	Slaughter	Vargas	
Boyle, Brendan	Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)	Veasey	
F.	Fudge	Matsui			
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	McCollum			
Brown (MD)	Gallego	McEachin			
Brownley (CA)	Garamendi	McGovern			
Bustos	Gonzalez (TX)	McNerney			
Butterfield	Gottheimer	Meeks			
Capuano	Green, Al	Meng			
Carbajal	Grijalva	Moore			
Cárdenas	Gutiérrez	Moulton			
Carden (IN)	Hanabusa	Murphy (FL)			
Cartwright	Hastings	Napolitano			
Castor (FL)	Heck	Neal			
Castro (TX)	Higgins (NY)	Nolan			
Chu, Judy	Himes	Norcross			
Cicilline	Hoyer	O'Halleran			
Clark (MA)	Huffman	O'Rourke			
Clarke (NY)	Jackson Lee	Pallone			
Clay	Jayapal	Panetta			
Cleaver	Jeffries	Pascarella			
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Payne			
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi			
Connolly	Jones	Perlmutter			
Conyers	Kaptur	Peters			
Cooper	Keating	Pingree			
Correa	Kelly (IL)	Pocan			
Courtney	Kennedy	Polis			
Crist	Khanna	Price (NC)			
Crowley	Kildee	Quigley			
Cuellar	Kilmer	Raskin			
Davis (CA)	Kind	Rice (NY)			
Davis, Danny	Krishnamoorthi	Richmond			
DeFazio	Kuster (NH)	Rosen			
DeGette	Langevin	Roybal-Allard			
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz			
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger			
DeBene	Lawrence	Rush			
Demings	Lawson (FL)	Ryan (OH)			
DeSaulnier	Lee	Sánchez			
Deutch	Levin	Sarbanes			
			Abraham	Gosar	Pearce
			Aderholt	Gowdy	Perry
			Allen	Granger	Peterson
			Amash	Graves (GA)	Pittenger
			Amodei	Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)
			Arrington	Griffith	Poliquin
			Babin	Grothman	Posey
			Bacon	Guthrie	Ratcliffe
			Banks (IN)	Harper	Reed
			Barletta	Harris	Reichert
			Barr	Hartzler	Renacci
			Barton	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
			Bergman	Herrera Beutler	Roby
			Biggs	Hice, Jody B.	Roe (TN)
			Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
			Bishop (MI)	Hill	Rogers (KY)
			Bishop (UT)	Holding	Rohrabacher
			Blackburn	Hollingsworth	Rokita
			Blum	Hudson	Rooney, Francis
			Bost	Huizenga	Rooney, Thomas
			Brady (TX)	Hultgren	J.
			Brat	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
			Bridenstine	Hurd	Roskam
			Brooks (AL)	Issa	Ross
			Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Rothfus
			Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Rouzer
			Buck	Johnson (LA)	Royce (CA)
			Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Russell
			Budd	Jordan	Rutherford
			Burgess	Joyce (OH)	Sanford
			Byrne	Katko	Scalise
			Calvert	Kelly (MS)	Schrader
			Carter (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
			Carter (TX)	King (IA)	Scott, Austin
			Chabot	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
			Chaffetz	Kinzie	Sessions
			Cheney	Knight	Shimkus
			Coffman	Kustoff (TN)	Shuster
			Cole	Labrador	Simpson
			Collins (GA)	LaHood	Smith (MO)
			Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Smith (NE)
			Comer	Lamborn	Smith (NJ)
			Comstock	Lance	Smith (TX)
			Conaway	Latta	Smucker
			Cook	Lewis (MN)	Stefanik
			Costello (PA)	LoBiondo	Stewart
			Cramer	Long	Stivers
			Crawford	Loudermilk	Taylor
			Culberson	Love	Tenney
			Curbelo (FL)	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
			Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry
			Denham	MacArthur	Tiberi
			Dent	Marchant	Tipton
			DeSantis	Marino	Trott
			DesJarlais	Marshall	Turner
			Diaz-Balart	Massie	Upton
			Donovan	Mast	Valadao
			Duffy	McCarthy	Wagner
			Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Walberg
			Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Walden
			Dunn	McHenry	Walker
			Emmer	McKinley	Walorski
			Estes (KS)	McMorris	Walters, Mimi
			Farenthold	Rodgers	Weber (TX)
			Faso	Meadows	Webster (FL)
			Ferguson	Meehan	Wenstrup
			Fitzpatrick	Messer	Westerman
			Fleischmann	Mitchell	Williams
			Flores	Moolenaar	Wittman
			Fortenberry	Mooney (WV)	Womack
			Fox	Mullin	Woodall
			Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Yoder
			Gaetz	Noem	Yoho
			Gallagher	Nunes	Young (AK)
			Garrett	Olson	Young (IA)
			Gibbs	Palazzo	Zeldin
			Gohmert	Palmer	
			Goodlatte	Paulsen	

NOT VOTING—17

Black	Green, Gene	Nadler
Costa	Johnson, Sam	Newhouse
Cummings	Kihuen	Sherman
Davidson	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)
Franks (AZ)	Carolyn B.	Waters, Maxine
Graves (LA)	McSally	Wilson (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1703

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 256, noes 165, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—256

Abraham	Crawford	Hollingsworth
Aderholt	Cuellar	Hudson
Allen	Culberson	Huizenga
Amash	Curbelo (FL)	Hultgren
Amodei	Davidson	Hunter
Arrington	Davis, Rodney	Hurd
Babin	DelBene	Issa
Bacon	Denham	Jenkins (KS)
Banks (IN)	Dent	Jenkins (WV)
Barletta	DeSantis	Johnson (LA)
Barr	DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Jones
Bergman	Donovan	Jordan
Biggs	Duffy	Joyce (OH)
Bilirakis	Duncan (SC)	Katko
Bishop (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Kelly (MS)
Bishop (MI)	Dunn	Kelly (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Emmer	Kind
Blackburn	Estes (KS)	King (IA)
Blum	Farenthold	King (NY)
Blunt Rochester	Faso	Kinzinger
Bost	Ferguson	Knight
Brady (TX)	Fleischmann	Kuster (NH)
Brat	Flores	Kustoff (TN)
Bridenstine	Fortenberry	Labrador
Brooks (AL)	Fox	LaHood
Brooks (IN)	Franks (AZ)	LaMalfa
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Lamborn
Buck	Gaetz	Lance
Bucshon	Gallagher	Latta
Budd	Garamendi	Lawson (FL)
Burgess	Garrett	Lewis (MN)
Bustos	Gibbs	LoBiondo
Butterfield	Gohmert	Loeb
Byrne	Gonzalez (TX)	Long
Calvert	Goodlatte	Loudermilk
Carson (IN)	Gosar	Love
Carter (GA)	Gowdy	Lucas
Carter (TX)	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Chabot	Graves (GA)	MacArthur
Chaffetz	Graves (MO)	Maloney, Sean
Cheney	Griffith	Marchant
Coffman	Grothman	Marino
Cole	Guthrie	Marshall
Collins (GA)	Harper	Massie
Collins (NY)	Harris	Mast
Comer	Hartzler	McCarthy
Constock	Hensarling	McCaul
Conaway	Herrera Beutler	McClintock
Cook	Hice, Jody B.	McHenry
Costa	Higgins (LA)	McKinley
Costello (PA)	Hill	McMorris
Cramer	Holding	Rodgers

Meadows	Rokita
Meehan	Rooney, Francis
Messer	Rooney, Thomas J.
Mitchell	Ros-Lehtinen
Moolenaar	Roskam
Mooney (WV)	Ross
Mullin	Rothfus
Murphy (PA)	Rouzer
Noem	Royce (CA)
Nolan	Russell
Nunes	Rutherford
O'Halleran	Sanford
Olson	Scalise
Palazzo	Schrader
Palmer	Schweikert
Paulsen	Scott, Austin
Pearce	Scott, David
Perry	Sensenbrenner
Peterson	Sessions
Pittenger	Sewell (AL)
Poe (TX)	Shimkus
Poliquin	Shuster
Posey	Simpson
Ratcliffe	Sinema
Reed	Smith (MO)
Reichert	Smith (NE)
Renacci	Smith (NJ)
Rice (SC)	Smith (TX)
Roby	Smucker
Roe (TN)	Stefanik
Rogers (AL)	Stewart
Rogers (KY)	Stivers
Rohrabacher	

NOES—165

Adams	Fudge	Norcross
Aguilar	Gabbard	O'Rourke
Barragán	Gallego	Pallone
Bass	Gottheimer	Panetta
Beatty	Green, Al	Pascarella
Bera	Green, Gene	Payne
Beyer	Grijalva	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Peters
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Heck	Pocan
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Price (NC)
Capuano	Hoyer	Quigley
Carbajal	Huffman	Raskin
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Cartwright	Jayapal	Richmond
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Rosen
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Cicilline	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Clark (MA)	Keating	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kennedy	Sánchez
Cleaver	Khanna	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kildee	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kilmer	Schiff
Connolly	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Conyers	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Correa	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lawrence	Sherman
Crist	Lee	Sires
Crowley	Levin	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Soto
DeFazio	Lipinski	Speier
DeGette	Lofgren	Suozi
Delaney	Lowenthal	Takano
DeLauro	Lowe	Thompson (CA)
Demings	Lujan Grisham, M.	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
Deutsch	Lynch	Tonko
Dingell	Matsui	Torres
Doggett	McCollum	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael F.	McEachin	Vargas
Ellison	McGovern	Veasey
Engel	McNerney	Velázquez
Eshoo	Meeks	Visclosky
Esperlat	Meng	Wasserman
Esty (CT)	Moore	Schultz
Evans	Moulton	Waters, Maxine
Fitzpatrick	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Foster	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Yarmuth
	Neal	

NOT VOTING—9

Black	Kihuen	Newhouse
Cummings	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)
Graves (LA)	Carolyn B.	
Johnson, Sam	McSally	

□ 1710

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from votes today on account of traveling with the Vice President on official business to Louisiana. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 279, "nay" on rollcall No. 280, "nay" on rollcall No. 281, and "yea" on rollcall No. 282.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House chamber for votes Wednesday, May 24. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 277, "yea" on rollcall No. 278, and "yea" on rollcall No. 282.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, the man who has served as a father figure to me for the past twenty years has taken a turn for the worse in his battle against cancer and his health is rapidly deteriorating. As such, I will be returning home and will miss votes today, Wednesday, May 24, and for the balance of the week. Had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall No. 274, "yea" on rollcall No. 275, "yea" on rollcall No. 276, "yea" on rollcall No. 277, "yea" on rollcall No. 278, "nay" on rollcall No. 279, "nay" on rollcall No. 280, "nay" on rollcall No. 281, and "yea" on rollcall No. 282.

PERMITTING OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO BE TAKEN WHILE THE HOUSE IS IN ACTUAL SESSION ON A DATE DESIGNATED BY THE SPEAKER

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 350, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 350

Resolved, That on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives may designate, official photographs of the House may be taken while the House is in actual session. Payment for the costs associated with taking, preparing, and distributing such photographs may be made from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR AN EVENT TO CELEBRATE THE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA I

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 14

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA I.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on June 11, 2017 for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the event described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OUR VETERANS ARE REAL HEROES

(Mr. BISHOP of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank our brave servicemen and -women who have put their lives on the line every day to protect us. Since the founding of our Nation, millions of Americans have proudly served and sacrificed in preservation of our democracy.

Our veterans have paid a tremendous price to defend our freedom, yet leaving the battlefield does not always mean their battles are over. It is, therefore, our duty as a nation to ensure that our servicemembers are properly and respectfully cared for when they return home.

Our veterans are real-life heroes living quietly among us. They are the patriots who were willing to give up everything—everything they had—for their God, their country, and for one another.

The Holy Scripture tells us, in John 15:13: “Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.” This weekend, let’s call to mind all those who have made the ultimate sacrifice. It is because of their valor, strength, and bravery that I

stand here before you today. They selflessly put their lives on the line to fight for us, and I am proud to continue fighting for them.

Our men and women of the military represent the very best of America. On behalf of Michigan’s Eighth Congressional District, we are eternally grateful for their service.

Happy and safe Memorial Day weekend.

□ 1715

PRESIDENT TRUMP’S BUDGET

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that a budget is more than a series of statements or line items. It is really a statement of your values and of your priorities.

If that is true, then Donald Trump’s anti-working families budget shows he doesn’t understand the challenges facing honest, hardworking Americans. Let’s be clear: the Trump budget was written by some of the wealthiest Americans for the benefit of the wealthiest Americans.

This budget is a major setback for the middle class, and it makes life even harder for anyone who is trying to punch a ticket to the middle class.

This budget eliminates hundreds of millions of dollars for job creation, it zeros out funding for workforce training and good-paying manufacturing jobs, and it makes it even harder for young people to succeed by cutting teacher training, eliminating after-school programs, and making it harder to pay off student loans.

The American people deserve better. This is not a budget that any Member of Congress should be comfortable supporting.

Democrats are speaking out today against the Trump budget. It is time Republicans do the same.

RECOGNIZING PASTOR TIM BURT’S RETIREMENT

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Pastor Tim Burt on his retirement. Pastor Burt has a long record of service to his community.

He founded American Infant Care Products, which came up with the fold-down infant changing tables found in many restrooms today, helping families of all sorts by providing a convenient way to care for their children.

But he also has now served as associate pastor at Living Word Christian Center in Brooklyn Park since 1989, establishing a small group ministry. In

this capacity, Pastor Burt oversaw visitor and public relations, pastoral care, and leadership and volunteer departments. His dedication to our community has certainly inspired many Minnesotans over the years.

Pastor Burt also served as the Minnesota State director for Christians United for Israel, where he developed a statewide network of leaders passionate about Israel, and has led a trip of fellow pastors to that country.

Mr. Speaker, as we recognize Pastor Tim Burt’s retirement, we are extremely grateful and proud of the work he has done. I wish he and Renee the very best in their future endeavors.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DRUG COURT MONTH

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I stand to support the lifesaving work of drug courts and veterans treatment courts during this National Drug Court Month, and to honor a constituent of mine with an incredible success story.

These courts are an indispensable resource to law enforcement and other community stakeholders impacted by the opioid epidemic, claiming the lives of 91 Americans each and every day.

Timothy Wynn is a veterans treatment court graduate from my district, whom I had the honor of meeting today. When the decorated marine returned home from Iraq in 2003, he turned to alcohol and other substances to ease his transition back into society. His substance use escalated. He found himself arrested seven times, and spent a year of his life in prison away from his young family. After his final arrest, Tim found the Philadelphia Veterans Treatment Court, where he was given the accountability he needed while also connecting him to the services he had earned.

Today, Tim is reunited with his family and continues his mission as the mentor coordinator for the court where he once stood as a participant.

There are drug court and veterans treatment court graduates just like Tim across the Nation. I call on my colleagues to support these graduates and the good work of drug courts and veterans treatment courts.

ABILITYONE PROGRAM

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the AbilityOne Program and its countless contributions to our communities and to people with disabilities.

Through this important program, community-based nonprofit agencies across the Nation have employed more than 45,000 people who are blind or differently abled. The AbilityOne Program harnesses the purchasing power of the Federal Government to buy products from these agencies, which have made it their mission to employ and train the blind and disabled.

Established in 1983, the program continues to empower those with disabilities by providing gainful employment to a segment of our population who typically experience one of the highest rates of unemployment in the Nation. These critically important employment opportunities have led to increased independence and enhanced quality of life for scores of disabled Americans.

Recently, I had the opportunity to tour an AbilityOne participant in the 22nd District of New York: Human Technologies Corporation located in Utica. This facility employs nearly 600 people on an annual basis.

As a critical part of our community, I am honored to serve this AbilityOne agency and their team of dedicated employees, who continue to make a significant economic impact on our region through the creation of quality products and services to government agencies across all sectors.

REMEMBERING RICHARD COLLINS

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, a young man in my district was killed in what appears to be a vicious crime, probably motivated by hate.

U.S. Army Second Lieutenant Richard W. Collins, III, was just days away from graduating from Bowie State University. Richard stood on the threshold of what promised to be a life of service to his country.

He has been remembered by family and friends as a kind soul, an angel, and a national treasure.

All of us across Maryland were shocked and devastated when we learned of the attack that took his life—an unprovoked attack at a bus station waiting for an Uber to pick him up. An individual came along and asked him to step left—whatever that meant. He said: “No, I won’t.” And he was stabbed in the chest.

We were deeply alarmed to learn that the suspect in Richard’s murder belonged to an alleged online White supremacist group. Richard was African American. Richard’s murderer must be held to account under the full weight of our laws, and, hopefully, he will be.

His life is a reminder of everything that makes our Nation extraordinary. His death is a painful reminder that our work in overcoming hatred in this country is far from over.

I have been keeping Richard’s parents and family in my thoughts and in my prayers this week, and I will continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with a very heavy heart to mourn the loss of a young man in my district who was killed over the weekend in a possible hate-crime. U.S. Army Second Lieutenant Richard W. Collins III was just days away from graduating from Bowie State University College of Business when he was stabbed by an assailant while waiting at a bus stop in College Park on the campus of the University of Maryland. He was there to visit friends and celebrate his having been commissioned as an officer in the Army just two days earlier.

At age twenty-three, Richard stood on the threshold of what promised to be an exciting life of service to his country, and the Army was fortunate to have such a driven and talented young person so eager to be a part of defending our nation. Richard represented the best of the Fifth District, the best of Maryland, and the best of America. All of us across the region were shocked and devastated when we learned of the attack that took his life. We were deeply dismayed as well to learn that the suspect in Richard’s murder belonged to an alleged online white supremacist group with references in its name to Nazism and to the so-called ‘Alt-Right’ movement that espouses xenophobia and racial hatred. The FBI is now investigating, and Richard’s murderer must be held to account under the full weight of our laws.

In viewing this tragedy, it is easy to get caught up in the details of who perpetrated the crime and why. But the real story I wish to share with my colleagues is Richard’s story. The story of a young man who was so proud to put on his Army uniform and had diligently drilled as a member of the ROTC in college. He has been remembered by family and friends as a ‘kind soul,’ an ‘angel,’ and ‘a national treasure.’ The loss of this outstanding young Marylander and young American diminishes us all.

I have been keeping Richard’s parents and extended family in my thoughts and in my prayers these past few days, and I will surely continue to be inspired by his memory for a long time to come. His life is a reminder of everything that makes our nation extraordinary. His death is a painful reminder that the work of banishing hatred from our midst is far from over and will require each and every one of us to share in the task. May God bless the memory of Second Lieutenant Richard W. Collins III and watch over his family and his community in this hour of their grief.

PROMOTING

FREEDOM, ANTICORRUPTION, THE RULE OF LAW, AND AN INDEPENDENT JUDICIARY SYSTEM IN NICARAGUA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today, the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee passed a bill that I authored, the Nicaraguan Investment and Conditionality Act, the NICA Act.

I thank Chairman DUNCAN and Ranking Member SIRES for working with me to pass this important bipartisan measure that seeks to promote freedom, anticorruption, the rule of law, and supports an independent judiciary system in Nicaragua.

This measure sends a strong message of support to the people of Nicaragua that they are not alone. We in the United States Congress recognize their plight and aspirations for a better future of freedom and opportunity. We share their values of a free and fair electoral system, of justice and liberty for all Nicaraguans, and we support their pursuit of a more open and democratic society.

PRESIDENT TRUMP’S BUDGET

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the President’s budget, and, in particular, the \$610 billion in proposed cuts to Medicaid over the next 10 years.

In my district on the central coast of California, Medicaid provides healthcare to over 280,000 people. These are people that need it the most, including low-income families, children, disabled, and pregnant women.

Clinics and hospitals, particularly in rural communities like my district, rely on Medicaid to provide patients with mandatory and preventative services. Employees from the number one industry in my area—agriculture—rely on those health clinics so that they can stay healthy and ultimately contribute to our economy and our culture.

If Medicaid is cut, as desired in the President’s budget, it will hurt not just my community, it will hurt our country.

Throughout our Nation, millions would lose healthcare, healthcare clinics would close, and many insurance companies who partner with Medicaid would see cuts in their reimbursement rates substantially.

I realize that many of us in Washington have not been on Medicaid, but many of us need to realize that Medicaid benefits many of the Americans that sent us here. The least we can do is support them and their families by fighting against the President’s budget

and fighting to keep funding for Medicaid.

MARCH DEFICIT AND BALANCING TRADE

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, President Trump recently told *The Economist* that he is "absolutely a free-trader." Ohioans would be the first to tell you that free trade and fair trade do not mean the same thing.

Our trade deficit ballooned to \$43.7 billion in March of this year—more red ink and more lost jobs. That skewed gap is even more pronounced with NAFTA nations, where we have a huge negative imbalance, totaling over \$16 billion with Mexico and nearly \$7 billion with Canada. That yields over 115,000 more forfeited jobs in our country.

Yes, trade deficits translate into lost jobs and lower wages for our workers like steelworkers that have been battered in Lorain, Ohio. We must stop these trade practices that snuff out our jobs and hurt our communities.

That is why tomorrow I will be reintroducing the Balancing Trade Act. This bill requires an actual U.S. policy that takes the trade deficit seriously. It provides real achievable steps to balance our trade deficits with countries with which we hold a deficit of over \$10 billion for three consecutive years.

I urge President Trump to support this measure as a reasonable step forward. Let us help heal heartland communities, many of which elected him. Let us seek trade solutions that lift up our people and create new jobs on all sides of North America's borders, but starting here in the good old USA.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here this evening, and I am delighted to be hosting the Progressive Caucus Special Order hour. We have a number of Members who are going to join us to discuss the President's budget proposal, which appears to have been written at Trump Tower, primarily for the benefit of people spending the weekend at the Mar-a-Lago Club in Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), to kick off our analysis of the Trump budget.

□ 1730

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity. I would like to thank the gentleman from Maryland.

The Progressive Caucus has its own version of a budget which we have discussed on the floor of Congress previously that we will be glad to put exactly next to the budget that has been produced by this President, because our budget takes a completely different course than the budget that has been put forth by the Trump administration.

We can tell you, now that we have seen the budget from the Republicans, it hits every fear that we thought was going to be in it. There are very few winners, and there are an awful lot of losers in the budget, and that is what we are going to try to show today, just who some of the winners are and who some of the losers are, just to give you a visual display of exactly what is in this Trump budget.

So what people need to know is that this is a budget that is not for the average person across the country. In fact, the average person will be hurt in multiple ways by the cuts that are in this budget. There are very few in this country who are going to applaud this, but it is very few because this is a budget that only benefits a very few. And we, in the Progressive Caucus, are going to do everything we can to fight this, tooth and nail, to make sure this doesn't become law.

Let me just show a few of the winners that we have on this. One of the winners are the wealthiest Americans. This is going to reduce trillions of dollars in taxes that are primarily paid by the wealthy. So clearly, the wealthy are going to do well.

Another group that does well is Wall Street and Big corporations. This budget slashes regulations for Big banks that caused the great recession, and it defunds the agency that is charged with protecting consumers.

Another beneficiary is defense contractors—a \$54 billion boost in defense spending at the expense of nearly every other program. That will increase money that will purchase unnecessary new weapons.

The border wall. This is going to put down a \$1.6 billion downpayment to build a wall across the Mexican border, something that truly is not necessary and not asked for.

And finally, the last beneficiary is polluters. This is going to roll back environmental regulations that protect our air and water.

So those are the winners on the Trump budget. But if you look on the other side of the equation, there are a whole lot more losers.

Let's start right up here with our friend, Big Bird. PBS funding. The Trump budget would cut funding for children's shows like *Sesame Street*.

Social Security. The Trump budget will get rid of the insurance to help people with disabilities.

Meals on Wheels. You know, I have had the great fortune of doing Meals on

Wheels delivery in Madison, Wisconsin, which is in my district. And not only is it often the only meal, the healthy meal that that person is getting delivered who often can't leave their homes, but it is also that daily check-in to make sure that person is all right.

I just met with someone who works with Meals on Wheels, and they said that there is not a week that goes by that they don't find someone who has fallen in their home and needed that person to come by for help. Well, the Trump budget eliminates funding for programs like Meals on Wheels.

The children's health insurance and Medicaid funding specifically for kids is cut. He cuts dental care for kids, cancer care for kids, access to inhalers, and access to vital medical devices for children.

He cuts nursing home care. Families are going to be forced to pay more out-of-pocket for nursing home care.

The school lunch program. Now, I understand, everyone may not love everything on their tray at lunch, but this is cutting funding for subsidized lunches, causing kids literally to go hungry in this country.

It has education cuts to school and literacy programs, to teacher training and class-size reduction. Over 20 programs are going to be cut. Even Special Olympics gets a cut in this budget.

Today, we had Secretary DeVos at the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, and, unfortunately, she couldn't make a case for any of these cuts, which is truly disappointing, because they are going to add hundreds of millions of dollars to give money to people who have children attending private schools, but we are going to be slashing the very programs that make our public schools so strong.

They slash programs for the Department of labor for job training.

There is a \$6 billion-plus cut to the National Institutes of Health that works on lifesaving research for diseases like Alzheimer's and ALS and diabetes. And it cuts another billion for cancer research, specifically, in this budget.

Loan repayment programs. This is going to end the loan repayment programs for police officers, nurses, and teachers who work in a public setting.

This has massive cuts to the Environmental Protection Agency that protect our air and water, and it guts general funding that provides that clean air and water programs that are going to affect people across the country.

It cuts funding to prevent major outbreaks for diseases like Ebola and Zika by cutting the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention program budget.

Opioid addiction, something that this Congress has, in a bipartisan way, found ways to find additional funding for; in this proposal by the Trump administration, it leaves families that

are dealing with addiction on the hook for the cost of treatment in many cases.

Border funding. It is not just that they are building a wall, but this also ramps up funding for deportation task forces which are going to tear families apart in this country; and it adds money to build more detention centers.

This budget will allow the government to sell off swaths of public land that is going to open up our national parks and public land to oil and gas development, including fracking operations.

And this budget, when it comes to women's healthcare, will go after protections in funding for women's healthcare by cutting Planned Parenthood.

Finally, for veterans, it makes it harder for veterans and low-income families of veterans to find housing.

That is just some of the losers, but we want to show the difference in the balance of the very few who benefit and the whole lot of people—and there is a whole lot of other areas that are going to be cut by this budget.

Now, the contrast really is the Progressive Caucus budget that we put forward that we will have a vote on, on this floor of Congress, where we do a completely different approach. Gone are the winners and losers of this case. And the winners would be a big category, being the American people, and the losers really being those, I think, who have abused the system for all too long.

We have a \$2 trillion investment in infrastructure that puts money into our roads and bridges, our schools, our waterworks, our broadband, and really makes sure that those are family-supporting jobs that people can get back to work and will create millions of new jobs, according to the Economic Policy Institute.

We make sure that we move forward in affordable healthcare by making it so we can negotiate for prescription drug prices and bring those costs down, as well as allow States to get closer to a single-payer system.

We specifically have comprehensive immigration reform that recognizes those who are aspiring Americans, not by building walls and more detention centers but really providing a path to citizenship so that we can find a way to still protect our borders, but also make sure that we have got a path for people who have lived here for so very long.

We close corporate tax loopholes and make sure that working families are getting the stronger benefit.

We have an investment to make sure that we can have universal child care for all families in this country, not like the proposal that President Trump has put forward that takes care of, quite honestly, President Trump and people like him and the wealthiest in this country, but making sure that every

family will never pay more than 10 percent of their income to have child care for their family. And on and on and on is what our contrast is.

So as someone who has been very active in the Progressive Caucus, someone who comes from America's heartland in Wisconsin, we wanted to show the winners and the losers but, more importantly, to show the different path forward the Progressive Caucus is going to put for a vote on the floor of Congress. And I think if you get a chance to compare and contrast these budgets, you can see there is an alternative.

We don't have to slash funding for all sorts of programs just to get \$54 billion of new spending for defense. We can actually invest in America, invest in healthcare, invest in our schools, make sure that college is affordable, all the things that we offer in our contrast budget. It is the only budget that is out there right now, so we would love to be able to show that contrast.

But we ask people to take a look at this, and then you decide what is best for your family. I think you are going to decide the Progressive Caucus puts a positive path forward that will make your family prosper and won't just support a very few in this country.

I thank the gentleman from Maryland. I appreciate this opportunity to have this time.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you so much, Congressman POCAN from Wisconsin, a distinguished leader in the House of Representatives, and the new co-chairman of the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, a budget, as we like to say, is not just a bunch of numbers, but it is an ethical document. It is a reflection of our values, and it is a plan of action for investment of our energy and our resources into the future.

The Progressive Caucus has drafted The People's Budget based on the actual needs of American society. So we have looked out, and we have seen that the great American infrastructure is ailing; it is crumbling. The bridges are falling down. The roads and the highways need repair. The transit systems are under tremendous stress, including the Metro system here in the Maryland, Washington, Virginia area.

The cybersecurity system is compromised. Our airports, our port structure, our water systems, like in Flint, Michigan, need desperate intervention and rescue and help. We propose a \$1 trillion plan of investment in the American infrastructure to create millions of jobs, putting people to work on restoring the strength and the vitality of America's basic institutions, the infrastructure that supports a strong and flourishing economy.

So that is the heart of it. But we are also working to defend the gains we have made in healthcare, to extend healthcare so that all Americans are

included in our health insurance system so we can squeeze out the bureaucratic bloat and the money that is wasted on insurance bureaucracy and red tape.

We are also working for investment in quality child care so working families are not spending 30 or 40 or 50 percent of their family budgets on trying to just pay for babysitters and piece together a system.

America is the wealthiest society on Earth, and this is the wealthiest moment in our history. We can provide healthcare for everyone. We can create a childcare system that works for working families in America. We can reinvest in American infrastructure.

But right now, there is no leadership, and there is no vision. We are so disappointed that the White House did not come forward with a plan, a bipartisan plan, to try to reinvest in American infrastructure, which everybody says he or she supports so we could get behind that, but we don't see anything.

Proverbs says that where there is no vision the people will perish, and so we have offered a vision. And instead, they have come with a plan that lacks all vision, lacks any plan for reinvesting in American infrastructure, lacks any investment in the vital services that people need and, on the contrary, works to dismantle healthcare services, Medicaid, education, community development grants, senior workforce, jobs training, you name it, the Peace Corps, National Endowment for the Arts, National Endowment for the Humanities; slashed \$6 billion from NIH in order to undermine scientific research and medical progress on colon cancer and breast cancer and Alzheimer's disease and asthma and bipolar disorder.

We have been making progress on all of these things, and, for some reason, the Trump administration says they want to pull the plug on it and slash \$6 billion from NIH and all of the institutions around the country that NIH supports.

Well, we have invited Congressman RO KHANNA to be with us tonight. He is a leading expert on the economy and on the manufacturing sector, and we have asked him to talk about investment in infrastructure and manufacturing, what we need and what, instead, we have gotten from the Trump budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA).

Mr. KHANNA. Thank you, Congressman RASKIN, and thank you for your leadership with the Progressive Caucus and in articulating a positive vision of what the American people need with a budget.

I want to address the issue of manufacturing because this President went around the country campaigning on bringing manufacturing jobs back. And there is a simple philosophical difference in what the Progressive Caucus

believes and the President's budget. If you believe, as the Republicans do, that we need to cut taxes and have less spending, you would be for this President's budget.

But if you believe, as we do, that the big issue facing this country is good-paying jobs and higher wages, you would be for the progressive budget.

□ 1745

Let me give you a concrete example. One of the programs that the President cuts in the name of less government and lower taxes is the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. Now, what does this do? What does the Manufacturing Extension Partnership do? It actually works with small- and medium-sized manufacturers across this country, many in the Rust Belt, to help them be competitive, to help them compete against currency manipulation, against unfair trade deals, to help them compete against lower cost labor.

How does the program do this? It partners them with leading technology companies to say, look, if you are a small- or medium-sized manufacturer, maybe you should have cloud technology. Move your technology off the factory floor and use the cloud to be more cost-competitive so that you can compete. Basically, the program helps to bring and keep manufacturing jobs in the United States.

Now, here is the irony. You would think, oh, is this a liberal idea? Is this the idea of Democrat, or a liberal Democrat? The irony is this was Ronald Reagan's idea. It was actually a program instituted by President Reagan in 1988 to help American manufacturers compete for the 21st century, and every administration has supported it.

One would think this President who ran on bringing manufacturing jobs would say, okay, let's quadruple funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. Instead, he zeroed it out, zeroed out the funding for manufacturing programs. The progressive budget says we want to increase our investment in manufacturing. We want to actually help the small- and medium-sized manufacturers create jobs in the United States.

I have one more concrete example before I hand it back over to my colleague, Mr. RASKIN.

The Appalachian Regional Commission invests in helping to create jobs across the parts of this country that most need that investment. I was down in Appalachia visiting HAL ROGERS' district, a distinguished Republican who chaired the Appropriations Committee, and we saw the Appalachian Regional Commission's investment in helping coal miners' kids get jobs.

This Republican budget, this administration zeros out the funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission. Instead, we ought to be increasing funding in programs that are going to help

transition folks from the industrial to the digital economy.

I think my colleague, Congressman RASKIN, will explain that the Progressive budget is not just a moral document. It very much is, and it keeps our commitment to seniors and to those in need, but it is also a blueprint for job creation and good wages and for creating jobs in precisely the places that need them most.

This is the big division in this Congress. Do you believe that the big issue is that we need more tax cuts for the investor class, that we need simply to cut government, or do you believe we need government to partner with local leaders, with businesses, to create jobs and better wages?

If you believe the latter, I urge you to take a look at the Progressive budget and see our vision for job creation and higher wages.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman KHANNA for that excellent discussion.

You would think, with all of the domestic budget of the country being dismantled and slashed and reduced by the Trump administration that we would end up saving money, but they don't in any way at all because the money is just being shifted over to the Pentagon.

So the proposal is to slash \$56 billion from things like Meals on Wheels, NIH research into eating disorders and asthma and Alzheimer's disease and heart and lung disorders and breast cancer and colon cancer, and environmental cleanup like the Chesapeake Bay cleanup, which they want to zero out, and then to shift the money over to the Pentagon at a time when the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform received a report and had a hearing on a McKinsey report which showed that there was \$125 billion in immediate savings available at the Pentagon in waste, fraud, abuse, and contractor overruns.

So, at a moment when the Pentagon is drowning in money that they don't know what to do with and all of the beltway bandits are buzzing around in order to get their slice of the pie, President Trump decides it is a good moment to try to dismantle services for the elderly and to stop job training for young people, to stop job training in location for retired citizens, wipe out funding for the Chesapeake Bay cleanup, and roll back or abolish preschool development grants to the States.

The litany of attacks on the American people is really quite astounding, and I invite everybody just to go and read the specifics of this budget, which can be read as nothing more than an assault on the health and the well-being and the security of the American people.

For example, the Department of Education budget proposes to cut \$578 bil-

lion in title I, part A to support services for disadvantaged students. It reduces IDEA funding by \$113 million, seriously jeopardizing special education services for students with disabilities all across the country.

It eliminates title II, part A, which provides Federal funding for teacher support and class size reduction. It eliminates or reduces more than 20 additional programs promoting literacy in our communities. It cuts Perkins Career and Technical Education funding by 15 percent. That is just on the education side.

Department of Health and Human Services, it eliminates the Community Services Block Grant. It eliminates the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. It cuts the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health by 40 percent. It reduces funding for Child Care and Development Block Grant programs by tens of millions of dollars. It reduces support for Federal job training for adults by 40 percent, job training for dislocated workers and youth.

It ends the Senior Community Service Employment Program, an excellent program that has located work, meaningful work, for tens of thousands of older Americans. It closes Job Corps centers. It eliminates funding to counter the worst forms of child labor through the Bureau of International Labor Affairs. It eliminates \$11 million in OSHA safety training grants for high hazard industries.

You have got to read it to believe it, but the amazing thing is, despite pulling the plug on all of these essential domestic programs that have been proven to work, it doesn't save us any money because the money is just thrown at the Pentagon and is being saved to throw up the wealth ladder in the country, send it up the wealth ladder through tax cuts to the largest corporations and the wealthiest Americans.

That is the name of the game. Everybody understands it, which is why this is the good news. At least we are hearing from both sides of the aisle that the President's budget written in gold at Trump tower for the people at Mar-a-Lago is DOA, dead on arrival. Everybody is saying it, that there is no way that America could absorb the shock of letting this budget come anywhere near to reality.

But the message that we get from President Trump and his administration is very simple: Let them eat emoluments. Let them eat emoluments. Now, of course, we don't get them; he gets them. But the American people are left empty-handed at the end of this.

We don't get any meaningful investment in the infrastructure of the country. There is no jobs program that is in here. There is no attempt to guarantee the solvency and the strength and the

resilience of the Social Security program. We have got that as part of our plan in The People's Budget for the Progressive Caucus.

It is far from trying to stabilize and strengthen Medicare and Medicaid, those two great victories of the Great Society. There is an attempt to undermine and ravage Medicaid and Medicare, again, to send all of the wealth up the income ladder, all of the wealth to the people who need it the least in the country, pulling the plug on everybody else.

Well, our hope is that we are going to be able to organize people to stop it, but the tragedy here is that there are so many needs in America that need to be addressed. Working people have seen a major erosion in their living standards over the last several decades. Working people have lost pension security.

Working people need to have retirement sources stabilized. We have got to use Social Security as a way to make sure that everybody can experience a decent and dignified retirement. Social Security is a great accomplishment, maybe the greatest antipoverty program ever created in the history of the Earth. It lifted millions of senior Americans out of poverty; and despite the opposition of the GOP at the time, now everybody concedes that Social Security was a brilliant idea with administrative bureaucratic overhead less than 1 percent, and it lifts millions of seniors to a state of at least a modicum of dignity in retirement. And there are millions of children who are on Social Security because of survivors benefits and disability benefits.

So we need to strengthen the Social Security system. We need to reinvest in it, and we need to expand it, because it used to be that there were supposed to be three pillars for people's old age: one was Social Security, another was a defined pension, and another was personal savings.

But the pensions from private employment are increasingly gone. They have been scattered to the winds. And people's personal savings have been eroded by the dramatic increase of economic inequality in the country and the erosion of the living standards of working people.

Tens of millions of Americans are relying exclusively on Social Security now, so we have got to reinvest in Social Security and make sure it works, and we have got plans for doing that, too.

But the point is that the real problems of the country have been ignored. There is no vision. There is no program. There is no policy for reinvesting in America coming from the Mar-a-Lago set, from this Cabinet of billionaires.

We are not getting any of it. Instead, we get an almost laughable, comical, cartoon version of rightwing GOP eco-

nomics, which proposes to slash everything and to uproot the basic programs that the American people rely on for a civilized society. We can do better than this.

I see I have been joined by my very distinguished colleague who will pursue the discussion. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say thank you to Congressman RASKIN for holding down this Special Order. You do such an excellent job, you and PRAMILA JAYAPAL, and we are grateful for it.

Mr. Speaker, here are just a few headlines from the budget that the Trump administration just released:

"Trump Budget Leaves Working Class Base Behind"; that is the Detroit Free Press.

"Meatloaf Again: Christie Meekly Accepts Trump's Medicaid Cuts"; that is the New Jersey Star-Ledger.

"Trump Budget Replicates Disastrous Kansas Approach. This Won't End Well"; that is the Kansas City Star, Mr. Speaker.

"No Help from Trump"; that is the Houston Chronicle.

"Trump Meets the Pope While His Budget Threatens the Least of Us"; that is The Sacramento Bee.

"The Harsh Budget Americans Voted for"; that is the Charlotte Observer.

"Another Bad Budget from Trump Targets the Poor," The Washington Post.

"Trump's Assault on Working Voters"; that is the Baltimore Sun.

"Surprise, Surprise: Trump's Budget Punishes the Sick and the Poor While Rewarding the Wealthy"; that is the LA Times.

"A Slash-and-Burn Budget," New York Daily News.

"Budget Cuts Include U.S. Heart"; that is northjersey.com;

The New York Times: "A Budget That Promises Little But Pain."

Bloomberg View: "Trump's Budget is a Waste of Everybody's Time."

Financial Times, no beacon of liberalism there, Mr. Speaker: "Trump's Implausible Plan for the U.S. Budget."

So whether you are talking about conservative instruments in the news or more liberal ones or more middle-of-the-road, it is really kind of amazing: Everyone seems to share one feeling about the Trump budget. We all hate it. It is bad. It is not a good thing, and there are plenty of reasons why people don't like it.

And so I just want to add that the OMB is led by one of our former colleagues, Mick Mulvaney, and I think Mick is a nice guy. I can't tell people that I personally dislike Mick. He is nice to me. But that is not what this is about.

□ 1800

This is about how we are operating in our public lives. In our public lives and

discharging our public responsibility, I have to quote the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. He says: Meals on Wheels sounds great. We're not going to spend money on programs that cannot show that they actually deliver on promises that we've made to people.

I will submit to you that Meals on Wheels is a very meritorious program, it costs very little money, and it allows vulnerable seniors and people with disabilities to live at home. Deep cuts.

Actually, Mick said as well: Deep budget cuts are actually one of the most compassionate things we can do.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, compassionate for who?

Maybe those billionaires at Mar-a-Lago—maybe they need a little love, too, sometimes—or the people who occupy Trump Towers.

Regarding HUD, or Housing and Urban Development, he said: It doesn't work very well. Tell that to the people who rely on low-income housing tax credits, section 8 voucher programs, and all types of housing programs that allow people to afford their housing.

On the issue of school nutrition programs, he says: Guess what. There's no demonstrable evidence that they're actually doing that. There's no demonstrable evidence that we're actually helping kids to do better in school. This is about school nutrition.

Here is another one: We can't ask single mothers to continue to pay for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Well, single moms might rely on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to help their kids learn how to read. I think that Sesame Street is a pretty good outfit. That might be their only avenue.

Here is another one: If you ask, 999 people out of 1,000 would tell you that Social Security disability is not part of Social Security. It is an old-age retirement that they think of when they think of Social Security.

Quite the contrary. People do think of Social Security disability when they think of Social Security.

Here is another quote: "Are there folks on SNAP who shouldn't be?"

That is the question.

So we are, again, trying to focus on fraud in SNAP, rather than worrying about hungry Americans.

Here is another quote: "Maybe it's reasonable to ask if there are folks who are on there that shouldn't be. That is a reasonable question to ask."

You know what? I think it is focusing on the wrong part of the problem. Hunger, Mr. Speaker, is the problem in the richest country in the history of the world. At its richest point in its own history, we are being told by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget that we cannot afford SNAP, Meals on Wheels, and public broadcasting. Amazing.

I think that, honestly, Mr. Speaker, it is often said that you should speak truth to power. I think we must speak truth to power. I think the gentleman from Maryland would agree with me that we have got to speak truth to power. But it occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that the power knows exactly what the truth is: this budget is going to hurt hungry children. The budget is going to cut seniors. It is going to cut veterans. It is going to cut public broadcasting, which is one of the major ways people get news in South Dakota and rural America. It is going to cut the Appalachian Regional Commission. It is going to leave devastation almost everywhere. It is going to cut the EPA by a third.

The power knows—and I am talking about Trump and his administration—the devastation that they are going to inflict on people. In fact, that is why they are doing it. They just don't believe the government has any role in helping to make Americans lives better.

Their idea of freedom, Mr. Speaker, is a billionaire being able to pollute anywhere and everywhere he wants. Their idea of freedom is amassing great fortunes at the expense of everyone else, all the while relying on our Nation's military, our Nation's police, the road system; all the while relying on clean water, clean air; all the while relying on public schools to educate their workforce.

They say: I did it all by myself. Yet everything they have done has been with the help of the government of the people of the United States of America. It is really outrageous, Mr. Speaker.

I think that we are in a moment when we have got to speak truth to each other, Mr. Speaker. We have got to go all across this Nation and talk to people in the barbershops, the VFW halls. We have got to talk to people in the church basement, the mosque basement, the synagogue basement. We have got to talk to people on the corners and tell them about this budget. If they hear about this Trump budget, they will be outraged.

Nobody can support this budget, not even a millionaire or a billionaire, unless you believe that you are not your brother's keeper, that you have no obligation to other people around you, that everything around you should be amassed to accumulate wealth for yourself. That is the only possible way anybody can stand next to this budget.

I really do hope that the Republican caucus puts this budget up for a vote. I want to see who is going to stand next to this monstrosity of a budget. I am curious to see who, representing southern Ohio, Kentucky, or Tennessee, is going to vote to zero out the Appalachian Regional Commission; who, representing a northern-tier State, is going to cut, zero out, LIHEAP. I want to see the Republican who is going to

do that. I think that will be a pretty gutsy move. I guarantee you, your constituents will know exactly what you did. They are watching, Mr. Speaker. People watch C-SPAN and they read the news. They read the headlines that I read off, Mr. Speaker, and they are aware of what is happening in the people's House at this very hour.

I want the people to know that it is the government's responsibility to take care of the least of these. If you are too poor, too old, or too sick to work, we should help people. We should do it. I believe it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I don't care if they call me a bleeding heart liberal—they can call me anything they want—but I am going to be there for low-income people who are too old, too sick, or too young to work. I am going to be there to make sure that people who are out of work but who are able-bodied have the support that they need to get to work, to have clean air, to have clean water, to promote jobs and infrastructure.

We are going to be there to do those things, Mr. Speaker, because we believe in them.

Do you know what else, Mr. Speaker?

We don't believe "tax" is a four-letter word. It is actually a three-letter word. It is not a bad word at all. In fact, it is the dues that you pay to live in a civilized society. If you think tax is some kind of a curse word, you can move to Somalia, because they don't have many there.

Here, we have the protection of our police. We have the protection of our courts. We have the protection of our Nation's military. We have the protection of people who inspect the meat, the water, the air, and everything else, and these people look after us as they discharge their public responsibility and they get paid in our tax money. There is nothing wrong with it. We stand on that.

I believe there has got to be a few Republicans who agree with what I just said. I believe there has got to be a few Republicans who believe that it is a good idea for the public to spend money on figuring out the vexing diseases that are ravaging people all over America, like ALS, Parkinson's, and Alzheimer's. We should research these diseases. And if we need public money to do it, Mr. Speaker, we should spend that money. But I don't think this Trump budget reflects that.

I want to see my friends on the Republican side of the aisle join us and say we should not cut the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; we should not cut critical programs that help people; we should not cut supplemental assistance programs, SNAP, and food stamps for hungry Americans; we should not cut Medicaid, leaving families on the hook to pay more for the care of their loved ones with disabilities.

I don't believe they believe these cuts are right. I just think that it is going

to take a lot of political courage to stand up and say: You know what? Sometimes the government does good for people—we have spent decades saying the government is the problem—and now people actually believe it sometimes, except they don't believe it when you are cutting their healthcare, basic research, cutting money for our parks, and literally cutting everything, except the military.

Oh, by the way, I am the proud father of a military son. My son is a veteran. He just finished 4 years of service in the United States Army, Mr. Speaker. He was a combat veteran. My whole family is proud of him. But I am going to tell you one thing: the money didn't go to him. He made less than \$25,000 a year. He didn't mind. He is serving his country.

Where is all this Big Money going to go? Who is getting it?

I don't know. People who make the machinery, the weapons industry, they are going to make out like bandits, you better believe that.

At the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, even the money that they are asking us to spend is going to hurt veterans. I know they are trying to plus-up a little on the VA, but there are a whole lot of other services that veterans benefit from, and they are going to get hurt.

Mr. Speaker, this Trump budget is wrong, and I believe that every Democrat knows it is wrong, and I even believe a few Republicans know that it is wrong. We should stand up and say that it is wrong.

It is wrong to slash the earned income tax credit and child tax credit by \$40 billion. This is money that goes to people who actually work for a living.

I heard one of our Nation's leaders in the administration say: Oh, you are crying about these people who are going to get cut. What about the people who pay all the taxes?

Mr. Speaker, if we would raise the minimum wage, you would have more people paying taxes, because people's pay would be higher. It is no comfort to say that half the people don't pay taxes. They do pay taxes. They pay payroll taxes, they pay sales taxes, they pay property taxes, they pay all kind of taxes, Mr. Speaker. It is wrong to try to imply that they are free-loaders because they don't pay income taxes. They would be glad to pay those income taxes if their income were higher, which it would be if we invested in America, which this budget does the opposite of. It divests America.

I just want to say to you as we begin to wrap up that our Nation is the greatest Nation in the world not because of bombs and guns and military. It is the greatest Nation because we believe in liberty and justice for all, and not just a millionaire's and a billionaire's liberty to pollute all they want, escape taxes all they want, do whatever they please, without any ramifications.

Mr. Speaker, justice is also a part of that equation. Justice means doing right by people. Justice means being fair to people. This budget is the exact opposite of it. This budget leaves out people like our veterans. It cuts almost a billion dollars from housing assistance programs to keep a roof over people's heads. It cuts Social Security by \$72 billion by restricting enrollment in disability insurance programs.

It hurts our national security. It spends over \$2 billion to build an unnecessary border wall. Oh, this wall. Mr. Speaker, in his campaign, the wall was among the most offensive things, because what it really said is we don't really want folks from south of the border around here. That is what it said. That is how they felt. Yet here we are spending money to prove that point.

It cuts the State Department and USAID by almost 32 percent. Generals will tell you that it is better to talk it out than to shoot it out. Yet here we are cutting down our ability to talk it out. What an outrage.

It eliminates international family planning.

Let me wrap up by saying this. I was talking to some of my Republican friends—and I do have many, and I am proud to say so—and one of them said to me: KETH, this thing probably is never going to see the light of day.

I said: Maybe it will and maybe it won't. But this Trump budget is a direct reflection of what he would do if he could do it. And that is scary.

Mr. RASKIN. I thank Congressman ELLISON for his eloquent remarks and extraordinary service as co-chair of the Progressive Caucus. He has been replaced this week by Congressman POCAN, who we heard from earlier this evening, but it was in deference only to the busyness of his schedule, since he has also become, in addition to the distinguished Congressman from Minnesota, the vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Let's begin to wrap this up. Let's review some of the extraordinary assaults on the health and the well-being of the American people that are embodied in this atrocious budget.

First, the President says: let's cut children's health insurance by more than \$600 billion.

This would strip countless children of dental care, asthma treatment, and other medical visits.

It eliminates over \$190 billion to the SNAP program, a supplemental assistance program that is the food assistance program which helps prevent 42 million working families from going hungry in America.

It calls for billions in cuts to Medicaid. It, unbelievably, in the middle of an opioid crisis across the country, would reduce access to drug addiction treatment and drug prevention services with a \$1.2 billion cut to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

□ 1815

At a time when we need to be doubling down on investment in drug prevention and drug treatment and dealing with the opioid crisis, the Trump administration simply hides under the bed.

The budget would cut the Department of Labor's job training programs by an astonishing two-thirds—that is job training for our people at a time when we are going through dramatic structural shifts in the nature of the economy with robots and mechanization, and they want to cut by 65 percent the Department of Labor's job training programs.

They want to sell off our national parks and public lands for oil drilling, gas exploration, and fracking. They want to sell the land of the American people—the trust that we have had for centuries—that a great Republican President, Teddy Roosevelt, once insisted on. They want to sell it off to their friends at Exxon Mobil and the frackers across the country.

They have spent \$10 billion building their stupid wall—a 14th century answer to a 21st century problem. Maybe they will have a moat and some alligators to go with it. But didn't I hear somebody say on the campaign trail that Mexico was going to pay for that wall? I heard millions of people chanting that at rallies, and the President was saying: Mexico—you can believe me—Mexico is going to pay for it.

Already they are putting \$2 billion in our budget while they are stripping schoolchildren of their lunches. While they are slashing scientific and medical research in the country, they want to put \$2 billion into a wall that nobody needs at a time when illegal immigration from the southern border is at a decade's record low. They want to take \$2 billion and put it into that.

They want to cut billions of dollars from afterschool programs, from teacher training, and from student loans. They want to eliminate funding for Planned Parenthood, which millions of women and men depend on not just for family planning but also for basic medical attention, purely out of animosity toward Planned Parenthood which has not received one penny for abortion services in many decades. They just want to dismantle it. They would destroy it if they could, despite the fact that millions of Americans depend on Planned Parenthood.

They want to cut Social Security—which they promised not to touch—by \$72 billion by restricting enrollment in the disability insurance program—and on and on. You name your favorite, most important Federal program, and I guarantee you, unless you are a Big Business beltway contractor defense bandit, it is going to be cut in this budget. You can go and check it out.

Now, if a foreign power—a foreign repressive power—like Putin's Russia or

Duterte's Philippines or Orban's Hungary set out to injure and demoralize the American people, they could not have done better than the budget which President Trump sent to Capitol Hill this week. This is a budget that is drafted seemingly by an enemy of the American people.

It is not the media that is the American people's enemy, as the President insisted, it is whoever drafted this budget. That is the enemy of the American people.

Let them eat emoluments, they are telling us with this. Let them eat emoluments. They have got all the emoluments. They are the ones taking the money from the foreign governments. But they are saying, Let them eat emoluments, because the American people have been robbed by this budget if it were ever to see the light of day.

Mr. Speaker, a great Republican President once spoke of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Abraham Lincoln was a Member of this body. He sat where we have the honor of sitting in this body, and he talked about government of the people, by the people, and for the people. This is a budget of the super rich, by the super rich, for the super rich. It was drafted by a Cabinet of billionaires for the people who are lounging at Mar-a-Lago today, and they give the finger to the rest of the country. That is what this budget says.

If my friends on the other side of the aisle are smart—and I know they are—and they know what is good for them—and I know they do, Mr. Speaker—they will say immediately this document is DOA and they have got nothing to do with it and very quickly distance themselves from it. We need to return to that great vision of a government that is of the people, by the people, and for the people. That is who we are as a country.

The government right now is experiencing a hostile takeover by a tiny elite, and that is what is taking place around the world today. If you look at Putin's Russia, if you look at Orban's Hungary, if you look at Duterte in the Philippines, if you look at what they tried to do with Le Pen in France, there is a new model, my friends, all over the world. Government is a money-making operation for a tiny elite in each society. They want to go back to something like kings and queens where the government serves the tiniest portion of the people.

They might get elected spouting populist rhetoric and slogans, but the minute they get in, Wall Street takes over. We have got a President who campaigned against Goldman Sachs, and his Cabinet is dominated by Goldman Sachs. How long are people going to fall for that magic trick? Not very long if anybody still believes in it out there. I don't think anybody's faith or confidence in this President as a populist will survive this budget—what a

joke, and what an insult to the great populists of American history like the populist movement in William Jennings Bryan, that they would dare to associate themselves with populism.

This is a budget that is based on elitism and class warfare, top-down class warfare: the richest people in this country against everybody else. That is what this budget represents. That is what it embodies.

So check out the Progressive Caucus' People's Budget. It is a real reinvestment in the infrastructure of the country: our bridges, our roads, our highways, our transit systems, our port systems, our airports, and cybersecurity—where America really needs investment, not stealing from poor people, not stealing from the working class, and not ripping off NIH and the Centers for Disease Control in order to put money in the Pentagon for a bunch of beltway bandits and defense contractors who have so much money they don't know what to do with it anymore. That is not what we need. We need a real investment in America.

This budget is an affront, and it is an insult to the American people. We should reject it immediately. I call on all of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to repudiate this document in a bipartisan fashion, and let's get down to work for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MEMORIAL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday we observe Memorial Day to honor members of America's Armed Forces who have died in service to our Nation. For those who have lost a loved one, a friend, a neighbor, or a comrade, this day has added significance, remembrance, and sadness.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, many of us in this House will attend Memorial Day ceremonies over the weekend as we honor those who have died in the service to this great Nation.

Certainly, in this office, one of the more difficult but one of the most honored opportunities is to be at the grave site of our fallen heroes as they are laid to rest and that American flag, which flies over our Capitol, is draped over their coffin.

On this Memorial Day, I really want to highlight my brother-in-law, Larry Emerman, who in the fall of 1980, in the service of this country as a pilot in the United States Navy as a lieutenant commander, lost his life in the service of our Nation.

Memorial Day is observed on the last Monday of May. Memorial Day is one of America's most solemn occasions. The tradition of Memorial Day dates back to 1864 in Boalsburg, Pennsylvania, which is considered to be the birthplace of Memorial Day. Three ladies decorated the graves of fallen Civil War soldiers, and the custom has continued every year since then.

It was an early fall day, in 1864, when Emma Hunter and her friend, Sophie Keller, picked flowers and went to the old cemetery to lay them on the grave of Emma's father, Reuben Hunter. Dr. Hunter was a young Boalsburg doctor at the time of the Civil War. When he volunteered to serve with the Army of the North, he was assigned to the hospital in Baltimore. In addition to attending the wounded soldiers, he also cared for the men who had contracted yellow fever while fighting in the southern swamplands. Dr. Hunter became ill. He died of yellow fever, and his body was buried in the Boalsburg Cemetery.

On their way that day in that early fall, the two girls met Mrs. Elizabeth Myers, whose young son, Amos, had been killed the last day of the Battle of Gettysburg and was also buried in the old cemetery. Learning where the girls were going, Mrs. Myers asked to join them. They shared the flowers, and they placed them on both graves. It was decided then and there that they would meet the following year with flowers for all who had died in the Civil War. The three young women told their friends of the plans, and when the day came around, most of the villagers joined them.

From that simple beginning came the observance of Memorial Day in Boalsburg, Pennsylvania. Every year since then, the people have met on the Diamond in Boalsburg Square for the walk to the old cemetery to lay flowers on the graves of all the soldiers dead.

They are led by a hometown band. All ages join in the walk and participate in the simple service of remembering. I have been proud to participate in that tradition which has spanned more than 150 years.

Boalsburg still puts on a traditional Memorial Day celebration complete with a parade, a community walk to the cemetery, speeches, military reenactments, and much more.

On Memorial Day, communities across the country will pay tribute to our fallen veterans who never returned home. Many of us will gather with family members, friends, and neighbors as we keep those we lost in our hearts.

Unfortunately, for many of our Nation, Memorial Day has become a day of picnics and family gatherings, which is not a bad thing, but we must always remember truly where Memorial Day came from and its purpose, that we not forget those sacrifices.

So as we raise the Stars and Stripes and as we lay wreaths at the monuments, memorials, and cemeteries, let us remember that our freedom is thanks to those who have died in sacrifice. We celebrate Memorial Day in honor of so many who are no longer with us. May God bless them, and certainly God bless the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his leadership and putting this opportunity today for us to gather on the floor to speak on the topic of not just Memorial Day but the service and the sacrifice that warranted its origination.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Memorial Day on May 29, 2017. On this day, Americans across our Nation pay respects to and honor members of the U.S. Armed Forces who have sacrificed their lives defending the freedoms that we so gratefully enjoy.

The decision to leave families and friends, travel to a land that is utterly unfamiliar, and risk their lives protecting the lives of others is among the most selfless acts one can make.

Roughly 1.5 million Americans are currently serving in one of the five branches of the Armed Forces. Of these Americans, nearly 90,000 are assigned to one of Georgia's numerous military bases which are scattered throughout our great State.

Georgia's First Congressional District that I have the honor and privilege of representing is particularly important to our Nation's Armed Forces as it includes Fort Stewart Army Base, Hunter Army Airfield, Kings Bay Naval Base, and Moody Air Force Base.

The service provided by our Nation's armed services is invaluable. Throughout our history, millions have paid the ultimate price for freedom—they have given their lives in order to save ours. I ask that you please keep these brave men and women in your prayers, not only on Memorial Day but every day.

It is an honor to represent a State and a district with such a strong tie to our Nation's defense. I ask that you pray for our troops, and I ask that you pray for our Nation. God bless each and

every one of you as we observe this great Memorial Day. God bless America.

□ 1830

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because this week is All American Week, the annual celebration of the 82nd Airborne Division's mission and the paratroopers who serve to uphold it.

Based in my district at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, the 82nd Airborne Division is the Nation's Global Response Force and can mobilize, load, and strike in a moment's notice. These rapid reaction forces put the "air" in airborne and are absolutely vital to our national security.

This year marks the division's 100th anniversary, and it is a special time for us to celebrate its incredible history as America's Guard of Honor.

Since its inception, the 82nd Airborne Division has played a role in every major U.S. conflict around the world. It was nicknamed the "All American Division" because of the unique and diverse group of soldiers who came together to form the division from all across the United States.

As the Representative of Fort Bragg in Congress, I am so proud of the 82nd Airborne's legacy, of our paratroopers and their families. They put country before self, and we are so grateful.

I will continue to work to ensure this critical installation remains the epicenter of the universe and the tip of the spear guaranteeing our national security.

As we celebrate All American Week this week, I ask my fellow Americans to join me in praying for servicemembers stationed at Fort Bragg who are currently deployed and for their families here at home.

We also remember our veterans who served in the 82nd Airborne Division, particularly those who made the ultimate sacrifice. Today's paratroopers stand on the shoulders of these giants.

Airborne, all the way.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, each Memorial Day, a newspaper in my State, the Arizona Republic, publishes one particular letter to remind its readers of the sacrifice our soldiers made in defense of their country. The letter is written by Sullivan Ballou to his wife on July 14, 1861.

Sullivan was a major in the Union Army, 32 years old, and about to enter the first battle of Bull Run. A little more than a week later, almost 3,000 Union soldiers had perished, including Sullivan.

Major Sullivan's letter reads as follows: "My very dear Sarah: The indications are very strong that we shall move in a few days—perhaps tomorrow. Lest I should not be able to write

again, I feel impelled to write a few lines that may fall under your eye when I shall be no more. . . .

"I have no misgivings about, or lack of confidence in the cause in which I am engaged, and my courage does not halt or falter. I know how strongly American civilization now leans on the triumph of the government and how great a debt we owe to those who went before us through the blood and sufferings of the Revolution. And I am willing—perfectly willing—to lay down all my joys in this life to help maintain this government and to pay that debt. . . .

"Sarah, my love for you is deathless. It seems to bind me with mighty cables that nothing but omnipotence could break; and yet my love of country comes over me like a strong wind and bears me unresistibly on with all these chains to the battlefield. The memories of the blissful moments I have spent with you come creeping over me, and I feel most gratified to God and to you that I have enjoyed them for so long. And hard it is for me to give them up and burn to ashes the hopes of future years, when, God willing, we might still have lived and loved together, and seen our sons grow up to honorable manhood around us.

"I have, I know, but few and small claims upon Divine Providence, but something whispers to me—perhaps it is the wafted prayer of my little Edgar—that I shall return to my loved ones unharmed. If I do not, my dear Sarah, never forget how much I love you, and when my last breath escapes me on the battlefield, it will whisper your name.

"Forgive my many faults and the many pains I have caused you. How thoughtless and foolish I have oftentimes been. How gladly would I wash out with my tears every little spot upon your happiness. . . .

"But, O Sarah, if the dead can come back to this Earth and flit unseen around those they loved, I shall always be near you; in the gladdest days and in the darkest nights . . . always, and if there be a soft breeze upon your cheek, it shall be my breath, as the cool air fans your throbbing temple, it shall be my spirit passing by.

"Sarah, do not mourn me dead; think I am gone and wait for thee, for we shall meet again."

So closes Major Ballou's letter.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT).

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank my very good friend from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), first of all, for his moving testimony on behalf of the greatest folks who ever served our Nation and for arranging this Special Order to honor the valiant men and women that serve our country every day.

While most of America views Memorial Day, rightly, as the official start of

summer vacations and cookouts, which we all enjoy, I hope we also do not forget to pause and remember the men and women who give the full, last measure of devotion serving our country. It is a day to remember those who died defending the freedoms we hold dear and acknowledge the debt of gratitude we owe to our servicemembers and their loved ones. This weekend, we stop to mourn so many of our heroes who served: brothers and sisters, fathers and mothers, aunts and uncles who never came home.

National cemeteries often serve as the final resting place for those who served our country. Founded by President Lincoln and enacted by Congress in 1862, today you can find these cemeteries tucked away in communities across America. Too often the history and stories they hold remain untold or forgotten.

In 1867, Culpeper National Cemetery was established and is located in my congressional district. Earlier this month, a 23-year-old young man was laid to rest there.

U.S. Army Sergeant Cameron Thomas grew up in Ohio, but his family later made Culpeper, Virginia, home. I was proud to see so many members of the Culpeper community lining the streets holding American flags to honor Sergeant Thomas.

At the age of 19, Sergeant Thomas became one of the youngest soldiers to ever earn the Ranger designation. On his fifth deployment, he was killed in action on April 27 in Afghanistan during a night raid on a remote ISIS stronghold that resulted in killing the head of ISIS in Afghanistan.

Family members and friends described him as a man who lived with intention and determination. He believed anything worth doing was worth overdoing and that moderation is for cowards. He was a man who knew his mission and served our country with distinction.

Sergeant Cameron Thomas represented the best of our armed services. He loved his family, passionately served his country, and will be a soldier we honor and cherish for the rest of our Nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) for doing this service for our country.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to take a moment to give recognition to a special veteran from my district who is 90 years old and is a World War II veteran, who worked in the U.S. Navy during World War II and saw many trips across the Pacific Ocean and endured the life of a sailor, sometimes monotonous and sometimes under very perilous circumstances, including at least one attack by kamikazes of his ship and convoy.

I pay special tribute at this time to Wayne Whitlock, who has persevered

for many years after service to his country in that great war.

Mr. Speaker, I am also reminded tonight of President Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. As President Lincoln looked out on a battlefield that had experienced almost 50,000 casualties, he said: "The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the Earth."

Mr. Speaker, very few of us in this Chamber will be remembered long after we leave Washington, D.C. Almost no one will remember my speech tonight, and it will soon become lost in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Yet we are here in this body because of the heroic efforts of men and women who have given their lives for this country for over 200 years. We can never forget their sacrifices.

The only reason we can participate in the activities of this Chamber is because of the sacrifices of our Armed Forces, particularly those who have paid the ultimate price. They have nobly defended our freedoms and our way of life up to their last measure of devotion. They left behind fathers, mothers, wives, sons, daughters, brothers, sisters, friends, and communities to ensure that future generations walk in the light of liberty.

President Lincoln was resolved that those soldiers shall not have died in vain. They and all the soldiers who have died defending American wars and conflicts still deserve that respect and dignity.

Mr. Speaker, we should govern every day with our heroes in mind. We should strive to make them proud of our speech, our actions, and our commitment to our promises. The American Dream, spirit, and Constitution that they fought for should be our charge.

I would be remiss tonight if I did not mention the loved ones these patriots left behind, who are also patriotic. Countless men, women, and children have watched their American soldiers walk away from home, hoping that they will return safely, unaffected physically, mentally, and emotionally. Sadly, many of those heroes never make it home. Knowing that no words can do justice to their sacrifices, I can only say: Thank you. A grateful nation mourns with your loss.

Mr. Speaker, Monday may be the official observance of Memorial Day, but we live with the memory of our fallen heroes every day across our country. I am eternally grateful for their sacrifices.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay respect to the American warfighter. As we celebrate Military Appreciation Month, it is important to convey that the words we use to honor our brave men and women in uniform must be followed up by action. The time for paying artificial lip service to the military community is over.

Next month, the House Armed Services Committee will initiate its annual markup of the National Defense Authorization Act. The NDAA is one of the few things in Washington that actually works. The NDAA has been passed—with bipartisan support—for the last 56 years.

But this year's NDAA might be the most important yet. For the last eight years, our military has been degraded, defunded, and disgraced by the previous administration's attempt to lead from behind. Today, the United States military lacks the requisite personnel and material readiness required to protect our nation against unforeseen and near-peer adversaries.

Our nation faces a litany of global threats from North Korea and Syria, to the Islamic State and Iran. Failed states and transnational fundamentalist regimes that want nothing more than to destroy democracy and the American spirit. The United States military is America's front line defense against the plague of radical Islamic terrorism and demagogues.

There is no other way to say it. Our military is broken. Consider the following:

The Navy is in its smallest state in 99 years, and faces increased demand with limited resources (274 ships).

Moreover, the Navy can only satisfy 40% of all Combatant Commander requests due to high operational tempo and lengthy maintenance periods.

50% of the civilian workforce working in Navy shipyards have less than five years of experience, and such inexperience impacts the on-time delivery of new ships, and increases the cost of the American taxpayer.

Prior to 1992, the Air Force purchased about 200 fighter aircraft per year; today the Air Force buys less than 20; that is a 90 percent reduction of new fighter aircraft.

And of the 58 Army Brigades stationed around the world, only three—three—are prepared to fight in an armed conflict tonight, meaning they require no additional training, manpower, or equipment.

I am honored to serve as the elected representatives of one of the largest military districts in America. No district in this entire country has more military retirees, military veterans, and military dependents than Northwest Florida.

Few districts can lay claim to Northwest Florida's operational and training footprint. My district is home to the Army's 7th Special Forces Group; the Air Force Special Operations Command; The Joint Gulf Range Com-

plex which provides supersonic air combat training and hypersonic weapons testing for frontline warfighters like the F-35 and the F-22; and Pensacola Naval Air Station, the cradle of Naval Aviation.

But the time for honoring the brave men and women of the military with just words is over. They need more than free dinners at Applebee's and free milkshakes at Dairy Queen to feel truly appreciated. We need congressional commitment to end the scourge of sequestration. We need to right the wrongs of the previous administration's systematic dismantling of military readiness. We need the 115th Congress show its true military appreciation by providing the American warfighter with the tools, training, and long term funding to protect the homeland and sustain America as the preeminent global superpower.

□ 1845

THE SCOURGE OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this coming Monday, May 29, marks the 2-year anniversary of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, called the JVTA.

Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives and the Senate worked together in a bipartisan manner to write this comprehensive, massive law to fight human trafficking. Basically, we said in this legislation that modern-day slavery will not be tolerated in the United States, and that message was made loud and clear when the law was signed 2 years ago.

Since that time, there have been wonderful successes by providing victims with help and services that they need to recover, and by capturing and charging both the traffickers and the buyers according to our law.

DEBBIE'S STORY

Mr. Speaker, Debbie grew up in an idyllic American neighborhood.

The middle child of a close-knit military family living in the suburbs, Debbie could have never imagined that she would be forced into sex slavery.

One cool Phoenix night, Debbie's mother thought nothing of letting her young daughter meet a friend in their front yard one night to play.

Busy with dishes and other children inside, her mother didn't realize that her young

daughter, clad in her cartoon pajamas, was being abducted by two men in front of their house.

These deviants threw Debbie in the car, drugged and gang raped her.

They held a loaded gun to her forehead and threatened to pull the trigger if she ever tried to escape.

For 60 days she was forced to have sex with countless men.

Thankfully for Debbie, a lucky anonymous tip led police to a hotel room where they found Debbie tied up and stashed under a bed.

CHERYL BRIGGS' STORY

Cheryl Briggs grew up in an abusive home, sexually and physically abused by her father.

Her mother left when Cheryl was very young to escape the abuse.

At the age of 12, Cheryl didn't know what else to do to get away from the father she feared, so she ran away.

She began hitchhiking with truck drivers and anyone who would take her.

This led her to a ride with a motorcyclist and into human trafficking hell.

He took her to a biker club filled with men who took advantage of her.

He became her trafficker.

She was forced to dance at a strip club by day and sold on the streets at night.

She was trapped in the world of human trafficking.

Cheryl didn't know how to get help.

She had no one to call and no one to provide for her.

No one came to rescue her.

That is until a patron at a strip club found out that she was only 15 and helped her escape.

LENA'S STORY

In her formative years, Lena wore turtle-necks and baggy clothes to school every day. Why did she do so?

To hide the bruises that covered her entire body.

When her abusive foster mother lost custody, Lena ran away.

She was just 13 years old.

After bolting from the front lawn at the Houston middle school, she ran into a friendly-looking stranger.

This man offered to look after her, protect and love her.

Human traffickers manipulate the vulnerabilities of their victims, he knew that Lena would do anything to feel loved.

For the next 3 months, Lena was trafficked to countless buyers.

He kept her on the move, switching from motel to motel to evade detection.

Finally, after tracking a BackPage advertisement her trafficker posted, police located Lena.

They arrested her trafficker in the hotel next door. With her help, the police ultimately charged her trafficker.

Debbie, Cheryl and Lena are all human trafficking survivors.

The things they had to endure are more horrific than most of us can even imagine.

But they survived, they overcame this tragedy.

It was for survivors like these women that CAROLYN MALONEY and I drafted the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act two years ago.

This far-reaching legislation, led by Senator JOHN CORNYN and Senator RON WYDEN in the Senate, made it clear that Congress would no longer turn a blind eye to this scourge in our society.

We wanted to ensure that victims were treated like victims, given the care and help they needed to overcome the evil inflicted upon them.

We also wanted to make sure that the traffickers and the buyers were both brought to justice.

HOUSTON SUPER BOWL STORY

This past February, my hometown of Houston, Texas, hosted the 51st Super bowl.

For most Americans the Super Bowl is a fun filled day spent with friends and family cheering on a favorite team.

But for trafficking slaves and potential trafficking slaves, it can be a very dangerous time.

Studies show that big events like Super Bowls create large upticks in the trafficking and purchasing of sex trafficking victims.

In order to counteract this, The Department of Homeland Security, as part of its Blue Campaign Initiative, began preparing months in advance.

DHS agents came to Washington, DC and briefed me and other members of the Texas Delegation on their anti-trafficking strategy for super bowl weekend.

Through the Blue Campaign, DHS raises public awareness, forges anti-trafficking partnerships and brings suspected human traffickers to justice.

I commend the Blue Campaign for collaborating with local, state and federal law enforcement agencies in preparation for the Super Bowl.

As a direct result of this large multi-agency operation, over 750 people were arrested across 15 different states.

At least 86 victims were rescued, and many more were likely spared being forced into the trafficking industry.

Having personally worked closely with the Blue Campaign on this, and many other operations, I see firsthand the important role DHS has in fighting the scourge of human trafficking.

This DHS Blue Campaign Authorization Act will ensure that this critically important program continues to provide safety to victims and justice to their traffickers.

SUCCESS OF JVTA AT 2 YEAR MARK

Over the last two years, more than 65 defendants have been charged with federal human trafficking violations.

Of those, 10 were buyers.

Without demand, there would be no market.

JVTA gives law enforcement the critical tools it needs to capture and prosecute criminals who purchase sex from minors or trafficking victims.

Long gone are the days where buyers could anonymously purchase sex from trafficking victims and simply return to their normal lives.

JVT also allows a federal judge to impose an additional assessment of up to \$5,000.

This money then goes into the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund.

This fund provides victims with increased access to services and resources.

It forces the criminals to pay the rent on the courthouse, forces both the buyer and the trafficker to pay for the system they created.

They inflicted pain and suffering on innocent people, they should be the ones to pay.

JVTA also clarified that the U.S. Marshals Service can assist local, state and federal law enforcement in the search and rescue of missing children.

Since the implementation of JVTA, U.S. Marshals have helped rescue 102 children.

As JVTA continues to be implemented, and prosecutors and judges are trained on the new tools it offers them, we will continue to see more and more traffickers and buyers held accountable for their crimes.

We will also see a system that treats victims like victims, providing them with the care and support they need to become survivors.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. POE of Texas. Tonight we have this Special Order, and we have several Members who are going to speak on this. The first Member who will speak is Representative WAGNER. She has served in the House since 2013, and she has, herself, worked extensively on human trafficking issues. She is a co-sponsor of the Shame Act that I have sponsored, and we have worked together. I am honored to introduce her as our first speaker on this very important issue of the human trafficking after 2 years of the legislation being signed. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for the opportunity to co-lead this Special Order with my dear colleague, Congressman TED POE, for Human Trafficking Awareness Week.

I was thrilled, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday the House passed my legislation, the Put Trafficking Victims First Act. Together, we can get victims of trafficking out of dangerous and abusive situations and create better, more accessible trauma-informed services. Victims don't just need to be rescued. They need opportunities to rebuild and sort through trauma and to live well.

My bill advances a survivor-centered approach to addressing human trafficking that ensures the safety, confidentiality, and the well-being of victims. It encourages stakeholders to recognize symptoms of trauma and coping mechanisms that may impact victims' interactions with law enforcement, the justice system, and service providers.

One of the key ways we can address the upsetting realities of human trafficking in the U.S. justice system is by giving victims a pathway to vacate and expunge their criminal records for offenses that they were forced to commit. I have met with many survivors in my home State of Missouri and across our great country who struggle to rebuild their lives because they are trailed by criminal records. Traffickers and pimps intentionally push victims to commit crimes as a means of control.

My heart breaks for these women who have suffered horrendous abuse and bear the mark of a record on top of

it. Criminal records make it difficult for survivors to get jobs, medical care, education, and even housing assistance. These records haunt survivors and can even lead to revictimization.

Mr. Speaker, if we are serious about giving survivors of trafficking a second chance, we must enact serious, fool-proof vacatur laws that erase the collateral consequences of treating trafficking victims like criminals. This is why I introduced, along with the support of many of my colleagues, the Trafficking Survivors Relief Act. This bill would give victims of trafficking relief from Federal or D.C. criminal convictions or arrests.

We know well that Federal courts are not—and I underscore “not”—infallible, and that many victims are trafficked within the District. These women don’t deserve criminal records. They deserve restitution, civil damages, and the empowerment to walk with their heads held high.

I am adamant that these women get a second chance at life, that they find housing, therapy, jobs, new friends, and new chances. I am adamant that the United States of America will no longer punish people for trauma that most of us cannot even imagine. I am adamant that the United States Congress will have the moral aptitude to enact the Trafficking Survivors Relief Act. I am adamant that not one more victim of trafficking will be mistreated in our criminal justice system. Mr. Speaker, I am adamant that we pass this bill into law.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. I would like to ask a couple of questions if she doesn’t mind. I know she has other appointments, but I wanted to ask her a couple questions. I would like to know how has the trafficking situation in her home State of Missouri decreased, or how has this legislation helped?

Mrs. WAGNER. Well, I will tell the gentleman that the legislation that he and I have worked on for a number of years and that he has spent the better part of a lifetime as a judge and as a legislator on is saving lives; but, sadly, my hometown of St. Louis, Missouri, would be ranked in the top 20 counties or cities in the Nation for human trafficking. So the problem is prevalent. It exists still.

What breaks my heart most of all are those children who have been victimized, whether it is by online predators or other means, those who are the most vulnerable in our society. We have been able to work with many of the safe houses, with our prosecutors, with our law enforcement, with our advocacy groups.

As Congressman POE and I both know, we can’t always legislate all the ills of society away. What I appreciate about the work that we do is not only passing laws and legislation to help those victims, but also the education

and awareness that is so very important. So anything that we can do to lift those advocates up, to bring a spotlight to this modern-day slavery is so very important.

I commend the gentleman from Texas for his work and for the Special Order here tonight. I look forward to a day when this heinous crime, this modern-day slavery no longer exists in the United States of America.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. I also wanted to compliment her on her tenacious work of going after backpage.com and making that resource unavailable for those traffickers and those buyers. I want to commend her for that.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that these online predators are the bane of our existence. It is a dark underbelly of the human trafficking and sex slavery trade that is out there, and it is absolutely unconscionable that crimes can be committed online that would not be allowed to be committed offline. We are going to go to the heart of the Communications Decency Act with my next piece of legislation that so many attorneys general and States and prosecutors and law enforcement and advocacy groups are begging for Congress to act to make sure that there is clarity so that States and the Federal Government can prosecute, and to make sure that we make the changes that are necessary in a very specific and narrow way to make sure that those online predators are not victimizing the children, women, and young boys of our land.

I look forward to working with the gentleman and my colleagues on much more work in this arena.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman being here and making such powerful comments.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD). She is an Iraqi war veteran and a former member of the Hawaii House of Representatives. She is working specifically, among other things, in the area of the juvenile justice system, trying to reform that.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for his leadership on this and many other issues, really taking up this cause and being a champion for the voiceless.

Last month I was in my district in Hawaii, and we traveled all across the State, on every island, holding town-hall meetings on a variety of issues, but one of the meetings and forums that I participated in was at the University of Hawaii at Hilo, and it was specifically around this issue of human trafficking, of sex trafficking.

In this small community in Hawaii, many people had gathered—it was a full room—trying to increase their own awareness and share more information about the prevalence of this issue, not just in places in other parts of the

world, but in our communities right here at home. I think that is something that surprises a lot of folks that I talk to, is you can read about these human trafficking problems in cities in Asia or other parts of the world, but very rarely do people think that it is happening in their own backyard, in their own hometown, when the reality is that this is a very real issue that exists in far too many of our hometowns and our communities all across the country.

In my own home State of Hawaii, girls as young as 11 years old have been recruited from schools, from beaches, from malls through an intricate network of sex traffickers. In 2016, last year, 30 cases of human trafficking were reported to the human trafficking hotline in Hawaii. Almost all of them had to do with the exploitation of women for sex and labor, and in 10 of these cases the individuals targeted were minors.

Now, what we know and what is terribly disturbing is how underreported this actually is, that these numbers are not at all representative of the reality that exists in our community because trafficking is more common than the number of cases reported.

Now, too often those who are victims of and those who are forced into trafficking are charged as criminals and are forced to live with this criminal record for the rest of their lives, never being able to escape the shackles of nonviolent crimes committed in the course of their being victims of human trafficking. This often inhibits them from getting the care and assistance that they really need, to be free, to be able to move on with their lives.

Our current criminal justice system is broken in so many ways, and in so many ways perpetuates a cycle of crime, exploitation, and poverty, stripping the most exploited and vulnerable individuals in our society of a fair chance for a new life and healing from unimaginable abuses perpetuated by truly evil criminals.

Now, at the local level in States like Hawaii, we have passed legislation that bans sex trafficking and classifies it as a class A felony, but that is not enough. That is why I am so proud to be a cosponsor of the Trafficking Survivors Relief Act, because it creates this promise of freedom for those survivors from the shackles of their past. It establishes a process to vacate convictions and expunge arrests for those charged with criminal offenses related to human trafficking, finally putting survivors on a path to rehabilitation and healing rather than a life of continued exploitation and abuse.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to get this legislation passed and actually enact this change so it helps those in our communities who need it the most.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii

for her work on this. As you can tell, this is a bipartisan effort. When we took this legislation 2 years ago and brought it to the House, there were 11 bills that came to the House of Representatives, and they almost all passed unanimously. Then they were sent to the Senate, and the Senate combined them into two bills. The same over there, almost unanimous; and then back over to the House, and the final passage was almost unanimous once again. It is a bipartisan effort, and I thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii for her work on this and her service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER). He is one of our newest, if not the newest, Members of Congress. He served in the Pennsylvania State Senate for a good number of years.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Judge POE for the work that he is doing this evening to bring attention to a critical problem that desperately needs our attention and needs our solutions, that of human trafficking.

The three largest international crime industries are drug trafficking, arms trafficking, and human trafficking. It is uncomfortable to talk about, but we can't shy away from talking about the fact that in the world today, young boys and girls are being sold across the globe for an average price of \$90. It is not just in remote parts of the globe. More than 14,000 people are trafficked into the United States each year. It is happening all across America, and in Lancaster, Berks, and Chester Counties, the district that I represent in Pennsylvania.

□ 1900

Four out of five people trafficked in the world today are trafficked for sexual exploitation. Eighty percent are female and half are children.

Antitrafficking groups gather in our churches, restaurants, and schools all across Pennsylvania and across the country. Those individuals, and the victims of trafficking, should know that they have allies in Congress.

My office has been in contact with organizations in my district like Safe Berks, the Chester County Anti-Human Trafficking Coalition, and law enforcement officials to discuss ways that we can work together to help victims.

I am also very pleased to cosponsor the bipartisan Trafficking Survivors Relief Act, introduced by my colleague ANN WAGNER, who was here with us this evening, from Missouri, a leader on this issue.

Victims of trafficking are forced to commit crimes like prostitution, drug dealing, and money laundering. We cannot punish these victims for crimes committed because of coercion and under the threat of violence or death.

We must ensure that we are doing all we can to help victims recover from

these unthinkable experiences. This legislation will help to do that by providing more judicial discretion for victims to clear their names of any wrongdoing.

I am proud to stand with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation that helps end this barbaric practice.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his comments, and now for his work on this issue of trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), another Ted here in Congress. TED YOHO is serving Florida's Congressional District 3. He is vice chairman of the U.S. House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the chairman of U.S. House Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee. He has supported many bills on this issue of trafficking and has worked very hard in his home State of Florida to bring awareness to this.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Judge POE for his tireless work on this issue. And I appreciate the leadership, and LLOYD SMUCKER. And as he has talked about, this is a bipartisan issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to modern-day slavery, because that is what this is, in the form of human trafficking.

Most people believe human trafficking only occurs at home. It is a foreign crime that would never happen in our community, let alone their own backyard. To that I say: Let me tell you about human trafficking in rural America.

I come from a district that is very rural. We had several summits on this issue. We talked to the local sheriffs and to the local police departments, and they said: Do you know what, we don't have that problem here. We are okay.

We invoked the help of the Department of Homeland Security, and they have got a great campaign called the Blue Campaign. We encouraged these officers to show up. And I am happy to say that most of the people that we talked to—the counties and the sheriffs—showed up.

And it wasn't more than about 2 weeks that I started getting calls from the sheriffs. And they said: Do you know what, that is happening right here.

It is an awareness campaign. And Ms. GABBARD from Hawaii mentioned how underreported it is. Of course, it is, if people aren't aware of it. But when you bring awareness through campaigns like the Department of Homeland Security's Blue Campaign, people wake up to this issue. And I love their motto: If you see something, say something. Let people know this is going on.

So let me tell you about our home community. In March of this year, a special needs student in Jacksonville,

Florida, was kidnapped. Her captors placed her under house arrest, basically. They incarcerated her for human trafficking. They placed an advertisement online offering her sexual services, which is quite possibly the only reason the police were able to find her. These people were advertising on the internet.

Also, in March of this year, 15 men were arrested in my hometown of Gainesville, Florida, on child solicitation charges. These men were discovered as part of an undercover operation that led them to believe they were communicating with young girls. The men believed the girls' guardians were allowing them to commit sexual acts with underage girls.

Only 2 months prior to this arrest, a Gainesville man was sentenced to 25 years in prison for sex trafficking an adult.

A month prior to that, Polk County—another rural county—detectives arrested 114 suspects in a human trafficking and prostitution ring. At least four of them were immediately identified as human trafficking victims. And merely 3 months later, an additional 104 were picked up in a second sting for human trafficking, including those soliciting sex from minors.

These are but a few examples of human trafficking-related crimes that have occurred in my community in the last 6 months. Florida is estimated to have the third highest rate of human trafficking in the country, following only behind California and New York—third in the Nation. That is not something any State wants a designation for. All three of these States are ideal because of their access to ports and interstate highways, allowing victims to be transported across State lines easily.

And it is estimated today—and I, again, sit on the Foreign Affairs Committee with Judge POE, and we have seen these numbers too often. It is estimated that 21 million people are trafficked around the world, resulting in an estimated \$150 billion in profits—profits from the sale of a human individual that goes to the traffickers who are often drug smugglers or terrorist organizations.

The 13th Amendment to our Constitution abolished slavery in this country. However, it still exists, and it is right in our own backyard. Because of this, we need to do all that we can to eradicate this.

The runaway child is picked up within 48 hours and forced within the sex trade. This is something that, if you believe in the 13th Amendment, we all need to stand up, take an active role in this, and we do this by the legislation that is up.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Judge for being a strong advocate and always being there for this.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how many minutes do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE). She, like the women in Congress, who I have given a lot of credit for all of this trafficking legislation, is very concerned about victims of family and domestic violence.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise as an original cosponsor of the Trafficking Survivors Relief Act of 2017, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this truly bipartisan piece of legislation.

We have come a long way in this country in recognizing and acknowledging the problems of sex trafficking; and not just laying the blame at the seat of a so-called prostitute but understanding that this is a crime where the persons being trafficked, as you have heard my colleagues say, are imprisoned in sex trafficking. And why is it?

You heard them talk about the \$150 billion impact that this has. There is a huge incentive to sell these women over and over and over and over again. Because unlike drugs, you can resell these products of these victims again.

Survivors of sex trafficking can't just walk away. They are in prison. They endure violent beatings, brainwashing, sexual assault, psychological control, and control of their purses and their identification. But then they find themselves arrested and convicted for prostitution, labeled as sex offenders, and then just revictimized by a system that doesn't understand that they were prisoners of this lucrative operation.

These survivors face long-term negative consequences. They are denied access to employment, housing resources, and student financial aid that is needed to develop a sustainable safe and stable life. The Trafficking Survivors Relief Act offers survivors postconviction relief from criminal charges stemming from nonviolent offenses committed as a direct result of being a victim of human trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, an estimated 300,000 children become victims of sex trafficking every year through fraud, force, and coercion. Many of them think, You know, I am going to be taken out to dinner by someone who loves me, and find themselves imprisoned at that very moment. Many of them are then arrested for these crimes that they are forced to commit.

In my State of Wisconsin, 79 percent of human trafficking cases reported in Wisconsin occur in my district, I am ashamed to say.

In the city of Milwaukee, last year, as an example, Mr. Speaker, two sisters, ages 16 and 17, were rescued during the FBI's Operation Cross Country. They told an undercover Federal agent that their mother had forced them into

prostitution. Had they been arrested, instead of recovered from their mother, who imprisoned them, would they have deserved to be branded for life with a criminal record?

Imagine every time that they applied for housing or for financial aid or for a job, that they would be denied on the basis of their criminal record; and they were coerced into this act as minors by their own mother. Imagine the re-traumatization and further devastation that repeated denial would have caused them.

It just makes these people so vulnerable, and it deserves a legislative solution that we are proposing here today.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her strong comments. I know where she stands on the issue of victims of violence.

Mr. Speaker, the 2-year anniversary of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act will be Monday. As a former judge and co-chairman of the Victims' Rights Caucus, with JIM COSTA from California, this is an important issue. I bet most Americans have never heard of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act because it was passed with bipartisan support, overwhelming support. Things like this don't make the news because we are not fussing and feuding between the two sides.

But it is a very important piece of legislation for our country. It goes after the trafficker. It makes sure they get arrested, and they go to prison where they belong. It also goes after the buyer, the person who hides and tries to buy young children on the marketplace of sex slavery. But it rescues victims and turns them into survivors. That is why this legislation is important.

The average age of a trafficking victim in the United States is 13. That means some are younger than 13. And it is a menace and a scourge that we, in the House of Representatives, along with our friends in the Senate, are going to make sure that the legislation is appropriate to solve this epidemic. That is why we are reminding individuals that we have this piece of legislation that is passed, and other pieces of legislation as well.

The last thing I wanted to mention is part of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act allows Federal judges to impose a fee on the trafficker or the buyer, and that money goes into a fund that helps victims of trafficking. That is a great idea. Make the criminals pay the rent on the courthouse by this type of restitution program.

I want to thank all of the people who helped out tonight. There is a lot more to be said about the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. We are going to continue to bring awareness of it to the American public.

I can tell you one thing, though, traffickers and buyers know about this leg-

islation. With the help of local and State and Federal law enforcement, we are going to stop this sale of our children and adult women here in the United States for money.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, this week, as the House of Representatives considers human trafficking legislation, I am proud to continue working with colleagues from both sides of the aisle to raise awareness on the heinous practice of human trafficking and to work together to eradicate it from our communities.

I thank my friend and classmate, Congresswoman ANN WAGNER of Missouri (MO-02) for organizing tonight's Special Order Hour.

Human trafficking—where people profit from the control and exploitation of others—occurs both here at home and abroad on a daily basis.

In fact, the International Labour Organization estimates that there are 20.9 million victims of human trafficking globally—68% of them are trapped in forced labor, 26% of them are children, and 55% are women and girls.

And in my home state of Ohio, human trafficking for sex and labor is on the rise.

According to recent reports from the Polaris Project, a nonprofit that tracks trafficking in the U.S. and abroad, 375 Ohio trafficking cases were reported from 1,352 calls to the National Human Trafficking Hotline in 2016. In 2015, there were 289 cases based on 1,070 calls. The 2016 numbers reflect a nearly four-fold increase over the Ohio figures from 2013.

While the overall increase in reporting can be partly attributed to greater awareness of the national hotline, we know, and officials confirm, that trafficking is, unfortunately, chronically under-reported.

We must do more to help trafficking victims and to encourage people when they see something that looks like an individual is being trafficked, that they say something.

Victims of human trafficking often live in the shadows of our society, so it is up to all of us to help identify and rescue victims of trafficking.

While human trafficking spans all demographics, there are some circumstances or vulnerabilities that lead to a higher susceptibility to victimization.

Runaway and homeless youth, as well as victims of domestic violence or sexual assault, are frequently targeted by traffickers.

Men and women, boys and girls, who are all alone, abused, and often believe they have nowhere to go.

Well, we can help. We must do more to assist victims of trafficking and provide them with the services and treatment necessary to regain control of their lives.

We must also ensure the investigation and prosecution of human trafficking crimes is focused on the traffickers, the people assisting the traffickers, and the purchasers—the individuals who are the real criminals in the enterprise.

Almost two years ago, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act—or the JVTA—was signed into law. The JVTA is helping to update efforts to combat the scourge of human trafficking and provided essential resources to survivors and law enforcement officials.

I am proud to have had a provision included in this comprehensive legislation and to have taken part in its drafting, passage, and enactment.

Mr. Speaker, since the JVT's enactment, we have witnessed important achievements, but we cannot stop here.

We must continue to work together to eradicate human trafficking and support the victims. Tonight, I pledge to continue to working with my colleagues to raise awareness and fight back against human trafficking, because as we all know, one victim of human trafficking is one too many.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of traveling with the Vice President to Louisiana for official business.

Ms. MCSALLY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for after 12 p.m. today and for the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Mr. KIHUEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 4 p.m. and tomorrow.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 366. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's vehicle fleet, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 25, 2017, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1420. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Daniel B. Allyn, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1421. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly

Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket Nos.: 120328229-4949-02 and 150121066-5717-02] (RIN: 0648-XF210) received May 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1422. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final specifications — Pacific Island Fisheries; 2016 Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures [Docket No.: 160422356-7283-02] (RIN: 0648-XE587) received May 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1423. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 150121066-5717-02] (RIN: 0648-XF259) received May 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1424. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Office of Strategic Operations and Regulatory Affairs, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicare Program; Advancing Care Coordination Through Episode Payment Models (EPMs); Cardiac Rehabilitation Incentive Payment Model; and Changes to the Comprehensive Care for Joint Replacement Model (CJR) [CMS-5519-F] (RIN: 0938-AS90) received May 22, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida):

H.R. 2617. A bill to provide first-time, low-level, nonviolent simple possession offenders under age 25 an opportunity to expunge that conviction after successful completion of court-imposed probation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Ms. SÁNCHEZ):

H.R. 2618. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide further tax incentives for dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2619. A bill to prohibit the Coast Guard from establishing any new anchorage grounds in the Hudson River, New York, until it reports to the Congress on the potential impact of such anchorage grounds to sites listed on the National Priorities List and to critical habitat; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BROOKS of Ala-

bama, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. STEWART, Mr. EMMER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. BANKS of Indiana):

H.R. 2620. A bill to revise various laws that interfere with the right of the people to obtain and use firearms for all lawful purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2621. A bill to strengthen security in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2622. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to include all funds when issuing certain geographic targeting orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2623. A bill to provide for a method by which the economic costs of significant regulatory actions may be offset by the repeal of other regulatory actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 2624. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand school choice opportunities for children of active duty members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. COHEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CLAY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2625. A bill to establish a grant program to encourage the use of assistance dogs by certain members of the Armed Forces and veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on

Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HURD (for himself, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 2626. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 and the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve visa security, visa applicant vetting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HURD (for himself, Mr. VELA, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 2627. A bill to authorize the development of open-source software based on certain systems of the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of State to facilitate the vetting of travelers against terrorist watchlists and law enforcement databases, enhance border management, and improve targeting and analysis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself and Mr. BARTON):

H.R. 2628. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for 12-month continuous enrollment of individuals under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. COLE, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. SMUCKER, and Mr. FERGUSON):

H.R. 2629. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide for appropriate designation of collective bargaining units; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. BIGGS):

H.R. 2630. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to La Paz County, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WALZ, Mr. GALLEG0, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2631. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the scope of procedural rights of members of the uniformed services with respect to their employment and reemployment rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 2632. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to undertake remediation oversight of the West Lake Landfill located in Bridgeton, Missouri; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2633. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2634. A bill to designate the Mental Health Residential Rehabilitation Treatment Facility Expansion of the Department of Veterans Affairs Alvin C. York Medical Center in Murfreesboro, Tennessee, as the "Sergeant John Toombs Residential Rehabilitation Treatment Facility"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HANABUSA (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2635. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 2636. A bill to establish an independent inspector general for the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 2637. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to reauthorize the Fishing Safety Training Grant Program and the Fishing Safety Research Grant Program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 2638. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an increased work opportunity credit with respect to recent veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DEFazio, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 2639. A bill to reauthorize the Elder Justice Act of 2009; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2640. A bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico):

H.R. 2641. A bill to promote the development of safe drugs for neonates; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mr. PAL-LONE):

H.R. 2642. A bill to allow certain Indonesian citizens to file a motion to reopen their asylum claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. DONOVAN):

H.R. 2643. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to require the annual human rights reports to include information on the institutionalization of children and the subjection of children to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment, unnecessary detention, and denial of the right to life, liberty, and the security of persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 2644. A bill to improve the understanding of, and promote access to treatment for, chronic kidney disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SOTO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CRIST, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COSTA, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 2645. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for congressional notification of disclosures of top secret information to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 2646. A bill to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2647. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 10 percent threshold on the deduction for medical expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2648. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the requirements that new Federal employees who are veterans with service-connected disabilities are provided leave for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disabilities apply to certain employees of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 2649. A bill to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to apply certain procedures before granting a certificate of public convenience and necessity for a proposed pipeline project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all trade agreements the United States enters into, should provide reasonable access and collaboration of each nation involved in such an agreement, for the purpose of search and recovery activities relating to members of the United States Armed Forces missing in action from prior wars or military conflicts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mrs. WAGNER):

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution to urge the President to direct the United States representative to the United Nations to use the voice and vote of the United States to hold the United Nations and its member states accountable for allegations of sexual abuse and exploitation by United Nations peacekeepers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. MEEKS):

H. Res. 353. A resolution supporting a democratic Hungary and reaffirming the long-standing and mutually-beneficial relationship between the United States and Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYCE of California (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H. Res. 354. A resolution condemning the violence against peaceful protesters outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence on May 16, 2017, and calling for the perpetrators to be brought to justice and measures to be taken to prevent similar incidents in the future; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Mr. COOK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DENT, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H. Res. 355. A resolution condemning in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Manchester, United Kingdom, on May 22, 2017, expressing heartfelt condolences, and reaffirming unwavering support for the special relationship between our peoples and nations in the wake of these attacks; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Res. 356. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Senate should give its advice and consent to the ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

tives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 2617.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I.

Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States . . .

Article I

Section 8.

Clause 18. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper . . .

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2618.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2619.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 2620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Second Amendment of the United States Constitution

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the common Defence", "to raise and support Armies", "to provide and maintain a Navy" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2622.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2623.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section I grants that "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States . . ." Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 grants that "The Congress shall have Power to . . . Regulate Commerce . . . Among the several States . . ." Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 grants that "The Congress shall have Power To . . . Make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by [the] Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 2624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 2625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8: to provide for the Common Defense.

By Mr. HURD:

H.R. 2626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; and

Article 1, section 8, clause 18; To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HURD:

H.R. 2627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 2628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 2629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause)—Under this clause, Congress has the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. By virtue of this enumerated power, Congress has governing authority over the lands, territories, or other property of the United States—and with this authority Congress is vested with the power to all owners in fee, the ability to sell, lease, dispose, exchange, convey, or simply preserve land.

The Supreme Court has described this enumerated grant as one "without limitation" *Kleppe v New Mexico*, 426 U.S. 529, 542–543 (1976) ("And while the furthest reaches of the power granted by the Property Clause have not been definitely resolved, we have repeatedly observed that the power over the public land thus entrusted to Congress is without limitation.")

Historically, the federal government transferred ownership of federal property to either private ownership or the states in order to pay off large Revolutionary War debts and to assist with the development of infrastructure. The transfers codified by this legislation are thus constitutional.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, sec. 8.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2633.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representa-

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H.R. 2634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. HANABUSA:

H.R. 2635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 2636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 2637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 2640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 2641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4: To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 2643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18(Necessary and Proper Clause) the Congress shall have the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 2644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18(Necessary and Proper Clause) the Congress shall have the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 2645.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the power to provide for the common defense and to make all laws necessary and proper to carry out this power.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 2646.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2647.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 2648.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 2649.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 Clauses 3 and 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. ROYCE of California.

H.R. 19: Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 169: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 173: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 227: Ms. BARRAGAN.

H.R. 291: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 299: Mr. EVANS, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 303: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. MASSIE, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 305: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 358: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 361: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 377: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 421: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 433: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 469: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 478: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 490: Mr. BARTON, Mrs. ROBY, and Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 519: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 525: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 535: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 548: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 564: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 676: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 681: Mr. MAST and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 721: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 731: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 749: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 785: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 820: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 821: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 830: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 845: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 849: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 881: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 916: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 995: Mr. FASO.

H.R. 1017: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. NEAL, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1038: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 1045: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1046: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1057: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 1059: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 1065: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 1083: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1133: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 1200: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1227: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1239: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 1247: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 1279: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1291: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1298: Mr. BARR and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1300: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1317: Mr. DUNN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1361: Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1421: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1478: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1494: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. TROTT, Mrs.

MIMI WALTERS of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1512: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 1516: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1555: Mr. EMMER and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.

H.R. 1560: Mr. ABRAHAM and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1599: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1626: Mr. EMMER and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1627: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 1651: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1676: Mr. EMMER and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1683: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1697: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. EMMER, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. FOX, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. GORMERT.

H.R. 1698: Ms. BASS, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. COLE,

Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1699: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1777: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1784: Mr. GARAMENDI and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 1785: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 1825: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1841: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 1844: Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1847: Mr. TROTT and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1860: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 1873: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 1881: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 1889: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1928: Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1939: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1993: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1997: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 2000: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 2001: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 2012: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2020: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 2023: Mr. UPTON and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2040: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 2056: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2079: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 2123: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2133: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 2147: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2170: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 2175: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2176: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2197: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2210: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. SMUCKER, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2239: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2240: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2272: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 2290: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. EVANS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2298: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 2310: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 2328: Mr. EVANS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RASKIN, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2340: Mr. DENHAM and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 2351: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 2353: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 2366: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 2372: Mr. ISSA, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 2375: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2383: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 2412: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 2422: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HECK, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 2434: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 2452: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 2477: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 2484: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 2500: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2506: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 2526: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HECK, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2542: Mr. POLIS and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2545: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 2552: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 2564: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2583: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2608: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 2613: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. MEADOWS.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. NUNES, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H. Con. Res. 43: Mrs. DINGELL.

H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. LAMBORN.

H. Res. 31: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H. Res. 129: Mr. DELANEY.

H. Res. 188: Mr. AMODEI.

H. Res. 201: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H. Res. 206: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H. Res. 218: Mr. GOSAR.

H. Res. 239: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Mr. KEATING.

H. Res. 259: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H. Res. 276: Mr. POLIS and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H. Res. 296: Mr. LAMALFA.

H. Res. 307: Mr. DESANTIS.

H. Res. 309: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 318: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. NOLAN.

H. Res. 335: Mr. TAKANO.

H. Res. 336: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. KEATING.

H. Res. 337: Mr. STIVERS.

H. Res. 351: Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. POLIS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. KATKO, and Mrs. LOWEY.

SENATE—Wednesday, May 24, 2017

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TOM COTTON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious and loving God, You continue to give us reasons for rejoicing in Your love and grace. We praise You for the beauty of the sunrise and the glory of the sunset.

Today, guide our lawmakers with Your wisdom and love, empowering them to strengthen men and women on life's journey. Lord, help our Senators to remember that nothing is impossible for You, for Your grace and might hold the galaxies in place.

Lord, we are grateful for Your presence in this Chamber, our Nation, and our world. Use us all for Your glory and for the good of those in need. Continue to do in our lives exceedingly, abundantly, above all that we can ask or imagine.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 24, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM COTTON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. COTTON thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, a new report released last night from the Department of Health and Human Services reveals startling new numbers showing just how substantial premium increases have been under ObamaCare. According to that report, average annual ObamaCare premiums have increased by nearly \$3,000 since 2013, the year that most of the healthcare law's mandates and regulations actually went into effect. In other words, it is now clear that average ObamaCare plans on the exchanges more than doubled from 2013 until now. That is an increase of 105 percent, or nearly \$3,000. These figures are based on the Obama administration's own data, but these exorbitant costs are just one part of the problem, to say nothing of the shrinking choices of insurers offering plans on the ObamaCare exchanges across the country.

Last week, our colleague from Iowa, Chairman GRASSLEY, came to the floor and shared with us the story of the Tacoma Narrows Bridge, a bridge in Washington State that was, as he put it, "set to fail from the very beginning." He told us how the bridge was built on a "flawed design," how it "self-destructed," and how it eventually "collapsed." Much like that bridge, he said, ObamaCare is becoming "its own bridge to nowhere with no insurance plan on its exchanges." Boy, he is right about that.

As time goes on, more Americans are finding themselves with fewer ObamaCare insurance options to choose from on the exchanges. Take a look at the map behind me, and you will see what I mean. On this map: Fewer choices: Number of insurers on the ObamaCare exchanges in 2017. What does it reflect?

In more than 1,000 counties across 26 States, families have only 1—just 1—ObamaCare option to choose from in the marketplace. ObamaCare customers in five States have only one insurer left on the exchanges. As a recent article predicted, "insurer choice in the ACA marketplace could hit an all-time low" next year in 2018.

Let that sink in for a minute. Families across the country could experience "an all-time low" when it comes to their choices for ObamaCare plans next year. In other words, things are likely to only get worse. Still, despite all the news reports and the studies and the personal stories shared by constituents, some of our colleagues simply refuse to face the realities of this failed law.

Consider what we saw just yesterday, when a group of Democratic Senators

held a press conference, essentially advocating for the ObamaCare status quo in rural America. But in case our friends missed it, I want to share a recent headline that reveals what ObamaCare's status quo has actually meant for families in these regions of the country. Here is what it read: "Rural Shoppers Face Slim Choices, Steep Premiums On Exchanges."

The article went on to cite a study showing that ObamaCare customers living in less populous areas of the country in 2017 "frequently had just one or two insurers from which to pick, and often faced significantly higher premiums than did people in more urban areas."

Much like that dilapidated bridge Chairman GRASSLEY described, ObamaCare is self-destructing all around us. We know things are likely to get worse unless we move beyond the failures of ObamaCare. In his home State of Iowa, more than 70,000 people are facing the harsh reality that they may be left with absolutely no options—none—on the ObamaCare individual market—zero.

Many Virginians recently learned they could also have fewer choices on the ObamaCare exchanges next year. In fact, people in 27 of the State's 95 counties could have just one option for coverage through the ObamaCare marketplace in 2018. Tennesseans in 16 counties are in a similarly distressing situation, as they, too, are likely to have just one choice when it comes to signing up for insurance through the ObamaCare exchanges next year.

So these are just the latest developments in ObamaCare's dwindling options, which over the years have continuously pushed too many people off their plan and left them with fewer choices. Take one Knoxville, TN, woman who recounted her experience in a recent news article. In 2015, she signed up for an ObamaCare plan with one major insurer, but by the end of the year, that company pulled out of the marketplace, leaving her to find a new plan. In 2016, she was forced to sign up for an ObamaCare plan with another insurer. Again, at the end of the year, that company left the marketplace, as well. Now in 2017, she signed up with yet another ObamaCare plan with yet another insurer, and—you guessed it—at the end of this year, that insurance company will also exit the ObamaCare marketplace, leaving the Tennessee mom to find an alternative option one more time. Unfortunately, her story is not unique. As insurers on the exchanges continue to propose premium increases and announce their intentions for participation next year, we

can expect even more troubling news to roll in.

These families deserve relief from ObamaCare—a failing law with limited, even nonexistent, choices that continue to shrink on the collapsing marketplace.

These families deserve relief from ObamaCare—a failing law with skyrocketing premiums that have risen by double-digit rate increases all across our country.

These families deserve relief from ObamaCare—a failing law with mandates that require people to buy plans that aren't right for their families, even if there are no suitable choices to pick from, even if they are too expensive to actually use.

How much more will it take for our Democratic colleagues to realize that we have to move beyond the failures of ObamaCare? The only way these families are going to get the help they need—and that so many have called for—is if we actually take action. The Republican Senate has been clear what we aren't OK with standing by and allowing this system to crash completely, dragging down even more families along with it.

We know that—just like that collapsing bridge—ObamaCare wasn't built on a sturdy foundation, nor were its policies truly built to last. Just like the bridge, it may have looked really good from the outside. We all remember the lofty claims our Democratic colleagues made about the law, but it never lived up to the fanfare. I know it is a disappointing reality for our friends across the aisle who championed the failed healthcare law. We know it is not the outcome they had hoped for, but the status quo is simply unacceptable.

We expect the Congressional Budget Office to release an updated score of the bill the House passed later today. It is a technical procedural step. Beyond likely reiterating things we already know—like that fewer people will buy a product they don't want when the government stops forcing them to—the updated report will allow the Senate procedurally to move forward in working to draft its own healthcare legislation.

So whatever CBO says about the House bill today, this much is absolutely clear: The status quo under ObamaCare is completely unacceptable and totally unsustainable. The prices are skyrocketing. Choice is plummeting. The marketplace is collapsing, and countless more Americans will get hurt if we don't act. No one should be comfortable with that. I know I am not, and I certainly hope our Democratic colleagues aren't either.

So instead of continuing to hold press conferences in what ultimately can only be described as a defense of the ObamaCare status quo, I would ask our Democratic colleagues to come to

terms with the situation Americans are facing, to stop the empty rhetoric, to join us in finally helping those who have been hurt by this failing law.

NOMINATION OF AMUL THAPAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, as the Senate continues to process nominations, I would like to take a moment to say a few words about one for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit whom we will confirm this week.

Judge Amul Thapar served with distinction on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky for close to a decade, having previously served as U.S. attorney for that same district and as assistant U.S. attorney for several years before that.

He was the first South Asian American to become a Federal judge, and once he is confirmed to the Sixth Circuit, Judge Thapar will be only the second South Asian American to serve on a Federal circuit court.

The American Bar Association has given him its highest rating—unanimously “well qualified.” That meant that in the group that rated him there was no one who didn't give him a “well qualified” rating, which is the best they could give any nominee. I certainly couldn't agree more with that characterization.

Judge Thapar is an excellent jurist. I know he will make a great addition to the Sixth Circuit, and I am proud to support his nomination. I would encourage all Members of the Senate to support him as we advance his nomination today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday former CIA Director John Brennan testified in the House Intelligence Committee that he had growing concerns about Russian interference in the final months of the 2016 election, adding that an investigation into potential collusion between the Trump campaign and the Kremlin was well founded. He issued very strong words.

Coming from a very careful civil servant from the intelligence community, Mr. Brennan's testimony should further compel Congress and the special counsel to pursue the full truth. What Mr. Brennan said was happening gets at the very core of our democracy, the free and fair election of our representatives. Americans of all political stripes should be outraged by what Putin and the Russians did during the 2016 elections. As former Director Brennan said, in America, “we cherish the ability to elect our own leaders without outside interference or disruption.”

So, again, I expect that the Senate Intelligence Committee will continue its bipartisan investigation into these events. I expect that Special Counsel Mueller will help us all get to the bottom of this. We must make sure he is not interfered with.

Finally, I expect this body will hold up a high standard for the next FBI Director. He or she should be someone who is nonpartisan and independent, a Director's Director, a prosecutor's prosecutor, not a politician of either party.

Amidst all of the furor, we cannot lose sight of the most serious part of this investigation: the scope of Russian interference in our elections and whether they colluded with representatives of an American campaign in the process. That is very serious stuff—very serious. We must pursue that investigation with vigor no matter who might stand in the way of it.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on the budget, yesterday morning the Trump administration released their 2018 budget. The document is stunning in its cruelty. It takes a sledgehammer to the middle class, the working poor, while lavishing tax breaks on the very wealthy.

They may not have intended it, but the Trump budget is a compilation of all the broken promises this President made to working Americans. In his budget, President Trump has broken promise after promise after promise to working people without any shame, without any remorse, without any explanation.

The President promised to increase infrastructure investment, but his budget actually cuts more money from infrastructure programs than the new money it puts in. The President's proposal to slash American infrastructure investments is a job-killing 180-degree turn away from his repeated promise of a \$1 trillion infrastructure plan.

President Trump's campaign promises on infrastructure are crumbling faster than our roads and bridges. I want to ask the Trump administration: How can we expect that you are going to be real about a trillion-dollar infrastructure plan when your budget cuts

infrastructure dramatically—right now? Don't you think it adds up? To us, it does. It makes us very dubious of any attempt to do infrastructure by this administration. We hope we are wrong, but the budget is a document that tells where the real truth is in terms of administration beliefs. They sure as heck, by this budget, don't like infrastructure.

The President has said that education is the civil rights issue of our time, but the Trump budget calls for over \$3.2 billion in cuts to higher education, eliminates programs that forgive loans for public service jobs like teachers and doctors, and eliminates subsidized loan programs that help lower the cost of college. College students of America, look at the President's budget and see if he is on your side. He sure as heck isn't.

The President said he would "save Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid without cuts. Have to do it." Those are his words. But the Trump budget slashes Social Security by \$72 billion and cuts Medicaid by hundreds of billions, in addition to the more than \$800 billion TrumpCare cuts took from Medicaid already in the House bill. All in all, it is a \$1 trillion broken promise on Medicaid.

Remember, America, Medicaid is a program that affects the poor. That is a good thing. But much of the money goes to help the middle class, elderly people in nursing homes, and families fighting opioid addiction. So the bottom line is this is another broken promise to the middle class that Trump made in the campaign.

The budget breaks promise after promise after promise the President made to what he called the forgotten America, the working men and women of America. Well, this budget forgot the forgotten American.

In addition, the Trump budget depends on fantasy math to make all the numbers work. Most budgets make assumptions, and they all stretch the math a little bit, but the Trump budget takes a quantum leap into a new dimension of budgetary fairy tale.

Not only does the Trump budget assume unrealistic growth as a way to balance the budget in 10 years—no economist, liberal or conservative, thinks we can achieve 3 percent growth in the near term—but the Trump budget double counts and double dips in a way we have never seen in any budget before. The Trump budget includes the assumption they will pass "deficit-neutral tax reform." In order for their massive tax cut to be deficit-neutral, they need to assume the economy grows fast enough to make up for lost revenues. But at the same time, the Trump budget assumes that growth will pay for tax cuts and help pay down the deficit—both.

Take the estate tax as an example. President Trump has proposed elimi-

nating the estate tax in tax reform. Yet the Trump budget assumes that the government will take in more than \$300 billion in estate taxes over the next 10 years. In other words, part of the budget says that we are getting rid of the estate tax, and part of the budget says that \$300 billion the estate tax brings in is counted toward balancing the budget. I have never seen anything like it. If an accountant did this, my guess is—I don't know accounting standards in detail—they would be kicked out of the accounting profession.

In short, as Benjamin Applebaum in the New York Times points out: "President Trump is proposing to balance the federal budget in part by simultaneously increasing estate taxation and eliminating estate taxation."

Let me read that again. This is a reporter for the New York Times, not some politician of a political party: "President Trump is proposing to balance the federal budget in part by simultaneously increasing estate taxation and eliminating estate taxation."

The gall, the nerve, and the facts-be-darned attitude in this budget are appalling. What they said on the estate tax is a complete contradiction. The government cannot take in money from a tax that no longer exists. Where are our fiscal watchdogs on the other side of the aisle when they do stuff like this?

Everyone knows Presidential budgets contain some degree of flexibility, but what the Trump budget does is a quantum leap that would make an accountant blush, if they could stay in their profession after doing this. The budget is a total fantasy, a deeply unserious proposal to Congress. Members of both parties are right to reject it, and I applaud many of my Republican colleagues for speaking out against this proposal.

Again, what will happen—my guess—is that Democrats and Republicans will ignore the Trump budget because it is so harsh on the middle class and because it is such an accounting nightmare. We will do our own budget, and we will probably produce something pretty good for the American people, as we did in 2017—as long as Donald Trump and the White House stay out of it.

TRUMPCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, Mr. President, a word on healthcare: The Republican attempts to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act, combined with the Trump administration's refusal to commit to making key cost-sharing payments that help keep healthcare costs low for working Americans, have created great uncertainty in our healthcare system. This uncertainty has already caused insurers to flee the marketplace or propose rate increases for next year.

A spokesman for America's Health Insurance plans—that is the insurance industry's main group; again, it is not a politician—said:

We need swift action and long-term certainty [on the cost-sharing program]. It is the single most destabilizing factor in the individual market, and millions of Americans could soon feel the impact of fewer choices, higher costs and reduced access to care.

My Republican colleagues, remember, if you continue to allow the President to do this, if we don't make cost sharing permanent, the system will deteriorate, and guess whose back it will be on? Yours, my Republican friends. You are in charge. And when people get a bad healthcare bill, you can blame anyone you want. You are in charge. Fix it.

Refusing to guarantee the cost-sharing payment is nothing short of sabotage, and the repeated attempts to pass TrumpCare will only make things worse.

The White House ought to step up and say once and for all that they will continue to make the cost-sharing payments permanently, and Republicans in Congress ought to drop their repeal efforts and, instead, work with us on stabilizing the market and improving our healthcare system.

Now, today the Congressional Budget Office will release its analysis of the House Republican healthcare bill—TrumpCare. I remind my colleagues how unusual it is for a CBO score to come out nearly 3 weeks after a bill has passed. It is like test driving a brand new car 3 weeks after you have already signed on the dotted line and paid the dealer in full.

Republicans in the House were so worried about how bad the CBO score might be, they rushed TrumpCare through—no hearings, no debate, no score. Never mind that this legislation remakes one-sixth of our Nation's economy. It has life-and-death consequences for millions of American families.

Republicans were haunted by the ghost of CBO scores past, so they went ahead without one.

When the CBO analyzed the first version of TrumpCare earlier this year, it concluded that 24 million fewer Americans would have health insurance if it became law. We also learned the bill would gut Medicaid, crush seniors with higher premiums, and would increase out-of-pocket expenses for Americans of all ages with higher deductibles and copays.

Given that there were few differences between the first and second versions of TrumpCare, we can expect that today's CBO analysis will likely show many of the same grave consequences as the first one. Only now, of course, TrumpCare includes a new amendment that allows States to opt out of the requirement to cover people with pre-existing conditions. It is hard to imagine such an amendment would make

CBO's score any better than the last, and it could certainly raise a lot of new questions.

Does the deal the Freedom Caucus got with the second version of TrumpCare violate the rules of reconciliation? Will the House have to change the bill and take yet another vote on TrumpCare? We know they don't want to do that.

We also don't know the answer to these questions, and we may not know the answers even after seeing today's CBO analysis. But all of these open questions demonstrate how reckless it was for Republicans to vote on this bill without properly vetting it first.

I yield the floor to my good friend, the senior Senator from Vermont, the former and hopefully future Senate President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Sullivan nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday, we received President Trump's first budget submission. He calls it "A New Foundation for American Greatness." Well, that might get an award for fiction, but it couldn't be further from the truth.

Instead of building a foundation for the American people, it pulls the rug out from under them. This budget has to be understood as something more than just a photo op with a slogan.

The President's budget displays a fundamental lack of understanding of the role of government of, by, and for the people in supporting the middle

class, lifting up the most vulnerable among us and serving our values and interests as a Nation. It proposes to cut nondefense discretionary spending by over \$1.5 trillion; that is, \$1,500,000,000 over 10 years, including a \$54 billion cut in fiscal year 2018 and a \$260 billion cut by 2027. This would be a 40-percent cut to nondefense programs in 10 years.

This is not only shortsighted, it is irresponsible and unrealistic. We should be supporting opportunity, and we should be creating jobs, not eliminating them. What this country needs is jobs. We should be caring for our veterans. We should promote our health and the environment. These are important to all people. It doesn't make any difference what political party you belong to. We shouldn't be recklessly slashing vital lifelines to the American people.

Sequestration has had devastating consequences for both defense and non-defense programs. These consequences are going to last a generation. The Trump budget would only extend and deepen those problems.

We are nearing the Memorial Day break, and I ask Members of both sides of the aisle: Let's sit down, and let's have Republicans and Democrats work together, as the Senate is supposed to, and negotiate a budget deal based on parity. We did this in 2013; we did it in 2015. It worked well. Such a deal would allow the Senate to provide appropriations bills that reflect our true, enduring values as a nation.

The Trump budget proposes over \$1.7 trillion in cruel and unsustainable cuts to important mandatory programs that provide a safety net of health and nutrition programs to those who are struggling most in our communities. Can you imagine, in the wealthiest, most powerful Nation on Earth, we are going to cut out programs to help the people most in need?

Many of the cuts in the Trump budget come from the Medicaid Program, where the President doubles down on the dangerous programmatic changes and cuts included in the TrumpCare bill. Not only would enacting this budget make it harder for low-income families to receive health coverage through Medicaid, but the proposal also cuts nearly \$6 billion from the Children's Health Insurance Program, which would force near-poverty children off health insurance.

I know in my own State of Vermont—it is not a wealthy State; it is a small State. But when we started a program to make sure children had healthcare, it was costly at first. In the long run, it saved us all a great deal of money. We were rated every year as the first or second healthiest State in the Nation. You have to have people healthy from the time they are children. You cannot suddenly say: Oh, we are going to spend a fortune when you are adults on illnesses that could have

been taken care of when you were children.

The President's budget proposes significant cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, which supports food assistance for individuals and families in need. How does the President expect to make America great again if there are hungry children in our schools? Every parent knows a hungry child cannot learn. How can we be the greatest country in the world if we do not offer a helping hand to the most vulnerable among us?

It has been and continues to be my goal that we complete the appropriations process in the Senate the way it is supposed to be done. Each of the 12 appropriations bills deserves debate and an up-or-down vote on the Senate floor. All Republicans and Democrats vote for the things they support and vote against the things they oppose. That is in the best interest of this country, and I know Chairman COCHRAN shares this goal. As vice chairman, I will work with him to do this.

This budget is an obstacle and not a pathway to this goal. The President's budget proposal is not bipartisan. In fact, I am willing to bet that, if you put the President's budget on the floor today and asked for a vote up or down, even though the Republicans are in the majority in the Senate, it would not pass because it does not make a hint of a gesture toward true bipartisanship. The appropriations process works best when you have bipartisan cooperation. This budget is not in the best interest of the country or of the real priorities of the American people. That is why it would not get even enough Republican votes to pass. It is unbalanced, needlessly provocative, and appallingly shortsighted.

Rural America, including rural States like Vermont, is missing in action in the President's budget. His budget eliminates key investments in rural communities and leaves them without Federal partnership support for everything from infrastructure development and affordable housing to programs that preserve the environment and provide food for the elderly.

It is a compilation of broken promises to working men and women and struggling families, and it frays the lifelines that help vulnerable families lift themselves into the middle class. This Vermonter does not find that acceptable, and I doubt others do.

Eliminating the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which we call LIHEAP, would leave thousands of Vermonters and thousands throughout this country out in the cold. The government should not be in the business of saying to families: OK, you have a choice. It is 10 degrees outside. You can either have heat, or you can eat. You can either have enough warmth so that you do not freeze to death, or you can have food so that you do not starve to death, but you cannot have both.

We are the most powerful, wealthy Nation on Earth. What a choice to force on people.

From LIHEAP, in my own State, Vermont received nearly \$19 million to help more than 21,000 households in all 14 counties last year. This is a vital lifeline, and it is especially important in rural communities. We cannot slash investments in our rural communities.

We cannot abandon Federal support for cleaning up Lake Champlain. Eliminating the Sea Grant and Geographic programs would be foolish, as it would waste the investments we have already made. It would mean that the money we have put in to clean our lake would end up being lost, and we would have to start all over again.

The large and dynamic ecosystem in Lake Champlain is the largest body of freshwater in the United States outside of the Great Lakes. It borders Vermont, New York, and Canada and is a treasure, but we cannot stand still. We do not want it to become polluted like other bodies of water throughout our country. You either advance or you slip behind, and once you start slipping behind, it becomes an escalating matter.

The budget is full of cuts that advance the administration's antiscience, know-nothing-ism agenda. It eliminates thousands of scientists and shuts off funding for research into cures for everything from Alzheimer's to cancer. You cannot say to people who are trying to find a cure for cancer and so many other diseases: Oh, we are going to cut your money for a few years, turn everything off, send the scientists home, and maybe in a few years we might give you money again.

You cannot do that with medical research. The University of Vermont would lose millions of dollars for valuable research—research that you cannot pause and hope to resume. We are so close to finding a cure for most kinds of cancer, just as we did years ago with polio. Are we going to turn that off? Are we going to say to the American people: We want to have a sloganeering budget. Sorry. When your grandchildren come along, maybe someday, somebody will restore this science and will find a cure for cancer.

This budget not only denies the reality of climate change, but it eliminates all of the Environmental Protection Agency's climate programs, from voluntary incentives to programs that seek to prevent further damage to public health and environmental quality. Climate change is very real, and we are at a critical moment. Now is not the time to turn back the progress we have been making.

The President has promised jobs, jobs, jobs. I would love to see jobs, jobs, jobs in this country, but under his budget, an estimated 4 million people, including veterans, would lose access to employment and training services

next year. Four million Americans would lose that promise of a job. He would eliminate almost \$4 billion from Pell grants. You do not create jobs by denying young people access to affordable higher education or by slashing job training.

Cutting the State Department's budget by more than 30 percent shows a clear lack of understanding of the vital role of soft power in our national security. The Secretary of Defense said: If you are going to cut the State Department's budget this way, you had better give me money to buy more bullets, because I am going to need them.

The budget would eliminate life-saving nutrition programs. It would impede our ability to promote stability in increasingly volatile regions of the world. America is not made safer by failing to feed the hungry.

As Defense Secretary Mattis has said, soft power is fundamental to our national security, which has been said by Secretaries of Defense and military leaders in both Republican and Democratic administrations.

The Trump budget would have serious and harmful consequences for our economy, for working families, for those who are struggling, for our environment, for health, for the seed corn of cutting-edge scientific and technological research, and for our national security. This is foolish, and it is not acceptable. You do not turn these things on and off to make a sound bite. Sound bites do not make America strong, and sound bites do not continue the greatness of America. Tough choices keep America great and help the American people.

I would remind the White House that the power of the purse rests with Congress. As vice chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I intend to exercise that power, and I will work with Chairman COCHRAN in laying out a bipartisan path forward.

Mr. President, there are far too many illogical, arbitrary, and harmful cuts in spending and wholly unbalanced priorities in the President's proposed fiscal year 2018 budget to list at one time. I will have plenty more to say about that in the weeks and months ahead, but I do want to take a moment to highlight one, as it illustrates the foolhardy way this Administration has sought to appease right-wing ideologues rather than do what is truly in the national interest.

For fiscal year 2017, the Congress—Republicans and Democrats—agreed to appropriate \$607.5 million for international family planning programs. Under our law, none of those funds can be used for abortion. They are for contraceptives and services like education and counseling to promote voluntary family planning in the world's poorest countries and, by doing so, to reduce reliance on abortion, reduce child mortality, improve maternal and child

health, and increase opportunities for women and girls.

These programs have a long track record. There is abundant, indisputable data to show they are effective and they save lives, and they illustrate that, while we may have fundamental differences about whether women should have the right to abortion, there is broad agreement about the importance of family planning.

For fiscal year 2018, the Trump Administration proposes to eliminate funding for international family planning as a way to "protect life." That may be an appealing sound bite, but that's all it is. For every \$10 million reduction in funding for family planning and reproductive health programs, the data shows that approximately 440,000 fewer women and couples receive contraceptive services and supplies, resulting in 95,000 additional unintended pregnancies, including 44,000 more unplanned births, 38,000 more abortions, and 200 more pregnancy-related deaths.

How does that protect life? The evidence is overwhelming that the absence of family planning not only means more unsafe abortions but higher birth rates, 95 percent of which occur in the poorest countries that cannot feed or provide jobs for their people today.

I would say to the ideologues in the White House who think that the way to protect life is to cut off funding for family planning: They don't know what they are talking about. These are the same people who support vastly expanding the Mexico City Policy beyond President Ronald Reagan and both President George H.W. Bush and President George W. Bush, to all global health funding. In fact, they will be responsible for more abortions, higher rates of child mortality, higher rates of maternal death, and greater suffering.

This is a shocking proposal. They either don't realize how much harm and suffering it would cause, or they don't care. Can you imagine if our government, in addition to trying to outlaw abortion, tried to take away the contraceptives Americans rely on to prevent unwanted pregnancies? Tens of millions of Americans depend on access to modern family planning services every day. The outcry would be immediate, and it would be deafening.

I am confident that the Congress will reject this unwise and cruel proposal. It would be unconstitutional in this country, and it should not be imposed on millions of impoverished people in the developing countries who depend on our assistance.

I would note the importance of it. We had a man whom I admired greatly in this body, a Republican chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Mark Hatfield. He was strongly anti-abortion but was an honest and good man who said that we had to have these family planning programs because without them, the number of

abortions would skyrocket, that the number of deaths at birth would skyrocket, and that we would have higher birth rates, 95 percent of which would occur in the poorest countries that could not feed or provide jobs for their people.

Let's not do that again. Let's not make policy by sound bite. Let's make policy as to what is best for our country and that best respects the values of America—values that we have tried to demonstrate throughout the world. We also try to demonstrate that to our own country no matter where you are, whether you are Republican or Democrat or Independent, whether you are poor or rich, rural or urban. Let's work on what is the best for America, not on a budget that tries to polarize America and pits one group against another.

Mr. President, on this table I have on the floor, I note that it shows how we, at the Pentagon, have money to put into a border wall at the cost of the Department of Agriculture, clean energy, climate change, the environment, education, foreign aid, infrastructure, healthcare, the middle class, civil rights, labor unions, nutrition programs, child nutrition, and community investments. If we want to spend \$40 billion on a wall that will make no sense and have the taxpayers pay for it—easy—let's vote it up or down. I do not think the American people want it. They would rather see that money be spent on programs that educate people, that create jobs, that improve science and find cures for cancer and others, not for a wall that we will pay for and that nobody else will pay for.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time on the Sullivan nomination expire at 3 p.m. today and that, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to discuss problems that affect almost every aspect of our everyday life no matter who we are, where we live, our level of income, or any other distinction that might be possible to make. These problems have to do with America's surface transportation system.

Like most Nebraskans, I believe infrastructure is a core duty of the Federal Government. It represents investment in our economy, public safety, and national security. In the Senate, much of my work has been focused on removing unnecessary obstacles to the flow of goods, materials, and, most importantly, people along our Nation's surface transportation networks. Through legislation and with Executive orders, we did lower the coefficient of friction on these systems. We can lower that enough that people and products can get where they need to go quicker and at a lower cost. I have been proud to support several pieces of legislation to do just that.

In 2015, Congress passed the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act—the FAST Act. It was our first long-term highway bill in more than a decade. As chairman of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee in the Senate, I was glad to help steer it to final passage.

I am also proud to have authored a significant number of its provisions. For example, the bill includes a new national strategic freight program that provides every State with annual guaranteed funding. Because of the freight program, States will have greater flexibility to work with key stakeholders and local officials to develop strategic investments in transportation. The program funnels transportation funds to States and allows them to decide on their terms how to use it. By dedicating funding for rural and urban freight corridors, the program enhances the flow of commercial traffic, and it increases safety on our Nation's roads.

The true beauty of this program is that it offers States the opportunity to make critical investments to best meet their specific geographic and their specific infrastructure needs. Nebraska can elect to invest in a rail grade crossing or a truck parking lot along a rural road. California could choose to invest in ondock rail projects at our Nation's largest port complex located just outside of Los Angeles. It works for all States without leaving any behind.

The FAST Act was an important first step, but there is more to be done. President Trump has spoken frequently about the need to invest in our transportation infrastructure. Just yesterday, the administration released a set of principles for reexamining how we do that. I am encouraged to see these proposals that will give States greater flexibility to develop our infrastruc-

ture as well as reduce unnecessary regulations that delay these very important projects.

The proposal also talks about providing long-term solutions, which is something I have long supported. This is critical for States to develop, construct, and maintain infrastructure. Last week, at a Senate Environment and Public Works Committee hearing, we heard an update from Transportation Secretary Elaine Chao. She committed to working closely with Congress as we continue to develop commonsense solutions for our infrastructure needs. She outlined some of the proposals the Department of Transportation is reviewing to include in this infrastructure package. During that hearing—the Presiding Officer was there as well—the Secretary told me she is committed to working closely with my colleagues and me to develop a national infrastructure policy.

I also brought up the issue of delays due to burdensome regulations like the National Environmental Policy Act permitting process that directly affects Nebraska projects. To address these delays, the Nebraska Unicameral unanimously passed legislation that would allow the Nebraska Department of Roads to assume the NEPA permitting process. NDOR has sent a letter to the Federal Highway Administration to begin the implementation of this program, and that could take up to 18 months to complete.

I asked the Secretary for an update on the progress of the application, and she assured me the Department is following it closely. She said: "We know the issue, we are tracking it, and we will continue to pay attention." Furthermore, Secretary Chao explained that the administration "will not specify any list of projects" in an infrastructure plan. States know their transportation needs best, not the Federal Government. The larger the role States have from start to finish in developing their own infrastructure, the more they can direct funding to the projects that directly affect their citizens.

For the benefit of families across America in both our urban and our rural areas, we need to look for out-of-the-box solutions to ensure that our infrastructure is up to date. That is why I have introduced the Build USA Infrastructure Act, which looks to solve two major challenges to our transportation system. The first is the near-term solvency of the highway trust fund's expiration of the FAST Act in 2020. The second is a lack of flexibility for States in starting and finishing major transportation infrastructure projects.

According to the March 2016 Congressional Budget Office projections, by the year 2026, the highway trust fund will face a cumulative shortfall of approximately \$107 billion. Meanwhile, we see construction costs climbing. The rise

in the use of electric and alternative-fuel vehicles is causing trust fund revenues to fall. Heavy Federal regulations continue to eat away at that purchasing power of the highway trust fund.

America needs a new plan to successfully meet the looming highway trust fund shortfall and to strengthen our transportation system. The Build USA Infrastructure Act gives us a plan.

For 5 years following the expiration of the FAST Act, this legislation would direct the U.S. Treasury to dedicate approximately \$21.4 billion in Customs and Border Patrol-collected fees and revenues to the highway trust fund. Now, CBP revenue collections on freight, cargo, and passengers include tariffs, duties, taxes, and user fees at U.S. land, water, and air ports of entry. CBP revenues from these sources amounted to nearly \$46 billion in fiscal year 2015. Because of their nature as charges on freight and travelers, Customs duties and fees closely abide by the “user pays” principle that we look at in transportation funding. According to CBP, the agency only utilizes \$2 billion of that revenue for its operations, so the diversion of revenue would not negatively impact CBP’s operating budget. By using an existing revenue stream which has a transportation nexus, we provide stability to the highway trust fund without increasing fees or taxes, and that is sound policy.

The Build USA Infrastructure Act also offers greater flexibility to States so their limited highway dollars can go further for them. I served 8 years in the Nebraska Legislature. I know our States, counties, and cities face real challenges in starting and completing infrastructure projects because of excessive procedural costs, delays, and really an overall lack of transportation funding. According to the Congressional Research Service, major Federal highway projects can take as long as 14 years to complete from start to finish. It took less time to build the Panama Canal, and we did that more than a century ago.

Greater flexibility, improved collaboration, and more autonomy can help States begin and complete their vital infrastructure projects in less time, which means lower costs. The Build USA Infrastructure Act would let them do that through State remittance agreements. This legislation would offer States more flexibility and control of infrastructure funding by establishing a new partnership between them and the U.S. Federal Highway Administration. Under this arrangement, States are permitted to enter into voluntary remittance agreements whereby they can remit 10 percent of their Federal aid highway dollars in exchange for State purview over design, permitting, and construction aspects of Federal aid highway projects. The

State-remitted money to the Federal Highway Administration would be deposited into the highway trust fund to help further address its growing deficit. It would give States breathing room as they work to bring in projects on time and on budget.

I am so confident in this bill because I have seen these concepts work at the State level. As a State senator in the Nebraska Legislature, I introduced the Build Nebraska Act. It directed a quarter of each cent of sales tax revenue toward maintaining Nebraska’s roads and bridges. Because of it, more than \$1 billion will be available to meet Nebraska’s infrastructure needs over the next 17 years.

I also introduced legislation that tasked the Nebraska Department of Roads with developing the Federal Funds Purchase Program. In exchange for giving up a portion of Federal transportation dollars, Nebraska counties and their towns can now receive funds with more reasonable regulatory requirements. Because of this program, major Nebraska transportation projects, such as the longstanding bridge replacement in Buffalo County and a major arterial street in South Sioux City, are up and running.

Investing in infrastructure means so much more than just adding a few lines to a map. It means connecting our families and delivering goods and services. In Nebraska’s case, it means feeding the world. With persistence and prudent planning, we can build for the future, we can give greater economic opportunity to rising generations, and we can connect communities—family to family, town to town, and coast to coast.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am happy to announce that soon I will be introducing legislation that reauthorizes several critical provisions to help fight human trafficking and bring us one step closer to ridding our country of this heinous crime.

The Abolish Human Trafficking Act is chiefly a bill about getting human trafficking victims the help they need by focusing on ways to support them as they rebuild their lives. To me, one of the most shocking things about this terrible crime that victims of human trafficking need most is a safe place to live because without that, they will not be able to escape the people who have enslaved them, nor will they be able to begin the steps of the long road to recovery.

This legislation reauthorizes the Justice Department’s Domestic Trafficking Victims’ Fund, which we established when we passed the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, a bill I authored that was signed into law last Congress. This fund—like a crime victims compensation fund—provides critical resources to help victims get the services they need to recover.

Part of the fund is financed through fines collected on convicted traffickers. It is a clear way we can use these fines to do some good. Last year, the fund provided almost \$5 million in victims services. By reauthorizing it, it can continue to serve more victims.

The bill also empowers victims by permanently reauthorizing the Human Trafficking Advisory Council—a group of survivors who annually advise the government on ways to combat this crime and lend a hand.

This bill goes a long way to help victims who should be at the forefront of any of our conversations about human trafficking. There is also no question that our Nation’s law enforcement officials need more support to track down the perpetrators of this crime and bring them to justice. Certainly, law enforcement needs more training to better equip them to serve victims too. This bill also does that.

It requires the Department of Homeland Security to implement screening protocols across law enforcement anti-trafficking task forces. One of the hardest things about human trafficking may be, in fact, being able to identify that it is occurring when it occurs right in front of your eyes.

This training will impact the work of law enforcement at the Federal, State, and local levels. That way, law enforcement at every level of government can learn how to better spot trafficking victims and will have the adequate training to connect victims to the services they need in order to recover.

The legislation will also direct the Department of Health and Human Services to continue a pilot program to train healthcare providers about human trafficking. Healthcare providers, after all, are likely to come in contact with human trafficking victims as well, and they need to know the telltale signs that will alert them so they can report this to the appropriate authorities.

I have noted before that so much of the battle is about educating professionals but not just professionals. I would say all of us as ordinary citizens need to be on the lookout for signs of human trafficking.

Sadly, I learned a few years ago, when the Super Bowl was held in Texas, that one of the premier trafficking events in the Nation each year is the Super Bowl, sad and as tragic as that sounds.

There is a role for all of us to play as regular citizens in identifying the telltale signs of human trafficking, and

then when we see something wrong, to say something about it so hopefully they can be investigated.

Through pilot programs like this one, my hope is that more people will better understand it. The more people who understand trafficking and its warning signs, the more we can do to help those trapped in this modern-day slavery.

The legislation will also give law enforcement more resources to target criminal street gangs who profit from human trafficking. They view human beings as just another commodity that they can make money from, and going after criminal street gangs who profit from human trafficking is really important. We would also enhance the penalties for several human trafficking-related offenses as well.

Finally, the Abolish Human Trafficking Act will improve and update the national strategy to fight human trafficking across the country by requiring the Department of Justice to add a demand reduction component. This will build on legislation passed in the last Senate by a vote of 99 to 0, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

I know by reading the newspaper and watching TV, people think nothing happens in Washington that is truly nonpartisan or bipartisan in nature. This is an example of why that is wrong. Certainly, this is a cause that every Member of the Senate can get behind, and there is no reason we shouldn't be able to pass this legislation soon with similar strong bipartisan, literally overwhelming bipartisan support.

I am grateful to our friend and the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Chairman GRASSLEY, for his focus on doing all we can for victims of human trafficking. In addition to his support for the Abolish Human Trafficking Act, I know he also plans to introduce complementary anti-trafficking legislation, the Trafficking Victims Protection Act.

I am hopeful both bills will be considered soon so we can prove the Senate is united in our opposition to human trafficking and so we can lend more support to the victims who so desperately need it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, here is the scorecard on 557 Presidential nominations during the first 100 days of the Trump administration, through April 29. According to the

Partnership for Public Service, in collaboration with the Washington Post, on Cabinet appointments, President Trump did his job, but Senate Democrats did not do their job. The President announced all of his Cabinet nominations before he was inaugurated on January 20, but Democrats delayed confirmation of Cabinet nominations more than those of any other recent President. On sub-Cabinet appointments, President Trump did not do his job. He was slower than any other recent President to send his nominations to the Senate.

So here is what could happen. If Democrats continue their delaying tactics, when President Trump does send sub-Cabinet nominees to the Senate, the President would have every excuse to stop nominating and simply appoint acting officials to about 350 of the remaining key positions.

An administration managed by acting Presidential appointees who have not been confirmed by the Senate would be a first in American history. Delaying the inevitable approval of nominations of a President you oppose might sound to your political base like good politics, but it would be supremely bad governing. Senate Democrats would actually diminish their influence and shoot themselves in both feet. They would be turning over to a President they don't like an excuse to staff the government with about 350 key appointees who are unconfirmed and unaccountable to the Senate. Now, this 350 number does not even include the Ambassadors in embassies all around the world, where there may be acting heads of the embassy.

Now, what difference would it make to have an administration mostly unexamined and unconfirmed by the Senate? Well, it would mean that the Senate would be giving the Executive more power at the expense of the legislative branch.

This undermines the checks and balances created by our Nation's Founders. Democrats complained that Republicans delayed some of President Obama's nominees, and that is true. In fact, that has always been true. My own nomination for U.S. Education Secretary in 1991 was delayed for 2 months by a Democratic Senator who put a hold on my nomination for unexplained reasons.

President Ford's nomination of Warren Rudman to the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1976 was blocked by Democratic New Hampshire Senator John Durkin.

The rest of the story is that Rudman eventually asked President Ford to withdraw the nomination, ran against Durkin, and defeated him in the next election. That is how Warren Rudman got to be a U.S. Senator. There is a better way to resolve differences between Senators and the President.

In December of 2015, President Obama seemed content to allow John

King of New York to serve as his Acting Secretary of Education for the last year of President Obama's term. I told the President I thought it was inappropriate for a President to have an acting Cabinet member for so long and that, while I disagreed with Mr. King on many points, I urged him to nominate King and, if he did, I promised that I would hold a prompt hearing and see to it that he was confirmed.

President Obama nominated John King on February 11, 2016. John King was confirmed by the U.S. Senate on March 14, 2016. I disagreed with Secretary King often, but the Secretary was confirmed. He was confirmed by and accountable to the U.S. Senate, as he should have been and as our Constitution envisions.

All of President Trump's Cabinet nominees are now confirmed, but this is how long it took compared with his three immediate predecessors: All of President Trump's nominations were announced before his inauguration, but the Senate confirmed only two of those nominations on day one because Senate Democrats would not agree to any more than that. A third Cabinet nominee was confirmed on January 31st. To compare, by January 31st in prior administrations, President Obama had 10 nominees confirmed, and George W. Bush and Bill Clinton each had 13 confirmed.

Please keep in mind that it is impossible for Democratic Senators by themselves to defeat a Trump nominee. Confirmation requires only a majority voting to be present; that is usually 51 Senators. There are 52 Republican Senators and, in addition, Vice President PENCE can vote in the case of a tie. There is no 60-vote filibuster available to block nominees because Democrats, when they were in the majority in 2013, changed Senate rules to eliminate the filibuster on nominations. So by their obstruction, Democrats are only delaying the inevitable, using various tactics to require the Senate to use nearly a week of floor time to approve even noncontroversial nominees.

We don't know how Democrats will treat President Trump's more than 350 remaining key nominees because the President has made so few of those. For example, I am chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. Aside from the Cabinet secretaries who come to our committee, of the 557 key positions identified by the Washington Post, 35 of them within the Cabinet agencies require recommendations to the full Senate by the HELP committee. In the Department of Health and Human Services, we have eight. In the Department of Education, we have 14. In the Department of Labor, we have 13.

At the end of the first 100 days, April 29th, our committee had received just one sub-Cabinet nomination from the Trump administration—that of Dr.

Scott Gottlieb for FDA commissioner. He was promptly confirmed on May 9th.

Compared with President Trump's one sub-Cabinet nomination sent to our committee in his first 100 days, President Obama made 13 sub-Cabinet nominations in his first 100 days, President George W. Bush made 10, and President Clinton made 14 to our committee.

There are actually nearly 700 more Presidential nominees requiring Senate confirmation who aren't considered key by the Washington Post analysis, so you can see this adds up to be a pretty big number of Presidential nominees whom we have a responsibility to consider and to confirm if we approve them.

Unfortunately, there are ominous signs about how Democrats will treat non-Cabinet nominees. As the Presiding Officer is especially aware, Democrats required the Senate to take nearly a week of floor time to consider the nomination of Iowa Governor Terry Branstad to serve as Ambassador to China. There was absolutely no excuse for this other than obstructionism.

Governor Branstad is the longest serving Governor in American history. He has a well-documented relationship with the Chinese President. He was one of the first appointees that the President announced. He was approved by a voice vote by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and ultimately approved by the full Senate earlier this week 82 to 13.

Yet, as a delaying tactic, Senate Democrats forced us to use nearly a week of our floor time to consider Governor Branstad. If Democrats treat other noncontroversial Ambassadors and sub-Cabinet members the same way they treated Governor Branstad, requiring nearly a week of Senate floor time to consider a nominee, then I think President Trump would almost certainly bypass the Senate and name hundreds of acting heads of sub-Cabinet departments. Under our Constitution, he may do that whenever he chooses. There are flexible limits on the time one may serve in an acting position, but if that time expires, the President can simply appoint someone else.

Hopefully, President Trump will speed up his nomination of sub-Cabinet members, and hopefully Democrats will return to the common practice of routine floor approval of Presidential nominations when the confirmation process has determined that the nominee deserves to be approved.

Our Founders created a system of government based on checks and balances of the three coequal branches of government. There has been much complaining recently about the rise of the executive branch at the expense of the legislative branch. Having an executive branch and embassies mostly

staffed by acting personnel not confirmed by or accountable to the U.S. Senate undermines the principle of three coequal branches of government.

The President should want his team in place and should speed up recommending key nominees to the U.S. Senate. And Senators, especially those in the minority, should want to have a say in the vetting and accountability that come with the Senate confirmation process.

FRED D. THOMPSON FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 375, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 375) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 719 Church Street in Nashville, Tennessee, as the "Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 375) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am grateful that the Senate has approved that measure naming the Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse in Nashville.

I stand at the desk of former Senator Thompson. This was a desk that Senator Howard Baker also had. I have the desk myself because Senator Thompson and I were inspired by Senator Baker to be involved in politics and government in our State and the House of Representatives—our delegation.

I think Senator CARPER and his committee all seem to think that it is very appropriate that the new Nashville courthouse be named for Senator Thompson. It gives me a great deal of pride and personal privilege to be able to ask for that to be done. I thank Congresswoman BLACKBURN in the House for her leadership and all the Members of the delegation and the Members of the Senate for their cooperation in this.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

NOMINATION OF COURTNEY ELWOOD

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, the Senate will shortly consider the nomi-

nation of Courtney Elwood to be the CIA's General Counsel. I wanted to take a few minutes this morning to discuss the nomination and put it in the context of the extraordinary national security challenges our country faces.

It is hard to imagine a more despicable act than the terrorist attack in Manchester Monday night, killing innocent teenagers and children who were out to enjoy a concert. The suffering that Americans and all in the Senate have been reading about and watching on television is heart-breaking by any standards. I think it is fair to say that, as Americans, we stand in strong solidarity with our British friends, our allies, as they confront this horror. Our country will, as we have for so many years, stand shoulder to shoulder with them as there is an effort to collect more information about this attack, about what actually happened, and work to prevent future attacks.

Not everything is known about the attack, but one thing Americans do know is that it can happen here. That is why, as I begin this discussion on this important nomination and the challenges in front of our country, I would like to start, as I invariably do when we talk about intelligence matters, by recognizing the extraordinary men and women who work in the intelligence community, who work tirelessly across the government to keep our people safe from terrorist attacks. So much of what they do is in secret, and that is appropriate. It is so important to keep secret what is called the sources and methods that our intelligence community personnel are using. It is important to the American people and it is important to our country to make sure that the people protecting them every day can do their jobs.

The reason I took this time this morning to talk about this nomination is to talk about the broader context of what we owe the American people, and I feel very strongly that we owe the American people security and liberty. The two are not mutually exclusive, and it is possible to protect the people of our country with smart policies that protect both their security and their liberty.

Smart policies ensure that security and liberty are not mutually exclusive. For example, I would cite as a smart policy something I was proud to have been involved in. Section 102 of the USA FREEDOM Act sought to make sure that we weren't just indiscriminately collecting millions of phone records on law-abiding people. A provision, section 102, says that when our government believes there is an emergency where the safety and security and well-being of the American people is at stake, our government can move immediately to deal with the problem and then come back later and settle up

with respect to getting a warrant. That was something that, I thought, really solidified what was a smart policy.

Our Founding Fathers had a Fourth Amendment for a reason—to protect the liberties of our people. What we said is that we are going to be sensitive to those liberties, but at the same time, we are going to be sensitive to the security and well-being of the American people at a dangerous time. We are going to say that, if the government believes there is an emergency, the government can go get that information immediately and come back later and settle up with the warrant process.

Issues ensuring that we have security and liberty are especially important today. We obviously face terrorism. We are challenged by Russia and North Korea, and the list can go on and on. The fact is, there are a host of these challenges, and it seems to me that if we look at the history of how to deal with a climate like this, too often there is almost a kind of easy, practically knee-jerk approach that is billed as dealing with a great security challenge that very often gives our people less security and less liberty. At a time when people want both, they end up getting less. That is what happens so often in crises, and far too often it happens in large part because senior lawyers operating in secret give the intelligence community the green light to conduct operations that are not in the country's interest.

I am going to walk through how misguided and dangerous decisions can be made and how much depends on how the lawyers interpret current law. In past debates people have said: You know, that happened years ago, many years ago, and various steps were taken to correct it. Today, I am going to talk about how misguided and dangerous decisions can be made today.

At the center of this question is the nominee to be the CIA general counsel and what I consider to be very troubling statements that have been made on a number of the key issues that involve decisions that will be made now. In outlining those, I want to explain why it is my intention to vote against the confirmation of Courtney Elwood to be the CIA's general counsel.

The key principle to begin with is that there is a clear distinction between keeping secrets of sources and methods used by the intelligence community, which is essential, and the creation of secret law, which is not. We in the Senate have a responsibility to make sure the public is not kept in the dark about the laws and rules that govern what the intelligence community can and cannot do.

I believe the American people understand that their government cannot always disclose who it is spying on, but they are fed up with having to read in the papers about the government se-

cretely making up the rules. They were fed up when they learned about the illegal, warrantless wiretapping program. They were fed up when they learned about the bulk collection of phone records of millions of law-abiding Americans.

What our people want to know is that the rules are going to be, No. 1, clear to everybody and, No. 2, that the government is operating within those rules. That is why the nominations for the intelligence community are so important. The American people need to know how these men and women understand the laws that authorize what they can and cannot do in secret.

Shortly, the Senate will consider the nominee to be the CIA's general counsel. I believe there are few more important positions in government than this one, when it comes to interpreting key laws. The advice the general counsel provides to the Central Intelligence Agency will be shielded from the American people and possibly from Congress as well. There is almost never accountability before the public, the press, watchdog groups, or other public institutions that help preserve our democracy. There are almost never debates on the floor of the Senate about the legality of the CIA's operations. It is all in secret.

The advice of this general counsel will carry especially important heft, given what CIA Director Mike Pompeo said during his confirmation. Again and again during those confirmation hearings, when asked what boundaries Director Pompeo would draw around the government's surveillance authorities, the Director responded that he was bound by the law. In effect, the Director said to the Senate and this body that he would defer to the lawyers. So if Congress and the American people were to have any clue as to what the Central Intelligence Agency might do under Director Pompeo, we were going to have to ask the nominee to be general counsel. That is why it is critical that she answer questions about her views of the law and that she answer them now before a confirmation vote.

I asked those questions, and what I heard in return was either a troubling response or some combination of "I don't know," and "I will figure it out after I am confirmed."

Now, without answers, we are left largely to judge Ms. Elwood by her record. So I am going to start by looking back at her previous service and what she says about it now.

With respect to the National Security Agency's illegal warrantless wiretapping, that became public at the end of 2005 when Ms. Elwood was at the Department of Justice. She reviewed public statements about the program and held discussions about those public statements with individuals inside and outside the administration. That includes discussions with the Depart-

ment of Justice's Office of Legal Counsel about the Department's legal analysis justifying the warrantless wiretapping program. She was especially involved when the Attorney General made public statements about the program. So the committee asked her about some of that Justice Department public analysis, and, in particular, the Department of Justice January 2006 white paper that was thought to justify the warrantless wiretapping program. Ms. Elwood responded that she thought at the time that the Department of Justice's analysis was "thorough and carefully reasoned and that certain points were compelling."

This was an illegal program. It violated the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. No interpretation of the law that defended that warrantless wiretapping program is carefully reasoned or compelling. It was an illegal program.

Ms. Elwood also said that some of the analysis "presented a difficult question" and that "reasonable minds could reach different conclusions." Of course, the point is not what "reasonable minds" might conclude. The point for us in the Senate is what her mind would conclude. Remember, this is the Department of Justice's conclusion that the laws governing wiretapping of Americans inside the United States could be disregarded because the President says so or because the Department of Justice secretly reinterprets the law in a way that no American could recognize. Remember, too, that we are talking about a program that may have begun shortly after 9/11, but it was still going on secretly and without congressional oversight more than 4 years later when it was revealed in the press. That was the context in which the Department of Justice—at the end of 2005 and the beginning of 2006, when Ms. Elwood was at the Department—determined that the warrantless wiretapping program was perfectly legal and constitutional.

This is—to say, in my view—at the least, dangerous, and it could happen again.

I wanted to give Ms. Elwood every opportunity to reconsider and distance herself from these assertions I described. So I asked very specific questions. First, did the Fourth Amendment warrant requirement apply? No, she responded. She endorsed the view that the warrantless wiretapping of Americans on American soil did not require warrants under the Fourth Amendment. That was not very encouraging.

What about the other arguments made to try to justify this illegal program?

The first was the notion that the 2001 authorization for use of military force somehow gave the government the green light to conduct warrantless wiretapping of Americans inside the

United States. This argument was ludicrous. The authorization for use of military force said nothing about surveillance. The applicable law governing national security wiretapping was the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—period. If the Bush Administration had wanted the law to conduct warrantless wiretapping after 9/11, it could have asked the Congress to pass it as part of the PATRIOT Act. It didn't. So when they got caught and had to explain to the public what they had been doing all these years, they said that the authorization for use of military force, which the Congress understood as authorizing war in Afghanistan, somehow magically allowed for wiretapping in the United States. The second argument was that the President had something called "inherent power" to disregard the law.

I asked Ms. Elwood if she agreed with either of these arguments. She wouldn't answer the question of whether the authorization for use of military force authorized warrantless wiretapping, and she wouldn't answer the question of whether the President's so-called inherent power authorized the warrantless wiretapping. That was not very encouraging, either.

I did get one answer. Ms. Elwood said that the arguments that the Bush Administration's secret interpretation of the authorization for use of military force, combined with the President's so-called inherent powers, allowed for the warrantless wiretapping, in her view, that "seemed reasonable." That definitely was not encouraging.

Then it occurred to me that having asked her about the past in some of these concerns that I have just raised, I thought maybe that is all part of yesterday. Maybe that is all in the past. Let bygones be bygones. So I looked for assurances that Ms. Elwood's defense of warrantless wiretapping wasn't relevant now. After all, Ms. Elwood's response to questions about the program referred to the law at the time. Maybe current law makes clear to everyone, including the nominee, that there will never again be warrantless wiretapping of Americans in the United States.

So what does the law actually say now? Back in 2008, Congress took a big part of the warrantless wiretapping program and turned it into the law now known as section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. The Congress wanted to make it absolutely clear that our country had really turned the page and that Americans wouldn't have to worry about any more violations of the law. So the Congress included in the law a statement that said: We really mean it. This law is "the exclusive means" by which electronic surveillance could be conducted.

I asked Ms. Elwood about whether the President's supposed powers under the Constitution could trump the current statutory framework in the For-

eign Intelligence Surveillance Act. Specifically, I asked her whether that provision in law—the one passed in 2008 that explicitly states that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act is the exclusive means for conducting wiretapping—would keep the President from asserting some other constitutional authority in this area.

She said she had not studied the question. This was the most troubling answer of all because this is about how the law stands today. This is not talking about yesteryear. This is about how the law stands today, and this was the nominee to be general counsel to the Central Intelligence Agency's not ruling out another assertion of so-called inherent Presidential power to override the law.

My fear is that if the public cannot get reassuring answers now to these fundamental questions of law, then Americans could end up learning about the nominee's views when it is too late—when our people open up the newspapers someday and learn about an intelligence program that is based on a dangerous and secret interpretation of the law. It happened repeatedly in the past, and my message today is that the Senate cannot let it happen again.

One of the reasons Ms. Elwood's views on whether the government was obligated to respect the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act is so important is that, for the most part, the Central Intelligence Agency operates under authorities that are actually more vague than is the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. In fact, those authorities are not even established in a statute that people in Iowa and Oregon could just go and read. The CIA's authorities to collect and use information on Americans and even to secretly participate in organizations in the United States are conducted under an Executive order, Executive Order No. 12333.

In January, during the last 2 weeks of the Obama administration, the intelligence community released two documents that offered a little bit of insight into how intelligence is collected and used under this Executive order. It was good that the Obama administration released the documents. More transparency is why I can come to the floor and be part of this conversation.

These and other publicly available documents demonstrate the extent to which the CIA deals with information on Americans all of the time. Right now, the CIA is authorized to conduct signals intelligence as well as the human intelligence that is generally associated with the Agency, and the intelligence the CIA obtains from various sources, which can be collected in bulk, inevitably includes information on law-abiding Americans.

What do the rules say that apply to all of this information on Americans?

What these rules say is, under this Executive order, the CIA can mostly do what it wants. If Ms. Elwood could find wiggle room in the airtight restrictions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, I think the Senate ought to be asking: What might she do with the flexibility in the rules that govern what the CIA can do under this Executive order?

In fact, even when this Executive order includes limitations, there are usually exceptions. Guess who decides what the exceptions are. The CIA Director and the CIA General Counsel.

In short, the rules look like an invitation for the CIA Director and the general counsel to conduct secret programs and operations that rely on case-by-case decisions that have no clear or consistent legal framework. That is why it is so important that these nominees give us some sense of where they stand before they are confirmed.

I started with Mike Pompeo, who is now the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. He wrote an article—an op-ed piece as it is called in the press—that called for the government to collect the bulk records of law-abiding Americans' communications and to combine all of those records—"publicly available financial and lifestyle information into a comprehensive, searchable database."

That, in my view, is breathtaking. It makes what everybody was talking about with regard to the old phone records collection effort look like small potatoes.

At his hearing, I asked then-Congressman Pompeo whether this database would have any boundaries. In other words, he is setting up a brandnew database—bigger than anything people have seen. He is going to collect people's lifestyle information and who knows what else.

He said "of course there are boundaries. Any collection and retention must be conducted in accordance with the Constitution's statutes and applicable Presidential directives."

The real question is, What does that mean?

It means the person who is deciding what, if anything, Director Pompeo's CIA cannot do is the lawyer, and that is where the nominee—Ms. Elwood to be general counsel—comes in.

We might ask: How would these questions come up at the CIA?

As a hypothetical, one question I asked Director Pompeo was: What happens when a foreign partner provides the CIA with information that is known to include the communications of law-abiding Americans?

For example, what if the Russians collected information on Americans and, instead of providing it to WikiLeaks, gave it to the CIA? It could be sensitive information about political leaders and our country and journalists and religious leaders and just

regular, law-abiding Americans. What would Director Pompeo do in that situation? When, if ever, would it be inappropriate for the CIA to receive, use, or distribute this information?

His answer was that it is highly fact-specific. He said he would consult with lawyers.

So, when she came for her nomination hearing, I said this is our chance. Let's ask the lawyer, Ms. Elwood, who is the nominee to be general counsel.

She said, like Director Pompeo, it would be based on all of the facts and circumstances. She said she had no personal experience with such a decision and was unable to offer an opinion.

This, in my view, is a prescription for trouble. We have a CIA Director and a nominee to be general counsel of the Agency, and neither of these two individuals will tell the Congress and the American people what the CIA will do under these circumstances which relate directly to the privacy of law-abiding and innocent Americans.

In her responses to committee questions, Ms. Elwood referred to one of the documents that was released in January—the revised Attorney General guidelines—which she said imposed “stringent and detailed restrictions” on what the CIA can do with the intelligence it collects that is known to include information about Americans.

We are not talking about an insignificant amount of information on Americans. We are talking about bulk collection. We are talking about information on Americans that the rules, themselves, describe as “significant in volume, proportion, or sensitivity.” Obviously, the mere fact that the CIA collects and keeps this kind of information raises a lot of concerns about infringements of Americans’ privacy.

I wanted to know what these stringent restrictions were that Ms. Elwood was talking about that she said would, again, just sort of magically protect the rights of Americans.

One of the issues our people are especially concerned about is whether the government, after it has collected lots of information on Americans, can conduct warrantless, backdoor searches for information about specific Americans. Those who dismiss the concerns about these backdoor searches argue that if the intelligence has already been collected, it is just no big deal to search it, even if the search is intended to obtain information on innocent, law-abiding Americans. The problem is, the more collection that is going on, the bigger the pool of Americans’ information that is being searched.

This has come up with regard to section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which we are going to debate in the coming months. As my colleagues know, a bipartisan coalition—a bipartisan group of Senators and House Members—has been trying for years to get the intelligence com-

munity to tell us how many innocent, law-abiding Americans are being swept up in the section 702 collection. That number, if we can ever get it, is directly related to whether the intelligence community should be allowed to conduct warrantless searches on particular Americans, and it is directly related to the point I offered at the outset, which is that we must have policies that promote security and liberty. If we do it smartly, we can have both.

These questions I have described also apply to information that is collected under the Executive order. In the case of the Executive order, there is not even a discussion about how much information about Americans gets swept up.

So what do the rules say about backdoor searches that have been conducted by the CIA under this Executive order?

It turns out, the CIA can conduct searches through all of this information on law-abiding Americans if the search is “reasonably designed to retrieve information related to a duly authorized activity of the CIA.”

Ms. Elwood has told the Intelligence Committee that there are really stringent requirements on this, but as I just read—“reasonably designed to retrieve information related to a duly authorized activity of the CIA”—that sure does not sound like it has much teeth in it to me. It does not sound very stringent to me.

I asked Ms. Elwood at the hearing what other restrictions might apply.

In a written response, she referred to training requirements, to record-keeping, and to the rule that the information must be destroyed after 5 years. None of that changes the fact that there is no meaningful standard for the searches. There is no check. There is no balance. Even the CIA’s rule that the information can only be kept for 5 years has a huge loophole in that it can be extended by the CIA Director after consultation with—guess who again—the general counsel.

Again, we have rules that are vague to begin with, whose implementation is up to the discretion of the CIA Director and the general counsel. At this point, the Senate has virtually nothing to go on in terms of how this nominee for this critical general counsel position would exercise all of this power.

Another aspect of CIA activities that are authorized by the Executive order is that of the secret participation by someone who is working on behalf of the CIA and organizations in our country.

These activities would obviously be concerning to a lot of Americans. Most Americans probably believe the CIA is not even allowed to do this anymore, but it is. The question is, whether there are going to be rules that prevent abuses.

Since that is yet another modern-day, present-time topic, I said I am

going to ask Ms. Elwood some questions on this. For example, for what purposes could the CIA secretly join a private organization in the United States?

The rules say the CIA Director can make case-by-case decisions with the concurrence of the general counsel, so I thought it would be appropriate to ask what the view is of the nominee to be the general counsel. Ms. Elwood’s response was that she had no experience with this matter and looked forward to learning about it. And that, of course, is typical of so many of her answers. Repeatedly, she declined to provide any clarity on how she would interpret the CIA’s authorities under this sweeping Executive order, but these are the calls she could make every single day if confirmed. At this point, the Senate has no clue how she would make them. It is my view that we cannot vote to confirm a nominee—particularly one who will operate entirely in secret—and just hope for the best.

I have other concerns about the Elwood nomination, particularly some of her views with respect to torture.

I asked Ms. Elwood whether the torture techniques the CIA had used violated the Detainee Treatment Act, often referred to as the McCain amendment. She had no opinion. I asked her whether those techniques violated the statutory prohibition on torture. She had no opinion. I asked her whether the torture techniques violated the War Crimes Act. She had no opinion. I asked her whether the torture techniques violated U.S. obligations under the Convention Against Torture, the Geneva Convention and other U.S. treaty obligations. She had no opinion.

How could she have no opinion? She has said that she read the 500-page executive summary of the Intelligence Committee’s Torture Report. The horrific details of waterboarding, extended sleep deprivation, stress positions, and other torture techniques are known to everyone, but the nominee to be the CIA’s General Counsel has no opinion on these matters.

Ms. Elwood did, however, commit to complying with the 2015 law prohibiting interrogation techniques not authorized by the Army Field Manual. That gets us again to the question of what decisions she would make now, based on current law. Everyone agrees that waterboarding is prohibited by the Army Field Manual, but the Army Field Manual can be changed. Fortunately, the 2015 law also prohibits any changes to the Army Field Manual that involve the use or threat of force. I asked her whether the CIA’s torture techniques fell safely outside of anything the Army Field Manual could legally authorize. Her response, again, was that she had not studied the techniques.

So that was her position. She said she will comply with the law and

agreed that the law prohibits interrogation techniques that involve the use or threat of force, but she refused to say whether waterboarding or any of the other CIA torture techniques falls outside that prohibition.

Finally, I asked the nominee how the constitutional rights of Americans would apply when the government seeks to kill them overseas. She responded that she had not considered the matter. Do these rights apply to legal permanent residents of the United States who are overseas? She did not have an opinion on that either.

To fully understand why this kind of avoidance is such a problem, we need to consider again what the CIA general counsel does and how she does it. I have been on the Senate Intelligence Committee since 2001. I have seen far too many intelligence programs go on for years before we find out about them. In so many of these cases, the problem lies in how senior lawyers interpreted their authorities. These interpretations are made in secret. They are made by a handful of people, and they are revealed to almost no one. We place almost immeasurable trust in the people who make these decisions. We cannot take this lightly.

The Senate and the American people have one shot—and one shot only—to get some insight into how those lawyers will make their decisions and how they view the laws that apply to them. That one shot is the confirmation process. So when a nominee refused to take positions, it short-circuits the process. This is not acceptable. We cannot just confirm someone to be the CIA's general counsel without knowing what she will do in that position. That would be an abdication of our duty.

I want to close by saying that, at this extraordinary time in American history, a time when our country—and if you sit on the Intelligence Committee, as I have for a number of years, you go into the Intelligence Committee room, and it is all behind closed doors, and you often walk out of there very concerned about the well-being of our people, given some of the grave national security threats we hear about once or twice a week.

The point is that our choice is not between security and liberty; it is between smart policies and ones that are not so smart. For example, on this floor, when the leadership of the committee was interested in weakening strong encryption, which is what keeps our people safe—we have our whole lives wrapped up in a smartphone, and smart encryption ensures that terrorists and hackers can't get at that information. It ensures that pedophiles can't get access to the location tracker and pick up where your child might be. We all know how much our parents care about the well-being of kids.

People are saying: Let's just build backdoors into our products, and I said

I am going to fight that. I will fight it with everything I have whenever it is proposed because it is bad for security, bad for liberty, bad for our companies that are trying to continue to offer high-skill, high-wage jobs because our competitors won't do it, and so far we have been able to hold it off.

As we seek in the days ahead to come up with smart policies that protect security and liberty, we have to get answers from those in the government who are going to have these key positions. Given the fact that the CIA Director, Mike Pompeo, made it clear in his hearing that he was going to rely on the person chosen by the Senate as his general counsel, I felt it was very important that we get some answers from the person we will be voting on shortly.

I regret to say to the Senate that this morning we are largely in the dark with respect to Ms. Elwood's views on the key questions I have outlined today.

I yield the floor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, President Trump has routinely attacked basic American freedoms—of the press, of peaceful assembly, of religion, of speech. When he lost the popular vote, President-elect Trump assailed the integrity of our electoral process and falsely claimed that millions of people voted illegally. When the press exposed those falsehoods, Mr. Trump dismissed credible reporting as “fake news.” When the courts ruled that his travel ban was unlawful, President Trump accused judges of abetting terrorists.

These actions have consequences beyond our own borders and embolden dictators around the world. President Trump displays a worldview that favors the military over diplomacy and transactional relationships over strategic alliances. President Trump's uncritical embrace of autocrats like Russian President Putin, Egyptian President Sisi, Turkish President Erdogan, and Philippine President Duterte is a repudiation of every reformer and activist seeking freedom from tyranny. It is a repudiation of America's values and founding principles.

President Trump's approach to the world is shortsighted and self-defeating. The greatest threats to U.S. national security come from countries that are corrupt, poorly governed, and fraught with poverty and disease. These countries require sustained engagement and assistance to prevent the kind of threats that could require American soldiers to go into war. These countries require American leadership and the American example to help address the root causes of conflict and to give a voice to the aspirations of their people.

That is why President Trump's proposed 32 percent cut to the budget of the State Department, his failure to

put forward nominees for leadership positions, and his disrespect for the career employees who serve our country are so dangerous. By undermining American influence abroad, President Trump erodes American strength.

While John Sullivan has an extensive career in public service, I am concerned that he lacks experience at the State Department. An understanding of the institution is, in many ways, as important as an understanding of our complex diplomatic terrain. Despite these concerns, I was encouraged by the statements and commitments he made at his confirmation hearing.

In his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Sullivan committed to promoting American values abroad, saying: “Our greatest asset is our commitment to the fundamental values expressed at the founding of our nation; the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These basic human rights are the bedrock of our republic and at the heart of American leadership in the world.”

He underscored that our alliances and partnerships “have been the cornerstone of our national security in the post-war era.” He commended the foreign service officers, civil servants, and locally employed staff who faithfully serve our country every day.

These statements are a rejection of the worldview proposed by President Trump. I hope that Mr. Sullivan honors these statements in office. For this reason, I support his nomination for Deputy Secretary of State.

Mr. WYDEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUERTO RICO'S FISCAL CRISIS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the significance of the unprecedented events now occurring in Puerto Rico.

According to the May 16 editorial in the Wall Street Journal, “The legal brawl over Puerto Rico's bankruptcy begins this week, and it will be long and ugly.”

As we have seen in Greece and Detroit, what is happening in Puerto Rico should be a wake-up call for fiscally distressed States—meaning our 50 States, our cities, and our territories—to get their own houses in order. It is the canary in the mine that ought to be available to everybody. At the same time, it should be a cautionary tale for those who seek to extend similar bankruptcy authority to our own 50 States.

In 2015, after years of fiscal mismanagement and borrowing to finance

their operations, Puerto Rico declared that its debt was unpayable and had to be restructured; however, because Puerto Rico lacked access to chapter 9 of the Bankruptcy Code, restructuring its complex debt outside of the court presented a challenge.

I held a hearing in the Judiciary Committee to examine this issue in December of 2015. We learned at that hearing that while bankruptcy is an effective tool to restructure debt, it merely treats the symptom and it doesn't solve the disease. I told you so, in that vein. I shared my views and the views of many others that unless Puerto Rico addressed its fiscal mismanagement woes, extending bankruptcy authority alone couldn't fix the problem. I told you so that, instead, it would merely kick the can down the road and harm thousands of retirees in Iowa and elsewhere who would bear the costs of Puerto Rico's irresponsible fiscal behavior. The Obama administration, though, pressed Congress to act and to provide Puerto Rico with an orderly bankruptcy-like process to restructure its debt.

According to the testimony of one Treasury official, "Without a comprehensive restructuring framework, Puerto Rico will continue to default on its debt, and litigation will intensify. . . . As the cascading defaults and litigation unfold, there is real risk of another lost decade, this one more damaging than the last." So now, even with a comprehensive restructuring framework, there is still a real risk of another lost decade.

Ultimately, this debt restructuring framework was coupled with an independent oversight board and adopted as the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act, referred to as PROMESA. This approach, we were told, would tackle Puerto Rico's debt crisis in an orderly way and would help to remedy the years of fiscal mismanagement. Nevertheless, I remained concerned that PROMESA and its bankruptcy-like provisions would invite years of litigation and uncertainty due to the lack of existing court precedent.

So it should be no surprise that a recent Bloomberg article titled "Puerto Rico's Bankruptcy Fight is About to Plunge Into the Unknown" described the bankruptcy process as "a circular firing" squad with "no established rule book to shape what comes next." The article reports that one market analyst "foresees a chaotic brew of lawsuits" because "nobody has any idea what is going to happen."

According to one news report, this is just the beginning, as PROMESA's bankruptcy provisions are "more likely to face years of appeal than a typical case."

Despite assurances otherwise, what happens next in the months and years to follow may be far-reaching and like-

ly will impact us all. In particular, prior to the enactment of PROMESA, Puerto Rico, like the States, couldn't declare bankruptcy. I told you this last year, and it is as I predicted last year—granting Puerto Rico the authority to restructure all of its debts, including its State-like constitutional obligations, would be viewed as precedent for giving States similar authority.

I am not really surprised to see this is happening right now.

Getting back to the fact that I told the Senate a year ago. This past September, William Isaac, the former head of the FDIC, called on Congress to pass a law "giv[ing] Illinois the option of utilizing chapter 9, which is akin to what Congress just did for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

The New York Times reported on May 3 that "bankruptcy lawyers and public finance experts are watching Puerto Rico's case closely, to see if it shows a path that financially distressed states like Illinois might also one day take."

The Chicago Tribune's editorial board recently wrote that investors are growing nervous about the talk of States seeking a bankruptcy system after the fashion of Puerto Rico, calling Puerto Rico "the frightening ghost of Illinois future."

The editorial wondered how much more difficult it would be for States to borrow money if lenders knew the States could shirk their obligations in bankruptcy when that debt becomes due.

For those who weren't listening to me last year, those who dismissed concerns that PROMESA would set a troubling and dangerous precedent should take notice and make sure that a one-time piece of legislation does not create a new norm. I hold out hope that PROMESA might manage to provide some help for Puerto Rico.

Success, though, will ultimately require strong leadership from the Commonwealth's leaders, which, for years, that leadership has been very lacking.

There is a lesson to be learned. The fiscal crisis in Puerto Rico should motivate all 50 States, our cities, and territories to find the courage now to make tough choices, which are the foundation of responsible governance, rather than look to the Federal Government and bankruptcy as a way out. If they do not, the effect could be long-lasting, harming the vulnerable both within their populations and outside of their borders.

Obviously, what a lot of smart people told us a year ago to solve Puerto Rico's debt problems simply has not worked out.

So at a time when States, citizens, and markets are all watching, we must stress fiscal responsibility and pay attention to what is happening there in Puerto Rico. Otherwise, the uncertainty and chaos we were assured

would not come to pass may be just over the horizon.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, on Tuesday President Trump sent his proposed fiscal year 2018 budget to Congress. A budget is supposed to reflect the President's priorities and the values our country holds dear. Unfortunately, President Trump's full budget shows how much disdain he has for supporting American families here at home, how little he values America's strong leadership around the world, and how much he misunderstands the essential role the Federal Government has in keeping our air and water clean, roads and bridges functioning, and the public safe from deadly diseases and other threats.

This President's budget shows how much he values corporate profits and polluters over children's health and demonstrates an irrational ignorance of basic principles that have worked for and against the American economy throughout the years. The budget wastes money on a border wall and deportation force that will not make America any safer and will tear apart families and communities.

President Trump fails to uphold the promise he made as a candidate to protect American workers and seniors, and he breaks new ground in the level of uncertainty he is willing to inject into our economy, our local communities, and relationships with our historical allies and economic partners. More than any other Presidential budget in recent memory, this budget must be considered dead on arrival.

President Trump's full budget for fiscal year 2018 is an exercise in extremism. President Trump wants to ax \$610 billion from Medicaid—the program that lifts up America's veterans and the most vulnerable men, women, and children, capping the funding in order to finance tax cuts for big businesses and the wealthiest among us. The budget further slashes the social safety net by cutting the food stamp program and eliminating critical social services programs. It directly hurts children by cutting \$6 billion from the Children's Health Insurance Program. The President wants to choke off funding for essential scientific research at the National Institutes of Health and

infectious disease detection and response at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, while also slashing funding for key global health initiatives that ensure economic stability.

Further demonstrating his misunderstanding of the ripple effect Federal investments can have, the President inexplicably wants to end the economic development assistance programs to rural and economically distressed communities. I was particularly disappointed that he would eliminate the Appalachia Regional Commission, which is very important to the people in the western part of my State as an economic tool that can bring badly needed jobs to Appalachia country.

He wants to put the American dream out of reach for would-be homeowners and seekers of safe and affordable housing with the elimination of HUD's rental assistance and homeowner partnership programs. The President calls for shifting more than \$143 billion in additional student loan payments to hard-working students and their families. And he recommends ending a vital program that helps first responders, law enforcement, teachers, nurses, librarians, public safety, and military have a chance to reduce the burden of their student loans so that they can continue to serve their communities. The President also continues the ill-conceived Republican assault on Federal workers and retirees with his proposal for wholesale slashing the programs and staff, such as the economic and environmentally important EPA and Chesapeake Bay Program, making it nearly impossible for many departments to carry out their basic mission.

I want to talk a few minutes about the foreign assistance budget. I have the privilege of being the ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In terms of our Nation's foreign policy, if the budget is a reflection of values, then what the Trump administration values is an American retreat from the world that would make the United States less safe and secure. The numbers speak for themselves in the narrow-minded budget release we have received.

What is most perplexing about the administration's combined 31.7 percent gutting of international affairs spending—as Secretary Defense Mattis has said: If you don't fund the State Department Diplomacy Center, you had better give the Defense Department more bullets and soldiers. This is counterproductive to making the world a safer place for America.

America is safer when the United States helps feed millions of starving people in Africa and the Middle East, helps Europe defend its democratic institutions from Russia interference, helps support countries and international organizations caring for vulnerable refugee populations, helps

train farmers and other technical workers, helps lead the world in fighting climate change and promoting global health, and helps fund programs to protect human rights and promote democracy. In each of these areas, the administration has taken a penny-wise and pound-foolish approach that will cost lives abroad and endanger Americans here at home.

Each of the programs I mentioned are either eliminated or there are significant cuts, making it impossible for our dedicated Foreign Service officers to carry out the critically important missions they undertake.

As I look at the massive spending cuts put forward by the White House for vital national security, it is impossible to conclude that this is anything but an "America alone" budget—one that, if enacted, will have disastrous effects on our standing in the world.

Luckily, the majority of Members of Congress know this budget is dead on arrival. I look forward to working with like-minded Republican colleagues to make sure nothing remotely close to this budget is enacted.

Fortunately, our Founders developed a system of checks and balances with the Constitution providing that Congress appropriates public funds. It is our responsibility to pass the appropriations bill. I intend to do everything within my power to work with Republicans, using the model of the fiscal year 2017 Omnibus appropriations, to prevent enactment of this outlandish executive branch attempt to cripple our economy and do lasting damage to our Nation's global leadership. Congress has a responsibility to ensure that we have a more realistic budget that helps the American public, contributes to genuine economic growth, and furthers America's true values.

I want to cite some examples in some areas as to how detrimental this budget is. First of all, there are economic assumptions made by the President's budget that are just not realistic. He assumes there is going to be a 3-percent economic growth rate, which economists tell us is simply not realistic. What does that mean? That means there is about \$2 trillion that is being used by economic assumptions which have no justification, meaning that we are going to see significant budget deficits increase if this budget were to become law. The budget double counts some of these gains in order to offset tax reductions. He is putting our economy at risk.

In healthcare, the President's budget continues the administration's misguided and ill-conceived efforts to jeopardize the health and well-being of our constituents under the Affordable Care Act. Make no mistake about it, President Trump is trying to make sure that the healthcare system in this country does not work. He is deliberately putting at risk the cautionary

provisions that are in the Affordable Care Act, which ensure that many of our constituents have affordable health rates without outrageous deductibles or copays. The Trump administration is jeopardizing that.

The Trump administration is jeopardizing the Medicaid system—\$610 billion cut in the Medicaid system, which is critically important for some of our most vulnerable people. There are 280,000 Marylanders who gained essential health coverage through the Medicaid expansion who will be left without access to care. There are an estimated 1.25 million Maryland Medicaid enrollees who will no longer be able to depend on benefits like mental health and substance abuse, pediatric dental services, or maternity coverage.

Our President is recommending a \$6 billion cut in the Children's Health Insurance Program, the CHIP program. That is absolutely outrageous. There is a bipartisan effort in Congress to make sure the children of America have the health they need.

Then there is a \$7 billion—22-percent—cut in the National Institutes of Health. Democrats and Republicans have come together, recognizing that America has provided the true leadership and basic research to deal with the mysteries of illness, and the President wants to reverse that trend. That will not only cost us in terms of our health advancements, but it will also hurt our economy.

The President cuts the funds to the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities. I thought we had made a commitment that we are going to narrow the gap of discrimination in our healthcare system. The President's budget moves in the opposite direction.

In Social Services and Social Security, the President, on his campaign trail, promised not to cut the Social Security system. He broke that promise with this budget. These cuts are a "Robin Hood in reverse" budget. His cuts in the Supplemental Security Income Program and Social Security Disability Insurance Program will be devastating for low- and modest-income individuals, as well as persons with disabilities and those over 65 years of age.

So we have seen cuts to programs the President claimed he would not cut when he was a candidate. The budget cuts nearly \$200 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, or food stamps, which helps low-income Americans with food purchases. He also cuts the TANF Program, which helps people who are in need of assistance. The budget eliminates the LIHEAP, Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, the Weatherization Assistance Program, and State Energy Program. I guess Donald Trump wants low-income Americans to freeze in the dark. This is shameful and reprehensible.

Yes, there is money for some advancements—the advancement of the so-called border wall with Mexico. I visited Mexico just a few months ago. I visited the U.S.-Mexico border. I couldn't find one border security guard, security personnel, who felt that building a wall made any sense. It will not keep out the illegal flow of people or drugs, and it will compromise our ability to work with our neighbors in the south to control immigration and to control drugs. The President's Executive order on immigration and the President's fiscal year 2018 budget ramp up deportation forces inside the United States, which will do more to harm our national security and public safety than to help. We shouldn't be moving in that direction.

Legal Services is one of the areas I worked on for a long time with my Republican colleagues to make sure we fund the Legal Services Corporation. The Trump budget completely eliminates that funding. The late Justice Antonin Scalia said at Legal Services Corporation's 40th Anniversary Conference in 2014: "LSC pursues the most fundamental of American ideals, and it pursues equal justice in those areas of life most important to the lives of our citizens."

We believe in equal justice under the law. If a person cannot get legal help, they cannot get equal justice under the law. And the President says there is no Federal role for this. I hope that we will soundly reject that.

The President's budget eliminates the Community Development Block Grant Program. That is very troubling. Here is one of the more flexible programs we offer the local government in order to be able to make their own decisions, and the President's budget eliminates that program.

The President's budget eliminates many of our programs under agriculture, which will hurt our rural areas and hurt our farming community. The budget proposes to eliminate new enrollment in the Conservation Stewardship Program and funding for the Regional Conservation Partnership Program. I am very familiar with the Regional Conservation Partnership Program. It was put in the last farm reauthorization bill. It was done as an effort to help deal with conservation in critically important areas, including the Chesapeake Bay watershed. It is a very important program to preserving our bay and preserving farm land so that we can have both a healthy bay and healthy agriculture. The President eliminates those programs. I could go on and on about agriculture—the many programs that are either severely restricted or eliminated under the President's budget.

In education, the fiscal year 2018 budget released by President Trump may be entitled "A New Foundation for American Greatness," but Presi-

dent Trump and Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos have severely undercut our students, educators, and public schools. The budget proposes to eliminate the Preschool Development Grant Program, a program that has successfully placed more than 2,700 additional 4-year-olds in high-quality preschool programs across my State. The vulnerable children in this program get a boost that helps them to lower the achievement gap among students of color, low-income children, and children with disabilities across my State. We should be expanding these programs, not reducing them. And 85 Members of this body voted in favor of the Every Student Succeeds Act and the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grant Program. That progress is jeopardized by the President's budget.

Yes, he finds money for a new program to help school choice programs, which will undermine the progress we have made in public education. Mr. President, 95 percent of our students get their education through the public schools, and that is jeopardized by the \$1.25 billion the President has included in his budget for school choice programs.

Maryland families understand the value of higher education. For too many, the cost of higher education means that it is difficult, if not impossible, for their children to have the higher education they need. Yet the President's budget takes away some of the tools we have in order to afford higher education. That is just not right. We should be making higher education more affordable, not less affordable.

In the environment, the President's proposed budget would eliminate the Chesapeake Bay Program. The Chesapeake Bay Program and related efforts are delivering encouraging results throughout the watershed and have built a tremendous movement forward. Yet President Trump has still targeted them for elimination. The local governments are doing their job in stewardship of the bay. The States are doing their job. Our stakeholders are doing their job. We depend upon the Federal Government to monitor and make sure that the programs are there—that all stakeholders are doing their fair share. The elimination of the Chesapeake Bay Program would jeopardize all of that progress. We cannot let that happen.

The President's budget would cut the EPA budget by 31.4 percent, the most severe cut of any major Federal agency. The investment in our Nation's water and waste water infrastructure has been flatlined through this budget proposal.

What in the world makes President Trump think that our Nation's drinking water infrastructure shall be kept at status quo? Don't we all remember

what happened in Flint, MI? We have discovered similar things in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. In Baltimore, our public school system cannot connect their water fountains to the water supply because of lead contamination. We need to have a greater commitment to make sure that the water supply to America is safe.

Under the budget, the Office of Compliance would be cut by one-third of its budget. That is EPA not being able to enforce the law. Aren't we a country of the rule of law? You would not think so under President Trump's budget.

The President's budget also does not contain a critical infrastructure plan. We heard that during the campaign. But nowhere in this budget is he providing for that increase. Instead, it proposes cuts in some of the highway trust programs.

Every day, civil servants perform countless tasks that help support and defend and protect America. Civil servants are saving lives, empowering small businesses, keeping America safe from harm, and otherwise ensuring a safe and prosperous future for our country, including our children and families. We know that our Federal employees often perform the type of work that no one else can do. It is a highly qualified Federal workforce. On May 5, Donald Trump issued a proclamation declaring May 7 through 13, 2017, as Public Service Recognition Week. He stated:

Throughout my first 100 days, I have seen the tremendous work civil servants do to fulfill our duty to the American people. At all levels of government, our public servants put our country and our people first.

He has a bizarre way of showing his appreciation. Earlier this week, he released a budget that punishes Federal workers by making them pay much more for their pensions, an additional \$5,000 for an average Federal worker, while making these pensions much smaller.

The relentless assault on the Federal workforce must end. The civilian workforce was smaller last year than it was 40 years ago, according to data from the Office of Personnel Management. Federal workers increasingly have been asked to do more and more with less and less. They have already sacrificed financially, contributing \$190 billion to deficit reduction just since 2011.

Workers hired in 2012 already are paying more for smaller pensions. Sequestration-related furloughs cost Federal workers \$1 billion in lost pay, and there was a 3-year pay freeze from 2011 to 2013, and substandard rises since then. Salaries and wages have fallen 6.5 percent since 2010, adjusted for inflation.

Now comes the latest attack on the Federal worker's pension, on top of continued attacks on pay, healthcare

and other benefits, collective bargaining, and due process rights. President Trump would eliminate the annual cost of living adjustments for people in the Federal Employees Retirement System, including current retirees, and reduce them by half a percentage point for people in the old Civil Service Retirement System, including current retirees.

According to certified financial planner Art Stein, the annuity would lose one-third of its value over 20 years if inflation averages between 2 and 3 percent annually, and nearly half of its value if inflation averages 4 percent. According to the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association, the average FERS annuitant would lose \$99,471 over 20 years, and the average CSRS annuitant would lose \$60,576 over 20 years under the Trump budget.

That is outrageous. That is outrageous. We are talking about people who are already retired. They can't re-enter the workforce. They have no choice. Yet we are telling them that they are not going to get what we promised. It is important to understand that 85 percent of the Federal workforce is located beyond the Washington metropolitan area. Federal workers are in big cities and small towns across America, striving to make things better for their neighbors.

Do we really want to engage in a race to the bottom with respect to our Federal workers? These are the people who make sure our parents' Social Security checks arrive on time. They make sure the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the food we eat are safe. They are trying to find a cure for our spouse's cancer and our sibling's type 1 diabetes.

They support our sons and daughters in harm's way, and they care for the wounded warriors at home. They patrol our borders and discover and disrupt terrorist threats aimed at our community. They are working to ensure that our grandchildren inherit a habitable climate. When we punish Federal workers—30 percent of whom are veterans, by the way—we are not just harming them and their families, but we are harming each and every American.

I intend to do everything within my power to work with Republicans, using the model of the fiscal year 2017 omnibus appropriations, to prevent the enactment of this dangerous executive branch attempt to cripple our economy and do lasting damage to our Nation's global leadership. Congress has the responsibility to ensure that we have a more realistic budget that helps the American public, contributes to genuine economic growth, and furthers America's true values.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from Utah.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the continuing effort to repeal and replace ObamaCare. This effort has essentially been going on since the day the bill was signed into law. I think most of us on the Republican side recognize the overwhelming consensus surrounding the failures of ObamaCare as a major reason we currently find ourselves in the majority.

As you know, the House passed the American Health Care Act, a bill that would repeal and replace ObamaCare, earlier this month. This is an important step in the process. Later today, we expect to hear from the Congressional Budget Office about the House bill. The CBO score will lay down an important marker for the repeal and replace efforts in the Senate. It will allow us to work to ensure that the House bill fits into the constraints of the reconciliation rules in the Senate, while we continue to strive toward our own policy goals to implement patient-centered healthcare and healthcare reforms that address cost and promote choice and competition.

I am very interested in what they say. These changes are more important than ever. Just today, we received a report from HHS that, from the time ObamaCare took effect through 2017, there was an average premium increase of 105 percent across the 39 States using healthcare.gov. This is just one snapshot of the runaway costs of ObamaCare, and it is just one of many examples indicating why we need to act as quickly as possible to repeal and replace the misguided law.

As the Senate continues to discuss the policy matters related to this effort, we will need to confront a number of different issues as we work to provide enduring reforms for our beleaguered healthcare system. As chairman of the Senate committee with jurisdiction over most of the salient issues under discussion, I want to make my views on these matters very clear.

First, it is my view that all of the ObamaCare taxes need to go. We should not be treating the ObamaCare taxes as a smorgasbord, picking and choosing which ones to keep and which to discard. I don't think there is a single tax increase in ObamaCare that has enjoyed support on this Republican side.

When all is said and done, the tax provisions of the Affordable Care Act represented a trillion-dollar hit on the economy in just the first 10 years. That is nearly 1 percent of the projected gross domestic product over the same period. In my view, it would be inappropriate, after spending the better part of a decade railing against ObamaCare's burdensome job-killing taxes, for us to then turn around and say that some of them are fine so long as they are being used to fund Republican healthcare proposals.

It is very simple. We need to repeal all of the ObamaCare taxes—the medical device tax, the health insurance tax, the so-called Cadillac tax, the taxes on healthcare savings and pharmaceuticals, and several others. They all have to go.

Second, we need to fully repeal the individual mandate. There has been some talk about keeping the mandate around temporarily, if nothing else, to help shore up the new system. But as I said with the ObamaCare taxes, Republicans have spent years condemning the individual mandate as an unconstitutional assault on individual liberty. We have also argued that it was ineffective and that it has failed to draw enough younger and healthier consumers into the insurance market in order to offset the cost of ObamaCare's draconian market reform mandates.

I don't see how we can now turn on a dime and say that the individual mandate is now somehow acceptable because we are using it to prop up a system that Republicans have designed. Like the taxes, the individual mandate, in my view, needs to be repealed. Lastly, we need to resist any temptation to alter the tax treatment of employer-provided health insurance as part of this particular exercise. Don't get me wrong. There have been a number of health reform proposals over the years that have dealt with this issue, including a legislative framework that I drafted, along with two of my colleagues. However, given the limitations we face in this current exercise and the fact that we are not starting from a blank slate but rather attempting to repeal a law that has been implemented for a number of years, we should be wary of the impact of pulling employer-sponsored insurance into this current debate.

The purpose of this budget reconciliation exercise to repeal and replace ObamaCare is to address costs in the individual markets. I believe it is important that everyone, whether they are Members of Congress, stakeholders in the business community, or living elsewhere in the country, manage their expectations about the possible outcomes of this process given the limitations we are facing.

While the constraints inherent to the budget reconciliation process may be inconvenient at the specific moment, they serve a number of important purposes. Under this process, the Senate will need to reduce the deficit by at least as much as the House bill. There is no way around that. The process for determining what provisions of the House bill will need to be changed is still ongoing. Of course, we will have to take a good long look at the numbers we get from CBO later today.

Not only do we need to take into account the CBO numbers and the budget rules, but we also need to consider what the best policy is, and, at the end

of the day, what approach is doable. We can do a lot in this exercise, but we should not make this the be-all and end-all of our healthcare reform effort.

As I said before, everyone should be managing their expectations at this point. While we can and should be ambitious in our efforts, we need to be realistic about the limitations that exist and be willing to practice the art of the doable, to compromise, and to really recognize what issues will need to be set aside for another day.

None of this is going to be easy, but I believe we are up to the challenge. I look forward to working with my colleagues on these issues and to finding solutions that will help us keep the promises we made to our constituents.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I want to follow the comments made by the President pro tempore of the Senate—the Senator from Utah—talking about problems that people have and problems that grow every day with their future look at healthcare and what it may mean for their families.

This is a top-of-the-mind issue for families in Utah, or Missouri, where I am from, or Montana, where the Presiding Officer is from, or Massachusetts. Anywhere in the country, anyone who is looking at this system and hoping to have a system they could rely on is finding that it is just not working. This is a plan that clearly has failed. It was a plan that gave all kinds of assurances, virtually none of which have been kept.

In our State today, we got some bad news in Missouri about what that health insurance exchange looks like next year. Blue Cross Blue Shield serves 30 counties in our State. Another Blue Cross-related group, Anthem, serves the rest of the State. But today, Blue Cross Blue Shield announced that it is going to pull out of the exchanges next year. Some 31,000 people in 25 counties around Kansas City will have no insurer at this moment who is willing to sell policies on the individual exchange. This is devastating news for those families—maybe they are already on their second or third insurance company in as many years—trying to wade through yet another individual plan that tells them what might or might not be covered. This is certainly a long way from the assurances that you would be able to keep your plan and you would be able to continue to see the doctors you like. It seems a long way from that pledge. Remember that pledge? If you like your plan, you can keep your plan. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. It didn't turn out to be that way at all.

In fact, in the five other counties that Blue Cross is leaving in our State—and I don't say this with any

disrespect toward that nonprofit company—they are losing money. This system won't work, and that is why we are down from multiple companies willing to offer insurance in all kinds of counties around the country to now States, like Iowa, having no insurance company at all that will offer an individual policy anywhere.

In the five metropolitan counties in the Kansas area, they have three competitors this year in those five counties. Humana announced in February that they would be leaving next year. Blue Cross announced today that they would be leaving. So 5 metropolitan counties at this moment, at least, have only one company that will even offer a policy, and 25 counties have no company that will offer a policy based on that announcement. If you only have one choice, do you really have any choices at all?

Under this plan, unless we go in a very different direction, the choice is to buy the policy or pay the penalty. This exchange that was promised where the average family would see their insurance costs go down \$2,500 a year—this is as far from that promise as you could possibly get. Not only has your policy likely gone up more than \$2,500, but your deductible has gone up in even higher percentages than that.

Certainly, 30 percent of the counties in America right now only have one company that will offer insurance. As I said earlier, our neighboring State to the north, Iowa, has no company that will offer insurance to anybody on the individual market. What kind of system is that?

In my State, we have 114 counties and the city of St. Louis in addition to those 114 counties. At this moment, 97 of them have only one company that will offer insurance. Unless things change dramatically, in January, 25 of those 97 will have no company that will offer insurance. Now, 77 counties—unless the one company offering insurance decides it can't participate in that market either—would have only one choice. I think it is likely that those 77 counties will see some change in whether they have one choice or no choice.

Last week, I came to the floor to talk about Missourians who have problems and who are seeing their out-of-pocket costs skyrocket under this. Let me share another story about one of the several people we heard from this week.

Holly is a cancer survivor. She lives in Southeast Missouri. She was forced again this year to switch insurance policies when the insurance company she had left the individual exchange, the ObamaCare exchange. That left Holly with only one choice. Again, people in the vast majority of our counties have the same option—they have one option. Holly had one option, and that carrier didn't cover any of her four

cancer doctors. Now, remember, this is a cancer survivor who literally has been in a fight for her life, and now she can't get a policy that allows her to see the doctors in whom, in that fight for her life, she developed confidence. So that means she can't see her oncologist under any policy she can get. She can't see the radiation oncologist, the surgical oncologist, and the reconstructive surgeon. None of those people are now available to her.

This is in a world where Holly, you, me—all of us were told: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Well, she liked all four of her doctors, and she can't keep any of those doctors. We were told: If you like your policy, you can keep your policy. If it weren't so serious, looking back at that promise, it would be like it was some cruel joke that somebody is coming up with that couldn't have been further from the truth. When you are battling cancer and you lose access to the doctors you know and trust, no reasonable person can argue to you that the system we have is working. The status quo is unacceptable. It is clearly unsustainable.

There is a lot of discussion about what kind of change we are going to have. The "why" here is more important than the "how." The "why" here is the most important part of this debate because the reason we have to change is that the system we have is absolutely not working.

Americans like Holly and all the families in the Kansas City area who are certain to lose this year's coverage next year may or may not have coverage at all. No company besides this one company that left was willing to be there this year. They deserve better. That is why I am going to continue to work with my Senate colleagues to give families more choices to expand their access to the healthcare providers they want and the kind of insurance coverage they would like to have.

This plan simply hasn't worked, it isn't working, and it is going to get worse before it gets better. That is why we are debating how to change it, not debating the effort that has totally failed. Now we need to get in and figure out how to stabilize this marketplace and answer those important questions for families all over this country who not only don't have the coverage they want, but they also don't have access to the healthcare they need.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I congratulate my colleague from Missouri for the excellent comments he made.

I bring to the floor a report that came out last evening, which is essentially the analysis that the Obama administration never wanted the American people to see, and it has to do with

ObamaCare from 2013 to 2017. This report that the Obama administration would love to hide from the American people makes the point that my colleague from Missouri just made.

In those years, from 2013 to 2017, once ObamaCare came into place, premiums around the country in the States that are buying on the Federal ObamaCare exchange went up 105 percent on average—more than double. It more than doubled in 20 States, and it tripled in three States: Oklahoma, Alaska, and Alabama. In Wyoming, it went up 107 percent in just 4 years. Tell me something else that has gone up by that price in our lives anywhere over that short period of time. Those are the numbers that are out today.

More than 7 years ago, the Washington Democrats wrote an enormously costly and complicated healthcare law. They forced it through the Senate, and they made lots of promises. They promised it would provide care for less money. They promised that you could keep your doctor and that you could keep your insurance. They promised that if you just allowed Washington to have more control, everything would be better for you. It hasn't worked out that way. These are the numbers we are looking at today, and it looks as if prices are going to go up again next year because of the mandates and the requirements of the Obama healthcare law.

In Connecticut, insurance companies say they want an average increase of about 24 percent; in Maryland, the average is 45 percent; and in Oregon, 17 percent. Americans are again facing double-digit increases in their ObamaCare premiums next year, just like this past year.

Some companies simply said: Hey, I am done. I am not going to sell anymore. It is just not worth it.

That is what Aetna has done—pulled out entirely. The thing that is so interesting about Aetna's decision is that they were one of the major cheerleaders early on back in the beginning of ObamaCare. They said: Oh yeah, we want to do this. We want to sell insurance all around the country. Well, now they are pulling out of ObamaCare all across America. What that means for people at home is that they have fewer choices.

People living in two-thirds of the counties in this country—and in every county in my home State of Wyoming—are down to fewer and fewer choices. We have one choice of a carrier to buy from on the exchange in Wyoming. In two-thirds of the counties, people have only one or two choices. There are now places where people have no choices. Even if they get a subsidy under ObamaCare, there is no place they can use it, so it is useless to them.

The companies that remain—what are they doing to help try to control

costs? Well, they are cutting back on access to doctors and to hospitals, as we just heard is the situation of the patient in Missouri.

Democrats say that people have to buy the insurance anyway because they say they put a mandate on it. Americans, like it or not, you have to buy ObamaCare insurance. If you don't like it, we are going to fine you. That is what the Democrats said. Well, in spite of the mandate, 20 million Americans said "No, thank you," and about 8 million paid a fine. Another 12 million got an exemption because there are actually 41 different ways you can get exempted from ObamaCare. People realize it is not a good deal for them. They know ObamaCare has made insurance so expensive that it is not a good value for their hard-earned dollars.

It is astonishing to hear Democrats now say that basically the problem was that Washington didn't have enough control. We need more government control, they are saying. There are a number of Democrats who want a single-payer healthcare system. Some call it Medicare for all. They can call it what they want—it means higher costs and more Washington control over the healthcare American families need.

The State of Vermont looked at this idea a couple of years ago. Even in this very small, very liberal State, they dropped the idea almost immediately. Why? Because they said it was too expensive.

That didn't stop other States from looking at it. Recently, this occurred in the State of California. Democrats in California recently offered a plan to have the State take control of all healthcare for everyone who lives there. Universal healthcare for all, they call it—doctor visits, hospitals, inpatient care, outpatient care, emergencies, dental, vision, mental health, nursing homes, everything, cradle to grave, universal health coverage.

So what do the stories in the California papers say about this? Well, they did a budget analysis. The budget office of the State of California did a budget analysis and said: What would such a thing cost? They came up with a cost of \$400 billion a year. That sounds like a big number, but how do you put that in perspective? What else can you do? Four hundred billion dollars. So they said: Well, let's compare it to the budget of the entire State of California. The entire budget for the State of California today is \$190 billion, so the cost of universal healthcare alone is twice the budget of the whole State of California. That includes teachers, firefighters, police, everything. They are proposing to spend twice the amount that they spend on everything on universal healthcare.

So what do the Democrats say? Well, we will just have to raise taxes. That is their answer to so much of everything. I guess they figure that hard-working

families in California would need to pay these taxes every year—not just once but every year because that price tag is \$400 billion each and every year.

Democrats have no good ideas on how to deal with this collapse of ObamaCare. Republicans are offering real solutions. We are looking for ways to bring costs down, to give people more freedom, and to give people more control over their own healthcare. We are working to make sure people can get the care they need from a doctor they choose at a lower cost. We don't have that with ObamaCare.

The Democrats are pushing the exact opposite approach. They are offering higher costs, higher taxes, more government control, more government say in your family's life.

ObamaCare has failed. Republicans are committed to finding long-term solutions to our Nation's healthcare needs.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon.

PARIS AGREEMENT

Mr. President, there is an African proverb that goes something like this: If you want to go fast, go alone; if you want to go far, go together.

The Paris Agreement was developed in that spirit; that 195 nations and territories can do more to protect our planet from climate change, the greatest environmental challenge of our lifetime, than the United States or any country can do isolated or on its own. Nearly 200 countries now have agreed to do their part to limit our global temperature rise by developing national plans to reduce their own emissions.

We know climate change is a global challenge that does not respect national borders. Emissions anywhere affect people everywhere, with the poorest and most vulnerable populations affected most. There is a reason why we call it "global warming." We know no one country, no one region, no one continent can solve this problem alone.

President Trump's inner circle has a different take on this historical agreement. For instance, during an appearance on "Fox and Friends" last month, Scott Pruitt, the EPA Administrator, denounced the Paris Agreement, calling it "a bad deal for America."

Asked about his biggest objection to the accord, this is what he said. He claimed China and India had no obligation until 2030—no obligation until 2030—even though "they are polluting far more than we are."

Well, that is just false. First, in 2015, the United States on a per capita basis produced more than double the carbon dioxide emissions of China—more than double—and eight times more than India. Also, contrary to what the Administrator continues to espouse, both China and India have pledged to reach their carbon emissions reduction goals by 2030, which means they are taking steps now—not 5 years from now, not 10 years from now, not 13 years from now—now, to meet those commitments. India is on schedule to be the world's third largest solar market by the end of 2017. In fact, last year, India unveiled the largest solar power facility in the world.

Meanwhile, Chinese leaders have ordered their country's coal companies to cut 1.3 million jobs over the next 5 years. Some of these workers will find jobs in the clean energy sector, which Beijing expects to generate more than 13 million jobs by 2020.

Make no mistake, if the United States cedes its leadership position on climate change, China will be ready and willing to assume that role—our role. In doing so, they will move ahead, and we will fall behind. It is just that simple.

We have a chart here that includes a quote from China's top climate negotiator. He told Reuters about 6 months ago that if Trump abandons efforts to implement the Paris Agreement, "China's influence and voice are likely to increase in global climate governance, which will then spill over into other areas of global governance and increase China's global standing, power and leadership."

The Chinese clearly understand that the Paris Agreement affords their country the opportunity to emerge in the 21st century as a clean energy superpower.

I have been there. A year ago, I was there. In the trains they built and the train systems they built, the huge electric buses, all electric buses that I rode, it is clear they know what they are doing, and their intent was to eat our lunch by pursuing this clean sustainable energy approach.

Unfortunately, those in the Trump administration seem to be the only ones who don't recognize that. Some day they will wish they had, and the rest of us will wish we had too. Withdrawing from this pact doesn't put America first, it puts America behind.

You don't have to take my word for it. Just ask our business community. They see the clear benefits for their businesses and for America if we continue to play a lead role in the implementation of the Paris Agreement. Over 1,000 American companies and investors, some of which are represented here on this chart, have written to President Trump urging his administration and him to address climate change through the implementation of

the Paris Agreement. The businesses, which include Exxon, Starbucks, Apple, General Mills, Walmart, Nike, Morgan Stanley, and BP—just to name a few—this is what all these companies and their leaders said: Failure to embrace the Paris accords "puts American prosperity at risk. But the right action now will create jobs and boost U.S. competitiveness."

I have another chart.

We have two letters here. One was written to a new President, President Obama, in 2009. Again, this is a full-page ad.

This is another ad that appeared in the past week to another new President, in this case, President Trump. Interesting enough, back in 2009, a Manhattan businessman named Donald J. Trump agreed with the 1,000 companies I mentioned earlier—the 1,000 companies that said we ought to do something about climate change. We ought to get on board and lead the way. Businessman Donald J. Trump agreed with them and joined CEOs to run an ad in the New York Times urging then-President Obama to "lead the world by example," ahead of the U.N. Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen.

In the ad right here, Donald Trump called on President Obama to allow the United States of America "to serve in modeling the change necessary to protect humanity and our planet."

Eight years later, the person who signed this letter and joined all these other CEOs in saying to President Obama: "Wake up. Let's do something about this climate change stuff. Make sure we are leading the parade"—8 years later, he is not signing the letter. He is the addressee on the letter, from, again, hundreds of CEOs from around the country, and they are urging him to do the very same thing Donald J. Trump had urged Barack Obama to do 8 years earlier. If you ever want to think of something that is ironic, find an example of two full-page ads that sort of represent the term "irony," this is it. This is it.

The companies noted in this second full-page ad that the Paris Agreement provides just the kind of framework we need. So U.S. businesses still recognize that our country leading the world in addressing climate change is the right approach. We might want to ask: Why doesn't our President, Donald Trump, realize that? With the Paris Agreement, the global community rightly recognized that there are challenges bigger than any one State and came together to do what is best for our collective future.

It is not the first time the global community came together for the greater good. In 1944, the world came together at the Convention on International Civil Aviation to regulate international air travel so planes could avoid flying into one another in the not-so-friendly skies of the future.

In 1968, the nonproliferation treaty helped prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, promote the peaceful use of nuclear energy, and further the goal of disarmament to help keep our world safe.

In 1977, the Chemical Weapons Convention outlawed the production, stockpiling, and use of chemical weapons, which the world agreed were inhumane.

On these critical issues, the world came together overwhelmingly to do what was in the best interest of humanity rather than the best interest of one single nation, but even these other historic and frankly commonsense agreements don't have as many signers as the Paris Agreement does.

We hear numbers thrown around a lot when we talk about the Paris Agreement, but to put the number of signers in context, let me just say it is nearly the whole world—nearly the whole world.

If you wonder what 195 national flags look like, pretty much the whole world, this chart depicts that. There are two flags down here that have not signed, and one of those is Nicaragua. They didn't sign because they thought the Paris accords didn't go far enough. The other country that didn't sign on is Syria. So, in effect, there is really only one country that has refused to accept the basis of the Paris Agreement, this huge Paris accord, and that one nation is Syria.

Our withdrawing leaves the United States in company with Bashar al-Assad. We will be his wingman. That is not the company we ought to be keeping, and that is not who we are.

When it comes to global challenges such as terrorism and cyber attacks, the United States doesn't sit back and wait for someone else to lead. We lead. America leads the way. We always have. It is part of the fabric of our Nation.

To win our freedom, we took on the mightiest nation on Earth at the time, England, not once but twice, and beat them. A half century later, we survived a bloody Civil War that took hundreds of thousands of lives and left hundreds of thousands more crippled and wounded. After that war, our President was assassinated and his successor, Andrew Johnson, was impeached. Somehow we survived all that and we went on to lead our allies to victory in World War I and World War II. We led our country out of the Great Depression and into victory in the Cold War as well.

Americans should, once again, be leading the world to combat what is likely to be the greatest challenge we will face in our lifetimes. Our children and their children are counting on this, and we should not let them down.

Somebody asked me how long it would take to read a list of the 195 nations that have signed on to the Paris Peace Accords, and I have the names

right here. I am not sure I can correctly pronounce all of the names—maybe page 1 and the last page, and I will leave it at that.

It starts out with Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, and Barbados.

That is the first page, and it goes on and on and on.

I will finish up with Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Vietnam, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

There are 195 in all. We ought to be in company with the names of all of the countries that are on that list. We should not be in the company of the one that is down here by itself—Syria.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 13 minutes remaining until the vote.

Mr. CARPER. Thank you.

IRAN

Mr. President, one of the countries on this list of the 195 subscribing to and signing on to the Paris Agreement was the country of Iran. I want to talk a little bit about Iran in the time that remains.

I came home from church this past Sunday. My wife and I were in the kitchen—we were fixing breakfast—when I turned on the television and watched, I think it was, CNN. They were broadcasting live from Saudi Arabia our President's talking to a large group of national leaders representing Muslim countries from around the world, hosted by Saudi Arabia. The President was giving his speech. He was using a teleprompter, but a lot of Presidents use teleprompters. He was reading a speech off of the teleprompter. As I was listening, I actually thought that this was a pretty good speech. Closer to the end of the speech—I do not know if he went off camera or went off the teleprompter and just did an inaudible or if this was part of the speech—he started talking about Iran and why they are a nemesis to a lot of the world and are not to be trusted—somebody we should not be doing business with or going into any kind of agreements with, even an agreement that causes them not to be able to build a nuclear weapon.

In any event, I thought to myself that there is a real irony here because, as he was going on and berating Iran, they were still counting the votes in Iran from the election that had occurred the day before, which is unlike many of the countries that were represented and that President Trump was addressing in that they do not have elections in those countries. Women do not get to hold office or run for office in many of those countries.

Let me just be the first to say that, clearly, Iran is not a Jeffersonian democracy, and, as some would suggest of late, maybe our credentials are somewhat tarnished on that too. I think of the over 1,600 people who registered to run for President in Iran. There were 1,600 people in Iran who wanted to run for President this year, and Iran's Guardian Council only allowed 6, ultimately, to run.

Iran has never allowed a woman to run for President. Women do hold elected positions. They serve in the parliament and in municipal positions, but none of them has ever run for President. We have had one or two or maybe three.

Iran does not enjoy a free press. International election observers are strictly forbidden, and there are widespread allegations that Iran's 2009 Presidential elections, in which Ahmadinejad was supposedly re-elected—I doubt that he was, but there are a lot of people who think those elections were rigged.

In Iran, most of the final decisions rest with the Supreme Leader, at least decisions of consequence, and the Supreme Leader, as we know, is not popularly elected by the people of that country.

Here is what happened in the elections in Iran over the weekend. A lot of people turned out to vote, and they were willing to support a candidate who openly advocates for engagement with the West, including with us. The Supreme Leader of Iran, frankly, did not want President Rouhani to be re-elected, but he was, with nearly 60 percent of the vote. In fact, the Supreme Leader, I think, and others urged others to get out of the race so that there would be just a one-on-one against a hard-line candidate, who was favored by the Supreme Leader, and President Rouhani, who turned out to be favored in the election by almost 60 percent of the voters.

Of the people who voted, I do not know how this breaks out by age, but the country of Iran is a young country. They had their revolution back in the late 1970s. You may recall they captured our Embassy and held our folks hostage during the end of the Carter administration. They created a lot of havoc—not a lot of bloodshed but a lot of havoc—and a lot of bad will from that point in time until almost to this day.

Most of the people who live in Iran today are under the age of 30. A clear majority of them were not alive in 1970 to 1979. They never knew the fellow who led that revolution in Iran in the late 1970s. Most of the people in that country today were born after 1979.

I have talked to any number of Americans, including those who have held senior positions in previous administrations who have gone to Iran in recent years, and they all tell me the

same story. They could not believe how welcomed they were by people everywhere—young people and not so young people, but especially by young people. There was a fascination on the part of especially the young people with our country, and there actually appears to be a fair amount of respect and admiration for our country. They would like to have a better relationship with our country.

They turned out and voted for a President. They also voted in municipal elections over the weekend. In the municipal elections, they voted out some sitting mayors of cities like Tehran, which is the capital city. The mayor there was a hard-liner, and, apparently, he has been knocked out of office or will be shortly. There are many other municipal leaders, and a moderate reformist will be succeeding one of the hard-liners.

I do not mean to suggest that all in Iran love us. They do not. The Revolutionary Guard and some of their leadership do not care for us at all. They, frankly, like terrorism and embrace terrorism and would like to continue to foment upheaval and terror in some parts around the country. They are not the future of their country. The future of their country voted last weekend. We have all heard about voting for change. Well, they voted for change, and my hope is that they will get what they voted for.

I think, for us, we have to be smart enough to say that no democracy is perfect—not ours, not theirs—and give them at least a passing grade for effort and see, as we go forward, how we can find ways to work together.

I served in the Vietnam war—three tours in Southeast Asia. I came back at the end of the war and moved from California to Delaware. I got an MBA and became the treasurer, Congressman, Governor, and Senator of Delaware. When I was a Congressman, I led a six-member congressional delegation, including one former U.S. POW, Air Force Capt. Pete Peterson, who spent 6 years in the Hanoi Hilton. We went back to Vietnam a month after I stepped down as a captain in the U.S. Navy. We went back to Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos to find out what happened to the thousands of MIAs whose bodies were never recovered. We do not know how they died or where they died or when they died, but we went back and tried to get to the truth. We did so at the behest and encouragement of the George Herbert Walker Bush administration.

We took with us a roadmap to normalize relations between the United States and Vietnam. Lo and behold, we ended up getting to meet their brand new leader, Do Muoi. He was a brand new leader who had only been in office for a week. We presented our roadmap to normalize relations. The six of us—Democrat and Republican Members of

the House—had a very emotional meeting with him—a very emotional meeting—and said that these are the things you have to do. If you want to normalize relations with us, give us access to crash sites, the ability to excavate crash sites, the ability to talk to people who live in those areas and communities that are around those crash sites, the ability to go into your war museums, and the ability to go into your military archives and get as much information as we can. We said that we wanted our folks—U.S. folks—to be able to go around the country, to travel around their country. If somebody reports seeing a round-eye, or somebody who might be American, we want to be able to go find him.

A long story short, they did all of the things we asked them to do. Pete Peterson, a Member of our delegation, became the U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam. He made sure that the Vietnamese kept to the letter and spirit of that agreement. They did, and we normalized relations.

When I went back to Vietnam last year with President Obama, I met with some of the same people I had met with in August of 1991, who are now leaders of their countries. Do Muoi is still alive. I wrote him a note and sent it to him while I was there.

There are 55,000 American names that are on a wall down by the Lincoln Memorial—55,000 men and women who died in the war, with whom I served—and we have allowed by-gones to be by-gones with Vietnam. They are not a Jeffersonian democracy, but it turns out that we have worked through our difficulties. They have become a major trading partner with the United States—in fact, a major market. They want to buy things from us, too, like Boeing jets, and a lot of them for a lot of money—billions of dollars.

As it turns out, they and Iran have an airline that is decrepit. We used to joke about an airline in this country that was called Allegheny. We called it “Agony.” We had another airline in this country called “Tree Top.” In Iran, they do not have an airline to be proud of, as they have very old airplanes and not especially safe airplanes. Like Vietnam, they want to buy our airplanes—a lot of them, for a lot of money.

I would hope that we could be smart enough to say that maybe we should sell to them. We are not going to sell them military equipment. We sell military equipment to Vietnam now, but we are not going to do that kind of thing with Iran. Maybe, if we are smart, we can sell them airplanes and, later on, the parts to the airplanes and, later on, other things as well. We should start small and go from there, as we have with Vietnam.

I will close, but if I could, I want to just say that our President, who has called for the isolation of Iran, also

has, basically, praised the actions of President Duterte, of the Philippines, the leader of the Philippines. Do you know what he has done? He has launched a campaign of extrajudicial murders and has killed over 8,000 people.

He has warmly welcomed the leader of Turkey, Erdogan, who may have won or may not have won a tight election that gives him extraordinary powers as the leader of that country.

The President welcomed to the White House Egyptian President El-Sisi, who came to power through military intervention and not an elected government. President Trump has said recently that he would be “honored” to meet with North Korean leader Kim Jong un, and that is despite the repeated threats from the Korean leader to launch nuclear weapons at the United States and our allies.

Somehow all of those things that this President has done and the things that he has spoken out against, including having any kind of relationship with Iran, does not seem, to me, to be consistent. I will be polite and say it is inconsistent. I think we need to be smarter than that.

With regard to the note that I wrote to the former leader of Vietnam when I was, literally, at the Hanoi Hilton—back at the prison in which JOHN MCCAIN and Pete Peterson were imprisoned—I saw a huge picture on the wall when I was there last year, and I wrote the note and gave it to a young Vietnamese man who knew Do Muoi. I wrote that same African-American proverb: If you want to go quickly, go alone. If you want to go far, go together.

Ultimately, we found a way with Vietnam. It took a long time. The war pretty much ended in 1975. It took a long time to get to more normal relations. We finally made it, and they are better for it, and we are too. Someday, the time will come to turn a page, I think, with Iran. We are not there yet, but we are getting a little closer.

For now, I just want to say to those people, though, in that country, who took the time and made the effort to vote and decided to vote for change and to vote for the reformist—the more moderate form of government—and wanted to be more westward looking than would otherwise be the case: Good for you. My hope in doing that is that you will join us in basically turning down the idea of continuing support for Hezbollah and for terrorism that the other part of Iran and some of the others in leadership are determined to sustain.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Sullivan nomination?

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 135 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Bennet	Grassley	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Reed
Boozman	Heinrich	Risch
Brown	Heitkamp	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Cantwell	Hirono	Rubio
Capito	Hoeven	Sasse
Cardin	Inhofe	Schatz
Carper	Isakson	Schumer
Casey	Johnson	Scott
Cassidy	Kaine	Shaheen
Cochran	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	King	Stabenow
Coons	Klobuchar	Strange
Corker	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Leahy	Tester
Cortez Masto	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	Markey	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Udall
Daines	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Merkley	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Wyden
Feinstein	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Murphy	
Flake	Murray	

NAYS—6

Booker	Gillibrand	Sanders
Duckworth	Harris	Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the standing rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Amul R. Thapar, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Jeff Flake, John Cornyn, Chuck Grassley, John Hoeven, James E. Risch, Mike Rounds, Deb Fischer, Mike Crapo, Jerry Moran, Pat Roberts,

Lindsey Graham, John Kennedy, Steve Daines, David Perdue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Amul R. Thapar, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 136 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Strange
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—48

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Harris	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hassan	Peters
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Brown	Heitkamp	Sanders
Cantwell	Hirono	Schatz
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Udall
Donnelly	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 48.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Amul R. Thapar, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from New Hampshire.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned by warnings from leading health insurance companies and State insurance commissioners that the Trump administration is now deliberately undermining the Affordable Care Act, leaving insurance plans no choice but to sharply raise premiums or exit the marketplaces.

I understand—I think we all do—that the Affordable Care Act continues to

experience stresses and that it needs to be strengthened. There is no doubt about that. I have been saying from the beginning that we need to correct what is not working, that we need to keep what is working, and that we need to work together to change it. Yet, in 2016, there were abundant signs that the law was working and that insurance markets were stabilizing.

For instance, in my State of New Hampshire, health insurance premium increases last year averaged just 2 percent. That is the lowest annual increase in history. Today, it is a very different picture. Because of the efforts of the Trump administration to undermine the Affordable Care Act, insurance companies in New Hampshire and across the country face widespread uncertainty. Many of them are deciding that they have no choice but to protect themselves by drastically increasing premiums.

This week, there was a report in the New Hampshire Union Leader, which is our State's largest newspaper, that premiums in New Hampshire could increase by as much as 44 percent. Now, President Trump says that the Affordable Care Act is "exploding," but let's be clear. If ObamaCare is exploding, as President Trump says, it is because this administration lit the fuse and has been working aggressively to undermine the law.

We can see on this poster what is being reported in other parts of the country. In the LA Times, we see that health insurers and State officials say that Trump is undermining ObamaCare and pushing up rates and that health insurers plan big ObamaCare rate hikes, and they blame Trump.

Perhaps the greatest damage has been done by the administration's refusal to commit to funding cost-sharing subsidies, which are the Federal subsidies that help millions of people pay for coverage. To protect themselves, many insurance companies are preparing two sets of premiums for next year—one premium level if the administration agrees to fund the cost-sharing subsidies and a second, dramatically higher premium level if the administration says no to cost-sharing subsidies.

More broadly, the administration's mixed signals and erratic management of the Affordable Care Act are causing uncertainty in the marketplace. Paul Markovich, the CEO of Blue Shield of California, has said that health plans are being forced to raise premiums to compensate for all of the turmoil.

It gets worse.

Last week, the Los Angeles Times reported that Seema Verma, the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, shocked a meeting of insurance industry executives by threatening to cut off funding for cost-sharing reductions unless insurers agreed to support the House Repub-

licans' bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act—the bill that was passed several weeks ago.

Washington State Insurance Commissioner Mike Kreidler criticized the administration's actions as playing Russian roulette with Americans' health insurance coverage. He said: "This has real impact on people's lives."

One insurance company executive said this about the administration's actions: "There's a sense that there are no hands on the wheel, and they are just letting the bus careen down the road."

Physicians and other healthcare professionals live by a time-honored pledge to do no harm, but the Trump administration is pursuing a course that will do tremendous harm to millions of Americans who have gained health coverage for the first time because of the Affordable Care Act. Unless and until Congress repeals the Affordable Care Act, it is the law of the land, and this administration has a responsibility to administer this law with fairness, with rigor, and with competence. The administration certainly does not have the right to take active steps to undermine or even sabotage the law or to threaten insurance companies with such steps if they do not support the repeal of ObamaCare.

It is time for the administration to reconsider its approach to healthcare reform. To date, regrettably, the administration's approach has been highly partisan, with no outreach to Democrats. Instead of a "do no harm" approach, instead of taking steps to fill President Trump's pledge that we are going to have insurance for everybody—and he came through New Hampshire on multiple occasions during his primary campaign and during the general election campaign. What he said about health insurance was that we were going to make sure that everybody has it; we are going to make sure that they pay less and that they get quality coverage. The administration now seems determined to take health coverage away from tens of millions of Americans.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the House Republicans' bill—the first one—to repeal the Affordable Care Act would take coverage away from 24 million Americans. Yesterday, the administration proposed a budget that would cut Medicaid by as much as \$1.3 trillion over the next decade. That would end coverage for millions of low-income Americans, people with disabilities, and so many of our elderly in nursing homes. In New Hampshire, where we are really on the frontlines of the heroin and opioid epidemic, it would end treatment for many people who are getting treatment for their substance use disorders because of the expansion of Medicaid.

When we think about the people who would be hurt by this, it is unconscionable to hear Office of Management and

Budget Director Mick Mulvaney say: "There is a certain philosophy wrapped up in the budget, and that is that we are no longer going to measure compassion by the number of programs or the number of people on those programs." I disagree with that view. By deliberately taking healthcare coverage from 24 million Americans, it shows the lack of compassion of this administration.

This is not about numbers. He is right about that. This should not be about numbers. This should be about people, about their families, and about what these proposals will do to everyday Americans who will no longer have access to affordable health coverage. Whether they have preexisting conditions or whether they need to get treatment for cancer, for substance use disorders, or for whatever their healthcare needs are, under this proposal, they are not going to be able to afford it. Millions of Americans will not be able to afford it.

I think there is a better way forward. Instead of tearing down the Affordable Care Act and taking health coverage away from people, we should be building on the gains and on the achievements of healthcare reform.

On that score, I want to share an extraordinary letter to the editor that was written by Carol Gulla, of Newmarket, NH.

I am reading her letter:

I was in good health; why bother with a physical?

That was my mentality for years before the Affordable Care Act (aka Obamacare). I work for a small nonprofit business, so we don't qualify for group health insurance plans. An annual physical wasn't included in the high premium, high deductible plans that were available to me on the individual health insurance market so they were often a luxury. But it was OK; I felt great! Why bother with doctors?

Because of the Affordable Care Act, last June I went for a routine physical. During [the exam] a lump was discovered in my breast. Ten days later, breast cancer was diagnosed. . . . Fast forward to today. I've just completed my final chemotherapy treatment and my prognosis is very positive. That physical saved my life.

Let me restate that—Obamacare saved my life.

That crucial physical in June would not have happened had it not been an essential preventive service included in all health plans under the ACA. While not perfect, my insurance through the ACA is far better than anything available to me as an individual in the past.

Ms. Gulla's letter continues:

Up until this point I have been pretty quiet about my diagnosis simply because I didn't want cancer to be the main topic of every conversation I had. But, with the Republican majority in Washington, including Secretary of Health & Human Services Tom Price, promising to repeal the ACA, being quiet is no longer an option. I am being asked to entrust my health and well-being to hollow promises of it will "be replaced by something better; it will be great." Forgive me if I'm skeptical!

This is my life we're talking about! Do not tell me to be patient. Do not tell me to "wait and see." Either outline a . . . plan for improving the Affordable Care Act, or leave my health insurance alone!

She signs it with her name, Carol Gulla, of Newmarket, NH.

I think we need to listen to Carol and to so many other people like her all across America.

Instead of allowing this administration to undermine and even sabotage the Affordable Care Act, we in the Senate need to work together, Democrats and Republicans, to strengthen the parts of the Affordable Care Act that are working in the real world, including Medicaid expansion, and to fix what is not working. According to multiple recent polls that I have seen on this issue, this is what the great majority of Americans want us to do. It is time for us to listen to the American people.

The Affordable Care Act has had a profoundly positive impact all across America, but it needs commonsense repairs and it needs strengthening. Mend it, don't end it, and certainly don't sabotage it. This should be a bipartisan focus in the Senate. I intend to do everything I can to encourage such a bipartisan effort. I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would be willing to do this important work if they understood how much the American people want to see us do this.

We know that the Affordable Care Act has had positive impacts in each of our States, including giving people peace of mind, knowing they can't be denied coverage based on preexisting conditions. So let's work together. Let's ensure that the Affordable Care Act works even better in the future for all Americans.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from New Hampshire before she leaves the floor for her statement on the Affordable Care Act. I know she made reference to the recent report from the Congressional Budget Office that we just received, and it tells the whole story. It tells us all we need to know about TrumpCare 2—the second attempt by the Republicans to replace the Affordable Care Act. What it tells us in the starkest terms is exactly the reason why the Republicans didn't want to wait around for this analysis.

For the record, the Congressional Budget Office is a nonpartisan agency of the Federal Government that analyzes our great ideas and tells us what is going to happen if they become law. I know this agency pretty well because when we wrote the Affordable Care Act, we waited and waited and waited, sometimes weeks at a time, until some bright idea that we thought we had was

analyzed in the cold reality of healthcare in America. Sometimes they came back and said good idea, and many times they came back and said bad idea.

The Republicans passed TrumpCare 2 in the House about 3 weeks ago and wouldn't wait for the Congressional Budget Office analysis. We thought to ourselves, that is unusual. That is the standard everybody uses in Congress. They wouldn't wait because they knew what was coming, and today it was announced.

This afternoon, here is what the Congressional Budget Office said about the Republican attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Next year, under the Republican plan, 14 million Americans would lose their health insurance. How about that for a starter. That is the starting point of their analysis. Over the next 10 years, 23 million Americans would lose their health insurance. Next year, premiums—the cost of health insurance—would increase 20 percent in the individual market. The CBO affirms that under current law—the Affordable Care Act—the marketplaces are stable. However, under the Republican repeal bill, one-sixth of the population resides in parts of America where the individual market would become unstable beginning in the year 2020.

There will be \$834 billion in cuts in Federal Medicaid Programs over the next decade. Do we know what those cuts mean? In my State, half the children born are covered by Medicaid. The mothers get prenatal care so the babies are healthy—paid for by Medicaid. The delivery is paid for by Medicaid. The postnatal care of that little infant is paid for by Medicaid.

That is not the most expensive part of Medicaid in my State and in most States. The most expensive part is for your mom and your grandmother in the nursing home. That is where most of Medicaid money goes. Two-thirds of it goes to those folks in nursing homes who have no other source of income, not to mention the disabled who count on Medicaid.

What the Congressional Budget Office tells us is that the Republican plan is going to devastate Medicaid across the United States. Which of the groups I just mentioned do we think we can toss overboard—babies born to low-income mothers, or the elderly who have no place to turn and have exhausted their savings and are living in nursing homes, or the disabled who need the help of Medicaid on a regular basis? Those are the casualties of this Republican repeal plan, not to mention the fact that the real driving force behind these terrible healthcare decisions is a tax cut for the wealthiest people in America.

This is from the Congressional Budget Office again: \$88 billion in tax cuts for the superwealthy and big businesses, including drug companies.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Those numbers came out while I was speaking on the floor, because I was talking about the first House-passed bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act. What the Senator from Illinois is telling me is that the numbers for the bill they passed to fix the first bill they couldn't pass are just as bad and in some ways even worse than the original bill.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, through the Chair, in response to the Senator from New Hampshire, they are equally disastrous.

Listen to these quotes from the Congressional Budget Office this afternoon about the Republican repeal plan: "People who are less healthy, including those with preexisting conditions, would ultimately be unable to purchase comprehensive individual market insurance at premiums comparable to those under current law if they could purchase it at all."

Listen to this. It goes on to say: "In particular, out-of-pocket spending on maternity care and mental health and substance abuse services could increase by thousands of dollars in a given year for the individual market enrollees who use those services."

Let me bring this home to your State. Your State has been devastated—our State has been hurt badly—your State has been devastated by the opioid crisis. I would like the Senator from New Hampshire, if she would, to respond to that by giving us some detail. What they are saying is that the Republican repeal of the Affordable Care Act is going to deny coverage in health insurance for substance abuse treatment for families whose kids are discovered to be on opioids.

I yield through the Chair without yielding the floor to the Senator from New Hampshire to describe her challenge in New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Well, that was going to be my followup question. In New Hampshire, we have the second highest percentage of overdose deaths in the country. We lose more people in New Hampshire to deaths from overdoses of opioids and fentanyl and heroin than we do to car accidents. And an overwhelming percentage of people—over 90 percent—are getting treatment for their substance abuse disorders through the expansion of Medicaid, which has been a bipartisan program in New Hampshire that has covered about 60,000 people, many of whom are getting treatment for substance abuse disorders.

So what the Senator from Illinois is telling me, from the CBO, is that based on the plan that passed the House that Republicans have supported, those people who are getting their treatment—lifesaving treatment for mental health issues and substance abuse disorders—

they are going to be kicked off of their plan, and they are not going to have any other option for getting that care.

Mr. DURBIN. That is what the Congressional Budget Office reports.

So we have these discussions on the floor—and the Senator from New Hampshire has been in the middle of them because of her State's experience with opioids—and both parties come together and wring their hands and say: What are we going to do about the opioid-heroin crisis in America? And we have come up with some good ideas. But here we have the Republican effort repealing the Affordable Care Act, which cuts the legs out from under all of our efforts because it takes away from families' Medicaid coverage that they are using for drug treatment, as well as coverage in their health insurance plans.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield once more, last year we passed the 21st Century Cures Act, which appropriated \$1 billion—\$500 million this year and \$500 million next year—to address the heroin and opioid epidemic we are having, and in the recent passage of the omnibus bill, we got \$700-plus million to help us fight this epidemic. So on the one hand, we are putting money in to address it, and on the other hand, we are taking away the treatment people need by passing a healthcare bill that is going to throw people off their treatment and give them no other option to address their substance use disorders.

Mr. DURBIN. That is exactly what the Congressional Budget Office reports to us.

This afternoon we had a press conference and we invited four or five families to come in with their kids. The theme of the press conference was, what is going to happen if your child has a preexisting condition?

Well, there were some amazing little kids there and some heroic moms and dads telling the story about what happens when you discover that your little infant has a cantaloupe-sized tumor from neuroblastoma and what happens for that family, what happens to that infant. Thank goodness those kids were all standing there smiling. They fought the good fight, and they have to continue to fight it, and each and every one of them is branded as having a preexisting condition. Back in the old days, before the Affordable Care Act, that meant those families were unable to buy health insurance, or if they could buy it, they couldn't afford it because the premiums were too high. So we passed the Affordable Care Act and said: Enough. We are not going to allow you to discriminate against anyone for a preexisting condition.

If you have a spouse with diabetes, if you have somebody in your family who is a cancer survivor, they can't use it against you. They can't discriminate. Now the Congressional Budget Office

tells us what is going to happen to those people. We are going back to the bad old days when those families will not only have to stay awake at night worrying about whether that baby of theirs is going to survive, they are going to stay awake at night also worrying about how in the world they are going to pay for their health insurance.

Is that the Republican answer? Is that Trumpism at work when it comes to healthcare in America? I can't believe the American people voted for that. I can't believe they are saying to our Republican colleagues: We really don't care if our health insurance covers preexisting conditions. Of course they care.

They come back with something called high-risk pools. I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire can remember those. Let me tell you about some of those warnings around swimming pools that say: No diving, the pool is too shallow. Well, the high-risk pools for preexisting conditions are way too shallow. No family with preexisting conditions should dive into those pools because the amount of money provided for by the Republicans in their affordable care repeal would only cover about one out of four families with preexisting conditions. Three out of four families: You are on your own.

Think about that. If you have ever been in a position in life where you are a parent with a sick child and have no health insurance, you will never forget it as long as you live. I know because I have been there. When I was a law student with a little baby who was sick, I had no health insurance. I will never forget it as long as I live.

Why don't the Republicans hear the same message we hear? Why aren't they listening to these families and the struggles they are going through to keep their kids alive? And they come up with a repeal plan that is going to make it exceedingly difficult—in some cases impossible—to provide quality care to these kids and to people with preexisting conditions. That, to me, is not our responsibility.

I go to the conclusion of the Senator from New Hampshire, which I think is the right one. Is the Affordable Care Act perfect? No. It is one of the most important and I think the most giving bills I have ever voted for, but it is far from perfect. We should be sitting down with the other side of the aisle—Republicans and Democrats—not to repeal the Affordable Care Act but to make sure we make the repairs that make a difference.

Each one of us has a list of things we would like to see addressed. The cost of premiums are too high in the individual market. Let's address that directly, and we should. The fact that pharmaceutical drugs don't have any regulation or control in terms of pricing is just plain wrong. And third—I

will just put on my agenda—I think every American should have the option of a public option plan like Medicare. You can decide if that is right for you or your family, but a not-for-profit plan based on Medicare should be available to every American no matter where you live. Those are the three things I would put on the table right away. To walk away from coverage for 23 million Americans and to endanger the coverage for those who remain with premiums they can't afford is hardly humane and hardly consistent with American values.

So I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for her contribution in this. We have to get the message out.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. If I could just add one more group of folks who are going to be affected by this bill that passed the House several weeks ago. That is our veterans. We have millions of veterans in this country who get their healthcare through Medicaid. We have asked these folks to put their lives on the line for this country, and now we are talking about taking away the healthcare they depend on.

I was at one of our community mental health centers in New Hampshire last week and met with a number of veterans who get their care through the expansion of Medicaid. They talked about what it means to be able to get care, to be able to go into that community mental health center and work with the veterans outreach coordinator who works with veterans, trying to make sure they get the help they need. If this bill goes forward, PTSD, which affects so many veterans, would be considered a preexisting condition and they wouldn't be able to get health insurance going forward.

This bill is nothing but mean-spirited. As the Senator said, all of the efforts to save money in the bill are so money can be used to give huge tax breaks to the wealthiest among us. I don't think that is what Americans want. As the Senator says, we need to work with our colleagues. We need to get a good bill that improves the Affordable Care Act, fixes what is not working, and makes it better.

Mr. DURBIN. If I may also say, I agree completely that discriminating against veterans should hardly be the starting point for the reform of our healthcare system.

I want to make this point because I know exactly what the first speech will be from the Republican side of the aisle. This point in the Congressional Budget Office affirms that under current law insurance marketplaces are stable. They are stable. That isn't what you will hear from the other side of the aisle. The other side of the aisle loves to use the phrase "death spiral," that the current healthcare system in America is in a death spiral.

The only death spiral in the current healthcare system is brought on be-

cause the Republicans have their hands around the throat of that system and they are choking it. Their sabotage of our current healthcare system is the reason there is uncertainty in the insurance markets. The insurance companies told us that this week: We don't know where you are going in Washington. We don't know what the future will hold. We have an obligation to our shareholders and people who work for us to make sure we protect ourselves. So we are going to hold back in terms of commitment.

So to the Republicans I would say: This is no death spiral. This is a self-fulfilling prophecy to bring down our healthcare system, and shame on those who would do it at the expense of vulnerable populations across America.

I will mention one other group while the Senator from New Hampshire is on the floor. The Illinois Hospital Association roundly opposes this Republican TrumpCare bill. The reason they do is they say it endangers smalltown hospitals—and we have a lot of them in our State—and inner-city hospitals as well. I am sure that is the case in New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Actually, the New Hampshire Hospital Association also opposes the bill for the very same reason. We have hospitals at risk if this bill is passed.

Mr. DURBIN. I am sure, in the Senator's State, like in our State of Illinois, there are larger cities with big hospitals that treat all kinds of cases, but were it not for that safety net of hospitals in small towns, these people living there would drive an extra 50 or 100 miles to get to a hospital and would see the loss of critical services for trauma and emergencies that currently exist with these smalltown hospitals.

According to the Illinois Hospital Association and others, the first casualties of the Republican repeal bill—the first casualties of TrumpCare—it is estimated in Illinois that we will lose 60,000 healthcare jobs at our hospitals because of the Republican approach. How important are these jobs? I will go out on a limb: In most communities, they are the best paying jobs in the community. The men and women who are the doctors and the nurses and the specialists who provide that basic care in these towns, sure, they get compensated better than most, but we want to compensate them and keep them there because without them, people don't have the basic health services they count on.

So from every perspective, whether it is the doctors, the nurses, the pediatricians, substance abuse treatment, hospitals and clinics, the Republican approach to repealing ObamaCare—repealing the Affordable Care Act—is devastating, and the Congressional Budget Office put it in writing today.

I might say, we should close by saying what is happening in the Senate

after the House passed this terrible bill, which the Congressional Budget Office told us about. Well, we don't know. It is a mystery. We would have expected that someone in the Senate would have decided: Let's put a bill on the table, let's have an open public hearing, let's have a debate about where we go, and let's make a good, sound decision that is in the best interests of the American families. That is not the case at all.

Instead, the Republican leader in the Senate has chosen 12 or 13 men to sit in a room outside of the view of the public and to craft an alternative to the terrible bill that passed the House. Nobody has seen it, nobody wants to talk about it. It has not been scored. It has not been debated. That is their idea of reforming healthcare in America. That is not going to work—at least not going to work for the best interests of the families I represent.

If we are going to come together on a bipartisan basis to repair and strengthen the Affordable Care Act, let's do it, but let's do it in the light of day, instead of hiding behind the doors of some room with 13 Senators who have been given this blessing, anointed, to try to come up with a new healthcare system for America. That, to me, is inconsistent with our responsibility—our public responsibility—when it comes to this critical issue.

So I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for her input on this. There will be more to be said.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. There will be. If I could ask one final question because not only is this effort in the Senate happening behind closed doors, but initially it excluded women.

Women are more than 50 percent of this country. We have particular needs when it comes to healthcare. Fortunately, the essential health benefits part of the Affordable Care Act provide requirements for preventive health for women, for mammograms. They cover maternity benefits when you have a baby. They are talking about writing this legislation without taking into consideration the women in the Senate, the women in the country, and what we need to do to make sure we have access to healthcare. That is just unconscionable, added to the fact that it is all being done behind closed doors.

Mr. DURBIN. I agree with that. Also, as the Senator from New Hampshire knows better than anybody, originally being a woman was a preexisting condition.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Absolutely. They want to take us back to that.

Mr. DURBIN. It would disqualify you or raise your premiums because you are a woman. We got rid of that gross discrimination against women when we did the Affordable Care Act. We shouldn't have a similar level of discrimination when it comes to writing any improvement in this Affordable Care Act.

This is a big enough Senate and a big enough place for us to all gather around the table and make sure we do this in the best interests of all Americans, regardless of gender, regardless of background, regardless of where you live. That is the way we should approach something as serious as an item that accounts for \$1 of every \$6 in the American economy—an item that is literally life and death for families all across Illinois, New Hampshire, and all across the United States.

The Congressional Budget Office said it all today. It is time for us to put Trump 2.0 to rest and try to come up with something which really is befitting this great Nation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the nomination of Judge Amul Thapar to serve as a judge on the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

It should surprise absolutely no one that Judge Thapar is the second nominee to a Federal court to come up for a vote in this Congress. His nomination comes on the heels of the nomination of now-Justice Neil Gorsuch, an ultra-conservative who could not earn enough support to be confirmed under Senate's normal rules, a judge so radical, so controversial that Senate Republicans had to change the Senate rules and lower the vote threshold to force his nomination through the Senate.

Now the Senate is poised to vote on a judge cut from the same cloth. Like Justice Gorsuch, Judge Thapar made the list of 21 acceptable judges that far-right groups drew up and handed to President Trump—judges who would tilt the scales of justice in favor of the rich and the powerful. As in Justice Gorsuch's case, those radical groups are committed to doing whatever it takes to make sure Judge Thapar sits on the Nation's highest courts.

For those groups, the goal is not just to get a few ultraconservative judges on our Federal courts; it is to capture the entire judicial branch. For years, billionaire-funded, rightwing groups have worked hand in hand with Republicans to ensure that our courts advance the interests of the wealthy and powerful over the rights of everyone else. They abused the filibuster to stop fair, mainstream judges from filling vacancies on Federal courts, they slowed the judicial nominations process to a crawl, and they threw the Constitution and Senate precedent out the window by refusing to consider Presi-

dent Obama's Supreme Court nominee. Under their watch, judicial vacancies stacked up and courts became overloaded with cases. Now Republicans and their extremist friends have a President who shares their concern about the interests of the 1 percent, and they are ready to stack our Federal courts with judges who will advance their radical agenda. Judge Thapar is much more than up to the task.

There are many reasons to oppose Judge Thapar's nomination to the Sixth Circuit, from his decisions making it harder for working Americans to get access to the judicial system to his support for sentencing policies that don't make us safer but that exacerbate the problem of mass incarceration. There is a lot to object to, but I want to highlight one area that should concern every person who thinks government should work for all of us; that is, Judge Thapar's stance on money in politics.

For decades, our laws restricted the amount of money that individuals and corporations could pour into the political process. In recent years, Federal courts chipped away at those laws, and then Supreme Court decisions in cases like *McCutcheon* and *Citizens United* took a sledgehammer to campaign finance laws, unleashing a flood of dark money into the political system.

There are now dozens of perfectly legal ways for the 1 percent to buy influence and favor: corporate campaign contributions and super pacs, the revolving door between government and the private sector, bought-and-paid-for experts to push alternative facts, armies of lobbyists swarming the Halls of Congress. Their investments have paid off in the form of special breaks, exemptions, deals, riders, subsidies, loopholes, and every other handout industry can imagine. That money—that unaccountable, dark, unlimited money—has fundamentally distorted our democracy.

Judge Thapar would make the problem worse. Judge Thapar believes that actual speech and monetary contributions are basically the same thing. When he had to decide on the constitutionality of a Kentucky rule preventing State judges and judicial candidates from donating to political groups or campaigns, he concluded that the rule was unconstitutional. In his decision, Judge Thapar said: "There is simply no difference between 'saying' that one supports an organization by using words and 'saying' that one supports an organization by donating money." No difference between talking about a candidate and dumping a bucket of money into the candidate's campaign. Wow.

In Judge Thapar's view, the Constitution should protect a billionaire's right to dump unlimited sums of money into the political process to influence the

outcome of elections. That is even further than the Supreme Court has gone. As the Sixth Circuit reminded Judge Thapar when it reversed his decision on donations, even the Supreme Court has refused to treat monetary donations as equivalent to direct speech.

The issue of concentrated money in our political system is one that doesn't split down party lines. Americans of all political views cringe at the massive amounts of secret money that slither through our political process. They have seen politicians beholden to the handful of deep-pocketed individuals and giant corporations, and they have seen those politicians turn their backs on the constituents they were elected to represent. That is at the heart of what is wrong in our Nation. Our government should work for everyone, not just for the millionaires and billionaires.

Fighting for a government that is accountable to the people means fighting to reduce the influence of concentrated money and concentrated power in our political system. It is time to take down the sign that says "government for sale" that hangs above Washington, DC, and we can start today by rejecting Judge Thapar's nomination to serve on the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDED U.S. SENATE TRAVEL REGULATIONS

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I wish to inform all Senators that on Friday, May 19, 2017, the Committee on Rules and Administration adopted amendments to the U.S. Senate Travel Regulations and corresponding changes to the committee and administrative office staff regulations, which are published as part of the travel regulations. All amendments are effective immediately.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of these modifications and the

text of the amended regulations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SUMMARY OF AMENDED REGULATIONS
U.S. SENATE TRAVEL REGULATIONS

The Committee has modified its travel regulations to provide that any mode of transportation hired for a fee while on official travel or for purposes of interdepartmental transportation, including but not limited to public transportation, is eligible for reimbursement.

The Committee also has modified its travel regulations to align the rules governing rental car reimbursements. The amended regulations provide that staff members may be reimbursed for rental car expenses incurred for purposes of interdepartmental transportation regardless of their duty station.

The amended regulations do not affect or alter the longstanding prohibition on the reimbursement of commuting expenses, and offices continue to be prohibited from obtaining reimbursement of "no show" charges associated with official travel and interdepartmental transportation.

COMMITTEE AND ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE STAFF
REGULATIONS

The Committee has also amended the Committee and Administrative Office Staff Regulations that are published as part of the Travel Regulations. The reference to "interdepartmental transportation" in the section governing the use of petty cash funds has been revised to be consistent with the amended Travel Regulations.

REGULATIONS AND STATUTORY AUTHORITY

The travel regulations herein have been promulgated by the Committee on Rules and Administration pursuant to the authority vested in it by paragraph 1(n)(1)8 of Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate and by section 6503 of Title 2 of the United States Code, the pertinent portions of which provisions are as follows:

Standing Rules of the Senate

Rule XXV

Paragraph 1(n)(1)8

(n)(1) Committee on Rules and Administration, to which committee shall be referred * * * matters relating to the following subjects: * * *

8. Payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same * * *

United States Code

Title 2 Section 6503

Sec. 6503. Payments from contingent fund of Senate

No payment shall be made from the contingent fund of the Senate unless sanctioned by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate * * *.

UNITED STATES SENATE TRAVEL REGULATIONS

Revised by the Committee on Rules and Administration

Effective October 1, 1991 as amended January 1, 1999, as further amended December 7, 2006, October 26, 2007, December 20, 2007, March 27, 2009, and May 19, 2017.

GENERAL REGULATIONS

I. Travel Authorization

A. Only those individuals having an official connection with the function involved may obligate the funds of said function.

B. Funds disbursed by the Secretary of Senate may be obligated by:

1. Members of standing, select, special, joint, policy or conference committees

2. Staff of such committees

3. Employees properly detailed to such committees from other agencies

4. Employees of Members of such committees whose salaries are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and employees appointed under authority of section 111 of Public Law 95-94, approved August 5, 1977, when designated as "ex officio employees" by the Chairman of such committee. Approval of the reimbursement voucher will be considered sufficient designation.

5. Senators, including staff and nominating board members. (Also individuals properly detailed to a Senator's office under authority of Section 503(b)(3) of P.L. 96-465, approved October 17, 1980.)

6. All other administrative offices, including Officers and staff.

C. An employee who transfers from one office to another on the same day he/she concludes official travel shall be considered an employee of the former office until the conclusion of that official travel.

D. All travel shall be either authorized or approved by the chairman of the committee, Senator, or Officer of the Senate to whom such authority has been properly delegated. The administrative approval authority required will be issued prior to the expenses being incurred and will specify the travel to be undertaken unless circumstances in a particular case prevent such prior approval.

E. Official Travel Authorizations: The General Services Administration, on behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration, has contracted with several air carriers to provide discount air fares for Members, Officers, and employees of the Senate only when traveling on official business. This status is identifiable to the contracting air carriers by one of the following ways:

1. The use of a government issued travel charge card

2. The use of an "Official Travel Authorization" form which must be submitted to the air carrier prior to purchasing a ticket. These forms must be personally approved by the Senator, Committee chairman, or Officer of the Senate under whose authority the travel for official business is taking place. Payment must be made in advance by cash, credit card, check, or money order. The Official Travel Authorization forms are available in the Senate Disbursing Office.

II. Funds for Traveling Expenses

A. Individuals traveling on official business for the Senate will provide themselves with sufficient funds for all current expenses, and are expected to exercise the same care in incurring expenses that a prudent person would exercise if traveling on personal business.

1. Travel Advances

a) Advances to Committees (P.L. 81-118)

(1) Chairmen of joint committees operating from the contingent fund of the Senate, and chairmen of standing, special, select, policy, or conference committees of the Senate, may requisition an advance of the funds authorized for their respective committees.

(a) When any duty is imposed upon a committee involving expenses that are ordered to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee charged with such duty, the receipt of such chairman for any sum advanced to him[her] or his[her] order out of said contingent fund by the Secretary of the Senate for committee expenses not involving personal services shall be taken and passed by the accounting officers

of the Government as a full and sufficient voucher; but it shall be the duty of such chairman, as soon as practicable, to furnish to the Secretary of the Senate vouchers in detail for the expenses so incurred.

(2) Upon presentation of the properly signed statutory advance voucher, the Disbursing Office will make the original advance to the chairman or his/her representative. This advance may be in the form of a check, or in cash, receipted for on the voucher by the person receiving the advance. Under no circumstances are advances to be used for the payment of salaries or obligations, other than petty cash transactions of the committee.

(3) In no case shall a cash advance be paid more than seven (7) calendar days prior to the commencement of official travel. In no case shall an advance in the form of a check be paid more than fourteen (14) calendar days prior to the commencement of official travel. Requests for advances in the form of a check should be received by the Senate Disbursing Office no less than five (5) calendar days prior to the commencement of official travel. The amount of the advance then becomes the responsibility of the individual receiving the advance, in that he/she must return the unexpended amount advanced before or shortly after the expiration of the authority under which these funds were obtained.

(Regulations Governing Cash Advances for Official Senate Travel adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration, effective July 23, 1987, pursuant to S. Res. 258, October 1, 1987, as applicable to Senate committees)

(4) Travel advances shall be made prior to the commencement of official travel in the form of cash, direct deposit, or check. Travel advance requests shall be signed by the Committee Chairman and a staff person designated with signature authority.

(5) Cash: Advances for travel in the form of cash shall be picked up only in the Senate Disbursing Office and will be issued only to the person traveling (photo ID required), with exceptions being made for Members and elected Officers of the Senate. The traveler (or the individual receiving the advance in the case of a travel advance for a Member or elected Officer of the Senate) shall sign the travel advance form to acknowledge receipt of the cash.

(6) In those cases when a travel advance has been paid, every effort should be made by the office in question to submit to the Senate Disbursing Office a corresponding travel voucher within twenty-one (21) days of the conclusion of such official travel.

(7) Travel advances for official Senate travel shall be repaid within 30 days after completion of travel. Anyone with an outstanding advance at the end of the 30 day period will be notified by the Disbursing Office that they must repay within 15 days, or their salary may be garnished in order to satisfy their indebtedness to the Federal government.

(8) In those cases when a travel advance has been paid for a scheduled trip which prior to commencement is canceled or postponed indefinitely, the traveler should immediately return the travel advance to the Senate Disbursing Office.

(9) No more than two (2) travel advances per traveler may be outstanding at any one time.

(10) The amount authorized for each travel advance should not exceed the estimated total of official out-of-pocket expenses for the trip in question. The minimum travel advance that can be authorized for the official

travel expenses of a Committee Chairman and his/her staff is \$200.

(1) The aggregate total of travel advances for committees shall not exceed \$5,000, unless otherwise authorized by prior approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

b) Advances to Senators and their staffs (2 U.S.C. 58(j))

(Regulations for Travel Advances for Senators and Their Staffs adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration, effective April 20, 1983, pursuant to P.L. 97-276)

(1) Travel advances from a Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account must be authorized by that Senator for himself/herself as well as for his/her staff. Staff is defined as those individuals whose salaries are funded from the Senator's account. An employee in the Office of the President Pro Tempore, the Deputy President Pro Tempore, the Majority Leader, the Minority Leader, the Majority Whip, the Minority Whip, the Secretary for the Conference of the Majority, or the Secretary for the Conference of the Minority shall be considered an employee in the office of the Senator holding such office.

(2) Advances shall only be used to defray official travel expenses

(3) Travel advances shall be made prior to the commencement of official travel in the form of cash, direct deposit, or check. Travel advance requests shall be signed by the Member and a staff person designated with signature authority.

(4) Cash: Advances in the form of cash shall be picked up only in the Senate Disbursing Office and will be issued only to the person traveling (photo ID required), with exceptions being made for Members and elected Officers of the Senate. The traveler (or the individual receiving the advance in the case of a travel advance for a Member or elected Officer of the Senate) will sign the travel advance form to acknowledge receipt of the cash.

(5) In no case shall a travel advance in the form of cash be paid more than seven (7) calendar days prior to the commencement of official travel. In no case shall an advance in the form of a direct deposit or check be paid more than fourteen (14) calendar days prior to the commencement of official travel. Requests for advances in the form of a direct deposit or check should be received by the Senate Disbursing Office no less than five (5) calendar days prior to the commencement of official travel.

(6) In those cases when a travel advance has been paid, every effort should be made by the office in question to submit to the Senate Disbursing Office a corresponding travel voucher within twenty-one (21) days of the conclusion of such official travel.

(7) Travel advances for official Senate travel shall be repaid within 30 days after completion of travel. Anyone with an outstanding advance at the end of the 30 day period will be notified by the Senate Disbursing Office that they must repay within 15 days, or their salary may be garnished in order to satisfy their indebtedness to the Federal government.

(8) In those instances when a travel advance has been paid for a scheduled trip which prior to commencement is canceled or postponed indefinitely, the traveler in question should immediately return the travel advance to the Senate Disbursing Office.

(9) The amount authorized for each travel advance should not exceed the estimated total of official out-of-pocket travel expenses for the trip in question. The minimum travel advance that can be authorized for the offi-

cial travel expenses of a Senator and his/her staff is \$200. No more than two (2) travel advances per traveler may be outstanding at any one time.

(10) The aggregate total of travel advances per Senator's office shall not exceed 10% of the expense portion of the Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account, or \$5,000, whichever is greater.

c) Advances to Administrative Offices of the Senate

(Regulations Governing Cash Advances for Official Senate Travel, adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration, effective July 23, 1987, pursuant to S. Res. 258, October 1, 1987, as amended, as applicable to Senate administrative offices)

(1) Travel advances shall be made prior to the commencement of official travel in the form of cash, direct deposit, or check. Travel advance requests shall be signed by the applicable Officer of the Senate and a staff person designated with signature authority.

(2) Cash: Advances in the form of cash shall be picked up only in the Senate Disbursing Office and will be issued only to the person traveling (photo ID required), with exceptions being made for Members and elected Officers of the Senate. The traveler (or the individual receiving the advance in the case of a travel advance for a Member or elected Officer of the Senate) will sign the travel advance form to acknowledge receipt of the cash.

(3) In no case shall a travel advance be paid more than seven (7) calendar days prior to the commencement of official travel. In no case shall an advance in the form of a direct deposit or check be paid more than fourteen (14) calendar days prior to the commencement of official travel. Requests for advances in the form of a direct deposit or check should be received by the Senate Disbursing Office no less than five (5) calendar days prior to the commencement of official travel.

(4) In those cases when a travel advance has been paid, every effort should be made by the office in question to submit to the Senate Disbursing Office a corresponding travel voucher within twenty-one (21) days of the conclusion of such official travel.

(5) Travel advances for official Senate travel shall be repaid within 30 days after completion of travel. Anyone with an outstanding advance at the end of the 30 day period will be notified by the Disbursing Office that they must repay within 15 days, or their salary may be garnished in order to satisfy their indebtedness to the Federal government.

(6) In those instances when a travel advance has been paid for a scheduled trip which prior to commencement is canceled or postponed indefinitely, the traveler in question should immediately return the travel advance to the Senate Disbursing Office.

(7) The amount authorized for each travel advance should not exceed the estimated total of official out-of-pocket travel expenses for the trip in question. The minimum travel advance that can be authorized for the official travel expenses of a Senator Officer and his/her staff is \$200. No more than two (2) travel advances per traveler may be outstanding at any one time.

d) Office of the Secretary of the Senate (2 U.S.C. 61a-9a)

(1) . . . The Secretary of the Senate is authorized to advance, with his discretion, to any designated employee under his jurisdiction, such sums as may be necessary, not exceeding \$1,000, to defray official travel expenses in assisting the Secretary in carrying out his duties

e) Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate (2 U.S.C. 61f-1a)

(1) For the purpose of carrying out his duties, the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate is authorized to incur official travel expenses during each fiscal year not to exceed sums made available for such purpose under appropriations Acts. With the approval of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate and in accordance with such regulations as may be promulgated by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized to advance to the Sergeant at Arms or to any designated employee under the jurisdiction of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, such sums as may be necessary to defray official travel expenses incurred in carrying out the duties of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper. The receipt of any such sum so advanced to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper or to any designated employee shall be taken and passed by the accounting officers of the Government as a full and sufficient voucher; but it shall be the duty of the traveler, as soon as practicable, to furnish to the Secretary of the Senate a detailed voucher of the expenses incurred for the travel to which the sum was so advanced, and make settlement with respect to such sum. Payments under this section shall be made from funds included in the appropriations account, within the contingent fund of the Senate, for the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS FOR TRAVEL ADVANCES FOR THE OFFICE OF THE SENATE SERGEANT AT ARMS)

(a) GENERAL—With the written approval of the Sergeant at Arms or designee, advances from the contingent expense appropriation account for the Office of the Sergeant at Arms may be provided to the Sergeant at Arms or the Sergeant at Arms' staff to defray official travel expenses, as defined by the U. S. Senate Travel Regulations. Staff is defined as those individuals whose salaries are funded by the line item within the "Salaries, Officers, and Employees" appropriation account for the Office of the Sergeant at Arms.

(b) FORMS—Travel advance request forms shall include the date of the request, the name of the traveler, the dates of the official travel, the intended itinerary, the authorizing signature of the Sergeant at Arms or his designee, and a staff person designated with signature authority.

(c) PAYMENT OF ADVANCES—

(i) Travel advances shall be paid prior to the commencement of official travel in the form of cash, direct deposit, or check.

(ii) Advances in the form of cash shall be picked up only in the Senate Disbursing Office and will be issued only to the person traveling (photo ID required), with exceptions being made for Members and elected Officers of the Senate. The traveler (or the individual receiving the advance in the case of a travel advance for a Member or elected Officer of the Senate) will sign the travel advance form to acknowledge receipt of the cash.

(iii) In no case shall a travel advance in the form of cash be paid more than seven (7) calendar days prior to the commencement of official travel. In no case shall a travel advance in the form of a direct deposit or check be paid more than fourteen (14) days prior to the commencement of official travel. Requests for travel advances in the form

of a direct deposit or check should be received by the Senate Disbursing Office no less than five (5) calendar days prior to the commencement of official travel.

(d) REPAYMENT OF ADVANCES—

(i) The total of the expenses on a travel voucher shall be offset by the amount of the corresponding travel advance, providing for the payment (or repayment) of the difference between the outstanding advance and the total of the official travel expenses.

(ii) In those cases when a travel advance has been paid, every effort should be made to submit to the Senate Disbursing Office a corresponding travel voucher within twenty-one (21) days of the conclusion of such official travel.

(iii) Travel Advances for official Senate travel shall be repaid within 30 days after completion of travel. Anyone with an outstanding travel advance at the end of the 30 day period will be notified by the Senate Disbursing Office that they must repay within 15 days, or their salary may be garnished in order to satisfy their indebtedness to the Federal Government.

(iv) In those instances when a travel advance has been paid for a scheduled trip which prior to commencement is cancelled or postponed indefinitely, the traveler in question should immediately return the travel advance to the Senate Disbursing Office.

(e) LIMITS—

(i) To minimize the payment of travel advances, whenever possible, travelers are expected to utilize the corporate and individual travel cards approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(ii) The amount authorized for each travel advance should not exceed the estimated total of official out-of-pocket travel expenses for the trip in question.

(iii) The minimum travel advance that can be authorized for official travel expenses is \$200. No more than two (2) cash advances per traveler may be outstanding at any one time.

2. Government Travel Plans

a) Government Charge Cards

(1) Individual government charge cards authorized by the General Services Administration and approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration are available to Members, Officers, and employees of the Senate for official travel expenses.

(a) The employing Senator, chairman, or Officer of the Senate should authorize only those staff who are or will be frequent travelers. The Committee on Rules and Administration reserves the right to cancel the annual renewal of the card if the employee has not traveled on official business during the previous year.

(b) All reimbursable travel expenses may be charged to these accounts including but not limited to per diem expenses and incidentals. Direct pay vouchers to the charge card vendor (currently Bank of America) may be submitted for the Airfare, train, and bus tickets charged to this account. All other travel charges on the account must be paid to the traveler for him/her to personally reimburse the charge card vendor.

(c) Timely payment of these Individually Billed travel accounts is the responsibility of the cardholder. The General Services Administration contract requires payment to the account within 60 days before suspension is enforced on the account. The account is cancelled and the cardholder's credit is revoked when a past due balance is carried on the card for 120 days.

(2) One Centrally Billed government charge account authorized by the General Services

Administration and approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration are available to each Member, Committee, and Administrative Office for official transportation expenses in the form of airfare, train, and bus tickets, and rental cars.

(a) Direct pay vouchers to the charge card vendor (currently Bank of America) may be submitted for the airfare, train, and bus tickets, and rental car expenses charged to this account.

(b) Other transportation costs, per diem expenses, and incidentals are not authorized charges for these accounts unless expressly authorized by these regulations or through prior approval from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(c) Timely payment of these Centrally Billed travel accounts is the responsibility of the cardholder, usually the Administrative Director or Chief Clerk of the office. The General Services Administration contract requires payment to the account within 60 days before suspension is enforced on the account. The account is cancelled and the cardholder's credit is revoked when a past due balance is carried on the card for 120 days.

(1) A centrally billed account may be established through the approved Senate vendor (currently the Combined Airlines Ticket Office (CATO)) and will be charged against an account number issued to each designated office; there are no charge cards issued for such an account.

III. Foreign Travel

A. Reimbursement of foreign travel expenses is not authorized from the contingent fund of Member offices.

B. Committees, including all standing, select, and special committees of the Senate and all joint committees of the Congress whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, are authorized funds for foreign travel from their committee budget and through S. Res. 179, 95-1, notwithstanding Congressional Delegations which are authorized foreign travel funds under the authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754).

C. (Restrictions)—amendment to Rule XXXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, pursuant to S. Res. 80, agreed to January 28, 1987.

1. (a) *Unless authorized by the Senate (or by the President of the United States after an adjournment sine die), no funds from the United States Government (including foreign currencies made available under section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754(b), as amended) shall be received by any Member of the Senate whose term will expire at the end of a Congress after—*

(1) *the date of the general election in which his successor is elected; or*

(2) *in the case of a Member who is not a candidate in such general election, the earlier of the date of such general election or the adjournment sine die of the second regular session of that Congress.*

(b) *The travel restrictions provided by subparagraph (a) with respect to a Member of the Senate whose term will expire at the end of a Congress shall apply to travel by—*

(1) *any employee of the Member;*

(2) *any elected Officer of the Senate whose employment will terminate at the end of a Congress; and*

(3) *any employee of a committee whose employment will terminate at the end of a Congress.*

2. *No Member, Officer, or employee engaged in foreign travel may claim payment or accept funds from the United States Government (including foreign currencies made available under*

section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754(b)) for any expense for which the individual has received reimbursement from any other source; nor may such Member, Officer, or employee receive reimbursement for the same expense more than once from the United States Government. No Member, Officer, or employee shall use any funds furnished to him/her to defray ordinary and necessary expenses of foreign travel for any purpose other than the purpose or purposes for which such funds were furnished.

3. *A per diem allowance provided a Member, Officer, or employee in connection with foreign travel shall be used solely for lodging, food, and related expenses and it is the responsibility of the Member, Officer, or employee receiving such an allowance to return to the United States Government that portion of the allowance received which is not actually used for necessary lodging, food, and related expenses.*

IV. Reimbursable Expenses: Travel expenses (i.e., transportation, lodging, meals and incidental expenses) which will be reimbursed are limited to those expenses essential to the transaction of official business while away from the official station or post of duty.

A. Member Duty Station(s): The official duty station of Senate Members shall be considered to be the metropolitan area of Washington, D.C.

1. During adjournment sine die or the August adjournment/recess period, the usual place of residence in the home state, as certified for purposes of official Senate travel, shall also be considered a duty station.

2. Each Member shall certify in writing at the beginning of each Congress to the Senate Disbursing Office his/her usual place of residence in the home state; such certification document shall include a statement that the Senator has read and agrees to the pertinent travel regulations on permissible reimbursements.

3. For purposes of this provision, "usual place of residence" in the home state shall encompass the area within thirty-five (35) miles of the residence (by the most direct route). If a Member has no "usual place of residence" in his/her home state, he/she may designate a "voting residence," or any other "legal residence," pursuant to state law (including the area within thirty-five (35) miles of such residence), as his/her duty station.

B. Officer and Employee Duty Station

1. In the case of an officer or employee, reimbursement for official travel expenses other than interdepartmental transportation shall be made only for trips which begin and end in Washington, D.C., or, in the case of an employee assigned to an office of a Senator in the Senator's home state, on trips which begin and end at the place where such office is located.

2. Travel may begin and/or end at the Senate traveler's residence when such deviation from the duty station locale is more advantageous to the government.

3. For purposes of these regulations, the "duty station" shall encompass the area within thirty five (35) miles from where the Senator's home state office or designated duty station is located.

C. No employee of the Senate, relative or supervisor of the employee may directly benefit monetarily from the expenditure of appropriated funds which reimburse expenses associated with official Senate travel. Therefore, reimbursements are not permitted for mortgage payments, or rental fees associated with any type of leasehold interest.

D. A duty station for employees, other than Washington, D.C., may be designated by

Members, Committee Chairmen, and Officers of the Senate upon written designation of such station to the Senate Disbursing Office. Such designation shall include a statement that the Member or Officer has read and agrees to the pertinent travel regulations on permissible reimbursements. The duty station may be the city of the office location or the city of residence.

E. For purposes of these regulations, the metropolitan area of Washington, D.C., shall be defined as follows:

1. The District of Columbia
2. Maryland Counties of
 - a) Charles
 - b) Montgomery
 - c) Prince Georges
3. Virginia Counties of
 - a) Arlington
 - b) Fairfax
 - c) Loudoun
 - d) Prince William
4. Virginia Cities of
 - a) Alexandria
 - b) Fairfax
 - c) Falls Church
 - d) Manassas
 - e) Manassas Park
5. Airport locations of
 - a) Baltimore/Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport
 - b) Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport
 - c) Washington Dulles International Airport

F. When the legislative business of the Senate requires that a Member be present, then the round trip actual transportation expenses incurred in traveling from the city within the United States where the Member is located to Washington, D.C., may be reimbursed from official Senate funds.

G. Any deviation from this policy will be considered on a case by case basis upon the written request to, and approval from, the Committee on Rules and Administration.

V. Travel Expense Reimbursement Vouchers

A. All persons authorized to travel on official business for the Senate should keep a memorandum of expenditures properly chargeable to the Senate, noting each item at the time the expense is incurred, together with the date, and the information thus accumulated should be made available for the proper preparation of travel vouchers which must be itemized on an official expense summary report and stated in accordance with these regulations. The official expense summary report form is available at the Senate Disbursing Office or through the Senate Intranet.

B. Computer generated vouchers should be submitted with a signed original. Every travel voucher must show in the space provided for such information on the voucher form the dates of travel, the official travel itinerary, the value of the transportation, per diem expenses, incidental expenses, and conference/training fees incurred.

C. Travel vouchers must be supported by receipts for expenses in excess of \$50. In addition, the Committee on Rules and Administration reserves the right to request additional clarification and/or certification upon the audit of any expense seeking reimbursement from the contingent fund of the Senate regardless of the expense amount.

D. When presented independently, credit card receipts such as VISA, MASTER CHARGE, or DINERS CLUB, etc. are not acceptable documentation for lodging. If a hotel bill is lost or misplaced, then the credit card receipt accompanied by a certifying letter from the traveler to the Financial

Clerk of the Senate will be considered necessary documentation. Such letter must itemize the total expenses in support of the credit card receipt.

TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES

I. Common Carrier Transportation and Accommodations

A. Transportation includes all necessary official travel on railroads, airlines, helicopters, public transportation, taxicabs or other mode of transportation hired for a fee, and other usual means of conveyance. Transportation may include fares and such expenses incidental to transportation such as but not limited to baggage transfer. When a claim is made for common carrier transportation obtained with cash, the travel voucher must show the amount spent, including Federal transportation tax, and the mode of transportation used.

1. Train Accommodations

a) Sleeping-car accommodations: The lowest first class sleeping accommodations available shall be allowed when night travel is involved.

When practicable, through sleeping accommodations should be obtained in all cases where more economical to the Senate.

b) Parlor-car and coach accommodations: One seat in a sleeping or parlor car will be allowed. Where adequate coach accommodations are available, coach accommodations should be used to the maximum extent possible, on the basis of advantage to the Senate, suitability and convenience to the traveler, and nature of the business involved.

2. Airplane Accommodations

a) First-class and air-coach accommodations: It is the policy of the Senate that persons who use commercial air carriers for transportation on official business shall use less than first-class accommodations instead of those designated first-class with due regard to efficient conduct of Senate business and the travelers' convenience, safety, and comfort.

b) Use of United States-flag air carriers: All official air travel shall be performed on United States-flag air carriers except where travel on other aircraft (1) is essential to the official business concerned, or (2) is necessary to avoid unreasonable delay, expense, or inconvenience.

B. Change in Travel Plans: When a traveler finds he/she will not use accommodations which have been reserved for him/her, he/she must release them within the time limits specified by the carriers. Likewise, where transportation service furnished is inferior to that called for by a ticket or where a journey is terminated short of the destination specified, the traveler must report such facts to the proper official. Failure of travelers to take such action may subject them to liability for any resulting losses.

1. "No show" charges, if incurred by Members or staff personnel in connection with official Senate travel, shall not be considered payable or reimbursable from the contingent fund of the Senate.

2. Senate travelers exercising proper prudence can make timely cancellations when necessary in order to avoid "no show" assessments.

3. A Member shall be permitted to make more than one reservation on scheduled flights with participating airlines when such action assists the Member in conducting his/her official business.

C. Compensation Packages: In the event that a Senate traveler is denied passage or gives up his/her reservation due to overbooking on transportation for which he/she held a reservation and this results in a pay-

ment of any rebate, this payment shall not be considered as a personal receipt by the traveler, but rather as a payment to the Senate, the agency for which and at whose expense the travel is being performed.

1. Such payments shall be submitted to the appropriate individual for the proper disposition when the traveler submits his/her expense account.

2. Through fares, special fares, commutation fares, excursion, and reduced-rate round trip fares should be used for official travel when it can be determined prior to the start of a trip that any such type of service is practical and economical to the Senate.

3. Round-trip tickets should be secured only when, on the basis of the journey as planned, it is known or can be reasonably anticipated that such tickets will be utilized.

D. Ticket Preparation Fees: Each Chairman, Senator, or Officer of the Senate may, at his/her discretion, authorize in extenuating circumstances the reimbursement of penalty fees associated with the cancellation of through fares, special fares, commutation fares, excursion, reduced-rate round trip fares and fees for travel arrangements, provided that reimbursement of such fees does not exceed the rates prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

E. Frequent Flyer Miles: Travel promotional awards (e.g. free travel, travel discounts, upgrade certificates, coupons, frequent flyer miles, access to carrier club facilities, and other similar travel promotional items) obtained by a Member, officer or employee of the Senate while on official travel may be utilized for personal use at the discretion of the Member or officer pursuant to this section.

1. Travel Awards may be retained and used at the sole discretion of the Member or officer only if the Travel Awards are obtained under the same terms and conditions as those offered to the general public and no favorable treatment is extended on the basis of the Member, officer or employee's position with the Federal Government.

2. Members, officers and employees may only retain Travel Awards for personal use when such Travel Awards have been obtained at no additional cost to the Federal Government. It should be noted that any fees assessed in connection with the use of Travel Awards shall be considered a personal expense of the Member, officer or employee and under no circumstances shall be paid for or reimbursed from official funds.

3. Although this section permits Members, officers and employees of the Senate to use Travel Awards at the discretion of the Member or officer, the Committee encourages the use of such Travel Awards (whenever practicable) to offset the cost of future official travel.

F. Indirect Travel: In case a person, for his/her own convenience, travels by an indirect route or interrupts travel by direct route, the extra expense will be borne by the traveler. Reimbursement for expenses shall be allowed only on such charges as would have been incurred by the official direct route. Personal travel should be noted on the traveler's expense summary report when it interrupts official travel.

G. Miscellaneous Transportation During Official Travel: The cost of public transportation, taxicabs, or other mode of transportation hired for a fee in connection with official travel will be allowed as an official transportation expense.

H. Dual Purpose Travel: Dual purpose travel occurs when a Senator, staffer, or other official traveler conducts both Senatorial office business and Committee office business

during the same trip. The initial point at which official business is conducted will determine the fund which will be charged for travel expenses from and to Washington, D.C. Examples include:

1. If committee business is conducted at the first stop in the trip, travel expenses from Washington, D.C., to said point and return will be chargeable to the committee's funds. Additional travel expenses from said point to other points in the United States, incurred by reason of conducting senatorial business, will be charged to the Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account.

2. If senatorial business is conducted at the first stop in the trip, travel expenses from Washington, D.C., to said point and return will be chargeable to the Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account. Committee funds will be charged with any additional travel expenses incurred for the purpose of performing committee business.

I. Interrupted Travel: If a traveler interrupts official travel for personal business, the traveler may be reimbursed for transportation expenses incurred which are less than or equal to the amount the traveler would have been reimbursed had he/she not interrupted travel for personal business. Likewise, if a traveler departs from or returns to a city other than the traveler's duty station or residence for personal business, then the traveler may be reimbursed for transportation expenses incurred which are less than or equal to the amount the traveler would have been reimbursed had the witness departed from and returned to his/her duty station or residence.

II. Baggage

A. The term "baggage" as used in these regulations means Senate property and personal property of the traveler necessary for the purposes of the official travel.

B. Baggage in excess of the weight or of size greater than carried free by transportation companies will be classed as excess baggage. Where air-coach or air-tourist accommodations are used, transportation of baggage up to the weight carried free on first-class service is authorized without charge to the traveler; otherwise excess baggage charges will be an allowable expense.

C. Necessary charges for the transfer of baggage will be allowed. Charges for the storage of baggage will be allowed when such storage was solely on account of official business. Charges for porters and checking baggage at transportation terminals will be allowed.

III. Use of Conveyances: When authorized by the employing Senator, Chairman, or Officer of the Senate, certain conveyances may be used when traveling on official Senate business. Specific types of conveyances are privately owned, special, and private airplane.

A. Privately Owned

1. Chairmen of committees, Senators, Officers of the Senate, and employees, regardless of subsistence status and hours of travel, shall, whenever such mode of transportation is authorized or approved as more advantageous to the Senate, be paid the appropriate mileage allowance in lieu of actual expenses of transportation. This amount should not exceed the maximum amount authorized by statute for use of privately owned motorcycles, automobiles, or airplanes, when engaged in official business within or outside their designated duty stations. It is the responsibility of the office to fix such rates, within the maximum, as will most nearly compensate the traveler for necessary expenses.

2. In addition to the mileage allowance there may be allowed reimbursement for the actual cost of automobile parking fees (except parking fees associated with commuting); ferry fees; bridge, road, and tunnel costs; and airplane landing and tie-down fees.

3. When transportation is authorized or approved for motorcycles or automobiles, mileage between points traveled shall be certified by the traveler. Such mileage should be in accordance with the Standard Highway Mileage Guide. Any substantial deviations shall be explained on the reimbursement voucher.

4. In lieu of the use of taxicab, payment on a mileage basis at a rate not to exceed the maximum amount authorized by statute will be allowed for the round-trip mileage of a privately owned vehicle used in connection with an employee going from either his/her place of abode or place of business to a terminal or from a terminal to either his/her place of abode or place of business: Provided, that the amount of reimbursement for round-trip mileage shall not in either instance exceed the taxicab fare for a one-way trip between such applicable points, notwithstanding the obligations of reasonable schedules.

5. Parking Fees: Parking fees for privately owned vehicles may be incurred in the duty station when the traveler is engaged in interdepartmental transportation or when the traveler is leaving their duty station and entering into a travel status. The fee for parking a vehicle at a common carrier terminal, or other parking area, while the traveler is away from his/her official station, will be allowed only to the extent that the fee, plus the allowable mileage reimbursement, to and from the terminal or other parking area, does not exceed the estimated cost for use of a taxicab to and from the terminal.

6. Mileage for use of privately owned airplanes shall be certified from airway charts issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, and will be reported on the reimbursement voucher and used in computing payment. If a detour was necessary due to adverse weather, mechanical difficulty, or other unusual conditions, the additional air mileage may be included in the mileage reported on the reimbursement voucher and, if included, it must be explained.

7. Mileage shall be payable to only one of two or more employees traveling together on the same trip and in the same vehicle, but no deduction shall be made from the mileage otherwise payable to the employee entitled thereto by reason of the fact that other passengers (whether or not Senate employees) may travel with him/her and contribute in defraying the operating expenses. The names of Senate Members or employees accompanying the traveler must be stated on the travel voucher.

8. When damages to a privately owned vehicle occur due to the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any Member, Officer, or employee of the Senate while acting within the scope of his/her employment, relief may be sought under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

B. Special

1. General:

a) The hire of boat, automobile, aircraft, or other conveyance will be allowed if authorized or approved as advantageous to the Senate whenever the Member or employee is engaged on official business outside his/her designated duty station.

b) Where two or more persons travel together by means of such special conveyance,

that fact, together with the names of those accompanying him/her, must be stated by each traveler on his/her travel voucher and the aggregate cost reimbursable will be subject to the limitation stated above.

c) If the hire of a special conveyance includes payment by the traveler of the incidental expenses of gasoline or oil, rent of garage, hangar, or boathouse, subsistence of operator, ferriage, tolls, operator waiting time, charges for returning conveyances to the original point of hire, etc., the same should be first paid, if practicable, by the person furnishing the accommodation, or his/her operator, and itemized in the bill.

2. Rental Cars:

a) Reimbursements for rental of special conveyances will be limited to the cost applicable to a conveyance of a size necessary for a single traveler regardless of the number of authorized travelers transported by said vehicle, unless the use of a larger class vehicle on a shared cost basis is specifically approved in advance by the Committee on Rules and Administration, or the form 'Request for a Waiver of the Travel Regulations' is submitted with the voucher, and found in order upon audit by the Rules Committee.

b) For administrative purposes, reimbursement may be payable to only one of two or more Senate travelers traveling together on the same trip and in the same vehicle.

c) Government Rate: In connection with the rental of an automobile for the use in conducting Senate business, it should be noted that the Defense Travel Management Office (DTMO), a division of the Department of Defense, arranges rental car agreements for the government.

(1) These negotiated car rental rates are for federal employees traveling on official business and include unlimited mileage, plus full comprehensive and collision coverage (CDW) on rented vehicles at no cost to the traveler.

(2) For guidance on rate structure and the companies participating in these rate agreements, call the approved Senate vendor (currently the Combined Airline Ticket Office (CATO)).

(3) Individuals traveling on behalf of the United States Senate should use these companies to the maximum extent possible since these agreements provide full coverage with no extra fee. The Senate will not pay for separate insurance charges; therefore, any individuals who choose to use non-participatory car rental agencies may be personally responsible for any damages or liability accrued while on official Senate business.

d) Insurance: In connection with the rental of vehicles from commercial sources, the Senate will not pay or reimburse for the cost of the loss/damage waiver (LDW), collision damage waiver (CDW) or collision damage insurance available in commercial rental contracts for an extra fee.

(1) The waiver or insurance referred to is the type offered a renter to release him/her from liability for damage to the rented vehicle in amounts up to the amount deductible on the insurance included as part of the rental contract without additional charge.

(2) The cost of personal accident insurance is a personal expense and is not reimbursable.

(3) Accidents While on Official Travel: Collision damage to a rented vehicle, for which the traveler is liable while on official business, will be considered an official travel expense of the Senate up to the deductible amount contained in the rental contract. Such claims shall be considered by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate on a case by

case basis and, when authorized, settled from the contingent fund of the Senate under the line item—Reserve for Contingencies. This is consistent with the long-standing policy of the government to self-insure its own risks of loss or damage to government property and the liability of government employees for actions within the scope of their official duties.

(4) However, when damages to a rented vehicle occurs due to the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any Member, Officer, or employee of the Senate while acting within the scope of his/her employment, relief may be sought under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

3. Charter Aircraft:

a) Reimbursements for charter aircraft will be limited to the charges for a twin-engine, six seat plane, or comparable aircraft. Charter of aircraft may be allowed notwithstanding the availability of commercial facilities, if such commercial facilities are not such that reasonable schedules may be kept. When charter aircraft is used, an explanation and detail of the size of the aircraft, i.e., seating capacity and number of engines, shall be provided on the face of the voucher.

b) In the event charter facilities are not available at the point of departure, reimbursement for charter from nearest point of such availability to the destination and return may be allowed.

c) When a charter aircraft larger than a twin-engine, six seat plane is used, the form 'Request for a Waiver of the Travel Regulations' is submitted with the voucher.

C. Corporate/Private Aircraft: Reimbursement of official expenses for the use of a corporate or private aircraft is allowable from the contingent fund of the Senate provided the traveler complies with the prohibitions, restrictions, and authorizations specified in these regulations. Moreover, pursuant to the Ethics Committee Interpretive Ruling 444, excess campaign funds may be used to defray official expenses consistent with the regulations promulgated by the Federal Election Commission.

1. An amendment to Rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, paragraph 1(c)(1)(C), enacted September 14, 2007, pursuant to P.L. 110-81, states:

(C)(i) Fair market value for a flight on an aircraft described in item (ii) shall be the pro rata share of the fair market value of the normal and usual charter fare or rental charge for a comparable plane of comparable size, as determined by dividing such cost by the number of Members, officers, or employees of Congress on the flight.

(ii) A flight on an aircraft described in this item is any flight on an aircraft that is not—

(I) operated or paid for by an air carrier or commercial operator certificated by the Federal Aviation Administration and required to be conducted under air carrier safety rules; or

(II) in the case of travel which is abroad, an air carrier or commercial operator certificated by an appropriate foreign civil aviation authority and the flight is required to be conducted under air carrier safety rules.

(iii) This subclause shall not apply to an aircraft owned or leased by a governmental entity or by a Member of Congress or a Member's immediate family member (including an aircraft owned by an entity that is not a public corporation in which the Member or Member's immediate family member has an ownership interest), provided that the Member does not use the aircraft anymore than the Member's or immediate family member's proportionate share of ownership allows.

2. Prior to the commencement of official travel on a corporate or private aircraft, the

traveler or the traveler's designee shall contact a charter company in the departure or destination city to request a written estimate of the cost of a flight between the two cities on a similar aircraft of comparable size being provided by the corporation or private entity.

a) For example, if a Learjet 45 XR aircraft is being provided by the corporation or private entity, the traveler or the traveler's designee shall request a written estimate of the cost to charter a Learjet 45 XR aircraft from the departure city to the destination city.

b) If no charter company is located in either the departure or destination city which rents a similar aircraft of comparable size, a charter company nearest either the destination or departure city which does so shall be contacted for a written estimate.

3. Following the completion of official travel on a corporate or private aircraft, reimbursement for related expenses may be processed on direct pay vouchers payable to each individual traveler, to the corporation or private entity, or to the travel charge card vendor. The written estimate received from the charter company shall be attached to the voucher for processing.

IV. Interdepartmental Transportation

A. The reimbursement for interdepartmental transportation is authorized as a travel expense pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 58(e) but only for the incidental transportation expenses incurred within the duty station in the course of conducting official Senate business. Such reimbursement would include the following expenses:

1. Mileage when using a privately owned vehicle.

2. Public transportation, parking, auto rental, taxicab, or other mode of transportation hired for a fee.

B. Pursuant to S. Res. 294, agreed to April 29, 1980, section 2.(1), reimbursements and payments shall not be made for commuting expenses, including parking fees incurred in commuting.

SUBSISTENCE EXPENSES

I. Per Diem Expenses

A. Allowance

1. Per diem expenses include all charges for meals, lodging, personal use of room during daytime, baths, all fees and tips to waiters, porters, baggagemen, bell boys, hotel servants, dining room stewards and others on vessels, laundry, cleaning and pressing of clothing, and fans in rooms. The term "lodging" does not include accommodations on airplanes or trains, and these expenses are not subsistence expenses.

a) Laundry: Laundry expenses must be incurred during the mid-way point of a trip. Reimbursable laundry expenses are for the refreshing of clothing during a trip, but not the maintenance of the clothing.

b) Meals: Reimbursable expenses incurred for meals while on official travel include meals and tips for the traveler only and may not include alcohol.

2. Per diem expenses will not be allowed an employee at his/her permanent duty station and will be allowed only when associated with round trip travel outside his/her permanent duty station.

a) Training: Meals in the duty station are only reimbursable when they are incurred during a training session. If the cost of the meal is included in the training session, then a meal certification form should be included with the voucher. The Committee on Rules and Administration will consider these on a case by case basis. Meal certification forms are available at the Disbursing Office or on the Senate intranet.

(1) Training is defined as a planned, prepared, and coordinated program, course, curriculum, subject, system, or routine of instruction or education, in scientific, professional or technical fields which are or will be directly related to the performance by the employee of official duties for the Senate, in order to increase the knowledge, proficiency, ability, skill and qualifications of the employee in the performance of official duties.

(2) Meetings in the duty station where meals are served, such as but not limited to Chamber of Commerce monthly meetings do not constitute training. Therefore, the meals associated with these meetings are not an authorized reimbursable expense.

3. In any case where the employee's tour of travel requires more than two months' stay at a temporary duty station, consideration should be given to either a change in official station or a reduction in the per diem allowance.

4. Where for a traveler's personal convenience/business there is an interruption of travel or deviation from the direct route, the per diem expenses allowed will not exceed that which would have been incurred on uninterrupted travel by a usually traveled route and the time of departure from and return to official business shall be stated on the voucher.

5. Per diem expenses will be allowed through the time the traveler departs on personal business and will be recommenced at the time he/she returns to official business. Such dates and times shall be stated on the voucher.

B. Rates

1. The per diem allowances provided in these regulations represent the maximum allowance, not the minimum. It is the responsibility of each office to see that travelers are reimbursed only such per diem expenses as are justified by the circumstances affecting the travel. Maximum rates for subsistence expenses are established by the General Services Administration and are published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. Maximum per diem rates for Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and possessions of the United States are established by the Department of Defense and are also published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. In addition, per diem rates for foreign countries are established by the Department of State and are published in the document titled, "Maximum Travel Per Diem for Foreign Areas."

a) Per diem expenses reimbursable to a Member or employee of the Senate in connection with official travel within the continental United States shall be made on the basis of actual expenses incurred, but not to exceed the maximum rate prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration for each day spent in a travel status. Any portion of a day while in a travel status shall be considered a full day for purposes of per diem entitlement.

b) When travel begins or ends at a point in the continental United States, the maximum per diem rate allowable for the portion of travel between such place and the place of entry or exit in the continental United States shall be the maximum rate prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration for travel within the continental United States. However, the quarter day in which travel begins, in coming from, or ends, in going to, a point outside the continental United States may be paid at the rate applicable to said point, if higher.

c) In traveling between localities outside the continental United States, the per diem rate allowed at the locality from which travel is performed shall continue through the

quarter day in which the traveler arrives at his/her destination: Provided, that if such rate is not commensurate with the expenses incurred, the per diem rate of the destination locality may be allowed for the quarter day of arrival.

d) Ship travel time shall be allowed at not to exceed the maximum per diem rate prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration for travel within the continental United States.

C. Computations

1. The date of departure from, and arrival at, the official station or other point where official travel begins and ends, must be shown on the travel voucher. Other points visited should be shown on the voucher but date of arrival and departure at these points need not be shown.

2. For computing per diem allowances official travel begins at the time the traveler leaves his/her home, office, or other point of departure and ends when the traveler returns to his/her home, office, or other point at the conclusion of his/her trip.

a) The maximum allowable per diem for an official trip is computed by multiplying the number of days on official travel, beginning with the departure date, by the maximum daily rate as prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration. If the maximum daily rate for a traveler's destination is higher than the prescribed daily rate, then the form "Request for a Waiver of the Travel Regulations" must be submitted with the voucher showing the maximum daily rate for that location and found in order upon audit by the Rules Committee.

b) Total per diem for an official trip includes lodging expenses (excluding taxes), meals (including taxes and tips), and other per diem expenses as defined by these regulations.

INCIDENTAL EXPENSES

I. Periodicals: Periodicals purchased while in a travel status should be limited to newspapers and news magazines necessary to stay informed on issues directly related to Senate business.

I. Traveler's Checks/Money Orders: The service fee for preparation of traveler's checks or money orders for use during official travel is allowable.

III. Communications

A. Communication services such as telephone, telegraph, and faxes, may be used on official business when such expeditious means of communications is essential. Government-owned facilities should be used, if practical. If not available, the cheapest practical class of commercial service should be used.

B. Additionally, one personal telephone call will be reimbursed for each day that a Senator or staff member is in a travel status. The calls may not exceed an average of five minutes a day, and cannot be reimbursed at a rate higher than \$5.00 without itemized documentation.

IV. Stationery: Stationery items such as pens, paper, batteries, etc. which are necessary to conduct official Senate business while in a travel status are authorized.

V. Conference Center/Meeting Room Reservations: The fee for the reservation of a meeting room, conference room, or business center while on official travel is allowable.

VI. Other: This category would be used (with full explanation on the Expense Summary Report for Travel) to disclose any expense which would occur incidentally while on official travel, and for which there is no other expense category, i.e., interpreting services, hotel taxes, baggage cart rental, etc.

CONFERENCE AND TRAINING FEES

I. Training of Senators' Office Staff: The Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account is available to defray the fees associated with the attendance by the Senator or the Senator's employees at conferences, seminars, briefings, or classes which are or will be directly related to the performance of official duties.

A. When such fees (actual or reduced) are less than or equal to \$500, have a time duration of not more than five (5) days, and have been asked to be waived or reduced for Government participation, reimbursement shall be made as an official travel expense. However, if the fee or time duration for meetings is in excess of the aforementioned, reimbursement shall be made as a non-travel expense.

B. Reimbursement shall not be allowed for tuition or fees associated with classes attended to earn credits towards an advanced degree or certification.

C. The costs of meals that are considered an integral, mandatory and non-separable element of the conference, seminar, briefing, or class will be allowed as part of the attendance fee when certified by the registrant. The meal certification form, which must accompany the reimbursement voucher, is available in the Disbursing Office or through the Senate Intranet.

II. Training of Committee Employees: Section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 provides for the expenditure of funds available to standing committees of the Senate for the training of professional staff personnel under certain conditions. It is the responsibility of each committee to set aside funds within its annual funding resolution to cover the expenses of such training.

A. Prior approval for attendance by professional staff at seminars, briefings, conferences, etc., as well as committee funds earmarked for training, will not be required when all of the following conditions are met:

1. The sponsoring organization has been asked to waive or reduce the fee for Government participation.

2. The fee involved (actual or reduced) is not in excess of \$500.

3. The duration of the meeting does not exceed five (5) days.

B. When such fees are less than or equal to \$500, have a time duration of not more than five (5) days, and have been requested to be waived or reduced for Government participation, reimbursement shall be made as a non-training, official travel expense. However, if the fee or time duration for meetings is in excess of the aforementioned, reimbursement shall be made as an official training expense. Reimbursement shall not be allowed for tuition or fees associated with classes attended to earn credits towards an advanced degree or certification.

C. If the fee or time duration for meetings is in excess of the aforementioned, advance approval by the Committee on Rules and Administration must be sought. Training requests should be received sufficiently in advance of the training to permit appropriate consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

D. The costs of meals that are considered an integral, mandatory, and non-separable element of the conference, seminar, briefing, or class will be allowed as part of the attendance fee when certified by the registrant. The meal certification forms which must accompany the reimbursement voucher are available in the Disbursing Office or through the Senate Intranet.

III. Training of Administrative Offices Staff: The administrative approval of the

voucher is the only approval required by the Committee on Rules and Administration. Training expenses of staff shall be limited to those fees associated with the attendance by staff at conferences, seminars, briefings, or classes which are or will be directly related to the performance of official duties. However, reimbursement shall not be allowed for tuition or fees associated with classes attended to earn credits towards an advanced degree or certification.

SPECIAL EVENTS

I. Retreats: Reimbursement of official travel expenses for office staff retreats is allowable from the contingent fund provided they follow the restrictions and authorizations in these regulations. Reimbursement of expenses for meeting rooms and equipment used during the retreat also is allowable. The vouchers for retreat expenses should be noted as retreat vouchers.

A. Discussion of Interpretative Ruling of the Select Committee on Ethics, No. 444, issued February 14, 2002

An office retreat may be paid for with either or both official funds (with Rules Committee approval) or principal campaign committee funds. Private parties may not pay expenses incurred in connection with an office retreat. Campaign workers may attend, at campaign expense, office retreats if their purpose in attending is to engage in official activities, such as providing feedback from constituents on legislative or representational matters.

B. When processing direct pay vouchers payable either to each individual traveler or to the vendor providing the retreat accommodations, prior approval by the Committee on Rules and Administration is not required. Retreat expenses, including but not limited to per diem, may be charged to the office's official centrally billed government travel charge card and paid on direct vouchers to the charge card vendor. Any deviation from this policy will be considered on a case by case basis upon the written request to, and approval from, the Committee on Rules and Administration.

C. Spreadsheet of Expenses

1. The Member office, Committee, or Administrative office, must attach to the retreat voucher(s) a spreadsheet detailing each day of the retreat broken out by breakfast, lunch, dinner, and lodging for each traveler attending the retreat.

2. For each traveler, the spreadsheet should list his/her duty station, additional per diem expenses incurred outside of the retreat, and any other retreat attendee the traveler shared a room with during the retreat. Any non-staff members attending the retreat also should be detailed on the spreadsheet. The "Waiver of the Travel Regulations" form does not need to be attached to retreat voucher(s) for the sharing of rooms.

3. The per diem expenses for staff members attending a retreat within their duty station are not reimbursable but should be detailed on the spreadsheet. All expenses for non-staff members attending the retreat are not reimbursable, but their attendance at the retreat must be taken into account when computing a per traveler cost on the spreadsheet.

4. An example of this spreadsheet can be found on the Senate Intranet.

II. Funerals: Members who represent the Senate at the funeral of a Member or former member may be reimbursed for the actual and necessary expenses of their attendance, pursuant to S. Res. 263, agreed to July 30, 1998. Additionally, the actual and necessary expenses of a committee appointed to represent the Senate at the funeral of a deceased Member or former Member may be reimbursed pursuant to S. Res. 458, agreed to October 4, 1984.

A. Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 58e, which authorizes reimbursement for travel while on official business within the United States, members and their staff may be reimbursed for the actual and necessary expenses of attending funerals within their home state only.

B. Examples of funerals that may be considered official business include, but are not limited to, funerals for military service members, first responders, or public officials from the Member's state.

SENATORS' OFFICE STAFF

I. Legislative Authority (2 U.S.C. 58(e), as amended)

(e) Subject to and in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, a Senator and the employees in his office shall be reimbursed under this section for travel expenses incurred by the Senator or employee while traveling on official business within the United States. The term "travel expenses" includes actual transportation expenses, essential travel-related expenses, and, where applicable, per diem expenses (but not in excess of actual expenses). A Senator or an employee of the Senator shall not be reimbursed for any travel expenses (other than actual transportation expenses) for any travel occurring during the sixty days immediately before the date of any primary or general election (whether regular, special, or runoff) in which the Senator is a candidate for public office (within the meaning of section 301(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971), unless his candidacy in such election is uncontested. For purposes of this subsection and subsection 2(a)(6) of this section, an employee in the Office of the President Pro Tempore, Deputy President Pro Tempore, Majority Leader, Minority Leader, Majority Whip, Minority Whip, Secretary of the Conference of the Majority, or Secretary of the Conference of the Minority shall be considered to be an employee in the office of the Senator holding such office.

II. Regulations Governing Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Accounts Adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration Pursuant to Senate Resolution 170 agreed to September 19, 1979, as amended.

Section 1. For the purposes of these regulations, the following definitions shall apply:

(a) Documentation means invoices, bills, statements, receipts, or other evidence of expenses incurred, approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(b) Official expenses means ordinary and necessary business expenses in support of the Senators' official and representational duties.

Section 2. No reimbursement will be made from the contingent fund of the Senate for any official expenses incurred under a Senator's Official Personnel and Office Expense Account, in excess of \$50, unless the voucher submitted for such expenses is accompanied by documentation, and the voucher is certified by the properly designated staff member and approved by the Senator.

Section 3. Official expenses of \$50 or less must either be documented or must be itemized in sufficient detail so as to leave no doubt of the identity of, and the amount spent for, each item. Items of a similar nature may be grouped together in one total on a voucher, but must be itemized individually on a supporting itemization sheet.

Section 4. Travel expenses shall be subject to the same documentation requirements as other official expenses, with the following exceptions:

(a) Hotel bills or other evidence of lodging costs will be considered necessary in support of per diem.

(b) Documentation will not be required for reimbursement of official travel in a privately owned vehicle.

Section 5. No documentation will be required for reimbursement of the following classes of expenses, as these are billed and paid directly through the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper:

(a) official telegrams and long distance calls and related services;

(b) stationery and other office supplies procured through the Senate Stationery Room for use for official business.

Section 6. The Committee on Rules and Administration may require documentation for expenses incurred of \$50 or less, or authorize payment of expenses incurred in excess of \$50 without documentation, in special circumstances.

Section 7. Vouchers for the reimbursement of official travel expenses to a Senator, employee, detailee pursuant to section 503(b)(3) of PL 96-465, or individual serving on a nominee recommendation panel pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 58(h) shall be accompanied by an "Expense Summary Report—Travel" signed by such person.

Vouchers for the reimbursement to any such individual for official expenses other than travel expenses shall be accompanied by an "Expense Summary Report Non-Travel" signed by such person.

COMMITTEE AND ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE STAFF

(Includes all committees of the Senate, the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, and the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate)

I. Legislative Authority (2 U.S.C. 68b)

No part of the appropriations made under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" may be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses (as defined in section 5701 of Title 5) at rates in excess of the rates prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration; except that (1) higher rates may be established by the Committee on Rules and Administration for travel beyond the limits of the continental United States, and (2) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, reimbursement for such expenses may be made on an actual expense basis of not to exceed the daily rate prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration in the case of travel within the continental limits of the United States.

II. Incidental Expenses: The following items may be authorized or approved when related to official travel:

1. Commissions for conversion of currency in foreign countries.

2. Fees in connection with the issuance of passports, visa fees; costs of photographs for passports and visas; costs of certificates of birth, health, identity; and affidavits; and charges for inoculations which cannot be obtained through a federal dispensary when required for official travel outside the limits of the United States.

III. Hearing Expenses (committees only)

A. In connection with hearings held outside of Washington, D.C., committees are authorized to pay the travel expenses of official reporters having company offices in Washington, D.C., or in other locations, for traveling to points outside the District of Columbia or outside such other locations, provided:

1. Said hearings are of such a classified or security nature that their transcripts can be accomplished only by reporters having the necessary clearance from the proper federal agencies;

2. Extreme difficulty is experienced in the procurement of local reporters; or

3. The demands of economy make the use of Washington, D.C., reporters or traveling reporters in another area highly advantageous to the Senate; and further provided, that should such hearings exceed five days in duration, prior approval (for the payment of reporters' travel expenses) must be obtained

from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

IV. Witnesses Appearing Before the Senate (committees only)

A. The authorized transportation expenses incurred and associated with a witness appearing before the Senate at a designated place of examination pursuant to S. Res. 259, agreed to August 5, 1987, will be those necessary transportation expenses incurred in traveling from the witness' place of residence to the site of the Senate examination and the necessary transportation expenses incurred in returning the witness to his/her residence.

B. If a witness departs from a city other than the witness' city of residence to appear before the Senate or returns to a city other than the witness' city of residence after appearing before the Senate, then Senate committees may reimburse the witness for transportation expenses incurred which are less than or equal to the amount the committee would have reimbursed the witness had the witness departed from and returned to his/her residence. Any deviation from this policy will be considered on a case by case basis upon the written request to, and approval from, the Committee on Rules and Administration.

C. Service fees for the preparation or mailing of passenger coupons for indigent or subpoenaed witnesses testifying before Senate committees shall be considered reimbursable for purposes of official travel.

D. Transportation expenses for witnesses may be charged to the Committee's official centrally billed government travel charge card and paid on direct vouchers to the charge card vendor. Additionally, per diem expenses for indigent witnesses may be charged to the Committee's official government charge card and paid on direct vouchers to the charge card vendor.

V. Regulations Governing Payments and Reimbursements from the Senate Contingent Funds for Expenses of Senate Committees and Administrative Offices

(Adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration on July 23, 1987, as authorized by S. Res. 258, 100th Congress, 1st session, these regulations supersede regulations adopted by the Committee on October 22, 1975, and April 30, 1981, as amended.)

Section 1. Unless otherwise authorized by law or waived pursuant to Section 6, herein, no payment or reimbursement will be made from the contingent fund of the Senate for any official expenses incurred by any Senate committee (standing, select, joint, or special), commission, administrative office, or other authorized Senate activity whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, in excess of \$50, unless the voucher submitted for such expenses is accompanied by documentation, and the voucher is certified by the properly designated staff member and approved by the Chairman or elected Senate Officer. The designation of such staff members for certification shall be done by means of a letter to the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. "Official expenses," for the purposes of these regulations, means ordinary and necessary business expenses in support of a committee's or administrative office's official duties.

Section 2. Such documentation should consist of invoices, bills, statements, receipts, or other evidence of expenses incurred, and should include ALL of the following information:

- date expense was incurred;
- the amount of the expense;
- the product or service that was provided;
- the vendor providing the product or service;
- the address of the vendor; and

f) the person or office to whom the product or service was provided.

Expenses being claimed should reflect only current charges. Original copies of documentation should be submitted. However, legible facsimiles will be accepted.

Section 3. Official expenses of \$50 or less must either be documented or must be itemized in sufficient detail so as to leave no doubt of the identity of, and the amount spent for, each item. However, hotel bills or other evidence of lodging costs will be considered necessary in support of per diem expenses and cannot be itemized.

Section 4. Documentation for services rendered on a contract fee basis shall consist of a contract status report form available from the Disbursing Office.

However, other expenses authorized expressly in the contract will be subject to the documentation requirements set forth in these regulations.

Section 5. No documentation will be required for the following expenses:

- a) salary reimbursement for compensation on a "When Actually Employed" basis;
- b) reimbursement of official travel in a privately owned vehicle;
- c) foreign travel expenses incurred by official congressional delegations, pursuant to S. Res. 179, 95th Congress, 1st session;
- d) expenses for receptions of foreign dignitaries, pursuant to S. Res. 247, 87th Congress, 2nd session, as amended; and
- e) expenses for receptions of foreign dignitaries pursuant to Sec. 2 of P.L. 100-71 effective July 11, 1987.

Section 6. In special circumstances, the Committee on Rules and Administration may require documentation for expenses incurred of \$50 or less, or authorize payment of expenses incurred in excess of \$50 without documentation.

Section 7. Cash advances from the Disbursing Office are to be used for travel and petty cash expenses only. No more than \$5000 may be outstanding at one time for Senate committees or administrative offices, unless otherwise authorized by law or resolution, and no more than \$300 of that amount may be used for a petty cash fund. The individual receiving the cash advance will be personally liable. The Committee on Rules and Administration may, in special instances, increase these non-statutory limits upon written request by the Chairman of that committee and proper justification.

Section 8. Documentation of petty cash expenses shall be listed on an official petty cash itemization sheet available from the Disbursing Office and should include ALL of the following information:

- a) date expense was incurred;
- b) amount of expense;
- c) product or service provided; and
- d) the person incurring the expense (payee).

Each sheet must be signed by the Senate employee receiving cash and an authorizing official (i.e., someone other than the employee(s) authorized to certify vouchers). Original receipts or facsimiles must accompany the itemization sheet for petty cash expenses over \$50.

Section 9. Petty cash funds should be used for the following incidental expenses:

- a) postage;
- b) delivery expenses;
- c) interdepartmental transportation (as defined in United States Senate Travel Regulations);
- d) single copies of publications (not subscriptions);
- e) office supplies not available in the Senate Stationery Room; and
- f) official telephone calls made from a staff member's residence or toll charges incurred within a staff member's duty station.

Petty cash funds should not be used for the procurement of equipment.

Section 10. Committees are encouraged to maintain a separate checking account only for the purpose of a petty cash fund and with a balance not in excess of \$300.

Section 11. Vouchers for the reimbursement of official travel expenses to a committee chairman or member, officer, employee, contractor, detailee, or witness shall be accompanied by an "Expense Summary Report—Travel" signed by such person. Vouchers for the reimbursement to any such individual for official expenses other than travel expenses shall be accompanied by an "Expense Summary Report—Non-Travel" signed by such person.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL LAURA J. RICHARDSON

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President today I wish pay tribute to a great leader and an exceptional Army officer, MG Laura J. Richardson, the Chief Legislative Liaison for the Office of the Secretary of the Army, as she prepares to leave this position for one of even greater importance.

Major General Richardson has served our Army and our Nation for more than 30 years. She was a true professional—a dedicated soldier, leader, officer, spouse, and mother. Throughout her career, she commanded our great soldiers at many levels, deployed to combat numerous times in defense of our Nation, and was assigned to some of the most critical positions in our military. As the Army's Chief Legislative Liaison, Major General Richardson continues to provide outstanding leadership, advice, and sound professional judgment on numerous critical issues of enduring importance to the Army, Congress, and this Nation.

A native of Colorado, Major General Richardson was commissioned a second lieutenant of aviation upon graduation from Metropolitan State College in Denver. Her first assignment after flight school was in Korea with the 17th Aviation Brigade, where she served as a platoon leader, company executive officer, brigade staff officer, and company commander. She next served at Fort Hood, TX, on the III Corps staff and in the 6th Cavalry Brigade as a company commander and brigade adjutant. In 1999, General Richardson was selected to serve as the military aide to Vice President Al Gore at the White House in Washington, DC. Following that assignment, she moved to Fort Campbell, KY, to serve as the Division Deputy G-3 of the 101st Airborne Division, Air Assault, and later commanded the 5th Battalion, 101st Aviation Regiment, including a deployment to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Major General Richardson has served in a variety of joint and Army staff positions to include: an assault helicopter battalion operations officer and executive officer; deputy director, then director for the Army's Transformation Office; and the Army's liaison officer to the U.S. Senate. She also served as

the garrison commander of Fort McNair and Fort Myer, VA.

Major General Richardson's assignments as a general officer include commanding general of the U.S. Army Operational Test Command, deputy commanding general of the 1st Cavalry Division at Fort Hood, TX, and most recently, deputy chief of staff for communications with Headquarters, International Security Assistance Force, ISAF, in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, Afghanistan.

For the past 3 years, Major General Richardson was the Chief of the U.S. Army Legislative Liaison. During this period of extraordinary change and challenge for the Army, Major General Richardson implemented and fostered improved strategic partnership with Congress. Through her leadership, the Army significantly enhanced relationships with both legislative chambers, improving understanding and broadening congressional support for Army priorities. Major General Richardson managed some of the most complex issues our Army faced through three legislative cycles with unparalleled results, enabling the Army to receive the necessary resources to support combat operations in two theaters of war, sustain the All-Volunteer Force, and improve the quality of life for our soldiers, their families, and our civilians.

On behalf of Congress and the United States of America, I thank Laura, her husband, MG Jim Richardson, and their entire family for their continued commitment, sacrifice, and contribution to this great nation. I join my colleagues in wishing her future success as she continues to serve our great Army and Nation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO RUSSELL GORDON

• Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, it is an honor to join the community of music lovers in New Mexico to recognize Mr. Russell Gordon in his final year of presenting the Los Alamos County Summer Concert Series.

For 28 years, the concert series has been a pillar of the community in northern New Mexico, bringing together families, neighbors, and friends with local, national, and internationally renowned musicians.

In 1988, Russell and his wife, Deborah, moved to White Rock, NM, where they started Gordon's CDs, Tapes and Records.

Local musicians remember playing on the sidewalk outside of his shop when Russell began the series in 1990. Today the series is a much larger affair with hundreds gathering around the historic Ashley Pond and other venues in Los Alamos on Friday evenings to begin their weekend with art, culture, and dance.

Russell Gordon's passion for music shines through the variety of genres featured, including Spanish, Native American, big band, bluegrass, classical, country music, folk, gospel, rock, jazz, and international acts. Russell has kept local New Mexican artists in his line-up over the years and helped grow and mentor the music scene throughout the State. He has inspired young musicians, expanded horizons, and has created countless memories for musicians and concert-goers in New Mexico.

As the ranking member on the Joint Economic Committee, I am proud to recognize the contributions of local small business owners like Russell and Deborah Gordon. We wish them the best of luck in their future endeavors and thank them for their contributions to the community.●

RECOGNIZING WINSHIP CANCER INSTITUTE

● Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, today I am honored to congratulate Winship Cancer Institute at Emory University on earning the prestigious comprehensive cancer center designation from the National Cancer Institute. This designation now places Georgia's own Winship Cancer Institute in the top 1 percent of all cancer centers in the United States.

Winship Cancer Institute was established in 1937 with a gift from one of Georgia's generous philanthropists, Robert W. Woodruff, whose mission was to allow Georgians to get the best cancer treatment in their home State. He envisioned doctors and researchers working together in the same facility, so that scientists would be reminded of the urgency of their work and motivated to bring innovative treatments to patients. Winship treated 168 patients in its first year. Today Winship sees more than 15,000 patients every year.

The research being performed at Winship Cancer Institute is particularly important to Georgians because Winship researchers are studying the environmental and genetic issues unique to cancer in our State. Winship's goals are very specific: reducing the risk of cancer and detecting cancer at the earliest possible stage.

An estimated 50,000 Georgians will be diagnosed with cancer this year, and approximately a third of them will receive some component of their treatment at one of Winship's clinical locations in metropolitan Atlanta.

In recommending Winship for this special designation, former President Jimmy Carter spoke of the research and work being performed at Winship that helped save his life after his cancer diagnosis at his advanced age.

Today Winship continues to stand out because of its commitment to aligning its outstanding cancer re-

search and education initiatives with its significant cancer prevention and cancer care efforts. I am proud to congratulate Winship Cancer Institute on this important milestone, as its researchers and clinicians continue their mission to lessen the burden of cancer for the citizens of Georgia.●

71 LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, my colleague Senator MIKE CRAPO joins me today in congratulating the 71 Livestock Association of southwestern Idaho and northeastern Nevada on its centennial anniversary. On June 24, 2017, members of the 71 Livestock Association will gather at the Three Creek School to celebrate 100 years of good stewardship on our western rangelands.

The 71 Livestock Association has deep roots in southwestern Idaho and northeastern Nevada and boasts a colorful heritage that defines our idea of western ranching. In the early 1870s, the Three Creek Area's premier cattleman, Joseph Scott, was the first to use a 71 brand after purchasing it from a Nevada rancher. The 71 Livestock Association took its name from that brand in homage to Scott.

In 1905, local ranchers requested that the Federal Government look into creating a forest reserve to protect grazing and other resources on the range. Less than a year later in 1906, with Gifford Pinchot as the first Chief of the Forest Service, President Theodore Roosevelt signed into law a forest reserve in Nevada. The creation of the forest reserve sparked a partnership between the Three Creek Ranchers and the U.S. Forest Service.

In December 1917, the ranchers of Owyhee and Twin Falls Counties came together to form the 71 Livestock Association with Joe E. Hawes as the first chairman. Noteworthy, the 71 Livestock Association started with both woolgrowers and cattle producers, which created a stronger partnership and greater collaboration among all range users and managers.

In the early 1930s, livestock producers in the West were concerned with deterioration of the range due to uncontrolled grazing and wanted to better protect the public lands. Due to that concern, Congress passed the Taylor Grazing Act in 1934, and the 71 Livestock Association created its first constitution and bylaws. The Taylor Grazing Act established grazing boards, and the 71 Livestock Association had three members on Idaho's very first grazing advisory board.

The 71 Livestock Association has seen many changes and has evolved to make conditions better on the range. In its formative years, they helped create a system for grazing as the main enforcement body on the forest reserve in Nevada. As the Bureau of Land Man-

agement began managing the range in southwestern Idaho and Elko County, NV, they helped to allocate range to its members and to help install key infrastructure like fences, pipelines, roads, phone service, electrical power, and even a tax levy for the Three Creek School.

From its inception, the 71 Livestock Association has experienced many challenges from jackrabbit infestations, plant poisoned cattle, severe winters, environmental lawsuits, endangered species, National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, regulations, and range fires. In addition, they have lived through the Sage Brush Rebellion and the Jarbridge Shovel Brigade. Through it all, they have been instrumental at bringing together ranchers and Federal, State and local agencies to discuss and resolve issues with a spirit of cooperation.

Today the 71 Livestock Association has been at the center of rangeland fire management. In their true spirit, the 71 Livestock Association pitched in to help with the rehabilitation and reclamation of the land and helped create and develop the Rangeland Fire Protection Associations, RFPA. By being first on the scene, the RFPA have been instrumental in helping to stop fires before they develop into larger uncontrolled range fires.

Because of its success and standing in the region, the 71 Livestock Association has seen members go on to represent constituents of southern Idaho in the Idaho State Legislature—notably, the late Noy Brackett, his son Bert Brackett, and the late George Swan.

The 71 Livestock Association serves as a role model for Idaho and the Nation on how to innovate and collaborate on land management issues. Today they remain focused on advancing their mission of “bettering conditions on the range.” Congratulations to the 71 Livestock Association on a successful 100 years of operation.●

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL ORPHAN TRAIN COMPLEX

● Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I would like to acknowledge an important event in our history, the Orphan Train Movement. This movement is not only extremely important to Kansas; it also placed approximately 250,000 orphaned, abandoned, and homeless children in homes across the United States. The National Orphan Train Complex, which is headquartered in our very own Concordia, KS—also known as Orphan Train Town—continues to tell stories of children who were impacted by these orphan trains.

The first orphan train arrived in Kansas in 1859 to the city of Wathena, where three children were placed with Kansas families. Since this first train, 12,000 children were moved to Kansas

homes. These children would grow up in Kansas, raising families, growing the economy, and serving their communities through farming, teaching, and starting businesses. These children and their journey are an integral part of Kansas history.

The mission of the National Orphan Train Complex in Concordia, KS, is to collect, preserve, interpret, and disseminate knowledge about the orphan trains and the children who rode them. The National Orphan Train Complex is the only organization compiling a master list of orphan train riders to assist future generations with genealogical information. The tireless work done by this organization deserves acknowledgement. I am proud to recognize the 15th annual celebration of Orphan Train Riders, which takes place June 1 through June 4.

I ask my colleagues join me in recognizing the Orphan Train Movement and the National Orphan Train Complex on their outstanding research and preservation of our Nation's history.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:40 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1005. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans.

H.R. 1162. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy to veterans.

H.R. 1329. An act to increase, effective as of December 1, 2017, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1370. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance and develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1545. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the authority of the Secretary of the Veterans Affairs to disclose certain patient information to State controlled substance monitoring programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1725. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit certain reports relating to medical evidence submitted in support of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary.

H.R. 1808. An act to amend and improve the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1809. An act to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2288. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws admin-

istered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2473. An act to direct the Attorney General to study issues relating to human trafficking, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 366) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's vehicle fleet, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 5:33 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 366. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's vehicle fleet, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1005. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1162. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1329. An act to increase, effective as of December 1, 2017, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1370. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance and develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1545. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to disclose certain patient information to State controlled substance monitoring programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1725. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit certain reports relating to medical evidence submitted in support of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1808. An act to amend and improve the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2288. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2473. An act to direct the Attorney General to study issues relating to human trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1641. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pesticides; Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule; Delay of Effective Date" (FRL No. 9962-94) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1642. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of four (4) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1643. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Daniel B. Allyn, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1644. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Defense Production Act Annual Fund Report for Fiscal Year 2016"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1645. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 on November 14, 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1646. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of a national emergency declared in Executive Order 13222 with respect to the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1647. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Quality Designations for the 2012 Primary Annual Fine Particle Matter (PM2.5) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for Areas in Tennessee" ((RIN2060-AT44) (FRL No. 9962-89-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1648. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Louisiana; Volatile Organic Compounds Rule Revision and Stage II Vapor Recovery" (FRL No. 9962-21-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1649. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; El Paso Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan" (FRL No. 9962-20-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1650. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Compliance Date Extension; Formaldehyde Emission Standards for Composite Wood Products" ((RIN2070-AK35) (FRL No. 9962-86)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1651. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule to List 6 Foreign Species of Elasmobranchs Under the Endangered Species Act (RIN0648-XE184) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1652. A communication from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to negotiations with Canada and Mexico regarding modernization of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA); to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1653. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Advancing Care Coordination Through Episode Payment Models (EPMs); Cardiac Rehabilitation Incentive Payment Model; and Changes to the Comprehensive Care for Joint Replacement Model (CJR); Delay of Effective Date" ((RIN0938-AS90) (CMS-5519-F3)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 18, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1654. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Advancing Care Coordination Through Episode Payment Models (EPMs); Cardiac Rehabilitation Incentive Payment Model; and Changes to the Comprehensive Care for Joint Replacement Model (CJR)" ((RIN0938-AS90) (CMS-5519-F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1655. A communication from the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2017-0516); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1656. A communication from the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2017-0517); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1657. A communication from the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2017-0515); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1658. A communication from the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2017-0514); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1659. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "340B Drug Pricing Program Ceiling Price and Manufacturer Civil Monetary Penalties Regulation" (RIN0906-AA89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 18, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1660. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clarification of When Products Made or Derived From Tobacco Are Regulated as Drugs, Devices, or Combination Products; Amendments to Regulations Regarding 'Intended Uses'; Further Delayed Effective Date; Request for Comments; Extension of Comment Period" ((RIN0910-AH19) (Docket No. FDA-2015-N-2002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1661. A communication from the Acting Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's fiscal year 2016 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1662. A communication from the Deputy Inspector General for Audit Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Met Many Requirements of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 but Did Not Fully Comply for Fiscal Year 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1663. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries" (RIN0648-XF210) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1664. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries" (RIN0648-XF259) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1665. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Com-

merce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pacific Island Fisheries; 2016 Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures" (RIN0648-XF587) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-29. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho memorializing the importance of agriculture in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 6

Whereas, since the beginning of time, the ability of man to provide food, fiber and fuel for himself and others has determined his independence, freedom and security; and

Whereas, the strength of a nation is based on its ability to sufficiently provide safe and reliable food, fiber and fuel for its people; and

Whereas, the family farm unit is the foundation of agriculture and one of the basic strengths of the United States; and

Whereas, a strong and viable agricultural industry is a very important part of our national security and overall well-being; and

Whereas, federal, state and local laws and regulations require farmers, ranchers and food processors in the United States to meet the highest standards in the world when it comes to environmental protection, worker safety, wage rates and food safety concerns; and

Whereas, United States farmers, ranchers and food processors pay for record audits on farm inspections and USDA product inspections to confirm that necessary criteria are met to adhere to the laws and regulations that apply; and

Whereas, the Food Safety Modernization Act requires that all food products, foreign and domestic, must adhere to the same food safety standards, and yet only 2% of all imported food products are actually inspected. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the members of the First Regular Session of the Sixty-fourth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, that we urge that United States farmers, ranchers and food processors be enabled to compete freely and trade fairly in foreign and domestic markets on a strictly level playing field. Be it further

Resolved, That food safety standards in the United States should be enforced fully on food from foreign countries wishing to participate in markets that lie within the boundaries of the United States and funded in a way that does not burden the United States taxpayer. And be it further

Resolved, When determining the economic value of international trade agreements, we urge that the cost of environmental protection, worker safety, wage rates and food safety standards be quantified and considered in such determinations. And be it further

Resolved, That we encourage the education of the general public regarding the importance of the role agriculture plays in the development of a society, recognizing that such public education, primarily at the middle and secondary school levels, is critical in the preservation and strengthening of the family farm unit and the overall preservation and strengthening of the agricultural industry itself. And be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

POM-30. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho urging the United States Air Force, President of the United States, and the United States Congress to thoroughly and conscientiously evaluate the utility and efficacy of basing a squadron of F-35 Lightning II Joint Strike Fighter aircraft at Gowen Field in Boise, Idaho, to facilitate a continued flying mission for the Idaho Air National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 9

Whereas, the State and the citizens of Idaho have a proud tradition of support for the armed forces of the United States of America; and

Whereas, the Idaho Air National Guard has distinguished itself in service to the State of Idaho and to the citizens of our state and the United States of America; and

Whereas, Gowen Field, located in the City of Boise, Idaho, has served admirably for decades as an effective, world-class military installation, both in federal and state service, as a base of operations for the Idaho Army National Guard and the Idaho Air National Guard; and

Whereas, the U.S. Air Force has chosen Gowen Field among five finalists for two sites to locate squadrons of F-35 Lightning II Joint Strike Fighter aircraft; and

Whereas, Gowen Field is the only finalist for the basing of F-35 aircraft in the western United States; and

Whereas, Gowen Field, Boise, and southwestern Idaho possess the facilities, infrastructure, airspace, climate, landscape, skilled personnel, relevant private-sector industry and strong public support for military operations required to effectively support the siting of F-35 aircraft; and

Whereas, the Idaho Air National Guard's existing A-10 aircraft flying mission faces the distinct possibility of elimination in the foreseeable future; and

Whereas, the economies of Boise, southwestern Idaho and the entire state would be materially damaged by the loss of an Idaho Air National Guard flying mission at Gowen Field, which now provides jobs and career opportunities for thousands of Idaho citizens, both military and civilian; and

Whereas, it is incumbent upon the leadership of the State of Idaho to extend its active support to efforts to maintain a viable flying mission for the Idaho Air National Guard, such as that which would be provided by the U.S. Air Force's basing of F-35 aircraft at Gowen Field. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the members of the First Regular Session of the Sixty-fourth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, that we encourage and call upon the U.S. Air Force, the Administration and Congress to thoroughly and conscientiously evaluate the utility and efficacy of basing a squadron of F-35 Lightning II Joint Strike Fighter aircraft at Gowen Field in Boise, Idaho, to facilitate a continued flying mission for the Idaho Air National Guard. And be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the United

States, to the Secretary of the Air Force, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

POM-31. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan memorializing the United States Congress to appropriate funds from the Nuclear Waste Fund for the establishment of a permanent repository for high-level nuclear waste or reimburse electric utility customers that paid into the fund; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas, The nuclear power industry needs a permanent repository for high-level nuclear waste produced by reactors. Nuclear power plays a vital role in meeting our nation's current and future energy needs. However, the failure to construct a permanent repository severely impedes efforts to construct new power plants to provide this clean and reliable base load power; and

Whereas, Over the last thirty years, the nuclear power industry and its customers have paid the federal government billions of dollars to construct a permanent repository. Under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, the U.S. Congress established the Nuclear Waste Fund to collect money for the repository. Revenue to the fund came from mandatory fees assessed on all nuclear energy. Since 1983, customers of Michigan electric utilities alone have paid \$812 million into the fund for construction of the repository; and

Whereas, A permanent repository for high-level nuclear waste has not been established and constructed. More than 2,000 metric tons of spent nuclear fuel from power plants continue to accumulate at temporary, and potentially vulnerable, sites across the nation, adding to the more than 70,000 metric tons already stored at these sites; and

Whereas, The Nuclear Waste Fund contains a substantial balance for establishment of the repository. While fee collection was suspended as of May 16, 2014, the fund still contains a balance of over \$31 billion for the express purpose of supporting radioactive waste disposal activities. It is imperative that Congress meet its obligation to the nuclear power industry and U.S. citizens that paid into this fund; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate, (the House of Representatives concurring), That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds from the Nuclear Waste Fund for the establishment of a permanent repository for high-level nuclear waste or reimburse electric utility customers that paid into the fund; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-32. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho supporting the Department of Energy, the President of the United States, and the United States Congress to identify, commit, and sustain the necessary funding to allow the Department of Energy to continue to make progress at meeting its cleanup milestones to benefit the citizens of Idaho and its environment; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 3

Whereas, at the direction of the United States government, the U.S. Department of

Energy's Idaho site was established in 1949 to demonstrate peaceful uses of splitting the atom through nuclear reactor research and development in its mission to create electricity for commercial use and propulsion for the United States Navy fleet; and

Whereas, during its history the Department of Energy's Idaho site designed and built fifty-two nuclear reactors, perfecting light-water reactor design and operation, proving that reactors could create more fuel than they use, extending the useful life of our country's naval vessels, and providing isotopes to the medical community for the elimination of cancer and other diseases; and

Whereas, in its sixty-eight-year history, radioactive and hazardous wastes were generated on-site, or were shipped to Idaho, that required storage or disposal using industry-accepted practices at the time, which presented environmental challenges at the 890 square-mile federal site and to the underlying Snake River Plain Aquifer, the primary drinking and agricultural water source for more than 300,000 Idaho residents; and

Whereas, elected officials, federal department administrators, environmental interest organizations, Idaho citizens, and the nuclear industry itself recognized the need to change past waste storage and disposal practices and clean up legacy waste sites that posed a potential or confirmed risk to people or the environment; and

Whereas, after several years of assessment and negotiations, the State of Idaho entered into a legally binding agreement with the federal government on December 9, 1991, to assess all potential waste sites at the Department of Energy's Idaho site and use the risk-based process outlined in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act to clean up legacy waste sites with the intent of protecting the second-largest continuous aquifer in the United States and restoring or preserving areas of the site to protect people and the ancestral lands of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes; and

Whereas, the Department of Energy and its contractors have completed environmental assessments of all suspected waste sites at the Department of Energy's Idaho site and completed the cleanup actions outlined in twenty of twenty-five records of decision; and

Whereas, environmental scientists and engineers have employed innovative cleanup technologies and processes to protect employees, the public, and the environment, while also expediting the remediation of contaminated sites and saving taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars; and

Whereas, the Department of Energy and its contractor continue to make measurable progress removing Cold War weapons waste from an unlined landfill with the aim of protecting the Snake River Plain Aquifer—one of Idaho's most precious natural resources. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the members of the First Regular Session the Sixty-fourth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein; that, in this twenty-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order, we support the Department of Energy, the Administration and Congress to identify, commit and sustain the necessary funding to allow the Department of Energy to continue to make progress at meeting its cleanup milestones to benefit the citizens of Idaho and its environment. Be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature supports continued funding for the national and international missions at the Department of Energy's Idaho site to include, but not be limited to, nuclear energy research and development, bioenergy research, renewable energy research, cyber security advancements, smart-grid technology deployments, and national security support to the Department of Homeland Security and other departments. And be it further

Resolved, That the chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

POM-33. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho relative to the Hells Canyon Complex; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 2

Whereas, the Snake River, and its surface and ground water tributaries, is the backbone of Idaho's economy, supplying water for 76% of Idaho's population, cities, businesses, dairies, factories and more than 3 million acres of irrigated lands above Idaho Power Company's Hells Canyon Complex; and

Whereas, in the first half of the 20th century, hydropower development in the mid-Snake and Hells Canyon spurred economic development, irrigation, industry and growth in Southern Idaho and has provided Idahoans with clean electric energy at rates that are among the lowest in the nation; and

Whereas, the State of Idaho, while recognizing the benefit of hydropower generation to the citizens of the State through sustaining economic growth and agriculture, also acknowledged the value of protecting Idaho's water, property rights and natural resources; and

Whereas, in 1964, the State, recognizing its sovereignty over Idaho's water resources and potential intrusions upon that sovereignty, approved through constitutional amendment, Section 7, Article XV, Constitution of the State of Idaho, the establishment of the Idaho Water Resource Board (IWRB) whose members are appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate, and empowered the IWRB to formulate a comprehensive State Water Plan as described in Section 42-1734A, Idaho Code; and

Whereas, pursuant to Section 42-1734A, Idaho Code, the State of Idaho has adopted a State Water Plan ("Plan"); and

Whereas, Policy 1A of the Plan provides that: "The State asserts sovereignty over the development and use of Idaho's water resources for the benefits of its citizens. [And that] [a]ny action by the federal government or other states that would impair Idaho's sovereignty over its water resources is against state policy"; and

Whereas, Policy 1N of the Plan provides that: "Appropriation of water for hydropower should be subordinated to subsequent upstream beneficial uses to assure an adequate supply of water for all future beneficial uses, and minimum stream flows for hydropower projects should be established by state action"; and

Whereas, Policy 2B of the Plan provides that: "The State asserts primacy over the management of its fish and wildlife and water resources. Accordingly, any reintroduction or introduction of federally listed species or other aquatic species without state consultation and approval is against

the policy of the State of Idaho because it would impair or impede the state's primacy over its water resources"; and

Whereas, Policy 4A of the Plan provides that the main stem Snake River will be managed to meet or exceed minimum average daily flows at Milner, Murphy, Weiser, Johnson Bar and Lime Point and that these "minimum flows provide the management framework for the optimum development of water resources of the Snake River Basin"; and

Whereas, Policy 4H of the Plan provides that: "Hydropower generation is a beneficial use of the flow of the Snake River, and it is in the public interest to protect the minimum average daily flows set forth in Policy 4A as a base flow for hydropower use"; and

Whereas, Policy 4J of the Plan provides that: "The minimum stream flows set forth in Policy 4A provide adequate flows for Snake River fish, wildlife, recreation, and scenic values in the main stem Snake River below Milner Dam"; and

Whereas Policy 4C of the State Water Plan in discussing the Swan Falls Agreement, recognized the value of hydropower through the acknowledgment and protection of minimum stream flows and ensured that electric rates remain beneficial to its citizens; and

Whereas, in 1976 the State of Idaho in partnership with neighboring states of Oregon and Washington (collectively "States"), together with the National Marine Fisheries Service filed a petition with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) requesting that "it issue an order requiring the licensee to take appropriate measures as compensation for" the loss of salmon and steelhead due to the construction and operation of the Hells Canyon Complex; and

Whereas, in 1980 the States and the Idaho Power Company executed a settlement agreement that, by its terms, constituted "full and complete mitigation for all numerical losses of salmon and steelhead caused by or in any way associated with the construction of, and operation within the existing license" for, the Hells Canyon Complex; and "further agree not to contend or support contentions by others before any agency or in any proceeding that additional fish or fish facilities are required by or in any way associated with the construction of, or operation within the existing license for," the Hells Canyon Complex; and

Whereas, the Idaho Power Company has complied with the terms of the 1980 Settlement Agreement with state support; and

Whereas, in 1984 the State and Idaho Power Company entered into the implementing agreements for the Swan Falls Settlement, which confirmed the State's primacy over flows of the Snake River through the establishment of minimum flows from Milner Dam to reaches below the Hells Canyon Complex; and

Whereas, the Idaho Power Company, since 2003, has been seeking to relicense the Hells Canyon Complex before the FERC under the Federal Power Act; and

Whereas, the State Water Plan directs the Water Resource Board to participate in the Hells Canyon Complex relicensing to ensure that the conditions in "the new license for the Hells Canyon Complex includes operational conditions that preserve and enhance the generation capacity of the project in a manner consistent with the State Water Plan"; and

Whereas, in 2004 the State, participating water users, and the Nez Perce Tribe entered into the 2004 Snake River Water Rights Agreement providing for cooperative agreements to assist in the recovery of listed spe-

cies under the Endangered Species Act in tributaries below the Hells Canyon Complex while providing certainty to Idaho landowners and water users in the exercise of property rights; and

Whereas, the 2004 Snake River Water Rights Agreement identified specific actions by the water users with respect to the rental of water to augment flows for listed anadromous fish below the Hells Canyon Complex, such agreement providing certain protections to the water users; and

Whereas, water users have benefited from the certainty regarding the water supply availability and operating conditions in the reaches of the Snake River upstream from the Hells Canyon Complex; and

Whereas, the Idaho Water Users Association, through Association Resolution No. 2017-6, has and continues to oppose introduction of salmon and steelhead species into surface waters above the Hells Canyon Complex due to the drastic impacts on irrigated agriculture, industry, water supply and electric generation; and

Whereas, Section 42-1734C, Idaho Code, requires that the Idaho State Water Plan "be submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission . . . as the state water plan for the conservation, development, management and optimum use of the state of Idaho's water resource" and the Plan has been submitted; and

Whereas, the State committed to certain actions through the 1980 Agreement, the Swan Falls Agreement, and the 2004 Snake River Agreement, that provide the citizens of Idaho certainty and appropriate management of the State's resources in a manner consistent with the intentions provided herein; and

Whereas, the State of Oregon has taken certain actions in the relicensing proceeding for the Hells Canyon Complex in an attempt to mandate the passage and introduction of salmon and steelhead above Hells Canyon Dam and into the Idaho waters of the Snake River, which form a border between Oregon and Idaho, that directly infringe upon Idaho's sovereignty over its water resources and primacy over management of its fish and water resources; and

Whereas, the Governor of the State of Idaho, through the Office of Species Conservation, is charged with coordinating with all state departments and divisions with respect to endangered, threatened, candidate species, species petitioned to be listed, and rare and declining species, coordinating state response to federal recovery plans and projects, participating in regional efforts and providing input to federal and state agencies with regard to such species act as an ombudsman for state citizens on ESA issues, and ensuring state primacy over management of its fish and wildlife, including prevention of reintroduction or introduction of listed species without state consultation and approval; and

Whereas, the Governor, by letter to the Natural Resources Agency Administrators and Directors dated May 27, 2016, directed that: "Each agency shall coordinate with the Governor's Office of Species Conservation and status of any introduction or reintroduction proposals under the Endangered Species Act"; and

Whereas, the Governor, by letter to Oregon Governor Brown dated July 19, 2016, advised that Idaho would not agree to Oregon's passage or introduction proposal above Hells Canyon Dam, in violation of Sections 67-818 and 67-6302, Idaho Code, stating in part:

“Such occurrence would violate long-standing Idaho law and policy opposing reintroduction of any species without the express consent of the Idaho State Legislature and executive branch. . . . Based upon state law and in part on our past experiences with reintroduced a species (e.g., wolves), Idaho cannot and will not, agree to the reintroduction of salmon or steelhead above Hells Canyon Dam.”; and

Whereas, while the Idaho Power Company serves customers in Idaho and eastern Oregon, approximately 95% of its customers are located in Idaho; and

Whereas, the Governor, by letter to Oregon Governor Brown dated January 17, 2017, advised that Oregon’s draft 401 conditions related to fish passage and reintroduction would impact Idaho waters and citizens and interfere with Idaho’s sovereign interests in managing its natural resources; and

Whereas, the Governor’s January 17, 2017, letter further advised that with respect to “any new requirement imposed by Oregon will lead to additional costs that will disproportionately impact Idaho customers” and “passage and reintroduction conditions should be removed”; and

Whereas, protecting Idaho’s sovereignty by ensuring that Oregon does not impose fish passage and introduction in violation of Idaho law and policy will continue to be a benefit to Idaho’s citizens through greater certainty regarding property rights, water supply and economic development. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the members of the First Regular Session of the sixty-fourth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, that the State of Idaho supports actions by the Governor and the Attorney General to oppose passage and introduction of salmon or steelhead above Hells Canyon Dam, that are necessary to protect Idaho’s sovereignty, including its waters and property rights, and to ensure that Idaho’s sovereignty is not violated by the introduction of salmon or steelhead to the reaches of the Snake River, and its Idaho tributaries, above Hells Canyon Dam. Be it further

Resolved, That the Governor and the Attorney General shall undertake such action as is necessary and appropriate to ensure that the terms of the 1980 Agreement are complied with in regard to mitigation for the Hells Canyon Complex to protect upstream water users, water rights, landowners and economic development from the State of Oregon’s efforts to pass and introduce salmon and steelhead above Hells Canyon Dam into waters of the State. And be it further

Resolved, That consistent with the authority of Section 67-6302, Idaho Code, the Legislature of the State of Idaho does not approve of the efforts by the State of Oregon and opposes any action by a federal agency, or any entity acting on behalf of a federal agency, or other groups, entities or individuals to require the passage and introduction or reintroduction of salmon or steelhead above Hells Canyon Dam, including trying to include in the FERC license for the Hells Canyon Project any provision that would result in introduction or reintroduction of any such species into the waters of the State of Idaho. And be it further

Resolved, That, the State of Idaho supports the relicensing of Hells Canyon Complex consistent with the following policies: (A) The license is consistent with the policies set forth in the Idaho State Water Plan; (B) The license recognizes that no salmon and steelhead populations can be introduced or

reintroduced above Hells Canyon Dam; (C) The license recognizes that the water rights for the Hells Canyon Complex are subordinated to future upstream uses as set forth in the partial decrees for each of the three dams; and (D) The mitigation requirements in the license for salmon and steelhead comply with the terms of the 1980 Settlement Agreement. And be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress and to the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

POM-34. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho encouraging western states and the Federal government to establish cooperative and coordinated efforts with the State of Idaho to prevent, to whatever extent possible, enforcement of invasive species laws and rapid response protocols, further spread of the mussels, and containment where established, until such time as viable tools for eradication are discovered; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 4

Whereas, eradication of invasive species is a matter of national concern, transcending state lines; and

Whereas, the presence of quagga and zebra mussels, collectively referred to as dreissenid mussels, in the West is a matter of growing and alarming concern; and

Whereas, the mussels were introduced into the Great Lakes in the 1980s by watercraft from the shipping industry through ballast water and adhesion to watercraft, having originated in Eastern Europe near the Black Sea, and now having spread to 32 states, including a discovery of larvae in Montana in November 2016; and

Whereas, in her five-year lifetime, a single quagga or zebra mussel will produce about 5 million eggs, 100,000 of which reach adulthood. The offspring of a single mussel will in turn produce a total of half a billion adult offspring; and

Whereas, mussels spread, in large part, by attaching to exposed hard surfaces of watercraft, as well as ballast water discharges, and being transported from water body to water body, many times across state lines, and many western states have now enacted laws to establish watercraft inspection programs to prevent the spread of quagga and zebra mussels to unaffected waters; and

Whereas, it is estimated that mussel introduction into the State of Idaho would cost Idaho approximately \$94 million per year. This figure does not include agriculture-related impacts, which would be devastating to the state, but reflects the impact to hydroelectric facilities, recreation areas, fish hatcheries, golf courses, intake valves for drinking water facilities and irrigation facilities; and

Whereas, federal action, and federal regulations, are necessary to address decontamination policies for those infested federal waters in the West; and

Whereas, the State of Idaho seeks to foster cooperative efforts between the western states and the federal government for the establishment of a coordinated effort to prevent, to whatever extent possible, through efforts including inspections, decontamination policies, enforcement of invasive species laws and rapid response protocols, further spread of the mussels, and containment

where established, until such time as viable tools for eradication are discovered. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the members of the First Regular Session of the Sixty-fourth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, that we encourage western states and the federal government to establish cooperative and coordinated efforts with the State of Idaho to prevent, to whatever extent possible, through efforts including inspections, decontamination policies, enforcement of invasive species laws and rapid response protocols, further spread of the mussels, and containment where established, until such time as viable tools for eradication are discovered. And be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, to the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States, to the leadership of the houses, assemblies and senates in the states of Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and California, and to the Pacific Northwest Economic Region.

POM-35. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho urging the United States Congress to appropriate \$8 million of the authorized \$20 million for fiscal year 2018 to the four Northwest states of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, according to the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act (WIIN), which includes the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (WRDA); to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 8

Whereas, Dreissenid mussels, specifically quagga mussels (*Dreissena rostriformis bugensis*) and zebra mussels (*Dreissena polymorpha*), are aquatic invasive species that cause irreparable ecological damage to many waters in the United States; and

Whereas, we are requesting \$8 million in federal matching funding for FY 2018 to combat the immediate threat of invasive quagga and zebra mussels to the Pacific Northwest region. Until recently, the Pacific Northwest region remained one of the only regions in North America without invasive quagga and zebra mussels. In November 2016, invasive mussel larvae were detected at Canyon Ferry Reservoir and Tiber Reservoir, located in Montana, and part of the Missouri River system. In response, Montana Governor Steve Bullock declared a natural resources state of emergency; and

Whereas, further spread of these invasive mussels will have a devastating and far-reaching impact on the economic and environmental wellbeing of the entire region. If invasive mussel populations become established in the Pacific Northwest, they will cost the region \$500 million a year, so it is vital that we work together to ensure that the invasive mussels do not make the short trip across the Continental Divide and into the Columbia River system. Failing to ensure this would not only result in Idaho water bodies becoming infested with quagga and zebra mussels, but the rest of the Columbia River Basin and region as well; and

Whereas, for these reasons, we ask Congress to appropriate \$8 million of the authorized \$20 million for FY 2018 to the four Northwest states of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, according to the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation

Act (WIIN), which includes the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (WRDA). The \$8 million in federal matching funding would be used to enhance funds already allocated by the states for watercraft inspection and decontamination stations with the purpose of protecting the Columbia River Basin against invasive mussels. Now that invasive mussel larvae have been found in Montana, federal assistance is key to ensuring that the Columbia River Basin system is protected and that invasive mussels do not spread to the rest of the region; and

Whereas, we appreciate the funding that Congress appropriated under the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (WRRDA) and WIIN to assist the four Northwest states. The emergency in Montana highlights the constant and ongoing threat of invasive mussels to the region, and the importance of the states' continued receipt of federal matching funding to support their efforts to protect against these aquatic invaders. Therefore, we respectfully ask that you consider our request and take the necessary steps to ensure that federal funds are appropriated to the four Northwest states in FY 2018. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the members of the First Regular Session of the Sixty-fourth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, that we urge Congress to appropriate \$8 million of the authorized \$20 million for FY 2018 to the four Northwest states of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, according to the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act (WIIN), which includes the Water Resources Development Act of 2016 (WRDA). The \$8 million in federal matching funding will be used to enhance funds already allocated by the states for watercraft inspection and decontamination stations with the purpose of protecting the Columbia River Basin against invasive mussels. Now that invasive mussel larvae have been found in Montana, federal assistance is key to ensuring that the Columbia River Basin system is protected and that invasive mussels do not spread to the rest of the region. And be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Interior, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

POM-36. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan urging the United States Department of Energy and the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission to fulfill their obligation to establish a permanent solution for handling high-level nuclear waste; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas, Nuclear power has been a significant source of the nation's electricity production over the last four decades. According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, nuclear power provided about 20 percent of the electricity produced in the United States in 2015, and Michigan's three nuclear power plants were responsible for about 26 percent of the electricity generated in the state; and

Whereas, Since the earliest days of nuclear power, determining how to deal with used nuclear fuel has been a great dilemma. Currently, more than 70,000 metric tons of spent

nuclear fuel are stored in pools or casks at temporary sites around the country, including locations in Michigan. This high-level radioactive waste demands exceptional care in all facets of its storage and disposal, including transportation; and

Whereas, More than 30 years ago, Congress enacted the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 to address the long-term storage of nuclear waste. The act requires the federal government, through the Department of Energy, to build a repository for the permanent storage of high-level radioactive material from nuclear power plants and to begin accepting waste by January 31, 1998. It is now 2017, and the nation remains without a permanent repository, despite billions of dollars collected from electric ratepayers for the project; and

Whereas, The Department of Energy's National Laboratories have pioneered a method of recycling spent nuclear waste into fuel, known as pyrochemical processing, which could extend the productive life of uranium and cut down on nuclear waste. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission should prioritize the development and implementation of technical specifications and licensing requirements to enable the construction of Generation IV reactors capable of performing pyrochemical processing; and

Whereas, The federal government needs to build a permanent repository and promote the construction of pyrochemical processing facilities. Spent nuclear fuel continues to pile up at temporary sites around the country, and the ongoing problem of permanent disposal is an impediment to the potential of nuclear power to help meet our nation's energy needs. Our nation can only continue to safely store this waste at temporary sites for so long; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That we urge the U.S. Department of Energy and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission to fulfill their obligation, as provided by law, to establish a permanent solution for handling high-level nuclear waste, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of Energy, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-37. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho urging the President of the United States, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the United States Congress to allow individual states to serve as the primary regulator of health insurance plans and permit the availability and sale of nonsubsidized health insurance plans in accordance with state-established statutes, regulations, and rules governing such plans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 7

Whereas, the Sixtieth Idaho Legislature passed Senate Joint Memorial 106, sponsored by the office of Governor C.L. "Butch" Otter, calling for an amendment to the U.S. Constitution that would prevent Congress from passing laws requiring citizens of the United States to participate in any health care insurance program or penalizing them for declining health care coverage; and

Whereas, the Idaho Health Freedom Act codifies as state policy that every person in the State of Idaho is and shall be free from government compulsion in the selection of health insurance options, and that such lib-

erty is protected by the constitutions of the United States and the State of Idaho; and

Whereas, the average Idaho rate increase for 2017 individual Affordable Care Act (ACA) health insurance plans was 24% and, with the year-over-year increases since the implementation of the ACA federal mandates, health insurance plans have become unaffordable for thousands of Idahoans and their families; and

Whereas, nearly 90,000 Idahoans can afford coverage only with the assistance of an ACA premium assistance tax credit or other subsidy, and Idaho's uninsured includes "middle class" individuals and families who earn too much to qualify for federal insurance premium assistance and have no coverage option other than high-cost ACA plans; and

Whereas, the premium amounts for pre-ACA individual transitional "grandmothered" plans were 30% to 50% less than those of the individual ACA plans, indicating that a return to state regulation of the individual insurance market would result in significantly lower premium amounts for many Idahoans; and

Whereas, prior to implementation of the ACA, the State of Idaho primarily regulated the Idaho health insurance market and provided aggressive oversight of all aspects of that market and enforced consumer protections as well as ensured a local, responsive regulation for consumers; and

Whereas, prior to the implementation of the ACA-mandated plans, Idaho had a stable and competitive individual insurance market, with among the lowest individual premium amounts in the nation, and consumers could choose from a variety of health insurance coverage options to best cover them and their families; and

Whereas, on January 20, 2017, President Donald J. Trump signed an executive order to minimize the economic burden of the ACA pending repeal, including instruction to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and to the heads of all other executive departments and agencies with authorities and responsibilities under the act to exercise all authority and discretion available to them to provide greater flexibility to states and to cooperate with them implementing healthcare programs. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the members of the First Regular Session of the Sixty-fourth Idaho Legislature, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, that the Idaho Legislature urges President Trump, Secretary Price and Congress to take the following action: Allow individual states to once again serve as the primary regulator of health insurance plans and immediately permit the free market availability and sale of nonsubsidized health insurance plans in accordance with state-established statutes, regulations and rules governing such plans; and be it further

Resolved, That the Idaho Department of Insurance issue guidance allowing for competitive, innovative, nonsubsidized health insurance plans, along with the free market sale of health insurance plans to Idahoans who choose to purchase them, in accordance with state-established statutes, regulations and rules governing such plans; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States, as well as to Governor C.L. "Butch" Otter and Director Dean

Cameron of the Idaho Department of Insurance.

POM-38. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of California calling upon the United States Congress to reject any effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act unless it is simultaneously replaced with an alternative program that meets the standards clearly and consistently articulated by the President of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 26

Whereas, Over the first two years of full implementation of the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) (Affordable Care Act), California's uninsured rate decreased by half—the largest percentage point decline in the uninsured rate of any state—from 17.2 percent in 2013 to 8.6 percent in 2015, according to the United States Census Bureau, with the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention indicating a further fall to 7.1 percent in the first nine months of 2016; and

Whereas, This decline, from 6.5 million uninsured individuals in 2013 to 3.3 million uninsured individuals in 2015, is a historic accomplishment that reaches across all income levels, geographic regions, and ethnic groups in California; and

Whereas, In June 2016, nearly 3.7 million individuals received coverage through the Affordable Care Act's Medicaid eligibility expansion; and

Whereas, Over 13 million children and adults—approximately one-third of the population—now receive health care coverage through the Medi-Cal program in California; and

Whereas, Since the California Health Benefit Exchange, also known as Covered California, opened its doors, it has cumulatively enrolled 2.5 million people into health care coverage; and

Whereas, Currently, nearly 1.4 million people are enrolled in health care coverage through Covered California, with approximately 90 percent receiving federal subsidies; and

Whereas, The lifeblood of these coverage expansions in California is the federal funding received through the Affordable Care Act; and

Whereas, California's strong consumer protections for health care coverage, access to comprehensive health coverage, including reproductive health care services, and vigorous regulatory system are threatened by the American Health Care Act under consideration in Congress; and

Whereas, The American Health Care Act will result in the elimination of all federal funding for Planned Parenthood, a reduction of tax credits and an increase in premiums for many low- and moderate-income Californians, the elimination of cost-sharing subsidies, a repeal of the Medicaid entitlement to coverage, the elimination of enhanced federal funding for new enrollment in Medi-Cal in 2020 resulting in a massive shift of costs to the state, more uninsured Californians, and fewer Californians receiving affordable coverage; and

Whereas, The American Health Care Act under consideration in Congress provides \$600 billion in tax cuts primarily to upper-income individuals, implements an "age tax" that allows insurers to charge an older person five times the amount charged to a young adult, and proposes that income-based premium subsidies would be replaced by age-based subsidies that hurt moderate-income individuals and makes insurance

unaffordable for all but the least healthy; and

Whereas, Millions of Americans rely on the essential provisions of the Affordable Care Act, including, among others, premium tax credits, cost-sharing subsidies, and easily comparable comprehensive coverage; and

Whereas, Since the Affordable Care Act was passed in March 2010, the United States private sector added over 15,000,000 jobs and set a record for consecutive months of job growth; and

Whereas, Health care policy is extremely complex because it involves the lives and well-being of hundreds of millions of Americans, impacts the national economy in innumerable ways, and involves complex laws and regulations, insurance markets, and consumer protections; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Senate affirms its strong support for the Affordable Care Act and calls upon the United States Congress to reject any effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act unless it is simultaneously replaced with an alternative program that meets the standards clearly and consistently articulated by President Trump: that not one American will lose coverage and that coverage will be more affordable and of higher quality for all Americans; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate urges Congress to not jeopardize the health of millions of Americans by pushing through irresponsible policy in late-night hearings, but instead allow for comprehensive public review, "including evaluations by the Congressional Budget Office and relevant policy committees, so that Americans have their concerns heard; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

POM-39. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to explore and support policies that will lead to the establishment of facilities within the United States for the reprocessing and recycling of spent nuclear fuel; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 9

Whereas, The federal Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 called for the United States Department of Energy to begin collecting spent nuclear waste and develop a long-term plan for storage of the material. In 2002, Congress approved Yucca Mountain in Nevada as the location to allow the Department of Energy to establish a safe repository for high-level spent nuclear waste; and

Whereas, In 2010, the Department of Energy halted the project at Yucca Mountain when the construction authorization process was in progress, despite the Nuclear Waste Fund receiving more than \$30 billion in revenue from electric customers throughout the United States in order to construct the facility and store the spent fuel; and

Whereas, The Argonne National Laboratory has developed a high-temperature method of recycling spent nuclear waste into fuel, known as pyrochemical processing. This process allows 100 times more of the energy in uranium ore to be used to produce electricity compared to current commercial reactors; and

Whereas, Extending the productive life of uranium ore through pyrochemical processing ensures almost inexhaustible supplies of low-cost uranium resources for the generation of electricity, minimizes the risk that used fuel could be stolen and used to produce weapons, and reduces the amount of nuclear waste and the time it must be isolated by almost 1,000 times; and

Whereas, Advanced non-light-water reactors currently under development in the United States and internationally have the potential to utilize used fuel from existing reactors as fuel, but according to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, there are no reprocessing facilities currently operating within the United States; and

Whereas, The federal government's inability to adequately store or reprocess almost 100,000 tons of spent nuclear fuel has adversely affected the residents of the state of Michigan. Michigan has paid more than \$800 million into the Nuclear Waste Fund since 1983, but the federal government has failed to use it to permanently store nuclear waste in a way that serves the public; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That we urge the President and Congress of the United States to explore and support policies that will lead to the establishment of facilities within the United States for the reprocessing and recycling of spent nuclear fuel; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 190. A bill to provide for consideration of the extension under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of nonapplication of No-Load Mode energy efficiency standards to certain security or life safety alarms or surveillance systems, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-76).

S. 215. A bill to authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to issue an order continuing a stay of a hydroelectric license for the Mahoney Lake hydroelectric project in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-77).

S. 226. A bill to exclude power supply circuits, drivers, and devices to be connected to, and power, light-emitting diodes or organic light-emitting diodes providing illumination or ceiling fans using direct current motors from energy conservation standards for external power supplies (Rept. No. 115-78).

S. 239. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to encourage the increased use of performance contracting in Federal facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-79).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 723. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project (Rept. No. 115-80).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 724. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to modernize authorizations for necessary hydropower approvals (Rept. No. 115-81).

S. 730. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects (Rept. No. 115-82).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 734. A bill to extend a project of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission involving the Cannonsville Dam (Rept. No. 115-83).

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 245. A bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-84).

S. 343. A bill to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to Indians (Rept. No. 115-85).

By Mr. ISAKSON, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1094. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. RISCH for the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

*Althea Coetzee, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1210. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce tax rates across the board; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1211. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to undertake remediation oversight of the West Lake Landfill located in Bridgeton, Missouri; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1212. A bill to provide family members of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others, and law enforcement, with new tools to prevent gun violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1213. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to post a copy of the most recent response plan for each onshore oil pipeline on a publicly accessible website; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1214. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to certain sporting good articles, and to exempt those articles from a definition under that Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. 1215. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to allow States that provide foster care for children up to age 21 to serve former foster youths through age 23 under the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1216. A bill to clarify that an authorization to use military force, a declaration of war, or any similar authority shall not authorize the detention without charge or trial of a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1217. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide for appropriate designation of collective bargaining units; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1218. A bill to promote Federal employment for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 1219. A bill to provide for stability of title to certain land in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1220. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1221. A bill to counter the influence of the Russian Federation in Europe and Eurasia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1222. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to La Paz County, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1223. A bill to repeal the Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 1224. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a Community Resilience Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1225. A bill to support research, development, and other activities to develop innova-

tive vehicle technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1226. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to equalize liability and financial assurance requirements for onshore pipeline facilities that could discharge oil into the Great Lakes system with such requirements for offshore pipelines, to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue an emergency order directing pipeline owners to comply with existing pipeline operating agreements or acquire sufficient resources to appropriately respond to possible oil spill incidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1227. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for 12-month continuous enrollment under Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1228. A bill to require a National Diplomacy and Development Strategy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. NELSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. Res. 176. A resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. Res. 177. A resolution congratulating the Webster University chess team for winning a record-breaking fifth consecutive national title at the President's Cup collegiate chess championship in New York City; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 178. A resolution to authorize testimony, document production, and representation in United States v. Kevin Lee Olson; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 203

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency may not regulate vehicles used solely for competition, and for other purposes.

S. 251

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 251, a bill to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board in order to ensure that it cannot be used to undermine the Medicare entitlement for beneficiaries.

S. 253

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 253, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 428

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 428, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to authorize States to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through enhanced pediatric health homes, and for other purposes.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 660

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 660, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to fulfill the Federal mandate to provide higher educational opportunities for Native American Indians.

S. 756

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 756, a bill to reauthorize and amend the Marine Debris Act to promote international action to reduce marine debris, and for other purposes.

S. 765

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Alabama

(Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 765, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for penalties for the sale of any Purple Heart awarded to a member of the Armed Forces.

S. 808

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 808, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 926, a bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1024, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1081

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1081, a bill to establish an Employee Ownership and Participation Initiative, and for other purposes.

S. 1082

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1082, a bill to provide for the establishment of the United States Employee Ownership Bank, and for other purposes.

S. 1107

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1107, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges, and for other purposes.

S. 1141

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1141, a bill to ensure that the

United States promotes the meaningful participation of women in mediation and negotiation processes seeking to prevent, mitigate, or resolve violent conflict.

S. 1191

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1191, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to refine how Medicare pays for orthotics and prosthetics and to improve beneficiary experience and outcomes with orthotic and prosthetic care, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 109

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 109, a resolution encouraging the Government of Pakistan to release Aasiya Noreen, internationally known as Asia Bibi, and reform its religiously intolerant laws regarding blasphemy.

S. RES. 162

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 162, a resolution reaffirming the commitment of the United States to promoting religious freedom, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 174

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 174, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International and celebrating the Lions Clubs International for a long history of humanitarian service.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1212. A bill to provide family members of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others, and law enforcement, with new tools to prevent gun violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Gun Violence Prevention Order Act of 2017: At this time, I would also like to thank Senators BLUMENTHAL, GILLIBRAND, and MARKEY for cosponsoring this legislation. Their support is sincerely appreciated.

Yesterday marked the 3rd anniversary of the horrific shooting that outraged the community of Isla Vista, California and the Nation. During this attack, the City of Isla Vista was struck by tragedy when 22-year-old Elliot Rodger went on a shooting rampage after fatally stabbing his two roommates and a friend. Armed with a Glock 34 handgun and two SIG Sauer P226 handguns, the assailant drove through the streets of Isla Vista, shooting and killing 3 young students and

injuring 14 others near the University of California, Santa Barbara campus before taking his own life. The Isla Vista community was in shock, and we as a nation struggled to comprehend how this tragedy could have been prevented.

As more facts emerged about the assailant, we learned that he had a history of mental health concerns and violent behavior. He had been prescribed medications used to treat schizophrenia and bipolar disorder and at age 18 Rodgers had begun to refuse the mental health treatment he had been receiving. Local deputies had also encountered him several times through conflicts and fights he had with friends and roommates. And less than a month before his deadly rampage, a concerned friend had called a county mental health staff member, and, after speaking with the assailant's mother, law enforcement conducted a welfare check at Rodger's apartment. At that point, Rodger's murderous plot was well underway, and had the police searched his room, they would have found a stockpile of guns and ammunition along with papers detailing his plans to kill. This individual should have never been able to obtain a firearm—and the bill I am introducing today would enable law enforcement and family members to intervene and prevent attackers like this assailant from carrying out atrocious acts of gun violence in the future.

Over 30,000 people die each year from gun violence, and on average, 7 children and teens are killed by guns every day. We know that families and friends are in the best position to recognize early signs of trouble before tragedy occurs. However, family members and law enforcement officials commonly have no legal means of taking preventive steps to stop a troubled individual from committing an act of gun violence before it occurs. To solve this problem, the State of California enacted a law in the aftermath of the Isla Vista attack that enables family members or law enforcement officers to ask a court for a gun violence prevention order.

Modeled on California's existing laws on domestic violence, when a judge believes there is sufficient evidence that an individual is a danger to themselves or others, the gun violence prevention order temporarily prohibits an individual from purchasing firearms or ammunition. And under a higher burden of proof, a court can also issue a warrant to remove any firearms or ammunition already in the individual's possession. Based on this California law and other State laws, the Gun Violence Prevention Order Act of 2017 would create a new law enforcement grant under the Community-Oriented Policing Services Program at the Department of Justice and incentivize States to take intervening measures to prevent gun violence. Specifically, this legislation

would ensure that families and others can seek a gun violence prevention order from a court to temporarily stop someone close to them who poses a threat to themselves or others from purchasing a firearm. This legislation also ensures that a court can issue a gun violence prevention warrant requiring law enforcement to take temporary possession of firearms that have already been purchased if the court determines that the individual poses a threat. Because criminal background checks are critical to preventing gun crimes, this legislation also requires the Department of Justice and comparable state law enforcement agencies to keep their background check databases up to date and requires courts to notify these agencies when a gun violence prevention order is issued.

Importantly, this legislation also protects due process rights by providing written notice and multiple opportunities for the court to make independent determinations on the matter.

Additionally, the Department of Justice and State law enforcement agencies would be required to protect the affected individual's confidentiality. Finally, I would like to say a few words about the victims and survivors of the Isla Vista attack and what this legislation means to their community. Many of the victims and survivors of this attack were students and young adults. They had their whole lives ahead of them. As communities across California and our Nation mark the third anniversary of this terrible tragedy, let us remember the lives of Weihang Wang, Cheng Yuan Hong, George Chen, Veronika Weiss, Katherine Cooper, and Christopher Michaels-Martinez. The families of these victims will never be the same again, and I will never forget hearing their stories in the aftermath of this attack. As a mother and grandmother, I cannot imagine the pain they have gone through. As the elected leaders of this body, we must never forget what happened in Isla Vista and take steps to keep our communities safe from the gun violence that continues to endanger them. We have seen the costs of inaction, and the Gun Violence Prevention Order Act of 2017 is a step we can take to protect communities across America and ensure that other communities do not experience the pain that Isla Vista went through. I hope my colleagues will join me in remembering the victims of this attack and supporting this legislation.

By Mr. Kaine:

S. 1224. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a Community Resilience Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to authorize a game-changing scale of investment in

making America's infrastructure more resilient to natural disasters.

The BUILD Resilience Act would build on the National Disaster Resilience Competition first authorized in the 2013 Hurricane Sandy emergency supplemental disaster package. It would authorize \$1 billion a year over 5 years to jumpstart large-scale investment in community resilience—supporting jobs, strengthening infrastructure, and reducing risk to communities from disasters like hurricanes and flooding.

This bill aims to follow the “ounce of prevention” principle. Cleaning up after a disaster is important, but if we invest in sturdier infrastructure before the disaster, there will be less to clean up after the disaster. This is borne out in two separate studies. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that every \$1 invested upfront in resilient infrastructure saves \$3 on the back end. The Multihazard Mitigation Council of the National Institute of Building Sciences estimates \$4 of benefit.

The Sandy Competition supported resilience projects in low-lying coastal areas of Virginia and Louisiana; in Sandy-affected areas of New York and New Jersey, in flood-prone Midwest regions like Iowa and North Dakota, and elsewhere. But Virginia's grant illustrates the scale of the challenge. This grant is supporting innovative flood-control projects but only in two at-risk neighborhoods of Norfolk, which is only one part of a broader Hampton Roads region. Neighboring localities like Newport News and Chesapeake submitted proposals to address their own infrastructure needs, but funding was insufficient. Since there will always be risk of another devastating storm, we must learn from Sandy and take steps now to protect our communities later. This bill tries to do that.

With a range from 1½ to 7 feet of sea level rise projected by the year 2100, the Hampton Roads region is the second largest population center at risk from sea level rise in the Nation, behind only New Orleans. Residents are dealing with skyrocketing flood insurance premiums and flooding not only after a Sandy or a Matthew but from ordinary rainstorms. This is a direct Federal responsibility given the presence of the largest concentration of naval power in the world. An ODU study estimates that the main Norfolk city road leading into Naval Station Norfolk could be inundated by the tides a few hours per day by midcentury. That makes this not only an infrastructure issue but a national security issue.

I hope to work with the White House and Congress to advance a comprehensive infrastructure package that rises to this challenge.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 176—COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REUNIFICATION OF JERUSALEM

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. NELSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 176

Whereas June 2017 marks the 50th anniversary of the Six Day War and the reunification of the city of Jerusalem;

Whereas there has been a continuous Jewish presence in Jerusalem for 3 millennia;

Whereas Jerusalem is a holy city and the home for people of the Jewish, Muslim, and Christian faiths;

Whereas, for 3,000 years, Jerusalem has been Judaism's holiest city and the focal point of Jewish religious devotion;

Whereas, from 1948 to 1967, Jerusalem was a divided city, and Israeli citizens of all faiths as well as Jews of all nationalities were denied access to holy sites in eastern Jerusalem, including the Old City, in which the Western Wall is located;

Whereas, in 1967, Jerusalem was reunited by Israel during the conflict known as the Six Day War;

Whereas, since 1967, Jerusalem has been a united city, and persons of all religious faiths have access to holy sites within the city;

Whereas this year marks the 50th year that Jerusalem has been administered as a united city in which the rights of all faiths have been respected and protected;

Whereas the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-45), which became law on November 8, 1995, states that Jerusalem should remain the undivided capital of Israel in which the rights of every ethnic and religious group are protected; and

Whereas it is the longstanding policy of the United States Government that a just resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can only be achieved through direct, bilateral negotiations without preconditions for a sustainable two-state solution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 50th Anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem and extends its friendship and hopes for peace to the residents of Jerusalem and the people of Israel;

(2) reaffirms its support for Israel's commitment to religious freedom and administration of holy sites in Jerusalem;

(3) continues to support strengthening the mutually beneficial American-Israeli relationship;

(4) commends Egypt and Jordan, former combatant states of the Six Day War, who in subsequent years embraced a vision of peace and coexistence with Israel and have continued to uphold their respective peace agreements;

(5) reaffirms that it is the longstanding, bipartisan policy of the United States Government that the permanent status of Jerusalem remains a matter to be decided between the parties through final status negotiations towards a two-state solution; and

(6) reaffirms the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-45) as United States law, and calls upon the President and all United States officials to abide by its provisions.

SENATE RESOLUTION 177—CONGRATULATING THE WEBSTER UNIVERSITY CHESS TEAM FOR WINNING A RECORD-BREAKING FIFTH CONSECUTIVE NATIONAL TITLE AT THE PRESIDENT'S CUP COLLEGIATE CHESS CHAMPIONSHIP IN NEW YORK CITY

Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 177

Whereas Webster University is the first team in the history of the President's Cup collegiate chess championship to win 5 consecutive national titles;

Whereas the 2017 victory is the seventh consecutive national championship for Grandmaster and coach Susan Polgar and the program at the Susan Polgar Institute for Chess Excellence;

Whereas Webster University is a leader in promoting chess as a vehicle for enriching the education of children and young adults; and

Whereas Webster University has become a hub for developing chess excellence in students from across the United States and around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates Webster University for winning a record-breaking fifth consecutive national title at the President's Cup collegiate chess championship; and

(2) encourages Webster University to continue promoting the educational benefits of chess among its students and the larger community.

SENATE RESOLUTION 178—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY, DOCUMENT PRODUCTION, AND REPRESENTATION IN UNITED STATES V. KEVIN LEE OLSON

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished Democratic leader, Mr. SCHUMER, I send to the desk a resolution authorizing the production of testimony and documents, and representation by the Senate Legal Counsel, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a request for testimony and documents in a criminal action pending in North Dakota federal district court. In this action, the defendant is charged with sending to Senator HEITKAMP an e-mail threatening to kill or injure her. A trial is scheduled for June 6, 2017.

The prosecution is seeking for introduction into evidence at trial documentary evidence from the Senator's office, including the e-mail at issue, as well as testimony from the Senator's correspondence manager. Senator HEITKAMP would like to cooperate by providing such relevant evidence. The enclosed resolution would authorize that staffer, and any other current or

former employee of the Senator's office from whom relevant evidence may be necessary, to testify and produce documents in this action, with representation by the Senate Legal Counsel.

S. RES. 178

Whereas, in the case of *United States v. Kevin Lee Olson*, Cr. No. 17-26, pending in the United States District Court for the District of North Dakota, the prosecution has requested the production of testimony and documents from Kobye Noel, an employee in the Washington, D.C. office of Senator Heidi Heitkamp;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent current or former employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate; and

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Kobye Noel, an employee in the Office of Senator Heidi Heitkamp, and any other current or former employee of the Senator's office from whom relevant evidence may be necessary, are authorized to testify and produce documents in the case of *United States v. Kevin Lee Olson*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent current and former employees of Senator Heitkamp's office in connection with the production of evidence authorized in section one of this resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 217. Mr. SULLIVAN (for Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1238, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 217. Mr. SULLIVAN (for Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1238, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 4, lines 1 and 2, strike "relating to food and agriculture" and insert "or the Secretary of Health and Human Services".

On page 4, strike line 3 and all that follows through the end of the matter following line 6 and insert the following:

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended—

(1) by striking the items relating to sections 523, 524, 525, 526, and 527; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 522 the following:

“Sec. 523. Guidance and recommendations.

“Sec. 524. Voluntary private sector preparedness accreditation and certification program.

“Sec. 525. Acceptance of gifts.

“Sec. 526. Integrated public alert and warning system modernization.

“Sec. 527. National planning and education.

“Sec. 528. Coordination of Department of Homeland Security efforts related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have 10 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 24, 2017, at 10 a.m. in order to conduct a hearing titled “Border Insecurity: The Rise of MS-13 and Other Transnational Criminal Organizations.”

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on May 24, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Nominations.” The witness list is attached.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today, May 24, 2017, off the floor at the start of the first scheduled vote to conduct a business meeting on the following:

—The nomination of Althea H. Coetzee to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 24, 2017, in SR-418 at 2:30 p.m. to consider S. 1094, the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017.

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during

the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Wednesday, May 24, 2017 from 2:30 p.m.–4 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 24, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in open session.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 24, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in open and closed sessions.

COMMITTEE ON THE SUBCOMMITTEE JUDICIARY ON CRIME AND TERRORISM

The Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on May 24, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Law Enforcement Access to Data Stored Across Borders: Facilitating Cooperation and Protecting Rights.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA, THE PACIFIC AND INTERNATIONAL CYBERSECURITY POLICY

The Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on East Asia, The Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 24, 2017 at 2:15 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled “American Leadership in the Asia-Pacific, Part 2: Economic Issue.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION, PRODUCT SAFETY, INSURANCE, AND DATA SECURITY

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 24, 2017, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold Subcommittee Hearing on “Pool Safety: The Tenth Anniversary of the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act.”

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that my intern, Kelsey Sherman, be granted privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Olivia Rockwell, Brian Larkin, Elizabeth Isbey, Benjamin Willis, and Elizabeth Dervan, legislative fellows in my office, be given floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the vote on confirmation of Judge Thapar occur at 1:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 25; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING THE WEBSTER UNIVERSITY CHESS TEAM FOR WINNING A RECORD-BREAKING FIFTH CONSECUTIVE NATIONAL TITLE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 177, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 177) congratulating the Webster University chess team for winning a record-breaking fifth consecutive national title at the President's Cup collegiate chess championship in New York City.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 177) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY, DOCUMENT PRODUCTION, AND REPRESENTATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 178, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 178) to authorize testimony, document production, and representation in United States v. Kevin Lee Olson.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motions to

reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 178) was agreed to.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 25, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m., Thursday, May 25; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Thapar nomination; finally, that all time during morning business, recess, adjournment, and leader remarks count postcloture on the Thapar nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators MANCHIN, SULLIVAN, and MERKLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from West Virginia.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the concerns of the good people of my great State of West Virginia, about their healthcare and the needs they have. If the American Health Care Act is passed, which is the Republican plan that was passed over in the House, many West Virginians are going to lose their current insurance coverage.

Individuals on Medicaid expansion would not be guaranteed coverage after 2020. That means that for anybody that has gotten insurance for the first time, there is no guarantee they can keep it at all past 2020. The American Hospital Association estimates that 68,200 West Virginians would lose their Medicaid coverage in 2018, and another 126,000 people who currently have it would be without Medicaid coverage by 2026.

The American Health Care Act, which is being sent by our friends in the House—our Republican friends in the House—increases the cost to our State. The bill cuts \$834 billion from Medicaid, meaning that the State

would receive less Federal Medicaid funding, and it would not increase if costs rise in the case of health crises.

In fact, the American Hospital Association estimates that my State of West Virginia would lose a total of \$9.8 billion over the next 10 years—\$9.8 billion over the next 10 years alone in my great State. With all of the hard work they have done, to go without healthcare is unbelievable.

This bill would also increase costs for older, sicker, poorer, rural West Virginians. We have this type of a population in all of our States. Older Americans would face higher costs because insurance companies could charge them five times more than younger beneficiaries—five times more. So if a young beneficiary is paying \$2,500 a year, they can end up paying \$10,000, \$12,000 a year. That would increase the costs to older Americans nationally by anywhere from \$2,000 to \$8,400.

We did this little comparison here of what that would actually look like. Let's say there is a low-income senior, somebody who hasn't gotten to Medicare eligibility yet because of their age, and they are over the 138th percentile of the poverty guidelines, and they are paying about \$1,700 now for their insurance under the Affordable Care Act.

With this piece of legislation, they are going to pay upwards of \$13,000—\$13,000, which they don't have. The cost to purchase insurance for low-income seniors in West Virginia who buy insurance on the exchanges, as I just showed you, could go up to almost 800 percent—800 percent of the costs they are paying.

So today I am going to share the story of a West Virginian who is concerned about losing her healthcare. This West Virginia native is Stephanie Fredricksen. She told me her story at a townhall that we had in the Eastern Panhandle in March. She asked me to make sure I shared this story with all of you. This will be printed in the RECORD. So this is going to be Stephanie's story. This is one of many stories throughout my State of West Virginia:

My name is Stephanie Fredricksen and back in April 2016, I woke up one day unable to turn my head due to stiffness in my neck and terrible pain. At first I thought I had just slept on it wrong and it would go away. By early May, the pain had spread to every joint in my body.

Then, I began to experience painful spasms in my back, my shoulders, my neck, and even my jaw. I started having blurred vision and shooting pain in my eyes. I also began suffering from extreme exhaustion, on really bad days activities as simple as getting out of bed, getting dressed, and brushing my hair can tire me out for hours. I could go on and on with a long list of other horrible symptoms.

My illness began to affect my job as a Property & Casualty Insurance Agent. I started missing more and more time from work, first due to doctor appointments and

then due to the worsening of my symptoms. Eventually, I was forced to file a claim for long-term disability insurance. I had been undergoing multiple tests and examinations and I thought the physicians would soon determine what was wrong and prescribe the appropriate treatment so I could get back my life and get back to work.

That never happened. During this time I had physical therapy and after a couple of weeks of treatment I was able to move my neck again. But by August, I was diagnosed with Systemic Lupus, Systemic Sclerosis, Osteoarthritis and Severe Spinal Stenosis among other related conditions. Although my employer assured me they had my back, in October, I received a certified letter from an attorney advising me that my employment had been terminated.

As a result, I lost my healthcare coverage and was offered COBRA coverage for a period of only three months.

On February 1, 2017, I became one of millions who rely on the Affordable Care Act (ACA). I was already familiar with the ACA because my husband had been covered by it since 2012.

My husband works for a small business that doesn't offer health insurance. The ACA was about \$350 less than for him to be added to my former employer's plan. Some of you may be thinking after hearing about some of my conditions that they aren't life ending but you would be wrong.

I suffer from autoimmune diseases. My immune system attacks my own body instead of resisting hostile foreign invaders. So my immune system will not fight off but will actually help the bad things to spread and become even stronger.

In approximately 50 percent of people with Systemic Lupus a major organ or tissue in the body such as the heart, lungs, kidneys or brain will become affected.

Between 10 and 15 percent of Lupus patients will die prematurely. However, it is widely believed that number is substantially underreported. Many deaths are reported as a result of the complications such as kidney failure and not the Lupus itself.

1 in 3 patients with Lupus also have another autoimmune disease. I fall into that category having been diagnosed with Systemic Sclerosis as well. Systemic Sclerosis can also involve the heart, kidneys, lungs, liver and brain. Internal organ complications are common and are often not symptomatic until the late stages of disease, thus routine screening is essential. Lung involvement is the leading cause of death.

She shared her story and much more with me at a townhall in Martinsburg. She asked me to read this on the Senate floor. She asked me to share her story because she has tried to share it with all of the elected officials herself, not just for herself but also for the protected 24 million Americans who are at risk of losing their insurance if the Affordable Care Act is repealed and replaced with the American Health Care Act, the act that was just passed in the House which is being sent to the Senate.

So she is asking us: Please, do not pass this. Do not repeal the ACA but fix it. We all know it needs to be repaired. The private market needs to be fixed, not to mention those who will no longer be able to afford it with the premiums going up, especially for the older, poorer senior citizens.

I obviously have pre-existing conditions, no job, and my husband's job does not offer health insurance. In other words, without the ACA, I would not be able to get the insurance I need so badly. I also fear that based on numbers provided by the CBO, if insurance is still available to me, I won't be able to afford it and of course there is also my husband's insurance to worry about.

At the same time many young and healthy people chose to take a gamble believing like we all do when we're young that nothing bad is ever going to happen to us.

As a result, the ACA risk pool was not as diverse as it should have been. Robust participation is so critical to ensuring citizens have access to and a real choice in affordable coverage. Imagine if those that oppose the ACA actually got behind it for the good of the country.

The ACA even with all of its opposition helped millions and it appears that the American people realize this, even many that were originally fooled by the negative rhetoric have decided they want to keep it. Please do what is right for us the citizens that have chosen each of you to represent us.

As I pointed out earlier, many of those people have come around to a different way of thinking as of late and I wouldn't be so sure that they will be there for you the next time when they vote if you have taken away their health care or their parents, siblings, children, grandparents, aunts, uncles, nieces, nephews, neighbors, friends, church members, coworkers, classmates, and so on. Of course we can't forget that a lot of those people will die as a result of not being able to keep their health care as well.

Putting your politics, egos, agendas, and parties aside in this case will actually save human lives. I ask you all not to repeal and replace the ACA and instead to work together to fix it and make improvements.

Please don't allow the CEOs of insurance companies and the wealthiest Americans to make even more money at the expense of those Americans who are the most vulnerable, like the disabled, the sick, the elderly and those with lower incomes.

I beg of you, PLEASE oppose the repeal of the ACA and please oppose any plan that could leave me and millions like me without health insurance or that will increase our premiums or deductibles or reduce or eliminate any current coverage. Our lives are depending on it and we are depending on you.

So, as I have promised, I have read this letter, Stephanie's story. I am hoping that Stephanie is listening and watching, but also for all the people that she represents—people who have serious illnesses, who are going to be left out or who are afraid they are going to be left out, elderly people who are going to not be able to afford insurance.

There are a lot of things that we can do, but one thing that we can all be doing is working together as Republicans and Democrats and putting our country first and people in our States and fixing this. We know it needs to be fixed. Get off the political rhetoric and quit blaming each other and sit down and say: OK, this needs to be repaired. This private market doesn't work the way it was intended to.

We need to get more young people involved. We need the market forces to work. We need for everyone who has in-

surance for the first time to use it in the most efficient, effective, and appropriate way. There is a lot that can be done, but not just by taking political votes and holding each other in harm's way.

I thank you for allowing me to tell Stephanie's story. I hope it helps. I can't wait to sit down and start working with all of our colleagues in this body.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY, DOCUMENT PRODUCTION, AND REPRESENTATION

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the preamble to S. Res. 178 be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, previously agreed to, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

SECURING OUR AGRICULTURE AND FOOD ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1238 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1238) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Roberts amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 217) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To preserve the authority of the Secretaries of Agriculture and Health and Human Services and make a technical correction)

On page 4, lines 1 and 2, strike "relating to food and agriculture" and insert "or the Secretary of Health and Human Services".

On page 4, strike line 3 and all that follows through the end of the matter following line 6 and insert the following:

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended—

(1) by striking the items relating to sections 523, 524, 525, 526, and 527; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 522 the following:

"Sec. 523. Guidance and recommendations.

"Sec. 524. Voluntary private sector preparedness accreditation and certification program.

"Sec. 525. Acceptance of gifts.

"Sec. 526. Integrated public alert and warning system modernization.

"Sec. 527. National planning and education.

"Sec. 528. Coordination of Department of Homeland Security efforts related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism."

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1238), as amended, was passed.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I want to talk this evening about a very serious threat to the United States; that is, the threat from North Korea and what we in the Congress should be doing about it.

Now, over the weekend we saw another piece of news about how the North Korean regime is again testing missiles, testing for intercontinental ballistic missiles, more missile launches, literally two in the last 2 weeks.

I would say this is one of the most serious threats facing the United States of America right now because what has now become clear, it is no longer if Kim Jong Un and the North Korean regime will have the ability to range the United States of America with an intercontinental ballistic nuclear missile. It is no longer if. It is when.

This has been stated time and time again in open hearings we have had on the Armed Services Committee with generals and some of the top experts in the United States. It used to be, hey, maybe he would have this capability sometime down the road. Maybe he will never get it. They are not saying that any longer. Think about that. Every American should be thinking about that. It is no longer if but when one of the craziest dictators in the world will have the capability to launch an intercontinental ballistic nuclear missile. It is not just ranging my State, the great State of Alaska, which unfortunately for me and my constituents is in the

line of fire earlier than other States or Hawaii, which faces similar risks to Alaska, but we are talking about the continental United States. We are talking about Chicago, New York City, Los Angeles. It is not if but when.

So yesterday in front of the Armed Services Committee, the Director of National Intelligence, our good friend, former Senator Dan Coats, when I asked him and General Stewart, the top military officer for our intelligence agencies, when they thought this was going to happen—well, it is a classified number and it is a classified time. I actually think it should be unclassified, given their estimates, to let the American people know what is coming because it is probably a lot sooner, at least in the estimates, than most people think. So that is what we are facing right now, and people should be concerned about it.

Let me give you a little bit more on the facts of this. Kim Jong Un, the leader of North Korea, the unstable dictator of North Korea, has publicly stated it is his goal to develop a nuclear-capable intercontinental ballistic missile that can strike the continental United States. Now, let's just be clear. This is a man who starves his own citizens, sentences them by the tens of thousands to inhumane labor camps, and just a month ago allegedly assassinated his half-brother in a Malaysian airport with poison to kill him.

In fact, since assuming power just 5 years ago, as my next chart shows, Kim Jong Un has conducted more missile tests and twice as many nuclear tests as both his father and grandfather did in their 60 years of ruling over North Korea. Look at these numbers: That is the Kim Jong Un regime, Kim Jong Il, Kim Il Sung. So he is focused on this more than his father and grandfather were. As I mentioned, it seems almost daily there is another one of these missile tests or even nuclear tests.

Now, one of the things you see in the press sometimes is, well, some of these missile tests are failing. There have been failures, and there have been notable successes, such as the country's first intermediate range ballistic missile, its first submarine launch ballistic missile, its first solid fuel launch missile, and its ability to put satellites in space. This is actual progress. This is significant progress.

On the nuclear side, the country's fifth test—and Kim Jong Un's third—had an estimated yield in terms of its power of 15 to 20 kilotons, approximately the size of the nuclear bomb dropped on Hiroshima. While this yield was not as large as they were expecting, the test again on the nuclear side shows steady progress in their nuclear program and steady progress in their ballistic missile program.

So what does all this mean? Why is Kim Jong Un testing so often? Even though he fails, he is still learning.

That is exactly what the commander of U.S. Strategic Command said last month during a Senate Armed Services hearing.

Gen. John Hyten stated: North Korea is going fast. Test, fail, test, fail, succeed. They are learning, and as you can see them learning, they are developing the capabilities for intercontinental ballistic missiles. That is how it works in the rocket business.

That is happening right now. That is happening right now. That is in the news right now.

Also in the news is what the United States has been doing to protect our allies from this and other threats. So let me give you an example. There has been a lot of news about the THAAD deployment, a missile defense system in South Korea deployed by the U.S. Army to protect our troops and South Korea's citizens, to protect our troops in Korea, protect our troops in Japan, and to protect our allies. Now, I am very supportive of this—very supportive of this.

The President is on his Middle East trip. He is going to Europe now. He mentioned just a few days ago maybe having a THAAD system in Saudi Arabia, an American system to help protect the Saudis from the Iranian missile threat. Again, I am very supportive.

As the Presiding Officer knows, in our last National Defense Authorization Act, we had significant authorization and funding to help Israel protect itself with a missile defense system, the Iron Dome system, where we have been working with the Israelis to help their citizens be protected against an Iranian missile threat.

Again, I support all of these. I applaud these efforts, I have supported them, I voted for them, but it does beg the question that some of my constituents back home in Alaska are beginning to ask, and I am sure other Americans are asking in every State in the country: What about us? What about the United States? What about the U.S. homeland? Isn't that where Kim Jong Un said he wants to launch intercontinental ballistic nuclear missiles? It is. It is exactly where he said he wants to do it.

The bottom line is, we need to do much more to protect ourselves. We need to do much more to protect the United States of America. Yes, we need to protect our allies, but we need to start focusing a little bit more on home, and we need to start focusing now.

In fact, if we know this threat is coming, which we do—there has been testimony after testimony—I think it would be the height of irresponsibility to not start working on increasing America's homeland missile defense. That is what we should be doing.

That is why I have introduced a very bipartisan bill called the Advancing

America's Missile Defense Act of 2017. Again, Republicans and Democrats are already on the bill. I believe the Presiding Officer is now a cosponsor.

I would like to paint a scenario that we all know will happen unfortunately sometime in the future—again, on why this bill is so important, why what we need to be doing on missile defense is so important.

Just think through the headline. Let's assume a couple years down the road Kim Jong Un has this capability to launch an intercontinental nuclear ballistic missile to hit a lower 48 city. Well, we know that is going to start leaking out. The headlines will be front page, banner headlines: Dictator of North Korea can range Chicago, New York. It will be all over the news. It will be the only thing we talk about.

There will be enormous pressure on the White House and others to do something about this. On that day when we see the banner headlines, a lot of Americans will be very nervous. The American people and the American media will look at the people in the Pentagon, will look at the people in Congress, will look at the leadership in the White House, and will ask three critical questions. Are we safe? Did we see this coming? Have we been doing anything about it and, if so, what? That is what they are going to ask.

We know that day is coming. We are not sure when, but we know that day is coming—again, not if, but when. People are going to ask those questions. If we know that, and we do, we need to be able to say to all three of those questions—whether it is the Secretary of Defense, the President of the United States, or whether it is all of us here, the Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, we need to be able to answer the American people and say: Yes, we are safe; yes, we saw this coming; and yes, we have the world's most robust, technologically advanced, capable missile defense system that will with near certainty shoot down any North Korean missile launch at the United States and give our President and the Congress the strategic time and space to make potentially world-altering decisions.

We know this is coming, and I think we should be doing everything we can in our power to focus on it, so we will be safe, and we will be able to say yes to all three of those questions if we begin to seriously focus on America's missile defense, which is what our legislation is all about.

Unfortunately, our Nation has not always been focused on funding our missile defense system, and in many ways the funding has been erratic. As the Center for Strategic and International Studies put it recently, such funding for America's missile defense has been marked by high ambition, followed by increasing modesty. I think the time for modesty on an issue of this importance is over.

From 2006 to 2016, homeland missile defense funding, adjusted for inflation, declined nearly 50 percent, and homeland missile defense testing declined more than 83 percent. The goal of our bill is to change that and change it significantly. Among its other elements, Advancing America's Missile Defense Act will grow our U.S. base missile interceptors from what we have now, which is about 44, to as many as 72 and will require our military to look at having up to 100 interceptors distributed across the United States.

The bill will also authorize the more rapid deployment of new and better kill vehicles. These are the bullets, essentially, on top of the warheads. It will allow a layer of space-based sensors and radars to track missile threats from launch to intercept, a technological advancement that would improve all missile systems to make sure we have a layered missile defense, whether it is THAAD in Asia, Aegis Ashore and on ships, or our missile system here at home—all of it integrated. Right now we don't have that.

The bill also will increase the pace of missile defense testing to allow U.S. forces to learn from actual launches of our defense systems and increase the confidence we have in our system and its effectiveness. This is very important. The Department of Defense needs to change the culture around missile defense, testing regularly and conducting more flight tests. Unfortunately, every test is not always going to be a success. It is OK to fail because we learn from failure.

I don't like to admit on the floor of the U.S. Senate that we could learn something from the North Koreans, but that is the approach they are taking. That is why their missile and nuclear programs are advancing so rapidly. They are not afraid to fail.

What we need to do is enhance our testing, enhance our missile defense, enhance our capabilities because, as I mentioned at the outset, it is no longer if, but when. That day is coming, and we need to be ready for it, and the United States Senate can lead in addressing this very significant challenge to America's national security.

I am encouraged that our bill has already gotten strong bipartisan support from Democrats and Republicans because they know how important it is. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle truly understand the significance and seriousness of this threat, and I hope they can continue to support our Advancing America's Missile Defense Act of 2017. There are very few foreign policy and national security issues that are more important than making sure we address this threat to America's security.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

TRUMPCARE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, our Nation and our government were founded on a principle that can be summed up in three words: "We the People," the first three words of our Constitution, the three words that our Founders wrote in supersized font so that no matter who you were you would remember that this is the guiding mission of our form of government. This is the guiding mission of the Constitution.

From across the room, you can't read the fine print of article I and article II and so forth, but you can see what the Constitution is all about: we the people.

Lincoln captured that notion when he spoke in his Gettysburg Address and said: "We are a nation of the people, by the people, and for the people." He didn't describe our system of government as of, by, and for the privileged. Our Founders didn't write "We, the powerful and privileged" at the start of our Constitution. That is what makes us different from the governments that dominated Europe, where the rich and powerful governed on behalf of the rich and powerful. America turned that on its head with our system of government. Our system of democratic republic governance.

Therefore, we are at a very strange moment right now because just 20 days ago, 217 Members, a small majority over in the House, voted for a bill that was all about government of and by the powerful, for the powerful, of and by the privileged, for the privileged, not by the people, for the people. They voted for TrumpCare.

We witnessed the House passing this horrific piece of legislation that will ensure that millions of low-income and middle-class Americans are worse off, will receive less care, and will have to pay more for their healthcare, assuming they can even get it. But, on the other hand, the bill delivers \$600 billion in platinum-plated tax benefits to the richest Americans.

Picture the situation: our President holding a celebration at the White House, standing on a platform, crushing more than 20 million people in terms of their access to healthcare, while celebrating a golden plate with platinum-plated gifts to the wealthiest Americans. That is what happened 20 days ago in the House of Representatives. That is not a pretty sight and certainly doesn't fit the mission of our Nation.

Franklin Roosevelt shared his vision of how we progress in the following fashion. He said: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have little."

But the Trump principle that was supported by 217 House Members 20 days ago is the opposite. The Trump

principle is that the test of our progress is whether we add more to the abundance of those who have most, while taking away from those who do not have enough. That is what happened. That is the difference between Franklin Roosevelt and government of, by, and for the people, and President Trump and 217 House Members who passed a bill of, by, and for the powerful and the privileged.

It is astonishing to me that this happened. American citizens, when they heard about the first version of this bill, TrumpCare 1.0, they overflowed the inboxes, they proceeded to fill the streets, they flooded the phone lines, and people up here heard them and said: We understand. We don't have the votes to pass this TrumpCare 1.0 in the House because we hear you telling us how horrific this bill is.

So they went back to work. But in TrumpCare 2.0 they produced a bill that is even worse than TrumpCare 1.0. They took an already bad bill, they made it more painful and more damaging, and they jammed it through without a hearing on the House side. They jammed it through without a CBO estimate of how many people it would hurt or what it would cost. They jammed it through because they didn't want to listen to the American people who said: What you are doing is diabolical and wrong. They didn't want to listen to the experts who said the same thing.

The experts weighed in from every direction—nonpartisans and analysts, health policy experts, the associations that work in healthcare, the groups that represent doctors, nurses, and patients. The American Medical Association said: "We are deeply concerned that the AHCA," which I will simply call TrumpCare to keep away the confusion—"We are deeply concerned that TrumpCare would result in millions of Americans losing their current health insurance coverage," and that "nothing in the MacArthur amendment remedies the shortcomings of the underlying bill."

The AARP called the bill "a bad deal for older Americans ages 50–64," because it "would significantly increase premiums for all older adults and spike costs dramatically for lower- and moderate-income older adults."

The AARP went on to state that the amendment that converted TrumpCare 1.0 into TrumpCare 2.0 was making "a bad bill worse" because it "establishes state waivers that allow insurance companies to charge older Americans and people with preexisting health conditions higher premiums and weaken critical consumer protections."

The American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network weighed in; the American Diabetes Association weighed in; the American Academy of Pediatrics weighed in; the American Heart Association; the American Lung Association; the March of Dimes and many,

many, many other groups that are familiar, household-known organizations. These groups that understand our healthcare system all came out and made it public that this plan, this TrumpCare 2.0, is a bad plan. It endangers Americans' health.

But 217 Members of the House didn't listen. The 217 Members voted for the Trump principle of crushing ordinary Americans to deliver \$600 billion in platinum-plated benefits to the richest Americans. If the House had listened and put that bill 6 feet under with a stake through its heart, I wouldn't be standing here today, but they sent that bill over to the Senate. It is here for the Senate to consider. There are 100 Senators who now have to decide: Are they behind the principle of "we the people," or have they decided that they want a different constitution—one that is about "we the privileged" and "we the powerful"?

I know that when I took my oath of office, I liked the Constitution the way it was written. I liked the principle behind this Constitution. So it is of major concern that the Senate might proceed to adopt TrumpCare 2.0 or modify it into TrumpCare 3.0.

Today, the Congressional Budget Office's score was released, which told us of and evaluated TrumpCare 2.0. It found that more than 20 million Americans—in its estimate, 23 million to be exact—will be uninsured under TrumpCare than under the Affordable Care Act. That would bring the total of uninsured to a much higher total of 51 million people under the age of 65 by the year 2026—nearly double the number of uninsured. That hurts real people. It hurts every single one of those individuals who lose their healthcare.

In my State of Oregon, just one piece, one provision of this bill, which crushes the expansion of Medicaid—in Oregon, it is the Oregon Health Plan—strips the healthcare of about 400,000 Oregonians. That is a lot of human carnage. It is enough people that, if they were standing hand to hand, they would stretch 400 miles from the Pacific Ocean to the border with Idaho. That is how many Oregonians would be impacted by this.

That is just the people who lose access to healthcare. There are many others who would go to their clinics or go to their hospitals and find that the clinics and hospitals have either limited their services or shut down because, you see, our clinics have gained tremendously from the investment under ObamaCare. In addition, they have gained tremendously from the fact that the people who came in the door had insurance to pay their bills. It is the reduction in uninsured individuals who come through the door—the ones who cannot pay for their care—that has dropped so much. With more people paying for their care, the finances of the clinics and the hospitals

are stronger. So TrumpCare not only hurts the 23 million who will lose insurance, but it hurts everybody, every American, by degrading our clinics and degrading our hospitals.

Individuals share their stories and their concerns, people like Lauren Rizzo in Portland. She is a single mother and small business owner who is alive today thanks to the health insurance she received through ObamaCare.

About 2 years ago, Lauren was not feeling well, so she went to get checked out at a clinic. Lauren figured she would be given a prescription for antibiotics and sent on her way. Instead, she was told to head straight to the emergency room, where she received emergency surgery to remove a 7½-inch mass from her abdomen. If Lauren had not gotten insurance through the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, she would not have gotten checked out, and she certainly could not have afforded the \$40,000 surgery bill and the nearly \$60,000 in followup care without going bankrupt. Very likely, without insurance, she would have had this mass continue to grow in her abdomen and maybe threaten her life. This may have been a life-and-death issue for her.

Here is what Lauren has to say in her own words:

I am a healthy and contributing member of society who is able to contribute and pay my way and continue to grow and succeed rather than someone who is slipping through the cracks and needing assistance to get by. It seems to me that turning people who are getting by into people who are falling behind is good for no one. Even if there is no compassion in our leadership's healthcare plan, I would have hoped someone would have injected a note of common sense.

Her point, made very poetically and poignantly, is that if you cannot get healthcare, you cannot remain a productive member of society. It is not just about your quality of life, and it is not just about the fact that you might suffer and that you might die, it is also about whether you can be healed and contribute. That is an important piece of why healthcare is so important.

Paul Bright of Sweet Home wrote to my office to share his story about finally having healthcare thanks to the Medicaid expansion. Paul wrote:

I'm one of those hardworking Americans the Republicans praise mightily—an entrepreneur, self-employed, buying American—and I'm on Medicaid thanks to the ACA.

Without the ACA—that is ObamaCare—I'd have no insurance at all to cover my prescriptions that keep me healthy so I can continue to work.

Do I want to be making so little income that I qualify for Medicaid? No. I want to be making a good income.

The only way I can continue working 60 hours a week to increase my household income is if I can keep my prescriptions and doctor appointments.

Without the medicine I need, I will become permanently dependent on government services, not just health insurance, but I will

start requiring food stamps, housing assistance, utilities assistance.

He concludes:

The smart economic decision is to keep me healthy so I can grow our economy.

Paul is right. Keeping him healthy isn't just the moral thing to do, it is a smart economic decision. Yet, under TrumpCare 2.0, Paul probably would not stay healthy because he would not be able to afford the appointments and he would not be able to afford the prescriptions. He would fall through the cracks.

Then there is a grandmother in Lake Oswego, OR, who wrote to me about her 12-year-old grandson who is living with a neurological disorder and who has been hospitalized three times over the past 5 years. The first time this woman's grandson was hospitalized at the age of 8, his father's insurance covered a 3-week hospital stay. At the time, that was enough to get the care he needed. But then we fast-forward to last year. Her grandson, now 12, needed to be hospitalized for several weeks, followed by residential treatment, followed by a brief period in a transitional school—a 10-month period in total. Those 10 months were covered because of ObamaCare, because of the ACA. For the past several months, this young boy has been home and recovering successfully. The ACA made that possible.

Carol Nelson of Turner, OR, writes to me and shares her words. She does not know how she will manage if her husband is kicked out of his nursing home because of TrumpCare 2.0. She writes:

My husband lives in a nursing home. He does not remember me after 33 years of marriage. I worry now. Will the new healthcare laws and Medicare, which I will get in 2018, cover us? Will he have to come home for me to take care of him even though I cannot stand for more than a few minutes due to congestive heart failure?

Carol continued:

I think there should be incentives to do what's best for your health written into the law but not to take it away. Without the ACA, I surely will die.

So here is a woman who has been married to her husband for 33 years, but he has dementia so badly that he does not recognize his wife. She would love to care for him at home, but she cannot. She has congestive heart failure, and his condition is extremely severe.

Medicaid funds more than half of the nursing home admissions in the United States of America. It is not simply about assisting struggling families or hard-working or low-income families; it is also about taking care of our seniors. She has a double challenge—her own care and her husband's care. "Without the ACA," she said, "I surely will die."

Should that be the healthcare system we have in the United States and because of which people are at the point

of losing their access to healthcare and putting their own lives at stake?

I think back to that issue of peace of mind. In a good healthcare system, all have the peace of mind that their loved ones will get the care when they are sick and that their loved ones will not go bankrupt when they get sick. We have made big strides in that direction. In Oregon, the 400,000 folks who are covered by the expansion of Medicaid alone represent a big stride in that direction, the tens of thousands who have gained access to care on the exchange because they can now get community pricing and not be fended off by a preexisting condition or blocked by a preexisting condition. They have more peace of mind.

We can do better. We could have a much simpler system, and we could have a much more efficient system, but let's not go backward and throw millions and millions of Americans off of healthcare.

Last night, I had the pleasure of speaking with Carol on the phone and talking to her a little more about her life. She told me about the cataract surgery she needed in order to be able to continue to see. She said that without that, she would have lost her license, and if she had not had a license, she could not have gone to the grocery store to feed herself and her son, because they live out in the country—an hour's drive from everything. She told me about the various preexisting conditions she has had to manage—conditions that would certainly prevent her from getting healthcare without her having the ACA, conditions that, without medical appointments and prescriptions, would cause her health to deteriorate rapidly without the ACA. That is what she means when she says: "I surely will die."

It is a powerful story, but it is certainly not unique. Every day, I am receiving stories like Carol's—story after story of folks who just want the peace of mind of having access to healthcare—as well as stories from constituents who are angry at President Trump and who are, quite frankly, angry at the 217 Republicans who voted for a government by and for the powerful and privileged over in the House 20 days ago.

They are also upset about the breaking of promises to the American people. They heard the promises over the past campaign year. The President made promise after promise on healthcare, and his healthcare bill breaks promise after promise.

President Trump promised his plan would provide healthcare for all, but it does not. According to the analysis we received just today, 14 million Americans would lose healthcare almost immediately. Within another 10 years, that would grow to about 23 million Americans. That is not healthcare for all; that is healthcare for 23 million fewer. Promise broken.

Over and over again, President Trump said his plan would make healthcare cheaper. The CBO estimates that premiums under TrumpCare 2.0 will go up 20 percent next year. Check this out. Here is the basic math. A 64-year-old man who earns \$26,500 a year would have his monthly cost for healthcare go up from about \$140 a month to about \$1,200 a month. When you are earning \$26,500, by the time you pay for your rent and your utilities and your car payment and your groceries, you do not have much left, but you can still get health insurance if it is costing you \$140 a month. But if out of that little more than \$2,000 a month you earn, you would have to pay \$1,200 a month, there is no way you can afford that insurance. So President Trump promised that healthcare would be more affordable—promise broken.

The President promised that under his plan, Americans would have better healthcare. Currently you are guaranteed essential benefits, including emergency services, rehabilitation services, maternity and newborn care, mental health and addiction treatment, hospital treatment, pediatric services—essential benefits. Those are the things you expect, in a healthcare system, to be covered.

But TrumpCare throws out the requirement to have essential care benefits. It means a State could choose to let insurers sell barebones plans that cover virtually nothing.

So you are making your payment and you think you have insurance, and then you get injured or you get sick and you find out it doesn't cover anything. That is not healthcare. That is predatory insurance policies, and that is what is allowed under TrumpCare.

So, Mr. President, you promised better healthcare and you delivered predatory policies—promise broken.

The President said he would make sure we kept the protections for preexisting conditions. He promised it. He repromised it. He triple promised it. He continued to promise it. But the amendment that he accepted for TrumpCare 2.0—passed 20 days ago by 217 Members of the House, in favor of government of, by, and for the powerful and the privileged—broke that promise and said States could allow the elimination of community pricing.

What that means is that you have preexisting conditions, but you can get the policy at the same price as everyone else. If you destroy community pricing, it means that when you file for your policy, the insurance company says: Well, let's see just what your problems are. Oh, we see you have asthma. We are going to charge you more. Oh, we see you have diabetes, we are going to charge you a lot more. We see you have delivered a child, which can create health problems. We are going to charge you more because you are a mother. We see that you had an

episode of cancer. It is in remission—good news—but the odds of your getting it are higher than someone else; so we are going to charge you more.

That is because their goal is to make sure those people who have preexisting conditions are not in their insurance pool, because they will make more money. That is an assault on the premise that everyone will be able to have affordable healthcare because those folks are told: Because you have this condition or that condition, we are going to charge you more. The charges will be so high—and will be intended to be so high—that they will not be able to buy insurance. So they won't be covered.

That is part of the reason that the CBO has analyzed the fact that there will be 23 million more people without insurance come 2026 under TrumpCare than under current law. We can think of this as a tax. For those who actually can summon the funds, it is a set tax on sick people, and the sicker you are, the higher the tax bill you pay under TrumpCare.

So when the President promised not once or twice or thrice but multiple times to make sure that we keep the protection for people with preexisting conditions, that was a promise broken.

The President promised not to cut Medicaid. As I was waiting to speak last night, I was watching a local television channel, and they were playing tapes of one rally after another where President Trump went out there and said: I am different; we will not touch Medicaid or Medicare or Social Security. He was emphatic. He was passionate. He was convincing.

He broke that promise under TrumpCare. It cuts \$880 billion out of Medicaid. On top of that, the budget he released yesterday calls for \$600 billion more on top of the \$880 billion. If you cut \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid, that is the promise broken. It is not broken by a little. When the President said he wouldn't touch Medicaid, he didn't proceed to break that promise in a tiny little way. No, he smashed it with a sledge hammer. He demolished it. He turned it into dust because he cuts \$1.5 trillion out of Medicaid.

Medicaid doesn't just help provide healthcare to hard-working, struggling families. It pays for nearly half of all births in America. It provides coverage for one out of three children—healthcare for one out of three children in America. It pays for nursing home care for more than half of the American seniors who need nursing home care. Medicaid is the single largest payer for mental health and substance abuse disorders.

A lot of folks here have come down to this floor—from both parties—to talk about taking on the opioid epidemic, a substance abuse epidemic, a highly addictive drug doing great damage across America. Medicaid is the largest payer

for substance abuse disorders in America, and TrumpCare cuts it by \$1.5 trillion.

Two out of three school districts rely on Medicaid funds to provide services to children with disabilities.

So there we have it—one broken promise after another.

Now we turn to the Senate because it is time for this Chamber to respond. The only appropriate response is for us all to get together, dig a deep hole here on the floor of the Chamber, throw that House bill—TrumpCare 2.0—into it, light it on fire, drive a stake through it, and make sure it never sees the light of day. That is the only reaction that honors our “we the people” government. That is the only action that would honor the promises that President Trump made to the Nation while campaigning.

Now, a group of my colleagues are holding secret meetings far from the public to work out a new version of TrumpCare—TrumpCare 3.0. There is no bipartisan dialogue on this, and I am certainly not invited to listen in. So I can’t tell you what they are coming up with, but I can tell you this: It is a process completely different than when we had a bipartisan, over a year-long process to debate and examine the question of the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare. The Finance Committee held 53 hearings. They spent 8 days marking up the bill. That was the committee’s longest markup in over two decades. They considered 135 amendments. That was one of the two major committees that worked on ObamaCare. The other was the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, known as the HELP Committee. They held 47 hearings—not secret meetings in some room but public and bipartisan meetings with all committee members welcome and the press welcome, hearings, roundtables, and walkthroughs. Then, they had a month-long markup—a month long. I was there. I was on the committee. We had a square table—two sides with my Republican colleagues and two sides with my Democratic colleagues. During that markup, amendment after amendment was considered. Three hundred amendments were considered—bipartisan amendments, amendments from Democrats, amendments from Republicans—and 160 amendments were adopted from my Republican colleagues—160 amendments from across the aisle. That is the type of bipartisan work that was done.

Let’s compare that to TrumpCare: no hearings in the House, no public display of the bill for a lengthy period for it to be publicly analyzed. There was virtually no chance for the public to see the actual text and weigh in. It passed under a process of rapid transit through the floor of the House, and then it came over here to the Senate.

Is the Finance Committee now holding hearings similar to what we did years ago on ObamaCare? We had 53 hearings. How many hearings has the Finance Committee had on TrumpCare 3.0? None, not one. The HELP Committee—the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—held 47 hearings, roundtables, and walkthroughs. How many hearings has the HELP Committee had here in the Senate on TrumpCare 3.0? Not a single one.

Secrecy is the guiding principle of the day—secrecy that might produce another version of TrumpCare that will be devastating to millions and millions of Americans. So, of course, they don’t want the public to watch that process. Of course, they don’t want to have weeks of hearings and markups that enable people to have hundreds of bipartisan amendments. If you are trying to push through something to destroy healthcare in America, you want to do it as secretly as possible. That is what is happening in the Senate at this very moment.

That is not the kind of process you should have in a democratic republic. That is the kind of process you have when you are about to do something diabolical and destructive that will hurt we the people.

ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act, isn’t perfect. We could work together to make it much better. We could say no to all of the strategies that the Trump administration is doing right now to undermine the success of the marketplace.

Remember, the marketplace was the Republican idea. That was the Republican plan: Have a marketplace where private healthcare insurance companies could compete. That is what came from across the aisle. But now the Trump administration is doing everything it can to undermine that particular strategy. They are hesitating about whether to provide the cost-savings funds that allow the companies to provide lower premiums and lower deductibles. That hesitation means the insurance companies can’t price out their policies for next year. So they either have to exit the exchange or they have to raise the price of their policies a lot higher.

The Trump administration is deliberately sabotaging the marketplace.

Then there is the fact that the whole point of the markets was to make it simple for an insurance company to go from one State to another State, to reach all of the customers at the same time of year—all making decisions—and you can reach out and talk to them. You can sell your policy easily. But the point is, a new company coming into the marketplace is concerned they will get a disproportionate share of those who are very ill, so there is an

adjustment that takes place to say: No. You can come into this marketplace, and we will guarantee that you will get an adjustment if your patients end up being sicker than the average patients.

That is intended to make multiple insurers come in and compete with each other. But my Republican colleagues destroyed that provision. It is called risk corridors. They destroyed that provision. They are destroying the ability of companies to competently, responsibly come into the insurance marketplace and participate in the exchanges.

So not only do we have the diabolical TrumpCare 2.0 and the secret 13 proceeding to develop TrumpCare 3.0, we also have the administration destroying the ObamaCare exchanges, the marketplaces, which were the Republican idea brought into that bill.

I will do all I can to make sure we don’t throw out healthcare for 23 million Americans. I hope every single Senator here, having come to this body and I know holding dearly this Constitution, will fight for “we the people” and not “we the powerful and privileged” and will fight against a bill that not only hurts healthcare for those 23 million people but also destroys healthcare institutions for everybody else because it undermines the financing of both the clinics and the hospitals.

In our own States, we are all hearing our Lauras and our Pauls and our Carols and our grandmothers talking about their 12-year-old grandsons. We are hearing them all say: Just say no. Do your job. Make our healthcare system work better. Live up to your commitment to “we the people,” a democratic republic, to fight for a nation of, by, and for the people.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. MERKLEY. I withhold my request.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:17 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 25, 2017, at 10:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 24, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOHN J. SULLIVAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ON THE RETIREMENT OF BRIAN C. COOPER FROM THE HOUSE PARLIAMENTARIAN'S OFFICE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise as both the Dean of the House and as a former employer of Brian Cooper to congratulate him on his impending retirement from the House of Representatives after 35 years of service, and to thank him for his years of dedicated service to the House.

Brian is a Baltimore native and the youngest of seven children of his parents Dolores and Ellsworth Cooper. Brian loves the Charm City so much that he has lived in the same house his whole life.

He is a proud graduate of Frederick Douglass High School in Baltimore (the very same high school attended by Supreme Court Justice and civil rights icon Thurgood Marshall). After high school Brian received a scholarship to the Community College of Baltimore, now known as Baltimore City Community College, where he received his degree in commercial and graphic arts.

Brian's first Capitol Hill job began in the fall of 1982 when he began work in the stock room for Publications and Distribution Services. Thereafter, in the 1980s and early 1990s, Brian worked for the House Post Office, the House document room, the Small Business Committee and the Government Operations Committee. At Government Operations, Brian served under both Jack Brooks and myself as Chair (the latter from 1991 through 1994). In that capacity Brian worked as staff assistant, handled filing and archiving of committee materials, and prepared documents for committee hearings and markups. I can personally testify that Brian's work was respected and appreciated by Members on both sides of the aisle.

In 1995, Brian joined the Office of the House Parliamentarian as Clerk where he spent a full 22 years, rising to become Chief Clerk to the Parliamentarian in 2009. Brian's most visible duties included assisting presiding officers during sessions of the House and handling timekeeping and legislative paperwork at the rostrum. In addition, Brian provided invaluable assistance in creating the first office computer network, supervising House pages, and preparing for joint meetings and joint sessions. It is no understatement to say that Brian observed and participated in a great swath of American political history during that time period.

Brian remains active in many artistic endeavors—including watercolor, oils, photography, and architectural design—which I understand he plans to continue in his retirement. Brian also plans to use his well-deserved retirement to travel to Italy and spend

more time with family (including his many nieces and nephews).

As a devoted Baltimore sports fan, Brian has enjoyed the highs and suffered the lows of the local teams. He is a particularly avid fan of the Baltimore Orioles, and I am sure he appreciates the good start they are off to this year.

I know from personal experience and observation that Brian is the consummate professional. Members and staff on both sides of the aisle know Brian to be committed to an orderly and accurate legislative process observed in a fair, nonpartisan manner. In this age of increasing polarization and legislative gridlock, Brian is a committed institutionalist. He is the rare individual consistently striving to continue the customs and traditions of the House, and committed to pass on his institutional knowledge to his successors.

The House and the Congress will greatly miss Brian's services, but we will greatly benefit from his work and legacy.

MEMORIAL DAY 2017

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the brave men and women who gave their lives in the defense of freedom and to preserve the liberties that we hold dear in this nation.

Every Memorial Day, our nation unites to remember our military heroes who have paid the ultimate sacrifice to defend the values and freedoms we all cherish. This day of remembrance represents why so many people in our country are grateful to be Americans. No other nation has sacrificed so much to secure not only its freedom, but that of other nations.

As we reflect on the remarkable lives of our nation's fallen soldiers and their families, we must continue to honor them each and every day, as a single day of commemoration is far short of what they deserve. I know that back home in my district, our community will do their part in carrying on the legacy of these selfless individuals.

The Granbury community will host their sixth annual "Field of Flags," which is a memorial of over a thousand flags flying along Highway 377 and is dedicated to the lives of those that were killed in action or that are still missing in action. As we attend Memorial Day events like the "Field of Flags" this weekend, it is imperative to teach younger generations about the sacrifices these people made in order for us to live by the values that founded this nation.

May God bless our men and women serving today and in days past, may He comfort those who endure the pain of loss, and may He never cease to shed his grace on Texas and this great nation.

ALEXANDER ESCALANTE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alexander Escalante for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Alexander Escalante is a student at Pomona High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alexander Escalante is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Alexander Escalante for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE BACKPACK BUDDIES FOUNDATION OF LOUDOUN

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the Backpack Buddies Foundation of Loudoun, a local organization that aims to ensure that all children and students not only receive food during the week at school but also on weekends. Recently, this organization donated \$41,000 to 18 groups across Loudoun County that support backpack buddy programs, including churches, schools, PTAs, and food pantries.

My constituent, Mr. Daniel Hampton, founded the Backpack Buddies Foundation of Loudoun in 2014, and at the time the organization served two schools and approximately 275 kids. This school year, still under his leadership, 82 schools and over 3,600 students participated in backpack buddies programs. While this is an excellent testament to the organization's growth, it also speaks to the amount of students that often go without food on weekends, and I am thankful that organizations, like Backpack Buddies Foundation of Loudoun, exist to help combat this issue.

Each year, the organization raises money for Backpack Buddy programs across Northern Virginia, yet this year marked a new fundraising record. The \$41,000 raised allowed for the organization to disperse funds to 18 grant

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

recipients in amounts ranging from \$500 to \$15,000, helping students all across Loudoun County. Most of the funds were raised at their annual Friendsgiving Dinner. However, they also host several other fundraisers and events throughout the year in their effort to support this important cause. While the organization is thrilled with this year's fundraising initiatives and grant program, they hope that next year they will be able to help even more children in Northern Virginia. The organization's leadership in ensuring that every student of Loudoun County is properly fed and taken care of is truly exemplary, and I appreciate their ambition in support of our most needy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me and countless others in thanking Backpack Buddies Foundation of Loudoun for their continuous efforts to aid our students who are in need. I am extremely grateful for the impact this organization has had on Virginia's 10th District and the entire Commonwealth of Virginia, and I look forward to speaking of its continued success in the future.

HONORING MELVIN MATTHEWS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Reverend Melvin Matthews.

Reverend Melvin Matthews was formally installed on May 22, 2016 at Bell Grove Missionary Baptist Church, making him the first new pastor since 1951 when his uncle, Reverend David Matthews, accepted the leadership role.

The elder David Matthews, a well-known spiritual and civic leader in Indianola, served the historic church for 65 years prior to his death on April 15, 2015, at 95.

The younger Matthews said, "I pray that God will use me to continue the great legacy of excellence started by Pastor Matthews 65 years ago."

Matthews grew up in Indianola and in Bell Grove Church, graduated from Gentry High School and Mississippi Valley State University before enlisting and becoming a pilot in the U.S. Air Force. After retiring from the service, he settled in Warner Robbins, GA, where he served as assistant pastor of the New Jerusalem Baptist Church, and youth minister, associate minister, education minister and economic development minister at the Fellowship Bible Baptist Church.

Since his return to Indianola in 2009, Mr. Matthews has served as assistant to the pastor, David Matthews, teaching the church's Thursday night Bible study.

Matthews has received his Bachelor of Theology degree and is scheduled to graduate from Abundant Blessings Theological Seminary on June 11 with his master's degree in theology.

Matthews's church, Bell Grove was organized as a "brush arbor" in 1868 in a location described as: "Just across the railroad, on the corner, facing Indian Bayou across the street from the site of the old Mississippi Power and

Light office." Down through the years, the church has experienced numerous strides and setbacks, including: being burned down twice, three other locations prior to the present spot on B.B. King Road, and the drowning of its first pastor on record, Rev. James Wright who was made pastor in 1878.

Since then, several moves included: comprising location on donated land "on the hill" on Adair Street and from there to its location on Chandler Street, where the church experienced major improvements under the leadership of Rev. E.G. Mason and elder Matthews.

Reverend David Matthews led the congregation from the corner of Hannah and Chandler to their present location on B.B. King Road in March 2006, where he continued to lead and inspire until his death. The younger Matthews stated, "With God's help, Bell Grove will be a Bible believing, Bible teaching and Bible preaching church with a great commitment to the 'Great Commandment and Great Commission,' knowing that God will use this to build a 'Great Church.'"

During the 13-month interim since Rev. David Matthews' passing, the Rev. E.T. Goodman of Greenwood, a retired former pastor of Mt. Beulah Baptist Church in Indianola, conducted the morning worship services and Bible study.

Reverend Melvin Matthews is the son of Missouri Gray Matthews and the late Rev. John Matthews and is married to the former Cynthia Williams Matthews of Goulds, FL.

He often reminds people never say what you won't do because God has a way of changing your plans. He always said there were three things he would never do: preach, teach and return to Mississippi. God fixed it so he had to do all three.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Reverend Melvin Matthews for his dedication to serving others and giving back to the African American community.

ALEXANDER FERNANDEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alexander Fernandez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Alexander Fernandez is a student at Arvada K-8 School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alexander Fernandez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Alexander Fernandez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

AIKEN CHAPEL MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. TREY GOWDY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation in honor of Aiken Chapel Missionary Baptist Church, for their 100th Anniversary:

Whereas, Aiken Chapel Missionary Baptist Church was formed in 1915 by a group of fourteen men and women who purchased land from Mrs. Ida Aiken to build a church; and

Whereas, the church was named for Mrs. Aiken and became Aiken Chapel Church, pastored by the late Reverend R. L. Goodwin, a founding member; and

Whereas, Aiken Chapel Missionary Baptist Church continues to be a leading church in Taylors, South Carolina, and under the leadership of Dr. W. O. Harrison Sr., pastor for more than thirty years, the congregation continues to be active and enthusiastic members of our community; and

Whereas, Aiken Chapel Missionary Baptist Church is celebrating its 100th Anniversary this year and this anniversary celebration will draw members from the Upstate community to participate in this momentous milestone in the history of their church; Now therefore, be it

Resolved that I, TREY GOWDY, do congratulate the members of Aiken Chapel Missionary Baptist Church in recognition of their 100th Anniversary and thank them for their unwavering commitment, dedication, and contributions to Greenville County and to the Fourth Congressional District of South Carolina.

HONORING BLUEINK TECHNOLOGIES

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a dynamic and promising New Mexico company, BlueInk Technologies.

Just over two years ago, Faze Sharif and Zach Lovelady founded BlueInk with the aim to modernize the authenticity of eSignatures. Before computers, documents had to be signed in blue ink to signify authenticity. However, things are not so simple anymore. Sharif and Lovelady understood that the way we execute documents needed to evolve to keep up with the fast-paced business world in which fraud, misunderstanding, and mistakes cost businesses and consumers billions each year. BlueInk's innovative software ensures that documents are reviewed and executed in a fully customizable and transparent manner.

BlueInk's document review system can be configured to give signatories either a quick overview or detailed step-by-step review of a document's terms in any language and on any device. This guarantees that documents are reviewed according to a signatory's preferences in a manner most convenient to that

individual. Additionally, BlueInk provides powerful fraud prevention and security measures that create a detailed audit trail of every event throughout the review and signing and uses cutting edge technologies to verify a signer's identity. These technologies include GPS and IP based geo-location, photo identification, SMS text codes and driver's license scans—all of which are memorialized after execution in a stand-alone document called the BlueInk Certificate of Evidence. The Certificate of Evidence creates almost irrefutable proof of execution to prevent contract disputes before they begin. This technology has helped a wide range of industries including real estate, multi-family housing; professional services; automotive; business-to-business; human resources, local, state and federal entities; and financial or lending institutions.

BlueInk is currently being used by companies and consumers across the United States and this fast growing, innovative company has offices in New Mexico and Arizona. On May 3, 2017, their technology was approved by the U.S. Patent Office. I applaud the ingenuity, tenacity and forward thinking of the founders and their staff members, and I look forward to seeing how this next generation eSignature software will change the face of business.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALL-
EN MISSISSIPPI MARINE U.S.
MARINE LANCE CORPORAL
(LCPL) MARC LUCAS TUCKER

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am humbled to rise today in memory of U.S. Marine Corps Lance Corporal (LCpl) Marc Lucas Tucker who was killed on June 8, 2005, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. LCpl Tucker died in a non-hostile vehicle accident on Alternate Supply Route Uranium, Iraq.

LCpl Tucker, a Pontotoc native and 1999 South Pontotoc High School graduate, was assigned to the 9th Engineer Support Battalion, 3rd Force Service Support Group, III Marine Expeditionary Force, Okinawa, Japan, attached to 2nd Force Service Support Group (FSSG), II Marine Expeditionary Force (Forward).

LCpl Tucker's mother, Donna Bagwell, says her son wanted to be a Marine from the time he was a little boy. He wanted to follow in the footsteps of his grandfather who also served in the Marine Corps.

In 2003, LCpl Tucker enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps. His service included training in Okinawa and South Korea in the Korean Demilitarized Zone (DMZ).

In 2005, LCpl Tucker volunteered to go to Iraq to protect our nation in Operation Iraqi Freedom. His death was hard on the family, but Mrs. Bagwell says her son wanted to serve our nation.

"He loved America," Mrs. Bagwell said. "He loved the Marine Corps and everything about it."

LCpl Tucker's awards include the Combat Action Ribbon, Good Conduct Medal, National

Defense Service Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Korean Defense Service Medal, Humanitarian Service Medal, and Sea Service Ribbon.

LCpl Tucker is survived by his parents; Kelly Tucker and Donna Bagwell and siblings; Christy Irby, Pam Bolen, and Terry Bagwell.

LCpl Tucker lived to serve our country and died while protecting it. His devotion to protecting our freedoms will not be forgotten

IN RECOGNITION OF DAVID
SHTULMAN FOR HIS WORK AS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE
JEWISH FEDERATION OF GREAT-
ER ANN ARBOR

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize David Shtulman for his work with the Jewish Federation of Greater Ann Arbor. As the Federation's Executive Director for the past nine years, Mr. Shtulman has helped the organization grow and develop to meet the needs of the Ann Arbor community.

Founded in 1987, the Jewish Federation of Greater Ann Arbor serves as a forum to initiate and coordinate activities that foster Jewish communal life while promoting social justice. The organization hosts a variety of events throughout the community, including public forums discussing local and national events, as well as dinners and community gathering events. Additionally, the Federation administers the Jewish Community Foundation, a fund that provides assistance to local groups that further the organization's mission. Since 2008, Mr. Shtulman has served as the organization's Executive Director and has played a crucial role in the Federation's success during his tenure.

Throughout his time as Executive Director, Mr. Shtulman has provided important guidance for the staff and members of the Jewish Federation of Greater Ann Arbor. Under his leadership, the size of the Jewish Community Foundation has grown substantially, allowing the organization to fund Hillel programs in the community in addition to family services and supports. As a result, the Federation was able to allocate over \$1.5 million to local, state and national organizations in the year 2015. Mr. Shtulman has also championed youth exchange initiatives as well as Hillel programs at the University of Michigan and Eastern Michigan University. His principled leadership and passion for helping the Jewish community have helped it grow stronger, and he will be missed as he retires as Executive Director next month.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring David Shtulman for his outstanding work as Executive Director of the Jewish Federation of Greater Ann Arbor. Mr. Shtulman has provided important aid to the Jewish community through his leadership and efforts.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIVITY OF
THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY
CHURCH

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Church in Media, Pennsylvania as it celebrates its 150th Anniversary on September 8, 2018.

In 1868, Father Henry Wright became the first pastor of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Church. As Media grew, the parish school opened its doors in 1912 and soon served many families.

In the last 25 years, the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Church has continued to grow and adopted the motto: The Helping Hands of Christ. The growth and development of the church's many ministries are a testament to this motto. Its many services include the St. Vincent de Paul Society, which provides shelter to the poor of Media, feeding the poor at the St. Francis Soup Kitchen monthly, collecting clothes for St. John's hospice, making rosaries for those imprisoned, knitting baby caps for premature births, and traveling on mission trips to St. Croix to aid a sister parish.

While the number of parishioners has grown immensely in the last one hundred and fifty years, the church's facilities and staff have kept pace. Most recently, the parish center has been refurbished and they have also added a youth Minister to their staff to develop ongoing spiritual endeavors for the children of the parish.

Mr. Speaker, we are grateful to the work of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Church, its parishioners, and Father Ed Bell, and I hope the church will continue to grow and thrive.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding missed votes due to family matters. Had I been present for Roll Call vote number 271, Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 348, Providing for consideration of H.R. 953, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017, I would have voted Yea. Had I been present for Roll Call vote number 272, H. Res. 348, The Rule providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 953—Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017, I would have voted Yea. Had I been present for Roll Call vote number 273, H.R. 2288, The Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act of 2017, I would have voted Yea.

CONGRATULATING TALIAFERRO
COUNTY FAMILY CONNECTION

HON. JODY B. HICE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Taliaferro County Family Connection, a nonprofit organization that advocates for children and families in northeast Georgia. Under the leadership of Executive Director Jackie Butts, Taliaferro Family Connection, in collaboration with its community partners, has achieved remarkable results.

For example, they developed and implemented a plan to tackle teen pregnancy, which had previously been on the rise. Now the rate is 42 percent lower. When they strategized to reduce truancy, within three years, the number of students absent from school more than ten days declined by 23 percent. And as a result of its welfare-to-work initiatives, traditional welfare rolls declined by more than 95 percent. But that's not all. More babies are being born healthy, more children are receiving immunizations, and fewer families are living in poverty.

These achievements are a result of the partnership of several organizations working together with families to address their community's needs. One such partner is the Taliaferro County Board of Commissioners and, in particular, Mrs. Jane Hubert. Commissioner Hubert has been faithful throughout the years, attending the monthly collaborative meetings and supporting its special events, including the bike rodeo, back to school bash, street dance, and more. According to Mrs. Butts, over the past 19 years, the Board of Commissioners "has supported every aspect of everything" Family Connection has ever done. "Everything I've needed they've come through with all these years," she said.

For these reasons and on the occasion of its 19th Anniversary, it is my honor to acknowledge Taliaferro County Family Connection and the partners that contribute to its success. Furthermore, I extend my personal appreciation to the families who join hand-in-hand with this worthy organization to ensure that their children succeed in school and beyond.

HONORING OLEALIA BRADSHAW

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable unsung hero, Mrs. Olealia Bradshaw of Mississippi.

Olealia Bradshaw was born to the late Spencer and the late Earnestine Frye on September 25th 1948. She is a graduate of John F. Kennedy Memorial High School in Mound Bayou, MS and later attended Coahoma Community College, where she obtained an Associate Degree in Social Studies.

Realizing the study of history was not her passion, she furthered her studies at Delta State University receiving a Bachelor Degree

in Home. While at Delta State University, she met and later married standout football player, Jimmy Lee Bradshaw. To that union, four children were born: Gabriel, Michellda, Rasheda, and Ernestine.

Upon graduating from Delta State University, Olealia began teaching at John F. Kennedy High School and she remained a teacher for twenty-nine years. Throughout the years, students, co-workers and community residents have expressed how she blessed their lives, personally and professionally. Although her influence in the realm of education is immeasurable, Olealia considers her greatest achievement to be her total surrender to the Will of God Almighty, and her desire to live a life that is pleasing to Him. She is a faithful member of St. Mark Church of God in Christ where she serves as the Sunday School Superintendent.

She lives her life in servitude to others. She and her late husband would open their home for the homeless and provided various services to the homeless to be able to re-establish their independence.

Mrs. Bradshaw is a mentor to many children, not only when she was in the educational system, but in her neighborhood and Christian community. She is someone who is admired, loved and respected for how she speaks the truth of the matters at hand.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Olealia Bradshaw for being an unsung hero to others in the Mississippi Delta.

COMMEMORATING MARYLAND'S
FALLEN HEROES

HON. ANDY HARRIS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of one of our nation's most important holidays, Memorial Day. On Monday, May 29, we will honor the brave men and women who have given their lives to this great nation. Over the course of our nation's history, countless Marylanders have made the ultimate sacrifice to protect our freedom here at home and to liberate others from tyranny abroad. Since the War on Terror began in 2002, more than 135 Marylanders have died fighting for what they believe in.

Amidst the festivities and parades we will all enjoy on Monday, let us not lose sight of the sacrifices made by our men and women in uniform, or the sacrifices made by the families they leave behind. These heroes and their families deserve our utmost respect, support, and gratitude. May God bless these fallen heroes and their families, and may God bless the United States of America.

BRET ELZEY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Bret Elzey for

receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Bret Elzey is a student at Goal Academy and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Bret Elzey is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Bret Elzey for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

TREVOR KINGSLEY GRAHAM

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Mr. Trevor Graham as a member of the United States Naval Academy Class of 2017.

Trevor will graduate from the U.S. Naval Academy with a Bachelor of Science in Chemistry and he will receive a commission as an Ensign in the United States Navy on May 26, 2017.

His career in the service has just begun, but it is a testament to Trevor's unselfish devotion to the people of this great nation.

The challenges will be many and the time, although it may seem like an eternity, will fly by almost unnoticed.

South Mississippi is proud of Trevor and his accomplishments. We look forward to him continuing to represent not only Mississippi, but the entire nation, as a United States Navy officer.

As Trevor embarks on a new chapter in life, it is my hope that he may always recall with a deep sense of pride and accomplishment graduating from a program as prestigious as the Naval Academy.

I would like to send Trevor my best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors, thank him for his service, and congratulate him on this momentous occasion.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CHIEF TIM
GREEN FOR HIS 35 YEARS OF
SERVICE TO THE CARMEL PO-
LICE DEPARTMENT

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chief Tim Green of the Carmel Police Department. For over three decades, Chief Green has displayed courage, resilience, and leadership in serving the city of Carmel and its residents. During his tenure,

Carmel was deemed the safest city to raise a child and best place to live in America, according to multiple national studies. The people of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District are forever grateful for Chief Green's commitment to making the City of Carmel and the wider community of Hamilton County a safer, better place to live.

After graduating from North Central High School, Chief Green earned a Bachelor's Degree in Law Enforcement from Calumet College. He then went on to graduate from the FBI National Academy in Quantico Virginia, the FBI Enforcement Executive Development Seminar, and the Indiana Association of Chiefs of Police Executive Leadership Academy. Chief Green has served the Carmel Police Department for 35 years. He was first hired as a patrolman at age twenty-two. He has served as Commander of the Special Investigations Division, Director of the Hamilton County Drug Task Force, and was Assistant Chief of Police for 16 years. In 2011, Mayor Jim Brainard appointed Chief Green to lead the Department as Carmel's Chief of Police, where he has served with distinction for the last six years.

Chief Green's commitment to quality police work and professionalism on the force has ensured the safety of our citizens, and has made Carmel a great place to live and do business. His colleagues have described him as a strong leader and great mentor. Chief Green's ability to lead by example inspires excellence in his fellow officers. His leadership has empowered the department to be successful in assessing and combatting trends in crime. During his time as Police Chief, Carmel's population has greatly increased and the department has grown to 113 sworn officers and 25 civilian support personnel and continues to be accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies, an international recognition for professionalism, excellence and competence.

Chief Green's devotion to a career of service to his community is invaluable. On behalf of all Hoosiers, I wish to extend a heartfelt thank you to Chief Green for his 35 years of service. I wish the very best to Chief Green, his wife Brigit, and his two children, Jessica and Evan, in his well-deserved retirement and in the next exciting chapter of his life.

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIQUE RATIFICATION OF THE 27TH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, this month, May of 2017, marks the 25th Anniversary of the unusual ratification of the 27th Amendment to the United States Constitution. Proposed to the state legislatures for ratification by the very First Congress in 1789, and sponsored by none other than James Madison, who was a Member of this House that year, it was finally incorporated into the Federal Constitution

more than 202 years later when the Alabama Legislature became the 38th to approve it on this date in 1992.

Early in our nation's history, this constitutional amendment was adopted, pursuant to the Constitution's Article V, by the legislatures of Maryland and North Carolina in 1789, by those in South Carolina and Delaware in 1790, by those in Vermont and Virginia in 1791, as well as by that of Kentucky in 1792. But the proposal still had not gained the approval of enough states to be fully ratified. More than 80 years after Kentucky, Ohio lawmakers belatedly ratified it in 1873; but by then, with so many additional states having joined the Union, the ratification threshold had risen much higher. In order to become part of the U.S. Constitution today, with 50 states currently in the Union, a proposed constitutional amendment requires adoption by at least 38 states.

During its later years, as the amendment approached full ratification, I was privileged to personally contribute to this proposal formally becoming part of the U.S. Constitution. Before starting my congressional service in 2005, I was among those members of the Texas House of Representatives who voted "aye" on House Joint Resolution No. 6, on May 25, 1989, during the Regular Session of the 71st Texas Legislature, by which Texas lawmakers approved the amendment.

A common sense proposal, the amendment reads quite simply: "No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened."

In other words, Members may set congressional salaries for the next term of office, but may not adjust their own wages during their current term.

It is safe to say, Mr. Speaker, that the 27th Amendment would never have made its way into the Federal Constitution were it not for the dogged persistence of an employee in the Texas House of Representatives by the name of Gregory Watson. Back in March 1982, Mr. Watson was a 19-year-old student at the University of Texas at Austin. At the same time, he had just recently been hired to work part-time for a Texas state representative at the nearby state Capitol building.

As instructed, Watson wrote a paper for a course entitled "American Government" at the University. He ended up choosing as the topic for that paper a still-pending proposed constitutional amendment that Congress had offered to the state legislatures for ratification some 192 years earlier. Intrigued, Watson argued in his paper that despite the proposed constitutional amendment having lingered before the nation's state legislatures since the year 1789, it was still needed as a means of holding Congress accountable for its actions relative to Members' salary and he pointed out, in the paper, that the proposal had no deadline by which America's state lawmakers must have taken action. Hence, despite its age, the proposed amendment was still technically pending business before our country's state legislatures.

Watson turned in the academic paper and was disappointed to get it back later with a grade of "C" on it. He also received a "C" in

the course overall. That stood for some 35 years until March 2017 when the overall course grade was officially raised to an "A" by UT-Austin upon formal petition of Watson's former professor.

Undaunted at the time by the original low grade on his term paper, Watson began in the spring of 1982 reaching out to seek sponsorship of the proposed constitutional amendment in the various state capitols across the United States. He was intent upon this amendment ultimately finding its way formally into the U.S. Constitution. The following year, 1983, the Maine Legislature became Watson's first success story. After that, in 1984, Colorado's lawmakers gave their approval. And from that point forward—with Watson vigorously pushing every step of the way—its momentum quickened until the proposal officially became the 27th Amendment to the Federal Constitution on May 5, 1992, a decade after Watson first learned of it.

From 1982 to present, Mr. Watson has been an institution in the halls of the Texas State Capitol in Austin, having been employed in both the Texas House of Representatives and Texas Senate, during his decades-long career as state legislative staff. Working for a number of my then-colleagues, it was there that I first came to know Mr. Watson.

To commemorate the quarter century of the 27th Amendment's presence within the U.S. Constitution, and at the same time to congratulate Mr. Watson on the March 2017 raising of his overall course grade from "C" to "A", I include in the RECORD an article from the March 14, 2017, edition of the Austin American-Statesman.

Mr. Speaker, as we in the Congress debate various proposals to amend the Federal Constitution, it is important that we keep in mind the lessons that the 27th Amendment's unconventional path to ratification teach us about the power of the American people's wishes to ultimately prevail in our deliberations.

HERMAN: 35 YEARS LATER, A+ FOR AUSTINITE WHO GOT CONSTITUTION AMENDED?

(By Ken Herman—American-Statesman Staff)

Looks like we're heading for a happier new ending on a happy old story that some of you might not know about. Gregory Watson seems headed for an upgrade.

We begin back in spring 1982 when Watson, then a University of Texas student, signed up for Sharon Waite's GOV 310 course on American Government. For his term paper, young Watson researched the proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, a hot topic of the day.

But Watson diverted when he came upon a book that listed other proposed constitutional amendments proposed but never ratified by the required three-fourths of the states.

"And this one instantly jumped out at me," he recalled.

"This one" was proposed in 1789 and concerned congressional pay raises. At the time Watson believed six states had ratified it, with the most recent being Virginia in 1791. (This turned out to be wrong; two others later did.)

Another key year here is 1917. Before that, Congress did not put expiration dates on proposed constitutional amendments. That meant the 1789 one was still in play, and this gave birth to a term paper Watson recalls he

titled, "Can a proposed constitutional amendment to the U.S. Constitution offered by Congress in 1789 still be ratified by the state legislatures after all these years?"

OK, not a title that smoothly rolls off the tongue, but on point.

The amendment says any pay hike members of Congress OK for themselves can't take effect until after the subsequent U.S. House election. The topic was hot in the early 1980s because in 1981 Congress had, in Watson's words, "slipped itself a sneaky pay raise" by tucking it into a coal miner health care bill.

So Watson turned his paper in to the course teaching assistant, who gave it a C-. Watson, a persistent fellow, appealed to Waite.

"She said she'd take a look at it. So I gave it to her," Watson told me. "And then the next class period, she kind of physically tossed it back at me and said, 'No change.'"

He got a C in the course and says he was "kind of, sort of" angry at Waite and the T.A. "So I said, 'I will not let this disappoint me. I will go out and get that thing ratified,'" Watson said.

He did, starting by contacting lawmakers in Maine in 1983. Watson's thing became the 27th (and most recent) amendment to the U.S. Constitution in 1992.

And that was that. The U.S. Constitution had a new amendment. And Watson still had a C in GOV 310.

About a year ago, UT government professor Zach Elkins and KUT Managing Editor Matt Largey contacted Watson and expressed interest in his story, but Watson didn't know what they were up to.

He found out March 4, live and on stage at the Paramount Theatre, where he had been invited for what he thought was to be a Q&A about his involvement in amending the U.S. Constitution. His story was one of several told at something called Pop-Up Magazine, which is kind of a live newsmagazine. Several other topics came up before Largey's telling of Watson's story, who then was invited on stage.

"It was at that point that professor Elkins handed me the envelope," Watson said.

The envelope contained an Update of Student Academic Record form requesting that his 1982 grade in the government course be changed from C to A+. It was signed by Waite.

In the space for "Explanation of error, delay or special circumstances," Waite wrote, "In light of the student's heroic efforts to prove the professor and T.A. wrong in their assessment of his term paper, Mr. Watson deserves an A+."

(FYI, UT doesn't do plus or minus grades so, if the form is approved, Watson's grade in the course will become an A.)

Waite, who was a lecturer at UT from 1981 to 1983, now works on a Mission citrus farm that's been in her family since 1922. Thanks to Watson's achievement, she proudly calls herself "a footnote to a footnote of history."

But she says C was the proper course grade at the time because she thought his theory about getting the constitutional amendment ratified was far-fetched. "I thought it couldn't be done," she said. "So he just proceeded to prove me wrong."

"Hey, a lowly lecturer has had more effect on the Constitution than anybody in the professorial ranks," Waite said with a laugh.

Elkins said he teaches about Watson's effort as an inspiring example of "heroic citizenship."

"We just need the dean's signature, and it's done," Elkins said of the grade change effort.

If this gets rejected, nobody should ever wear burnt orange again.

Largey remains understandably fascinated by Watson's story, which he has told at Pop-Up Magazine events in San Francisco; Washington; New York; Portland, Ore.; and Seattle.

"He is one of a kind," he said of Watson. Largey's KUT story about Watson is scheduled to air at 6:45 and 8:45 a.m. Tuesday. You also should be able to find it at KUT.org.

Happier ending upcoming, indeed. And you might have a chance to make it even happier. Watson, 54, long has struggled financially as he worked in the government world, where jobs come and go.

Watson never graduated from college. He's been pretty much a constant presence at the Texas Capitol since 1982, where he's worked for 15 different lawmakers. He moved to Austin City Hall in 2015 to work for then-Council Member Don Zimmerman. When Zimmerman was defeated last year, Watson was out of work. He's now an aide to Rep. Stephanie Klick, R-Fort Worth.

In addition to the government jobs, Watson has moonlighted in retail and has bused tables at a downtown restaurant. His current legislative job ends when the legislative session ends in May. He needs a job after that. Maybe you know of something.

I can tell you Watson knows his way around government and got the U.S. Constitution amended.

And, assuming the change gets OK'd, he got an A in GOV 310.

One more thing: Yes, Watson still has his 1982 term paper—somewhere.

"I have tried and tried and tried to find that thing," he said. "I don't know where I put it. It's not the type of thing I would have thrown in the garbage. So it's somewhere. And I'm one of these funny people that keeps everything, so I've got storage unit after storage unit. It's somewhere in a box in a storage unit."

"Hopefully, the termites haven't gotten to it."

They wouldn't dare.

HONORING SANTA CRUZ CHIEF OF POLICE KEVIN VOGEL

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Santa Cruz Chief of Police Kevin Vogel for his 30 years of service to the Santa Cruz Police Department, and the community it serves.

Chief Vogel has dedicated his entire career to the people of Santa Cruz, and was first sworn in as a cadet for the SCPD in June 1987. Throughout his long and distinguished career, Chief Vogel has served in numerous capacities in the Department, including as a patrol officer, traffic officer and detective. He was promoted to sergeant in January 1995 where he served as a patrol supervisor, downtown supervisor and detective sergeant. He was promoted to lieutenant in 2002, and to Deputy Chief of Police in May 2004. He was appointed as the City's 21st Chief of Police on December 9, 2010.

A champion of creative and transparent community-oriented policing, Chief Vogel oversaw the implementation of a highly suc-

cessful and innovative predictive policing program. This program utilizes technology based on earthquake prediction technology, and was praised by numerous media outlets and law enforcement agencies around the country, including The New York Times, ABC World News, and was even named as one of Time Magazine's "50 Best New Inventions" of 2011. More important than the accolades however, was the significant reduction in crime rates experienced under the program. Under Chief Vogel's leadership, Santa Cruz policing became a model for the nation.

Chief Vogel also shouldered the impossible task of guiding the SCPD through its greatest hardship that occurred on February 26, 2013 when two officers, Sgt. Loran "Butch" Baker and Detective Elizabeth Butler, were tragically gunned down in the line of duty. This devastating crime shook our community to its core as we all mourned the loss of these fallen heroes. Through this time of uncertainty, Chief Vogel acted with honor and poise. He memorialized his fallen officers beautifully, and guided a deeply aggrieved department and community through this very difficult time. As time has passed, Chief Vogel ensured that the memories of Sgt. Baker and Detective Butler will not fade, and challenges his officers every day to honor their legacy and ultimate sacrifice by continuing to selflessly perform the work of upholding public safety in their communities.

Mr. Speaker, as someone who has dedicated their career to public service, it is my pleasure to add my name to the chorus of thanks and congratulations to someone who embodies that ideal of service to others. I wholeheartedly congratulate Chief Kevin Vogel on his retirement, and wish him all the best. There is no doubt that his commitment to justice, security, and prosperity for his community of Santa Cruz will serve as an enduring legacy.

DANIEL ARREDONDO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Daniel Arredondo for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Daniel Arredondo is a student at Wayne Carle Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Daniel Arredondo is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Daniel Arredondo for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING JAMES EDWIN GASPER
ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. NEAL P. DUNN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of James Edwin Gasper, who today celebrates 90 years on this earth.

James, or "Jimmy" as his friends know him, moved to Washington County, Florida in 1932 with his mother, father and brothers and, with the exception of his time serving our nation during World War II, has lived there ever since.

In 1945, Mr. Gasper enlisted in the Army Air Corps and was assigned to 1223 Military Police Company in Bad Kissingen, Germany—ultimately completing his tour of duty in 1947 as a member of the newly-minted United States Air Force in Fürstenfeldbruck, Germany. Mr. Gasper's service earned him the WWII Victory and Army Occupation medals, and he was qualified as Marksman for both Pistol and Carbine.

After returning home from his time in the service, Mr. Gasper married the love of his life, the late Nellie Gasper, and raised a family that has grown from four children to include six grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren. Mr. Gasper also went on to dedicate 40 years to the Florida Department of Transportation and served Washington County by setting up voting machines for all local elections.

Mr. Gasper is a lifelong member of the National Rifle Association of America, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the VFW Military Order of the Cootie, Disabled American Veterans, the DAV National Order of the Trench Rats, and above all else, is a devout member of the Church of Christ.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring a great American of the Greatest Generation on his 90th birthday, James Edwin Gasper.

HONORING DR. L. FRANCES P.
LIDDELL

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. L. Frances P. Liddell's dedicated commitment of service to her community and her services to the conference of Minority Public Administrators (COMPA) and the National Planning Committee.

Dr. L. Frances P. Liddell was awarded by the renaming of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA), in her honor, to the Dr. L. Frances P. Liddell Student Policy Debate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dr. L. Frances P. Liddell.

IMPORTANCE OF INTERNATIONAL
STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS FOR
THE UNITED STATES

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a globally engaged and welcoming United States. Historically, hosting international students and scholars at our colleges and universities has been one of the most important ways America reinforces those values. We all need to recognize the vital contributions that international students, scholars and their families make when we welcome them to this great country.

Welcoming international students and scholars strengthens our diplomatic ties with countries across the globe and increases our national security.

International students and scholars who have spent time in the United States become informal ambassadors when they return home, sharing an appreciation for common values, counteracting stereotypes about the U.S., and enhancing respect for cultural differences.

Likewise, the ability to perform and compete globally is a vital component of a 21st century education. While less than 2 percent of U.S. students study abroad each year, having international students on our campuses can better prepare U.S. students to succeed as global citizens.

International students also contribute to the economic well-being of the United States. According to NAFSA: Association of International Educators, international students and their families supported 400,000 jobs and contributed nearly \$33 billion to the U.S. economy during the 2015 to 2016 academic year.

In my district, during the 2015 to 2016 academic year, 12,249 international students and their families contributed \$359.7 million, supporting 5,967 jobs.

May is a critical month on the college calendar. It is the traditional end of the academic year, when graduation ceremonies take place across the country. But it is also a time when prospective students make their final choice on where they plan to study in the fall.

Actions taken by this administration, most significantly the Travel Ban Executive Order, have generated a great deal of uncertainty within U.S. colleges and universities. Many currently enrolled international students may choose not to travel home at the end of the academic year, for fear they might not be allowed to return in the fall.

Unsurprisingly, for prospective students, nearly 40 percent of higher education institutions reported application declines for the first time in many years.

Moreover, the anti-immigrant rhetoric and uncertainty created by our broken immigration system make the United States less attractive to the students and scholars who we want to contribute to our campuses and communities.

To ensure our nation's security, economic well-being, and academic leadership, we must remain an open and welcoming United States. So, to the international students and scholars who may be unsure about coming, I say: Your

contributions are valued and you are welcome here.

SUPPORTING MONTENEGRO
JOINING NATO

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. MOULTON of Massachusetts, in strong support of the small but strategically important country of Montenegro. This past weekend, Montenegro celebrated the eleventh anniversary of its independence. This week, President Trump will attend the NATO Summit in Brussels, where Montenegro will be officially welcomed as a new Member.

Along with the gentlewoman from Maine, I chair the Congressional Montenegro Caucus. The goal of the Caucus is simple: to educate Members of Congress on U.S.-Montenegro relations and show the people of Montenegro that they have friends here in the United States, including the U.S. Congress.

Over the last year, the relationship between the United States and Montenegro has received greater attention here on Capitol Hill. I rise today to ask my colleagues to continue to devote time and attention over the year ahead on this important alliance.

Indeed, in an overwhelming display of bipartisanship on March 28th the Senate ratified accession of Montenegro to become the 29th member of NATO. On April 11th, President Trump signed a Presidential Memoranda codifying this significant landmark.

I am proud to also share that on April 27th our counterparts—the elected representatives in the Montenegrin Parliament—voted 46–0 to ratify accession to NATO.

Eleven years ago this week, the people of Montenegro voted in favor of peacefully becoming an independent state and dissolving the union with Serbia. Shortly thereafter, all five members of the United Nations Security Council recognized the newest country in the world, beginning a new chapter in the history of trans-Atlantic relations regional and history.

The events of the last few weeks and the last 11 years demonstrate the truest form of representative democracy. Civil debate here on Capitol Hill and in Podgorica among elected leaders representing the will of our constituents has shown the world that democracy remains the best form of government, despite its imperfections. As Churchill said, "No one pretends that democracy is perfect or all-wise. Indeed it has been said that democracy is the worst form of Government, except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time." [Churchill By Himself, 2013]

The inclusion of Montenegro into NATO will strengthen regional and trans-Atlantic security, and sends a strong message of the importance of democratic values. As my colleagues know, democratic values—transparency, equal justice and rule of law—must constantly be fostered. Accession into NATO has allowed Montenegro to advance toward these values. It is our responsibility as a Congress to help

this new nation further embrace Euro-Atlantic integration and to increase its ability to fight organized crime and corruption.

Meanwhile, American business leaders likewise play a vital role. For example, the Stratex Group, the largest American investor in Montenegro with roots in Massachusetts, continues to work alongside our Embassy to foster stronger bilateral relations and a commitment by all Montenegrin elected officials—local and federal—to these democratic values we all hold dear. Only two places in Montenegro fly the American flag: the U.S. Embassy and the Stratex properties.

Beyond strengthening our formal diplomatic alliance, my colleagues here in Congress must endeavor to creatively promote stronger ties in at least two ways.

First, the State Partnership between the Maine National Guard and Montenegro has been successfully building relationships for over a decade, linking a unique component of the U.S. Department of Defense with the armed forces of Montenegro in a cooperative, mutually beneficial relationship. Through this program, the U.S. National Guard conducts military-to-military engagements in support of defense security goals but also leverages whole-of-society relationships and capabilities to facilitate broader interagency and corollary engagements spanning military, government, economic and social spheres.

Second, we must support business and cultural diplomacy—in Montenegro and around the world, encouraging our diplomats to have a greater appreciation for American investments in emerging democracies. To attract additional investment, Montenegro must fully commit to the rule of law, transparency and an independent judiciary. With the continued focus from the United States, I am confident Montenegrin government leaders will continue down the path of reform.

The Congressional Montenegro Caucus congratulates Montenegro on their achievements as they finally have a seat at the table at this week's NATO meeting, and stands in support of a stable, secure Europe based on collective self-defense, economic freedom, the rule of law, and democracy.

—
GRIFFIN CROSS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Griffin Cross for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Griffin Cross is a student at Arvada West High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Griffin Cross is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Griffin Cross for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge

Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

—
CONGRATULATIONS TO JORDAN
VALLEY INNOVATION CENTER

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Jordan Valley Innovation Center on 10 years of dedication to new and innovative ideas.

The Jordan Valley Innovation Center is a place where students at Missouri State University and the private sector come together and work towards creating and researching the development of new technologies. As technology continues to change, it's important to have hands-on opportunities like the ones provided by the Jordan Valley Innovation Center.

Construction began for the center in 2005 and two years later, construction was completed. Since then the Jordan Valley Innovation Center has been a vital part of southwest Missouri and its success.

I am honored to recognize Jordan Valley Innovation Center on its 10-year anniversary. I look forward to watching this center grow as it continues to be a place of learning and creating. On behalf of Missouri's 7th Congressional District, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Jordan Valley Innovation Center on all its success.

—
GEORGE R. DUNLAP

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. George R. Dunlap, a U.S. Navy and Coast Guard veteran from Kansas City who served in both World War II and the Korean War. As one of four brothers to serve in active duty, George enlisted right after high school graduation on his eighteenth birthday in 1945. After his years of service, George moved to Kansas City where he devoted twenty-five years of his life to the Kansas City Police Department.

George's example of lifelong service to his country and community deserves our utmost appreciation. I am honored to share my gratitude and respect for this wonderful Missourian and applaud George for his dedication to serve and protect our country. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Mr. Dunlap and all those who serve our great nation.

INTRODUCTION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT THE SENATE SHOULD GIVE ITS ADVICE AND CONSENT TO THE RATIFICATION OF THE CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (CEDAW)

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the sense of the House of Representatives that the Senate should give its advice and consent to the ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).

CEDAW is a landmark international agreement that calls on governments to take appropriate measures to end discrimination against women in all areas of life. The Convention seeks to develop women's equality in legal status, human rights, political participation, employment, education and healthcare, while committing countries to change or eradicate discriminatory laws, customs, and practices.

Despite 189 countries ratifying CEDAW, the United States is the only industrialized country in the world that has not ratified the treaty, even though its fundamental principles of equality and nondiscrimination are paramount to the ideals of our nation. Other nations that have not ratified CEDAW include Somalia and Iran.

CEDAW is not self-executing, but would be a powerful statement uniting the U.S. with most of the world in its commitment to women's rights and equality. Any legislation the United States might adopt to comply with the treaty would have to go through the normal Congressional process.

Ratification of CEDAW would continue our nation's proud bipartisan tradition of promoting and protecting human rights. Senate action in favor of ratification of CEDAW would strengthen our standing as a global leader for the rights of women and girls. I hope my colleagues will cosponsor this important resolution that will benefit women in the U.S. and around the world.

—
HONORING CYNTHIA LEON

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate A. Cynthia Leon on her reappointment as Chairman of the Texas Public Safety Commission.

On March 8, 2017, Governor Greg Abbott reappointed Cynthia to the Texas Public Safety Commission. Originally appointed in 2011 by then Governor Rick Perry, Cynthia served as the Commission's chairman from April 2012 to March 2017. Prior to serving on the Texas

Public Safety Commission, Cynthia served as regional director for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Cynthia also served our country for 25 years in the U.S. Navy Reserves, retiring with the rank of captain.

Outside of her work on the Texas Public Safety Commission, Cynthia is an active member of her community. She is a member of the International Women's Forum and Leadership Texas, previously chairing the Dallas-Fort Worth and San Antonio Federal Executive Boards. Cynthia is also a life member of the Naval Reserve Association, Navy League, U.S. Naval Institute and the Reserve Officers Association.

Mr. Speaker, I again congratulate Cynthia on her well-deserved reappointment. I know that she will continue to lead the Texas Public Safety Commission in the right direction.

JOSIAH DOMINGUEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Josiah Dominguez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Josiah Dominguez is a student at Arvada K-8 School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Josiah Dominguez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Josiah Dominguez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING GROVER HOLMES
HORTON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Mrs. Grover Holmes Horton.

Mrs. Horton, born June 15, 1938, left to be with the Lord on May 7, 2016. She was a great mother, grandmother, great-grandmother, sister and friend.

Mrs. Horton was a God-fearing member of Goodman Missionary Baptist Church under the leadership of Rev. Dr. Nathaniel Christian. She was a very dedicated member who served in the choir and was the Secretary in her church.

Mrs. Horton was very active and became the founder of Goodman Male Chorus and a member of Tri-City Gospel Choir.

Mrs. Horton served with the John L. Webb Grand High Court, Prince Hall Affiliation—F&M as the Most Ancient Matron of Goodman Court No. 91 in Goodman, MS; the 7th District Lecturer; and the 7th District past Most Ancient Matron.

Mrs. Horton enjoyed working as a home liaison for the Holmes County School District and was also a Certified Election Poll Worker for many years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the late Mrs. Grover Holmes Horton.

CHRISTOPHER TRAPANI

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Mr. Christopher Trapani as a member of the United States Merchant Marine Academy Class of 2017.

Christopher will graduate from the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy on June 17, 2017, with a Bachelor of Science and he will be commissioned as an Ensign in the United States Navy Reserve.

His career in the service has just begun, but it is a testament to Christopher's unselfish devotion to the people of this great nation.

The challenges will be many and the time, although it may seem like an eternity, will fly by almost unnoticed.

South Mississippi is proud of Christopher and his accomplishments. We look forward to him continuing to represent not only Mississippi, but the entire nation, as a United States Navy Reserve officer.

As Christopher embarks on a new chapter in life, it is my hope that he may always recall with a deep sense of pride and accomplishment graduating from a program as prestigious as the Merchant Marine Academy.

I would like to send Christopher my best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors, thank him for his service, and congratulate him on this momentous occasion.

IN MEMORY OF THE LIFE OF DR.
DORIS MITCHELL OLIVEIRA

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life of Dr. Doris Mitchell Oliveira who passed away on May 10, 2017.

Dr. Oliveira was born February 9, 1934 to the late Dr. Joseph Mitchell, Sr., M.D. and Mrs. Vivian J. Mitchell. Her father was an obstetrician-gynecologist physician in Macon County, Alabama, and her mother was known for her work with the American Red Cross.

Dr. Oliveira graduated from Tuskegee University College of Veterinary Medicine and was still working at the age of 83 when her health began to decline.

She was a member of the Alabama New South Coalition, Tuskegee Chapter of Links, Inc., the Republican Party of Macon County and a past member of the Board of Trustees at the University of West Alabama.

She is survived by her son Manuel Joseph Oliveira and brother, Dr. Joseph Mitchell, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating the life of Dr. Oliveira. She will be greatly missed.

JUAN FLORES

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Juan Flores for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Juan Flores is a student at Jefferson High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Juan Flores is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Juan Flores for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call No. 268 (Probation Officer Protection Act of 2017), I inadvertently voted Yea. My intention was to vote Nay.

CONGRATULATING LEON J.
ZIMMERMAN

HON. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is our honor to congratulate Leon J. Zimmerman of Trenton, New Jersey on his retirement after a 50 year career spanning governmental affairs, public relations, journalism, and communications.

Operating his own consulting firm for 44 years, Mr. Zimmerman was a highly regarded veteran of the New Jersey state lobbying corps. During his career, he represented several clients, including government agencies, businesses, private corporations, and trade

associations. He also represented clients from industries like insurance, harness racing, and security alarms. One of these was the Professional Insurance Agents of New Jersey (PIANJ), which he represented for 43 years. PIANJ will be honoring Mr. Zimmerman at their convention in June 2017. Moreover, prior to starting his own public relations firm, Mr. Zimmerman was a national award-winning journalist for more than 12 years with the *Bergen Record*.

Throughout his career, Mr. Zimmerman held several positions and received numerous accolades. From his service to the insurance industry, he was recognized with the PIANJ Legislative Award in 1990 and received PIANJ's Distinguished Insurance Service Award in 1998—the first time this award was presented to an individual who was not an insurance industry official. During his work on harness racing, he served as President of the North American Harness Publicists Association, President and Chairman of the U.S. Harness Writers Association, and the founding President of the Association's New Jersey Chapter. He also received the Harness Horsemen International Media Award in 2006, North American Harness Publicists Golden Pen Award in 2000, and the U.S. Harness Writers Member of the Year Award in 1998 and 2011. In addition, for his work in the security alarm industry, Mr. Zimmerman was recognized with the NJ Burglar and Fire Alarm Association President's Award in 1992 and 2004, and he was honored with the National Burglar and Fire Alarm Association Executive Director of the Year Award in 1992.

Mr. Zimmerman was also involved in other professional and civic activities. For example, he served as President of the New Jersey Legislative Correspondents Club, and he was a speaker for courses and seminars in high schools and universities. In addition, Mr. Zimmerman was an advocate for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. He served on the Governor's Council on the Prevention of Developmental Disabilities, and he was a member of the Board of Trustees of Bancroft, a leading nonprofit, and of the Association for the Advancement of the Mentally Handicapped, Mercer County Chapter. He was also Executive Committee member and Chairman of Committees on Legislation and Advocacy for the New Jersey State Developmental Disabilities Council.

Mr. Speaker, we sincerely hope that our colleagues will join us in congratulating Mr. Zimmerman on his retirement after his illustrious career and thanking him for his service to the public and his community in New Jersey.

HONORING REVEREND MANNEY
MURPHY

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a multi-talented God-fearing man, Reverend Manney Murphy. Reverend Manney Murphy has been many things in his life: A star athlete at Vicksburg High

School, executive with General Motors, business owner and for 3½ years the pastor of St. Mark Baptist Church, and chaplain for the Alcorn State University Braves football team during Jay Hopson's tenure as head coach. But his biggest role has been working with Central Mississippi Prevention Services helping young people make it to a better life through the program's summer camps and tutoring programs.

When he was a student at Ole Miss, he was asked to go to high schools and participate in special programs to speak to students. When he attended United Theological Seminary, he wrote two covenants: one for youth ministry and another for jail and prison ministry.

Murphy returned to Vicksburg in 2001 and began working with Central Mississippi Prevention director, Joe Johnson. Murphy has also served as director of the Vicksburg Housing Authority's community center, helping develop a jobs program, a GED program partnered with Hinds Community College and the Vicksburg Warren School District, and an after school tutorial program.

Murphy said at this point in his life he would like to return to the classroom to teach and work on a summer camp program called "Camp Wow," and find other ways to serve Vicksburg.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Reverend Manney Murphy for his hard work, dedication and a strong desire to serve God and community.

HONORING THE GRADUATION OF
ASHLEE VICTORIA PEREZ

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the graduation of Ashlee Victoria Perez from St. Mary's University in San Antonio, Texas, with the Class of 2017.

Marco Antonio Perez and Claudia Perez are very proud of their daughter, who graduated with a Bachelor's Degree in Exercise and Sports Science. Ashlee averaged an exceptional Grade-Point-Average of 3.7 during her time at St. Mary's, all while maintaining active membership in the national sorority Sigma Sigma Sigma, becoming the captain of the cheer squad, and earning the Academic Madeline Scholarship. Her achievements are a testament to her work ethic and perseverance.

Mr. Speaker, I wish only the best for Ashlee in all her endeavors and know her future is filled with limitless possibilities.

MAKHMUD CHARIEV

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Makhmud Chariev for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Makhmud Chariev is a student at Standley Lake High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Makhmud Chariev is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Makhmud Chariev for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

TRUMPSCARE, OR THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2018 BUDGET

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of our values and priorities as a nation.

Sadly, the President's budget fails this moral test of government.

This budget does not reflect our dreams for our nation; rather it is the "Nightmare on Pennsylvania Avenue."

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the President loves TrumpCare so much that he decided to double down and give us "TrumpScare" for a budget.

This TrumpScare budget stacks the deck for the rich while undermining hard-working Americans everywhere.

Throwing billions at defense while ransacking America's investments in jobs, education, clean energy and lifesaving medical research will leave our nation weakened.

America will not be made great by stealing another \$610 billion from Medicaid, abandoning seniors and families in need, depriving students of realizing a dream to attend college without drowning in debt, or disinvesting in the working families to give unwanted tax breaks to wealthy corporations and the top 1 percent.

America will not be positioned to compete and win in the global, interconnected, and digital economy by slashing funding for scientific research, the arts and humanities, job retraining, and clean energy.

And the President's TrumpScare budget does not "put America First" by cutting Social Security Disability Insurance benefits and Meals on Wheels for Americans who depend upon these programs to sustain themselves.

Even a cursory review leaves the inescapable conclusion that this budget represents a betrayal—of our values as a nation, and of the promises made by the President during the election campaign.

Just like the "TrumpRussia" scandal, we have another mystery and the question is: "Whodunit?"

So the real question is whether the budgetary priorities in the budget represent a betrayal of the President, or a betrayal by the

President of the promises he made repeatedly to the American people?

The answer to this question will tell us all we need to know about this budget and this President.

THEY'RE NOT COMING HOME

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this Memorial Day in honor and remembrance of all The Fallen who gave That Last Full Measure. I include in the RECORD this poem penned in their honor by Albert Carey Caswell.

THEY'RE NOT COMING HOME

(By Albert Carey Caswell)

They're not coming home
To their families where they belong,
who now must live so all alone
And to their Brothers In Arms,
who heard their last most heroic moans
No, they're not coming home
As up to Heaven they have flown
On the wings of an Angel which they now own
As Angels In The Army Lord to fight this new battle,
but not alone
They are not coming home
Could any of us such courage own?
And go off to war
And leave all that you so love and adore
For all the more
And for all their Brothers and Sisters to their left,
to their right endure
Oh the dreaded cost and horrors of war
Am sorry my dear child,
your Daddy or Mommy are not here no more
To hold you and tell you how much you they adore
To tuck you in at night
To assure you everything's all right
I know it's hard to hold the tears back you fight
Daddy, Mommy, oh how I wish you were here tonight!
As it gets harder to see their face with each year insight
But, they're not coming home
And as you awake in the middle of the night
Hush my child and don't you cry,
everything is going to be all right
Your parents are Angels now at the height
As they watch over you in the middle of the night
Both day and night,
as you will always be in their sights
Can't you feel their angel's breath envelop you,
and hold you so very tight
And one day up in Heaven together again
you'll take flight
America, on this blessed day
Give thanks,
and give your most solemn praise
As you kneel and pray
For all those heroes who gave
That Last Full Measure,
who make up the home of the free and brave
On this Memorial Day
Give thanks to all of those who gave
As out to their loved ones call each and every day
And tell them how much their sacrifice means to us in every way

For the real heroes are the ones who fell,
who now lie in deep dark cold quiet graves I do tell

Who on Christmas mornings we no longer hear,
their laughter as they appear

Even the warm memories we take,
in our hearts still can't replace
Just to look into their face
Oh how your hearts break
Cause they're not coming home
But, in a box with the names they own
And some will never be found,
only our Lord God knows them now
No, they're not coming home
Sadly, for any Nation to grow and thrive
Our most precious and most courageous of all loved ones must die
Must lay down their lives
As it the price of freedom so very high
The price all of their loved ones so despise
Who must now live with tears in eyes
The magnificents who upon this Nation relies
Am so sorry but they're not coming home to-night
Amen

JACOB KEESE HOLLAND

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Mr. Jacob Holland as a member of the United States Air Force Academy Class of 2017.

Jacob will graduate from the U.S. Air Force Academy with a Bachelor of Science in Biology on May 24, 2017, and he will be commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the United States Air Force.

His career in the service has just begun, but it is a testament to Jacob's unselfish devotion to the people of this great nation.

The challenges will be many and the time, although it may seem like an eternity, will fly by almost unnoticed.

South Mississippi is proud of Jacob and his accomplishments. We look forward to him continuing to represent not only Mississippi, but the entire nation, as a United States Air Force officer.

As Jacob embarks on a new chapter in life, it is my hope that he may always recall with a deep sense of pride and accomplishment graduating from a program as prestigious as the Air Force Academy.

I would like to send Jacob my best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors, thank him for his service, and congratulate him on this momentous occasion.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Monday, May 22, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 1862 and H.R. 1842.

TOM CLARK

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tom Clark for his leadership, vision and lasting impact on Denver and Colorado as the CEO of the Metro Economic Development Corporation and Executive Vice President of the Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce.

With more than 30 years of economic development experience at the state, regional, county and city level, Tom's unique perspective and wealth of knowledge is unparalleled. Tom's career spans four decades from Director of Commercial and Industrial Development for the Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, through positions with the Fort Collins Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Denver Corporation, the Boulder Chamber of Commerce, the Jefferson Economic Council, and the Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce.

Tom was the founder and first president of the Metro Denver Network, the Metro Denver region's first economic development program, for which he received the Arthur D. Little Award for Excellence in Economic Development. In 2012, Tom was recognized as the Denver Post's Business Person of the Year as well as awarded the Denver Business Journal's Power Book Award for Economic Development and Government. He has also been recognized as one of the nation's top economic development professionals by the Council on Urban Economic Development.

I extend my deepest appreciation for Tom and his dedication to our great state, and wish him the best of luck in retirement and future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CLIFTON THOMAS WALKER

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to honor the life of Mr. Clifton Thomas Walker, who passed away on April 25, 2017, at the age of 95. Throughout his life, Mr. Walker was a respected leader in our community and an exemplary husband, father, and grandfather. His dedicated service, with the U.S. Marine Corps, Loudoun County Sheriff's Office, and Lovettsville Volunteer Fire & Rescue Department, helped keep the people of Virginia's Tenth District safe for over 50 years, and he will always be remembered.

Mr. Walker, originally from Bullock, North Carolina, joined the Marine Corps in December of 1941 just three days after the bombing of Pearl Harbor. During his 20 years in the Marine Corps, he was stationed around the world, serving in Northern Ireland, Guam, Okinawa, Washington, DC, and Lebanon. Additionally, he was a decorated member of the Marine Corps Pistol Team, receiving bronze,

silver, and gold medals, and he achieved the rank of Distinguished Pistol Shot in record time.

In May of 1959, Mr. Walker married his wife, Elaine, and they began building their home on South Berlin Pike in Lovettsville, Virginia, where they lived since Mr. Walker's retirement from the Marine Corps in 1961. Mr. Walker went on to work for DECO Electronics in Leesburg, the Painter Lumber Company in Lovettsville, and finally the Loudoun County Sheriff's Office, where he served for thirteen years as the manager of the Department's Office of Property and Evidence.

During that time, Mr. Walker also served his community in various capacities. He was previously a member of the Lovettsville Town Council, the Lovettsville Planning Commission, and the Lovettsville Lions Club. He also volunteered for 35 years, starting in 1966, as a member of the Lovettsville Rescue Squad, which chartered as the Lovettsville District Volunteer Fire and Rescue Company, Inc. In recognition of his honorable service, he received the second Rescueman of the Year Award in 1971 and the Most Dedicated Member of the Year Award in 1980. Through his long and impressive career Mr. Walker became one of the most well respected members of the entire fire Company, and the memory of his dedication to service will always be present as a true inspiration to our local community.

Mr. Walker leaves behind a selfless legacy and career of service and will be greatly missed by the countless lives he has touched. He is survived by his wife, Elaine, and three daughters, Debbie, Linda and Carol, his grandson, Brandon, and many nieces and nephews.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating the life of, and bidding farewell to, Clifton Thomas Walker. May he rest in peace, and his family be comforted.

RECOGNIZING THE 99TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC DAY OF AZERBAIJAN

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 99th anniversary of the Republic Day of Azerbaijan, and to extend my best wishes to all Azerbaijanis as they celebrate Republic Day. May 28th marks the founding of the Democratic Republic of Azerbaijan, when the people of Azerbaijan first gained their independence from the Russian Empire in 1918. Although Azerbaijan's independence was ended by Soviet forces in 1920, it is noteworthy that the Democratic Republic of Azerbaijan was the world's first secular parliamentary democratic republic in a predominantly Muslim nation—earning diplomatic recognition from the United States during the administration of President Woodrow Wilson. We also recall, with admiration, that the Democratic Republic of Azerbaijan granted universal suffrage to its citizens in 1918, making it the first Muslim country to give women the right to vote.

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Azerbaijan restored its independence on October 18, 1991, when its Parliament adopted the Constitution Act on the Restoration of the State of Independence of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

For the people of Azerbaijan, these last two decades of independence have not been without challenges. At the top of the list would be the ongoing conflict with Armenia. Although a cease fire was signed in 1994 more than 20 percent of Azerbaijan's territory—including Nagorno-Karabakh and seven surrounding districts—remains under Armenian occupation and more than 1 million Azerbaijanis remain refugees unable to return to their home villages. In 1993, the U.N. Security Council adopted four resolutions demanding complete, unconditional and immediate withdrawal of Armenian forces from the occupied territories of Azerbaijan. I am happy that Azerbaijan is committed to a peaceful resolution of the conflict with Armenia, and I support a swift and peaceful resolution to this conflict as well.

Azerbaijan is a key global security partner for the United States. As an active member of NATO's Partnership for Peace program, Azerbaijan cooperates with the United States in countering terrorism, nuclear proliferation, and narcotics trafficking. Azerbaijani troops serve shoulder to shoulder with U.S. soldiers in Afghanistan, as they previously did in Kosovo and Iraq. In support of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, Azerbaijan has extended important over-flight clearances for U.S. and NATO flights as well as regularly providing landing and refueling operations at its airports for U.S. and NATO forces. Azerbaijan also plays an important role in the Northern Distribution Network, a supply route to Afghanistan, by making available its ground and Caspian naval transportation facilities.

Azerbaijan has emerged as a key player for enhancing global energy security. The Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan oil pipeline and the Baku-Tbilisi-Erzurum gas pipeline are the main arteries delivering Caspian Sea energy resources to global markets, and completion of the Southern Gas Corridor—which will run from the Caspian Sea through Azerbaijan, Georgia, Turkey, Greece, and Albania into Italy—will increase the energy security of key American allies by increasing the amount of natural gas from the Caspian Sea to European markets.

Notably, Azerbaijan also provides roughly 40 percent of Israel's oil consumption. What may be more surprising to some is that Azerbaijan—a predominantly Muslim country—enjoys friendly ties with Israel beyond oil sales. Jews have resided in Azerbaijan for 2,500 years without persecution and today, the Jewish community in Azerbaijan numbers over 12,000. Azerbaijan is also home to Christian communities and has been praised for its religious tolerance by the European Parliament.

As co-chair of the Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus, I congratulate the people of Azerbaijan on the monumental occasion of Republic Day in their national history. May the partnership between the United States and Azerbaijan progress and continue to benefit both of our nations.

AUNT BETTY'S 95TH

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Betty Helms, a World War II Navy Veteran who turns 95 today. Betty's life has been full of hard work and accomplishments as she was in the first group of enlisted women allowed in the U.S. Navy. Her tenacity to overcome adversity and eliminate barriers truly shows her character and life's work. Continuing with her lifelong theme of removing roadblocks to pursue her goals, she went on to earn an accounting degree from the University of Missouri in 1950. She later started her own consulting business and did not retire until age 85.

I am honored to share my gratitude and respect for this accomplished Missourian. Her dedication, determination and service are an inspiration to us all. I ask all my colleagues to join me in thanking Betty for her years of service and wishing her the happiest of birthdays.

INTRODUCTION OF INDONESIAN FAMILY REFUGEE PROTECTION ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation with my colleague, Rep. FRANK PALLONE, Jr., which would simply allow Christian Indonesian citizens who arrived in the United States between January 1, 1997 and November 30, 2002 fleeing religious persecution, the opportunity to reopen their claims for asylum within two years of the bill's enactment. The bill would only apply to individuals who were denied asylum solely for missing filing deadline which closes one year after arrival.

Beginning in 1997, when extreme violence and destruction of churches in Indonesia was at its height, many Indonesian Christians were driven from their homes. These individuals came to the United States, seeking refuge from persecution for their religious beliefs, but were either unable to file before the one-year deadline or were unaware any deadline existed. They deserve the opportunity to have their claims heard.

The United States has a long history of taking in refugees fleeing persecution and providing a process to fairly consider their claims. This bill does not automatically grant asylum, but merely removes a procedural barrier to their claims being considered. These individuals seeking asylum deserve a second chance to avoid the persecution they have fled and remain united with their families.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

HONORING SAMUEL KEITH
TOLIVER, SR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Mr. Samuel Keith Toliver, Sr.

Mr. Toliver serves the Mound Bayou community as a consummate professional and champion of organizations that are committed to innovation, change, and providing solutions.

Mr. Toliver has successfully sustained a 30 plus year career as a school teacher and is a respected and well-known name amongst the Mound Bayou community. He founded and funded the Boy Scout Troop 302 to help young men develop the skills and knowledge that will help them meet the challenges of the twenty first century. Many of his troops have been recognized by the former President of the United States of America, William Clinton, for earning the highest ranking of Eagle Scout and have went on to achieve the highest rankings in the military. He is also a retired U.S. Army veteran; he served in the Vietnam War. After retirement he went on to serve as Commander of the American Legion; ensuring and helping veterans to receive severance by taking them to various centers and appointments for health issues. He also became a local farmer and a member of the Black Farmers Association, which allows many of the local community to pick from his various harvests to feed their families.

He continuously uses various formats to serve and inspire others throughout his home state of Mississippi. This includes spearheading countless charity events, and encouraging others to demonstrate acts of service. Samuel K. Toliver, Sr. is a powerful voice in the community and will continue to blaze trails for the advancement of people of color in professional settings.

For the past 23 years, Mr. Toliver has been serving as a constable. He continues to serve his community in Mound Bayou, and at 71 years old, he shows no signs of slowing down.

Mr. Samuel Keith Toliver, Sr., and former wife Lois Gant Toliver, are the devoted parents of two sons: Samuel Keith, Jr and Steven, and two daughters: Kesha and Karmaletta.

Mr. Toliver is also a dedicated member of Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church in Mound Bayou, MS, where he serves as a Pastor.

The past 50 years are saturated with the footprints of Toliver's positive influences in his service to his church, community, and family.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Samuel Keith Toliver for his tireless service to his community of country.

WILLIAM CORONA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud William Co-

rona for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

William Corona is a student at Arvada K-8 School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by William Corona is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to William Corona for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HELPING ENSURE THAT ALL VETERANS GET THE CARE THEY HAVE EARNED

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my strong support for the significant package of the veteran's bills that we considered in the House both yesterday and today.

As the former Chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee (2001 through 2005), I am acutely aware of the challenges our veterans face, especially as they transition from military to civilian life. As Chairman, I authored more than a dozen laws to expand health, education, job training and homelessness benefits for the men and women who served in uniform. Thankfully these laws continue to help our veterans today.

Still, there are new problems and new issues that urgently need our attention. Massive wait times, forged documents by VA officials, ineptitude, lack of equipment and understaffing at VA medical facilities are just a few of the significant transgressions that have been exposed and are undermining the quality of service and the treatment our veterans receive.

In 2014 and 2016 Congress passed the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act (P.L. 113-146) and the Faster Care for Veterans Act (P.L. 114-286), respectively, to usher in a complete overhaul of VA systems and to institute new technological services for scheduling and in order to secure more timely appointments. Some, but not nearly enough, progress has occurred. Much more must be done.

I commend Chairman PHIL ROE, MD and his team at the Veterans Affairs Committee on the package of bills before us this week. All seven will help improve the benefit programs and the delivery of healthcare service for our veterans.

For instance, The Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act of 2017 (H.R. 2288) will empower veterans who have been denied benefits to have more options as they pursue their appeals. Under the new bill, vets will be able to waive a hearing and sub-

mit additional evidence, pursue a hearing and submit additional evidence, or transfer the jurisdiction of their case to the Board of Veterans Appeals. The new options should help cut through some wait time.

The VA Scheduling Accountability Act (H.R. 467) would require an annual certification of compliance with scheduling directives. Additionally the bill blocks awards and bonuses to any leadership personnel at any medical center that fails to comply with the scheduling directives. Another bill before us, H.R. 1005 would allow the federal government to enter into agreements with state veteran's homes to pay for adult day health care for certain eligible veterans.

The No Hero Left Untreated Act (H.R. 1162) will create a one year pilot program at the VA to use innovative therapy to treat veterans who suffer from invisible wounds, which include post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury (TBI), military sexual trauma, chronic pain, or opiate addiction. As the author of the Veterans Health Programs Improvement Act (P.L. 108-422) which authorized regional veteran polytrauma centers for multiple injuries including TBI, I fully support H.R. 1162 as a way to ensure that the VA is able to adapt to the newest and best practices for treating veterans with these unique traumas and conditions.

The Quicker Veterans Benefits Delivery Act of 2017 (H.R. 1725) will require stronger reporting requirements from the Department of Veterans Affairs regarding the necessity for in-person disability examinations; and the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2017 (H.R. 1329) will increase the cost-of-living-adjustment for disabled veterans who receive compensation to equal the same rate of increase for citizens who receive Social Security in 2018.

Finally, the VA Prescription Data Accountability Act (H.R. 1545) will help combat drug addiction among our veterans by creating better information and data sharing between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the states' recording programs.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues that while this package of veterans bills marks another step forward, we cannot be lulled into thinking that the Department of Veterans Affairs and the delivery of veterans' benefits and healthcare will be forever fixed simply with the enactment of new legislation, no matter how well written.

Good legislation is the necessary, minimum first step. But equally important is the full and consistent implementation of the new laws, along with regular and aggressive oversight by this Congress. We must be vigilant and continue to push to ensure that all veterans get the care they have earned—at the time they need it—not months or years later.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees

to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 25, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 1

10:30 a.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To receive a briefing on countering corruption in the Organization for Secu-

rity and Co-operation in Europe region, focusing on returning ill-gotten assets and closing safe havens.

SD-G11

JUNE 6

10:30 a.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine Austria's chairmanship of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, focusing on priorities and challenges.

SR-188

JUNE 7

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on National Parks

To hold hearings to examine working to improve the National Park Service workplace environment.

SD-366

JUNE 8

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2018 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

JUNE 13

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Justice.

SD-192

SENATE—Thursday, May 25, 2017

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable LUTHER STRANGE, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious Father, fill our government's legislative branch with Your truth. Where it is in need of purging, cleanse it. Where it is in error, direct it. Where anything is amiss, reform it. Where it is right, strengthen and confirm it. Where it is in want, furnish it. Where it is divided, unite it.

Today, use our lawmakers for Your purposes. As they have the opportunities, may they strive to do good for Your glory. Guide and strengthen them as You provide for their needs. Lord, remind them that they are laborers together with You.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The assistant bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 25, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable LUTHER STRANGE, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. STRANGE thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, what has happened in the years since

Democrats forced ObamaCare on our country? Health choices have plummeted downward year after year. Health costs have skyrocketed higher year after year. And what have Democrats, who promised the opposite, done all these years since, as Republicans repeatedly warned we had to act before ObamaCare hurt more Americans on its inevitable path to collapse? Well, they have done basically nothing. They said we were exaggerating. They were wrong. They said things would get better. They got even worse. Rather than work with us to fix healthcare, they pretended things were fine, while more Americans got hurt.

So you can imagine my surprise when Democrats recently sent a letter that essentially conceded that the status quo of ObamaCare is unsustainable. Was it because they actually wanted to work together on reform? I sure wish that were the case, but so far it seems part of a new strategy to—get this—blame someone other than themselves for the failures of ObamaCare. Did they actually think anyone was going to buy this? Come on.

Just the other day, a bombshell report came out that reminded us exactly where the blame for ObamaCare's failures has always belonged. The blame belongs with ObamaCare. The official report said that since ObamaCare's full enactment in 2013, premiums had, on average, doubled in the vast majority of States that use ObamaCare's Federal exchange, and premiums even tripled in a handful of others. Think about that. Premiums doubled in the vast majority of these States, and premiums tripled in a handful of others. There is no serious way to now try to spin away these years and years of ObamaCare's failures on cost.

By the same token, there is no serious way to try to spin away or ignore the years and years of ObamaCare's failures on choice. Just take a look at the chart behind me. It shows that 49 percent of the counties in my State have just one insurer. Half of the counties—one choice. And when you have one choice, you have no choice at all. That is the latest in a long-term trend we have seen under ObamaCare. To add insult to injury, predictions show that next year could be even worse for families when it comes to their choices under this law.

Unfortunately, my State is not alone either. This year, there are 26 States with at least 1 county where residents have just 1 insurance option under ObamaCare. That means millions of Americans living in more than 1,000

counties across our country really have no choice at all.

Thanks to ObamaCare, things could again get even worse next year. Just yesterday, tens of thousands of Missourians across 25 counties—from small towns to Kansas City—learned that they may join the ranks of Americans without a single insurance option to choose from next year—not one—thanks to ObamaCare and its years-long trend of fewer and fewer choices.

Does any of that sound like what Americans were promised?

A mother in Louisville recently wrote to my office begging for Members of Congress to address the failures. "Middle class Kentuckians are hurting because of ObamaCare," she said. "Residents [have] little choice for health plans" and "our family is not the only one suffering from the high costs of health insurance." She concluded, "I hope you will push hard to fix our healthcare system."

I know many of my colleagues have received letters like this one from their constituents as well.

ObamaCare has caused so much pain for families across our country, and it is not going to just magically somehow get better on its own. I know that, like so many families across the country, I am not satisfied with the ObamaCare status quo, and I don't think it is acceptable for its failures to be considered the new normal. As the people of Kentucky have shown in election after election, they don't either.

Senate Republicans are working together to move past the problems of ObamaCare and to help those who have been hurt by it. We would love for Democrats to join us. Democrats have already effectively conceded that ObamaCare has failed. Now the question is, Will they work with us to actually fix this mess, or will they waste more time in some futile attempt to now redirect blame? The ObamaCare status quo is unsustainable. It is indefensible, and we have to move beyond it before more Americans get hurt.

NOMINATION OF AMUL THAPAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, later today Senators will vote to confirm Judge Amul Thapar of Kentucky to the U.S. Appeals Court for the Sixth Circuit. Judge Thapar will make an outstanding addition to the U.S. Appeals Court for the Sixth Circuit. He has a reputation as a qualified judge with an impressive legal mind. He will fairly apply the law to all those who enter his courtroom because, in Judge Thapar's

own words, “the most important attribute of a judge is to be open-minded and not to prejudice a case without reading the briefs, researching the law, and hearing from the parties.”

In 2007, President Bush nominated him to be a U.S. district judge for the Eastern District of Kentucky. At that time, the Senate confirmed his nomination on a voice vote, and Judge Thapar became the first South Asian American Federal judge in the history of our country. When we confirm him to the Sixth Circuit later today, he will be the second South Asian American judge ever to serve on a Federal circuit court.

Judge Thapar has been recognized for his work on the bench. The most recent edition of the *Almanac of the Federal Judiciary* quoted attorneys who “agreed that Thapar has excellent legal ability.” Additionally, the American Bar Association, which prominent Senate Democrats have called “the gold standard” for evaluating judges, awarded him its highest rating—unanimously “well qualified.” In other words, the people involved in rating him couldn’t find anybody who didn’t say he was well qualified. That is the highest rating one can achieve.

Judge Thapar has the necessary credentials, integrity, and respect from his colleagues to join the Sixth Circuit. I am proud to support him, and I urge all Senators to vote to confirm Judge Thapar’s nomination later today.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, as we approach the Memorial Day weekend, we are reminded of the great sacrifices so many men and women in uniform have made on our behalf throughout the years. The servicemembers whose memory we honor paid the ultimate price in defending our Nation, our families, and our freedom. We are forever indebted to them. But as we reflect upon the fallen soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, we are also reminded of the responsibility we have to the heroes who have returned home—our veterans.

I don’t have to tell colleagues how important keeping our commitment to our veterans is. We have an All-Volunteer Force. We cannot break faith with the Americans who bravely and willingly fight on our behalf. One way we can honor them is by working to ensure that they receive the quality, timely care they need through the Department of Veterans Affairs. That is why, after the State work period, we will be taking up a bipartisan bill reported out of committee just yesterday that will enhance accountability at the VA, improve the care veterans receive, and empower the VA with the tools necessary to remove employees who are failing to perform at the high-quality level our Nation’s heroes richly de-

serve. Importantly, this bill—the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act—will build on progress we have already made with the 2014 Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act.

We know that many challenges remain in ensuring that veterans have access to the care they need and deserve at the VA, but this legislation will further improve our ability to meet our commitment to them. I appreciate Chairman ISAKSON for his continued efficacy on behalf of our veterans, as well as Senator RUBIO for his leadership on this critical legislation. I look forward to the full Senate taking up the bill and passing it soon.

CELEBRATING THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY’S 225th ANNIVERSARY

Mr. McCONNELL. One final matter, Mr. President. Next week on June 1, the Commonwealth of Kentucky will celebrate the 225th anniversary of its admittance as a State into the Union. Originally part of Virginia known as the Kentucky County, it became the 15th State of this Nation in 1792. So today I rise to celebrate my home State of Kentucky, the Commonwealth of Kentucky, a place the Native American Wyandot Nation called the “land of tomorrow.”

Once considered the far western frontier, Kentucky has developed into a State with diverse industries, a strong heritage, and international prominence.

When you think about my home State, many things follow as distinctly Kentuckian. The natural beauty of our mountains, farmlands, and riverways foster deep love. Blessed with fertile land and an abundance of coal, Kentucky’s cultural heritage has developed in both the fields and the mines. The proud tradition of the Commonwealth includes bourbon and basketball, but also pioneers, statesmen, artists, scholars, and athletes.

From the days of Daniel Boone’s heroic exploration through the Cumberland Gap, Kentucky has been home to numerous courageous men and women. The trailblazing spirit has animated Kentuckians from all walks of life throughout the generations. A pioneer of abdominal surgery, Ephraim McDowell expanded the boundaries of medical science. Tori Murden McClure rowed across the Atlantic Ocean as the first American and first woman to brave the waters alone. Responsible for a world famous fried chicken recipe, Colonel Harland Sanders franchised his store at the age of 62 and taught us all that it is never too late to chase our passion. Acclaimed news anchor Diane Sawyer, born in Glasgow, began her career as a weather forecaster in Louisville. Muhammad Ali, an international sports legend, became a global ambassador for peace.

The Commonwealth has given rise to statesmen who have defended the Union, protected our liberties, and represented Kentucky values. Leaders like Henry Clay, Abraham Lincoln, and Alben Barkley each left an indelible imprint on the history of our Nation. Civil rights icon Georgia Powers fought against racial injustice in our State, inspired Kentucky to open public accommodations, and was the first African American to serve in the Kentucky State Senate.

Kentucky’s poets, musicians, and actors have garnered international acclaim for their craft. Jesse Stuart’s poems and short stories captured the beauty of Kentucky’s mountains, and Pulitzer Prize winning author Robert Penn Warren described the unbreakable link between poetry and democracy. The National Quilt Museum in Paducah is a global center of creativity and tourism. Kentucky is also home to music legends and Grammy Award winners like Loretta Lynn and Chris Stapleton and the birthplace of entertainment stars such as Jennifer Lawrence, George Clooney, and Johnny Depp.

In the world’s greatest college basketball rivalry between the University of Louisville and the University of Kentucky, legendary coaches and unforgettable players have, for decades, kept fans on the edges of their seats until the final buzzer. For over 140 years, the Kentucky Derby has been known as a mile and a quarter that makes champions and brings the eyes of the world to Louisville.

I am exceptionally proud to represent Kentucky in the U.S. Senate, and I am forever grateful to the people of my home State for giving me the opportunity to do just that. Kentucky has a distinguished history, and I am confident that trailblazers and pioneers from across the Bluegrass State will continue to make it the land of tomorrow. It is my honor to call the Commonwealth my home, and I look forward to celebrating this 225th anniversary next week.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the

Thapar nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Amul R. Thapar, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the nomination of Judge Amul Thapar to serve on the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Judge Thapar is President Trump's first nominee to serve on a Federal appeals court. Last week, the Senate Judiciary Committee considered this nomination and no Democrat voted for it.

Judge Thapar is on the list of 21 candidates that the Federalist Society and Heritage Foundation have selected for President Donald Trump to choose from when filling Supreme Court vacancies.

Judge Thapar is well known to the Federalist Society. He was a member of that organization prior to becoming a district court judge, and since he became a judge he has spoken at Federalist Society events 17 times.

Some of my colleagues on the Republican side are like Captain Renault in *Casablanca*, who claimed he was "shocked, shocked" to find out there was gambling going on in Rick's Cafe.

They are shocked that anyone could be concerned about the Federalist Society, which they claim is just a simple debate club. Far from it—consider the following background.

The organization was founded in 1982 by students at two law schools, Yale and the University of Chicago, under the faculty supervision of Robert Bork and Antonin Scalia, who just happen to be the two most prominent conservative legal scholars of their generation.

According to a recent article about the Federalist Society by Jeffrey Toobin: "within just a few years, the group was embraced and funded by a number of powerful, wealthy conservative organizations, which eventually included foundations associated with John Olin, Lynde and Harry Bradley, Richard Scaife, and the Koch Brothers."

The Federalist Society's website includes the group's purpose statement. It claims that the legal profession is: "currently strongly dominated by a form of orthodox liberal ideology which advocates a centralized and uniform society."

The statement describes the Federalist Society as a group of conservatives and libertarians calling for: "re-ordering priorities within the legal system," to fit their principles. Does that sound like the mission statement of a nonpartisan debate society?

How has the Federalist Society gone about this reordering? It's been largely the work of Mr. Leonard Leo, the long-time executive vice president of the

Federalist Society who is currently serving as an advisor to the Trump White House.

Mr. Leo has been credited with being a driving force behind the Supreme Court nominations of Justice Neil Gorsuch, Chief Justice John Roberts and Justice Samuel Alito. That is one-third of the current Supreme Court that he has helped put in place.

Mr. Leo recently gave a speech where he said: "I've seen that comment about the third of the Supreme Court. I prefer controlling interests. But we haven't quite been able to launch a hostile takeover yet."

Mr. Leo went on to advocate for radical change, saying: "I would love to see the courts unrecognizable." He has said of the judicial confirmation process: "it's like war."

In an unprecedented move, President Trump outsourced the selection of Supreme Court candidates to Mr. Leo, the Federalist Society, and the right-wing Heritage Foundation. He publicly thanked these special interest groups for putting together his list of 21 Supreme Court candidates, and Mr. Leo was the first person to call Neil Gorsuch about his nomination.

As Jeffrey Toobin wrote, Leonard Leo: "knew how to play the game—how to find a nominee who met Trump's ideological requirements as well as his own, while observing the proprieties expected for judicial nominees."

Mr. Leo told Mr. Toobin that it was: "easy" to find these nominees because: "when you've been working in this vineyard for twenty-five years you know everybody."

That brings us back to Judge Thapar.

Leonard Leo, and the big money right-wing interests that fund the Federalist Society, feel that they know Judge Thapar well enough to include him on the list of 21.

They have had plenty of opportunity to get a sense of his views, as Judge Thapar had been a member of the Federalist Society and has frequently spoken at their events.

At his hearing and in my questions to him, I sought reassurance from Judge Thapar that he would be independent from this right-wing group and President Trump.

His answers did not provide that reassurance.

For example, I asked Judge Thapar whether he agreed or disagreed with the Federalist Society's purpose statement. He ducked the question, saying he didn't know what the Federalist Society meant by the statement.

I asked him if he thought it was appropriate for the President to delegate his Supreme Court selection process to the Federalist Society and Heritage Foundation, since this creates incentive for judges not to contravene the views of those organizations and their big-money donors. He ducked again, saying he would not opine on this be-

cause he claimed it was a "political question."

In the aftermath of *Citizens United*, special interest groups pour dark money into campaigns in support of Republican judicial nominees like Judge Thapar. I asked Judge Thapar if he would discourage secret donations in support of his nomination.

After all, if we don't know who is secretly donating in support of his nomination, how will we know when Judge Thapar needs to recuse himself because one of those donors has an interest in a case he is considering?

He dodged that question too, saying he wasn't aware of any donations about his nomination. Of course, he wouldn't be aware of secret donations—that's the problem.

I also asked him about the original understanding of the Constitution's Emoluments Clause. He said he could not discuss it because there is pending litigation on the matter.

That is curious, because I thought the Federalist Society's view was that the original meaning of constitutional provisions was immutable and unchanging. If the meaning of the Constitution doesn't change, why do Federalist Society nominees decline to tell us this meaning when there is litigation underway affecting President Trump?

I asked Judge Thapar about his decision in *Winter v. Wolnitzek*. This was a major campaign finance decision in which he applied strict scrutiny to invalidate a ban on judges making political contributions. A unanimous Sixth Circuit panel reversed his ruling.

A group of 24 campaign finance reform organizations sent a letter saying: "Judge Thapar embraced the troubling 'money is speech' paradigm in a radical way that goes beyond Supreme Court doctrine." These groups oppose his confirmation, and I ask unanimous consent to have their letter printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Given Judge Thapar's evasiveness on questions about his views, I am left to judge him on his record, such as his troubling decision in the *Winter* case, and the fact that the Federalist Society and Heritage Foundation hand-picked him for their judicial wish list.

I need more reassurance than that to support a nominee for a lifetime appointment on the Federal court of appeals. I will oppose his nomination.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 17, 2017.

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS: We the undersigned organizations write to oppose the confirmation of Judge Amul Thapar to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit due to his troubling record on the issue of money in politics.

We are deeply concerned with the power of wealthy campaign donors in American politics, and specifically with the aggressive role

the U.S. courts have played in undermining our democracy by elevating the voices of a wealthy few over the views of everyday Americans.

Much of the problem can be attributed to four decades of flawed Supreme Court rulings. These decisions have twisted the meaning of the First Amendment and prevented our elected representatives and the people from enacting reasonable protections against big money. In fact, nearly half of the money in the 2016 federal elections—more than \$3 billion—can be directly tied to a few of the Court's most damaging rulings.

What concerns us about Judge Thapar's record is that he has gone beyond the Supreme Court's directives in his antagonism towards basic rules designed to ensure we have a government that is of, by and for the people.

In *Winter v. Wolnitzek*, 186 F.3d 673 (E.D. Ky. 2016), Judge Thapar struck down a prohibition on judges making political contributions by applying strict scrutiny to this contribution ban, in spite of the fact that the Supreme Court has been clear that contribution limits and bans are to be reviewed under a lower form of scrutiny. The Sixth Circuit overturned Judge Thapar's ruling on this point and reinstated the contribution ban.

Further, Judge Thapar embraced the troubling "money is speech" paradigm in a radical way that goes beyond Supreme Court doctrine, writing "there is simply no difference between 'saying' that one supports an organization by using words and 'saying' that one supports an organization by donating money."

Sen. Whitehouse pointed out in Judge Thapar's Senate Judiciary Committee hearing that "those of us who are in politics know that that is a false statement, that it is indeed a preposterous statement factually because money has a completely different effect than speech once it enters the political arena."

The Supreme Court itself does not treat financial contributions as being equal to actual speech. Rather, the Court considers contributing to a campaign a form of association or attenuated speech since the contributor does not control the content of the communication resulting from the contribution.

If Judge Thapar had his way, wealthy donors and special interests could be able to give unlimited sums of money directly to candidates for office. Thapar would make it even harder than it is now for everyday people to be heard and affect who runs for office, who wins elections, and what issues get attention; and easier for powerful politicians to make secret wink and nod deals with their richest contributors.

Judge Thapar's responses to questioning on the subject during his hearing and in subsequent "questions for the record" did nothing to allay our concerns. In response to Sen. Klobuchar's questions about why he applied strict scrutiny to the contribution ban, for example, Judge Thapar struggled to explain why he assumed (without analysis) that the same standard should apply to contributions as to solicitations.

The role of big money in politics became a central issue in the debate over Justice Neil Gorsuch's confirmation to the U.S. Supreme Court because the public cares deeply about this issue. To ensure that all voices are heard, not just those of powerful corporations and wealthy donors, it is essential that we confirm judges and justices who understand that the Constitution gives us the people the power to protect our democracy from big money.

Unfortunately, Judge Amul Thapar does not appear to see our pro-democracy Constitution as the vast majority of Americans do—and for this reason we urge you to oppose his confirmation to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

Sincerely,

American Federation of Teachers, Americans for Democratic Action, Center for American Progress, Center for Emergent Diplomacy, Class Action, Communications Workers of America, CODEPINK, Democracy Spring, Demos, End Citizens United, Every Voice, Free Speech for People, Friends of the Earth, Just Foreign Policy, Maplight, MAYDAY, National Association of Social Workers, Participatory Politics Foundation, People for the American Way, PeopleNow.org, Reverb Press, Small Planet Institute, United for Democracy, Voices for Progress.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to address the comments that were made by the Republican majority leader about the issue of healthcare. What he said today I have never heard him say before. He said it was the fault of the Democrats for refusing to work with the Republicans to change the Affordable Care Act. I had not heard that before.

I find it an interesting suggestion because what happened after the House of Representatives passed a measure 3 weeks ago to change the healthcare system in America, the issue then came to the Senate but did not go through the regular order of business.

It is my understanding—and has been reported widely in the press—that Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, assembled a group of 13 Republican Senators who have been meeting in private over the last 3 weeks to discuss an alternative to the healthcare bill that passed in the House of Representatives. There are no Democrats in that room. None have been invited. Incidentally, there are no women in that room from the Republican side—13 male Senators meeting in private.

So to hear this suggestion from the Republican leader that the real problem they are running into is that the Democrats are not helping, we were not invited to this party. They are meeting privately to come up with something, and I don't know what it might be, but I have an idea of how we can achieve a bipartisan real effort when it comes to healthcare in America.

I would suggest we create a committee in the Senate. I have a name for it, the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. I suggest we have 12 Republicans and 11 Democrats on that committee. I suggest they sit down, take the bill sent by the House, and improve it, make it better. Now, this suggestion is such a good one that the committee already exists.

It is under the chairmanship of LAMAR ALEXANDER—whom I respect personally very much—and the ranking member, PATTY MURRAY of the State of Washington, a Democrat. I know, hav-

ing spoken to Senator MURRAY, she is ready to roll up her sleeves and go to work to write a revision to the healthcare bill, the healthcare system in America.

There have been no hearings, none, on the measure passed by the House of Representatives. So when the Republican leader says he wishes the Democrats would join in the effort, this committee is ready and willing to work. I am sure, if he picked up the phone and called Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY, they could get to work on doing a much better job than what the House of Representatives did.

Why am I so critical of the House of Representatives? Not because of the traditional rivalry between the Chambers, but because yesterday the Congressional Budget Office took a look at the bill that passed the U.S. House of Representatives 3 weeks ago by two votes. It was all Republicans voting for it. It passed by two. A number of Republicans refused to support it. It had no support from the Democratic side.

It was an unusual bill because it went out of the regular order of business. The regular order of business suggests that when you are going to do something that might have an impact—a large impact—on America, you should go to an agency that is a non-partisan, expert in the field, that will analyze your bill and tell you what impact it will have. Most of us think we have pretty good ideas for making America a better place to live and good ideas for legislation.

Luckily, we have something called the Congressional Budget Office, which sometimes brings us back down to Earth and says: It might not work exactly as you thought it would work. Traditionally, bills—significant bills that affect a lot of Americans and families and things important like healthcare—they are submitted to the Congressional Budget Office so they can analyze them and decide the impact they will have.

Well, 3 weeks ago, Speaker PAUL RYAN and Republicans in the House said something I had not heard before in my service in Congress. They said: We are not going to wait for this analysis. We are going to vote on this bill even before the Congressional Budget Office has a chance to analyze its impact. Remember, we are talking about changing the healthcare system in America, and that literally impacts every single American. It is one-sixth of our Nation's economy. You would think, before anyone was bold enough to suggest they wanted to change the system, they would at least send their proposal to the Congressional Budget Office for an analysis. The Republicans in the House failed to do so, refused to do so, passed the measure by two votes, and sent it to the Senate.

So, yesterday, the Congressional Budget Office completed its analysis.

Now that we have an analysis of what is known as TrumpCare or the Republican healthcare approach, it is pretty clear why they did not want the Congressional Budget Office to take a look at it. This is what the Congressional Budget Office reported publicly last night: Next year, under the Republican proposal for healthcare reform, 14 million Americans will lose their health insurance. Over the next 10 years, 23 million Americans will lose their health insurance.

Do you remember when we started this conversation? The goal was to make sure we changed the laws in America so more Americans would have the protection of health insurance. Just the opposite occurs if the Republican plan goes forward. The second thing we were looking for is a goal in healthcare reform to reduce the growth, the rate of growth, in health insurance premiums.

Every one of us knows what that is all about. Health insurance premiums have been going up way too high for way too long. The Republicans have been critical of the current system, saying the cost of health insurance is going up too fast. So they put in their reform proposal which passed the House of Representatives.

Here is what the Congressional Budget Office had to say about the Republican approach: Next year, premiums for health insurance will increase by 20 percent in the individual market. That is the market where we have seen this dramatic growth in costs already, and the Republican plan makes it worse.

The third thing we find is this argument by the Republicans that somehow the current healthcare system in America, the Affordable Care Act, is in a death spiral. Listen to what the Congressional Budget Office said about the health insurance market in America today. The CBO affirms that under current law, marketplaces—health insurance marketplaces—are stable.

However, under the Republican repeal bill, one out of every six Americans will be living in parts of this country where the individual market would become unstable as a result of the Republican bill. So instead of stabilizing the market and ending the so-called death spiral, the Republican bill makes it worse.

It turns out that when you take a close look at this so-called death spiral, you find the Republicans have their hands around the throats of the healthcare system of America choking it and claiming this patient is not looking good, Doctor. If they would stop their efforts to sabotage the current system and work to improve it and make it stronger, then we could save health insurance for a lot of Americans and bring stability to the system.

The Republican bill at its heart is not about a healthcare bill, though, it

is about tax cuts. The Republican proposal for healthcare reform starts with eliminating almost \$900 billion in taxes paid by the wealthiest people in America. By taking \$900 billion out of the healthcare system, they are unable to keep health insurance alive for so many Americans. The Republican approach eliminates \$834 billion in the Federal Medicaid Program. What is the Federal Medicaid Program? Let me give you three examples of what it is.

In Illinois today, half of the babies who are born are paid for—their medical care is paid for by the Medicaid system: prenatal care for mom so the baby is healthy, the delivery of the baby, and postnatal care afterward. These are lower income individuals. Half of them are paid for by Medicaid today, but that is not the most expensive part of Medicaid.

The most expensive part of Medicaid is for your mom and dad and your grandmother and grandfather who are in a nursing home and have no savings left. All they have is Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. That is the most expensive part of Medicaid. Those who are disabled living in my State, in Alabama, in New York, and other States—disabled people and low-income people need medical care and they rely on Medicaid.

So when the Republican healthcare reform and repeal cuts \$800 billion-plus out of Medicaid, it is at the expense of the groups I just mentioned: babies and moms, elderly people in nursing homes, and the disabled. Those are the ones who will see a cutback in medical services so we can give a \$900 billion tax cut to the wealthiest people in America.

I know the Democratic leader is here. I want to yield the floor when he arrives, but I want to close by telling a story. Yesterday, I had three moms and a dad who brought their children to a press conference. It was a great press conference, if I may say so. These kids stole the show, as they should. Each one of them—each one of them had a compelling story about having survived a terrible illness. Many of them were cancer victims.

Moms told stories. One mom said: I was changing my little girl, and I noticed a lump in her abdomen. It turned out to be a neuroblastoma cancer tumor. It was removed. My little girl spent weeks, months in the hospital, and she is still going back.

Each one of them told a story. As you looked at these kids, smiling and happy and bouncing around, you thought to yourself: Thank goodness. Thank goodness for America, with its great medical care, and thank goodness these families had health insurance—because they were there concerned about what the Republicans are doing when it comes to preexisting conditions.

Because these kids have survived cancer, they are risky from an insur-

ance viewpoint. We decided 6 years ago to put an end to that worry for these families. You cannot discriminate against a person or a family in America based on a preexisting condition—thank goodness—because one out of three of us have a preexisting condition. The Republican approach takes away that protection and says Governors can ask for a waiver so health insurance in their State can discriminate against people with preexisting conditions.

So three moms and a dad came yesterday and said: Please stop this Republican plan. What will our families do? Our kids have preexisting conditions. We cannot afford to see our premiums go through the roof because the Republicans withdraw this protection.

That is the real-life consequence of this debate. This is not just about a lot of politicians on Capitol Hill blowing hot air. It is about families—real families with real kids and real challenges and whether they are going to have real protection when they need it.

The Congressional Budget Office yesterday came out with a report and said the measure that passed the House, the Republican measure, is a disaster for families across America. We have to stop it. We have to do everything in our power to do it. I might say to my friend from New York, the Democratic leader, that when the Republican leader came to the floor this morning and said: Why won't the Democrats join us in repairing the Affordable Care Act? I say to the Republican leader: Open the door of that room where you have 13 male Republican Senators sitting down and debating the future of healthcare. Open the door, open the windows, and let's have an honest, open, bipartisan conversation not about repealing our healthcare system but making it stronger, protecting the very families who showed up yesterday at a press conference and whom I am going to remember for a long time.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, let me thank my good friend from Illinois for, as usual, his articulate, compassionate, and outstanding work and for the great job he and others did yesterday when they invited the people here. I reiterate just what the Senator from Illinois stated; that is, once they take repeal off the table—they are having real trouble with repeal—we want to sit down and make our healthcare system better. It is not perfect. No one thought it was.

It is better than it was. Many more people are covered. Preexisting conditions, college kids—kids get out of college, and they get healthcare. All of that is better. We don't want to get rid

of everything, but we want to improve it. We are working. Forty-eight Senators, as my colleague from Illinois knows—every Democrat signed a letter to Leader McCONNELL saying we want to work with you to improve this system, not to sabotage the existing system, not to repeal the good things we have but to improve it.

And we have gotten no answer in that regard.

TRIBUTE TO BILL DAUSTER

Mr. President, I have just a few words first about Bill Dauster, someone who has labored long and hard and well in this body. We depend on our hard-working staff. I am so blessed to have such a great, dedicated, loyal, hard-working, smart staff. One of their best traits is that they are not afraid to tell me when they think I am off base, and it helps keep things going right.

Well, Bill Dauster was one of the great staffers I have met in all the years I have been here in the Senate. He worked, of course, for Harry Reid, my dear friend. He is now working for Senator VAN HOLLEN, but he will be retiring tomorrow.

Now, Bill was Leader Reid's deputy chief of staff for policy for many years. Before that he worked for the Budget Committee, the Finance Committee, and for Senator Feingold of Wisconsin. The list of legislation that Bill has worked on is long and illustrious. He was known as a great friend and mentor to his colleagues wherever he went.

In Reid's office, he was jokingly called "the butler" because he was constantly trying to help other members of the staff. Senator Reid's staffers fondly remember Bill Dauster during the final days of the debt ceiling negotiations, running in and out of Senator Reid's office as he rushed to go meet with younger staffers on the Hill who were sent to him for advice. Even on his busiest days, Bill made time for others.

In an industry in which many rub shoulders and network after work, Bill was a different kind of guy. He was known to give the same response to any coworker who asked him to come to a social event. He would repeat: I love you, but I love my family more, and I need to be home with them. He was so dedicated to his family, we heard. He would regale us with many stories about them.

He came up with great ideas. He was a great sounding board for me.

So on behalf of all of us in the Senate, we want to thank Bill for his long service to the Senate, for his role in crafting legislation over three decades, and for his mentorship to other Senate aides, old and young. He is retiring, but his influence in this body will last long after he has left.

We all wish him well in this next phase of life, where, hopefully, he will be able to spend more time where he

enjoys it the most—at home with his family.

TRUMP CARE

Mr. President, another matter—healthcare. Yesterday, the Congressional Budget Office, led by a Director who was handpicked by current HHS Secretary Tom Price, Donald Trump's appointee, released its analysis of the House Republican healthcare bill—TrumpCare.

The report makes clear that TrumpCare would be a cancer on the American healthcare system—causing costs to skyrocket, making coverage unaffordable for many seniors and those with preexisting conditions, all the while leaving 23 million fewer Americans with health insurance.

Now, when people hear this, they say: Why would the Republicans want to do it? That just seems mean-spirited. Well, I will tell you why: because their No. 1 goal is to give a tax break for the wealthiest of Americans. People making above \$250,000 pay an additional charge to help everyone else with healthcare on their unearned income—not on what they do when they are working, but on stocks, bonds, and investments. The No. 1 goal of our colleagues across the aisle, sadly, is to help those very rich people get even richer.

Now, to do that, they have to take away people's healthcare. To get the money for those tax breaks, they take away people's healthcare. So the bottom line is very simple: Unless you are a healthy millionaire, TrumpCare is a nightmare. I think that is why our Republican colleagues are having such trouble putting together their own bill, because, as Senator DURBIN has noted, they have excluded us from their negotiations.

Well, the CBO report ought to be a final nail in the coffin of the Republican effort to sabotage our healthcare system. Republicans in Washington and the President should read the report cover to cover, throw their bill in the trash can, and begin working with Democrats on a real plan to lower costs and improve care.

There is a lot to unpack in this report. It came out late yesterday. So I want to focus on a couple of provisions this morning.

First, on health insurance costs, the CBO report makes clear that premiums under this bill are headed up in the next several years. Consumers would see their premiums increase by 20 percent for next year's plans. Now, Republicans will crow about premiums going down in the outer years—years away. But the decrease in premiums occurs for only one reason: The quality of the insurance will plummet. If you have a barebones plan that hardly helps you, where you have to pay huge deductibles, huge copayments, and huge premiums and it covers next to nothing, of course, the cost will even-

tually go down. What good is that? Why even talk about that kind of healthcare? People don't need it and don't want it. Cheaper insurance isn't going to help anyone if it doesn't actually lead to the healthcare people need.

Listen to this one. Older Americans—everyone in America 50 to 64 who doesn't have a lot of income, making say \$25,000 a year—TrumpCare is going to force you to pinch pennies just to be able to afford health insurance. The CBO report says that some seniors could see their premiums go up a whopping 800 percent under this bill.

In one of the newspaper articles I saw, I think the senior citizen was in his early sixties. They were making about \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year—not unusual for a senior of that age—and their premiums went up from \$1,700 to \$13,000. How are you going to vote for that, my friends, telling these people who have worked hard their whole lives that they have to pay a lot more and a lot of that money is going to wealthy people for a tax cut?

What about out-of-pocket expenses? By the way, out-of-pocket expenses really bother people. How many of us have heard over and over again: I have healthcare, and, when I went to the doctor, they said: You, first, have to lay out \$5,000. How many of us have heard that? Everybody. The Republican bill makes it worse.

According to the CBO report, out-of-pocket costs could balloon for vital services in States where they decline to cover essential health benefits. Americans could be paying thousands of dollars more every year if they need maternity care or programs that treat substance abuse or mental health services.

Listen to this one. According to reports, in States that elect not to include maternity care, which every State could elect to do under the Republican bill—and many will—insurers would most likely sell maternity benefits as an add-on at \$1,000 a month—\$17,000 more in total. Under TrumpCare, women may well have to pay more—much more insurance—just because they are a woman, because of pregnancy. So costs go up, up, up. If, God forbid, this bill becomes law and costs go up, any citizen of this country should go to their Senators who voted for this and say: What the heck did you do? You made it worse.

Now, uncertainty in the market is the second issue. The CBO report confirms that the Republican attempts to repeal the Affordable Care Act and the Trump administration's refusal to guarantee to continue making cost-sharing payments is causing the instability in the market.

Here is what the report says. Now, this is the report put out by the Republican-appointed head of the CBO. So this is not some Democratic propaganda-type document. These are "just

the facts, ma'am," as Mr. Friday said. Here is what the report says: "Substantial uncertainty about the enforcement of the individual mandate and about future payments of the cost-sharing subsidies" have led insurers to withdraw from the current marketplace.

AHIP—that is the biggest organization of our Nation's insurers, the insurance companies; they are non-partisan—said the same thing.

Why, if our colleagues want more people to stay in the market and are complaining that people are leaving the market, don't we come together—hopefully, with the President, who thinks that he could do this on his own—and say: We are going to make this cost-sharing permanent. We all know insurers want certainty in the future or they pull out. That is what the insurance business is all about. Yet, grudgingly, one little step at a time, they don't take away the cost-sharing because they know the damage it would do—this is President Trump—but they are afraid to make it permanent and that causes problems.

So there is only one word for what the President is doing and our Republican colleagues are doing when it comes to the present healthcare system—sabotage. If our Republican friends continue to allow the President to play coy about these cost-sharing payments—which bring premiums down, which bring costs for average citizens down—as a potential threat, if we don't make cost sharing permanent, the system will deteriorate. Again, it will be on the President's back, on our colleagues' backs. I hate to say that, but those are the facts.

We want to make it permanent. We tried to put it in the appropriations bill, to make it permanent, which would have kept costs low or kept people in the exchanges. Our colleagues said no.

Finally, as to preexisting conditions, the CBO report states:

People who are less healthy would ultimately be unable to purchase comprehensive non-group health insurance at premiums comparable to those under current law, if they could purchase it at all.

Let me repeat the last part of the CBO report written by an appointee of our Republican head of HHS: "if they could purchase it at all." Think about that for a minute.

Under TrumpCare, if you have a pre-existing condition, if you are sick, your health insurance costs could go up so high that you can't afford insurance. Before the new healthcare law passed under President Obama, how many of us heard from families: My daughter has cancer, but the insurance company won't cover me, or I got kicked off and I have to watch her suffer because I can't afford the treatment, the payments. It is horrible, heart-wrenching. It is going back to those days under this bill, unfortunately.

This report ought to be the final nail in the coffin of the Republican effort to sabotage our healthcare system. It will make much more certain that sick people are priced out of insurance companies, that the most vulnerable are left high and dry when they need care the most, when there is an illness in the family.

Is that the sort of healthcare system our colleagues envision for this country? When you are sick, when one of your family members is sick, is that when they are not allowed to give you healthcare? What in the heck do you have it for?

I certainly hope that is not the idea on the other side of the aisle, but this bill that the House passed would do it.

In conclusion, the nonpartisan scorekeepers have spoken loudly and clearly—no ambiguity. TrumpCare means higher costs and less care for the American people, the average American. Let's not lose sight of what is at stake here. The health and well-being of the American people is on the line. There are life-and-death consequences for so many millions of people. They are relying on us to get this right.

So for the good of the country, President Trump and our Republican colleagues should abandon TrumpCare, stop sabotaging the healthcare system, and work with Democrats—we are waiting—to fix our healthcare system, not pull it from under them.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. President, finally, I have one more note. It is Memorial Day. I want to take a moment to express my deep and abiding gratitude for the men and women in our armed services who gave their last full measure of devotion in defense of our Nation and our liberty.

In big cities and small towns throughout America and in my home State of New York, we will honor our fallen veterans and pay tribute to them. We will give a hug to the Gold Star moms who have made the ultimate sacrifice. May we never forget their sacrifice so that we may enjoy the blessings of freedom.

Since the founding of this country, since the farmers on Bunker Hill put down their plows and took up muskets, Americans have been willing to make that ultimate sacrifice for our great way of life, our freedom. May we never forget them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULIVAN). The Senator from Connecticut.

RUSSIAN INVESTIGATION

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I join my colleague from New York in expressing the special respect and passion that we all feel in honoring this great holiday that remembers the service and sacrifice of great Americans, to make sure we sustain and preserve and enhance our democracy. Part of that democracy is indeed the rule of law, as well as protecting the institutions that

make us great as a Nation, including our elections system and its integrity.

Today should also be a time to observe and commemorate the continued respect for the law that makes us great. Part of that respect was demonstrated recently when the Deputy Attorney General appointed a special counsel to investigate possible coordination between the Trump administration and the Presidential campaign with the Russians as they interfered with those democratic institutions. Make no mistake, there is consensus and unanimity in the intelligence community, and more broadly among us in this body, that the Russians purposefully and relentlessly interfered in the 2016 election through a cyber attack on this Nation. In my view, it was an act of cyber warfare.

The questions now are who and how in the Trump team may have colluded with the Russians in that illegal, outrageous activity and, indeed, whether there has been obstruction of justice since then. Mounting evidence indicates that there has been.

I have joined many of my colleagues in praising the appointment of a special prosecutor because it is vitally necessary for a fair and impartial, as well as aggressive, investigation. The special prosecutor must follow the evidence wherever it leads, and I have confidence that Bob Mueller is the right person for this assignment. He has the grit and backbone to stand up to pressure. He has the prosecutorial experience and expertise to conduct a truly professional investigation.

I called for a special prosecutor back in February. I was one of the first, if not the first, among our colleagues to do so because the conflicts of interest raised by the recusal of the Attorney General and the potential involvement of the Deputy led me to think that such an appointment was absolutely necessary.

I now call on the President to support this investigation. With the utmost respect for the Office of the President, it should be unnecessary to call for that cooperation and support. My hope was that the President would say as soon as the appointment occurred that he would indeed cooperate. But, instead, he has continued to characterize this investigation as a witch hunt and a charade. He has demeaned and disrespected it and indicated that, if anything, there will be less than full cooperation. That would be a grave disservice to our democracy and to the American people.

The integrity of our electoral system is bigger and more important than any single electoral contest or even any occupant of the White House. It is about the freedom and independence of this Nation, something we cherish and celebrate on this Memorial Day weekend.

I urge President Trump to demonstrate his adherence to the rule of

law by cooperating and articulating fully his cooperation with this investigation. I hope that not only President Trump but all of his associates will do so and that they will provide whatever testimony and documents are necessary to complete this investigation as quickly and effectively as possible.

I also believe that the Attorney General of the United States owes the American people his adherence to the rule of law by committing himself to follow the guidelines that respect the press. Indeed, we would know very little, if anything, about many of the events that prompted the appointment of a special prosecutor without the free press reporting development after event after development that have led to this day.

There are guidelines and regulations that protect the President against any kind of compulsory process or punishment. If there is punishment to be accorded to lawbreakers, the press should be recognized for the special role they have in our democracy and the special protections, the constitutional guarantee they enjoy under the First Amendment. There are guidelines under 28 CFR 50.10 that provide legal guidance and regulations that should be observed, and I hope that the Attorney General will demonstrate in deed and word his adherence to those guidelines rather than threatening to lock up reporters—as the President has unfortunately done currently in conversations with Director Comey—or punishing them.

Whatever the violations of government officials may be, there should be an articulate, clear, and explicit adherence to those regulations by the Attorney General.

Let's take a moment to go through where we are right now.

Last July, after a disturbing series of reports suggesting the attempt by a foreign power to influence an American election, the Federal Government began to investigate the Russian Government's interference in the Presidential election.

We learned just yesterday from a published report that this activity included conversations among Russian officials regarding how best to sway individual Trump officials and that the FBI's early handling of this matter may have been influenced by an unreliable document traceable to Russian intelligence—a form of interference in our justice system that is stunning.

In December of 2016, U.S. intelligence officials concluded that the Russians had orchestrated the theft of electronic materials from the Democratic National Committee and John Podesta in an attempt to undermine Hillary Clinton's Presidential campaign. The Obama administration responded by implementing sanctions on the Russian Government.

Shortly after President Trump took office, Attorney General Sally Yates warned the White House that National Security Adviser Michael Flynn had lied to officials about discussing sanctions with the Russians and was vulnerable to Russian blackmail. The White House waited 2½ weeks to take action and did so only after a March 9 Washington Post report and, in fact, days after Sally Yates' warning, fired her.

We also know that Director Comey was warned or asked—in fact, demanded by President Trump that he pledge his loyalty and that he would be in jeopardy of losing his job if he did not. Shortly thereafter, the President clearly expressed to Director Comey his sense of that warning when he asked Director Comey to shut down, in effect, the Flynn investigation. As we all know, Director Comey resisted both of the President's requests.

In early March, following sharp criticism about his failure to disclose meetings with Russian officials under oath, Attorney General Jeff Sessions recused himself from the Department of Justice investigations.

Later that month, President Trump's son-in-law, Jared Kushner, became the third high-ranking Trump administration official caught misrepresenting potentially his ties to an admitted meeting with Russian officials from his security clearance application.

On May 9, President Trump fired FBI Director James Comey, a stunning event amidst these unprecedented revelations. After clumsy and contradicting explanations seeking to advance a false narrative that the firing was a result of Director Comey's handling of the Hillary Clinton email matter, the White House essentially abandoned that conflicting series of stories, and President Trump admitted publicly that he was thinking about the FBI's Russia investigation when he decided to fire Comey. He boasted the next day in his meeting with the Russian Foreign Minister that he felt greatly relieved of pressure resulting from that investigation.

The New York Times has reported that Comey was seeking increased funding and resources to expand the Russia probe. The Times also subsequently revealed that Director Comey had discussed with others and wrote memos detailing how President Trump asked him to pledge his loyalty and shut down the Federal investigation into Mr. Flynn.

We must wait for all the facts to emerge, but even if only some of these reports are accurate, the conclusion is almost inescapable that the President of the United States fired the FBI Director in an attempt to shut down the investigation into ties between his associates, including Michael Flynn, and the Russian Government. The names of these associates have been well docu-

mented—Paul Manafort, Roger Stone, Carter Page, as well as Michael Flynn.

There is, unfortunately, more. Just in the past few days, additional disturbing facts and press reports have surfaced, including testimony by former CIA Director John Brennan before the House Intelligence Committee. He said that before he left office, he became deeply concerned that Russian intelligence services were attempting to manipulate Trump associates to influence the Presidential campaign. He noted that many Russian contacts of individuals linked to the Trump campaign emerged in those reports. The Washington Post reported that Comey had informed Congress about the FBI Russia investigation late in March and that Trump had asked Director of National Intelligence Daniel Coats and National Security Director Michael Rogers to push back on that investigation—in effect, to clear the President—and deny Trump campaign collusion with the Russians. According to this report, both officials, to their credit, refused to do so.

In the Armed Services Committee, I asked Director Coats whether he discussed with Director Rogers any attempts by the administration to interfere with the investigation. He refused to answer—a pause and silence that spoke volumes.

Revelation after revelation shakes our confidence in this administration's truthfulness and confidence. This investigation by the special prosecutor is vitally necessary.

We must not lose sight of the damage that has already been done. These reports paint a deeply disturbing picture of possible obstruction, a mosaic pieced together by facts that show not only events and conversations but also motives. After a series of these events and conversations, they can no longer be seen as isolated or accidental or inadvertent. The cumulative effect, like threads in a fabric, is to establish a picture of motive, intent, mens rea, and criminal activity.

Special Counsel Mueller must have the mandate and all of the funding and resources that he needs to follow the facts wherever they may lead—resources, independence—but also support.

That is why, again, I call on the administration to express its support and its intention to cooperate.

This kind of investigation can mean the difference between the upholding of our democratic institutions and placing them in jeopardy. Therefore, I urge that we as a body remain vigilant and continue the Judiciary Committee's oversight, inquiry, and investigative activity so as to assure that we know the reasons then-FBI Director Comey was fired—we have that responsibility as a matter of oversight—and continue that kind of scrutiny in order to assure the independence and resources the

special prosecutor needs. Likewise, the Intelligence Committee's activities are absolutely necessary.

Almost certainly, the special prosecutor will produce no report or elaborate public explanation. He will bring criminal charges if they are warranted by the evidence. He will seek convictions in court if those prosecutions are justified under his finding. A report with recommendations and finding as to how we can avoid this kind of interference with our democratic institutions in the future must be the work of the Intelligence Committee and of an independent commission, which I have supported. An independent, bipartisan commission can do the kind of public, transparent, vigorous, and independent work that is necessary, just in the way that we have done in the wake of other crises.

I urge that we proceed on all of these fronts. They are vital to our democracy. They are an essential, inextricable part of freedom, the rule of law, and freedom of the press.

I hope that the press will continue its unfettered use of its First Amendment freedom to give us the truth and to continue those reports that have brought us to this day, because the truth will be uncovered in the course of the criminal process. It will be uncovered by the Intelligence Committee and, hopefully, by an independent commission. The essential role of the free press in fostering government accountability is recognized by existing regulations, and the Attorney General of the United States should leave no confusion that the Department of Justice will adhere to those regulations.

Indeed, 28 CFR 50.10 recognizes the "essential role of the free press in fostering government accountability" and, therefore, sets parameters and procedures, for approval by the Attorney General of the United States, under standards that are set forth for any government action that may, in any way, inhibit or impede the press.

We will probably never know the real impact of Russia's intervention in the outcome of the 2016 election. These investigations are not about assessing the impact. They are about determining who participated criminally with the Russians in that interference. The American people deserve a thorough and impartial investigation into the Trump team's ties to that interference and the effort by President Trump and others to cover it up.

In the wake of Watergate, the saying arose that the coverup was worse than the crime. It was then, and it would be worse—or at least as heinous—in the crime here. Make no mistake that the crime is, actually, a theft of our democracy—an interference by the Russians in our democratic institutions—which they will repeat if we do not make them pay a price and, likewise, if we do not make the Americans who co-

operated with them pay a price as well. This principle is central to our democracy and our rule of law.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to join me in calling for the cooperation of the Trump administration as well as for recognizing the importance of the investigation—its independence, its resources—for the free press and the rule of law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

OPIOID CRISIS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in speaking about the opioid crisis that has devastated families in States across the country.

I thank my colleague, Senator MANCHIN, for organizing the speeches today.

In my State, deaths from prescription drug abuse have now claimed the lives of more Minnesotans than have homicides or car crashes. We lost our beloved Prince because of an opioid overdose, which is still being investigated. Just as importantly, we lost a student in Duluth and a mom in Rochester, MN—over 400 people in just the last year. We continue to see dangerous synthetic opioids shipped across our borders in increasing amounts—a trend that the U.S. Customs and Border Protection expects to continue, as we heard in a Judiciary Committee hearing last week.

Today, I joined Senator PORTMAN in his subcommittee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and we talked about what is going on from that perspective as well.

While there is more work to do to combat this epidemic, first, I recognize that we have made some meaningful progress on a bipartisan basis. We passed the CARA Act, which is something that was led by Senators PORTMAN, WHITEHOUSE, AYOTTE, and me. We set a framework up for the Nation, and I look at it in three ways.

The first way is that we have to do everything we can to prevent addiction. That means changing some of our prescription practices across the country. Do you really need 30 pills when you get your wisdom teeth out? It is about asking those questions and changing those practices.

The second thing would be to look at prescription drug monitoring. Senator PORTMAN and I have a bill that would make it mandatory for States to share their data across State borders. I found a guy in Moorhead, MN, through his rehab counselor, who had 108 different prescriptions for opioids from something like 80 different doctors in 50 different cities. He went from North Dakota to South Dakota, to Minnesota, to Wisconsin. That is why sharing that data would greatly reduce that doctor shopping.

I see here the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN. Senator CORNYN and I led

a bill years ago to make it easier for people to throw away their leftover prescription drugs so they would not get in the hands of those who should not be taking them. Those are ideas for reducing that demand.

Then you go to the next area, which, of course, is that of trying to reduce the illegal drugs from coming in, like with the STOP Act, which Senator PORTMAN and I introduced, making it harder to get these drugs in through the Postal Service, and doing more with law enforcement. By passing the SALT Act, which is a bill that Senator GRAHAM and I introduced, it will make it easier for prosecutors—the Presiding Officer is a former prosecutor—to prove up cases with analogue drugs, which is when perpetrators basically take a substance, change it a little, and then say: Hey, it is a new drug. Then it makes it harder for the Feds to go after it, and you have to prove it up in court.

So we are making some changes to our law to make it easier, especially in rural areas, where they are not going to be able to get a medical doctor in to prove up what the substance is in order to make it easier to prove these cases.

These are all very good ideas, but what we are here to talk about today is the issue of the funding and what will happen if we do not have the funding for treatment. We did a good job with the Cures Act last December, in which we made \$1 billion available over 2 years, as well as the work that was done on a bipartisan basis with the budget for the rest of the year. I consider those good signs.

Unfortunately, the budget and the CBO score of the healthcare repeal bill that was released this week—the bill that came over from the House—shows us that we are at risk of working backwards on this issue.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, mental health and substance abuse benefits could be cut under the healthcare bill, which would increase out-of-pocket costs by thousands of dollars for those who need these vital services. This is on top of the \$839 billion in cuts to Medicaid under the bill and additional cuts in the President's budget of more than \$600 billion to Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program, even though these programs cover 3 out of every 10 people who have an opioid addiction. This would be devastating for so many, if these budget cuts took effect.

I would like to do more. I would, actually, like to pass the LifeBOAT Act, which Senator MANCHIN introduced and I am a cosponsor. That would simply put an extra fee on some of these opioids so that the people who have been reaping the profits from these drugs would be helping to pay for the treatment. I think that is a great idea. Unfortunately, this budget takes us the other way.

It eliminates programs that help rural communities build hospitals and get access to vital telemedicine services. It cuts critical medical research that is happening at the NIH—just when, at the end of last year, we added that money to the NIH's funding. It was shown just in the last month that, with the budget for the rest of the year, we have continued that positive trend. The budget also doubles down on other cuts that would hurt small towns and rural communities, which would impact jobs and opportunities. It eliminates rural business programs, which have helped to create hundreds of thousands of jobs. It cuts rural housing programs and infrastructure grants and loan programs.

Altogether, these cuts not only threaten the progress we have made in fighting against the opioid crisis, but they also threaten the prosperity of the rural communities, which have been the hardest hit. We need a budget that helps and not hurts rural America.

We have a lot of work to do. I appreciate, again, the work of our Democratic and Republican colleagues in the Senate. As we have shown with the budget—from last month through the rest of this year—we have put some common sense in there and have done a good job and have gotten a lot of bipartisan support. My hope is that we will do the same thing here and make a smart budget and reject the one that has been proposed by this administration and come up with something much better that helps and not hurts the people of our States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to spend a little bit of time today talking about how badly ObamaCare is failing the American people and how my Republican colleagues and I are working to repeal and replace it with healthcare that works. I wish I could say that Democrats and Republicans were working together to replace it with healthcare that works. Unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues have taken a walk on this particular topic and, apparently, are not interested in participating.

Even though 30 million Americans remain uninsured under ObamaCare, the individual market—where people buy their health insurance if they do not have employer-provided coverage or government-provided coverage—is in a death spiral. This was confirmed by a study by the Department of Health and Human Services. It was also the subject of a Wall Street Journal article today that makes the point that average premiums in the individual market have increased 105 percent since 2013 in the 39 States in which the ObamaCare exchanges are federally run. This translates into \$3,000 more out-of-pocket

for middle-class, hard-working families—a 105-percent increase in premiums since 2013.

I dare anybody to say ObamaCare is working as it was intended. All one has to do is look back to President Obama's very words, when he said: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor; if you like your health insurance policy, you can keep that. He also said: Oh, by the way, we are going to save you money too. A family of four will save \$2,500 a year. Contrast that to the \$3,000-a-year increase since 2013 in the individual market—a 105-percent increase.

As I said earlier, this week the Department of Health and Human Services released a report that underscores the negative impact ObamaCare is having on families across the country. The report highlights the incredible increase in annual premium prices since ObamaCare took effect, and I mention that in the aggregate.

Let's look at places like Texas. In Texas, the average monthly premium jumped from \$222 in 2013 to \$404—about an 82-percent increase. If you are a young person buying health insurance, a young family or anybody, for that matter, spending \$222 a month and it jumps 82 percent, to \$404, that is a big bite out of your disposable income. That is pretty bad, there is no question about it, but Texas wasn't close to being the hardest hit.

For example, in Wisconsin, premiums have almost doubled. In Montana, they have gone up 133 percent. In some States, the premiums have actually tripled. As I said, the average individual premium has more than doubled in the 39 States using healthcare.gov—an increase of 105 percent since 2013.

That is not the only problem with ObamaCare. This year, one in three counties across the United States have just one insurer on the ObamaCare exchange. In other words, ObamaCare has gotten it so wrong that the risk pools are mainly people who are older and who need healthcare more, and many younger people—young, healthy people who are important in the risk pool to help bring premiums down for everybody—are simply taking a walk. This isn't the mark of a healthcare law that is working for the American people or helping our country grow healthier. It is the mark of a law that is actually hurting families by giving them fewer options at a higher cost and failing to deliver on any promises. We wonder why people are cynical about their own government. Well, it is because of promises made and promises not kept, and ObamaCare—I have said it before and I will say it again—is one of the biggest examples of consumer fraud I have ever seen in my lifetime.

We are talking about real-world consequences here. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to talk about how many people would be po-

tentially hurt by repealing and replacing ObamaCare. Of course, that is purely speculative. They are making it harder because they refuse to participate in this process, but we are determined to make sure we bring premiums down and make health insurance more affordable for those who want to buy it.

Let me talk about concrete examples of people terribly affected by the ObamaCare healthcare law. One of my constituents wrote me a few weeks ago and said she and her husband got their insurance from her husband's job, but since ObamaCare came into effect, their premiums have tripled, and she estimates their deductibles have doubled. What is also frightening is that her prescriptions have skyrocketed too. As an example, an inhaler that previously cost her \$35 now costs almost 10 times that amount—well over \$300.

Given the outrageous costs, this Texan decided to see if she could get a better deal on the exchange since her insurance costs kept going up and up and up. She said the deductible she would have gotten was \$6,000 a year. Add that to higher premiums, and she said ObamaCare was too high to even think about changing to.

ObamaCare has had so many negative ripple effects throughout our entire economy. It restricted the number of hours people can work because of the employer mandate. It raised taxes, depressing economic activity and growth—things like the medical device tax. The medical device industry is one of the most innovative, lifesaving industries in our country and literally in the world. Yet ObamaCare imposed a medical device tax and chased those jobs and the innovation that goes along with them offshore. I remember one of my constituents from Dallas, TX, said they had a location in Costa Rica, and as long as the medical device tax applied to things they did in Texas and in the United States, they were going to take their business and build it in Costa Rica for one reason and one reason alone; that is, to avoid this crushing tax.

The result has not been good for the economy, and it has not been good for healthcare. Many folks can't find any reasonable insurance that will actually pay for what they want. They can't afford what insurance they do have, and they feel hopeless and helpless as the rates keep climbing.

Because I know these stories apply not only in Alaska or in Texas, they apply all across the country, one would think we would have Senators on both sides of the aisle clamoring and working together to try to come up with some solutions, but, once again, it is stony silence from our colleagues across the aisle.

As my constituent rightly pointed out, so much of their income is now

going toward premiums and other healthcare costs, she said she and her husband feel like they are actually being robbed. That is why we believe, on this side of the aisle—I wish I could say on both sides of the aisle but certainly on this side of the aisle—that we need to find a solution that works for our country.

So here is an open invitation to any of our colleagues in either House of Congress: Please come work with us, not for our benefit, not for any political gain or advantage but because it is the right thing to do. That is why we get elected. That is why we serve, not to engage in petty politics but to actually do things that help our constituents.

This isn't just a red-State problem. I pointed that out earlier when I referenced Wisconsin and Montana. This is a problem that confronts our entire country.

So we are going to continue to keep working on a bill that repeals this ObamaCare disaster and replaces it with patient-centered, accessible healthcare that make sense for the American people. I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle come around to join us because we do intend to get this done.

I just want to read a couple of other excerpts from this Wall Street Journal editorial today. They talk a little bit about how to read the CBO report. The Congressional Budget Office, as the Presiding Officer knows, really has the final word on interpreting, from an official standpoint, what the impact of proposed legislation would be, but I have to say this is far from the holy writ.

Here is a good example. In this article, they point out ObamaCare coverage estimates—CBO estimates for ObamaCare coverage by year in millions of enrollees. For example, in 2013, they projected that 7 million enrollees would enroll in ObamaCare, and it was 6 million. That is not too far off, but let's look at 2015. In 2015, they said 13 million would enroll, and 11 million enrolled. Again, that is ballpark, but then we go to 2016. They predicted that 21 million people would enroll in ObamaCare. Do you know how many enrolled? Twelve million. They missed it by almost 50 percent. That is not close. Then, in 2017, they projected it would be 15 million, and it was 10 million.

I say that not to disparage the Congressional Budget Office because I know they are doing the best they can, but it is hard to predict the future, and it is also hard to predict how markets will work and how people will respond to the incentive of more choices and lower costs.

This is not a red-State or a blue-State issue because, as I mentioned, in Missouri alone HHS has said that premiums have increased 145 percent. So

wouldn't we think we would have both Senators from Missouri on the floor working with us to try to solve the problem? I know Senator BLUNT is working with us to try to solve the problem, but we would benefit from having a bipartisan effort to address the problem.

They also point out that there are other things the CBO report talks about which is significant, particularly in terms of getting our economy growing again. They said, for example, that the House bill cut taxes by \$992 billion, spending by \$1.1 trillion, and reduced the deficit by \$119 billion. Now, I know that is not the primary effort here when it comes to healthcare, but if we want to get our economy growing again, if we want to make it possible for more people to buy healthcare coverage at a price they can afford, it helps if they have a job, and it helps if the economy is growing.

Here is the thing that, to me, is perhaps the most cynical argument by the critics of what we are trying to do in repealing and replacing ObamaCare. Despite the fact that there are 30 million people uninsured now—hardly a success, hardly the gold standard for providing access to healthcare coverage—the Congressional Budget Office points out what I think is pretty obvious. If you take the gun away from people's heads and you don't force them to buy a product they really don't want, fewer people are actually going to buy it because it doesn't suit their needs, and it is not available at a price they can afford. As the Wall Street Journal points out, without the threat of government to buy insurance or else pay a penalty, some people will conclude that ObamaCare coverage isn't worth the price, even with the subsidies.

Sometimes I wish we would have honest and open debates about the problems that confront our country, and certainly healthcare is something near and dear to all of our hearts. Too often I feel as though we are ships passing in the night or reverting to our talking points rather than having an open and honest discussion. This is an area where we can benefit from an open and honest discussion and an acknowledgment that the status quo is unsustainable.

If Hillary Clinton were President of the United States today, we would be revisiting ObamaCare because the individual market is, as I described earlier, failing. It is failing. I am confident our colleagues across the aisle would be eager to try to step forward to address that, but because the candidate they did not choose won the Presidency, then they are in full-blown resistance, not offering to lift even a finger to try to help us solve this problem, and it is a shame, but it is not too late.

We invite them again to join us as we repeal and replace ObamaCare, pro-

viding people with more choices at a price they can afford, not because we are going to hold a gun to their head and say you are going to have to buy a product you don't want, at a price you can't afford, we are going to give people the freedom to choose. That is not a bad thing. That is a good thing. That is what America is all about—not having government force you to make decisions that you don't view are in your own economic self-interests.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I rise to speak on the same subject as my friend from Texas.

Listen, Democrats are ready to talk to Republicans about improving our healthcare system, but we aren't going to engage in a debate that presupposes that the end result is going to be millions of people losing care and rates going up for everybody in order to fund a tax cut for the wealthy. That is the plan Donald Trump and the Republicans are pushing.

So my Republican friend is right: Democrats are not interested in having a discussion about how many people are going to lose coverage. We are not interested in having a discussion about how high the rate increases are going to be. We are not interested in having a discussion about big tax breaks for millionaires, billionaires, insurance companies, and drug companies.

Let's be honest. If Republicans were serious about working with Democrats, we wouldn't be using an arcane Senate rule which allows them to push through a bill with 50 votes. If Republicans really wanted to work with Democrats on healthcare reform, they would do it through normal business. If Republicans were really serious about working with Democrats on healthcare reform, they would be going through regular order and going through the committee process.

Whatever we want to think about the Affordable Care Act, it went through the committee process. I think 160 Republican amendments were accepted in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee in 2009. The Finance Committee held multiple meetings. The bill was on the floor of the Senate for a month. Republicans are jamming this bill through—no committee process, no committee meetings, no committee markups, no open-floor process.

Even Senator CORKER called out his own party and said that this is no way to rewrite one-sixth of the American economy—13 male Republican Senators, behind closed doors, in secret.

Democrats are desperate to work with Republicans on fixing what is wrong with our healthcare system. Not every problem has been fixed, but we are not going to start with 17 million people losing healthcare or rates going

up by 20 percent. And we want to do it in a way that is transparent to the American public, where everybody can see.

On the second point my friend from Texas raised—this idea that CBO got the numbers wrong when they estimated how many people would be insured by the Affordable Care Act in 2009—as he mentioned, they weren't off by that much, but to the extent they were off, there is a simple reason for it: CBO did not take into account that Republican States would seek to undermine the Affordable Care Act in every conceivable way possible. CBO gave Republican Governors and State legislatures the benefit of the doubt that once this law was passed, once it was presenting an avenue to insurance for millions of people across the country, both parties would seek to implement it. That is not what happened. Republican States refused to set up State-based exchanges. Republicans brought lawsuit after lawsuit to try to stop the Affordable Care Act from going forward. Republicans, in control of the House and the Senate, jammed through legislation that reduced the risk insurance provided to insurance companies. CBO did not estimate that Republicans would wage a 6-year-long campaign to undermine and undo the Affordable Care Act.

In States that implemented the act, such as Connecticut, numbers met or beat expectations. In States that didn't implement the Affordable Care Act, sought to undermine it, numbers didn't meet the expectations.

Then comes President Trump, who openly telegraphs his desire to undermine the Affordable Care Act, cuts off all of the advertising, tells the IRS to stop enforcing the law, bleeds out payments to insurance companies one month at a time, teasing that this will be the last month they get their money.

Finally, on this question of a gun to the head of consumers—I guess that is a reference to the provision of the Affordable Care Act that says: If you don't buy insurance, then you will pay a penalty. That is absolutely part of the Affordable Care Act. Why? Because if you want protection for people with preexisting conditions, then you have to have a mandate that people buy insurance, or else people just won't buy insurance until they are really sick, knowing they can't be charged more.

Actuarially, the protection for people with preexisting conditions only works with the individual mandate. I remember Senator CRUZ, during his marathon filibuster, admitting that. Republicans and Democrats know that. That is why the American Health Care Act, which just came out of the House of Representatives, includes an individual mandate. So let's not pretend like this is a partisan issue.

The rightwing American Health Care Act that came out of the House of Rep-

resentatives 2 weeks ago includes an individual mandate—it is in there—because they know the same thing: If they want to preserve any modicum of protection for people with preexisting conditions, they have to require people to buy insurance. They just put the mandate in a different place. In the Affordable Care Act, the penalty kicks in if you don't buy insurance. In the House bill, the penalty kicks in after you have lost insurance and you try to sign up again. It is the same mandate, the same penalty, just a slightly different timetable for payment.

Here is what TrumpCare does: higher costs, less care, tax cuts for the rich.

I want to talk about the CBO score that came out last night—not major adjustments from the first CBO score, but there are some important amendments that they make. But the bottom line is that if you care about costs, there are going to be higher costs. That is what CBO says. There is a 20-percent increase in cost the first year, 5 percent in the next year for good measure. There is less care—I mean significantly less care—23 million people. Big improvement—24 million people lost care in the first House bill; 23 million people lose care in the second House bill. And all of this is done in order to pass along tax cuts to the wealthy. We are talking about \$662 billion of tax cuts for the wealthy.

Here is what CBO says: Premiums are projected to rise 20 percent in 2018. So our Republican friends who came down to this floor for 6 years and said we need to repeal the Affordable Care Act because costs are too high just passed a bill in the House of Representatives that CBO guarantees will raise premiums by 20 percent in 2018.

And it got a lot worse. CBO says that if you are an individual with a preexisting condition and you live in a State that takes advantage of one of these waivers, the premiums, frankly, don't even matter to you because you won't be able to afford the catastrophic high cost associated with your illness.

If you are an older American, especially an older American living on Social Security, then you are targeted by the American Health Care Act. A 64-year-old making \$26,000—and I have a lot of 64-year-olds in Connecticut making \$26,000, and I bet a lot of my colleagues here who live in lower cost and lower income States have even more of this population—today you are paying about \$1,700 a year for healthcare. That is what your premium is after taxes. Under the American Health Care Act, your premium would go up to \$21,000 a year. You are making \$26,000, and your premium goes up to \$21,000. You would receive about \$5,000 in tax credits, but in the end, you would be paying \$16,000 in healthcare premiums.

Now, obviously you wouldn't be paying \$16,000 in insurance premiums because you couldn't afford healthcare if

you still want to pay your rent and you still want to pay your gas bill and you still want a few groceries.

The reason why massive numbers of people lose insurance is because 20 percent is just the average; for some people, premiums will go up 700 to 800 percent, especially if you are older or if you are lower income.

Here is what CBO says will happen if the Affordable Care Act stays: The number of uninsured will go up a little bit. It will tick up to about 28 million. But for all my colleagues on the Republican side who have been claiming that the Affordable Care Act is in a "death spiral," CBO tells you that you are wrong. You are wrong. They state clearly that the marketplaces will remain stable. Now, again, they may not be counting on the kind of sabotage President Trump is engaged in. If President Trump continues to destabilize the markets, maybe this number will be wrong. But if you had an administration that was attempting to enforce and implement the Affordable Care Act, you would get about the same number of people who are uninsured.

Here is what happens if you pass the American Health Care Act: The number goes immediately up to over 40 million uninsured and peaks after 10 years at 51 million people.

Senator CORNYN said: Listen, we still have 30 million people who don't have insurance; let's try to solve that problem. But CBO says that the House bill doesn't solve the problem. It turns a problem of 28 million Americans without health insurance into a humanitarian catastrophe—more people uninsured at the end of this than were uninsured before the Affordable Care Act passed.

So I guess what Senator CORNYN is saying is that whatever product emerges from these secret meetings will insure more people and that CBO will verify that. That is something on which we can work together. Let me guarantee, that won't be the case.

To give a sense of how many people 23 million is, because I know that is kind of a hard number to get your head wrapped around, this is the number of people who lose insurance under the House bill, according to CBO. CBO's new numbers just came out last night. That is the equivalent population of Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, South Dakota, Rhode Island, North Dakota, and West Virginia. When we put up this chart a couple months ago, I think there was one additional State. So by moving from 24 million losing insurance to 23 million people losing insurance, one State came off this list. But that is the equivalent population of how many folks lose healthcare in this country. That is why I call it a humanitarian catastrophe.

Then let's just think about what CBO says about who benefits. Here are 23 million people who lose insurance—and that is a pretty simple formula. The bill takes insurance from 23 million people in order to pass along a \$173 billion tax break for the pharmaceutical industry and the insurance industry and a \$230 billion tax break for very rich people. Some of it will go to people making above \$200,000 a year, but most of it will go to people making over \$1 million or \$1 billion a year. The numbers actually work out pretty squarely. The cuts to healthcare in the bill roughly work out to be about the same amount in tax cuts for the wealthy.

By the way, there is another chart here that is a great one. There is another chart that shows who benefits when we look at the tax breaks. If you make under \$200,000 a year, you get zero benefit from the American Health Care Act. Every single dime of the tax cuts for individuals or families goes to those making over \$200,000 a year. How about that—a \$230 billion tax break, and not a dime of it goes to people making under \$200,000 a year. So this bill was a nightmare before the CBO score, and it is even more of a nightmare today.

Let me point out one more important thing that CBO says about this bill. Inside this bill, in a new amendment that allowed it to pass the House of Representatives, is a provision that allows States to get waivers from the essential healthcare benefits requirement that insurance actually provide you coverage for healthcare and the community rating requirement that you spread out the costs of healthcare across the entire population of people who are insured.

What CBO says is that about one-sixth of the population—that is equivalent to about 25 States and Washington, DC—who might obtain waivers, including both the essential benefits requirement and the community rating benefit—that would result in insurance markets coming apart at the beginning of 2020.

CBO states that “less healthy people would face extremely high premiums, despite the additional funding that would be available” under the bill to reduce premiums. CBO says specifically: “In particular, out-of-pocket spending on maternity care and mental health and substance abuse services could increase by thousands of dollars in a given year for the nongroup enrollees who would use those services.”

Let me put a finer point on this. The legislative jujitsu that Republicans did in the House to get this thing passed involved eliminating the requirement that people with preexisting conditions be protected from premium increases, combined with a high-risk pool that would have a bunch of money in it to help reduce premiums for those people.

CBO tells you essentially that those high-risk pools are a fraud. CBO says there is not enough money in the high-risk pools in order to provide any meaningful benefit for people with preexisting conditions. In particular, they say, women going through pregnancy, families going through pregnancy, and individuals with mental health and substance abuse will see thousands of dollars in additional costs because the money in the risk pools cannot cover the cost of that care.

We have an opioid epidemic raging throughout this country, and the House just passed a bill that will increase costs for people suffering from substance abuse by thousands of dollars. We can do better. Republicans can emerge from these secret meetings, set aside their plan to ram through this vote with no committee process through reconciliation, and we can start talking about what to preserve in the Affordable Care Act and what we need to change. That is what Americans want us to do.

The majority of Americans do not want this bill repealed. The majority of Americans today support the Affordable Care Act. Yes, that number is different than what it was a few years ago. Maybe that is because, faced with this benefit, faced with these insurance protections being eliminated, Americans are rallying to the defense of the Affordable Care Act. That doesn't mean Democrats don't believe we can make some commonsense amendments, but it does mean we are not willing to participate in a process that presupposes that the outcome will be less people being insured, costs getting higher in order to finance tax breaks for the very wealthy and for insurance companies and drug companies.

Republicans should come out from behind closed doors, work with Democrats. CBO tells you a humanitarian catastrophe is coming if you don't.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I am here to visit about the topic of healthcare. I will be spending time in Kansas this week, and there probably will be no topic of conversation that will be greater than people's concerns about healthcare. I will tell you, as I have indicated to many of my colleagues, this is like no other issue I have ever dealt with as an elected official in how personal the consequences are of the decisions we make here.

While I certainly admit there is plenty of politics and partisanship and too much back and forth that revolves around this concern about healthcare, what I do know is, the people who visit with me, in so many instances, are my friends, my neighbors, our kids' teachers, they are people I go to church with, and in many instances, as they have a conversation with me about

what we are going to do in regard to healthcare, tears begin to stream down their cheeks as they worry about themselves but, more importantly, they worry about their family members, their sons, daughters, husbands, wives, and parents.

This is a very personal issue. The concerns Kansans have about this and what we might do is sincere and real. I also know the Affordable Care Act—the law that is in existence today—is failing many Americans as well. In fact, just this week, yesterday, we learned the company Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas City is exiting the market and will no longer provide a product in the Kansas City area of our State, which means, in most instances, individuals will no longer have an option in regard to the Affordable Care Act.

What we have in place doesn't work, but I also know what has come from the House isn't the solution to this problem either. The work we have to do—you and I, Madam President, and our colleagues—is serious and one that has real and personal consequences for every American, and we must take our responsibilities seriously.

I have indicated to my colleagues that neither the Affordable Care Act, which I voted against, nor what the House has passed, is anything I would vote for. I really wish we were doing something different than either one of those things.

As I thought about my remarks today, I was about to say that I suppose I came too late to get my ideas adopted by Congress, but really I came to this issue early, and I think it was 2004, maybe 2006, in which, at least in my own mind, I penned on paper and worked on drafting legislation on what I called a 10-point plan to address the affordability and availability of healthcare.

I can tell you that my ideas, which predate President Obama's, were nothing like the Affordable Care Act, and they really were nothing like the conversation we are having today. I wish we would be addressing the underlying reasons that healthcare costs so much rather than focusing so much attention on the issue of health insurance and its premiums.

If we can drive the things out of healthcare that unnecessarily raise the price, the cost of access to healthcare, we can make a tremendous difference in healthcare premiums and the affordability of healthcare for all Americans, not just trying to figure out what kind of plan we can develop, what kind of insurance program, what kind of subsidy or tax credit we can provide, but we would be treating the underlying problem, not just the symptoms.

I suppose, to give a little understanding of what I am talking about, in my view, the things we ought to consider are allowing more competition in

the market, more free enterprise opportunities, allowing people to purchase insurance from coast to coast, expanding the support for community health centers. These centers are already in existence. They need to be more available in more places.

We are a very rural State, and it is hard to find those community health centers, but they provide healthcare services to people who have no ability to pay and no insurance. We ought to be more supportive of community health centers, not less, providing, particularly, primary care for people in difficult circumstances.

We also need to give small businesses and organizations the ability to organize and create larger pools so they can negotiate for better premiums. We need to utilize health savings accounts. We need to support medical research. If we can find a cure for cancer, the delay of the onset of Alzheimer's, we can save billions of dollars in our healthcare system as well as save lives and improve the quality of life of people who suffer from the diseases that are so prevalent.

We need to address the issue of prescription drug costs. How do we make certain no drug company takes advantage of cornering the market or how do we make certain they don't utilize our current laws to extend the life of their patent, eliminating the chance for competition to come into play and the introduction of generic medicine that can save, again, consumers and patients lots of money.

We need to promote preventive healthcare. Wellness, fitness, diet, and nutrition are the things that probably give us the biggest bang for our buck and don't necessarily need to be a government program, but people need to work at living healthier and healthier lives and prevent diseases from occurring in the first place.

We need additional physicians and other healthcare providers—nurses and others—and we have not put the attention into developing programs to educate and train the next generation of medical providers. We need to make sure Medicare and Medicaid actually pay for the cost of the services they promised to pay for on behalf of low-income citizens as well as citizens who are seniors, instead of having the cost shifting that occurs as a result of the system we have today, in which Medicare doesn't pay or Medicaid doesn't pay sufficient amounts of money to actually pay for the services a patient receives under either one of those programs.

Again, those are things that I think would be beneficial to every American, and it wouldn't be spending our time trying to figure out how we modify the insurance system, how we figure out about subsidies or tax credits for people within the system. Again, I don't come late to this issue, but it doesn't seem to be the direction we are going.

Before my time expires, one of the items I wanted to particularly highlight is the value of medical research. I am proud this Congress passed an appropriations bill that includes an additional \$2 billion for use in medical research for the National Institutes of Health, and perhaps something that we can even be additionally proud of is, we did that without spending more money. We simply—I shouldn't say "simply." Nothing is easy about it. I am on the Appropriations subcommittee that is responsible for the funding of NIH. We reallocated money that was being spent someplace else in support of medical research. Again, if we find the cure for cancer, if we reduce the onset, the time in which people suffer from Alzheimer's, if we can find the cure for diabetes and other diseases, the life-saving changes that are being made through that medical research and the costs that will accrue to our healthcare delivery system are hugely important.

I particularly commend the Director of the National Institutes of Health for working so closely with Members of Congress and the American people in support of medical research. Dr. Francis Collins is a national resource. I am not a scientist. I don't understand all the concepts that are spoken about when we talk about medical research—a long shot from that. One of the things Dr. Collins, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, has been able to do is explain to me and to my colleagues and to others across the country the value of medical research without getting me lost in the details of the actual science. He is someone who can talk to a layperson about medical research and science in a way that captures me, captures my attention, but I don't get lost in the medical or technical or scientific words and jargon that so often scientists use in having the conversations.

Dr. Collins has been so bipartisan in his approach. I smiled when I read the story. He indicated that when he was being chosen to be the Director of the National Institutes of Health, he called his mother back home and indicated to her: Mom, I am going to become the Director of the National Institutes of Health.

She said: But we are Republicans. I don't want you working for government.

Here is a man who has used his time not working for government, perhaps working in government, but working for the American people and really for worldwide solutions to problems we all face in our families.

There is no American, there is no one in this Chamber whose family has not been affected by the diseases I described and the other long list of afflictions we have as human beings that NIH is not working to make a difference in their lives.

We need to continue that support for the National Institutes of Health as we

pursue appropriations bills into the future, and our ability to do that together is important and a source of satisfaction that can come.

I have indicated, from time to time, that it is sometimes difficult to find the things in the jobs that we have as U.S. Senators where you get the sense of accomplishment. There are a lot of challenges in getting things done, but the idea that we have come together to support medical research and find life-saving cures gives us something to take great satisfaction in and gives us hope that what we have been able to accomplish in this regard, as Republicans and Democrats but really as Americans, can be a role model as we try to find solutions to other problems. I hope that will be the case as we try to find solutions with regard to how do we care for the American people when it comes to their affordability and availability of healthcare.

You and I, Madam President, come from States that are very rural. In any kind of healthcare solution that we find, we need to make certain we are increasing the chances that hospital doors remain open in rural communities across our States, and we need to make certain there are more physicians, not less, there are more healthcare providers, that nursing home and healthcare services are more available, and that pharmacy remains on Main Street.

In fact, in the cases of our States, you could find ways, I suppose, that reduce the cost of healthcare only to discover that you no longer have a provider, no longer have a hospital or a physician or a pharmacy in your hometown. Sometimes when you talk about the affordability, you must quickly couple that with availability. Whatever its price is, if it is not in your community, if it is not in your county, if it is not in your region of the State, it doesn't necessarily matter what it costs.

Our work is serious, and I look forward to working with you and my colleagues as we try to find solutions to make certain healthcare is something every American has access to.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, just 1 week after a party-line vote in the Judiciary Committee, the Senate is about to vote on the nomination of Judge Amul Thapar to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. It has been more than 16 months since the Senate confirmed a Federal appellate judge and almost 11 months since we voted on a circuit or district nomination. That is because of Leader MCCONNELL's unprecedented obstruction, blocking any votes on President Obama's qualified, consensus nominees, all in an effort to leave as many judicial vacancies as possible for President Trump and the far right special interest groups who are charged with selecting his nominees.

The 7 days Judge Thapar has waited for a vote is quite a contrast with the last circuit judge that Leader MCCONNELL permitted to be confirmed. Judge Felipe Restrepo's nomination languished for 6 months on the Senate floor last Congress before he was finally given a floor vote. Of course, there was no good reason for that. Judge Restrepo had bipartisan support at every step of the process: positive blue slips from his Democratic and Republican home State Senators, a voice vote in the Judiciary Committee, and a bipartisan 82-6 confirmation vote. Likewise, there was no good reason for Leader MCCONNELL to deny votes on other circuit nominees like Donald Schott and Jennifer Puhl. They were reported with strong bipartisan support in the Judiciary Committee and had bipartisan support from their home State Senators, but were left languishing on the Executive Calendar for months, without ever receiving floor consideration. We should not forget the 20 district nominees and the five Court of Federal Claims nominees, who were reported with bipartisan support and then fell victim to Senate Republicans' unprecedented obstruction and were denied a vote after waiting months or even years. Of course, we cannot overlook one of the most shameful inactions of the Senate—the treatment of Chief Judge Merrick Garland, who did not even receive a hearing for his nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court.

So why are we now rushing to confirm Judge Thapar? It is only fair to note that the seat to which he has been nominated has been vacant for nearly 4 years. President Obama's nominee to that seat did not receive this expedited process. She did not even receive blue slips from the Kentucky Senators. Now, that is their right. Had I still been chairman, I would have honored that decision—as I did for both circuit and district nominees—however much I might have disagreed with it. We should not pretend that we are required to vote so quickly on Judge Thapar simply because the Republican leadership held this seat vacant.

This is a nomination that requires thorough consideration by the Senate. It is no secret that Judge Thapar is a favorite of the same far right groups that handpicked Justice Gorsuch—in fact, Judge Thapar was on the same shortlist that they gave to President Trump. Given Judge Thapar's apparent views on campaign finance regulation, it is no surprise that these groups, who are some of the biggest opponents of any efforts to bring transparency to campaign financing, want to see him elevated to a circuit court. His answers during his hearing did not allay my concerns.

I was also troubled by Judge Thapar's responses to my written questions. Like Justice Gorsuch, he dodged a very simple question about whether the

First Amendment permits a religious litmus test for entry into the United States, but even that nonanswer was inaccurate. Judge Thapar responded that the constitutionality of a religious litmus test is an active question in pending litigation regarding the president's Executive order targeting Muslim-majority countries, and that he could not comment on it. That is not accurate. There is no question that such a religious litmus test is unconstitutional—even the Trump administration does not argue otherwise. Instead, they are arguing that the Executive order does not impose such a litmus test. Judge Thapar failed to get the facts right, and failed to show me that he understands one of the most fundamental principles of our Constitution. It will be very difficult for me to support any judicial nominee who fails to answer this question with adherence to both the Constitution and the facts.

The role that far right interest groups have played in this nomination and the Gorsuch nomination is troubling. A President is free to consult with whomever he wishes on potential nominees, but the “advice and consent” power belongs to the Senate, not the Federalist Society. For decades, Presidents of both parties have consulted with home State Senators, a requirement formalized through the Judiciary Committee's blue slip process. This tradition protects the role of all 100 Senators in the confirmation process and helps ensure that Presidents work with Senators of both parties to find consensus nominees.

During my nearly 20 years as either chairman or ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, I encouraged Republicans and Democrats to work with President Clinton, President Bush, and President Obama to find qualified, consensus nominees, and I protected the rights of Senators in both parties. As Ranking Member FEINSTEIN noted in a memo that was circulated yesterday, no judicial nomination made by the last three Presidents was confirmed without the support of both home State Senators. I cannot recall a nominee being confirmed over the objection of his or her home State Senator. The blue slip is not a partisan issue; it is about constitutional checks and balances and the Senate's role in protecting the independence of our Federal judiciary. I encourage President Trump to follow the example of his predecessors from both parties and work with us to find consensus nominees to ensure that our Federal courts remain the envy of the rest of the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

OPIOID CRISIS

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam President, I would like to take this time to discuss a critical public health crisis affecting constituents in Illinois and all

across the country. Each day, 46 people die from overdose of prescription painkillers in the United States. In Illinois, that number is only growing.

Overdose deaths in Illinois from opioids rose about 275 percent from 2008 to 2014. There are an estimated 460,000 nonmedical prescription opioid users in Illinois alone. A major portion of the total number of drug-poisoning deaths between 2013 and 2015 were a result of opioid and prescription drug abuse. Over 4,000 people died as a result of opioids and prescription drugs, and 2,000 people died due to heroin. Illinois also had the third fastest rising death rates from synthetic opioids in the Nation, with overdoses rising by 120 percent from 2014 to 2015. Unfortunately, Illinois is third from the bottom for treatment of substance abuse because of lack of funding and resources to healthcare providers and law enforcement partners in the State.

These numbers are alarming, but I would like to share a story behind those numbers—a face. Laura Fry is a mother whose family has experienced the worst of the opioid epidemic. Her son, Alexander, is 29 years old and in remission from heroin use disorder.

Alexander was just a normal kid growing up in Wauconda, IL. He had his entire life ahead of him. Then, when he was 17, he had a snowboarding accident and was taken to the emergency room after he lost consciousness. That is when doctors found a mass on his cerebellum and he had to undergo major brain surgery. It was after this surgery that Alexander became addicted to morphine, and his drug abuse began.

When Alexander graduated from high school, he began working at a hospital, where he was able to steal drugs to fuel his abuse. Over time, his drug abuse spiraled out of control. He was fired from his job for stealing narcotics and was arrested for possession of heroin. But because this was his first offense, he was given a very strict 2-year probation. Over the next 4 months, he tested positive for heroin several times, and then he simply disappeared. Laura did not know where her son was or whether he was even alive for 10 months. Finally, he was arrested and taken into custody.

In Lake County, IL, we thankfully have a criminal justice system that recognizes addiction is a disease. The court gave Alexander the opportunity to continue his probation, and he was allowed to perform hundreds of hours of community service and to attend an intensive outpatient program.

In the spring of last year, Laura and her son Alexander appeared in court for the last time. Alexander is now a volunteer for Live4Lali, a substance abuse program in Illinois. He attends community outreach events, shares stories, and offers trainings in naloxone use—a lifesaving drug that reverses opioid

overdoses. He has gone from being a user to someone who is transforming lives.

Alexander's story is a reminder that Congress must focus on enhancing recovery efforts, and we are beginning to take steps in the right direction. For example, I was a proud supporter of the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, also known as CARA, when I served in the House. CARA, which passed with overwhelming bipartisan support, establishes, supports, and strengthens a number of programs to fight the opioid crisis in communities. It provides opportunities for rehabilitation, like the outpatient program Alexander attended, and expands access to drugs like naloxone, which are saving lives on the frontlines of this epidemic.

I applaud these efforts, but I have serious concerns about the majority's commitment to actually funding these essential programs to rehabilitate our fellow Americans who are suffering from opioid addiction because, while we can all agree that CARA's intent was to transform our opioid crisis, the bill failed to provide any actual funds to enact these effective programs.

I, along with many of my colleagues, have asked for CARA to be fully funded and to provide additional funding to the drug courts and veteran treatment courts, which essentially reduced crime, saved taxpayer dollars, and saved the lives of more than 1.25 million civilians and veterans. In addition, we must also make sure families have access to medicine that can save lives during an overdose by calling on manufacturers to offer naloxone to rein in the costs.

I share this story because the turmoil that the Fry family faced is not unique. Millions of Americans are experiencing the impact of opioid abuse, and many of these American stories have much more tragic endings. We can and must do more for these families.

I ask that we take the time, consider the story of Alexander and his family, and step up and do the right thing. Let's fund CARA fully.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, let me thank my colleague, Senator MANCHIN, for arranging the time to talk about the ongoing opioid epidemic across the country. I know his home State of West Virginia—much like my home State of Rhode Island—has been hit particularly hard by this epidemic.

This is not happening in some far off place or some distant country. It is happening in Rhode Island, West Virginia, and, indeed, every State throughout the Nation. Last year, over 330 Rhode Islanders lost their lives due to opioids.

Rhode Island is a small State, so let me talk about a national statistic that shows the extent of this crisis. Last

year, drug overdoses killed 50,000 Americans. That means more people died last year because of drug overdoses than due to car crashes or gun violence. These numbers are staggering, and it is happening in all of our communities.

Since 2011, the number of overdose deaths has increased by more than 90 percent. Unfortunately, year after year, Rhode Island continues to top the Nation in terms of rates of overdose deaths. We must work to turn this around and get more people access to treatment for opioid addiction.

In 2008, almost a decade ago, Congress enacted the landmark Paul Wellstone and Pete Domenici Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Law. For the first time, the law required insurance companies to cover behavioral health services in the same way that it would cover physical health services. This was a critical step, but it ultimately did not solve the problem, as some insurance companies have continued to find ways to avoid complying with the law—or at least its spirit.

It took passage of the Affordable Care Act to improve access to behavioral health services. For the first time, critical consumer protections, like banning discrimination based on preexisting conditions, ensured that individuals with substance abuse disorders could not be denied coverage.

Further, the ACA established a set of essential health benefits that all insurance plans must cover, including mental health and substance abuse treatment. Gone are the days when consumers would pay steep prices for health insurance that in actuality did not even cover basic health services, such as mental health care or maternity care.

In addition, the ACA prohibits lifetime annual limits on care. Before the ACA, many people with chronic health conditions, such as substance use disorders, would hit their annual cap just a couple of months into the year and then would have to pay all other costs out of pocket for the rest of the year.

Lastly, the expansion of Medicaid has made a tremendous improvement in access to behavioral health services. In States like Rhode Island that have expanded Medicaid, we have seen a sharp drop in the percentage of people with substance use disorders who seek care in the emergency department because they are uninsured. Medicaid is the single largest payer of substance use disorder services and pays for one-third of all medication-assisted treatment in the country.

TrumpCare would reverse all these gains. According to the Center on Budget Policy and Priorities, repeal of the ACA would mean 2.8 million people with substance use disorders would be at risk of losing their coverage. Repeal of the Medicaid expansion would cut

\$4.5 billion from mental health and substance use disorders for those with low incomes, to say nothing of TrumpCare's broader goal of ending Medicaid as we know it. TrumpCare would all but eliminate this critical safety net.

TrumpCare goes even further to turn back the clock on consumer protections like preexisting conditions. People with substance use disorders would be disadvantaged immediately, as their disorder could be considered a preexisting condition. This has the double effect of pricing people with mental and behavioral health issues out of the market entirely and encouraging people not to seek care out of fear of being labeled by their insurance company as having a preexisting condition.

On top of that, TrumpCare would gut the essential health benefits in the ACA. This means that there would be no rules about what health insurance must cover, such as preventive health services and mental and behavioral health services. Even with coverage, people will have to pay out of pocket for the services they need. For substance use disorders, which could add up to \$20,000 a year in out-of-pocket costs alone.

Over the last couple of years, I have worked with my colleagues on the Senate Appropriations Committee to include historic funding increases for programs that help the opioid crisis. In fact, the fiscal year 2017 omnibus provided \$511 million for prevention, enforcement, treatment, and recovery across various agencies, including over \$300 million for the Department of Health and Human Services, \$50 million for the Department of Veterans Affairs, and over \$160 million for the Department of Justice. Last year, we passed the 21st Century Cures Act, which directed \$1 billion to States to combat the opioid crisis. We must continue these efforts.

However, this week, the President released his budget proposal for next year, and it does the exact opposite. First of all, the President's budget doubles down on his plan to decimate Medicaid. The President has proposed cutting hundreds of billions of dollars from Medicaid, block-granting the program with no protections for the most vulnerable. In fact, his budget offers no details on how it plans to structure Medicaid—just that he intends to cut the program beyond repair.

On top of that, the President's budget makes enormous cuts to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Agency, SAMHSA, which implements many of our most effective substance use disorder prevention and treatment programs, such as the Community Mental Health Services Block Grant Program, which President Trump has proposed cutting by over 20 percent.

Further, President Trump has proposed cutting the National Institutes

of Health by nearly \$6 billion, which would interrupt critical research into new and better ways to treat substance use disorders, along with research into how we can better treat pain without the use of addicting opioid painkillers. Coupled with TrumpCare, this budget proposal would only worsen the opioid crisis.

I am committed to continuing to work with my colleagues to prevent that from happening. I am heartened to see so many of my colleagues talk about these very issues this afternoon.

It is my hope that we will be able to work together over the coming months to ensure that the gains we have made in the fiscal year 2017 omnibus and the Cures Act are not lost. We have much more work to do, and people in my State and across the country are counting on us to do that for them.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY
IMPROVEMENTS ACT

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, we have a lot of issues we are working on right now. Some of the big ones include the budget conversation. For the first time in a long time, the budget conversation really circles around, how are we going to get back to balance? It is an interesting dialogue. There is going to be a lot of dispute about elements of the President's budget. There will be a lot of controversy back and forth about aspects in the House and the Senate proposals. But for the first time in a long time, the beginning point of the conversation is, how do we get back to balance? That is a good place to start. I am pleased to see that is a part of the conversation again.

There are a tremendous number of things that have to be dealt with in this process. I want to bring up two quick ones and then talk about some of the small business issues we are facing.

One of them is that when we go through the budget process, I encourage my colleagues to deal with the budget gimmicks that are still in place in the budget process—areas that seem to bring down the deficit but we all know actually do not. Those don't help us as Americans. That may help with some sort of scoring issues; that doesn't really help where we are.

The second aspect to that is, let's actually put the appropriations bills on the floor. For the last several years, there have been continuing resolutions or omnibuses without any amendment process brought. We should be able to, in a bipartisan way, agree to bring

these appropriations bills to the floor, actually have an amendment process, and actually deal with this in a public setting. There are straightforward ways to deal with our debt and deficit. It begins with actually confronting debt and deficit in a way that will really matter.

It is interesting as well that when we talk about a lot of the big issues, regulations often come up as one of the prime problems. Regulations are often big, expensive, and deal with a lot of controversy.

Quite frankly, there are thousands of regulations out there that impact small businesses. For a small business, it is not typically just one regulation, it is the hundreds of little ones that they are constantly trying to live under. It is the culmination of all of these different regulations and trying to figure out where they are. Most small businesses don't have lawyers. They don't have compliance people. They don't have folks lined up to monitor all of these things. They have to try to figure it out as they go. They are small businesses. They are family-owned businesses. They are trying to take care of their own families and the neighbors around them. But all of these regulations come at them as well.

Let me read what Karen Karrigan, the president and CEO of the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council, wrote in an op-ed just last week. She wrote:

Red tape is strangling our small businesses and undermining entrepreneurship. Indeed, according to [Small Business and Entrepreneurship] Council research, the cumulative loss of new businesses over the last decade totals 3.42 million missing businesses—

Not workers—

for America's economy. For existing small businesses, the per-employee cost of regulation is just over \$11,000. Excessive regulation in the U.S. has hurt our competitiveness in the global economy. The U.S. ranks No. 51 in the world for ease of starting a business, according to the World Bank. This same report is consistent with other global studies that have found America's friendliness and general "ease of doing business" has eroded year after year.

That is according to Karen Karrigan, president and CEO of the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council, in her op-ed last week.

Each new regulation on small business adds another cost, another burden, another requirement that small businesses have to comply with. This cumulative burden is crushing small business.

Let me give some examples. Julian Lumber Company is in Antlers, OK. You ought to come and see Antlers, OK. It is a beautiful area of our State. Julian Lumber Company, a family-owned business, makes wooden fence posts, treated poles. If you have a telephone pole in that area or other posts and poles, it often came from Julian

Lumber Company. It also has a small trucking company to be able to haul posts to retail stores across the Midwest and the Southwest. Julian employs about 50 people but recently had to shift a part-time employee who was doing compliance to full-time—doing nothing but compliance 40 hours a week because of all the Federal regulations. When Robert Julian funded this business in 1974, he didn't set out to just create jobs for a compliance officer, he actually set out to do lumber work, but unfortunately, now his business also includes Federal compliance.

Small businesses are vital to our economy. Surely we can agree on that. They drive job creation and innovation. Excessive and poorly crafted government regulations disproportionately—the burden of them—fall on small businesses and on their growth. If Julian Lumber has to hire more people to just do compliance, not lumber, there is a problem.

Then there is Ander's Shoe Store in Miami, OK, which was founded in 1930 by Joe Ander after he immigrated to Oklahoma from Poland. Today, Ander's Shoe Store is owned and operated by Joe's daughter, Dena Ander, who is 102 years old. She has worked at Ander's Shoe Store for 86 years.

My favorite quote ever from a small business owner came from her when she said, at 101, that her health is better than her help, and so she just keeps working.

Dena Anders is not waking up every day and reading the Federal Register to find out what new Federal regulation came down. She is not trying to track through all the different compliance officers and attorneys that she would have to contact to try to figure out how to read a new Federal regulation that comes down. She is taking care of a shoe store in Miami, OK. She has two employees, but her shoe store has to live by the same regulations that a lot of large stores also have to live by.

Every Member of this body—when they are home, they talk about small businesses and the importance of small businesses and how to help them succeed. I am asking, are we as a body willing to do what we said we were going to do back home? Ninety-seven percent of the businesses in my State of Oklahoma are small businesses. Lots of us make promises to these small businesses. It is time to fulfill them.

Regulatory reform for even small businesses, for whatever reason, is becoming politicized. This is not a political, Republican-Democrat issue. Small business owners are not Republicans or Democrats; they are Americans. They are people, and this should not be a partisan issue. I would be willing to work with every Senator of any party to be able to get this done.

I have introduced the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements

Act. It has passed its way through committee. It is S. 584. It does some simple things—things that should not be controversial.

It closes loopholes in the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which became law in 1980. That bill was designed to help small businesses, but there are some loopholes in it, and the agencies are going around it.

This is not a bill that I just came up with on my own; it is a bill that had been drafted in direct response to small businesses and small business leaders around the country. It has been discussed for a long time, but for whatever reason, it has never been passed. I want to run through a few things that it does.

First, the agencies should account for the economic impact of regulations, especially on small business, and it should be the full economic impact. Agencies have this little caveat that they will do. They will say: Well, it is not a direct cost, it is an indirect cost on business. So they will put a new regulation on them and say: We are only going to count direct costs of the regulations, but we are not going to count anything indirect, such as electricity.

If they put a Federal regulation down and a State entity is then required to create new regulations based on it, they won't count the State regulations based on it.

If permitting from a different agency is required, they will say: Well, that is somebody else who does that.

Well, if you are a small business, cost is cost is cost. The Federal Government plays this game of what is a direct and indirect cost to a business. A small business does not get to play that game, and they have to pay the bills for it.

So it is a very simple thing for us to say: Include the costs. We try to get some clear language on it. An agency would have to consider "reasonably foreseeable impacts." So I get that you are not going to get every pencil in the process, but what is reasonably foreseeable, you should be able to anticipate that.

Second, we require the IRS to actually listen to small businesses before they release IRS rules. So many hours are spent by every small business complying with IRS regulations and requirements. We would like to have the IRS actually engage with small businesses when they put out policy and guidance and say: How is this going to affect small businesses? How can they work this out to make sure it is as easy as possible for small business owners?

Third, increase the transparency in the rulemaking process. Small businesses tell me that when they learn of new regulatory requirements, they are often blindsided. They had no idea the rule was even coming. In the rare instance when a small business owner speaks out to an agency, they are often

confused when they see the final rule because it doesn't look at all like what they had recommended or had raised.

Years ago, there was something created called SBRFIA panels. Only Washington, DC, comes up with a term like that. Small businesses were supposed to be able to engage with the Federal Government on designing how regulations would come out. But, again, the loopholes were so present in the law that the agencies were just going around them. We need to close that.

As simple as it sounds, when an agency is creating a rule, don't you think they should call small businesses and say: How will this work at your place, or will it work at all?

Fourth, let's deal with old rules. There are lots of regulations out there that are old, that become very complicated for small businesses to be able to maintain, and no one has ever gone back to look at them. Let's create a simple system so that when a rule comes out, it has to be reviewed within 10 years. That way, we have no rule that is 40, 50 years old, and no one has even touched it or looked at it to make sure that it still works, No. 1, and that it is not overcomplicating the process.

Finally, and here is something pretty straightforward, give first-time forgiveness for paperwork violations. When small businesses have a paperwork violation, they have a paperwork violation. They are not trying to break the law. They are not trying to violate regulations. They missed one. Why don't we give first-time grace to small businesses? Now, I wouldn't say that if they are violating health and safety issues. Obviously those are things they should have already taken care of. But just paperwork things—we have so many small businesses that get a fine because they missed a piece of paperwork. Again, so many small businesses don't have compliance people tracking this stuff for them all the time, and occasionally they make a mistake. This is still a government that works for them. They don't work for the government.

My simple recommendation is this: For small businesses, give them first-time paperwork forgiveness rather than a Federal compliance person showing up at their place with a fine. Let's be reasonable about this. That should be a simple, straightforward thing.

Quite frankly, these are all things small business owners have asked for. These were things even in the Obama administration. The chief counsel for the Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy—this is what the Obama administration's small business advocate wanted. I don't understand how this could be a partisan issue. It is simple, straightforward, and clean. There is no hidden anything in the bill. It is trying to actually get regulatory relief and common sense back into the way we do regulations.

Over 200 trade associations representing millions of small businesses have already written me in support of this bill from all over the country—not from Oklahoma, from all over the country.

Many in this Chamber pride themselves on being the advocate for the little guy and standing up for small businesses. I would ask my colleagues if they are ready to actually put feet to those words. This is a straightforward way to do it. We talk about helping small businesses; let's actually do it. I ask my colleagues to be able to walk alongside of us and help us get this bill passed and get some regulatory relief.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

OPIOID CRISIS

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I rise to speak with a lot of my colleagues coming down speaking on the opiate crisis we have in all of our States.

West Virginia has been hit the hardest in the Nation right now, and I want to speak to this because it is something we must address. This has been a silent killer for far too long.

I don't know a person who I have ever met who doesn't know somebody in their immediate family, extended family, or close friends who has not been affected by either prescription drug abuse or illicit drug use. With that, here we are.

I rise with my colleagues who have been coming down—they will be coming the rest of the day—to bring attention to this national crisis that is devastating every community. Many of the Senators you are going to hear from—and have already heard from—are from States that are dealing with an increase in this opiate abuse, just like my State of West Virginia. Just like I have, they have heard from families, community leaders who are on the front lines. They are begging for solutions, funding, and they need facilities to properly combat the scourge we have right now.

Let me say to everybody who is watching, everybody who is listening in any way, shape, or form that you are hearing this: 20 years, 30 years ago, I was as guilty as everybody in the public policy arena in government, in my State government in West Virginia. If you fooled with drugs back then, we thought, well, we will put you in prison; you committed a crime. Well, guess what. We have been putting them away for 20, 30 years, and we never cured a single soul.

Finally, we have come to the realization that addiction is an illness. Any other illness gets treatment. So we need treatment, but we don't have treatment centers. Budgets are tight.

I have a cousin who is a judge. Every day he says: JOE, I sentence people for the crimes they commit every day. He

says: I have never had the first person say: Hey, Judge, we don't have a prison cell or a jail cell to put this person in. But if it happens once a day, it will happen 5 or 10 times a day, if I believe someone needs to get treatment because of their addiction, they will say: Well, Judge, I am sorry. We have no place to put them. We have no treatment centers. We will find a jail cell for you, but we will not find a treatment center because we don't have them.

The States don't have the money. Counties don't have the money. Municipalities don't have the money. The Federal Government has never dedicated enough money for this. So we keep talking about everything that happens.

Last year, over 800 West Virginians died of prescription drug abuse. They died of abuse from prescription drugs, and everyone says: Well, how do people get started? I don't know. Most of them have done heavy work in West Virginia. We do mining and manufacturing. That is heavy work, and sometimes they get hurt.

I am going to read a letter later—I do every week try to come down to put real families, real faces, for you all to understand that this is a real issue.

When I have said this is a silent killer, we never talk about it. If you have somebody addicted in your family, you are kind of ashamed of it. You don't want anybody to know because they think that something is wrong with your family if someone has an addiction. They try to take care of themselves and they can't and that person doesn't get the help they need.

So when you look back at the use and the lack of a treatment, let me just tell you about the epidemic we are dealing with. Any other epidemic of this sort—and knowing it is an illness, it can be called a pandemic. Remember the Ebola concerns we had. All of the different things we were concerned about that could turn into a pandemic, we acted immediately. Well, we haven't acted immediately on this. We have had over 200,000 West Virginians die since the turn of the century. That is unbelievable, and to not do anything about it and keep our mouths shut, we have done that for far too long.

Today, 2.1 million Americans abuse or depend on their opiates. According to the CDC, Centers for Disease Control, three out of four new heroin users abuse prescription opiates before moving to heroin. I am told they move to heroin because it is cheaper, but they have already been hooked and addicted. Most of them got hooked and addicted on legal prescription drugs. That means there was some doctor who said: Here is something that is really going to help you, and they write that prescription. They think everything in a bottle is going to heal you.

In the United States of America, less than 5 percent of the world popu-

lation—7.2 billion people live on planet Earth, less than 330 million in this country—4.6 percent of the world population consumes 80 percent of all the opiates produced and consumed in the world. What in the world happened to us? How did we become so pain-intolerant? How did we become so addicted?

Between 2009 and 2013, only 22 percent of Americans suffering from opiate addiction participated in any form of addiction treatment, and more and more people go without treatment every day.

Misuse and abuse of opiates cost the country an estimated \$78.5 billion in 2013 just in lost productivity. So for those people who don't have compassion, don't think we should be doing these things, and you only look at the bottom line, if you are going to the bottom line, look at this bottom line: \$78 billion of lost productivity, medical costs, and criminal costs.

Talk to any of your law enforcement in any community you live in and ask them: Of all the calls you have gone on, how many have you gone on that are drug-related? A minimum of 80 to 90 percent of everything that they are called in, any type of assistance, any type of a crime that is committed, it is because of drugs. Some form of drugs are involved for our police. So think about what they are doing and how it takes them away from protecting the law-abiding citizens.

I have a bill called—and we will talk about treatment—it is LifeBOAT. I am still waiting for some of my friends and fellow colleagues on the Republican side to look at this bill very seriously. All I am asking for is one penny to charge the pharmaceutical manufacturers—one penny per milligram—that will go toward treatment centers throughout America, and every State needs them.

That one penny, they said: That is a new tax. We can't vote for a new tax. I said: Wait a minute. This opiate arena is pretty profitable, and we are not going to charge people whom opiates were designed for, which are people with severe illnesses, cancer patients. Basically, this is just for opiates, no other pharmaceutical products, just opiates. That is \$1.5 to \$2 billion a year. Can you believe that? That one penny.

Now, when they tell me, I am not going to vote for any new tax. I say: Well, you didn't hesitate to vote for a tobacco tax. You didn't hesitate to vote for an alcohol tax.

We have more people dying of this than anything else, and I am asking for a treatment plan. I can't get one penny, not one penny.

So I am asking for everyone to consider it. I truly believe no one would lose their election over voting to fund treatment centers for people who are desperately in need. That is the LifeBOAT Act.

I want to read you a letter, and I do this every week. It is just heart-

breaking, these letters, but it shows real people's lives, and it shows what it has done to their lives.

This letter is from Shadd Baisden. He writes:

My name is Shadd Baisden, and I am from Dingess, WV. I am writing to tell you my story of opioid addiction. I am an out-of-work coal miner with 9 years' experience. I was injured in the mine in 2011. I was dragged down a belt line 200 feet and messed the disks in my back, the L5, S1 in my back. This was how my addiction got started.

I was prescribed painkillers and needed surgery but felt I was too young for that. I was out of work for a year when I decided to settle my compensation claim so I could return back to work. While I was injured, the mine I worked in shut down so I had no job to go back to. I had been on painkillers the whole time I was out of work, but I stopped being prescribed after my settlement.

So when he made his settlement, basically that went away, his healthcare on that. So he had no other way of getting prescribed medicine.

He continues:

I was buying them off the street just to ease my pain. In 2013, I started using oxycodone and could not stop. I even got my wife hooked on them.

I have three daughters—11, 10, and 3 years of age. My youngest wasn't born at the time. Our addiction became so bad that we would steal things from our family just to get the drugs. I lost my license to drive. I lost my two oldest daughters because of my addiction. That is when I knew I had to have serious help.

I sought counseling and treatment. I took parenting classes, and my wife and I worked our tails off to get our girls back. We have now been clean and sober for 3 years and have custody back of all three of our girls.

I am currently out of work but do lots of odd jobs in my area because I can't afford to get my license back, and the vehicle I own was vandalized 3 months ago because I gave an officer info on a dealer not far from my home, and somehow the dealer found out and beat the windows out of my car while I was working.

I thank God every day for helping me and my wife stay clean.

I thank you for everything you do for the people of West Virginia and hope my story helps someone. I may be out of work right now, but good things will come as long as we stay clean and positive.

Now, the conclusion of this is Shadd and his wife are perfect examples of the people we can help if we made it easier for people dealing with substance abuse to get treatment. Shadd and his wife are the people I am fighting for every day. I will continue to fight for the people and families and children who have lost their way and need our help, and I am not going to stop fighting until they get it.

Every one of you all probably have a story. Every one of our young people—our pages and everybody else, everyone in the audience, whoever it may be, younger people—have probably been approached to try something, have probably been approached in their own schools to try something: Well, this is no problem. It is the hip thing to do in school.

They have recreational marijuana. A lot of people tell me they get started by experimenting, and then it moves into different things.

I don't know what it is. We don't know what our body chemistry is made up of. We don't know why some people are addicted and some people don't get addicted, but we know opiates are extremely addictive. We know that. It affects you. The only thing I can tell you is, it is something we are going to continue to fight. We are going to make people aware. We are starting education classes.

The United States of America should start educating in every class from preschool, kindergarten—you are not too young to know what this can do to you—all the way up through adulthood. We have to prevent people from getting on these horrific drugs that are killing people. Then we have to treat the people who are addicted and get them back into the workforce.

I ask all of you—and the concern we have, and I know in your beautiful State you have the same challenges we do. We all do. We are willing to fight together. This is a bipartisan effort. This is not one side and the other side taking credit or one side blaming the other side. This is one that we have to rise up as Americans—forget about Democrats and Republicans—and fight this. The U.S. Congress is responsible for fighting it and helping the people all over our country.

I yield the floor to my good friend from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from West Virginia who is fighting hard on a lot of different fronts to meet the challenge of this opioid and drug abuse epidemic that is sweeping across the country, and it is really hitting us in the rural areas in West Virginia. I always say our State is just one big small town, and both Senator MANCHIN and I have personal experience with families who have been deeply affected by this. It is destroying families, lives, and futures.

Chances are we all know someone, as I said, who has been affected, but we have been especially hard-hit in the State of West Virginia, and we have seen more than our fair share of devastating consequences: babies born exposed to drugs, families torn apart, children ripped from their parents because of their parents' habits and life-

style, grandparents raising children when they had no real intention or didn't know that is what was going to happen.

We have the unfortunate distinction as a State of leading the Nation in drug overdose deaths per capita. Ninety-one Americans die each day because of this crisis, and far too many of them are our neighbors, our coworkers, our friends, and our children. No community is immune. That is why this all-hands-on-deck, community-oriented, coordinated, community-focused effort must move forward.

Fortunately, many individuals and organizations—and I get to meet with them regularly. It is inspiring to hear how people in the community are pulling together. They are already working hard educating—as Senator MANCHIN said, you can't start too early educating—treating, and rehabilitating people who are struggling with abuse within their families, helping them and those who are at risk of becoming addicted. From healthcare to law enforcement, we are working to tackle this crisis from all angles.

Drug courts play an important role in that fight. In order to get at the root of the problem, we must have more recovery and treatment services, and incarceration is not always the right answer. Sometimes treatment, not the criminal justice system, is the answer.

Yesterday, I had the pleasure of meeting an incredible young woman—inspirational, really—who knows all of this very well. Her name is Chelsea Carter, and she is from Logan, WV. When she met me yesterday, she said: We met. We met 10 years ago.

I said: Really? Where did we meet?

She said: I did your nails at Spa Bliss.

I said: Oh, well, thank you for that.

But along that journey, Chelsea has had a rough, rough go. At one point, Chelsea was charged with 17 felonies due to her drug habit. She told me her drug habit began when she was 12 years old. She said she was able to continue life through high school. It appeared as though she had a normal life. She was a cheerleader, participated in school, and all the time she was getting deeper and crawling deeper into a drug-addicted hole.

After she faced the criminal justice system, she became committed to getting off drugs and getting clean the very first night she spent in jail, and she has been clean ever since. She went through the drug court system, and, basically, it has saved her life. But that is not the end of the story for Chelsea. She has a bright future ahead of her, and she has moved forward.

She was in town for the annual conference of the National Association of Drug Court Professionals. She has committed her life to helping people like her who have had this situation and who have been at the bottom of the pit

of hopelessness, bad health, and bad decisionmaking. She is committed to helping her fellow West Virginians crawl out of that pit, like she did, and become productive individuals. This is the world's largest conference on treatment courts and criminal justice reform.

Back home in Logan, Chelsea is the program director at Appalachian Health Services. She just got her master's degree. One of the things that struck me is that, even in a management position, she continues to counsel and treat a full load of patients, and she told me she will always do so.

Chelsea's story is an example of the progress that can be made by fully committing to fighting the drug epidemic. There are victories and programs that work. Drug court is not the only one, but it is one in the spectrum of solutions.

I am committed to the fight and to working with all of our colleagues who are speaking out today. I know many of us are committed to this. It doesn't leave a family or community untouched. I am really inspired by West Virginians like Chelsea Carter who are on the frontlines.

With that, I yield for my colleague from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Thank you, Mr. President, and I thank my friend from West Virginia.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN

While I have an opportunity to take the floor, I want to change the subject, if I may. I want to talk about the concern I have of one of the President's priorities in the 2018 fiscal year budget. That priority is Yucca Mountain.

Specifically, the President included \$120 million in his budget for the Department of Energy to restart licensing activities for the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository.

As a proponent and author of the legislation called No Budget, No Pay Act, which would restore regular order to the budget and appropriations process, I am pleased to see the President did submit to Congress a detailed budget proposal.

As a small government, fiscal conservative, I hoped that this new administration would focus on budget priorities that would reduce duplicative spending and streamline programs in order to save taxpayer dollars. You can imagine my disappointment that they, instead, decided to prioritize funding to restart licensing activities for a failed proposal.

Over the past few weeks, I have outlined on the Senate floor some of the issues with Yucca Mountain, whether it is the crippling effect it would have on Nevada's economy or the public safety issues associated with transportation of this nuclear waste. I will continue to come to the floor to educate

my colleagues on the many issues associated with Yucca Mountain, because, plain and simple, it is not a viable option for the long-term storage of our Nation's nuclear waste. Instead of throwing more taxpayer dollars into a failed proposal, we should be working on a real long-term solution rooted in consent-based siting.

You have heard me raise the question that many Nevadans be thinking: Why should a State with no nuclear powerplants of its own be forced, against its will, to house all of the Nation's nuclear waste?

I stand by the Department of Energy's 2010 decision to terminate the Yucca Mountain program, and I stand by its 2015 recommendation for a consent-based siting.

Yucca Mountain is dead. Let me take you through what it would take to put this failed program back on life support. Prior to the suspension of the program in 2010, the Federal Government had spent close to \$15 billion on Yucca Mountain.

Now, I recognize that some of my colleagues might say: Well, the government has already spent this much on the government repository; shouldn't we complete it?

First of all, let me say that restarting the program would need \$2 billion more just to complete the licensing process—\$1.66 billion for the Department of Energy and \$330 million for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

After 3 to 5 years spent on licensing, there could well be another 5 years in legal challenges, and there is no certainty that Yucca Mountain would ever be built.

Second, even if Yucca Mountain were to go forward, it would be an expensive repository project. The Department of Energy's best estimate is that another \$82 billion—let me repeat that; another \$82 billion—would be needed to license, litigate, build, operate, decommission, and eventually close Yucca Mountain. On top of the money that has already been spent, that adds up to more than \$96 billion for what is called the total system life cycle cost.

That leads to my third point. We need to reevaluate the whole nuclear waste cost question. There is a business case to be made against Yucca Mountain. The Department of Energy's own estimates for Yucca Mountain say that the nuclear waste fund will only pay about 80 percent of the total life cycle costs, or about \$77 billion. The remaining \$19 billion would have to come from an annual appropriations voted by this Congress. That means more money for this project paid by taxpayers.

But it does not have to be that way. In 2012, the Department of Energy did its own cost assessment and concluded that all other costs, like transportation, being equal, walking away from Yucca Mountain and starting with a

new repository site in a deep salt bed or deep shale formation would actually save between \$12 billion and \$27 billion over the life of the repository.

Before we spend any more taxpayer dollars on Yucca Mountain, we need to ask the Department of Energy experts to come before us and explain what they learned about repository costs in their previous studies. Beyond that, we need new cost studies on geologic disposal in repositories, studies that include the lessons learned from recent progress with repositories in Europe, and new studies that look at the nuclear waste program overall and incorporate the cost of safe on-site reactors, early removal of spent fuel from shutdown reactors, and consolidated interim storage facilities, as recommended by the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future.

It is clear that rather than forcing the State of Nevada to accept nuclear waste at a scientifically unsound site, taxpayer dollars would be better spent identifying viable alternatives for the long-term storage of nuclear waste in areas that are willing to house it. Finding alternatives is the commonsense path forward, as well as the fiscally responsible decision.

I urge my colleagues, as we continue the budget appropriations process for this next fiscal year, to conduct oversight over the life-cycle costs of repositories and to focus on further implementing the Department of Energy's consent-based siting process, instead of wasting more taxpayer dollars on a failed proposal.

I stand ready to partner with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on this issue, and I am confident that together we can find a solution to this problem once and for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion on the Elwood nomination be withdrawn, and that following leader remarks on Tuesday, June 6, the Senate resume consideration of the nomination, with the time equally divided until 2:15 p.m. I further ask that at 2:15 p.m., on June 6, the Senate vote on confirmation of the Elwood nomination, and that, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELLER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I yield back all remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Thapar nomination?

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 137 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Strange
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Harris	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hassan	Peters
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Brown	Heitkamp	Sanders
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Markey	Warner
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Franken	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—4

Cantwell	Schatz
Hirono	Udall

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Iowa.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, May is National Foster Care Month. I thank my colleagues for unanimously supporting the resolution recognizing May as National Foster Care Month.

National Foster Care Month has been recognized for over 20 years as a time we all celebrate the voices of foster youth and bring awareness to the challenges these young people face. During this month, organizations in Iowa—and, for that matter, all across the country—have been working to support and to recognize the young people who are in foster care.

Nationally, there are over 425,000 children in foster care. In Iowa alone, almost 4,000 kids entered foster care in 2015, the last year for statistics. I salute all of those who work tirelessly to support these children. This includes a lot of different groups but particularly foster parents, who open their hearts and homes to children who need this vital support. The group also includes social workers, advocates, and alumni of the foster care system who, as young people, have gone through a lot. They are there to inform lawmakers and the public, and they are there to fight to secure better outcomes for kids in care.

As stated in our resolution, Congress must continue to work toward real solutions for these children, who often face trauma, abuse, and neglect, both before and after they are removed from their parents' care. We must work to ensure that all children, no matter their circumstances, have a permanent, loving home and consistent, caring adults in their lives.

With legislation such as the Fostering Connections Act, passed in 2008, and the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act, passed in 2011, we have made some progress. These laws provided new investments and new services to improve the outcomes for children in the foster care system.

Even after all that, our work is not done. Over 20,000 young people aged out of the foster care system in 2015, with no legal permanent connection to any family. This impacts their ability to pursue higher education, to find employment and stable housing, and, most importantly, to prepare for the future.

While in care, children experience an average of three different placements;

65 percent of the kids in foster care change schools seven or more times. We see a great amount of instability and resulting insecurity when this is what happens in the life of somebody in foster care. This constant uncertainty compounds the trauma of neglect and of abuse and makes it hard for these kids to make connections to their communities.

Through my work in the Senate Caucus on Foster Youth, I have had the opportunity to hear firsthand what these young people in foster care need. They need love, they need support, they need safety and permanency, and they need a family. Those last two are the first words I ever heard from kids in foster care when I first took time 25 years ago to listen to some of them. They had been shunted from one home to another home over a period of time. They said: We would like to have a mom and dad; we would like to have a home. That is what this movement is all about.

Moving forward, Congress must continue to work to find better solutions and secure better outcomes for our young people in foster care.

Once again, I thank all of my colleagues for supporting this resolution. It is important that this month—and, for that matter, all year long—we continue to support the goals of National Foster Care Month.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I wish to address the issue of the healthcare debate that has been going on since the first of the year. Now that it has passed the House of Representatives, it comes to the Senate. The Senate is working on its own bill, not working from the House bill. This is still evolving, and I hope it will evolve very, very quickly.

One of the things we face is to make sure we have accessible, affordable care for anyone who wants to buy health insurance.

I rise today, as I have in the past, to share real stories from real Iowans who have been harmed—not helped—by the Affordable Care Act. I know there are plenty of examples we can give of people who have not benefited from the Affordable Care Act. As we have found so many times, the Affordable Care Act has become the un-Affordable Care Act. The other side often talks about the benefits of ACA without mentioning the reality I am trying to bring to this debate.

There is a reason Republicans are acting to protect Americans from the loss of access to medical care. ObamaCare has broken its promises. All these promises, made over and over again, have not stood the test of time, so I would like to remind everyone of some of these promises.

The promise: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor.

The reality: This promise was even scrubbed from the ObamaCare website after everyone knew it was a farce.

The promise: You will be able to keep your insurance plan.

What is the reality? In the fall of 2013, between 7 and 12 million people had health insurance cancelled. ObamaCare's mandates resulted in fewer choices for people to buy affordable insurance. People were kicked off plans they liked and plans that, until ObamaCare, they could afford. This promise was dubbed the "Lie of the Year."

Another promise was made: Your premiums will go down by \$2,500.

That is not even close. I have been quoting for a long period of time that they had gone up at least \$3,500. Now, more recently, I have seen a figure of an average of \$4,300. So, in reality, that \$2,500 promise that premiums would go down wasn't even close.

In Iowa, premiums increased up to 43 percent in just 1 year. One farmer told me that his insurance went up from \$20,000 to \$32,000 in 1 year. He was able to get the premium down to \$25,000 by taking advantage of an HMO, but the deductible for that plan was \$15,000. You have an insurance policy, but you may never use it.

The biggest promise: You were promised access to affordable health care. The law is called the Affordable Care Act. That is the most concerning of all—the situation created by ObamaCare is far from affordable.

What is the reality? Premiums in 2017 have doubled for a majority of States using ObamaCare exchanges. In three States, premiums have tripled during ObamaCare. One Iowan from Pomeroy, IA, wrote to me and said she shopped for an ObamaCare plan and found that she would have to pay \$9,000 out-of-pocket before her insurance kicks in. She told me she doesn't know where that money would come from, and of course that makes that policy too expensive to use.

For the past 7 years, ObamaCare has not been working, and it will never work for the American people. Republicans are not going to accept failure. That is why we are working so hard to put together what we have promised the people of this country for the last 7 years—to repeal and replace. Pointing out the shortcomings of affordable care, we aim for better, and that is what guides us as we continue to work on repealing and replacing this failed law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

ARCTIC COUNCIL

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I often come to the floor of the U.S. Senate to discuss issues of the Arctic. Since the United States is an Arctic

nation, it seems that it is only appropriate to give updates when there have been items and events that are noteworthy in this space.

Several weeks ago, we hosted in Alaska the Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting, an event duly of note and an event upon which I would like to spend a few moments this afternoon updating colleagues on all that took place at this ministerial and provide a little bit of a recap of the role of the United States as chairman of the Arctic Council for these past 2 years.

This opportunity today to congratulate those in the State Department, the people of Fairbanks, AK, and the Alaska Arctic Council Host Committee for a successful Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting in Fairbanks is certainly timely.

I have also come to review the accomplishments and the challenges of the Arctic Council during the recent chairmanship by the United States and I think also to look ahead at what I hope and expect will be our Nation's continued leadership in the Arctic.

As I mentioned, for the past 2 years now, the United States has been chair of the Arctic Council. This is an international forum for the eight Arctic nations. That includes the United States, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, and Sweden. It also includes six permanent participant organizations that represent the indigenous peoples of the Arctic, as well as dozens of interested observer nations and international organizations.

I think it is important to recognize that while you would understand and assume that the Arctic nations are clearly interested in happenings in the Arctic, the interest in being an official observer as part of the Arctic Council has grown steadily in these recent years as nations around the world are recognizing the opportunities that are presenting themselves in this portion of the globe.

The Arctic Council was established in 1996, and it focuses its work on sustainable development and environmental protection in the Arctic. When we speak at these council meetings, as Arctic Parliamentarians, we always refer to the Arctic as a zone of peace. It is that way now; we would like to see it remain so.

Back in April of 2015, the United States took over as chair from Canada, and at that time, the United States proposed three thematic areas that we would focus on during this 2-year chairmanship. Those three areas were improving economic and living conditions in Arctic communities; Arctic Ocean safety, security, and stewardship; and the third issue area was to address the impacts of climate change.

While there were many who believed that the previous administration focused most of its attention on climate change—sometimes at the expense of

the other two areas and most notably the focus on economic and living conditions for the people who live and work and raise their families in the Arctic—I believe we saw a good outcome from this 2-year chairmanship.

I would like to note today and acknowledge the work of Julie Gourley as the U.S. Senior Arctic Official; the work of Ambassador David Balton as the chair of the Senior Arctic Officials; and ADM Robert Papp, who served as the U.S. Special Representative for the Arctic. All three of these individuals served to facilitate the U.S. chairmanship and worked to increase public awareness and knowledge of the Arctic. I thank them for that.

I also commend the City of Fairbanks and the Fairbanks North Star Borough, which hosted the ministerial meeting. I think it is important to recognize that most assumed that when the United States hosted the ministerial, it would be in Alaska's largest city. Anchorage certainly has the ability to accommodate just about any conference, anywhere, at any time, but I think it was significant that we chose to host in a city that—while it is not above the Arctic Circle, it is getting pretty close up there.

The people of Fairbanks went all out to embrace our friends from around the world. Their efforts were matched by the tremendous work of the Alaska Arctic Council Host Committee and particularly of Nils Andreassen, who connected the Arctic Council with the host communities during its numerous meetings.

In the past, what we had seen at these Arctic Council meetings was folks would fly into an Arctic location, and more often than not, we would be in a large conference hall, typically with no windows and closed doors, and then everyone would fly out without having any real interaction with the community. They wouldn't have an opportunity to engage with the public, and sometimes it made the work of the Arctic Council a little bit of a mystery.

I think we missed some opportunities to build support for the Arctic Council and its work and also to learn and to hear from those who live in our Arctic communities what matters are of concern to them. The Alaska Host Committee worked to break down that barrier by organizing side events. There were dozens of different side events and receptions that allowed for critical interaction.

The City of Fairbanks and the North Star Borough provided incredible hospitality. They always do that, but I think this time they went above and beyond in rolling out the red carpet to ensure the success of the meeting for all who were involved.

During the U.S. chairmanship, there were a number of successful activities that I would like to highlight briefly.

First, there was an agreement on enhancing international arctic scientific

cooperation. This was signed by all eight Arctic nations at the Fairbanks ministerial. It is now the third legally binding agreement among the Arctic nations. We have already done an agreement on search and rescue and a second one on oil spill preparedness. This is now the third, focusing on scientific cooperation. This new agreement will allow scientists to more freely and assuredly work across political borders to develop scientific knowledge about the Arctic.

What I think is significant about this particular document is that the process to develop the agreement was co-chaired by the United States and Russia. This demonstrates that while our nations clearly have a good number of disagreements and disputes around the world, the Arctic can be that place of cooperation. I think we demonstrated that with this particular scientific cooperation.

Another area of focus was on telecommunication. For the first time, we have assessed telecommunication infrastructure in the Arctic. For anyone who has been there or who has been to any very remote location, you know well the importance of dependable communications. Those familiar with the Arctic know that we have significant gaps. We have significant challenges in this area. Finland, which has now assumed the chairmanship, will take this issue with them and work with the private sector to do what they can to improve telecom in the Arctic.

The Arctic Council also launched an Arctic ship traffic data cooperative agreement. The intent is to have a better understanding of the ships that are operating in the Arctic.

As we all know, we are seeing sea ice recede. We are seeing shipping lanes in areas where we have not had an opportunity to have ships or any level of commerce. With this project, we are seeking to collect information from each Arctic nation about the shipping activity in the Arctic for traffic trend analysis.

This is important because we are seeing an increase in shipping levels in the U.S. Arctic—an increase by nearly 60 percent over the last 8 years. It is clearly expected to increase with every passing year, as we are seeing sea ice diminish. As we are seeing this increased volume of shipping traffic, I think it is important to keep in mind that when it comes to charting, when it comes to mapping, less than 5 percent of the U.S. Arctic has been charted to modern standards.

Again, think about what is happening. We are seeing increased shipping traffic. We still don't know as much as we need to know about the charting and the mapping, so it is vital for homeland security, for local security, and for navigational necessity that we have an accurate understanding of who is transiting when and where within the region.

I have talked with Native whaling captains, those who are engaged in a level of subsistence, particularly in the Bering Straits area. Understanding when and where and who is transiting is very important for those subsistence hunters as well.

Another item that came from the Arctic Council ministerial—and this was not a direct outcome from this meeting but the prior one—a new fund, the Algu Fund, was established to help the indigenous peoples of the Arctic more fully participate in the decision making of the Arctic Council and its working groups.

The permanent participants and the indigenous peoples who make up these representatives are a critical piece of the discussion in these significant meetings with Foreign Ministers. To have that local knowledge, to have the voices of the local people of the Arctic speaking up is important. Think about it. They don't necessarily have a formal government, a fund that can help send them to these meetings, to be part of these working groups. And so often-times, their participation is not present, and not because they don't wish to be but because they lack the resources.

So this Algu Fund was established. The goal is to raise \$30 million for the fund, which will benefit the Aleut, the Athabaskan, Gwich'in, Sami, and over 40 Russian indigenous groups.

Of the other work that was conducted, seven new observers were added to the Arctic Council, including the country of Switzerland. There were additional organizations that were added, but we are now up to a total of 39 observers, 13 of these being from non-Arctic nations. So again, the interest in all things Arctic, regardless of where you are on the globe, is really increasing.

On the sidelines of the ministerial meeting, there were 12 mayors from Arctic communities in Alaska, Canada, Finland, Iceland, and Norway. They held their own forum to look at the challenges to local governments in the Arctic. Issues such as economic diversification with benefits to local populations, infrastructure investment, energy independence, efforts to adapt to a changing climate, and the incorporation of traditional and local knowledge in the decisionmaking were discussed. These mayors from across the region saw the value of attending the ministerial meeting, even though they were not part of the official meetings. But they also felt that it was important to ensure that the people of the Arctic, those who actually live there, work there, and raise their families there, were heard in the discussions, as well.

Even after all that I have highlighted, there are many other documents from the ministerial meeting that I could mention here, but one that I would like to draw particular atten-

tion to is the Fairbanks Declaration. This is the statement signed by all eight Arctic nations coming out of the 10th Arctic Council Ministerial. I think it is significant to note that, in these issue areas that the United States focused on—Arctic Ocean safety, security, and stewardship, improving economic and living conditions, and addressing the impacts of climate change—the statements coming out were good, strong statements of agreement, and there was true cooperation and collaboration.

I think I would be remiss in stating that there was some speculation that, with a new administration taking over right at the end of the United States' term, there was some discussion as to this: Well, how is this declaration going to be coming about, because it is the United States that ultimately, as the chair, holds the pen there?

I know there has been a lot of discussion around this town about the administration's position on the Paris Agreement. The President is still determining how he wants to proceed there. But I do think it is noteworthy—very noteworthy—that the Fairbanks Declaration, which was signed by Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, speaks directly to climate change in the Arctic. Specifically, it notes the entry into force of the Paris Agreement. But in looking specifically to the language relating to climate change, it states, and I will quote here:

Note again that the Arctic is warming at more than twice the rate of the global average, note with concern that the pace and scale of continuing Arctic warming will depend on future emissions of greenhouse gases and short-lived climate pollutants, reiterate the importance of global action to reduce both greenhouse gases and short-lived climate pollutants to mitigate climate change.

Then, it calls for the Arctic Council to undertake additional analysis. So I think that is significant as well. It is an important recognition, and, while this administration has not yet determined where they may end up when it comes to the Paris Agreement, I think it is telling to look to this document—again, that was not only signed by the United States, but, ultimately, it was drafted by the United States—as an indicator of the realities that we face with climate change and, particularly and most noteworthy, in the U.S. Arctic, where we are seeing that impact most pronounced.

I mentioned the aspect of climate change, but the Declaration is broader than that. It also recognizes the importance of the contributions of the Arctic indigenous peoples, the importance of healthy Arctic communities, the impact of maritime activity in the region, and the emergence of the Arctic Economic Council, which is an issue that I feel very strongly about.

We had an extraordinary Alaskan woman who was chairing the AEC throughout these past 2 years, and she

did a fabulous job standing that up. Her contributions were quite remarkable.

There is the need to improve the access of Arctic communities to clean, affordable, and reliable energy sources. So, again, I would commend to anyone's reading the Fairbanks Declaration. If you are interested in Arctic issues or if you are interested in just a sense of the breadth and the depth of the issues and challenges facing the Arctic region, I think it is an important document.

With our handing the gavel now to Finland, the obvious question request is this: What happens next for the United States in the Arctic? I am encouraged by Secretary Tillerson's comments in Fairbanks that the United States will remain engaged and remain a leader on Arctic policy. That has got to be key. We have made great headway in recognizing that we are an Arctic nation. At every appropriations hearing that I have been to thus far, I think I have reserved my questions to ask about Arctic-specific issues—whether it is the status of where we are on infrastructure, such as icebreakers, or whether it is a recognition and an understanding that, with decreasing sea ice up north, you have people in ships up there, which we have never seen before. Quite honestly, we now have an area of exposure. We focus a lot on the southern border. We now have a northern border that is open. What might that mean?

We were able to query Secretary Kelly this morning about possibly partnering with Canada as we look to how we can provide for sharing of information about who is coming and who is going and knowing what we have in front of us. We will have an opportunity—again, as we move forward with legislative initiatives, appropriations, and reviewing the President's budget—to make sure that the leadership that the United States has demonstrated these past 2 years as we have been chairing the Arctic Council continues and that it continues in a strong and a prominent way.

With that, I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I would like to commend my colleague from Alaska. Closer to the Poles, you see the effect of climate change more starkly. I am glad that she spoke on this issue. She is a real champion for her State, which means recognizing that climate change is having an effect on the Arctic and on those villages up there. It will have a lot of consequences going forward.

I say thank you to Senator MURKOWSKI.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the House Republican healthcare bill and the devastating effect that it would have on people with mental illness and those affected by the Nation's opioid epidemic.

Nationwide, more than 52,000 Americans died from drug overdoses in 2015, the most recent year for which data are available, with 63 percent of those deaths involving an opioid. This means that drug overdose deaths now surpass the number of people who die each year from automobile accidents or from firearms.

That same year in Minnesota, we lost more than 570 people to drug overdoses. About half of those deaths were tied to prescription medication—particularly, opiate pain relievers—and another 20 percent of those deaths were associated with heroin. We saw drug overdose deaths jump 11 percentage points in Minnesota from 2014 to 2015.

The opioid epidemic knows no boundaries. It has touched people and families of all incomes, of all races, and of all ages. Some communities in Minnesota have been hit particularly hard by this crisis, including our Native American population. Not long ago, I visited the Bois Forte Indian Reservation. Bois Forte is a small, beautiful reservation up in northern Minnesota, a community where people know each other and trust each other. In fact, historically, the trust has run so deep that folks in Bois Forte didn't even lock their doors at night. But the opioid epidemic—I was told this by the Tribe chairman—and the impact it has had on the people in the reservation has changed that. Opioids are changing and destroying families and communities, and one clear sign of this is that people now are locking their doors, the chairman told me.

Right now, we need to be doing all we can to help people, families, and communities that have been devastated by opioid addiction. We must provide support for treatments and other necessary interventions, and we need to be focusing on prevention. That is why we passed the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act just last year, and why we followed it up with the behavioral health provisions in the 21st Century Cures Act—again, just at the end of last Congress.

Now these important advances are under threat. The so-called healthcare bill that Republicans pushed out of the House of Representatives would undermine the very programs that help people with opioid addiction. For instance, as the CBO confirmed yesterday, the bill guts Medicaid, cutting the program's budget by more than \$830 billion over 10 years. These losses are compounded by the additional \$610 billion in cuts to Medicaid proposed in President Trump's budget yesterday.

In total, these cuts would amount to close to a 50-percent reduction in the funding for the Medicaid Program, causing at least 14 million people to lose Medicaid coverage over the next decade. Medicaid is the No. 1 payer for behavioral health services in the Nation. It covers both prevention and treatment for people at risk for or actively battling opioid addiction.

For example, Medicaid pays for about one-quarter of medication-assisted treatment for opioid and heroin addictions. Because of the Medicaid expansion, 1.3 million additional people gained access to behavioral health services, which reduced the number of low-income adults needing substance use treatment but not receiving it by 18 percent.

To further undermine coverage, the House bill would also allow States to eliminate essential health benefits. The essential health benefits are 10 key benefits that plans exchanges must offer, including maternity care, prescription drugs, and mental health and substance use disorder services. What we know is that before the ACA was passed, many people with private insurance did not have coverage for the mental health services they needed. One in three did not have coverage for substance use disorder treatment, and close to one in five did not have coverage for mental healthcare.

Now is not the time to be cutting back on those benefits. In fact, last year, the Surgeon General issued a report on addiction, which found that there are more people with substance use disorders than people with cancer. What the CBO score confirmed yesterday was that people who live in States that rollback essential health benefits, who still need the services that are no longer included in the essential health benefits would "experience substantial increases in out-of-pocket spending on health care or would choose to forgo the services."

The report goes on to call out the fact that out-of-pocket costs for these patients could increase by thousands of dollars a year, and the benefits would again be subject to annual and lifetime limits. Substance use disorder services are highlighted as specific benefits that CBO anticipates States will exclude first.

I want to make this clear to my colleagues and to the American people: You cannot say that you want to address our country's opioid epidemic and at the same time support this bill. Those things are in direct opposition to one another. So, to all of my colleagues who supported CARA and supported the 21st Century Cures Act, I urge you to work with us to build on the ACA so that we can effectively address the opioid epidemic ravaging our country.

My colleague on the other side of the aisle, Senator CORKER from Tennessee, had it right when he remarked on the

secret partisan process currently underway in the Senate. Earlier this week he said:

It's a very awkward process, at best. There are no experts. There's no actuaries. . . . Typically, in a hearing, you'd have people coming in and you'd also have the media opining about if a hearing took place, and X came in and made comments.

Senator CORKER is spot-on. The American people deserve an open and transparent discussion on how we can best improve healthcare in our Nation. Many Americans are struggling just to keep their heads above water, paying their bills, raising their kids, caring for their parents, and coping with health problems.

Families in Minnesota and in all of our States have been or are currently being ripped apart by opioid addiction. They need our help. They don't need a bill or a budget, for that matter, that is hastily put together for ideological reasons. They don't need policies that undercut their care and their livelihood.

Ninety-one people die every day in the United States from an opioid overdose. Only one in five people who currently need treatment for opioid use disorders is actually getting it.

American lives hang in the balance. People are counting on us to do the right thing. So let's do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join my colleagues, Senator FRANKEN and Senator WARREN, who are also here for this conversation that was kicked off earlier this afternoon by our friend and colleague from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN.

West Virginia does not have a whole lot in common with Rhode Island. We are a coastal State. Senator MANCHIN comes from a very landlocked mountainous State. Our biggest mountain in Rhode Island is probably the Johnson landfill. But we have something in common, which is the extent to which opioid addiction and opioid overdoses have stricken our State. We have had over 200 deaths per year. In a State our size, everyone is within 2 or 3 degrees of separation of everyone else. Those 200 deaths reverberate through our whole State.

There is a small town in Rhode Island called Burrillville, up in our northwest corner. Burrillville is a very small town in Rhode Island. I went up there for a meeting about the opioid epidemic at Burrillville High School. In the previous quarter, in just 3 months, that one little town had six deaths from opioid overdoses. That is six times that the little police force had to respond, six times the funeral parlors had to handle grieving families, six times that death notices had to be published in the local paper. It felt like a battering to people in that community.

Senator MANCHIN has a pretty good idea to help make sure that we have the funding to get treatment to people before these tragedies take place. He proposes what he calls the LifeBOAT Act, which is one penny for each milligram of active opioid in a prescription drug—one penny. It is only a penny, but it would have raised about \$2 billion last year. So \$2 billion would save a lot of people and save a lot of lives.

Just to give you some idea of the scale, Purdue Pharma has generated estimated sales of more than \$35 billion since 1995 for opioid medications. It has annual revenues of about \$3 billion, mostly from OxyContin. That is just one company. So the idea of adding a penny really does not seem to me to be asking very much.

The way we operate now in the Senate, I know that asking corporations to do anything seems impossible because they have the financial whip hand over so many Senators because of the unlimited money they are allowed to spend and threaten to spend in our politics. But really, after all the lives that have been lost, after all the lives have been affected, you would expect that just out of common decency this industry would step up and say: For a penny, we are in. So let's hope they come around to that because I think it is a good plan.

TrumpCare, on the other hand, would be a disaster. So many people get their opioid treatment through Medicaid and through the expansion of Medicaid that the Affordable Care Act created. To undo that, to strip \$1.4 trillion, as President Trump has proposed, out of Medicaid is inevitably going to deny people access to care.

I am not the only one saying this. Someone who works in Providence with recovering heroin addicts wrote to me. His name is Travis. He wrote to me about his clients who are receiving medication-assisted treatments. He credits their being able to come in and get the care that they get to the Affordable Care Act. He said that it is the reason he and his colleagues have been able to help recovering addicts enter effective treatment programs. It works.

Travis relates that repealing the Affordable Care Act would have what he calls a profound impact on his clients' ability to get needed addiction and recovery services.

I will turn the floor over to Senator WARREN in a minute, but I want to recognize one other person. I will not use last names. His name is Mark. He wrote to me from Rumford, RI, which is a very nice part of East Providence, RI.

This is a gentleman who became addicted to opiates at the age of 52. He had surgery, and after the surgical procedure, his doctor gave him opiates for the pain. The doctor was somewhat indiscriminate about continuing to prescribe those opioids.

Mark realized that he was addicted. He went to a recovery group in Rhode Island called CODAC, which does very good work for treatment. He went into recovery, and he succeeded for 8 years without using opioids.

As sometimes happens, family stresses, business stresses, other stresses intervene. In his case, a family stress caused a relapse, but he knew what to do. He went back to CODAC. He became sober again. Now he is back in recovery, clean and sober.

This pattern of recovery and then an occasional relapse and then back to recovery again is very often the way people who have an addiction get through it. To make sure that the treatment is there for them when they relapse can be a lifesaver.

By the way, Mark is a success. He is in the music business. He has toured around the world. The fact that CODAC was there for him on those two occasions has allowed him to achieve that success. Again, this was a 52-year-old individual whom a surgery sent into addiction.

I will close by pointing out that one of the things the CARA bill, which many of us worked so hard on, accomplished was to send the message that addiction is not a moral failing. It is a medical condition. It should be treated as a medical condition. Not only is it not a moral failing, I think many of us who have had family, loved ones, friends, or any experience with folks who are going through recovery—what we have learned is that recovery is actually a noble accomplishment. It is not an easy path, but it is a path that demands deep honesty, deep courage, deep trust, very often love. It is a path that people who are walking it can and should be proud of, and we should be proud of them for their achievements, and we should be there for them in their relapses and make sure the care that will put them back on that path is available.

I yield the floor to my terrific colleague from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his important words and all the Senators who have come to the floor this afternoon to talk about the Republican plans to dismantle our healthcare system.

As we speak, Republicans in the Senate are busy behind closed doors working overtime to come up with a secret health plan to ram through the Senate. I guess they are afraid of how the public would react if we could see the full scope of their plans, but in the last 24 hours, we have seen new details about what they want to do. The formula is as clear as it is cruel: destroy healthcare for tens of millions of

Americans, including people struggling under the weight of our national opioid crisis. Why? In order to give tax cuts to rich people.

These plans are simply unforgivable, and I say "unforgivable" because I cannot find any justification that makes it OK to take away health insurance from 23 million Americans. I cannot come up with a single sliver of an argument that says it makes sense to rip away more than \$800 billion from kids with complex medical needs, seniors in nursing homes, and one of the largest sources of help for people and families struggling with substance abuse disorder, all to produce tax breaks for a handful of millionaires and billionaires.

The Republican agenda is destroying healthcare in this country, and it has never been clearer. President Trump released his budget proposal this week. If the healthcare bill is a punch to the gut, his budget is a knife in the ribs. The Trump budget is about the future, and for the future, Trump says there is too much medical research. He wants to cut more than \$5 billion from the NIH budget. That is the place where research is ongoing about treatments for Alzheimer's, cancer, diabetes, ALS. That is America's future that President Trump wants to cut by more than \$5 billion.

Then there is the Republican effort to blow up our existing healthcare system. The Republican bill would open the door to discriminating against people with preexisting conditions, and there is more. Insurance companies could drop coverage for mental health and substance abuse disorders. Insurance companies could decide not to cover pregnancy or maternity care. They can drop coverage for prescription drugs. Insurance companies could, once again, impose lifetime limits on diseases like cancer and heart conditions, even for people on employer plans in States like Massachusetts that want nothing to do with the waivers the Republican bill allows.

The CBO says that out-of-pocket costs for these services that are no longer covered would rise "thousands of dollars a year," but cutting out cancer patients and mamas and newborn babies and people with preexisting conditions just wasn't enough for the Republicans. President Trump used his new budget to cut hundreds of millions of dollars from the Federal agency leading the fight against opioids. Tens of thousands of people are dying, and the Trump budget cuts money needed in the fight against opioids. It gets even worse.

Together, the Republican healthcare bill and the President's budget rip well over a trillion dollars out of the Medicaid Program, which provides health insurance to one in five people in this country. Medicaid funds more than half the people in nursing homes. When a

new baby is born in this country, Medicaid pays for about half of those births. Seniors in nursing homes and new babies are just targets for the Republican cuts.

Then, like extra chocolate sauce drizzled over this misery sundae, the budget also cuts the Children's Health Insurance Program by 20 percent over the next decade. Children's health insurance is the program that works together with Medicaid to provide health insurance for one out of every three kids in this country. Trump and the Republicans say: Let them go sick.

What does that mean? Don't repair a hole in their hearts or fix their broken arms? Don't treat them when they get ear infections or does it just leave someone else to pay? If that is the answer, then tell us who? Who exactly is going to pay for the healthcare for these children?

I just don't get what the Republicans in Congress are thinking. I know they have people back in their home States who are begging them to keep healthcare coverage. Disease, accidents, old age, substance abuse, these misfortunes don't ask whether you are a Democrat or a Republican before they come knocking at your door. I just don't get how Republicans can turn their backs on people who will be hurt, but I understand whom the Republicans are helping.

The CBO score lays it out in black and white. The budget lets you go line by line to see just whom the Republicans do care about. The Republican healthcare bill burns down healthcare access for millions of people in this country in order to hand out tax breaks to a tiny handful of millionaires and billionaires.

The Republican budget rips away coverage for people with disabilities so that giant corporations can keep more of their giant profits. The Republican budget tosses seniors out of nursing homes and puts the brakes on Alzheimer's research so the richest people in this country can rake in millions in tax cuts. That is not puzzling; that is unforgivable.

Let's be clear about what is at stake here. A couple of weeks ago, I was at Malden Care Center, which is part of the Cambridge Health Alliance. Health providers like these in Massachusetts are on the frontlines, and they are fighting back against the opioid epidemic.

The folks at Cambridge Health Alliance told me that before the ACA, they were lucky if one out of every three people walking through their doors had health insurance. Today, after years of hard work in Massachusetts to pass bipartisan health reform and then to implement the ACA, more than 97 percent of the people in our State have healthcare. More than 9 out of 10 people coming into Cambridge Health Alliance clinics now have coverage. Be-

cause of that coverage, CHA could offer a wide range of services, including treatment for opioids. They are making headway: More lives saved, more success stories, more healthy babies.

I am not going to tell the seniors and the mamas and the people on the frontlines of the opioid crisis they have to give up those gains to pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest people in this country. If Senate Republicans want to defend this indefensible budget and unforgivable healthcare bill, then they can start by coming out from behind closed doors where they are conducting secret negotiations over healthcare. They can look the American people in the eye and admit they care more about the wealthy few in this country than they do about hard-working families and people who need our help. They can be straight up, and the American people—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—can hold them accountable for what they are trying to do to our families and to our country.

I yield the floor to my colleague from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The Senator from Maryland.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM DAUSTER

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, the Senate is an institution that remembers its giants, its lions—the Senators who have served with distinction, who negotiated critical legislative deals, who fought for their States and their constituents, and who have participated in historic debates on this Senate floor. They have statues and libraries to remember them and portraits in these halls.

The Senate has been home to many extraordinary individuals but less frequently acknowledged is the truth that no Senator operates alone. We rely on the counsel and good service of dedicated staff in both our committees and personal offices. Among those staff, there is perhaps no greater giant of the Senate than Bill Dauster, who retires this week after more than three decades of service.

With a clear-eyed understanding of the Senate, with all its features and its flaws, a dedication to progressive values and collegiality that has endeared him to Senator and staffer alike, Bill has been an asset to this institution and to all who have served with him. I am very pleased he is with us on the floor today.

Senator Harry Reid called Bill his "utility player" for his ability to step into any issue or complicated matter and find a solution.

I am privileged that Bill Dauster joined my staff early this year to help me set up my office and get it off to a good start in the U.S. Senate. I could not have asked for a better and more knowledgeable guy as I began my service here.

There are few major legislative battles that Bill Dauster has not joined in the past 30 years, including the Children's Health Insurance Program, the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, and the Affordable Care Act. He worked for Senator Feingold when he stood against the so-called PATRIOT Act because of its invasion of privacy, and he helped shepherd Democratic priorities, ranging from the minimum wage to important infrastructure investments.

He has written a book on Senate procedure—and I mean literally—and he has been as much a scholar of the Senate as a participant in its daily life. Bill is a leader of what the Washington Post once called "the whisper brigade," the people, the staff who stand with their Senators, from committee hearings to floor speeches, to answer questions and offer suggestions and help make us better and more prepared.

In that capacity, Bill Dauster has mentored countless staff and always stayed accessible to answer the most basic questions. With a quote or a quip, he has brought levity to serious policy discussions. He has built a reputation as an honest broker, a brilliant dealmaker, and an incredibly generous soul.

Bill's character is shaped by his Jewish faith, which he has studied and sought to illuminate to others. He has devoted free time to analysis of the Torah on Wikipedia and many other places, crafting interpretations that are as detailed, carefully explained, and straightforward as the analysis he has provided on countless Senate bills.

Bill Dauster is a devoted family man with his equally accomplished and brilliant wife Ellen and his three children who are his pride and joy. I am very pleased that his wife Ellen and daughter Emma are with us today.

He is a science fiction fan, particularly of Star Trek, perhaps seeking stories that are more believable than modern politics.

I wish Bill a restful retirement, but given his active mind, I suspect he would sympathize with Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes' maxim that leisure is "a chance to do other jobs that demand attention."

Instead, I will thank him for his service to the Senate and his country and wish him a joyful and fulfilling next frontier. I ask my colleagues to join me in saying: Farewell, but don't wander far.

HONORING SECOND LIEUTENANT RICHARD WILBUR COLLINS III

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I stand to pay tribute to a distinguished young man from the State of Maryland: 2LT Richard Wilbur Collins III, a brave, brilliant, passionate, selfless, and kind American hero.

Second Lieutenant Collins, a resident of Calvert County, MD, was a 23-year-

old student at Bowie State University, where he was a member of the Bowie ROTC Program and was airborne-certified. On May 18, just last week, he was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army's intelligence branch. Second Lieutenant Collins was scheduled to graduate with a bachelor's of arts in business administration from Bowie State University earlier this week. His future could not have been brighter.

Tragically, Second Lieutenant Collins' life was cut short by a horrific act of violence that the FBI is investigating as a hate crime. We must bring the perpetrator of this evil act to justice and directly confront the racism behind it.

Second Lieutenant Collins' selfless and courageous contributions to our State and Nation will continue to have a lasting impact on those who knew and loved him and on the broader community who learned of his tragic and senseless death. At the young age of 23, Second Lieutenant Collins raised his right hand to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. He was a young man of extraordinary courage and ability and will be deeply missed by all who knew him.

Second Lieutenant Collins leaves behind his grieving family: his father, U.S. veteran Richard W. Collins II; his mother Dawn Collins, his sister Robin Collins, and countless friends.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering Second Lieutenant Richard Wilbur Collins III and in expressing our deepest condolences to his family and friends.

TRUMPCARE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, as our colleagues know, just yesterday we received the Congressional Budget Office's analysis of the most recent version of the Republican health care bill, the bill that passed out of the House of Representatives, also known as TrumpCare 2.0.

I encourage all of us, every one of our colleagues, to read the CBO report and to read it carefully. For those who are interested, it can be found online at www.cbo.gov. On the front page you can link to the report, which I have here in my hand.

I think it is worth reminding our colleagues that the Congressional Budget Office is composed of professionals, budget experts, and the current Director of the Congressional Budget Office was selected by the Republican chairman of the House Budget Committee and the Republican chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. Without an umpire on budget issues, this Senate would be in absolute chaos when it comes to determining the impact of many of our major decisions, so it is very dangerous when people start attacking the umpire when it comes to

these important issues that can have literally life or death implications for our constituents.

What you will find in this most recent Congressional Budget Office report is that the most recent House Republican plan is even worse than the original plan, which also was the subject of a Congressional Budget Office report. What this CBO report tells us is that, like the earlier version, this so-called health bill is really a massive transfer of wealth from working-class and middle-income Americans to the top 1 percent of the wealthiest in our country and some very powerful special interests. Its title would much more fittingly be "wealthcare," not healthcare.

Let's take a look at some of the findings that are in this report that can be found online. I turn to page 4 of the report, where the Congressional Budget Office reaches the conclusion that if we adopt this House proposal, if the Senate votes for the House Republican bill, there will be 23 million fewer of our fellow Americans who will have access to affordable healthcare when it is phased in than today. So if we were to adopt this, if this becomes law, we are saying to 23 million of our fellow Americans: Sorry, we are going to take away your access to affordable healthcare. It is right there on page 4. That is because what this so-called healthcare bill does is take away some of the supports that provide access to affordable healthcare. It reduces for millions of Americans the tax credits they use for their premiums in the Affordable Care Act exchanges.

As you will find on page 3 of this report, it also cuts Medicaid by \$834 billion. Now some people will say: Hey, no problem; that is just going to be sent to the States, and States are going to have more flexibility.

The Congressional Budget Office is very clear that when you are talking about Medicaid cuts of this impact, one of two things happen: Either a lot fewer people get access to affordable healthcare or States have to raise taxes on the people in their States to ensure continued access. But this notion that somehow there are all these extra funds floating around and that greater flexibility will allow fewer dollars to go further with no negative impact is a fairytale.

In fact, Medicaid already has lots of provisions for flexibility. They have a whole suite of waiver provisions. Our State of Maryland exercised lots of waivers under the Medicaid program to allow it to be creative and flexible.

This \$834 billion cut we found out about yesterday with the President's budget is just the first round of cuts. They are proposing another almost \$610 billion cut to Medicaid. Total cuts are \$1.4 trillion to Medicaid.

I would remind my colleagues that in addition to helping working-class

Americans get access to healthcare, two-thirds of Medicaid money goes to help seniors in nursing homes, and 60 percent of seniors in nursing homes use Medicaid to help pay the bills. Two-thirds of it goes to those seniors and people with disabilities.

The Congressional Budget Office is telling us that this TrumpCare 2.0, this latest version of the Republican healthcare bill, is going to result in 23 million fewer of our fellow Americans having access to healthcare. It is going to cut Medicaid, and this is just the first round, by \$834 billion.

Why do this? Who is benefiting from this? Well, let's look at the very first page of the Congressional Budget Office report. It reduces revenues by \$992 billion. There are cuts to Medicaid by \$834 billion, and it reduces revenues coming in by \$992 billion, essentially transferring revenues that are going to help tens of millions of our fellow Americans get access to healthcare and transferring that to tax breaks. Those tax breaks go overwhelmingly to the very wealthiest Americans—to the top 1 percent, in fact.

One of the things we did when we put together the Affordable Care Act to help pay for it was—we said: You know what, we think wealthier households should have to pay a small fee on their unearned income to be devoted to the Medicare trust fund.

Everyone in the country knows when they get that pay stub, it tells them how much is taken out for Medicare—3.4 percent. We said: Look, that should not just apply to earned income from hard-working people. If you're in the top 1 percent, if you are a higher income earner, you should also be contributing some of your capital gains revenue to help strengthen Medicare. That is what we did.

Yet this bill provides all those households with a tax cut. In fact, for millionaires, the average annual tax cut as a result of this bill will be \$50,000—a \$50,000 tax cut to millionaires while cutting access to affordable care for 23 million of our fellow Americans.

Why all these tax cuts are in something masquerading as a healthcare bill, I don't know, but we now know certainly who benefits the most from this legislation. Beyond those top 1 percent income earners, you also have insurance companies and the pharmaceutical industry. They get some tax breaks, as well, under this legislation.

Finally, I said at the outset that this TrumpCare 2.0, the most recent Republican healthcare bill, is worse than the original one. The original one was rotten to the core. The original one had most of the provisions I am talking about. So what got added that makes this one even worse? To find that, people should look at page 5 of this report and see what happens to people in States that decide to get rid of the patient protection provisions in the Affordable Care Act.

We have heard a lot of talk about how that House bill isn't really going to hurt people with preexisting conditions like diabetes and asthma. We have heard all that, but here's what the Congressional Budget Office report says. This is what the referee, the umpire, has to say about that with respect to those States. It says: "Community rated premiums would rise over time, and people who are less healthy," and then they state "including those with preexisting conditions or newly acquired medical conditions," right? So people who have had any kind of preexisting condition or prior health condition that an insurance company will argue makes them a much greater risk—people who are less healthy and those with preexisting conditions "would ultimately be unable to purchase comprehensive nongroup health insurance at premiums comparable to those under current law, if they could purchase it at all." They go on to say "despite the additional funding that would be available under H.R. 1628."

That is the House bill. Despite that additional funding to help reduce premiums, they go on, and I hope our colleagues will pay attention to this conclusion: "As a result, the nongroup markets in those states would become unstable for people with higher-than-average expected health care costs." Translation: People with preexisting conditions, people who, because they had diabetes or asthma as a child or they have a congenital disease—any preexisting condition will make it much harder for them to afford any kind of coverage at all, and ultimately the nongroup markets in those States will become unstable for those people. That is why this TrumpCare 2.0, this House healthcare bill, this Republican bill, took a really rotten bill and actually made it worse.

It is not enough, colleagues, for people to make a few cosmetic changes to this, to put couple of bandaids on it in the Senate, and say "Hey, we made this thing better" because this is rotten to its core.

If people really want to address healthcare reform, let's work together to improve the exchanges. There are commonsense things we can do to improve the exchanges, but you don't improve the exchanges by cutting Medicaid by \$834 billion. That has nothing to do with the exchanges. You don't improve the exchanges by giving a windfall tax credit to the wealthiest Americans. That has nothing to do with healthcare.

TrumpCare 2.0, this Republican healthcare bill, is rotten to the core. Let's throw it out, and let's focus on the question of fixing the exchanges. If people want to do that, we can actually get something done. But let's not pretend we are doing healthcare when really what the goal so far has been is "wealthcare."

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. RES. 176

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Monday, June 5, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 107, S. Res. 176, with the time until 5:30 p.m. equally divided in the usual form; further, that at 5:30 p.m., the Senate vote on the resolution with no amendments or motions in order to the resolution or the preamble; finally, that if the resolution is agreed to, the preamble be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 66 through 93 and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Sean L. Murphy

IN THE NAVY

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. John A. Okon

Capt. Michael W. Studeman

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Edward L. Anderson

Capt. Stuart P. Baker

Capt. Michael D. Bernacchi, Jr.

Capt. Frank M. Bradley

Capt. Daniel L. Cheever

Capt. Yvette M. Davids
Capt. Brian P. Fort
Capt. Peter A. Garvin
Capt. William J. Houston
Capt. Sara A. Joyner
Capt. Frederick W. Kacher
Capt. Timothy C. Kuehhas
Capt. Carl A. Lahti
Capt. Andrew J. Loisel
Capt. Douglas G. Perry
Capt. Fred I. Pyle
Capt. Erik M. Ross
Capt. Paul J. Schlise
Capt. James P. Waters, III

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Bradford J. Shwedo

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Giovanni K. Tuck

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment as the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army and appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 3034:

To be general

Lt. Gen. James C. McConville

The following named officer for appointment as the Deputy Judge Advocate General, United States Army, and for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 3037 and 3064:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Stuart W. Risch

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Thomas C. Seamands

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Mark E. Black

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Matthew V. Baker

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Chris R. Gentry

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Robert A. Karmazin

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Marion Garcia

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Whitlock

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Miguel A. Castellanos

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Windsor S. Buzza

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Randall V. Simmons, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Michael D. Wickman

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Carl A. Alex
 Brig. Gen. Francis M. Beaudette
 Brig. Gen. Christopher F. Bentley
 Brig. Gen. Gary M. Brito
 Brig. Gen. Patrick W. Burden
 Brig. Gen. Joseph R. Calloway
 Brig. Gen. Paul T. Calvert
 Brig. Gen. Paul A. Chamberlain
 Brig. Gen. Ronald P. Clark
 Brig. Gen. Brian P. Cummings
 Brig. Gen. Edwin J. Deedrick, Jr.
 Brig. Gen. Rodney D. Fogg
 Brig. Gen. Robin L. Fontes
 Brig. Gen. Maria R. Gervais
 Brig. Gen. Karen H. Gibson
 Brig. Gen. David P. Glaser
 Brig. Gen. William H. Graham, Jr.
 Brig. Gen. James B. Jarrard
 Brig. Gen. Gary W. Johnston
 Brig. Gen. Mitchell L. Kilgo
 Brig. Gen. Ronald Kirklin
 Brig. Gen. John S. Kolasheski
 Brig. Gen. Viet X. Luong
 Brig. Gen. Patrick E. Matlock
 Brig. Gen. Brian J. Mennes
 Brig. Gen. Jeffrey L. Milhorn
 Brig. Gen. James J. Mingus
 Brig. Gen. Christopher J. Sharpsten
 Brig. Gen. John P. Sullivan
 Brig. Gen. Frank W. Tate
 Brig. Gen. Daniel R. Walrath
 Brig. Gen. Brian E. Winski

The following named officers for promotion in the United States Army Judge Advocate General's Corps to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624, 3037, and 3064:

To be brigadier general

Col. Susan K. Arnold

Col. Joseph B. Berger, III
 Col. Robert P. Huston

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Richard J. Lebel

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Todd W. Lewis

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Army Medical Corps to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624 and 3064:

To be brigadier general

Col. George N. Appenzeller

Col. Telita Crosland

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Steven R. Rudder

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Laura J. Richardson

The following named officer for appointment as the Judge Advocate General, United States Army, and for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while serving as the Judge Advocate General, under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601, 3037, and 3064:

To be lieutenant general

Brig. Gen. Charles N. Pede

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Phillip G. Sawyer

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Brian D. Beaudreault

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN382 AIR FORCE nomination of James E. Thompson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN411 AIR FORCE nomination of Johanna K. Ream, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN412 AIR FORCE nominations (118) beginning PAUL R. AGUIRRE, and ending PETER LAWRENCE ZALEWSKI, which nominations

were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

IN THE ARMY

PN317 ARMY nomination of Kalie K. Rott, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN318 ARMY nomination of Norma A. Hill, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN319 ARMY nomination of Frank C. Pescatello, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN320 ARMY nomination of Basim M. Younis, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN321 ARMY nomination of Stanley F. Gould, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN322 ARMY nomination of Scott W. Fisher, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN323 ARMY nominations (16) beginning GARY L. BEATY, and ending MICHAEL A. M. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN324 ARMY nominations (2) beginning DANIEL J. CONVEY, and ending PHILIP A. HORTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN325 ARMY nominations (2) beginning SOPHIA DALCE, and ending BURKE LENZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN326 ARMY nomination of Dawn E. Elliott, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN327 ARMY nomination of D012528, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN328 ARMY nomination of Benjamin W. Hillner, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN329 ARMY nomination of Celina S. Pargo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN330 ARMY nomination of Paul R. Ambrose, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN331 ARMY nominations (2) beginning JAMES L. DUNGCA and ending NATHAN S. LANHAM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN332 ARMY nomination of Charles R. Burnett, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN383 ARMY nomination of Pablo F. Diaz, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN384 ARMY nomination of Craig A. Nazareth, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN385 ARMY nomination of Brian C. McLean, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN386 ARMY nomination of Raymond C. Casteline, which was received by the Senate

and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN387 ARMY nomination of Daniel J. Shank, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN388 ARMY nomination of Christopher W. Degn, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN389 ARMY nomination of Jason T. Kidder, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN390 ARMY nomination of Tito M. Villanueva, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN391 ARMY nomination of Philip J. Dacunto, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN392 ARMY nomination of Stephen R. November, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN393 ARMY nomination of Luisa Santiago, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN394 ARMY nomination of Robert J. Bonner, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 8, 2017.

PN413 ARMY nomination of Mohamad El Samad, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN414 ARMY nomination of Lana J. Bernat, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN415 ARMY nomination of Patrick K. Sullivan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN416 ARMY nominations (207) beginning DEREK L. ADAMS, and ending JAMES M. YATES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN417 ARMY nominations (230) beginning RODNEY ABRAMS, and ending D010081, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN418 ARMY nominations (58) beginning CHRISTINE N. ADAMS, and ending CHARLETTE K. WOODARD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN171 MARINE CORPS nominations (5) beginning MARK S. JIMISON, and ending SHAWN P. WONDERLICH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 27, 2017.

PN233 MARINE CORPS nomination of Jason G. Laxis, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 4, 2017.

PN235 MARINE CORPS nomination of Kevin J. Goodwin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 4, 2017.

PN341 MARINE CORPS nomination of Javier E. Vega, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN342 MARINE CORPS nomination of Sergio L. Sandoval, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN451 MARINE CORPS nomination of Michael S. Stevens, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN452 MARINE CORPS nomination of Patrick J. Mullen, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN453 MARINE CORPS nominations (45) beginning RAYMOND L. ADAMS, and ending DOUGLAS S. WOODHAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

IN THE NAVY

PN147 NAVY nomination of Susan M. McGarvey, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 27, 2017.

PN168 NAVY nomination of Sheila I. Almendras-Flaherty, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 27, 2017.

PN170 NAVY nomination of Adrian D. Ragland, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 27, 2017.

PN207 NAVY nomination of Christopher R. Desena, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 4, 2017.

PN212 NAVY nomination of Kenneth L. Demick, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 4, 2017.

PN214 NAVY nomination of Michael C. Bratley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 4, 2017.

PN333 NAVY nomination of Evan M. Colbert, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN334 NAVY nomination of Luciana Sung, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN335 NAVY nomination of William A. Schultz, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN336 NAVY nomination of William L. McCoy, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN337 NAVY nomination of Chris F. White, which as received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN338 NAVY nomination of Karl M. Kingry, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN339 NAVY nomination of Michael A. Polito, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN340 NAVY nomination of Raymond J. Carlson, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN343 NAVY nomination of Christopher M. Allen, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 24, 2017.

PN430 NAVY nomination of Aaron L. Witherspoon, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

PN437 NAVY nomination of John E. Fritz, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 10, 2017.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 60, 62, and 64.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of David L. Norquist, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller); Kari A. Bingen, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense; and Robert Story Karem, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Norquist, Bingen, and Karem nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

INCREASING THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY TO VETERANS ACT OF 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 12 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 12) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Moran amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 218) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill by striking section 2, relating to reduction of benefits for senior executives and certain health care employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs convicted of a felony)

Strike Sec. 2.

The bill (S. 12), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 12

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Increasing the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability to Veterans Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. ACCOUNTABILITY OF LEADERS FOR MANAGING THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 709 the following new section:

“§ 710. Annual performance plan for political appointees

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct an annual performance plan for each political appointee of the Department that is similar to the annual performance plan conducted for an employee of the Department who is appointed as a career appointee (as that term is defined in section 3132(a)(4) of title 5) within the Senior Executive Service at the Department.

“(b) ELEMENTS OF PLAN.—Each annual performance plan conducted under subsection (a) with respect to a political appointee of the Department shall include, to the extent applicable, an assessment of whether the appointee is meeting the following goals:

“(1) Recruiting, selecting, and retaining well-qualified individuals for employment at the Department.

“(2) Engaging and motivating employees.

“(3) Training and developing employees and preparing those employees for future leadership roles within the Department.

“(4) Holding each employee of the Department that is a manager accountable for addressing issues relating to performance, in particular issues relating to the performance of employees that report to the manager.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 709 the following new item:

“710. Annual performance plan for political appointees.”.

SEC. 3. ACCOUNTABILITY OF SUPERVISORS AT DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR HIRING WELL-QUALIFIED PEOPLE.

(a) ASSESSMENT DURING PROBATIONARY PERIOD.—

(1) DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—With respect to any employee of the Department of

Veterans Affairs who is required to serve a probationary period in a position in the Department, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall require the supervisor of such employee to determine, during the 30-day period ending on the date on which the probationary period ends, whether the employee—

(A) has demonstrated successful performance; and

(B) should continue past the probationary period.

(2) LIMITATION ON EMPLOYMENT AFTER PROBATIONARY PERIOD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), no employee of the Department serving a probationary period as described in paragraph (1) may complete that probationary period unless and until the supervisor of the employee, or another supervisor capable of making the requisite determination, has made an affirmative determination under such paragraph.

(B) PROBATIONARY PERIOD DEEMED COMPLETED.—

(i) NO DETERMINATION.—If no determination under paragraph (1) is made with respect to an employee before the end of the 60-day period following the end of the 30-day period specified in such paragraph, the employee shall be deemed to have completed the probationary period of the employee effective as of the end of that 60-day period.

(ii) RETROACTIVE EFFECT OF DETERMINATION.—If an affirmative determination under paragraph (1) is made with respect to an employee after the end of the 30-day period specified in such paragraph, the employee shall be deemed to have completed the probationary period of the employee effective as of the end of that 30-day period.

(3) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS REGARDING DETERMINATIONS.—Not less frequently than monthly, the Secretary shall notify the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives regarding—

(A) each instance during such month in which a supervisor did not make a determination required under paragraph (1) during the period required in such paragraph; and

(B) each such instance included in a previous notification under this paragraph for which the supervisor still has not made such a determination.

(b) SUPERVISORS.—With respect to any employee of the Department who is serving a probationary period in a supervisory position at the Department, successful performance under subsection (a) shall include demonstrating management competencies in addition to the technical skills required for such position.

(c) PERFORMANCE PLAN.—Each annual performance plan conducted for a supervisor of an employee serving a probationary period shall hold the supervisor accountable for—

(1) providing regular feedback to such employee during such period before making a determination under subsection (a) regarding the probationary status of such employee; and

(2) making a timely determination under subsection (a) regarding the probationary status of such employee.

(d) SUPERVISOR DEFINED.—In this section, the term “supervisor” has the meaning given such term in section 7103(a) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 4. ACCOUNTABILITY OF MANAGERS FOR ADDRESSING PERFORMANCE OF EMPLOYEES.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that, as a part of the annual perform-

ance plan of an employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs who is a manager, the manager is evaluated on the following:

(1) Taking action to address poor performance and misconduct among the employees that report to the manager.

(2) Taking steps to improve or sustain high levels of employee engagement.

SEC. 5. WRITTEN OPINION ON CERTAIN EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS AFTER TERMINATING EMPLOYMENT WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 717. Written opinion on certain employment restrictions after terminating employment with the Department

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Before terminating employment with the Department, any official of the Department who has participated personally and substantially during the one-year period ending on the date of the termination in an acquisition by the Department that exceeds \$10,000,000 shall obtain a written opinion from an appropriate ethics counselor at the Department regarding any restrictions on activities that the official may undertake on behalf of a covered contractor during the two-year period beginning on the date on which the official terminates such employment.

“(b) COVERED CONTRACTOR DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘covered contractor’ means a contractor carrying out a contract entered into with the Department, including pursuant to a subcontract.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 715 the following new item:

“717. Written opinion on certain employment restrictions after leaving the Department.”.

SEC. 6. REQUIREMENT FOR CONTRACTORS OF THE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYING CERTAIN RECENTLY SEPARATED DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 8129. Requirement for contractors employing certain recently separated Department employees

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A covered contractor may not knowingly provide compensation to an individual described in subsection (b) during the two-year period beginning on the date on which the individual terminates employment with the Department unless the covered contractor determines that the individual—

“(1) has obtained the written opinion required under section 717(a) of this title; or

“(2) has requested such written opinion not later than 30 days before receiving compensation from the covered contractor.

“(b) INDIVIDUAL DESCRIBED.—An individual described in this subsection is any official of the Department who participated personally and substantially during the one-year period ending on the date of the termination individual's employment with the Department in an acquisition by the Department that exceeds \$10,000,000.

“(c) COVERED CONTRACTOR DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘covered contractor’ means a contractor carrying out a contract entered into with the Department, including pursuant to a subcontract.”.

(b) APPLICATION.—The requirement under section 8129(a) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to any entity that enters into a contract with the Department on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 81 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 8128 the following new item:

“8129. Requirement for contractors employing certain recently separated Department employees.”.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS BONUS TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 114 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 114) to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit an annual report regarding performance awards and bonuses awarded to certain high-level employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 114) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 114

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Veterans Affairs Bonus Transparency Act”.

SEC. 2. ANNUAL REPORT ON PERFORMANCE AWARDS AND BONUSES AWARDED TO CERTAIN HIGH-LEVEL EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 714. Annual report on performance awards and bonuses awarded to certain high-level employees

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that contains, for the most recent fiscal year ending before the submittal of the report, a description of the performance awards and bonuses awarded to Regional Office Directors of the Department, Directors of Medical Centers of the Department, and Directors of Veterans Integrated Service Networks.

“(b) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall include the fol-

lowing with respect to each performance award or bonus awarded to an individual described in such subsection:

“(1) The amount of each award or bonus.

“(2) The job title of the individual awarded the award or bonus.

“(3) The location where the individual awarded the award or bonus works.

“(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(1) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(2) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 713 the following new item:

“714. Annual report on performance awards and bonuses awarded to certain high-level employees.”.

DR. CHRIS KIRKPATRICK WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 57, S. 585.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 585) to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

S. 585

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—EMPLOYEES GENERALLY

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Sec. 102. Stays; probationary employees.

Sec. 103. Prohibited personnel practices.

Sec. 104. Discipline of supervisors based on retaliation against whistleblowers.

Sec. 105. Suicide by employees.

Sec. 106. Training for supervisors.

Sec. 107. Information on whistleblower protections.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EMPLOYEES

Sec. 201. Prevention of unauthorized access to medical records of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 202. Outreach on availability of mental health services available to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 203. Protocols to address threats against employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 204. Comptroller General of the United States study on accountability of chiefs of police of Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers.

TITLE I—EMPLOYEES GENERALLY

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term “agency”—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means an entity that is an agency, as defined under section 2302 of title 5, United States Code, without regard to whether one or more portions of title 5 of the United States Code are inapplicable to the entity; and

(B) does not include any entity that is an element of the intelligence community, as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4));

(2) the term “employee” means an employee (as defined in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code) of an agency; and

(3) the term “personnel action” has the meaning given that term under section 2302 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 102. STAYS; PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES.

(a) REQUEST BY SPECIAL COUNSEL.—Section 1214(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) If the Merit Systems Protection Board grants a stay under this subsection, the head of the agency employing the employee shall give priority to a request for a transfer submitted by the employee.”.

(b) PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES.—Section 1221 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) If the Merit Systems Protection Board grants a stay to an employee in probationary status under subsection (c), the head of the agency employing the employee shall give priority to a request for a transfer submitted by the employee.”.

(c) STUDY REGARDING RETALIATION AGAINST PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report discussing retaliation against employees in probationary status.

SEC. 103. PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICES.

Section 2302(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (12), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following:

“(14) access the medical record of another employee or an applicant for employment as a part of, or otherwise in furtherance of, any conduct described in paragraphs (1) through (13).”.

SEC. 104. DISCIPLINE OF SUPERVISORS BASED ON RETALIATION AGAINST WHISTLEBLOWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 7515. Discipline of supervisors based on retaliation against whistleblowers

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘agency’—

“(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means an entity that is an agency, as defined under section 2302, without regard to whether any other provision of this chapter is applicable to the entity; and

“(B) does not include any entity that is an element of the intelligence community, as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4));

“(2) the term ‘prohibited personnel action’ means taking or failing to take an action in violation of paragraph (8), (9), or (14) of section 2302(b) against an employee of an agency; and

“(3) the term ‘supervisor’ means an employee who would be a supervisor, as defined under section 7103(a), if the entity employing the employee was an agency.

“(b) PROPOSED DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the head of the agency employing a supervisor, an administrative law judge, the Merit Systems Protection Board, the Special Counsel, a judge of the United States, or the Inspector General of the agency employing a supervisor determines that the supervisor has committed a prohibited personnel action, the head of the agency employing the supervisor, in accordance with the procedures required under paragraph (2)—

“(A) for the first prohibited personnel action committed by a supervisor—

“(i) shall propose suspending the supervisor for a period of not less than 3 days; and

“(ii) may, in addition to a suspension described in clause (i), propose any other action, including a reduction in grade or pay, that the head of the agency determines appropriate; and

“(B) for the second prohibited personnel action committed by a supervisor, shall propose removing the supervisor.

“(2) PROCEDURES.—

“(A) NOTICE.—A supervisor against whom an action is proposed to be taken under paragraph (1) is entitled to written notice—

“(i) stating the specific reasons for the proposed action; and

“(ii) informing the supervisor of the right of the supervisor to review the material which is relied on to support the reasons for the proposed action.

“(B) ANSWER AND EVIDENCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A supervisor who is notified under subparagraph (A) that the supervisor is the subject of a proposed action under paragraph (1) is entitled to 14 days following such notification to answer and furnish evidence in support of the answer.

“(ii) NO EVIDENCE FURNISHED; INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE.—After the end of the 14-day period described in clause (i), if a supervisor does not furnish evidence as described in clause (i) or if the head of the agency determines that such evidence is not sufficient to reverse the proposed action, the head of the agency shall carry out the action.

“(C) SCOPE OF PROCEDURES.—An action carried out under this section—

“(i) except as provided in clause (ii), shall be subject to the same requirements and procedures (including regarding appeals) as an action under section 7503, 7513, or 7543; and

“(ii) shall not be subject to—

“(I) paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 7503(b);

“(II) paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) and subsection (c) of section 7513; or

“(III) paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) and subsection (c) of section 7543.

“(3) DELEGATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (B), the head of an agency may delegate any authority or responsibility under this subsection.

“(B) NONDELEGABILITY OF DETERMINATION REGARDING PROHIBITED PERSONNEL ACTION.—If the head of an agency is responsible for determining whether a supervisor has committed a prohibited personnel action for purposes of paragraph (1), the head of the agency may not delegate that responsibility.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“7515. Discipline of supervisors based on retaliation against whistleblowers.”

SEC. 105. SUICIDE BY EMPLOYEES.

(a) REFERRAL.—The head of an agency shall refer to the Special Counsel, along with any information known to the agency regarding the circumstances described in paragraphs (2) and (3), any instance in which the head of the agency has information indicating—

(1) an employee of the agency committed suicide;

(2) prior to the death of the employee, the employee made any disclosure of information which reasonably evidences—

(A) any violation of any law, rule, or regulation; or

(B) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety; and

(3) after a disclosure described in paragraph (2), a personnel action was taken against the employee.

(b) OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL REVIEW.—For any referral to the Special Counsel under subsection (a), the Special Counsel shall—

(1) examine whether any personnel action was taken because of any disclosure of information described in subsection (a)(2); and

(2) take any action the Special Counsel determines appropriate under subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 106. TRAINING FOR SUPERVISORS.

In consultation with the Special Counsel and the Inspector General of the agency (or senior ethics official of the agency for an agency without an Inspector General), the head of each agency shall provide training regarding how to respond to complaints alleging a violation of whistleblower protections (as defined in section 2307 of title 5, United States Code, as added by section 107) available to employees of the agency—

(1) to employees appointed to supervisory positions in the agency who have not previously served as a supervisor; and

(2) on an annual basis, to all employees of the agency serving in a supervisory position.

SEC. 107. INFORMATION ON WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS.

(a) EXISTING PROVISION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2302 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 4505a(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 2302(d)” and inserting “section 2302(c)”.

(B) Section 5755(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 2302(d)” and inserting “section 2302(c)”.

(C) Section 110(b)(2) of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 (5 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended by striking “section [2303(f)(1)] 2302(f)(1) or (2)” and inserting “section [2303(e)(1)] 2302(e)(1) or (2)”.

“(D) Section 704 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 344) is amended by striking “2302(c)” each place it appears and inserting “2307”.

(E) Section 1217(d)(3) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3657(d)(3)) is amended by striking “section 2302(d)” and inserting “section 2302(c)”.

(F) Section 1233(b) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3673(b)) is amended by striking “section 2302(d)” and inserting “section 2302(c)”.

(b) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 2307. Information on whistleblower protections

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘agency’—

“(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), has the meaning given that term in section 2302; and

“(B) does not include any entity that is an element of the intelligence community, as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4));

“(2) the term ‘new employee’ means an individual—

“(A) appointed to a position as an employee of an agency on or after the date of enactment of the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017; and

“(B) who has not previously served as an employee; and

“(3) the term ‘whistleblower protections’ means the protections against and remedies for a prohibited personnel practice described in paragraph (8), subparagraph (A)(i), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (9), or paragraph (14) of section 2302(b).

“(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF HEAD OF AGENCY.—The head of each agency shall be responsible for the prevention of prohibited personnel practices, for the compliance with and enforcement of applicable civil service laws, rules, and regulations, and other aspects of personnel management, and for ensuring (in consultation with the Special Counsel and the Inspector General of the agency) that employees of the agency are informed of the rights and remedies available to them under this chapter and chapter 12, including—

“(1) information regarding whistleblower protections available to new employees during the probationary period;

“(2) the role of the Office of Special Counsel and the Merit Systems Protection Board with regard to whistleblower protections; and

“(3) how to make a lawful disclosure of information that is specifically required by law or Executive order to be kept classified in the interest of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs to the Special Counsel, the Inspector General of an agency, Congress, or other agency employee designated to receive such disclosures.

“(c) TIMING.—The head of each agency shall ensure that the information required to be provided under subsection (b) is provided to each new employee of the agency not later than 6 months after the date the new employee begins performing service as an employee.

“(d) INFORMATION ONLINE.—The head of each agency shall make available information regarding whistleblower protections applicable to employees of the agency on the public website of the agency, and on any online portal that is made available only to employees of the agency if one exists.

“(e) DELEGATES.—Any employee to whom the head of an agency delegates authority

for personnel management, or for any aspect thereof, shall, within the limits of the scope of the delegation, be responsible for the activities described in subsection (b).”.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“2307. Information on whistleblower protections.”.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EMPLOYEES

SEC. 201. PREVENTION OF UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS TO MEDICAL RECORDS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(A) develop a plan to prevent access to the medical records of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs by employees of the Department who are not authorized to access such records;

(B) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress the plan developed under subparagraph (A); and

(C) upon request, provide a briefing to the appropriate committees of Congress with respect to the plan developed under subparagraph (A).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed assessment of strategic goals of the Department for the prevention of unauthorized access to the medical records of employees of the Department.

(B) A list of circumstances in which an employee of the Department who is not a health care provider or an assistant to a health care provider would be authorized to access the medical records of another employee of the Department.

(C) Steps that the Secretary will take to acquire new or implement existing technology to prevent an employee of the Department from accessing the medical records of another employee of the Department without a specific need to access such records.

(D) Steps the Secretary will take, including plans to issue new regulations, as necessary, to ensure that an employee of the Department may not access the medical records of another employee of the Department for the purpose of retrieving demographic information if that demographic information is available to the employee in another location or through another format.

(E) A proposed timetable for the implementation of such plan.

(F) An estimate of the costs associated with implementing such plan.

(b) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 202. OUTREACH ON AVAILABILITY OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES AVAILABLE TO EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct a program of outreach to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs to inform those employees of any mental health services, including telemedicine options, that are available to them.

SEC. 203. PROTOCOLS TO ADDRESS THREATS AGAINST EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure protocols are in effect to address threats from individuals receiving health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs directed towards employees of the Department who are providing such health care.

SEC. 204. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES STUDY ON ACCOUNTABILITY OF CHIEFS OF POLICE OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTERS.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to assess the reporting, staffing, accountability, and chain of command structure of the Department of Veterans Affairs police officers at medical centers of the Department.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments be considered and agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 585), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 585

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—EMPLOYEES GENERALLY

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Sec. 102. Stays; probationary employees.

Sec. 103. Prohibited personnel practices.

Sec. 104. Discipline of supervisors based on retaliation against whistleblowers.

Sec. 105. Suicide by employees.

Sec. 106. Training for supervisors.

Sec. 107. Information on whistleblower protections.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EMPLOYEES

Sec. 201. Prevention of unauthorized access to medical records of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 202. Outreach on availability of mental health services available to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 203. Protocols to address threats against employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 204. Comptroller General of the United States study on accountability of chiefs of police of Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers.

TITLE I—EMPLOYEES GENERALLY

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term “agency”—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means an entity that is an agency, as defined under section 2302 of title 5, United States Code, without regard to whether one or more portions of title 5 of the United States Code are inapplicable to the entity; and

(B) does not include any entity that is an element of the intelligence community, as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4));

(2) the term “employee” means an employee (as defined in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code) of an agency; and

(3) the term “personnel action” has the meaning given that term under section 2302 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 102. STAYS; PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES.

(a) REQUEST BY SPECIAL COUNSEL.—Section 1214(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) If the Merit Systems Protection Board grants a stay under this subsection, the head of the agency employing the employee shall give priority to a request for a transfer submitted by the employee.”.

(b) PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES.—Section 1221 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) If the Merit Systems Protection Board grants a stay to an employee in probationary status under subsection (c), the head of the agency employing the employee shall give priority to a request for a transfer submitted by the employee.”.

(c) STUDY REGARDING RETALIATION AGAINST PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEES.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report discussing retaliation against employees in probationary status.

SEC. 103. PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICES.

Section 2302(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (12), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following:

“(14) access the medical record of another employee or an applicant for employment as a part of, or otherwise in furtherance of, any conduct described in paragraphs (1) through (13).”.

SEC. 104. DISCIPLINE OF SUPERVISORS BASED ON RETALIATION AGAINST WHISTLEBLOWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 7515. Discipline of supervisors based on retaliation against whistleblowers

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘agency’—

“(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means an entity that is an agency, as defined under section 2302, without regard to whether any other provision of this chapter is applicable to the entity; and

“(B) does not include any entity that is an element of the intelligence community, as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4));

“(2) the term ‘prohibited personnel action’ means taking or failing to take an action in violation of paragraph (8), (9), or (14) of section 2302(b) against an employee of an agency; and

“(3) the term ‘supervisor’ means an employee who would be a supervisor, as defined

under section 7103(a), if the entity employing the employee was an agency.

“(b) PROPOSED DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the head of the agency employing a supervisor, an administrative law judge, the Merit Systems Protection Board, the Special Counsel, a judge of the United States, or the Inspector General of the agency employing a supervisor determines that the supervisor has committed a prohibited personnel action, the head of the agency employing the supervisor, in accordance with the procedures required under paragraph (2)—

“(A) for the first prohibited personnel action committed by a supervisor—

“(i) shall propose suspending the supervisor for a period of not less than 3 days; and

“(ii) may, in addition to a suspension described in clause (i), propose any other action, including a reduction in grade or pay, that the head of the agency determines appropriate; and

“(B) for the second prohibited personnel action committed by a supervisor, shall propose removing the supervisor.

“(2) PROCEDURES.—

“(A) NOTICE.—A supervisor against whom an action is proposed to be taken under paragraph (1) is entitled to written notice—

“(i) stating the specific reasons for the proposed action; and

“(ii) informing the supervisor of the right of the supervisor to review the material which is relied on to support the reasons for the proposed action.

“(B) ANSWER AND EVIDENCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A supervisor who is notified under subparagraph (A) that the supervisor is the subject of a proposed action under paragraph (1) is entitled to 14 days following such notification to answer and furnish evidence in support of the answer.

“(ii) NO EVIDENCE FURNISHED; INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE.—After the end of the 14-day period described in clause (i), if a supervisor does not furnish evidence as described in clause (i) or if the head of the agency determines that such evidence is not sufficient to reverse the proposed action, the head of the agency shall carry out the action.

“(C) SCOPE OF PROCEDURES.—An action carried out under this section—

“(i) except as provided in clause (ii), shall be subject to the same requirements and procedures (including regarding appeals) as an action under section 7503, 7513, or 7543; and

“(ii) shall not be subject to—

“(I) paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 7503(b);

“(II) paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) and subsection (c) of section 7513; or

“(III) paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) and subsection (c) of section 7543.

“(3) DELEGATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (B), the head of an agency may delegate any authority or responsibility under this subsection.

“(B) NONDELEGABILITY OF DETERMINATION REGARDING PROHIBITED PERSONNEL ACTION.—If the head of an agency is responsible for determining whether a supervisor has committed a prohibited personnel action for purposes of paragraph (1), the head of the agency may not delegate that responsibility.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“7515. Discipline of supervisors based on retaliation against whistleblowers.”

SEC. 105. SUICIDE BY EMPLOYEES.

(a) REFERRAL.—The head of an agency shall refer to the Special Counsel, along with any information known to the agency regarding the circumstances described in paragraphs (2) and (3), any instance in which the head of the agency has information indicating—

(1) an employee of the agency committed suicide;

(2) prior to the death of the employee, the employee made any disclosure of information which reasonably evidences—

(A) any violation of any law, rule, or regulation; or

(B) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety; and

(3) after a disclosure described in paragraph (2), a personnel action was taken against the employee.

(b) OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL REVIEW.—For any referral to the Special Counsel under subsection (a), the Special Counsel shall—

(1) examine whether any personnel action was taken because of any disclosure of information described in subsection (a)(2); and

(2) take any action the Special Counsel determines appropriate under subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 106. TRAINING FOR SUPERVISORS.

In consultation with the Special Counsel and the Inspector General of the agency (or senior ethics official of the agency for an agency without an Inspector General), the head of each agency shall provide training regarding how to respond to complaints alleging a violation of whistleblower protections (as defined in section 2307 of title 5, United States Code, as added by section 107) available to employees of the agency—

(1) to employees appointed to supervisory positions in the agency who have not previously served as a supervisor; and

(2) on an annual basis, to all employees of the agency serving in a supervisory position.

SEC. 107. INFORMATION ON WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS.

(a) EXISTING PROVISION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2302 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 4505a(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 2302(d)” and inserting “section 2302(c)”.

(B) Section 5755(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 2302(d)” and inserting “section 2302(c)”.

(C) Section 110(b)(2) of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 (5 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended by striking “section 2302(f)(1) or (2)” and inserting “section 2302(e)(1) or (2)”.

(D) Section 1217(d)(3) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3657(d)(3)) is amended by striking “section 2302(d)” and inserting “section 2302(c)”.

(E) Section 1233(b) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3673(b)) is amended by striking “section 2302(d)” and inserting “section 2302(c)”.

(b) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 2307. Information on whistleblower protections

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘agency’—

“(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), has the meaning given that term in section 2302; and

“(B) does not include any entity that is an element of the intelligence community, as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4));

“(2) the term ‘new employee’ means an individual—

“(A) appointed to a position as an employee of an agency on or after the date of enactment of the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017; and

“(B) who has not previously served as an employee; and

“(3) the term ‘whistleblower protections’ means the protections against and remedies for a prohibited personnel practice described in paragraph (8), subparagraph (A)(i), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (9), or paragraph (14) of section 2302(b).

“(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF HEAD OF AGENCY.—The head of each agency shall be responsible for the prevention of prohibited personnel practices, for the compliance with and enforcement of applicable civil service laws, rules, and regulations, and other aspects of personnel management, and for ensuring (in consultation with the Special Counsel and the Inspector General of the agency) that employees of the agency are informed of the rights and remedies available to them under this chapter and chapter 12, including—

“(1) information regarding whistleblower protections available to new employees during the probationary period;

“(2) the role of the Office of Special Counsel and the Merit Systems Protection Board with regard to whistleblower protections; and

“(3) how to make a lawful disclosure of information that is specifically required by law or Executive order to be kept classified in the interest of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs to the Special Counsel, the Inspector General of an agency, Congress, or other agency employee designated to receive such disclosures.

“(c) TIMING.—The head of each agency shall ensure that the information required to be provided under subsection (b) is provided to each new employee of the agency not later than 6 months after the date the new employee begins performing service as an employee.

“(d) INFORMATION ONLINE.—The head of each agency shall make available information regarding whistleblower protections applicable to employees of the agency on the public website of the agency, and on any online portal that is made available only to employees of the agency if one exists.

“(e) DELEGATES.—Any employee to whom the head of an agency delegates authority for personnel management, or for any aspect thereof, shall, within the limits of the scope of the delegation, be responsible for the activities described in subsection (b).”

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“2307. Information on whistleblower protections.”

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EMPLOYEES

SEC. 201. PREVENTION OF UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS TO MEDICAL RECORDS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(A) develop a plan to prevent access to the medical records of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs by employees of the Department who are not authorized to access such records;

(B) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress the plan developed under subparagraph (A); and

(C) upon request, provide a briefing to the appropriate committees of Congress with respect to the plan developed under subparagraph (A).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed assessment of strategic goals of the Department for the prevention of unauthorized access to the medical records of employees of the Department.

(B) A list of circumstances in which an employee of the Department who is not a health care provider or an assistant to a health care provider would be authorized to access the medical records of another employee of the Department.

(C) Steps that the Secretary will take to acquire new or implement existing technology to prevent an employee of the Department from accessing the medical records of another employee of the Department without a specific need to access such records.

(D) Steps the Secretary will take, including plans to issue new regulations, as necessary, to ensure that an employee of the Department may not access the medical records of another employee of the Department for the purpose of retrieving demographic information if that demographic information is available to the employee in another location or through another format.

(E) A proposed timetable for the implementation of such plan.

(F) An estimate of the costs associated with implementing such plan.

(b) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 202. OUTREACH ON AVAILABILITY OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES AVAILABLE TO EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct a program of outreach to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs to inform those employees of any mental health services, including telemedicine options, that are available to them.

SEC. 203. PROTOCOLS TO ADDRESS THREATS AGAINST EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure protocols are in effect to address threats from individuals receiving health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs directed towards employees of the Department who are providing such health care.

SEC. 204. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES STUDY ON ACCOUNTABILITY OF CHIEFS OF POLICE OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTERS.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to assess the reporting, staffing, accountability, and chain

of command structure of the Department of Veterans Affairs police officers at medical centers of the Department.

**UNANIMOUS CONSENT
AGREEMENT—S. 1094**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the Elwood nomination, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1094, the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability Act; that the committee-reported substitute be adopted, and that there then be 3 hours of debate, equally divided in the usual form; and that following the use or yielding back of time, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

**TRIBUTE TO ALASKA ARMY AND
AIR NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE-
MEMBERS**

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, every week I have been coming down to the Senate floor to honor an individual who is serving in my great State of Alaska, who is helping to make our State, his or her local community, or even our country a better place. We call these individuals our Alaskan of the Week.

Alaska carries a mystique. We all know that. I am a little biased, but it does, rightfully so. It is a beautiful State. We all think it is the most beautiful State in the world. I encourage everybody who is watching from the Gallery or on TV to make sure they take at least one trip to Alaska sometime in their life. You will love it. It will be the trip of a lifetime.

But Alaska is much more than just a beautiful State. It is actually a State that is critically important to America—critically important to our country. We have abundant natural resources: fish, metals, minerals, and oil and gas. They are resources that help feed our country, help build our country, and help power our country.

Further, given today’s threats, we are also the most strategically located State in the country. In fact, General Billy Mitchell, father of the Air Force, said in testimony to the Congress in the 1930s that Alaska was “the most important strategic place in the world,” which could control Asia, North America, and Europe. He said that whoever controls Alaska controls the world.

In Alaska, we are the hub of combat airpower for the Asia-Pacific and the rest of the world. We are also a vital expeditionary platform, with some of the Army’s best trained troops, who

can deploy anywhere in the world on a moment’s notice. Importantly, we are the cornerstone of our country’s missile defense system.

What makes this military triad truly exceptional is the Arctic-tough women and men in uniform supporting each of these pillars of America’s military might in Alaska, who work day and night to ensure that our country is safe.

Following Armed Forces Day a few days ago, where we honor all of those who currently serve in the military—and we are all going to be celebrating in a few days Memorial Day to honor those who gave their lives serving our country—I recognize a group of proud Alaskans who help protect our country. These individuals were recently awarded the 2017 Alaska Missile Defender of the Year award from the Missile Defense Advocacy Alliance. Today, they are our Alaskans of the Week.

These are National Guard servicemembers from the Alaska Army and Air National Guard who have demonstrated leadership, excellence, and selfless commitment in their operation of the U.S. Ground-based Midcourse Defense system, at Fort Greely, and the Early Warning Radar system at Clear Air Force Station in Alaska, over the past year. Essentially, these are the men and women who keep our country safe with America’s most sophisticated missile defense system. So I would like to read their names on the Senate floor.

Base defenders of the year from the 213th Space Warning Squadron at Clear Air Force Station: SSgt Jonathan Rivera-Calderon and SSgt Stanislav Barilov.

Missile defenders of the year from the 213th Space Warning Squadron at Clear Air Force Station: Capt. Erik Haugen and TSgt Mark Lockwood.

Base defenders of the year from Fort Greely: SGT Nathan Williams and SGT Travis Hall.

Best crew winners from the 49th Missile Defense Battalion, Delta Crew: MAJ Michael Long, CPT Anthony Montoya, 1LT Rachel Simmons, SSG Caroline Domenech, and SGT Jose Aponte.

These Alaskan missile defenders continue to stand ready and excel as they protect our country and our citizens from an increasingly diverse set of national security threats. They are just a few of the 300 men and women missile defenders in interior Alaska who, every day, protect the entire United States. They like to call themselves the “300 protecting the 300 million.” I think of them as modern-day Spartans, the 300 Spartans who fought alongside King Leonidas to protect Greece in 480 BC. That is who they are, modern-day Spartans.

The mission of these men and women is to protect the entire country from a rogue missile threat—whether from

North Korea, Iran, or another country—that could hit any city in America. This is what they do 365 days a year, 24/7. They are on call on Christmas, New Year's, and Super Bowl Sunday. They are tough, well-trained, and they are committed patriots of America.

We face a dizzying array of threats across the globe. But the one that keeps not only me but many Members of the Senate and our military up at night right now is the threat from North Korea. There is no doubt that North Korea and the leader of that country are intent on obtaining and nuclear-tipped intercontinental ballistic missile that can range our entire country. Recent unclassified briefings on this issue have said it is no longer a matter of if but when North Korea is going to have this capability.

To protect us from this impending threat, this advancing threat, a number of us introduced a bill this past week to enhance our missile defense system across the country. While Alaska's missile defenders currently keep us safe, like many in our military they need more training and better technology so these brave men and women can do their job and continue to keep America safe in the future.

Leading up to Memorial Day, I want to make sure to thank all who have served and continue to serve our Nation in uniform. I especially honor those who made the ultimate sacrifice, and, of course, their families. I also want to make sure I recognize Alaska's missile defenders. While millions of Americans will be outside this weekend, having a barbecue and celebrating Memorial Day, every American in this country can rest assured that these brave missile defenders in Alaska, men and women like the Spartans of old, stand watch to defend our freedoms. They are doing it today and they will do it on Memorial Day, just like they do every day of the year.

That is why all of them, in my view, merit the award of Alaskans of the Week.

TRIBUTE TO WADE QUIGLEY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize another Alaskan, one who happens to be right here in the Senate Chamber, Senate Page Wade Quigley. I think we should call him the Junior Alaskan of the Week.

Wade is from Girdwood, AK. He is actually right here, getting a little red in the face. I think he is slightly embarrassed. Girdwood was originally called Glacier City, for the ice-capped mountains surrounding the town. About a 45-minute drive from Anchorage, it is a very, very special place. My wife Julie and I and our three daughters love Girdwood. We spend a lot of time there skiing and enjoying the outdoors.

Wade is now 16 years old. When I was told that this morning, I was a little

surprised. He is much more mature than 16. He will be entering his senior year at South Anchorage High School, the school that my daughter Laurel attends, next fall.

Like a true Alaskan, Wade takes full advantage of our State's abundant natural resources, teaching skiing in the winter and commercial fishing for pink salmon during the summers in Kodiak, AK.

In DC, Wade has been doing a great job serving in the U.S. Senate as a page. According to those who supervise him, as well as his fellow pages, Wade is eager to take any opportunity to talk or learn about his State. The esteemed Laura Dove herself has referred to Wade as "Alaska's best ambassador." I thought that is what Senator MURKOWSKI and I were supposed to be. It is a grand compliment. Others say he has a heart for public service, humor, and kindness. He is extremely well-liked throughout this building.

In just 2 weeks, Wade and all the pages will complete their service as Senate pages. By the way, it is very, very hard work. They are up at 5 o'clock a.m., studying at 6 o'clock a.m., classes until 9 o'clock, and then working in the Senate until the wee hours. I thank Wade and all the Senate pages for their service to the Senate, to their States, to their country.

Wade's energy and upbeat outlook will be missed in this body. Even though he is leaving us in the Senate, Wade hopes to continue his service to his country by attending the U.S. Air Force Academy.

Whatever his final path is, I am sure he will bring to it the same work ethic and the same love for his country and for Alaska and, I believe now, after 6 months, for the U.S. Senate.

Wade, to you and all the pages who have done such a great job, thank you, and, yes, thank you for being the Junior Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues to discuss the heroin, fentanyl, and opioid crisis that has devastated communities across our Nation. I want to thank the Senator from West Virginia for giving us the floor today and for his continued leadership in working to combat this crisis. It is going to take an all-hands-on-deck approach, with Members of both parties and at all levels of government working with those on the frontlines to find solutions.

We recently received near final information on the number of lives lost last year and the specific substances involved in New Hampshire as a result of this crisis. What is clear is that the threat continues to evolve and grow. In

2016 alone, there were 477 confirmed overdose deaths in New Hampshire. That is an increase from 439 deaths in 2015 and 326 in 2014. Already this year, there have been 73 confirmed overdose deaths in my State, with another 86 suspected cases awaiting final toxicology results.

In recent months, we have seen new deadly challenges that are emerging. A few weeks ago, I met with members of the Drug Enforcement Agency in New Hampshire. Among the topics we discussed was the spread of a dangerous synthetic drug, carfentanil. Carfentanil is 100 times stronger than even fentanyl. It is killing people faster, and we are seeing its deadly use rising in New Hampshire. We have seen six confirmed deaths from carfentanil in the past few weeks.

During my meeting with the DEA, I heard from those on the frontlines about the dangerous impacts it has on their lives as well. Carfentanil and other fentanyl compounds are so dangerous that they can put first responders at risk if they are exposed.

It is clear that we must do more to support those struggling and those on the frontlines to stem and ultimately reverse the tide of this crisis. We need more resources to address this problem because people are dying. What we cannot do is institute policies that would make matters worse.

I am encouraged that the Trump administration has discussed the severity of this crisis, but their actions so far don't match their words. The President's budget that was announced this week would have devastating consequences on efforts to combat this crisis. This budget includes hundreds of millions of dollars in cuts to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. It also cuts the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program. This is a program that provides key support to law enforcement officials on the frontlines.

I am particularly disturbed by this administration's continued attacks on Medicaid. Medicaid has been critical to ensuring that Granite Staters struggling with addiction have access to treatment and recovery services. The drastic cuts to Medicaid in the President's budget proposal go above and beyond even the devastating cuts included in the dangerous TrumpCare bill that passed through the House of Representatives. This budget proposes cutting \$610 billion to Medicaid, which is on top of the \$839 billion cut in TrumpCare. TrumpCare also ends Medicaid expansion, which experts have said is the No. 1 tool we have in combating this crisis.

TrumpCare undermines the requirement that insurance companies must cover mental health and substance use disorder services. According to yesterday's CBO report, this could lead to out-of-pocket costs totaling thousands

of dollars for people seeking these services. In the midst of this crisis, we need to be strengthening prevention, treatment, and recovery efforts and giving stronger support to those on the frontlines, but these recent actions by this administration show that President Trump is failing to live up to his own words on this deadly epidemic. And cuts to programs that help people in the throes of addiction are irresponsible, unacceptable, and unconscionable.

I am grateful to many of my colleagues for reaching across the aisle to propose policies to address this epidemic. This is an issue that rises above partisanship, and this is work we need to be doing because the lives of the people of our States depend upon it. I am going to continue to work with my colleagues on solutions, while standing firm against proposals that would pull us backward.

I again thank Senator MANCHIN for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO RON HINDLE

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to deliver a difficult speech. My senior communications adviser, Ron Hindle, is retiring after more than 30 years in the U.S. Senate. If you do some quick math, you will realize that Ron has been part of the Senate longer than I have. I came here in January of 1997 and quickly learned Ron would be an indispensable part of my team. Previously, he had worked for my predecessor, Al Simpson. That meant he knew Wyoming, and he knew how to communicate with Wyomingites.

I am so glad I hired Ron when I came to DC. He has written some of the best speeches I have given over the past 20 years. When Ron told me he was retiring, I went back and looked at a few of his remarks between tears.

When my longtime State director retired, Ron wrote:

There is an old saying we all heard before: Good help is hard to find. Here is my experience: Good help is not only hard to find, it is also impossible to replace.

That was true about Robin, and it is equally true of Ron. In a speech to the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, Ron called the library card "our passport to adventure." For a speech to the Young Entrepreneurs Academy, Ron referred to books, "especially biographies and autobiographies—as 'How To' manuals for success." When I

spoke to my grandson's graduating fifth grade class, Ron wrote me an example comparing the Supreme Court to grandparents: "If they say no, there is no one else to turn to."

I hope this sampling of Ron's work can convey why he has been an important part of my team. He has a way with words that few people have and, more importantly, he knows what I want to say and how I want to say it. Ron does more than help me with speeches. If there is a student in Wyoming who has achieved an important goal, Ron helps me with a laudatory note. When an organization like Daughters of the American Revolution has their annual convention, Ron works on the statement commemorating that event. When a Wyoming business celebrates an important anniversary, Ron has helped me congratulate that success.

My staff and I will miss Ron, not only for the help he gives us but for the person he is. He is kind, considerate, and generous. He is also willing to lend a helping hand in everything we do, from hosting our holiday cookie party to organizing trivia, and building games for our staff planning sessions. This isn't goodbye, as Ron will remain my neighbor and my friend.

Today I want to celebrate all that Ron has done for me, for my office, for Wyoming, and for America. It is appropriate for me to once again quote Ron in describing the word "celebrate" to Wyoming Cowboy Challenge Academy graduates, Ron wrote:

Celebrating is much more than the things we do—it's the feelings we get from the great accomplishments of our life. It is the joy and happiness that comes from the heart when we have reached one of our goals. It's the sense of satisfaction we feel that comes from the knowledge that we have taken on a difficult challenge and mastered it. It is the increase in self-confidence and self-esteem that comes from learning to trust in ourselves to make the right choices and the right decisions.

Ron, Diana joins me in celebrating you today. You have been a great example of the importance of public service, and your legacy will continue in my office and in Wyoming as business owners, students, and others reread the words you wrote over more than 30 years. I thank you for devoting so much of your life to making my office a better place to work and, more importantly, Wyoming a better place to live. Thanks for all you have done for all of us and America. I wish you the best.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PARIS AGREEMENT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, there has been a lot of discussion in the media over the last couple of weeks about what President Trump is going to do and should do with the Paris climate agreement. We know all about this agreement. It was entered into by President Obama in December of 2015 at the U.N. annual party that they hold, the 21st annual Conference of Parties meeting.

Let me explain what this is. It was 21 years ago they decided—the United Nations had always been quite offended every time something happened that they were doing in the United Nations that was not in the best interest of the United States. Several of us would call and threaten to withhold some of our funds supporting the United Nations. Of course, the United Nations has always wanted to be independent. They wanted to not be accountable to anyone so consequently they put together these parties. The best way for them to do that is if they could somehow be funded independently and not be accountable to the various countries—not just the United States but any of the rest of them.

So they hold this meeting in December of every year, and they hold it in very exotic places. Everybody gets really excited. They have 192 countries come in. What they are trying to do is get them all to limit their CO₂ emissions. Of course, they all come in because 99 percent of the 192 countries are ones who want to get money out of this deal. I ran into a friend of mine from Benin, West Africa. This was several years ago. I said: Why are you here? You are not really going to agree with this stuff. He said: No, this is where the money is. This is the biggest party of the year.

One of the worst things that ever happened at their big party was—they headed to South America someplace, I don't remember where—when they ran out of caviar. They have these big meetings every year.

Well, the last one I went to was December 2009. It was in Copenhagen. You might remember that was just after President Obama was elected. He and his administration were pledging to the 192 countries that we were going to pass a form of cap and trade. Well, they all went to Copenhagen—NANCY PELOSI, Hillary, John Kerry, Barack Obama—they all went there and told them we were going to pass cap and trade here in the United States so they all needed to follow form. This is interesting because of the 192 countries he was talking to, most of them didn't even know our form of government. They didn't know that we had a Senate that had to confirm these things or that we even had a legislature. They assumed that was going to happen.

I remember, right after they left, I went to Copenhagen. I had to go in the

morning and get back in time for votes all in 1 day. I did that. At that time, they termed me as the “one-man truth squad.” I told them under no circumstances—this is 2009—were we going to pass any kind of cap and trade in this country. I was right. They were shocked over there because they assumed if the President said we are going to do it, that we are going to do it. The legislation was estimated at that time to cost between \$300 and \$400 billion—that is per year—to implement. It never came to a vote because the Democrats knew they had at that time—keep in mind this is 2009—they had control of the White House, they had control of the House and Senate, and they had, at that time, 60 votes in the Senate, but they couldn’t get the votes because it was too expensive.

So many people thought it was the first time we would consider cap and trade, but it wasn’t. We had been working on that for years. They first tried it in 2003. In 2003, we had a bill for the U.S. Senate. I remember being down here—because at that time I was chairman of the Subcommittee on the Environment and Public Works. They had that jurisdiction. So I was down here to try to make sure that thing wasn’t going to pass. Sure enough, it didn’t. We defeated it, 43 to 55. Then the same group tried it again in 2005. At that time, they only got 38 votes, and that failed. Then, in 2008, Senators John Kerry and Joe Lieberman tried it again. Of course, at that time, it failed again. Now, that is a far cry from the 60 votes necessary in order to get something like that to pass. We have been looking at that with various forms of legislation for quite a number of years.

After suffering those embarrassing defeats in the Senate, President Obama sought to do by regulation what he couldn’t do through legislation. That is how we got the Clean Power Plan. I think it is important to think back where we got to this point. There has also been an implementation cost, by their own admission, some \$300 billion a year, and it made it impossible at that time for us in the United States to build a new coal-fired powerplant.

It is interesting. Some people say: Why do you go back so often to Oklahoma? I said: Well, I like to talk to real people. I can remember being at Shattuck, OK. I bet the Chair doesn’t know where Shattuck is. It is in Western Oklahoma.

A guy said: Now, explain this to me. This was actually during the Obama administration.

He said: If we in the United States are dependent upon fossil fuels—that is, coal, oil and gas, and nuclear—to produce 89 percent of the power it takes to run this machine called America, and if President Obama is successful in doing away with coal, oil and gas, and nuclear, then how do we run this machine called America?

For that reason, the President decided he was going to do this with regulations.

I ask unanimous consent that this list of all of the regulations—47 of them—we have been able to do away with in the first 100 days be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

A few weeks ago, he signed an Executive order instructing the EPA to unwind the United States from this regulation. That is exactly what my friend, EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, is working to accomplish right now.

While the President has disavowed the Paris Agreement, he has not pulled out as of this time. He has been kind of busy doing other things.

I understand there are a lot of competing voices on this front. Many people don’t believe the Paris Agreement is binding. While that is true, to a certain degree, it is kind of shortsighted.

I am speaking today because I believe the President should make a clean exit from the Paris Agreement and avoid a lot of confusion. There are two key reasons I want to do that.

The first one, reason No. 1, is that if we remain in the agreement, we are putting ourselves at significant litigation risk.

The Paris Agreement commits the United States to lowering its greenhouse gas emissions by 26 to 28 percent by 2025. This is interesting because in the Paris Agreement that took place, the President at that time, President Obama, was getting just a little bit panicky. He had already gone to seven of these and had been unable to pass any kind of an agreement that would accomplish his goal of putting coal, oil, and gas out of existence. So this agreement that he made, he made unilaterally, saying: I agree on behalf of the United States of America that we will reduce our emissions of CO₂ by between 26 and 28 percent by 2025.

Well, we all know that the environmental community wants to do whatever it possibly can to regulate carbon. There is a reason for this. You might wonder why this is. There is a professor named Richard Lindzen. Richard Lindzen is a professor at MIT and is one of the top professors in this discipline. He said: If you control carbon, you control life.

It makes it a bureaucrat’s dream. So yes, in fact, that is what he was trying to do. That is all they want. So if we stay in the Paris Agreement, environmental groups—radical groups—would be able to sue the EPA to force it to regulate greenhouse gas emissions under section 115 of the Clean Air Act. Section 115 of the Clean Air Act is entitled “International Air Pollution.” This section is triggered when a country asserts that our pollution is harming them, establishing an endangerment finding, and when there is a reciprocal agreement between our

countries and those countries that have such a regulation.

It is not difficult to imagine that if we remain in the Paris Agreement, the environmentalists, NGOs, led by the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Sierra Club, and others, will file lawsuits against the EPA as it takes legal steps to deregulate the Clean Power Plan.

While there has not been an internal endangerment finding, the environmentalists would be working to force the issue. Further, they would make the case that the reciprocal requirements of section 115 of the Clean Air Act are met by the Paris climate agreement. Even though it is not binding at the international level, the environmentalists could, with a sympathetic judge, make a case that the administration has made the reciprocal agreement by staying in Paris. It would sound good. It is not too hard to find a sympathetic judge nowadays. This is something they have been planning to do all along. They built this back door into the agreement as the Obama administration was actually writing it.

You ask, why would certain lawsuits be filed? A former general counsel at the Sierra Club, David Bookbinder, said that section 115 of the Clean Air Act is—these are his words—“the silver bullet de jour of the enviros, and they are dead serious about this,” meaning that they believe the Paris Agreement clearly states that it meets the reciprocity test established by section 115 of the Clean Air Act.

If you have noticed, the environmental groups have been very silent about whether the administration should stay in the agreement. We all know they want us to stay in the agreement, but why be so quiet at this time? Because we have not heard from them. Well, the reason is, I think the environmental groups who are trying to accomplish this see that there is real progress being made to convince the President to stay in the Paris Agreement, which means they could have their wish of greenhouse gas regulations. If we stay in the agreement, they could sue the EPA and force regulations under section 115. So they have been very quiet. They don’t want President Trump to know they will also benefit if we stay in the agreement. Because of this, they are allowing people to believe that nothing will happen by staying in the agreement. I have heard this from Republicans and Democrats.

It really does not make too much difference, because for ratification, the votes are not there, and everybody knows it. In the meantime, you are subject to the lawsuits. So they just don’t want us to know it as well. Could it be that a Republican President would give them the tools they need to force greenhouse gas regulations even without meaning to? It is a possibility.

This is why the President needs to make a clean exit from the agreement.

If the President stays in the Paris agreement, he will be putting at risk our ability to accomplish his campaign goals; namely, ending the war on fossil fuels and rescinding the Clean Power Plan. He has already taken the Executive steps he needs on this front. The EPA is currently on solid legal footing. But we must not limit the effectiveness of these key steps by remaining in the Paris Agreement.

So that is reason No. 1. Reason No. 1 is that if we remain in the agreement, we are subjecting ourselves to all of the lawsuits that will be out there.

The other reason, the second reason I will mention, is that even if we pull out of the agreement, we will still have a seat at the table.

I have heard the statement quite often, in fact, by some people in the Trump administration—they say: We don't want to pull out of it because we want to maintain a seat at the table. As they have these meetings every December, we want to be there so we can express what America really is planning to do and is not planning to do.

But let's keep in mind that the seat at the table was established way back in 1992. That was when they had the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the UNFCCC. This is the 1992 treaty that supports all the big parties that meet every December that are held in the exotic locations I mentioned. That group was the foundation of the Paris Agreement and the foundation of the Copenhagen discussion in 2009.

Now, 2009 is when they had the event in Copenhagen. That is the one where all the people went and told them that we were going to pass cap and trade, which we were not going to pass cap and trade, and we didn't. Further, it was the foundation of the Kyoto Protocol of 1997, which was the first agreement that sought to set binding international greenhouse regulations.

The Senate demonstrated its intent to defeat that with the Byrd-Hagel resolution. Let's remember what that was. The Berg-Hagel resolution—by Senators Byrd and Hagel—was right here in this Chamber. They said they were going to oppose the ratification of any treaty that does one of two things—either it is harmful economically to the United States of America, or that countries that are developing countries, such as China, are not a part of it.

Well, that was the case. So the Kyoto Protocol of 1997 was a natural follow-on from that decision that was made. So even if President Trump removes the United States as a signatory to the Paris Agreement, we will continue to have a seat at the table and the President will have the ability to negotiate further deals. That is already done. That was the done, and it is inescap-

able. It was done back in 1992. We have been a party to that protocol. We have been ever since then and we will continue to be regardless of whether the President pulls out of the Paris Agreement.

In the event the President does decide to stay in the Paris Agreement, he will need the Senate for ratification because the Paris Agreement meets seven out of eight criteria established by the State Department to determine what constitutes a treaty. An agreement need meet only one of these, and this meets seven. So it would have to come in for ratification. If the President does not exit, the Paris Agreement will be considered as a treaty.

It is in the best interests of the Nation and the President's agenda to make a clean exit from this agreement. That is why we sent a letter, which was sent out this morning by about 25 Members of the Senate, encouraging the President to pull out of the agreement. It is the best way to get everything he wants: a complete end to the war on fossil fuels—which has been ongoing since the day Barrack Obama went into power—without the risk of any further future litigation mandating that the EPA establish new greenhouse gas regulations, and a decent seat at the table for the United States, which we all agree that we want. If for some reason he decides not to withdraw, he will have to submit it to the Senate as a treaty, and it would be defeated.

Let me mention two other things which I think are important and which I want to include in the RECORD at this time.

You know, we have been talking about the Paris Agreement. The far left has been trying to get a forum of cap and trade ever since Kyoto in 1997. They have tried to do it through legislation, tried over and over again, as I mentioned. They could not do it, so they tried to do it through regulation.

You might wonder, what was it way back in the beginning—what were the motives for this in the very first place? I carry this. I think it is very important to realize what people were saying about it.

The former Minister of the European Union—her name was Margot Wallstrom. She said: "Kyoto is about the economy, about leveling the playing field for big business worldwide."

Then along came Jacques Chirac. He said during a speech at the Hague in November of 2000 that Kyoto represents "the first component of an authentic global governance."

Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper once dismissed UN's Kyoto Protocol as a "socialist scheme."

Then Christiana Figueres, who was actually at Paris at the time this thing was put together, said that "the real goal is to change the economic development model for redistribution of wealth among nations."

Those are some of the original comments people have forgotten about.

The last thing I will mention, because I think it is significant, is that I remember going to Copenhagen. At that time, the person who was the head of the EPA—an appointment by the President at that time—was Lisa Jackson. Lisa Jackson—actually, we became pretty good friends at that time. She had one problem: She had a hard time saying things that were not true. I asked her a question right before we left. I said: I have a feeling that once I leave town, once I go to Copenhagen, you are going to come up with an endangerment finding.

This was live on the record, by the way, in the committee I was chairing. She kind of smiled, so I knew it was true.

I said: Now, if you come up with an endangerment finding, it has to be based on science. What science would you rely on?

She said: Well, on the IPCC.

That is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Now, I wouldn't say as luck would have it, but it is kind of coincidental that right after she made that statement was when the big scandal that was referred to as "Climategate" came along. They discovered that the scientists who were with IPCC were not getting the results they wanted. So they rigged the science, and they were caught doing it with emails. So there wasn't any question as to what they were trying to do. So that totally diffused the effectiveness and the legitimacy of the IPCC.

In fact, Christopher Booker of the UK Telegraph said: "This is the worst scientific scandal of our generation."

So when people keep saying that science is settled, that is where it all came from—the IPCC.

Clive Crook of the Financial Times said:

The closed-mindedness of these supposed men of science, their willingness to go to any length to defend a preconceived message, is surprising even to me. The stink of intellectual corruption is overpowering.

Well, I assumed at the time that that would end their providing the science and justification for passing what would have been the largest tax increase in the history of this country.

So, anyway, back to the issue here, several of us feel that to avoid all of this from happening, the best way to do it is to have this President, when he gets back from his trip, do what he campaigned on and pull out of the Paris Agreement, and I anticipate that he will do that.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTIONS
PASSED

SEC Rule requiring oil and gas companies to disclose their "playbooks" on how to win

deals. Inhofe-CRA—first signed since 2001; Stream Buffer Zone rule that blocks coal mining; Education rule mandating federal standards for evaluating teacher performance; Education rule establishing national school board; Interior rule that blocked Alaska-control of hunting & fishing; Social Security rule that put seniors with “representative payees” on gun-ban list; OSHA rule that changed paperwork violation statute of limitations from 6-months to 5-years.

Defense rule that blocked contractors from getting deals if suspected (not convicted) of employment-law violations; Labor rule blocking drug-testing of unemployment beneficiaries; BLM rule blocking oil and gas development on federal lands. Federal Communications Commission rule that would have established 2nd regime of privacy rules in addition to Federal Trade Commission; HHS rule that would make it easier for states to fund Planned Parenthood; Department of Labor (DOL) rule forcing private sector employees onto government run retirement plans; DOL rule allowing states to bypass protections on retirement plans.

TRUMP EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

Regulatory reform: requires 2 regulations be repealed for each new regulation; WOTUS: directs EPA to rescind Waters of the United States Act; Energy: repeals clean power plan, other harmful regulations . . . ending War on Fossil Fuels; Mexico City: reinstates ban of fed funds going to NGOs that do abortions; Hiring Freeze: freezes federal hiring (exempted military); Military: rebuilds military; Approves Keystone XL pipeline; Approves Dakota Access pipeline.

Permit Streamlining: expedites infrastructure and manufacturing project permits; Immigration: 90 day suspension on visas for visitors from Syria, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Yemen. 20 day suspension of U.S. Refugee Admission Program; Sanctuary Cities: blocks federal Department of Justice grants to sanctuary cities; Dodd-Frank: demands review of Dodd-Frank banking regulations and demanding roll-back; Shrink government: directs federal agencies to reorganize to reduce waste and duplication; Trade: evaluates policies to reduce trade deficit; Opioids: fed task force to address opioid drug crisis; Fiduciary rule: delays implementation of bad DOJ rule; Religious Liberty: Eases enforcement of Johnson Amendment and grants other protections for religious freedom; Offshore drilling: revises Obama-era offshore drilling restrictions and orders a review of limits on drilling locations; National Monuments: Directs a review of national monument designations.

Improves accountability and whistleblower protections for VA employees; Affirms local control of school policies and examines Department of Ed regulations; Reviews agricultural regulations; Reviews use of H-1B visas; Top-to-bottom audit of Executive Branch; Moves Historically Black Colleges and Universities offices from Department of Ed to White House; Obamacare: directs federal agencies to ease burdens of ACA; Establishes American Technology Council; Establishes office of Trade and Manufacturing Policy; Identifies and reduces tax regulatory burdens; “Hire America, Buy America”; Establishes a collection and enforcement of antidumping and countervailing duties and violations of Trade and Customs laws; Creates an order of succession within DOJ; Revokes federal contracting executive orders.

Mr. INHOFE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, this weekend we will mark the beginning of the Memorial Day remembrances that we do every year. Memorial Day, of course, is on Monday, but many activities will begin even today and tomorrow to honor those who have died in the defense of our country. These men and women had families, they had dreams for the future, and they had their whole lives ahead of them. But they did something extraordinary.

I remember that a few years ago I had the opportunity to be at the American cemetery in Normandy. At the end of the tour of that cemetery, the guide had us sit down on a ledge with the English Channel to our back and those 8,000 graves in front of us that we had just looked at and had talked about the sacrifices made. Then he flipped open his computer and, at that exact same spot, on the 20th anniversary of the D-day, General Eisenhower—former President Eisenhower—in 1964 was talking to Walter Cronkite. He said to Walter Cronkite: You know, Walter, my son John graduated from West Point on D-day, and over the last 20 years, I have watched him and his wife raise their family and have the experiences they have had, and, he said, many times I have thought about these young men and the life they didn’t get to lead because of what they were asked to do.

Particularly, you had the person sitting there 20 years later who ultimately was the person who asked them to do what they were asked to do, and you understand that that is the kind of decision he thought about. It is the kind of sacrifice we should think about as we think about those who didn’t get to pursue their dreams and didn’t get to see the family they had grown up with or have the family they would have liked to have had because they laid down their lives so that we could take care of our families, so that we could realize our dreams, so that we could enjoy the freedoms that our Nation is truly blessed with and that make us truly extraordinary in our belief and our defense of freedom, not only for ourselves but for people everywhere.

We are grateful for all that these people have done, and this is a time of year that we particularly set aside to honor those fallen heroes—the soldiers, the sailors, the airmen, the marines, the people in the National Guard and the Coast Guard and the Reserve—called up and losing their lives in that cause.

Also, it is good for us to remember those who served and who were willing to make that sacrifice, if necessary, and often have their own burdens they carry from their service. Maybe that burden was just simply losing those years when others were already at a civilian job that they would only be able to go to later.

I am honored to represent nearly 500,000 Missouri veterans. As a member of the bipartisan Congressional Veterans Jobs Caucus, I am committed to helping our veterans find good-paying jobs as civilians. We took an important step in that direction recently when President Trump signed the Honoring Investment in Recruiting and Employing American Military Veterans Act, or the HIRE Vets Act. I believe it may have been the first bill the Senate passed. I was pleased to be the principal sponsor of that bill, and it was the underlying bill on the continuing resolution that funded the government on April 17, and so it became law.

It addresses the fact that transferring from military to civilian life represents a number of challenges. It represents challenges for our servicemembers, and that transfer can be a difficult personal decision to make, but it is also difficult to navigate the civilian employment market and to find out who is recognizing the skills and the lessons learned by veterans and who may not be quite at the forefront of that.

The HIRE Vets Act helps to facilitate that transition by providing veterans more information on employers that offer benefits and opportunities geared toward hiring veterans. Many employers say they are veteran friendly, and many employers are veteran friendly, but there has really been no standard that anyone could look at to determine whether that was true or not—no standard for what employers aspire to do at their workplace or no standard that future veterans and employees can seek out.

This would be much like a LEED standard on energy efficiency. If you have that standard on your building or at your workplace, people know exactly what that means. This bill asks the Department of Labor to establish a similar kind of standard for those who are the best, for those who are nearly as good, and for those who are almost as good as them to see what people are doing—a tiered recognition of employers to see what they are doing to welcome, encourage, recognize, and promote veterans.

Some of the criteria that could go into that evaluation would include the percentage of new hires at your company who are veterans, the percentage of the overall workforce that is made up of veterans, what type of training and leadership activities are made available that are designed to maximize what a veteran uniquely has learned as a veteran, and what other benefits and resources are offered—things such as tuition assistance, things that encourage veterans to go ahead and get one other category of training or more.

Creating a national standard will help veterans narrow down their employment options and focus their job

search efforts on the companies that recognize the value of their military service and what that value will bring to their new workplace, and also companies that will provide a long-term career path where those skills are used and appreciated. So this is a step in the right direction.

I have talked to the Secretary of Labor just this week, who said they intend to have this plan up and running by the end of this year, quicker than they were required to do but certainly not quicker than we hoped they would be able to do. So this is going to be a priority at the office of the Secretary of Labor, as veterans should be a priority for our society.

Today, we have the most powerful military in the world, but we really need to recognize—and I think we do recognize—that behind that military stands supporting families. Families are the backbone of the military today. They provide the kind of support that servicemembers need. They provide the encouragement for the difficult challenges of going from one post to another and one job to another. I think there are ways we can recognize those families and what they do in a better way.

I was able this year again to introduce the Military Family Stability Act. Military families have changed over the years. Our military stays in service longer. The skill levels they acquire are more valuable than might have been the case in the past. As the military gets more technical, having invested the time and training on someone in service is a more significant investment than it may have been at another time. Our policies that affect military families haven't kept pace with our investment in people who are serving.

According to a study by the Military Officers Association of America, 90 percent of military spouses who are women are either unemployed or underemployed. More than half of those people cite concerns about their spouse's service as a deterrent to their prospective employers: having to leave quickly without notice, not getting the ability to transfer from one State to another, or when their training or licensing has happened in the State they were living in.

Too often, military spouses have to end up sacrificing their own career. I think, in any case, we would understand there is some sacrifice here when you are moving from place to place, but there doesn't need to be a needless sacrifice.

So the Military Family Stability Act would allow families to address a problem. I consistently hear from military spouses and people serving in the military who talk about the challenges their spouses face in Missouri and across the Nation.

An ill-timed move takes a child needlessly out of school a month early or

makes a child start a school year a month late or prevents a husband or wife from being able to commit to a 9-month teaching contract or start a graduate program on time because the move they had anticipated happening is delayed. I have had people come and testify on exactly those two specific things and others that made a big difference in their family and their family's enthusiasm about the service they were jointly giving to the country.

For many families, if you make that move early, the family has to absorb the move. I think there is a better way to do this. I think we can increase stability in military families. This bill enables the servicemember or family to either move early or remain at their current duty station for up to 6 months while the spouse or the serving parent begins a new assignment. Now, for that to happen—the spouse moving early to the new assignment—the servicemember moving early or staying a little bit later has to absorb their single service-person expenses for staying. But as to the much more significant expenses, the family goes at a reasonable time when it is better for the family to go.

I am proud that this bill has garnered widespread support from numerous military family and veteran service organizations, including the National Military Family Association, the Military Officers Association of America, and others.

I am also pleased that at this moment, as we reintroduce the bill, Senator GILLIBRAND and I, Secretary Mattis—a former marine and decorated General, one of our most distinguished officers, who has seen the impact on families as he served—staff members at the Department of Defense, Senator MCCAIN, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and his staff have been working with us to iron out the details on a bill that they all support and agree will help our military men and women and their families.

So the HIRE Vets Act and the Military Family Stability Act are bipartisan. They are commonsense measures that really get us closer to our goal of ensuring that we provide the support for servicemembers and veterans who have defended us.

We will also continue our oversight on the Veterans' Administration to ensure that those who have served receive more choices and that their healthcare benefits and other benefits they have earned are benefits that they will receive. There is really no reason they can't receive many of those benefits where they would prefer to go as opposed to where the government has previously thought were the only options. Veterans' choice is important. They chose to serve. We can now give them more choice than we have in the past to decide what works for them and their families.

So as we approach Memorial Day, I know that all the Members of the Sen-

ate are appreciative of those who served and the families who served alongside them. I look forward not only to honoring veterans between now and next Monday but between next Monday and a year from next Monday, continuing to do those things we can to be sure that those who serve and those who have served are fully appreciated for their service.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, there has been a rare outburst of bipartisanship in the Senate this week. It is somewhat amazing, and I think it should be celebrated because Democrats and Republicans agree that the administration's new budget is a complete disaster. It has fallen with a bipartisan thud here in our Chamber.

I think there is a reason for that. Throughout the campaign and now as President, President Trump has made a lot of promises. He has promised a balanced budget. He has promised no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid. He has promised the best healthcare for everyone at the lowest cost. He has promised massive new tax cuts. He has promised a great wall paid for by Mexico.

Skeptics, including myself, have awaited this budget to see the hard choices, the details, and the math that could make sense of those promises. After all of those words—and there were a lot of them—and all of those promises, we now have a budget, and it makes no sense.

Let's walk through a few of the numbers. Every year, our country collects on average about 18 percent of our gross domestic product in taxes—the equivalent of about 18 percent of our gross domestic product in taxes, and every year we spend just over 21 percent of the GDP. That gap is why our national debt continues to grow. Instead of closing the gap, where you have spending here and revenue here—instead of closing that gap, the President's budget proposes further tax cuts, bringing down the share of the GDP we are collecting and increasing defense spending while promising to balance the budget.

Just this morning, President Trump sent his Secretary of the Treasury to Congress to explain how all this adds up. He couldn't do it. He couldn't do it. The only way the math in this budget works, the only way that the gap closes, is by assuming that magically

our economy will grow faster than any serious economist in the country predicts and that, as a result of that outside growth, the government would take in an extra \$2 trillion in taxes. That is the plan. That is the \$2 trillion assumption about the finances of our country and the potential burden of the next generation of Americans, some of whom are sitting here with us today.

Even if you accept that math—which I don't—but even if you accept that math, we have another problem. The administration's budget also proposes massive tax cuts that it claims will not add to our debt because of the same \$2 trillion in new tax revenues. As has been pointed out, that is double-counting, plain and simple, the kind that would cause any college freshman in America to fail his or her accounting exam. This would be like depositing the same paycheck at two different banks and claiming that your salary had doubled, then increasing your spending on groceries, travel, housing, and everything else as if it were actually true that your income would be double. You would go broke, and that is what is going to happen here.

It is no wonder that a Republican Congressman said that this budget was like building a house on what he called "a sandy foundation." The administration's only hope of getting this through is if Americans, including some of the President's strongest supporters, ignore the math and ignore the fact that his proposal actually grows our national debt, cuts Social Security, cuts Medicaid, and savages countless programs that protect vulnerable Americans and invest in our future.

On Medicaid in particular, a lot of us are scratching our heads at the math, let alone the real world pain that would result, should this proposal become law.

The healthcare bill, which passed on the floor of the House—and I said about that bill that even if I think about the townhall meetings I have had in Colorado, where people object most strenuously and most strongly to what is called *ObamaCare* or the *Affordable Care Act*, if you set out to design a bill less responsive to the people in my townhall who opposed *ObamaCare*—if you set out to draft a bill less responsive, you couldn't do a better job than they did in the House of Representatives.

I thank the Presiding Officer for his work on healthcare because I can actually recognize the concerns of my constituents in his fine work as opposed to what we have seen in the House.

One of the things that are so disturbing about that bill is that they are slashing Medicaid by around \$830 billion. That is 20 percent of the Medicaid Program that has been cut in that House budget. This new budget would gut the program by another \$600 bil-

lion. Combined, that would cut Medicaid nearly in half by 2026—in half. That means millions more Americans. This is why the CBO—the Congressional Budget Office—told us that 23 million Americans would lose their health insurance as a result of the bill—because it would mean that the minute all of this happened, people would struggle to get quality healthcare services.

In addition to the 23 million who are going to lose it because of the plan the Republican majority passed in the House, in my home State of Colorado—and I do not think it is very different from a lot of places in this regard—half of the people who are on Medicaid are kids. Are they supposed to go to work, or do we want them in school and having the benefit of a healthcare program?

Do we expect seniors in long-term care to go back to work? There are millions of Americans who are living in nursing homes, having spent their entire life savings for the privilege of being in long-term care or in nursing homes that are paid for by Medicaid. What are they supposed to do? Are we going to empty out the nursing homes in the United States?

I think, to some extent or another—I always get into trouble with my staff every time I say this, but I am going to say this again here—every one of us in this Senate is a conservative if "conservative" means to protect the institutions of our government and to think carefully before we leap. There is nothing conservative about this proposal on Medicaid. It is a radical proposal—a 20-percent Medicaid cut. We have not seen anything like that in our history.

What is amazing about this budget is not just that the math does not add up but that its targets are shockingly clear: rural communities, vulnerable Americans, vital investments in our future. This budget slams communities that are already hurting in our economy. Farmers would face a 21-percent cut to the Department of Agriculture, meaning less help to fight erosion, protect water quality, and improve irrigation. The budget eliminates the *TIGER* Grant Program entirely, which builds roads, bridges, and train stations all across the country. It cuts the maintenance budget for the U.S. Forest Service by over 70 percent, making it harder to maintain the trails and facilities that support rural outdoor economies.

I invite anybody here and I would welcome anybody to come visit Colorado. That is not a hardship; it is a beautiful place. See the condition that our national forests are in and the work that needs to be done and the conditions under which employees of the Forest Service are being asked to do their jobs. It is not right. It is not fair.

This budget eliminates essential air service which helps connect our most

remote areas. Besides water, it is probably the most important lifeblood of our rural communities. It cuts assistance to State and volunteer fire departments, exposing our mountain towns to even greater risk. This is a horrible budget for rural America—horrible.

This budget also turns its back on families who are struggling the most. It eliminates support to heat low-income homes through the winter. That is the reason Democrats and Republicans do not support this budget. It cuts safety inspections for coal miners, while devastating support to fight pollution and clean up toxic sites that disproportionately harm poor communities. It cuts assistance to the homeless and community development block grants—ends it—which promote affordable housing and economic development in low-income areas. It slashes food stamps by 25 percent. It is like the Grinch himself wrote this budget. Nearly half of those who benefit from that program are children—poor children.

This budget not only ignores our duty to ensure that kids in poverty do not go hungry, it also fails to invest in their future. This budget cuts education funding by \$9 billion. It slashes afterschool and summer programs for low-income children. It cuts funds to help teachers become better teachers. It cuts programs to help students work their way through college.

There is not anybody in America who thinks it is right that we are bankrupting families and students because of the high cost of college, which is something that their parents and grandparents did not have to endure because of choices we made then that we are not making today.

Who in his right mind thinks an answer to that is to cut work-study programs? Yet that is in the budget. It takes aim at our next generation. The budget targets next-generation research and technology that we need in order to compete in the 21st century. It slashes funds to the National Science Foundation.

Do you want a reason as to why Republicans and Democrats do not support this budget—why we have bipartisan opposition for it? It is that it cuts the NIH, the National Institutes of Health, by \$8 billion even though its research supported over 330,000 jobs and \$60 billion in economic activity just last year. It cuts research for low-cost, clean energy even though experts predict nearly \$8 trillion of global investment in renewable energy over the next 25 years. It devastates the Department of Energy's loan program that spurs private investment and pays for itself.

Believe me, I have worked in every level of government. I have been in the private sector, too, and I know there is waste in every level of government.

There is waste in the Federal Government. There are programs that make no sense, and there are decisions we make that make no sense. We need to strive every day to become better stewards of taxpayer dollars. I do not think we do a good enough job in this place of oversight, of how taxpayer dollars are being used. Yet this budget does not target waste, and this budget does not target fraud and abuse; it targets who we are as a nation and what we hope for, for the next generation.

In these times, the American dream is not something we can take for granted. It is the product of choices our forbearers have made and choices we have made—choices to invest in the future, to look out for one another and ensure that all Americans have opportunities to make the most of their God-given potential.

Budgets are more than just dollars and cents; they answer important questions about our vision for the future and our values as Americans. In that sense, it is worth considering how this budget would affect the everyday lives of Americans—of the people who come to our townhalls or the people who are too busy working, trying to provide for their families, to be able to go to our townhalls.

If this budget were to pass, a working mom might lose healthcare for herself and have to worry that her aging mother might not be far behind. She might have to cut back hours at work to pick up her kid whose afterschool program was just canceled. Driving home, she will wonder whether her child's weeklong cough has anything to do with the air he is breathing or the water he is drinking or whether that dinner was the last of the groceries for the month even though it is only the 25th.

These are the choices our constituents are going to face, and that is not the future we want. It is not an America we would choose for our kids.

(Mr. BLUNT assumed the Chair.)

I am wrapping up here. I know my colleague from Louisiana is here.

The most expensive thing for us to do is to give up on working people, our kids, and on urban and rural communities that are too often forgotten by people in Washington. That, I am afraid, is what this budget does—it gives up. In a sober analysis on real solutions to our problems and our basic commitment to each other, we are as fellow citizens bound by a common destiny, but this does not meet the test.

I look forward to working with Republicans and Democrats, together, to write a budget that actually reflects the will of the American people. I look forward to working with the Presiding Officer and my colleague from Louisiana, who is doing such good work on healthcare.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for his kind words.

I rise to speak about our Republican effort to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act. I always kind of chuckle when I say the "Affordable Care Act," as I have a friend back home whose quote for his insurance was \$39,000 for 1 year. That is the un-Affordable Care Act.

A family member from San Francisco whose policy was \$20,000 for 1 year had a \$6,000 deductible for each person. I think her husband actually voted for BERNIE SANDERS, but she is like: The heck with this because I cannot afford it.

Then there is another fellow here in Washington, DC, who is an insurance consultant. If anybody can get a good deal, an insurance consultant should be able to. He says:

My family premium is \$24,000 a year with a family deductible of \$13,000. We will pay \$37,000 before we receive benefit from our insurance policy.

That is unsustainable.

President Trump saw that during the campaign. He said over and over again—kind of his four pledges, if you will—that he wished to maintain coverage, lower premiums, get rid of those mandates that Americans hate in ObamaCare, and care for those with preexisting conditions. This is what he said over and over. It is a great pledge.

He actually said something else as well: He said he wanted to make healthcare easy. Now we have an approach to do this. Some people call it auto enrollment, but I call it making it easy. In this way, we can increase coverage and achieve the goals of President Trump's to lower the premiums. We are using something that is already used in Medicare and 401(k) plans. Again, we make it easy to enroll. Let me elaborate on this.

People argue that we have to have a mandate because without a mandate, people will lose coverage, and if people lose coverage, only the sick enroll and healthcare expenses increase. I think the Senate actually has an opportunity to do something better. We can make it easy. Under this, we can imagine that someone is eligible to be enrolled in our program unless he calls us up and says he does not want to be.

This is what we do in Medicare. When we—when I, when you, when any of us—turn 65, we are automatically enrolled in Medicare. I turned 65, and I am on Medicare. It is not a mandate. I can call them up and say that I do not want to. You have never heard anybody complain about it. It is just called making it easy.

Similarly, when a Fortune 500 company puts in a 401(k) plan, it has learned that if it asks somebody to sign all of the forms, and they can opt into its 401(k) retirement plan, it gets

about 65 percent participation, but if they say: You are in unless you call us up and tell us you do not want to be—if they make it totally easy, they get 95 percent participation in that 401(k) program.

We know both from Medicare and from business that if you make enrollment easy, you have 95 percent participation. Now, that is so good in the setting of this because if we have all of those enrolled who are eligible to join the ObamaCare replacement plan, we make that insurance pool large.

We call it a pool for a reason. If you pour a cup of water into an ocean, it does nothing to the level of the ocean. Similarly, if you have one person who is ill who is in a big pool of otherwise healthy people, it does nothing to the expense because the expense of that one person's illness is spread over many. So by making enrollment easy—fulfilling President Trump's pledge—just like the ocean with one cup of water, that one person who is sick, the expense spread out over many, the impact on any one person's premium is nil.

By the way, there is a lot of conservative support for this sort of concept. First let me just say that coverage is important. If we pretend that people having coverage is not important, it is just not true. I am a physician. I can tell my colleagues there are many conversations I have had where someone who was poorly insured or uninsured might need some critical medicine or critical procedure and we had to work, scramble, do everything we could to get her the coverage she needed to have sometimes a lifesaving procedure.

Rich Lowry is a conservative columnist for the National Review. He had a column saying that the worst argument against replacing the Affordable Care Act is that coverage is not important. Coverage is important.

If we go on toward this kind of concept—make healthcare enrollment easy; you are in unless you are out—Jim Capretta, Joe Antos, and Stuart Butler have all spoken about using this concept. Nina Owcharenko and Bob Moffit of the Heritage Foundation wrote in Senator JOHN McCAIN's Presidential plan in 2008 that it would be accompanied by a system of automatic enrollment of health insurance, either at the workplace—and then they go on. But they were praising the Presidential candidate's—but now Senator JOHN McCAIN's—employment of let's make it easy to enroll.

By the way, President Trump kind of emphasized this. Just before he was inaugurated on January 15, he gave an interview to the Washington Post and he was talking about his proposed healthcare law. We have already mentioned the components that he said were in it. He wanted all covered, caring for those with preexisting conditions, getting rid of the mandates, and

lowering premiums, but he added this: People under his law “can expect to have great healthcare. It will be in a much more simplified form. Much less expensive, and much better.”

I like that: simplified.

Under ObamaCare, we have like 16 pages online that people have to fill out with all their W-2s with them in order to find out if they are eligible. The patients I saw in a hospital for the uninsured where median income may have been \$16,000, people lived in perhaps public housing, they took public transportation to the public library in order to log on because they did not have a home computer, much less internet. That is not simple. That is why enrollment numbers are lower for lower incomes. We make it easy.

Let me just emphasize one more time: If we can get that bigger pool of people, premiums fall. So for my family member in San Francisco who can't afford that premium, if we get that pool bigger, premiums fall. Similarly for the insurance consultant here or my friends back home in Louisiana, if we can make that pool bigger by making enrollment easier, their premiums will fall.

I will just say that I call myself a kitchen table conservative. All those conservative families who voted for Donald Trump, who sit down at their kitchen table and they know they can't afford a \$20,000 premium and already they are struggling with their car note, their house note; they have given up sending their kids to a private school; they are doing whatever they can to make ends meet. Under the un-Affordable Care Act, they are required to pay so much. When they heard President Trump say that he would lower their premiums, they saw that as a lifeline for their family budget. Their vote for President Trump was a cry for help: Help us with insurance premiums we cannot afford.

Now, as a kitchen table conservative myself, to those families who voted for Republican candidates over the last several elections but who absolutely know they need help with their health insurance, we have a solution for them.

But let me pause for a second. You don't have to be a conservative to care for this solution. In fact, people on the left have actually endorsed this concept as well.

I will end by saying this. As we come up with a replacement plan for the Affordable Care Act, it will not be a Republican solution and it will not be a Democratic solution. At its best, it will be an American solution—an American solution for that family at the kitchen table, struggling to pay their premiums, who can't do so now but know that they need coverage. In so doing, if we can fulfill President Trump's campaign pledges to cover all, caring for those with preexisting conditions, eliminating mandates, and lowering

premiums by making enrollment easy through something called auto enrollment, we will have done our job.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM DAUSTER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have two words for Bill Dauster: Thank you.

Thank you, Bill Dauster, for your brilliant mind and unwearied service to the U.S. Senate, to the American people, and to America's most noble ideals.

Thank you for your good humor, and thank you for your endless supply of good ideas.

The Senate is going to miss you.

In Steven Spielberg's Movie “Lincoln,” with Daniel Day-Lewis, there is a scene in which President Lincoln is talking with Congressman Thaddeus Stephens of Pennsylvania, played by Tommy Lee Jones.

Thaddeus Stephens was one of the most righteous, uncompromising abolitionists in all of American history—and thank goodness for him.

In the movie, he tells President Lincoln that there is no use in appealing to the moral decency of slaveholders and their allies to end slavery and racial discrimination.

The reason, he says, is that “the inner compass that should direct the soul toward justice has ossified”—become utterly useless—“through tolerating the evil of slavery.”

President Lincoln's reply was so wise. He said, “A compass, I learnt when I was surveying, . . . it'll point you True North from where you're standing, but it's got no advice about the swamps and desert and chasm that you'll encounter along the way.”

He went on to say, “If in pursuit of your destination, you plunge ahead, heedless of obstacles, and achieve nothing more than to sink in a swamp, what's the use of knowing True North?”

There is a lesson in that story for all of us.

Passing laws in our democracy requires more than passion and more than clever speeches.

Passing laws requires legislative skill. It requires mastery of parliamentary procedure and arcane rules. That is how we avoid the “swamps and desert and chasms” that President Lincoln spoke of.

Bill Dauster knows more about the rules of the Senate than probably anyone since Senator Robert C. Byrd. That has made him something of a legend in the Senate, on both sides of the aisle.

But what makes him even more admirable is the reason that Bill Dauster has mastered the mechanics of law-making.

Bill has worked for a lot of big names in American politics, but it is dignity and justice and fairness for the little guy that has always driven him.

In 30-plus years, he left the Senate only twice, for brief stretches. Once was to be President Bill Clinton's deputy assistant for economic policy during the golden years of a budget surplus. The other time was in 1998 and 1999, to work on the Presidential exploratory committee of Senator Paul Wellstone.

Paul Wellstone used to say: “I didn't come to the Senate to fight for the Rockefellers. They have enough lobbyists. I'm here to fight for the little feller.”

That could be Bill Dauster's motto too.

Bill Dauster has the rare sort of vision in which no one is invisible, no one is so small that they are undeserving of respect.

Bill isn't the only dedicated public servant in his family. His equally brilliant wife, Ellen Weintraub, has served as a commissioner on the Federal Election Commission since 2002.

They are the parents of three grown children, Matthew, Natanya, and Emma.

We thank the entire Dauster-Weintraub family for sharing Bill with us.

Somehow, even with the obligations of work and family, Bill has found the time to be something of a Talmudic scholar.

So let me end with this thought, from the ancient Talmudic sage, Rabbi Tarfon, who wrote, “Do not be daunted by the enormity of the world's grief. Do justly, now. Love mercy, now. Walk humbly, now. You are not obligated to complete the work, but neither are you free to abandon it.”

For 30 years, Bill Dauster has helped this Senate pass laws that have made life more just and more merciful for untold multitudes, in America and around the world. Although he is leaving the Senate, I know he will never abandon that work.

THE PRESIDENT IN SAUDI ARABIA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, while the Office of Management and Budget was putting the finishing touches on its Orwellian-themed “A New Foundation for American Greatness,” the President's fiscal year 2018 budget, which proposes to eliminate or drastically reduce funding for a vast array of critical programs on which the American people—including the most vulnerable among us—depend, the Trump family was being feted by one of the world's wealthiest and repressive regimes.

Not only has the Saudi family used its vast oil wealth to promote an extremist ideology, including in madrassas and mosques in South Asia, the Middle East, and North Africa, its grip on power is made possible through corruption and the systematic denial of fundamental rights, including the brutal oppression of women and girls,

human trafficking, and the exploitation of foreign labor.

After criticizing the Saudis during the Presidential campaign, earlier this week, President Trump and his family basked in the opulent glow of Saudi family royalty. According to press reports, just prior to their arrival, the President's son-in-law finalized a \$110 billion sale of American weapons to the Saudis; yet neither the President nor his advisers, who danced with Saudi sheiks in a grand palace, voiced any concern that Saudi Arabia is a police state whose citizens have no opportunity to change their government, where criticism of the Royal family is not tolerated, and where arbitrary arrest and torture are common, nor with the Saudis' repeated misuse of U.S. military equipment against innocent civilians in Yemen.

In fact, standing next to the Saudi Foreign Minister at a joint press conference, Secretary Tillerson rightly called on the Iranian Government to restore freedom of speech and assembly for its people so they can "live the life that they deserve." But do the Saudi people not deserve such rights? He made no such appeal to the Saudi monarchy.

Secretary of State Tillerson has also made clear that the values and individual rights that Americans have long believed are what makes the United States the great country that it is and which are in fact universal values enshrined not only in our Bill of Rights, but also in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, will take a back seat to our "national security and economic interests." In that sense, the administration is modeling itself after China and Russia, which, given President Trump's admiration for "strong" leaders like President Putin and Secretary Tillerson's background as the head of the world's largest oil company, should surprise no one.

According to a press report, Secretary of Commerce Ross found it "fascinating" that there were no protests during the President's visit to Saudi Arabia. "Not one guy with a bad placard," he said, apparently oblivious to the fact that protests are prohibited and any protester would have been immediately arrested.

I know I am not the only one here who finds it hard to fathom that a President who has condemned terrorism, as he should, says virtually nothing about the Saudi royal family's own support for extremism that breeds terrorism, and nothing about the Saudi regime's gross mistreatment of its own citizens. In fact, the President's daughter, who purports to speak on behalf of the White House, publicly praised the Saudi regime's progress on women's rights, ignoring the fact that every woman she met with—none of whom were women's rights activists—required the permission of a male relative to participate.

America's values, including the defense of human rights, are a source of our strength, our durability, and our leadership in the world. I have no qualms with a President of the United States visiting Saudi Arabia. In fact, I support it. What I don't support, however, is the President agreeing to a massive sale of weapons to a regime that, with the exception of its antipathy toward Iran, shares little in common with the United States. Saudi Arabia has been a supporter of terrorism. Its armed forces have committed war crimes in Yemen. Saudi Arabia ranks among the world's worse violators of human rights—even below Iran. The message to the Saudi regime and the Saudi people from President Trump and his family is that these issues are no longer important enough to even mention.

Those of us who have been working on protecting and promoting U.S. national security interests since long before this administration took office know better. It is not possible to effectively separate our values, like the protection of individual freedoms and other human rights, and our national security and economic interests. They are inextricably linked, and we will all pay the price if we ignore that reality.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE WASHINGTON NATIONAL OPERA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my wife Marcelle and I know and respect Jacqueline Mars. She joined the Washington National Opera's board of trustees in 2003. She was elected as chairman of the board of the Washington National Opera in 2011 and oversaw WNO's affiliation with the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Some of the highlights during her tenure as chair have been the acclaimed production of American Ring—The Ring of the Nibelung; M&M's Opera in the Outfield; the Holiday Family Opera; and the American Opera Initiative. Marcelle tells me that, in recognition and appreciation of all of her tireless efforts and enormous contribution and support of the Washington National Opera, the Board of Trustees of the Washington National Opera have unanimously approved that Jacqueline Mars will now be recognized as chairman of the board of trustees emeritus of the Washington National Opera.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE WASHINGTON NATIONAL OPERA

The Board of Trustees of the Washington National Opera (the "Board") does hereby adopt the following resolutions:

Whereas, the Board recognizes the extraordinary achievements of Jacqueline Badger

Mars as Trustee and Chairman of the Washington National Opera;

Whereas, in her years as Chairman, Jacqueline Badger Mars has provided wise, far-sighted, and creative leadership in guiding the Washington National Opera from the challenges it faced in effectuating its historic affiliation with the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, through its successful and acclaimed production of Wagner's *Der Ring des Nibelungen* cycle of operas—perhaps the most ambitious project that can be undertaken in the opera world, to its commissioning and introduction of new works by new composers and librettists as part of the American Opera Initiative;

Whereas, Jacqueline Badger Mars's service as Chairman has included numerous other highlights and accomplishments; and

Whereas, the Board wishes to recognize its deep appreciation to Jacqueline Badger Mars for her untiring efforts and enormous contribution to and support of the Washington National Opera and the operatic art form generally, and for her friendship over the years, now, therefore, be it:

Resolved, That Jacqueline Badger Mars shall hereinafter be recognized as Chairman of the Board of Trustees Emeritus of the Washington National Opera; and further

Resolved, That this resolution shall be effective May 15, 2017.

NATIONAL MISSING CHILDREN'S DAY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues that today is National Missing Children's Day.

President Reagan highlighted the importance of making child safety a priority when he established May 25 as National Missing Children's Day for the first time in 1983. On this day, we pause to remember those children who have gone missing and honor those who are dedicated to their rescue.

According to the FBI, hundreds of thousands of children are reported missing each year. Most of these cases are closed within hours, thanks to the quick actions of families, communities, and law enforcement personnel, but there also are children, like Lyric Cook and Elizabeth Collins, who never make it home safely.

Ten-year-old Lyric and 8-year-old Elizabeth disappeared in 2012 while taking a bike ride near their grandmother's house in Evansdale, IA. Their bodies were found in the woods nearby later that year. Almost 5 years have passed since their lives were cut short, but the perpetrator has yet to be identified.

My heart goes out to their grieving families and the families of all the other children who have lost their lives in similar tragedies. These child abduction and murder cases are a reminder of the need to promptly pass legislation to extend the key programs authorized by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act. The Senate passed such a bill by a vote of 89 to 0 in the 114th Congress. Another measure that would make a difference in the

lives of missing children is Kevin and Avonte's Law. Last year, the Senate unanimously passed this legislation, which is named in honor of two boys with autism who died after wandering from safety. This bill, which I cosponsored, promotes the use of technology to help locate children with autism and related conditions who may be susceptible to wandering away from safety. It also supports training for first responders and other community officials to help prevent and respond to these cases.

A related bill passed the other Chamber by a wide margin late last year. I am currently working with the sponsor of that companion bill, Congressman CHRIS SMITH, to resolve the differences between our two bills. Congressman SMITH and I intend to reintroduce an updated version of Kevin and Avonte's Law in each Chamber in the coming weeks.

Finally, I would also like to take this opportunity to announce that I will soon introduce legislation, known as the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2017. The bill I am developing includes several provisions to help in the fight against child exploitation. First, it promotes training of school resource officers, to ensure that they can better detect and respond to child trafficking cases. Second, it updates the authorization for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. Third, it extends and updates some of the key programs that were established under the Trafficking Victims Protection Act.

In closing, the feeling of dread and helplessness that families must feel when a child goes missing is unimaginable. To help prevent similar tragedies in the future, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting these important pieces of legislation.

ASIAN PACIFIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize May as Asian Pacific American Heritage Month and celebrate the many contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, AAPI. The Asian American and Pacific Islander community is diverse and draws from a variety of distinct cultures, each of which has strengthened this country—providing leaders, innovators, scientists, activists, artists, and citizens.

As we take the time to recognize Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and their heritage, it would be negligent to forget that this year marks 75 years since President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066. He signed Executive Order 9066 in the aftermath of the attack on Pearl Harbor and authorized the Department of War—today known as the Department of Defense—to establish “military zones.” The military had complete au-

thority over these zones, including control over who entered and who was permitted to leave. The military zones became internment camps. In total, some 75,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry and 45,000 Japanese nationals were imprisoned in these camps across the country.

At the time, many attempted to justify the internment camps by citing Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor. They cited the need to protect our homeland from potential espionage. They cited the fact that Japan was our wartime enemy. They cited the likelihood that the next attack would come from someone “looking like” the enemy.

What they failed to explain was why no internment camps were established for Americans of German ancestry—or Italian ancestry. Japan was not our only wartime enemy; yet Japanese Americans were the only ones thrust into imprisonment under the guise of “national security.”

It is not difficult to guess why. Japanese Americans were targeted because their heritage was thought to be easier to perceive. Of course, in many cases, the U.S. Department of War did not draw distinctions between Americans of Japanese ancestry and Americans of other Asian or Pacific Islander ancestry. If you were thought to look like the enemy, you were a target—full stop—and were at risk of being imprisoned illegally by the American Government.

This is one of the darkest periods in our history. We must not forget it. We cannot forget the tens of thousands of innocent families who were stripped of their basic human and legal rights and property, racially profiled, and degraded. We cannot forget that “national security” was then—and is now—a poor justification for racial profiling and a transparent attempt to sanction and institutionalize racism.

These are lessons the Asian American and Pacific Islander community has carried for generations, all while making our country stronger and more inclusive. The AAPI experiences—when we take the time to hear them—force us to engage in self-reflection, to be more aware of our own biases, and more cautious of our own impulses.

As the former chairman and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on East Asia and the Pacific, I have worked hard to stay mindful of the needs and concerns of the AAPI community. I have learned that, while we have come a very long way over the past 75 years, the AAPI community still battles nativism that portrays its members as something other than “real” Americans. They still bear the burden and pain of discrimination, and they still struggle to have their voice and their perspective heard during the great debates of our time.

The changes Republicans are seeking on healthcare, for example, would have

far-reaching consequences for the AAPI community. Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders have one of the highest incidences of Hepatitis A. In fact, in 2013, they had the highest Hepatitis A rates out of any ethnic group in the country. In 2015, tuberculosis was 30 times more common among Asian Americans than among any other group. Both Hepatitis A and tuberculosis would be considered preexisting conditions—conditions that would have made many Asian American and Pacific Islanders uninsurable before President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law and conditions that would result in sky-high premiums under the misguided American Health Care Act.

By comparison, the Affordable Care Act has reduced the uninsured rate for minority communities by at least 35 percent. It also expanded Medicaid, allowing over 250,000 more Maryland beneficiaries to access an array of mental health services like therapy, psychiatric rehabilitation, and many others. The Affordable Care Act's Medicaid expansion had similar positive impacts for mental health services across the country, which affects Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders directly as they continue to work tirelessly to reduce suicide rates. For these reasons, when we think of healthcare, we must consider the human cost our policies inflict on every community—on every American.

Likewise, immigration bans based on country of origin, race, or religion are awakening newfound fear that minority communities will be targeted once more, that racial profiling will rear its ugly head again, licensed and sanctioned by the Federal Government. The AAPI community's concern is warranted; people's fear is understandable. Each Member of Congress must realize that caring about the mistakes of our past means working with purpose and with conviction to prevent them from happening again in the present. We must use our votes where our values need defending and our voices where there is silence.

As we move forward through Asian Pacific American Heritage Month and beyond, I implore every member of this Chamber to remember that the best way to honor that heritage is to respect the community bearing it. Hearing their experiences, carrying their lessons with us into the policy arena, and considering their needs and fears as our own, these are the substantive ways by which we can truly honor Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage. I am committed to honoring it accordingly and join every American of Asian or Pacific Islander heritage in celebrating this month as their own.

JEWISH AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and celebrate Jewish American Heritage Month. As a proud Jewish American, I am honored to have the opportunity to acknowledge our heritage and the ways by which it has helped shape this country. The list is a long one, but this year, I want to focus on Mendes Cohen, whose legacy serves as a microcosm of our community.

Mendes Cohen was born in Richmond, VA, in May of 1796 to Israel and Judith Solomon Cohen, both of whom were immigrants. Mendes's father came from Germany, and his mother came from England. His father died when Mendes was just 12 years old. The event was a tragedy, of course, for Mendes, his six siblings, and his mother, who moved the family to Baltimore for a fresh start shortly thereafter.

Mendes grew up not far from where I grew up; he was raised not unlike I was raised. He believed in the value of public service. He believed in serving his country and working for the good of his community. He held fast to an ideology based on tolerance, equality, and fraternity. It was precisely this ideology that led him to fighting in the War of 1812 at Ft. McHenry. After the war, he and his brother Jacob began lobbying to change Maryland's constitution so that Jews could run for public office. In 1826, he was successful, and by 1847, he was a delegate in the Maryland General Assembly. He carried his love of country and belief in public service with him throughout the remainder of his life, going on to serve as a delegate to the State Peace Convention during the Civil War.

Mendes was, simply put, a historic marvel. He was a forward thinker, an activist, a consummate public servant, and a proud Jew. He broke down the single greatest barrier to Jewish entry into public life and opened the door for Jews—including me—to pursue public service. Today, as I stand in this Chamber as a U.S. Senator from Maryland, I am struck by the impact of Mendes Cohen's legacy. If I were able to speak to him now, I would tell him: thank you. Thank you for paving the way for me to have it all: my faith, my family, my heritage, and my career in public service. If Mendes were able to speak now, I imagine he would tell us that his work is unfinished. He would encourage us to continue carrying the torch of public engagement and civil service. He would remind us that path toward progress, by its very definition, has no endpoint.

These values underpin the broader Jewish community in Maryland and across the country. We learned early in our own history that the tide of oppression and bigotry can rise quickly and that, when it floods one shore, it floods them all. We learned that, when it comes for one community, it spares

none. We learned that we must be our own stewards—that pluralism and equality demand constant guardians and that, when prejudice threatens them, nothing but our own tenacity can fend it off.

That tenacity is needed now more than ever, as we are confronted by resurgent anti-Semitism in every corner of the world—even here, at home. In the past few months, we have witnessed hate speech targeted at the Jewish community on social media, the ostracism and vilification of Jewish students on college campuses, and attacks against Jewish businesses and synagogues; yet it is precisely because the Jewish community has endured generations of persecution that promoting tolerance, equality, and inclusion has become a central tenant of Jewish American culture.

Jewish Americans participated in the abolitionist movement in the 19th century. They joined the ranks of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee during the Civil Rights movement. The partnership between Julius Rosenwald and Booker T. Washington resulted in the construction of thousands of schools for African-American children in the South throughout the 20th Century.

Jewish Americans are proud of their history promoting such causes. They are proud of their faith and their heritage, but they are also proud to profess their support of other people's faiths and heritage. They are proud to be guardians of a free and pluralistic society; they are proud to weave love out of millennia of knowing hate. That is the story of Jewish Americans. From Mendes Cohen to the American Jewish community's defense of diversity and inclusion today, every chapter we write, though unique, shares the same theme: progress—progress and equality.

Jewish Americans have, therefore, helped make the United States the force for human and equal rights that it is today, but each day, we face challenges to those ideals, challenges that have felt increasingly ominous in recent months; yet this country will remain a beacon for the oppressed and the downtrodden. That beacon will stay lit due, in no small part, to the continued activism and conviction of the Jewish American community. This month, we thank them for that service, as we remind ourselves that our work goes on.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today I wish to honor our brave men and women in law enforcement. During National Police Week, we commemorate the conviction and compassion they bring to their jobs every day, as well as the difficult choices and the sacrifices they make. From members of local po-

lice departments, to rapid transit officers, to court bailiffs, public safety officers risk their lives to keep our families and communities safe. That is a fact that we can never forget and a reality that confronts public safety officers and their families every day. This is a time to reflect on what law enforcement officers do for our communities, to thank those who serve us, and to pay special recognition to those who have lost their lives in the line of duty.

It is in that spirit, and with a heavy heart, that I rise to honor seven Michigan law enforcement officers who were killed in the line of duty in 2016. These men gave everything to their communities, their families, the State of Michigan, and their country. Across Michigan, our hearts have been shattered by their deaths, and our grief and gratitude go out to their families. Let us take one moment to honor their lifetimes of service: Myron Jarrett, Police Officer, Detroit Police Department; Ronald Kienzie, Court Officer, Berrien County Trial Court; Kevin Miller, Sergeant, Detroit Police Department; Collin Rose, Wayne State University Police Department; Kenneth Steil, Sergeant, Detroit Police Department; Michael Winter, Posse Deputy, Branch County Sheriff's Office; and Joseph Zangaro, Security Supervisor, Berrien County Trial Court.

The deaths of these officers were only some of the devastating tragedies that have shaken communities in Michigan and across this country. In these difficult times, we must always acknowledge each other's sacrifices, walk in one another's shoes, and feel the compassion in each other's hearts. This is what our law enforcement officers strive to do for us, and what we can do for them. During National Police Week and every day, we must continue to support our law enforcement officers, and we must work to ensure that they and their communities have the resources they need to live safely and serve the highest ideals of this Nation.

HONORING TROOPER THOMAS CLARDY

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to honor the memory of Trooper Thomas Clardy, who was killed in the line of duty on March 16, 2016.

Last week, the country observed National Police Week, a week in honor of the brave law enforcement officers who lost their lives in the line of duty, and on Monday, we will observe Memorial Day, a day we honor the heroic men and women who paid the ultimate sacrifice in service to their country. Thomas Clardy, an officer and a veteran, is one of those brave people to whom our Nation owes a debt of gratitude.

Born and raised in Park City, UT, Trooper Clardy spent his adult life in

service to his country, his community, and his family. After graduating from high school, Trooper Clardy spent 2 years in the U.S. Army before transferring to the U.S. Marine Corps, where he served 11 years.

Following his honorable discharge from the Marines, Trooper Clardy began a long and esteemed career in service to his community. He graduated from the Massachusetts State Trooper Academy in 2005 and was a valued member of the Massachusetts State Police until his untimely death.

Trooper Clardy was a dedicated and loving husband to his wife, Reisa, and father to his seven children. Thanksgiving was a sacred holiday for Trooper Clardy. He spent it, without fail, surrounded by friends and loved ones, enjoying football with the kids and spending quality time with the family he loved so much.

Today we honor his service and sacrifice. May his memory continue to challenge and inspire us.

HONORING OFFICER RONALD TARENTINO

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to honor the memory of Officer Ronald Tarentino, who was killed in the line of duty on May 22, 2016.

Last week, the country observed National Police Week, a week in honor of the brave law enforcement officers who paid the ultimate sacrifice in service to their community. Officer Ronald Tarentino was one of those brave officers.

Officer Tarentino was born in Medford and raised in Medford and Tewksbury, MA. The son of a police officer, he followed his father's example when he joined the police force, spending 7 years in the Leicester Police Department before transferring to the Auburn Police Department, where he served until his untimely death 2 years later.

I had the honor of attending the wake of Officer Tarentino and was moved by the stories of his selfless dedication to those around him. Officer Tarentino was the coworker everyone loved. His passion for his work was easily apparent to anyone who knew him. He came into work with a smile and made friends with all of his colleagues. Outside of work, he enjoyed fishing, hunting, and archery and was a member of the Massachusetts Police Association, the Auburn Elks, and Mustangs of Massachusetts.

Most of all, Officer Tarentino was a loving husband and a father of three. Today we honor his service and sacrifice. May his memory continue to challenge and inspire us.

RECOGNIZING THE 555TH PARACHUTE INFANTRY BATTALION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes today and

share with my colleagues an extraordinary piece of our country's World War II and civil rights history: the story of the 555th Parachute Infantry Battalion—or the Triple Nickles, as they would come to be called.

The 555th was officially activated in December 1943 at Fort Benning, GA, and began as a company of Black officers and enlisted men. Seventeen soldiers graduated Army jump school the following February, earning a coveted Parachutist Badge—their “wings.” The Army transferred the unit after several months to Camp Mackall, NC, and, in November 1944, redesignated it Company A of the newly activated 555th Parachute Infantry Battalion.

Although the 555th did not serve overseas during World War II, it performed an important role in defending the American homeland. In 1944 and 1945, the Japanese launched roughly 9,000 “balloon bombs,” explosives attached to paper balloons that rode the jetstream current across the Pacific Ocean and over the contiguous United States.

One of these balloon bombs exploded in Oregon, killing a pregnant woman and five children in what historians regard as the only American World War II combat casualties to occur in the contiguous United States.

The members of the 555th boarded a train westward to Oregon on a secret mission to help defend Americans living in the Pacific Northwest and the natural timber resources deemed vital to the war effort.

The incident in Oregon was one of more than 275 documented balloon bomb related incidents as far east as Detroit, MI, south into Texas, and north into Canada and Alaska.

Japanese balloon bombs, of course, had the potential not only to wound or kill but also to set forests ablaze in the western United States. Putting those fires out and dealing with their aftermath could divert the Nation's focus on the war effort and dampen American morale.

The Triple Nickles arrived in Oregon in 1945 and were sent out to Pendleton Air Field, then still an active military base. They were assigned to work with the U.S. Forest Service and received specialized training as smokejumpers and on the handling of unexploded balloon bombs.

As part of Operation Firefly, the 555th made some 1,200 jumps and fought more than 35 fires in Oregon, Washington, and other western States between July and October 1945.

Smokejumping is no easy feat; it is dirty, sweaty, and dangerous work, but because of the 555th's dedication and professionalism, the unit only ever sustained one fatality: Malvin Brown tragically fell to his death in the Umpqua National Forest about 45 miles northwest of Crater Lake. His death is regarded as the first smokejumper death in U.S. history.

Make no mistake about it, Malvin Brown and the other soldiers of the 555th Parachute Infantry Battalion are heroes. They were the first Black paratroopers ever to serve in the U.S. Military, which they did with honor and distinction. They are also the only military unit in history to work as smokejumpers.

The soldiers of the 555th faced painful discrimination and blatant racism on a daily basis. They were barred from the store on base while at Fort Benning, GA, even though German and Italian prisoners were allow to enter. Even after the Triple Nickles arrived in Oregon, they found most restaurants and bars would not serve them.

The Army sent the 555th to Fort Bragg, NC, following the Japanese surrender and, in December 1947, integrated the unit into the famed 82nd Airborne Division—making the 82nd the Army's first racially integrated division.

On June 3, 2017, the State of Oregon will commemorate the 555th Parachute Infantry Battalion's remarkable history and important contributions to the country with the installation of an Oregon State historic marker at the Smokejumper Museum in Cave Junction.

It is my true honor to share their story today with my colleagues and to express my profound gratitude to all the Triple Nickles for their service.

75th ANNIVERSARY OF ALEUTIAN ISLANDS CAMPAIGN AND ALEUT EVACUATION

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, as we approach Memorial Day, we remember the men and women who sacrificed their lives in devotion to the causes of liberty, freedom, and democracy. As such, I would like to take the opportunity to speak about one event in our Nation's history that had a profound impact on my great State of Alaska. June 3 marks the 75th anniversary of the Aleutian Islands Campaign of the Second World War.

This “Forgotten Battle” began with the bombing of Dutch Harbor and subsequent invasions of Adak, Kiska, and Attu, AK by the navy of Imperial Japan. For the Allied forces, this campaign resulted in 1,481 casualties, 640 missing, and 3,416 wounded, but perhaps what is even less known, is the impact this conflict had on the Aleut—Unangan/Unangas—peoples of Alaska.

In the months of June and July of 1942, Aleut communities were damaged, homes and personal possessions rummaged through or destroyed by Allied forces, and more than 881 Aleut civilian residents of the Pribilof Islands and the Aleutian Islands west of Unimak Island were relocated to temporary camps in Southeast Alaska. Forty-two residents of Attu were taken to Japan in September 1943, where they spent the rest

of the war as prisoners, and nearly half of them died, mainly of hunger and malnutrition.

The campaign ultimately ended in an Allied victory with the Japanese withdrawal from the Aleutians in 1943, but the effects are still felt by those communities and peoples who were impacted.

Today, before the Senate, I would like to take a moment to honor the sacrifices of our servicemembers, including the 25 Aleut who joined the Armed Forces and the three who participated in the U.S. invasion to recapture Attu and later received Bronze Stars for their valor. I want to also honor the civilians, the Aleut evacuees, and Attuan prisoners of war whose communities, culture, languages, and lives were forever affected.

From June 2 to 4, 2017, a memorial ceremony will take place in Alaska to honor and acknowledge the evacuees, their descendants, and veterans of this "Forgotten Battle," both living and deceased.

REMEMBERING CECILIA ZARATE-LAUN

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and legacy of Cecilia Zarate-Laun. Her passing leaves Wisconsin without one of its greatest advocates for justice and peace, and I am proud to pay tribute to this extraordinary woman.

Cecilia was born in Santander Province of Colombia. She was the oldest of five sisters and attended school in Bucaramanga and at the National University of Colombia. Following the completion of her studies, she took a position as a professor of nutrition, a job that led to her arrival in Madison, WI for graduate school.

Cecilia received a scholarship to attend the University of Wisconsin-Madison for her master's degree. While studying in Madison, Cecilia met her beloved husband, Jack. After completion of graduate school, Cecilia returned to Colombia, working as a nutritionist for the Colombian Government's National Nutrition Plan. In 1976, she married John "Jack" Laun and the following year returned to the United States.

In 1987, extended civil war in Colombia inspired Cecilia and Jack to cofound the Colombia Support Network CSN, a grassroots human rights organization based in Madison, WI. Cecilia's work with CSN was her pride and joy. As CSN program director, Cecilia worked tirelessly to connect Americans to Colombian communities affected by the war. She was inspired to help establish new chapters of CSN in locations ranging from the University of Wisconsin-Madison to central New York, connecting these communities through a "sister cities" program to rural Colombian communities facing

violence during the Colombian civil war.

She led over 50 delegations of citizens, journalists, and public officials to Colombia so they could fully understand the effect of the civil war. After working with Cecilia and CSN to establish a sister community relationship between Dane County, WI and San José de Apartadó, Colombia, I had the honor to accompany her on one of those delegations in 1993.

In addition to her public service through CSN, Cecilia was a member of the national board of directors of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. She was also a member of the Latin American Subcommittee of the American Friends Service Committee—Quakers—served on the board of directors of the Wisconsin Network for Peace and Justice, and, in October of 2015, received the Global Citizen of the Year Award from the Madison Chapter of the United Nations Association.

Regardless of the cause or project, Cecilia approached everything with unparalleled strength, courage, and a sense of selflessness. She approached her battle with cancer with the same attitude. Over the last 4 years, while Cecilia fought against her disease, she continued to fight for others. Her strength was truly amazing.

While Cecilia is greatly missed by her family, friends, and community, she leaves behind a legacy for future leaders to emulate. She will always be remembered for her courageous effort to fight for those who could not fight for themselves.

Cecilia had an incredibly big heart and an unwavering commitment to others. I am fortunate to have been able to call her my friend.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL H. BENNETT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to Judge Michael H. Bennett. Judge Bennett will be retiring in May 2017 after serving 28 years as an immigration judge.

Former Oregon Governor Tom McCall once said, "Heroes are not giant statues framed against a red sky. They are people who say, 'This is my community, and it is my responsibility to make it better.'" Judge Bennett truly is a hero, for he has devoted much of his life to making the United States and his community better.

Judge Michael Bennett began his career as a general attorney for the legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service in El Centro, CA. He also worked as an Assistant Attorney General and Assistant Public Defender for the Government of American Samoa. Judge Bennett was appointed as an immigration judge in El Centro, CA, in 1989.

In Oregon, we were fortunate to have Judge Bennett assigned to our immi-

gration court in 1998. During his tenure, Judge Bennett has served as an impartial adjudicator who is known for his fair and compassionate decisions. He has gained the respect of his colleagues, fellow attorneys, and the public for his intricate knowledge of immigration law. Further, Judge Bennett has created a positive work environment in the Portland immigration court that is commendable and should be recognized.

Judge Bennett comes from a long line of public servants, including his grandparents and parents. His grandfather served in the U.S. Navy and fought in WWII. Judge Bennett's father also served in the U.S. Navy and eventually earned his Ph.D. and became a teacher. Judge Bennett and his wife, Sivali, have continued to dedicate themselves to making Oregon a better place through their public service.

It is an honor to recognize Judge Michael H. Bennett for his service to the United States, to Oregon, and to his community.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MAINE DENTAL ASSOCIATION

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the Maine Dental Association was incorporated in 1867 with 22 members. Today I wish to recognize the MDA and its more than 700 members for 150 years of dedication to their profession and to the people of our State.

The remarkable advancements in dentistry over the years were accompanied by a greater understanding of the link between oral health and overall health. As doctors who specialize in oral medicine, the dentists of the MDA are a central part of Maine's healthcare sector. Expanding access to healthcare, including oral healthcare, is among the most important issues facing our society. Maine is a large, rural State with a strong network of dental clinics supported by MDA members. In addition, the MDA sponsors the Donated Dental Services Program that provides free comprehensive care to our disabled, aged, and medically compromised citizens in need.

Access to oral healthcare in Maine took a major step forward on May 20, 2017, when the University of New England College of Dental Medicine held a commencement ceremony for its first graduating class. The MDA has been a strong supporter of this first dental college in northern New England since the college was founded in 2013, and many of the 62 graduates who earned doctor of dental medicine degrees performed clinical rotations in communities throughout the State under the guidance of MDA members. I visited the Portland UNE clinic and was delighted to learn of the plans of many students to practice in Maine where their services are very much needed. From preventing and treating oral

health problems to educating parents and caregivers, MDA members also play an essential role in the health, safety, and well-being of Maine children.

Throughout our State, members of the Maine Dental Association provide vital healthcare with expertise, commitment, and compassion. It is a pleasure to congratulate the MDA for 150 years of accomplishments and contributions benefiting the people of Maine.

175TH ANNIVERSARY OF CASE IH AGRICULTURE AND FARM EQUIPMENT

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the 175th anniversary of Case IH Agriculture and Farm Equipment and to recognize its outstanding commitment and contribution to Wisconsin's economy.

Mr. Jerome Increase Case, born in 1819 in western New York, was well acquainted with agricultural equipment even as a young man. Case provided threshing services to local farms and realized at the young age of 16 that farming techniques needed improvement after witnessing a demonstration of an early threshing machine that could thresh more in one hour than a man could all day. After settling in Wisconsin in the early 1840s, Case built his first thresher-separator in Rochester, WI, but when the town refused to let Case draw electricity from the local mill, Case loaded his invention into a wagon and headed to Racine, WI.

The J.I. Case Threshing Machine Company was founded in 1842 at a time when Racine's tallest building was the local grain elevator. By 1848, the company was Racine's largest employer. As a true pioneer in the field of agricultural equipment, J.I. Case manufactured the first steam engine tractor in 1869. The Old No. 1 is still on display at the Smithsonian Institution. Although it was mounted on wheels, it was still drawn by horses. The first self-propelled steam engine followed in 1876.

Case machines were first transported beyond U.S. borders in 1871 and won first prize at the Paris Exposition. By 1886, Case became the largest producer of steam engines in the world.

During World War II, the company's plants manufactured aircraft wings, aircraft towing tractors, artillery shells, and doors for the Sherman tank. In fact, the company's 1942 centennial was celebrated 7 years late because of the war.

In 1985, Case IH became the Nation's second-largest farm equipment manufacturer after J.I. Case purchased the agricultural division of International Harvest and the business legacies of two major equipment companies were united under one company. In 1999, Case IH merged with New Holland Ag to form a parent company, CNH Global,

although equipment was still produced under the Case IH name. Since the merger, Case has remained at the forefront of the farming industry, seeking new ways to adapt to the changing trends. In 2010, Case IH created the world's first tractor to meet the tier 4 emissions requirements of the Environmental Protection Agency. Case IH Agriculture and Farm Equipment currently works with more than 4,900 dealers and distributes products in more than 160 countries.

As one of Wisconsin's founding manufacturers, Case has been a major contributor to Wisconsin's farming legacy. Over the past 175 years, this proud company has provided jobs for countless Wisconsin families and economic growth for the State I am so proud to represent.

I offer my sincere congratulations to Case leadership and workers as they celebrate 175 years of business, and I wish them the very best for many more years of success in Racine and around the world.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO HARRY SIMMONS, JR.

• Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to commend Harry Simmons, Jr., of Yazoo City, MS, for his service and contributions to the State of Mississippi while serving as the 81st president of the Delta Council.

Since its founding in 1935, Delta Council has grown to be a widely respected economic development organization representing the business, professional, and agricultural interests of the Mississippi Delta region. I am grateful to Delta Council for its continuous role in meeting the economic and quality of life challenges in this unique part of our country.

Harry Simmons's tenure as council president began in May 2016. In leading the council, he has been a notably strong advocate for Federal flood control, farm support, and infrastructure improvements in the Delta region.

A Yazoo County native, Mr. Simmons graduated from Yazoo City High School and earned an agricultural economics degree from Mississippi State University. He has had a strong career as a catfish and row-crop producer. Mr. Simmons, with his daughter Katy and son-in-law Andy Prosser, jointly manage both his farm operation and highly successful catfish processing operation, Simmons Farm Raised Catfish. His processing facility employs more than 200 people in Yazoo County, and his farming operation consists of catfish, corn, soybeans, and cotton production.

In addition to his leadership in Delta Council, Mr. Simmons has served as chairman of the Catfish Institute, president of Catfish Farmers of America, and on the boards of both the

Yazoo Planters Cotton Gin and Yazoo County Development Foundations. He also served our State and Nation as a commissioned officer in the Mississippi National Guard.

I am pleased to join the people throughout my State in commending Harry Simmons, Jr., and sharing our appreciation with his wife, Shirley, and their children, Emily and Katy, and grandson, Miller, as the 82nd annual meeting of the Delta Council membership convenes in June.●

RECONIZING JEROME D. MACK MIDDLE SCHOOL

• Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, today I am honored to congratulate the Jerome D. Mack Middle School, in Las Vegas, NV, for earning the School Innovation and Change Award, SICA. On June 1, 2017, a representative of the National Principals Leadership Institute will join with Mack Middle School to recognize this achievement formally to a gathering of 700 parents, students, and teachers.

This award recognizes Mack Middle School's principals, teachers, staff, and students for their efforts to embrace new and innovative strategies for educational improvement. To win this award, Mack Middle School submitted a competitive application to the National Principal Leadership Institute that included a school profile, a school changes story, documents supporting those changes, a reflection of innovation, a sustainability plan for how a \$10,000 award would be used, and a description of community building.

Earning this award is no easy feat. In its improvement efforts, Mack Middle School has seen many upgrades in technology and pedagogy that mark demonstrable change. Every student now receives a laptop computer, and all assignments are completed on a virtual classroom portal. Students are taught to critically self-assess their own abilities and have learned to improve their skills to new levels of mastery. Their principal is a nationally board certified teacher and a nationally accredited principal mentor. Ten of their teachers attend national board certification classes, and approximately 390 of their students will earn high school credits this year. All this to say Mack Middle School is more than deserving of this award.

Moreover, these changes have positively affected the campus dynamic as teachers are excited about their work and students take charge of their education plans. More community center than a school, Mack Middle School has become a hub where parents and students alike partake in use of the school's athletic fields and even the school's Wi-Fi signal. In an area that is too often marred by high crime and poverty, the school stands as a beacon of what is possible when teachers are

engaged in their community and where parents take an active role in their students' lives. Mack Middle School is an inspiration for East Las Vegas and the greater Nevada community.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Jerome D. Mack Middle School for their hard work, innovative approaches to education, and their efforts to improve educational outcomes for students in East Las Vegas.●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM "BILL" AUSMUS

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week, I have the distinct honor of recognizing William "Bill" Ausmus of Hardin, a World War II Army veteran who celebrated his 100th birthday earlier this month. Bill has been involved with a variety of community organizations in Big Horn County for many years, helping countless Montanans along the way. His accomplishments are something we can all celebrate.

After his World War II military service concluded, Bill spent almost seven decades serving in his local American Legion Post 8 and remained in an active capacity with the post into his nineties. His professional vocation was serving as the Big Horn County surveyor and, for a time, the assessor. These vital positions afforded him the opportunity to interact with and provide useful help to many in his local community. Bill developed a reputation for accuracy and customer service in his professional work. He was also integral in the formation of his local Methodist Church and is known for his volunteerism and generous donations to community projects and causes.

The longevity of his many endeavors and willingness to help others along the way serves as an inspiration to us all. When looking back through the history of Big Horn County during the past century, it is clear that Bill has been key contributor. Congratulations, Bill, on your recent 100th birthday, and thank you for your service.●

TRIBUTE TO CLAIRE ALISON

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Claire Alison, an intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Claire is a graduate of El Camino Real Charter High School in Los Angeles, CA. Currently, she is attending California State University, Northridge, where she is majoring in history. Claire is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of her experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Claire Alison for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH SCHATZ

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Joseph Schartz, an intern in my Washington, DC office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Joseph is a graduate of South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, having earned a degree in journalism. Currently, he is attending the Georgetown University McCourt School of Public Policy, where he is pursuing his master's in public policy. Joseph is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Joseph Schartz for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:34 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 467. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that each medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs complies with requirements relating to scheduling veterans for health care appointments, to improve the uniform application of directives of the Department, and for other purposes.

H.R. 624. An act to restrict the inclusion of social security account numbers on Federal documents sent by mail, and for other purposes.

H.R. 953. An act to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1293. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that the Office of Personnel Management submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees.

H.R. 2052. An act to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to prohibit the wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following

concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 11:58 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 375. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 719 Church Street in Nashville, Tennessee, as the "Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on today, May 25, 2017, he has signed the following enrolled bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 366. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's vehicle fleet, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 467. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that each medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs complies with requirements relating to scheduling veterans for health care appointments, to improve the uniform application of directives of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 953. An act to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 1293. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that the Office of Personnel Management submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2052. An act to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to prohibit the wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 624. An act to restrict the inclusion of social security account numbers on Federal documents sent by mail and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 512. A bill to modernize the regulation of nuclear energy (Rept. No. 115-86).

S. 692. A bill to provide for integrated plan permits, to establish an Office of the Municipal Ombudsman, to promote green infrastructure, and to require the revision of financial capability guidance (Rept. No. 115-87).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 176. A resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem.

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 722. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Scott P. Brown, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Independent State of Samoa.

Nominee: Scott Philip Brown.

Post: Ambassador New Zealand and the Independent State of Samoa.

Nominate: April 25, 2017.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$250, 6/23/14, McFadden for Senate; \$250, 8/27/15, Friends of Kelly Ayotte Committee.

Contributions as Chairman of the Peoples Seat PAC, Fiscal Responsibility PAC Converted to SCOTT PAC (attached hereto as Attachment "1") Incorporated herein as Attachment "1")

2. Spouse: Gail M. Brown, None.

3. Children and Spouses: Ayla M. Brown, none; Arianna S. Brown-Hendry, none.

4. Parents: Judith A. Brown, none; C. Bruce Brown—Deceased.

5. Grandparents: Bertha C. Rugg—Deceased; Philip N. Rugg—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Bruce W. Brown—estranged, no contact or information available.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Lee Ann Riley, none; Robyn L. Brown, none.

8. Attachment "1": All PAC's including Fiscal Responsibility PAC, S. Brown, Chair—Recipient name, Disburse date, amount: Mike Sullivan for U.S. Senate Committee, 4/11/2013, \$875.00.

Friends of John Thune, 5/10/2013, \$500.00.

Gabriel Gomez for Senate, 5/10/2013, \$1,000.00.

Kirk for Senate, 5/10/2013, \$1,000.00.

New Hampshire Republican State Committee, 10/24/2013, \$5,000.00.

New Hampshire Republican State Committee, 10/24/2013, \$5,000.00.

Scott County Republican Central, 11/11/2013, \$500.00.

The Addivino Committee, 11/20/2013, \$1,000.00.

Friends of Frank Guinta, 11/21/2013, \$1,000.00.

Texans for Senator Cornyn Inc., 11/21/2013, \$2,500.00.

Daugaard for South Dakota, 11/21/2013, \$1,500.00.

Tisei Congressional Committee, 12/9/2013, \$1,000.00.

Hampstead Town Republican Committee, 12/9/2013, \$500.00.

Pat Roberts for US Senate Inc, 1/8/2014, \$2,500.00.

Massachusetts Citizens for Jobs, 1/8/2014, \$5,000.00.

New Hampshire Republican State Committee, 2/24/2014, \$5,000.00.

Collins for Senator, 3/11/2014, \$2,500.00.

Friends of Frank Guinta, 3/11/2014, \$4,000.00.

Friends of John McCain Inc, 3/11/2014, \$5,000.00.

Friends of John Thune, 3/11/2014, \$5,000.00.

Friends of Kelly Ayotte, 3/11/2014, \$5,000.00.

Committee To Elect House Republicans, 3/11/2014, \$1,000.00.

New Hampshire Republican State Committee, 3/11/2014, \$5,000.00.

Senate Republican Majority PAC, 3/11/2014, \$5,000.00.

Belknap County Republican Committee, 3/13/2014, \$1,000.00.

Carroll County NH Republican Committee, 3/13/2014, \$1,000.00.

Cheshire County Republican Party, 3/13/2014, \$1,000.00.

Committee To Elect House Republicans, 3/13/2014, \$4,000.00.

Concord Republican City Committee, 3/13/2014, \$1,000.00.

Coos County Republican Committee, 3/13/2014, \$1,000.00.

Derry Republican Committee, 3/13/2014, \$1,000.00.

Grafton County Republican Committee of New Hampshire, 3/13/2014, \$1,000.00.

Hillsborough County Republican Committee, 3/13/2014, \$1,000.00.

Manchester Republican Committee, 3/13/2014, \$1,000.00.

Merrimack Republican Committee, 3/13/2014, \$1,000.00.

Nashua Republican City Committee, 3/13/2014, \$1,000.00.

Rockingham County Republican Committee, 3/13/2014, \$1,000.00.

Strafford County Republican Committee, 3/13/2014, \$1,000.00.

Sullivan County Republican Committee, 3/13/2014, \$1,000.00.

New Hampshire for Scott Brown, 3/26/2014, \$5,000.00.

New Hampshire for Scott Brown, 3/26/2014, \$5,000.00.

Merrimack County Republican Committee, 3/26/2014, \$1,000.00.

Debicella for Congress, 4/22/2014, \$1,000.00.

Friends of Kelly Ayotte, 4/23/2014, \$2,500.00.

Rockingham County Republican Committee, 5/5/2014, \$1,000.00.

Grafton County GOP, 5/19/2014, \$400.00.

New Hampshire Sheriff's Association, 6/9/2014, \$500.00.

Bedford Republican Committee, 8/12/2014, \$210.00.

Hillsborough County Republican Committee, 9/5/2014, \$200.00.

Friends of Kelly Ayotte Inc., 4/27/2015, \$2,500.00.

Georgians for Isakson, 6/23/2015, \$2,500.00.

Friends of John McCain, 6/25/2015, \$2,000.00.

Fiscal Responsibility PAC, 6/30/2015, \$4,837.00.

Kasich for America, 8/27/2015, \$1,000.00.

NH Republican Party Federal, 8/31/2015, \$5,000.00.

Ron Johnson for Senate, 8/31/2015, \$2,500.00.

Jasper for NH Committee, 9/23/2015, \$1,000.00.

Carly for President, 9/25/2015, \$1,000.00.

Friends of Pat Toomey, 9/25/2015, \$5,000.00.

Huckabee for President, Inc., 9/25/2015, \$1,000.00.

JEB 2016, Inc., 9/25/2015, \$1,000.00.

Ted Gatsas for Mayor, 9/25/2015, \$1,000.00.

Portman for Senate Committee, 9/28/2015, \$5,000.00.

Chris Christie for President, Inc., 9/29/2015, \$1,000.00.

Pataki for President, Inc., 9/30/2015, \$1,000.00.

Friends of Kelly Ayotte, Inc., 10/6/2015, \$2,500.00.

New Hampshire Republican Club, 10/21/2015, \$500.00.

August Wolf for Senate, 10/29/2015, \$1,000.00.

Marco Rubio for President, 11/5/2015, \$1,000.00.

USA Triathlon Foundation, 11/5/2015, \$1,500.00.

Kirk for Senate, 11/9/2015, \$5,000.00.

Lindsey Graham 2016 Committee, 11/10/2015, \$1,000.00.

Chris Sununu for NH Governor, 11/17/2015, \$2,500.00.

Friends for Joe Heck, 11/23/2015, \$5,000.00.

Murkowski Committee, 12/3/2015, \$2,500.00.

Friends of Kelly Ayotte, Inc., 1/5/2016, \$4,900.00.

Cruz for President, 1/11/2016, \$1,000.00.

Friends of Joe Kenney Comm., 3/1/2016, \$250.00.

McCain for Senate, 3/10/2016, \$3,000.00.

Burr, Richard M, 4/12/2016, \$1,000.00.

Chris Sununu for NH Governor, 5/31/2016, \$2,500.00.

Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., 6/8/2016, \$2,500.00.

America Rising PAC, 6/17/2016, \$5,000.00.

Mass. Victory Committee, 6/17/2016, \$500.00.

Friends of John McCain, 8/30/2016, \$1,000.00.

Friends of JEB Bradley for State Senate, 9/1/2016, \$500.00.

Friends of Dan Innis, 9/22/2016, \$1,000.00.

Friends of Andy Sanborn, 10/14/2016, \$500.00.

Gannon for Senate, 10/25/2016, \$250.00.

Committee To Elect House Republicans, 10/27/2016, \$2,500.00.

Friends of Chris Sununu, 10/31/2016, \$1,000.00.

Friends of Chris Sununu, 2/2/2017, \$7,000.00.

Edwards for Congress Committee, 4/6/2017, \$2,700.00.

Handel for Congress, Inc., 4/21/2017, \$2,000.00.

America Rising PAC, 4/21/2017, \$10,000.00.

New Hampshire Republican State Committee Federal, 4/21/2017, \$1,000.00.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Fred Aziz and ending with Nathalie Scharf, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 25, 2017.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with David Gossack and ending with Pamela Ward, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 25, 2017.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1229. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Move America bonds and Move America credits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELLER, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1230. A bill to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1231. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to allow all eligible voters to vote by mail in Federal elections, to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for automatic voter registration; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1232. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to exempt from inspection the slaughter of animals and the preparation of carcasses conducted at a custom slaughter facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1233. A bill to improve the efficiency and reliability of rail transportation by reforming the Surface Transportation Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1234. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 to provide for expedited project implementation relating to the comprehensive Everglades restoration plan; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1235. A bill to reduce the number of nuclear-armed submarines operated by the Navy, to prohibit the development of a new long-range penetrating bomber aircraft, to prohibit the procurement of new intercontinental ballistic missiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1236. A bill to require the Attorney General to designate Human Trafficking Coordinators for Federal judicial districts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1237. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1238. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1239. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules applicable to length of service award plans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1240. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to establish an Office of Public Participation and Consumer Advocacy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1241. A bill to improve the prohibitions on money laundering, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CARDIN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1242. A bill to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1243. A bill to require sexual assault prevention and response training for all individuals enlisted in the Armed Forces under a delayed entry program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1244. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for additional funds for the essential air service program; to the Com-

mittee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 1245. A bill to award career pathways innovation grants to local educational agencies and consortia of local educational agencies, to provide technical assistance within the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education to administer the grants and support the local educational agencies with the preparation of grant applications and management of grant funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1246. A bill to increase the participation of historically underrepresented demographic groups in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education and industry; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1247. A bill to provide for loan repayment for teachers in high-need schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1248. A bill to amend title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1249. A bill to authorize additional district court judgeships for the northern, middle, and southern districts of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1250. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to improve the recruitment and retention of employees in the Indian Health Service, restore accountability in the Indian Health Service, improve health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 1251. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to establish a pilot program for providing portable benefits to eligible workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1252. A bill to reclassify certain low-level felonies as misdemeanors, to eliminate the increased penalties for cocaine offenses where the cocaine involved is cocaine base, to reinvest in our communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1253. A bill to improve the coordination and use of geospatial data; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the small employer health insurance credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1255. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to credit individuals serving as caregivers of dependent relatives with deemed wages for up to five years of such service, and to support State medical training programs for caregivers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. RISCH, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1256. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters, Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service as a "Ghost Army" that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1257. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to adopt an electronic system to help expedite the placement of children in foster care or guardianship, or for adoption, across State lines, and to provide funding to aid States in developing such a system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1258. A bill to require States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding use of force incidents involving law enforcement officers and civilians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 1259. A bill to improve and extend agricultural commodity programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1260. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain Federal land located in Gulf Islands National Seashore for certain non-Federal land in Jackson County, Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 1261. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay the reasonable costs of urgent care provided to certain veterans, to establish cost-sharing amounts for veterans receiving care at an emergency room of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1262. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to certain exceptions to discharge in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1263. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit oil-, gas-, and methane hydrate-related seismic activities in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Straits of Florida planning areas of the outer Continental Shelf, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 1264. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to allow the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to exempt cer-

tain depository institutions from certain legal requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1265. A bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 to provide for the expansion of emergency planning zones and the development of plans for dry cask storage of spent nuclear fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1266. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with nonprofit organizations to investigate medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. HATCH, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1267. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey to a State all right, title, and interest in and to a percentage of the amount of royalties and other amounts required to be paid to the State under that Act with respect to public land and deposits in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1268. A bill to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to allow States to provide foster care maintenance payments for children with parents in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility for substance abuse and to reauthorize grants to improve the well-being of families affected by substance abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1269. A bill to require the Office of Pipeline Safety to consult with the Environmental Protection Agency or the Coast Guard in the event the Federal on-scene coordinator has concerns about the ability of a pipeline operator to respond to a worst case discharge; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MERKLEY)):

S. 1270. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to carry out programs and activities to ensure that Federal science agencies and institutions of higher education receiving Federal research and development funding are fully engaging their entire talent pool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1271. A bill to designate certain mountain peaks in the State of Colorado as "Fowler Peak" and "Boskoff Peak"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LEE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1272. A bill to preserve State, local, and tribal authorities and private property rights with respect to unmanned aircraft systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1273. A bill to amend chapter 329 of title 49, United States Code, relating to average fuel economy standards for automobiles; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1274. A bill to direct the President to establish an interagency mechanism to coordinate United States development programs and private sector investment activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

S. 1275. A bill to improve the housing conditions and promote useful land uses within tribal communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TILLIS, and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 1276. A bill to require the Attorney General to make a determination as to whether cannabidiol should be a controlled substance and listed in a schedule under the Controlled Substances Act and to expand research on the potential medical benefits of cannabidiol and other marihuana components; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1277. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a high technology education pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1278. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CRAPO:

S. 1279. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs through the use of non-Department health care providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1280. A bill to help keep law enforcement officers and communities safer by making grants to purchase body worn cameras for use by State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1281. A bill to establish a bug bounty pilot program within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1282. A bill to redesignate certain clinics of the Department of Veterans Affairs located in Montana; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1283. A bill to authorize the award of a military service medal to members of the Armed Forces who were exposed to ionizing radiation as a result of participation in the testing of nuclear weapons or under other

circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. KING, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1284. A bill to raise the consolidated assets threshold under the small bank holding company policy statement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1285. A bill to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians to lease or transfer certain lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. KING):

S. 1286. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. COONS, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. NELSON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DAINES, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1287. A bill to allow United States citizens and legal residents to travel between the United States and Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1288. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to allow preservation leasing as a form of compensatory mitigation for discharges of dredged or fill material affecting Indian land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1289. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt Indian tribes from compensatory mitigation requirements in connection with certain discharges of dredged or fill material, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the proposed export to the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of certain defense articles; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S.J. Res. 43. A joint resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces

against al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, and associated persons or forces, that are engaged in hostilities against the United States, the Armed Forces, or its other personnel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 179. A resolution expressing support for the designation of June 2, 2017, as "National Gun Violence Awareness Day" and June 2017 as "National Gun Violence Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. Res. 180. A resolution condemning the violence against peaceful protesters outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence on May 16, 2017, and calling for the perpetrators to be brought to justice and measures to be taken to prevent similar incidents in the future; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Ms. HARRIS):

S. Res. 181. A resolution designating the week of May 21 through May 27, 2017, as "National Public Works Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 182. A resolution designating May 2017 as "Melanoma Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. KAINE, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. HELLER):

S. Res. 183. A resolution recognizing the significance of May 2017 as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month and as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 54

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 54, a bill to prohibit the creation of an immigration-related registry program that classifies people on the basis of religion, race, age, gender, ethnicity, national origin, nationality, or citizenship.

S. 97

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 97, a bill to enable civilian re-

search and development of advanced nuclear energy technologies by private and public institutions, to expand theoretical and practical knowledge of nuclear physics, chemistry, and materials science, and for other purposes.

S. 231

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 231, a bill to implement equal protection under the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the right to life of each born and preborn human person.

S. 263

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 263, a bill to facilitate efficient State implementation of ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to require the appropriation of funds to use a fee, fine, penalty, or proceeds from a settlement received by a Federal agency, and for other purposes.

S. 301

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 301, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit governmental discrimination against providers of health services that are not involved in abortion.

S. 341

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 341, a bill to provide for congressional oversight of actions to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

S. 369

At the request of Mr. CASEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 369, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 407, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 413

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr.

KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 413, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit prescription drug plan sponsors and MAPD organizations under the Medicare program from retroactively reducing payment on clean claims submitted by pharmacies.

S. 424

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 424, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include certain Federal positions within the definition of law enforcement officer for retirement purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 445

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 445, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to condition assistance to the West Bank and Gaza on steps by the Palestinian Authority to end violence and terrorism against Israeli citizens.

S. 515

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 515, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 568

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 568, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 623, a bill to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of

assistance provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to promote quality basic education in developing countries, to better enable such countries to achieve universal access to quality basic education and improved learning outcomes, to eliminate duplication and waste, and for other purposes.

S. 652

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 652, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 692

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 692, a bill to provide for integrated plan permits, to establish an Office of the Municipal Ombudsman, to promote green infrastructure, and to require the revision of financial capability guidance.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 822, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to modify provisions relating to grants, and for other purposes.

S. 872

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 872, a bill to amend title

XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 910

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 910, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes.

S. 981

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 981, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy efficiency materials pilot program.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1002, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1035

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1035, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to the scope of employee pension benefit plans.

S. 1057

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1057, a bill to amend the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998 to address harmful algal blooms, and for other purposes.

S. 1092

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1092, a bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1094, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1122

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1122, a bill to amend the

Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to clarify when the time period for the issuance of citations under such Act begins and to require a rule to clarify that an employer's duty to make and maintain accurate records of work-related injuries and illnesses is an ongoing obligation.

S. 1151

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1151, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a nonrefundable credit for working family caregivers.

S. 1169

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1169, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with an option to provide medical assistance to individuals between the ages of 22 and 64 for inpatient services to treat substance use disorders at certain facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1191

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1191, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to refine how Medicare pays for orthotics and prosthetics and to improve beneficiary experience and outcomes with orthotic and prosthetic care, and for other purposes.

S. 1196

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1196, a bill to expand the capacity and capability of the ballistic missile defense system of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1227

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1227, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for 12-month continuous enrollment under Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 106

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 106, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate to support the territorial integrity of Georgia.

S. RES. 139

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut

(Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 139, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 168

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 168, a resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia.

S. RES. 174

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 174, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International and celebrating the Lions Clubs International for a long history of humanitarian service.

S. RES. 176

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 176, a resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem.

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 176, *supra*.

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 176, *supra*.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1237. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1237

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF RULE ALLOWING DISCHARGE TO GOVERNMENTAL CLAIMS ARISING FROM THE DISPOSITION OF FARM ASSETS UNDER CHAPTER 12 BANKRUPTCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation

"(a) Any unsecured claim of a governmental unit against the debtor or the estate that arises before the filing of the petition, or that arises after the filing of the petition and before the debtor's discharge under section 1228, as a result of the sale, transfer, exchange, or other disposition of any property used in the debtor's farming operation—

"(1) shall be treated as an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition is filed;

"(2) shall not be entitled to priority under section 507;

"(3) shall be provided for under a plan; and

"(4) shall be discharged in accordance with section 1228.

"(b) For purposes of applying sections 1225(a)(4), 1228(b)(2), and 1229(b)(1) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the amount that would be paid on such claim if the estate of the debtor were liquidated in a case under chapter 7 of this title shall be the amount that would be paid by the estate in a chapter 7 case if the claim were an unsecured claim arising before the date on which the petition was filed and were not entitled to priority under section 507.

"(c) For purposes of applying sections 523(a), 1228(a)(2), and 1228(c)(2) to a claim described in subsection (a) of this section, the claim shall not be treated as a claim of a kind specified in section 523(a)(1).

"(d)(1) A governmental unit may file a proof of claim for a claim described in subsection (a) that arises after the date on which the petition is filed.

"(2) If a debtor files a tax return after the filing of the petition for a period in which a claim described in subsection (a) arises, and the claim relates to the tax return, the debtor shall serve notice of the claim on the governmental unit charged with the responsibility for the collection of the tax at the address and in the manner designated in section 505(b)(1). Notice under this paragraph shall state that the debtor has filed a petition under this chapter, state the name and location of the court in which the case under this chapter is pending, state the amount of the claim, and include a copy of the filed tax return and documentation supporting the calculation of the claim.

"(3) If notice of a claim has been served on the governmental unit in accordance with paragraph (2), the governmental unit may file a proof of claim not later than 180 days after the date on which such notice was served. If the governmental unit has not filed a timely proof of the claim, the debtor or trustee may file proof of the claim that is consistent with the notice served under paragraph (2). If a proof of claim is filed by the debtor or trustee under this paragraph, the governmental unit may not amend the proof of claim.

"(4) A claim filed under this subsection shall be determined and shall be allowed under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 502, or disallowed under subsection (d) or (e) of section 502, in the same manner as if the claim had arisen immediately before the date of the filing of the petition."

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 1222(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “unless—” and all that follows through “the holder” and inserting “unless the holder”;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) subject to section 1232, provide for the treatment of any claim by a governmental unit of a kind described in section 1232(a).”;

(B) in section 1228—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(aa) by inserting a comma after “all debts provided for by the plan”; and

(bb) by inserting a comma after “allowed under section 503 of this title”; and

(II) in paragraph (2), by striking “the kind” and all that follows and inserting “a kind specified in section 523(a) of this title, except as provided in section 1232(c).”; and

(ii) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting “, except as provided in section 1232(c)” before the period at the end; and

(C) in section 1229(a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) provide for the payment of a claim described in section 1232(a) that arose after the date on which the petition was filed.”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1232. Claim by a governmental unit based on the disposition of property used in a farming operation.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any bankruptcy case that—

(1) is pending on the date of enactment of this Act and relating to which an order of discharge under section 1228 of title 11, United States Code, has not been entered; or

(2) commences on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce, along with Senator FRANKEN, the Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2017. I thank Senator FRANKEN for supporting and working with me, since the 112th Congress, on this important bill to help our Nation's family farmers.

This bipartisan bill addresses the 2012 United States Supreme Court case *Hall v. United States*. In a 5-4 decision, the Supreme Court ruled a provision that I authored in the 2005 Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act did not accomplish what we in Congress intended. The Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2017 corrects this unfortunate result and restores Congress's original intent. The bill clarifies that bankrupt family farmers reorganizing their debts, under chapter 12 of the bankruptcy code, may treat capital gains taxes owed to the government, arising from the sale of farm assets during the bankruptcy, as general unsecured claims. This bill will give family farmers a chance to reorga-

nize successfully and remove the Internal Revenue Service's veto power over a plan's confirmation.

Congress created chapter 12 in 1986 as a temporary measure to provide a specialized bankruptcy process for family farmers. In 2005, Congress made chapter 12 a permanent part of the bankruptcy code. Between 1986 and 2005, we learned what worked and did not work for family farmers reorganizing under chapter 12. In particular, family farmers faced serious problems when they needed to sell land to fund their reorganization plan. For example, a family farmer might sell portions of the farm in order to generate cash and pay creditors. Unfortunately, in most of these cases, the family farmer is selling land with a low cost basis, because it has likely been held in the family for a very long time. As a result, the family farmer gets hit with a substantial capital gains tax, which is owed to the Internal Revenue Service.

Under the bankruptcy code's priorities structure for claims, taxes owed to the IRS must be paid in full, unless the IRS agrees otherwise. This creates problems for the family farmer who needs cash to pay creditors and reorganize. Since the IRS has the ability to require full payment, it essentially holds veto power over the confirmation of a family farmer's chapter 12 plan. In many instances, the effect is that a family farmer will not be able to have a plan confirmed. This is a harsh result and does not make sense if the goal is to give family farmers a fresh start. Recognizing this problem, Congress amended the bankruptcy code in 2005 to provide that in these limited and particular situations, the taxes owed to the IRS would be stripped of their priority and treated as general unsecured debt. This removed the government's veto power over plan confirmation and paved the way for family farmers to reorganize under chapter 12.

Unfortunately, in *Hall v. United States*, the Supreme Court ruled that despite Congress's express goal of helping family farmers, the language we used failed to accomplish the intended result. To be clear, the *Hall* case was about statutory interpretation. There is no question about what Congress was trying to do; rather, the question is, “Did Congress use the correct language?” My goal, along with others at the time, was to relieve family farmers from having their reorganization plans fail because of certain tax liabilities owed to the government. Justice Breyer noted this point in his dissent: “Congress was concerned about the effect on the farmer of collecting capital gains tax debts that arose during (and were connected with) the Chapter 12 proceedings themselves. . . . The majority does not deny the importance of Congress' objective. Rather, it feels compelled to hold that Congress put the Amendment in the wrong place.”

Hall v. United States, 132 S.Ct. 1882, 1897 (2012) (Breyer, J., dissenting) (internal citations and quotations omitted).

As a result of the *Hall* case, family farmers facing bankruptcy now find themselves caught between a rock and a hard place. The rules have changed and must be corrected in order to provide certainty and clarity in the law. The Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2017 does this and provides the help needed for family farmers.

This bill adds a new section 1232 to the bankruptcy code. This new section, along with other conforming changes, gives guidance and certainty to debtors, practitioners, and courts as to how these claims are to be treated during bankruptcy. I'm pleased that the bill we're introducing today will help family farmers who are facing hard times.

In the wake of the *Hall* decision, this bill ensures that what Congress sought to do in 2005 actually occurs. The Family Farmer Bankruptcy Clarification Act of 2017 provides the help that may one day be needed for the hard working family farmers across our great Nation.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1238. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1239. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules applicable to length of service award plans; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce two bills that will benefit the brave women and men who volunteer at our local firehouses: the Volunteer Responder Incentive Protection Act and the Volunteer Firefighters' Length of Service Award Program Cap Adjustment Priority Act. I am pleased to be joined by my friend and colleague from Maryland, Senator CARDIN, in re-introducing this bipartisan legislation.

Across our nation, volunteer firefighters play a critical role in helping to ensure the safety of our communities and the well-being of our neighbors. The State of Maine, for example, has approximately 11,000 firefighters in more than 400 departments. Because Maine is a largely rural state, more than 90 percent of those firefighters are volunteers.

Without these public-spirited citizens, many communities would be unable to provide emergency services protection at all, while others would be forced to raise local taxes to pay salaries and benefits for full- or part-time

staff. Often, communities seek to recruit and retain volunteers by offering modest benefits. The bills we are introducing today would support these efforts by helping to ensure that nominal benefits to volunteers are not treated as regular employee compensation.

The Volunteer Responder Incentive Protection Act would allow communities to provide volunteer firefighters and EMS workers with up to \$600 per year of property tax reductions or other incentives, without those benefits being subject to federal income tax and withholding. This would ease the administrative burden that local departments sometimes face when they reward their volunteers. We also want to help first responders save for retirement. For years, local and state governments have provided their volunteer firefighters and EMS personnel with different forms of benefits, including Length of Service Award Programs, commonly known as LOSAPs. These are pension-like benefits for volunteer emergency responders.

Our second bill, the LOSAP Cap Act, would help communities recruit and retain volunteer firefighters by increasing the annual cap on contributions to their retirement accounts to \$6,000, and allowing for adjustments for inflation.

As we begin the complicated process of reforming our nation's tax code, I believe we should take care to protect those who serve this country with such bravery. That is why Senator CARDIN and I have introduced these bills today, and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting them.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1262. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to certain exceptions to discharge in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1262

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Fairness for Struggling Students Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. EXCEPTIONS TO DISCHARGE.

Section 523(a)(8) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by striking "dependents, for" and all that follows through the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting "dependents, for an educational benefit overpayment or loan made, insured, or guaranteed by a governmental unit or made under any program funded in whole or in part by a governmental unit or an obligation to repay funds received

from a governmental unit as an educational benefit, scholarship, or stipend;".

Mr. DURBIN. Today I am reintroducing the Fairness for Struggling Students Act. This bill takes an important step toward addressing the student debt crisis in America. It would once again treat private student loans like nearly all other forms of private unsecured debt and permit these loans to be discharged in bankruptcy.

Student loan debt has reached an astronomical \$1.4 trillion—more than double what it was in 2008. Student loan debt is now the second largest form of consumer debt in America, after only mortgage debt. The balance of student loan debt is larger than credit card and auto loan debt. Currently, around 44 million borrowers hold student loan debt, with an average balance of roughly \$30,000.

This past weekend, the New York Times published an editorial that clearly and concisely describes the student debt crisis that we face. The editorial is titled "Student Debt's Grip on the Economy," and I ask consent to place it into the RECORD. As the editorial points out, "student debt has become a drag on graduates' hopes and a threat to economic growth."

This editorial reports that as college costs have continued to increase, wages have not kept pace. Students continue to take out larger amounts in loans to afford the rising costs of college. This crushing student loan debt has forced young people to delay making important life decisions like getting married and economic investments such as home ownership. We are also seeing an increase in the wealth gap between college graduates with student debt and those without student debt. The burdens of student debt are threatening the notion that being college-educated is enough to get ahead. As the editorial notes, "the fallout from these burdens, afflicting those who are supposedly best prepared to face and shape the future, is not only a personal financial issue but also a social and economic one."

These burdens are even more significant for students who have taken out private student loans. Federal student loans have fixed, affordable interest rates, and a variety of consumer protections including forbearance in times of economic hardship and manageable repayment options. Private loans, on the other hand, frequently have high, variable interest rates, and they lack the repayment options and protections that federal loans offer. In 2013, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau reported that the outstanding private student loan debt in America was \$165 billion, at least \$8 billion of which was then in default. As it turns out, many students were steered into costly private student loans by for-profit colleges, often when the students still had eligibility for lower-cost federal loans.

One of those students is a woman named Marta, from Chicago, who wrote to me about her story and asked me to only use her first name. Marta came to the United States from Poland in 1994 with her family, hoping for a better life. She is a U.S. citizen now, and has a family of her own. As an aspiring designer, Marta wanted to enroll in a college that would help launch her career. So after meeting a recruiter at a college fair from the now-closing, for-profit Harrington College of Art and Design, she enrolled in the fall of 2004. At the urging of the recruiter, she signed the enrollment paperwork and began courses. Being the first in her family to attend college, she did not know the difference between private and federal student loans. The recruiter assured her that the paperwork was just part of the normal college enrollment process.

It was only after she graduated that Marta learned that in signing the paperwork the recruiter gave her, she had taken out a combination of federal student loans and much riskier and more expensive private student loans. She now has over \$120,000 in student debt, the majority of which is in private student loans. The monthly payments are overwhelming and Marta worries about what this crushing debt means for her family's future. Thanks to high-interest rates, her private loans continue to grow despite doing her best to make her payments.

Marta enrolled in college to get a good career and widen her future opportunities. But she has been left with enormous debt from a failed for-profit college. And now she is struggling and needs a fair chance to get back on her feet. There are stories like Marta's in every corner of America. And it's time to do something about it.

Today I am reintroducing the Fairness for Struggling Students Act. This bill would restore the bankruptcy code's pre-2005 treatment of private student loans.

Since 2005, private student loans have enjoyed a privileged status under the bankruptcy code: they cannot be discharged in bankruptcy except in extremely limited circumstances. Only a few other types of private unsecured debt cannot be discharged in bankruptcy—criminal fines, child support, back taxes and alimony. In contrast, nearly all types of private unsecured debt, including credit card and medical debt, are dischargeable in bankruptcy.

Congress had no good reason to make private student loans non-dischargeable in 2005. It was a provision that was quietly slipped into a broader bankruptcy reform bill with little debate and no justification. There was no evidence that private student loan borrowers had abused the bankruptcy system to avoid repayment before 2005. But, since the law changed in 2005, lenders have been incentivized to extend expensive private student loans to

students that the students cannot repay and that they can never escape. This is overwhelming for students and an impairment on our overall economy.

The Fairness for Struggling Students Act will make important relief available to students being crushed by private student loan debt, and will discourage private lenders from extending risky loans.

This bill is supported by a large coalition of educational, student, civil rights and consumer organizations including the American Association of Community Colleges, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, American Association of University Women, American Council on Education, American Federation of Teachers, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, Center for Responsible Lending, Consumer Action, Consumer Federation of America, Consumers Union, Demos, Empire Justice Center, NAACP, National Association of Consumer Bankruptcy Attorneys, National Consumer Law Center (on behalf of its low income clients), National Association of College Admission Counseling, National Association of Consumer Advocates, National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, National Consumers League, Public Citizen, The Institute for College Access and Success, UNCF, and Young Invincibles.

I want to thank the cosponsors of this bill, Senators WHITEHOUSE, FRANKEN, BLUMENTHAL, HIRONO, WARREN, REED, WYDEN, BALDWIN, HASSAN, KAINE, and MURPHY for their support, and I hope more of my colleagues will join us.

This is just one step of what we need to do to get control of the student debt crisis in our country. But it is a critical step, and it is long overdue. Let's give struggling students a fair chance.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 1264. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to allow the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to exempt certain depository institutions from certain legal requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I wish to introduce the Community Bank Sensible Regulation Act of 2017, a bill that would allow financial regulators to exempt community banks from unnecessary and unduly burdensome requirements, if doing so is in the public interest. My bill would provide this authority to the FDIC, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Reserve and would apply to financial institutions with less than \$10 billion in assets.

The aim of my legislation is to allow the financial regulators to exempt community banks from highly complex regulations designed to protect our fi-

ancial system from systemic risks that would arise from the failure of larger banks. All banks, large and small, should be well-capitalized and properly regulated, but that does not mean that our financial regulators must impose a "one size fits all" regulatory regime across the board without regard to the risks posed to the financial system by banks with fundamentally different business models and of vastly different sizes.

Some regulations that are appropriate or essential for larger banks may make no sense when applied to community banks. For example, current law requires community banks to demonstrate that they are in compliance with the Volcker Rule—which restricts proprietary trading and hedge fund investments by banks—even though community banks rarely engage in such trading. Even so, community banks must shoulder the burden of complying with this complex regulation. My bill would allow the regulators to exempt community banks from the Volcker Rule.

As the GAO has noted, smaller banks are "disproportionately affected by increased regulation, because they are less able to absorb additional costs." These costs are significant. According to industry representatives, the cost of complying with regulations absorbs 12 percent of total bank operating expenses, and is two-and-a-half times greater for small banks than for large banks.

The cost of regulation puts community banks at a competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis larger banks. Over the past two decades, the share of the U.S. banking industry represented by community banks has declined from 40 percent to just 18 percent. Over the same period, the share of the market represented by the five largest banks has grown from roughly 18 percent to 46 percent. I am concerned that unnecessary regulation will accelerate these trends, and ironically, contribute to the further consolidation of the banking industry into a handful of "too big to fail" banks.

Community banks play an essential role in meeting the credit needs of their customers, particularly small businesses, homeowners, and farmers. Although community banks represent just 18 percent of total banking assets, they are responsible for half of our nation's small business loans. With small business formation at generational lows, it is essential that we preserve and protect their access to credit, as they are the major driver of job creation in our country. In addition, community banks provide three-fourths of our nation's agricultural loans, a line of finance that requires highly specialized knowledge of farming and a long-term perspective suited to agricultural cycles.

Regulators should be able to tailor their regulations to take the distinc-

tive nature of community banks into account. My bill would allow regulators to exempt community banks from unnecessary and burdensome regulations where it is in the public interest to do so. I urge my colleagues to support it.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1268. A bill to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to allow States to provide foster care maintenance payments for children with parents in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility for substance abuse and to reauthorize grants to improve the well-being of families affected by substance abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1268

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Child Protection and Family Support Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. FOSTER CARE MAINTENANCE PAYMENTS FOR CHILDREN WITH PARENTS IN A LICENSED RESIDENTIAL FAMILY-BASED TREATMENT FACILITY FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 472 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 672) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(C), by striking "or" and inserting ", with a parent residing in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility, but only to the extent permitted under subsection (j), or in a"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(j) CHILDREN PLACED WITH A PARENT RESIDING IN A LICENSED RESIDENTIAL FAMILY-BASED TREATMENT FACILITY FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, a child who is eligible for foster care maintenance payments under this section, or who would be eligible for the payments if the eligibility were determined without regard to paragraphs (1)(B) and (3) of subsection (a), shall be eligible for the payments for a period of not more than 12 months during which the child is placed with a parent who is in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility for substance abuse, but only if—

"(A) the recommendation for the placement is specified in the child's case plan before the placement;

"(B) the treatment facility provides, as part of the treatment for substance abuse, parenting skills training, parent education, and individual and family counseling; and

"(C) the substance abuse treatment, parenting skills training, parent education, and individual and family counseling is provided under an organizational structure and treatment framework that involves understanding, recognizing, and responding to the effects of all types of trauma and in accordance with recognized principles of a trauma-informed approach and trauma-specific interventions to address the consequences of trauma and facilitate healing.

“(2) APPLICATION.—With respect to children for whom foster care maintenance payments are made under paragraph (1), only the children who satisfy the requirements of paragraphs (1)(B) and (3) of subsection (a) shall be considered to be children with respect to whom foster care maintenance payments are made under this section for purposes of subsection (h) or section 473(b)(3)(B).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 474(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 674(a)(1)) is amended by inserting “subject to section 472(j),” before “an amount equal to the Federal”.

SEC. 3. ENHANCEMENTS TO GRANTS TO IMPROVE WELL-BEING OF FAMILIES AFFECTED BY SUBSTANCE ABUSE.

Section 437(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(f)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “INCREASE THE WELL-BEING OF, AND TO IMPROVE THE PERMANENCY OUTCOMES FOR, CHILDREN AFFECTED BY” and inserting “IMPLEMENT IV–E PREVENTION SERVICES, AND IMPROVE THE WELL-BEING OF, AND IMPROVE PERMANENCY OUTCOMES FOR, CHILDREN AND FAMILIES AFFECTED BY METHAMPHETAMINE, HEROIN, OPIOIDS, AND OTHER”;

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘regional partnership’ means a collaborative agreement (which may be established on an interstate, State, or intrastate basis) entered into by the following:

“(A) MANDATORY PARTNERS FOR ALL PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.—

“(i) The State child welfare agency that is responsible for the administration of the State plan under this part and part E.

“(ii) The State agency responsible for administering the substance abuse prevention and treatment block grant provided under subpart II of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act.

“(B) MANDATORY PARTNERS FOR PARTNERSHIP GRANTS PROPOSING TO SERVE CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENTS.—If the partnership proposes to serve children in out-of-home placements, the Juvenile Court or Administrative Office of the Court that is most appropriate to oversee the administration of court programs in the region to address the population of families who come to the attention of the court due to child abuse or neglect.

“(C) OPTIONAL PARTNERS.—At the option of the partnership, any of the following:

“(i) An Indian tribe or tribal consortium.

“(ii) Nonprofit child welfare service providers.

“(iii) For-profit child welfare service providers.

“(iv) Community health service providers, including substance abuse treatment providers.

“(v) Community mental health providers.

“(vi) Local law enforcement agencies.

“(vii) School personnel.

“(viii) Tribal child welfare agencies (or a consortia of the agencies).

“(ix) Any other providers, agencies, personnel, officials, or entities that are related to the provision of child and family services under a State plan approved under this subpart.

“(D) EXCEPTION FOR REGIONAL PARTNERSHIPS WHERE THE LEAD APPLICANT IS AN INDIAN TRIBE OR TRIBAL CONSORTIA.—If an Indian tribe or tribal consortium enters into a regional partnership for purposes of this subsection, the Indian tribe or tribal consortium—

“(i) may (but is not required to) include the State child welfare agency as a partner in the collaborative agreement;

“(ii) may not enter into a collaborative agreement only with tribal child welfare agencies (or a consortium of the agencies); and

“(iii) if the condition described in paragraph (2)(B) applies, may include tribal court organizations in lieu of other judicial partners.”;

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “2012 through 2016” and inserting “2018 through 2022”; and

(ii) by striking “\$500,000 and not more than \$1,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000 and not more than \$1,000,000”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting “; PLANNING” after “APPROVAL”;

(ii) in clause (i), by striking “clause (ii)” and inserting “clauses (ii) and (iii)”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) SUFFICIENT PLANNING.—A grant awarded under this subsection shall be disbursed in 2 phases: a planning phase (not to exceed 2 years); and an implementation phase. The total disbursement to a grantee for the planning phase may not exceed \$250,000, and may not exceed the total anticipated funding for the implementation phase.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) LIMITATION ON PAYMENT FOR A FISCAL YEAR.—No payment shall be made under subparagraph (A) or (C) for a fiscal year until the Secretary determines that the eligible partnership has made sufficient progress in meeting the goals of the grant and that the members of the eligible partnership are coordinating to a reasonable degree with the other members of the eligible partnership.”;

(4) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i), by inserting “, parents, and families” after “children”;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “safety and permanence for such children; and” and inserting “safe, permanent caregiving relationships for the children”;;

(iii) in clause (iii), by striking “or” and inserting “increase reunification rates for children who have been placed in out of home care, or decrease”; and

(iv) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (v) and inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) improve the substance abuse treatment outcomes for parents including retention in treatment and successful completion of treatment;

“(iv) facilitate the implementation, delivery, and effectiveness of prevention services and programs under section 471(e); and”;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking “where appropriate.”; and

(C) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F) and inserting the following:

“(E) A description of a plan for sustaining the services provided by or activities funded under the grant after the conclusion of the grant period, including through the use of prevention services and programs under section 471(e) and other funds provided to the State for child welfare and substance abuse prevention and treatment services.

“(F) Additional information needed by the Secretary to determine that the proposed activities and implementation will be consistent with research or evaluations showing which practices and approaches are most effective.”;

(5) in paragraph (5)(A), by striking “abuse treatment” and inserting “use disorder

treatment including medication assisted treatment and in-home substance abuse disorder treatment and recovery”;

(6) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E) and inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) demonstrate a track record of successful collaboration among child welfare, substance abuse disorder treatment and mental health agencies; and”;

(7) in paragraph (8)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “establish indicators that will be” and inserting “review indicators that are”; and

(ii) by striking “in using funds made available under such grants to achieve the purpose of this subsection” and inserting “and establish a set of core indicators related to child safety, parental recovery, parenting capacity, and family well-being. In developing the core indicators, to the extent possible, indicators shall be made consistent with the outcome measures described in section 471(e)(6)”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “base the performance measures on lessons learned from prior rounds of regional partnership grants under this subsection, and” before “consult”; and

(ii) by striking clauses (iii) and (iv) and inserting the following:

“(iii) Other stakeholders or constituencies as determined by the Secretary.”;

(8) in paragraph (9)(A), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than September 30 of each fiscal year in which a recipient of a grant under this subsection is paid funds under the grant, and every 6 months thereafter, the grant recipient shall submit to the Secretary a report on the services provided and activities carried out during the reporting period, progress made in achieving the goals of the program, the number of children, adults, and families receiving services, and such additional information as the Secretary determines is necessary. The report due not later than September 30 of the last such fiscal year shall include, at a minimum, data on each of the performance indicators included in the evaluation of the regional partnership.”; and

(9) in paragraph (10), by striking “2012 through 2016” and inserting “2018 through 2022”.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2017.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself,
Mr. LEE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and
Mr. COTTON):

S. 1272. A bill to preserve State, local, and tribal authorities and private property rights with respect to unmanned aircraft systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Drone Federalism Act of 2017. This good government bill provides a clear legal framework to the modern day challenges of drone regulation and empowers every level of government to issue reasonable restrictions on drone operations. I

thank Senators LEE, BLUMENTHAL, and COTTON for joining me on this bill, and I appreciate their support.

In recent years, small unmanned aircraft have emerged as a transformative new technology. These devices—more commonly known as drones—are highly capable, commercially available, and operable even by novice consumers.

The way that drones are flown in the daily life of our communities and in such great numbers has raised new challenges for safety, privacy, and security that demand cooperation between the federal, state, and local governments.

Today, drone operations present an astounding array of challenges. In just two years, over 2,500 drone incidents have been reported to the Federal Aviation Administration, or FAA. The most recent year of data, from October 2015 to October 2016, saw the number of incidents surge 166% over the prior year. In addition, there have been some alarming reports. On February 26th, 2017, a drone crashed through the 27th floor window of a Manhattan apartment building in New York City. The next month, on March 28th, a drone crashed through the 23rd floor window of City Hall in Buffalo, New York. Drones have repeatedly interfered with medical helicopters. On May 1st, 2016, a medevac helicopter trying to land at Florida Hospital East in Orlando was forced to abort its initial landing because of a drone. On November 14, 2015, a helicopter leaving children's hospital in St. Louis, Missouri had to take evasive action to avoid a drone, banking 60 degrees. Drones also interfere with emergency wild fire fighting. On April 30, 2017, multiple drones filming the Opera fire in Riverside, California forced firefighting helicopters to suspend operations. This happened eight times in 2015, and another eight times in 2016, in California alone. Drones have also crashed into the Golden Gate Bridge, including twice last month. On April 1st, a drone flown almost two miles beyond line of site fell from the sky into a lane of traffic, only a few feet from the crowded sidewalk. Again on April 9th, another drone flown beyond line of site crashed one of the bridge's towers.

These incidents are occurring throughout the nation, but each state has faced its own challenges. Half of all reported incidents came from just five States: California, Florida, New York, Texas, and New Jersey.

In fact, one-fifth of all drone incidents reported to the FAA occurred in California. What works for protecting urban areas will be different than what is needed in rural areas.

The current legal framework for managing the airspace, which evolved over a century of manned aviation, is a poor fit for these new challenges. Drones bear little resemblance to the

manned aircraft that came before them.

First, drones intrude into the everyday life of our communities in a way that airplanes do not. Airplanes fly into and out of airports, and municipalities can try through zoning to minimize disruptions. Drones, on the other hand, can take flight from any location, can hover anonymously overhead, and are often used to film whatever aspect of public or private life may catch the operator's interest of the operator's.

Second, drones are seldom engaged in interstate commerce once they have been purchased. Short communication range and limited battery life means that commercially available drones are almost always operated locally, and are unlikely to be operated across state lines.

Third, there are far more drones than there are airplanes. Already, more than 750,000 drones have been registered, and the FAA anticipates up to 4 million drones by 2020. By contrast, there are little more than 200,000 manned aircraft registered in the United States.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

The Drone Federalism Act would address the modern challenges of drone operations and provide a clear legal framework to regulate drones. The bill has three provisions.

First, the bill preserves the authority of State, Tribal, and local governments to issue reasonable restrictions on the time, manner, and place of drone operations within 200 feet of the ground or a structure. These could include speed limits, local no-fly zones, temporary restrictions, and prohibitions on reckless or drunk operators, for example.

There are regulations that the FAA must issue uniformly throughout the country to ensure the safety and efficiency of the national airspace. This bill does not interfere with that authority. However, the bill does require the FAA to consider legitimate state and local interests when exercising preemption, and to respect any reasonable additional low-altitude restrictions that state and local governments choose to impose.

Second, the bill reaffirms that the federal government will respect private property rights to the airspace in the immediate reaches above a property, including at least the first 200 feet. Neither Congress nor the FAA may authorize drone operations immediately over property without the owner's permission.

Third, the bill promotes cooperation between the levels of government by directing the FAA to partner with a diverse group of cities and States to test out different approaches and report on best practices.

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS REGULATE DRONES

The Drone Federalism Act is consistent with the recent action taken by

States to regulate drone operations. In response to drone incidents and the concerns of their communities, lawmakers throughout the country have identified the need for a variety of new approaches to managing drones. Indeed, at least 38 States are considering drone legislation this year, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures.

These proposals include: definitions of harassment and voyeurism, airport protections, penalties for interfering with emergency responders, protections against the delivery of contraband at prisons, bans on flights over football games, and definitions of aerial trespass, among others.

This exercise of the laboratories of democracy is appropriate. Our communities should not have to rely on an already overburdened federal agency to craft specific regulatory protections for every local context, supply on-the-ground enforcement agents, or pursue complicated civil cases in court for every infraction. Local police should be empowered to issue citations akin to a traffic violation for clear-cut infractions, without having to prove an action meets a vague tort law standards of negligence and harm. There should be no question that a State has a right to prevent drones from interfering with emergency responders or delivering contraband into prisons; to criminalize hit-and-runs, voyeurism, stalking, or harassment with a drone; to allow judges to deny drones to sex offenders.

Neither should there be any question that a State or municipality has a right to restrict the use of drones where it would be hazardous. Just as the federal government has banned drone operations over Federal Parks, States should have the option to protect State parks. Just as the Federal Government banned flights over sensitive areas, like the entire Capital region, cities should have the option to protect schools or other sensitive areas of their own. Just as the Federal Government can impose temporary flight restrictions over major sporting events or airshows, a county should have the option to protect its summer fairgrounds or holiday parade route.

CONCLUSION

The Drone Federalism Act that I am introducing today, along with Senators LEE, BLUMENTHAL, and COTTON, is a proactive, affirmative solution. It recognizes the federal interest in protecting the safety and efficiency of the national airspace, while also respecting private property rights, Tribal sovereignty, the powers reserved to the States by the Tenth Amendment, and the general principle of local self-determination.

This bill will invite the democratic participation of government at every level, avoid the need for years of litigation about the scope of preemption, and enable effective local enforcement.

It is incumbent on Congress to provide clarity and to guarantee all sides an equal voice moving forward.

This bipartisan bill is the way to do that.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TILLIS, and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 1276. A bill to require the Attorney General to make a determination as to whether cannabidiol should be a controlled substance and listed in a schedule under the Controlled Substances Act and to expand research on the potential medical benefits of cannabidiol and other marijuana components; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Cannabidiol Research Expansion Act with my colleagues, Senators GRASSLEY, DURBIN, TILLIS, and ERNST.

Cannabidiol, or CBD, is a nonpsychoactive component of marijuana. In many instances parents, after exhausting other treatment options, have turned to CBD to as a last resort to treat their children who have intractable epilepsy. Anecdotally, CBD has produced positive results.

However, due to existing barriers and the fact that marijuana is a schedule I drug, rigorous research that is needed to better understand the long-term safety and efficacy of CBD as a medicine, as well as the correct dosing and potential interaction with other medications, is lacking.

The Cannabidiol Research Expansion Act seeks to both reduce these barriers and spur additional research to ensure that CBD and other marijuana-derived medications are based on the most up to date scientific evidence. It also provides a pathway for the manufacture and distribution of FDA-approved drugs that are based on this research.

It does this while maintaining safeguards to protect against illegal diversion.

First, the bill directs the Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services to complete a scientific and medical evaluation of CBD within 1 year. Based on this evaluation, the legislation directs the Department of Justice to make a scheduling recommendation for CBD that is independent of marijuana. This may include transferring the schedule of CBD to another schedule, or removing it from the list of controlled substances altogether. A scheduling recommendation for CBD that is independent of marijuana has never been done before.

Second, without sacrificing appropriate oversight, it streamlines the regulatory process for marijuana research. In particular, it improves regulations dealing with changes to approved quantities of marijuana needed for research and approved research protocols. It also expedites the Drug Enforcement Administration registration

process for researching CBD and marijuana.

Third, this legislation seeks to increase medical research on CBD, while simultaneously reducing the stigma associated with conducting research on a schedule I drug. It does so by explicitly authorizing medical and osteopathic schools, research universities, practitioners and pharmaceutical companies to use a schedule II Drug Enforcement Administration registration to conduct authorized medical research on CBD.

Fourth, the bill allows medical schools, research institutions, practitioners, and pharmaceutical companies to produce the marijuana they need for authorized medical research. This will ensure that researchers have access to the material they need to develop proven, effective medicines. Once the FDA approves these medications, the bill allows pharmaceutical companies to manufacture and distribute them.

Fifth, the bill allows parents who have children with intractable epilepsy, as well as adults with intractable epilepsy, to possess and transport CBD or other nonpsychoactive components of marijuana used to treat this disease while research is ongoing. To do so, parents and adults must provide documentation that they or their child have been treated by a board-certified neurologist for at least 6 months. They must also have documentation that the neurologist has attested that other treatment options have been exhausted and that the potential benefits outweigh the harms of using these nonpsychoactive components of marijuana. The neurologist must also agree to monitor the patient for potential adverse reactions.

Finally, because existing Federal research is severely lacking, the bill directs the Department of Health and Human Services to expand, intensify, and coordinate research to determine the potential medical benefits of CBD or other marijuana-derived medications on serious medical conditions.

The 2016 National Academy of Sciences report, titled "The Health Effects of Cannabis and Cannabinoids: The Current State of Evidence and Recommendations for Research" underscored the need to reduce research barriers, increase the supply of CBD and marijuana for research purposes, and address existing research gaps.

The Cannabidiol Research Expansion Act seeks to do just this.

This bill is critical to helping families across the country as they seek safe, effective medicines for serious illnesses. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important legislation.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1282. A bill to redesignate certain clinics of the Department of Veterans Affairs located in Montana; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize the commitment to duty and personal courage of three Montanans by introducing a bill to redesignate three Department of Veterans Affairs facilities in their honor. Through their distinguished service to our Nation, the actions of these three gentlemen have earned the respect and gratitude of the Treasure State.

Under this resolution, the Community Based Outpatient Clinic on Palmer Street in Missoula will be designated in honor of David J. Thatcher. Mr. Thatcher was an outstanding Montanan. The humble circumstances of his upbringing in rural, eastern Montana helped him develop a strong work ethic. In 1940, with war raging across Europe and the clouds of war on the horizon for the United States, he enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Corps.

Following the attack on Pearl Harbor, he volunteered to serve as a tail gunner for a high risk mission to attack targets deep within Japanese controlled territory. This counterattack would be known to history as the Doolittle Raid. After finishing the bombing mission and running low on fuel, his aircraft crash landed near the coast of China. Mr. Thatcher was instrumental in helping the crew reach safety following the crash and for his actions during the Doolittle Raid, he was awarded the Silver Star. A few years later, the actor Robert Walker portrayed Corporal Thatcher on the silver screen in "Thirty Seconds Over Tokyo." After the war, Mr. Thatcher embarked on a career with the U.S. Postal Service and married his sweetheart Dawn. Their marriage spanned seven decades until he passed away last June at the age of 94.

In Billings, the Community Based Outpatient Clinic on Spring Creek Lane will be designated in honor of Dr. Joseph Medicine Crow. Dr. Medicine Crow was an accomplished warrior and esteemed historian. He was born on the Crow Indian Reservation in eastern Montana and traveled across the U.S. while pursuing his education. In 1939, Dr. Medicine Crow earned his master's degree from the University of Southern California, becoming the first member of the Crow Tribe to attain that credential. In 1943 he joined the United States Army. While serving as an Army scout during World War II, Dr. Medicine Crow fulfilled the four requirements to become a war chief. While fighting against the German forces he led a war party, stole an enemy horse, disarmed an enemy, and touched an enemy without killing him. Later in life he served as the Crow tribal historian, received multiple honorary doctorate degrees, and spoke at venues across the Nation. He was the last Crow war chief, and his passing last April, at the age of 102, was a loss to our Nation. For his lifetime of service to the Crow Tribe, the State of

Montana, and to United States, Dr. Medicine Crow was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

The Billings Community Based Specialty Clinic located on Majestic Lane will be designated in honor of Benjamin Charles Steele. Mr. Steele is remembered by Montanans as a ranch hand, teacher, artist, and Bataan Death March survivor. Born and raised in Montana, he joined the U.S. Army Air Corps in 1940. After he was captured by the Japanese, Mr. Steele's sturdy fortitude helped him endure a 66-mile trek in the Philippines, a prisoner ship, and a forced labor camp. He was a prisoner of war in the Pacific Theater of World War II for a total of 1,244 days. Using charcoal to sketch on concrete, he withstood the harsh treatment in captivity and honed his artistic talents. His artistic expressions were captured on contraband paper, and some of the works he created in captivity were preserved and went on tour through the Nation after the war. In August of last year, we lost a warrior-artist when Mr. Steele passed away at his home in Montana at the age of 98.

The World War II generation produced many heroes. In 2016, Montana lost three of our greatest heroes when Thatcher, Medicine Crow and Steele completed their earthly tours of duty. In 2017 it is fitting that we honor their service and their remarkable lives by naming three Veterans Affairs facilities in their honor. Each generation of veterans using these facilities will help keep their memories alive. Their unique stories will inspire the future generation of warriors to defend our Nation and preserve our cherished individual liberties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1282

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REDESIGNATION OF CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CLINICS IN MONTANA.

(a) DAVID J. THATCHER DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CLINIC.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—The clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 2687 Palmer Street in Missoula, Montana, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the “David J. Thatcher Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic”.

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the clinic referred to in paragraph (1) shall be considered to be a reference to the David J. Thatcher Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic.

(b) DR. JOSEPH MEDICINE CROW DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CLINIC.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—The clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 1775 Spring Creek Lane in Billings, Montana, shall after the date of the enactment of this

Act be known and designated as the “Dr. Joseph Medicine Crow Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic”.

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the clinic referred to in paragraph (1) shall be considered to be a reference to the Dr. Joseph Medicine Crow Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic.

(3) PUBLIC DISPLAY OF NAME.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any local public display of the name of the clinic referred to in paragraph (1) carried out by the United States or through the use of Federal funds shall include the English name, Dr. Joseph Medicine Crow, and the Crow name, Dakaak Baako, of Dr. Joseph Medicine Crow.

(B) LOCAL DISPLAY.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a local public display of the name of the clinic referred to in paragraph (1) includes a display inside the clinic, on the campus of the clinic, and in the community surrounding the clinic, such as signs directing individuals to the clinic.

(c) BENJAMIN CHARLES STEELE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CLINIC.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—The clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 1766 Majestic Lane in Billings, Montana, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the “Benjamin Charles Steele Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic”.

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the clinic referred to in paragraph (1) shall be considered to be a reference to the Benjamin Charles Steele Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. COONS, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. NELSON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DAINES, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1287. A bill to allow United States citizens and legal residents to travel between the United States and Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I am very pleased to join my friend, the junior Senator from Arizona, in introducing the Freedom for Americans to Travel to Cuba Act of 2017.

I will have more to say about this bill, and United States policy toward Cuba, in the weeks and months ahead. My purpose in speaking today is simply

to point out that 55 Democratic and Republican members of the Senate have cosponsored this bill to allow Americans to travel to Cuba in the same way that they can travel to any other country in the world. And based on my conversations with other Senators, especially Republicans, I have little doubt that if we voted on this bill today more than 60 Senators would support it.

It is indefensible that the Federal government currently restricts American citizens and legal resident from traveling to a country 90 miles away that poses no threat to us, unless they engage in certain activities and not others. For example, an American biologist can go to Cuba to study threatened species of migratory birds. That same American cannot take his family on a trip to visit Cuba's national parks. Why? Because one is defined as scientific research and the other is defined as tourism.

At a time when U.S. airlines and cruise ships are flying and sailing to Cuba, does anyone here honestly think that preventing Americans from traveling is an appropriate role of the Federal government? Why only Cuba? Why not Venezuela? Or Russia? Or Iran, or anywhere else? It is a vindictive, discriminatory, self-defeating vestige of a time long passed. This bill would end these Cold War restrictions on the freedom of Americans to travel. It would not do away with the embargo.

We are told that the Trump Administration is conducting a review of U.S. policy toward Cuba. That is to be expected of a new administration. We have also heard a rumor, and I hope it is only a rumor, that in return for the votes of certain Senators or representatives on health care legislation, promises may have been made by the White House to impose further restrictions on the normalization of relations with Cuba. I hope that is not the case. I hope the review produces a policy based on what is in the U.S. national security interest and on what is in the interests of the American and Cuban people, an overwhelming majority of whom want closer relations. And I hope the policy reflects the bipartisan majority in Congress that supports expanding our engagement with Cuba, as evidenced by the bill we are introducing today.

I and others who have traveled to Cuba many times over the past 20 years, who have met with Cuban officials, with Cubans who have been persecuted for opposing the Castro government, and with many others, have requested meetings with top White House officials before the review is completed and any final decisions are made.

Every one of us wants to see an end to political repression in Cuba. The arrests and physical mistreatment of dissidents by the Cuban government are deplorable, just as they are by other governments including some, like

Egypt's and Turkey's, whose leaders have been feted at the White House, or, in the case of Saudi Arabia, have feted President Trump and his family. Americans can travel freely to Egypt, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and every other country, except Cuba.

The issue is how best to support the people of Cuba who struggle to make ends meet, and who want to live in a country where freedom of expression and association are protected, and where they can choose their own leaders in a democratic manner.

Anyone who thinks that more economic pressure, or ultimatums, will force the Cuban authorities to stop arresting political dissidents and embrace democracy have learned nothing from history. For more than half a century we have tried a policy of unilateral sanctions and isolation, and it has achieved neither of those goals. Instead, it has been used by the Cuban government as an excuse for repression to protect Cuba's sovereignty. It has hurt the Cuban people, not the Cuban government. And it has provided an opening for our adversaries and competitors, like Russia and China, in this hemisphere.

Change is coming to Cuba, and we can help support that process. There is already visible, tangible evidence that the changes in U.S. policy initiated by President Obama are having positive effects for the Cuban people and for our security and economic relations with Cuba, even though critics, particularly those who have never been to Cuba, prefer to deny it.

But most importantly, the bipartisan bill we are introducing today is about the right of Americans, not Cubans, to travel. Any member of Congress, especially those who have been to Cuba, should support the right of their constituents to do so. American citizens are our best Ambassadors to Cuba, and it is wrong for the United States government to be imposing restrictions that have no place in the law books of a free society.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 179—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF JUNE 2, 2017, AS "NATIONAL GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS DAY" AND JUNE 2017 AS "NATIONAL GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH"

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. Kaine) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 179

Whereas, each year, more than—

(1) 32,000 people in the United States are killed and 80,000 are injured by gunfire;

(2) 11,000 people in the United States are killed in homicides involving firearms;

(3) 21,000 people in the United States commit suicide by using firearms; and

(4) 500 people in the United States are killed in accidental shootings;

Whereas, since 1968, more people have died from guns in the United States than on the battlefields of all the wars in the history of the United States;

Whereas, by 1 count, in 2016 in the United States there were—

(1) 384 mass shooting incidents in which not fewer than 4 people were killed or wounded by gunfire; and

(2) 48 incidents in which a gun was fired in a school;

Whereas gun violence typically escalates during the summer months;

Whereas, every 70 minutes, 1 individual in the United States under 25 years of age dies because of gun violence and more than 6,300 such individuals die annually, including Hadiya Pendleton, who, in 2013, was killed at 15 years of age while standing in a Chicago park; and

Whereas, on June 2, 2017, on what would have been Hadiya Pendleton's 20th birthday, people across the United States will recognize National Gun Violence Awareness Day and wear orange in tribute to Hadiya and other victims of gun violence and their loved ones: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports—

(A) the designation of June 2017 as "National Gun Violence Awareness Month" and the goals and ideals of that month; and

(B) the designation of June 2, 2017, as "National Gun Violence Awareness Day" in remembrance of the victims of gun violence; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to—

(A) promote greater awareness of gun violence and gun safety;

(B) wear orange, the color that hunters wear to show that they are not targets, on June 2;

(C) concentrate heightened attention on gun violence during the summer months, when gun violence typically increases; and

(D) bring citizens and community leaders together to discuss ways to make communities safer.

SENATE RESOLUTION 180—CONDEMNING THE VIOLENCE AGAINST PEACEFUL PROTESTERS OUTSIDE THE TURKISH AMBASSADOR'S RESIDENCE ON MAY 16, 2017, AND CALLING FOR THE PERPETRATORS TO BE BROUGHT TO JUSTICE AND MEASURES TO BE TAKEN TO PREVENT SIMILAR INCIDENTS IN THE FUTURE

Mr. MARKEY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 180

Whereas, on May 16, 2017, President Donald J. Trump hosted President Recep Tayyip Erdogan of Turkey, a longstanding NATO ally, for an official meeting at the White House to discuss counterterrorism cooperation and bilateral issues;

Whereas, on the evening of May 16, 2017, over two dozen protesters gathered outside of the Turkish Ambassador's residence in

Washington, DC, to demonstrate opposition to Turkish government policies;

Whereas after hours of peaceful protest, violence erupted when pro-Erdogan supporters and individuals from the Turkish Embassy grounds pushed past District of Columbia police officers to brutally attack the demonstrators;

Whereas those Turkish officials blatantly suppressed the First Amendment rights of United States citizens, and multiple armed Turkish security officials beat, kicked, and choked unarmed demonstrators;

Whereas multiple video recordings of the violence and reports by the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia and the Department of State confirm that the demonstrators did not instigate the violence;

Whereas at least 11 individuals were seriously injured in the ensuing brawl, with two individuals requiring immediate hospitalization;

Whereas two armed Turkish security officers attached to a security detail were detained at the scene for physically assaulting Federal agents;

Whereas those two Turkish security officers were later released and subsequently allowed to leave the United States because they held Derived Head of State immunity;

Whereas the Department of State did not request that Turkey waive the immunity for these two security officers in order to fully investigate the assault prior to their being released from custody;

Whereas a joint criminal investigation into the incident is ongoing with the combined efforts of the Washington Metropolitan Police Department, the United States Secret Service, and the Department of State Diplomatic Security Service;

Whereas at no point was President Erdogan in danger;

Whereas immunity for diplomatic personnel and certain other foreign officials is a core principle of international law, as is the right to protest peacefully and freely in the United States;

Whereas this is the third instance of violence perpetrated by members of Turkish President Erdogan's security detail in the United States;

Whereas in 2011, a brawl erupted in the halls of the United Nations General Assembly between members of Turkish President Erdogan's security detail and United Nations security officers, resulting in one United Nations security officer being hospitalized due to serious injuries;

Whereas in 2016, members of Turkish President Erdogan's security detail engaged in unwarranted violence against journalists reporting on an event at the Brookings Institution;

Whereas Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said on May 21, 2017, that the violence outside the Turkish Embassy was "outrageous" and "simply unacceptable"; and

Whereas the right to assembly, peaceful protest, and freedom of speech are essential and protected rights in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the rights to peacefully assemble and freely express one's views are essential to the fabric of American democracy;

(2) the Turkish security forces acted in an unprofessional and brutal manner, reflecting poorly on President Erdogan and the Government of Turkey;

(3) any Turkish security officials who directed, oversaw, or participated in efforts by

Turkish security forces to illegally suppress peaceful protests on May 16, 2017, should be charged and prosecuted under United States law;

(4) the United States Secret Service and the Diplomatic Security Service of the Department of State should review this incident and confirm with the Turkish National Police the standards expected by visiting security details to prevent future violent incidents;

(5) the Department of State should immediately request the waiver of immunity of any Turkish security detail official engaged in any assault in the United States prior to release of that individual from custody;

(6) the Department of State should conduct a review of its own security procedures to determine how to mitigate the likelihood of such an event in the future;

(7) the United States respect for free speech requires officials of the United States to speak out against such incidents; and

(8) the United States should take steps to strengthen freedoms for the press and civil society in countries such as Turkey, and combat efforts by foreign leaders to suppress free and peaceful protest in their own countries.

SENATE RESOLUTION 181—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 21 THROUGH MAY 27, 2017, AS “NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK”

Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 181

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services are of vital importance to the health, safety, and well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas the public works infrastructure, facilities, and services could not be provided without the dedicated efforts of public works professionals, including engineers and administrators, who represent State and local governments throughout the United States;

Whereas public works professionals design, build, operate, and maintain the transportation systems, water infrastructure, sewage and refuse disposal systems, public buildings, and other structures and facilities that are vital to the people and communities of the United States; and

Whereas understanding the role that public infrastructure plays in protecting the environment, improving public health and safety, contributing to economic vitality, and enhancing the quality of life of every community of the United States is in the interest of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 21 through May 27, 2017, as “National Public Works Week”;

(2) recognizes and celebrates the important contributions that public works professionals make every day to improve—

(A) the public infrastructure of the United States; and

(B) the communities that public works professionals serve; and

(3) urges individuals and communities throughout the United States to join with representatives of the Federal Government and the American Public Works Association in activities and ceremonies that are designed—

(A) to pay tribute to the public works professionals of the United States; and

(B) to recognize the substantial contributions that public works professionals make to the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 182—DESIGNATING MAY 2017 AS “MELANOMA AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 182

Whereas, as of May 2017, there are nearly 1,000,000 people living with melanoma in the United States;

Whereas over 160,000 people of the United States will be diagnosed with melanoma in 2017;

Whereas melanoma is the second-most commonly diagnosed cancer in young adults; Whereas approximately 90 percent of cases of melanoma can be traced to exposure to ultraviolet rays;

Whereas Congress enacted the Sunscreen Innovation Act (Public Law 113-195) to help bring new, safe sunscreens to the market;

Whereas increasing intermittent sun exposure in childhood and throughout the lifetime of a person is associated with an increased risk of squamous cell carcinoma, basal cell carcinoma, and melanoma;

Whereas 1 blistering sunburn during childhood or adolescence can nearly double the chance that a person develops melanoma later in life, while 5 or more blistering sunburns in late adolescence increases the risk of—

- (1) melanoma by 80 percent; and
- (2) nonmelanoma by 68 percent; and

Whereas research shows that wearing sunscreen and taking other preventive measures can prevent sunburn and reduce the risk of skin cancer and premature aging: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 2017 as “Melanoma Awareness Month”;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of Melanoma Awareness Month;

(3) continues to support research for the prevention, detection, and treatment of, and a cure for, melanoma; and

(4) supports efforts to promote awareness of, and education on, sunsafe behaviors, including the use of sunscreen and sun-protective clothing.

SENATE RESOLUTION 183—RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MAY 2017 AS ASIAN/PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH AND AS AN IMPORTANT TIME TO CELEBRATE THE SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS OF ASIAN AMERICANS AND PACIFIC ISLANDERS TO THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. KAINE, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr.

GARDNER, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. HELLER)) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 183

Whereas the people of the United States join together each May to pay tribute to the contributions of generations of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders who have enriched the history of the United States;

Whereas the history of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in the United States is inextricably tied to the story of the United States;

Whereas the Asian American and Pacific Islander community is a diverse population, comprised of more than 45 distinct ethnicities and more than 100 language dialects;

Whereas, according to the Bureau of the Census, the Asian American population grew at a faster rate than any other racial or ethnic group in the United States during the last decade, surging nearly 46 percent between 2000 and 2010, a growth rate that is 4 times the rate for the total population of the United States;

Whereas, according to the 2010 decennial census, there are approximately 17,300,000 residents of the United States who identify themselves as Asian and approximately 1,200,000 residents of the United States who identify themselves as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, making up approximately 5.5 percent and 0.4 percent, respectively, of the total population of the United States;

Whereas the month of May was selected for Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month because the first immigrants from Japan arrived in the United States on May 7, 1843, and the first transcontinental railroad was completed on May 10, 1869, with substantial contributions from immigrants from China;

Whereas section 102 of title 36, United States Code, officially designates May as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month and requests that the President issue an annual proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities;

Whereas Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, such as Daniel K. Inouye, a Medal of Honor and Presidential Medal of Freedom recipient who, as President Pro Tempore of the Senate, was the highest-ranking Asian American government official in the history of the United States, Dalip Singh Saund, the first Asian American elected to serve in Congress, Patsy T. Mink, the first woman of color and the first Asian American woman to be elected to Congress, Hiram L. Fong, the first Asian American Senator, Daniel K. Akaka, the first Senator of Native Hawaiian ancestry, Norman Y. Mineta, the first Asian American member of a presidential cabinet, Elaine L. Chao, the first Asian American woman member of a presidential cabinet, Mee Moua, the first Hmong American elected to a State legislature, and others, have made significant contributions in both the Government and Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas 2017 marks several important milestones for the Asian American and Pacific Islander community, including—

(1) the 155th anniversary of the date of enactment of the Act of July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. 489, chapter 120), which promoted the construction of the transcontinental railroad;

(2) the 135th anniversary of the date of enactment of the Act entitled “An Act to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to

Chinese", approved May 6, 1882 (22 Stat. 58, chapter 126);

(3) the 105th anniversary of the first planting of a cherry tree from Japan in Washington, DC;

(4) the 75th anniversary of the signing of Executive Order 9066 (7 Fed. Reg. 1407; relating to authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe military areas), which authorized the internment of Japanese-Americans; and

(5) the 25th anniversary of the formal establishment of Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month;

Whereas, in 2017, the Polynesian Voyaging Society will complete the final leg of its Malama Honua Worldwide Voyage after 4 years of sailing the world and teaching traditional wayfinding practices, along with the importance of caring for the land and sea;

Whereas, in 2017, the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, a bicameral caucus of Members of Congress advocating on behalf of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, is composed of 50 Members, including 17 Members of Asian or Pacific Islander descent;

Whereas, in 2017, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are serving in State and territorial legislatures across the United States in record numbers, including in—

(1) the States of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia; and

(2) the territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands;

Whereas the number of Federal judges who are Asian Americans or Pacific Islanders doubled between 2001 and 2008 and more than tripled between 2009 and 2016, reflecting a commitment to diversity in the Federal judiciary that has resulted in the confirmation of high-caliber Asian American and Pacific Islander judicial nominees;

Whereas there remains much to be done to ensure that Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders have access to resources and a voice in the Government of the United States and continue to advance in the political landscape of the United States; and

Whereas celebrating Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month provides the people of the United States with an opportunity to recognize the achievements, contributions, and history of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and to appreciate the challenges faced by Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significance of May 2017 as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month and as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; and

(2) recognizes that the Asian American and Pacific Islander community strengthens, and enhances the rich diversity of, the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 218. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. MORAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 12, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 218. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. MORAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 12, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike Sec. 2.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 25, 2017 at 10 a.m., in 328A Russell Senate Office Building, in order to conduct a hearing entitled "Examining the Farm Economy: Perspectives on Rural America."

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 25, 2017 at 9:30 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on the posture of the Department of the Army in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2018 and the Future Years Defense Program.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate in order to hold a hearing on Thursday, May 25, 2017, at 9:45 a.m. in Room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC, to consider the nominations of Mr. Dan R. Brouillette to be Deputy Secretary of Energy and Mr. Neil Chatterjee and Mr. Robert F. Powelson to be Members of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 25, 2017, at 10 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Proposals for the Department of Treasury and Tax Reform."

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on May 25, 2017 at 9:30 a.m., to hold a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Senate Select Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during

the session of the Senate, on May 25, 2017, following the first floor vote in the Capitol, to conduct an executive business meeting. Agenda is attached.

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Thursday, May 25, 2017 from 2 p.m. in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed Member briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MULTILATERAL INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS, AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC, ENERGY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

The Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy, and Environmental Policy is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 25, 2017 at 2 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Assessing the United Nations Human Rights Council."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 25, 2017, at 9:30 a.m. in order to conduct a hearing entitled, "Stopping the Shipment of Synthetic Opioids: Oversight of U.S. Strategy to Combat Illicit Drugs."

PRIVILEGES

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Katie Wright, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 181, S. Res. 182, and S. Res. 183.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

DIGITAL COAST ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 25, S. 110.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 110) to require the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to establish a constituent-driven program to provide a digital information platform capable of efficiently integrating coastal data with decision-support tools, training, and best practices and to support collection of priority coastal geospatial data to inform and improve local, State, regional, and Federal capacities to manage the coastal region, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 110) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 110

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Digital Coast Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Digital Coast is a model approach for effective Federal partnerships with State and local government, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector.

(2) Access to current, accurate, uniform, and standards-based geospatial information, tools, and training to characterize the United States coastal region is critical for public safety and for the environment, infrastructure, and economy of the United States.

(3) More than half of all people of the United States (153,000,000) currently live on or near a coast and an additional 12,000,000 are expected in the next decade.

(4) Coastal counties in the United States average 300 persons per square mile, compared with the national average of 98.

(5) On a typical day, more than 1,540 permits for construction of single-family homes are issued in coastal counties, combined with other commercial, retail, and institutional construction to support this population.

(6) Over half of the economic productivity of the United States is located within coastal regions.

(7) Highly accurate, high-resolution remote sensing and other geospatial data play an increasingly important role in decision making and management of the coastal zone and economy, including for—

(A) flood and coastal storm surge prediction;

(B) hazard risk and vulnerability assessment;

(C) emergency response and recovery planning;

(D) community resilience to longer range coastal change;

(E) local planning and permitting;

(F) habitat and ecosystem health assessments; and

(G) landscape change detection.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COASTAL REGION.—The term "coastal region" means the area of United States waters extending inland from the shoreline to include coastal watersheds and seaward to the territorial sea.

(2) COASTAL STATE.—The term "coastal State" has the meaning given the term "coastal state" in section 304 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453).

(3) FEDERAL GEOGRAPHIC DATA COMMITTEE.—The term "Federal Geographic Data Committee" means the interagency committee that promotes the coordinated development, use, sharing, and dissemination of geospatial data on a national basis.

(4) REMOTE SENSING AND OTHER GEOSPATIAL.—The term "remote sensing and other geospatial" means collecting, storing, retrieving, or disseminating graphical or digital data depicting natural or manmade physical features, phenomena, or boundaries of the Earth and any information related thereto, including surveys, maps, charts, satellite and airborne remote sensing data, images, LiDAR, and services performed by professionals such as surveyors, photogrammetrists, hydrographers, geodesists, cartographers, and other such services.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DIGITAL COAST.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program for the provision of an enabling platform that integrates geospatial data, decision-support tools, training, and best practices to address coastal management issues and needs. Under the program, the Secretary shall strive to enhance resilient communities, ecosystem values, and coastal economic growth and development by helping communities address their issues, needs, and challenges through cost-effective and participatory solutions.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The program established under paragraph (1) shall be known as the "Digital Coast" (in this section referred to as the "program").

(b) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary shall ensure that the program provides data integration, tool development, training, documentation, dissemination, and archive by—

(1) making data and resulting integrated products developed under this section readily accessible via the Digital Coast Internet website of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the GeoPlatform.gov and data.gov Internet websites, and such other information distribution technologies as the Secretary considers appropriate;

(2) developing decision-support tools that use and display resulting integrated data and provide training on use of such tools;

(3) documenting such data to Federal Geographic Data Committee standards; and

(4) archiving all raw data acquired under this Act at the appropriate National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration data center or such other Federal data center as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate the activities carried out under the program to optimize data collection, sharing and integration, and to minimize duplication by—

(1) consulting with coastal managers and decision makers concerning coastal issues, and sharing information and best practices, as the Secretary considers appropriate, with—

(A) coastal States;

(B) local governments; and

(C) representatives of academia, the private sector, and nongovernmental organizations;

(2) consulting with other Federal agencies, including interagency committees, on relevant Federal activities, including activities carried out under the Ocean and Coastal Mapping Integration Act (33 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.), the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 (33 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.), and the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998 (33 U.S.C. 892 et seq.);

(3) participating, pursuant to section 216 of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347; 44 U.S.C. 3501 note), in the establishment of such standards and common protocols as the Secretary considers necessary to assure the interoperability of remote sensing and other geospatial data with all users of such information within—

(A) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(B) other Federal agencies;

(C) State and local government; and

(D) the private sector;

(4) coordinating with, seeking assistance and cooperation of, and providing liaison to the Federal Geographic Data Committee pursuant to Office of Management and Budget Circular A-16 and Executive Order 12906 of April 11, 1994 (59 Fed. Reg. 17671), as amended by Executive Order 13286 of February 28, 2003 (68 Fed. Reg. 10619); and

(5) developing and maintaining a best practices document that sets out the best practices used by the Secretary in carrying out the program and providing such document to the United States Geological Survey, the Corps of Engineers, and other relevant Federal agencies.

(d) FILLING NEEDS AND GAPS.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary shall—

(1) maximize the use of remote sensing and other geospatial data collection activities conducted for other purposes and under other authorities;

(2) focus on filling data needs and gaps for coastal management issues, including with respect to areas that, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, were underserved by coastal data and the areas of the Arctic that are under the jurisdiction of the United States;

(3) pursuant to the Ocean and Coastal Mapping Integration Act (33 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.), support continue improvement in existing efforts to coordinate the acquisition and integration of key data sets needed for coastal management and other purposes, including—

(A) coastal elevation data;

(B) land use and land cover data;

(C) socioeconomic and human use data;

(D) critical infrastructure data;

(E) structures data;

(F) living resources and habitat data;

(G) cadastral data; and

(H) aerial imagery; and

(4) integrate the priority supporting data set forth under paragraph (3) with other available data for the benefit of the broadest measure of coastal resource management constituents and applications.

(e) FINANCIAL AGREEMENTS AND CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary—

(A) may enter into financial agreements to carry out the program, including—

(i) support to non-Federal entities that participate in implementing the program; and

(ii) grants, cooperative agreements, inter-agency agreements, contracts, or any other agreement on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis, with other Federal, tribal, State, and local governmental and non-governmental entities; and

(B) may, to the maximum extent practicable, enter into such contracts with private sector entities for such products and services as the Secretary determines may be necessary to collect, process, and provide remote sensing and other geospatial data and products for purposes of the program.

(2) FEES.—

(A) **ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION.**—The Secretary may assess and collect fees for the conduct of any training, workshop, or conference that advances the purposes of the program.

(B) **AMOUNTS.**—The amount of a fee under this paragraph may not exceed the sum of costs incurred, or expected to be incurred, by the Secretary as a direct result of the conduct of the training, workshop, or conference, including for subsistence expenses incidental to the training, workshop, or conference, as applicable.

(C) **USE OF FEES.**—Amounts collected by the Secretary in the form of fees under this paragraph may be used to pay for—

(i) the costs incurred for conducting an activity described in subparagraph (A); or

(ii) the expenses described in subparagraph (B).

(3) **SURVEY AND MAPPING.**—Contracts entered into under paragraph (1)(B) shall be considered “surveying and mapping” services as such term is used in and as such contracts are awarded by the Secretary in accordance with the selection procedures in chapter 11 of title 40, United States Code.

(f) **OCEAN ECONOMY.**—The Secretary may establish publicly available tools that track ocean and Great Lakes economy data for each coastal State.

(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$4,000,000 for each fiscal year 2018 through 2022 to carry out the program.

SILVER STAR SERVICE BANNER DAY ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 917 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 917) to amend title 36, United States Code, to designate May 1 as “Silver Star Service Banner Day.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 917) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 917

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Silver Star Service Banner Day Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Congress has always honored the sacrifices made by the wounded and ill members of the Armed Forces.

(2) The Silver Star Service Banner has come to represent the members of the Armed Forces and veterans who were wounded or became ill in combat in the wars fought by the United States.

(3) The Silver Star Families of America was formed to help the people of the United States remember the sacrifices made by the wounded and ill members of the Armed Forces by designing and manufacturing Silver Star Service Banners and Silver Star Flags for that purpose.

(4) The sole mission of the Silver Star Families of America is to evoke memories of the sacrifices made by members of the Armed Forces and veterans on behalf of the United States through the presence of a Silver Star Service Banner in a window or a Silver Star Flag flying.

(5) The sacrifices made by members of the Armed Forces and veterans on behalf of the United States should never be forgotten.

(6) May 1 is an appropriate date to designate as “Silver Star Service Banner Day”.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 146. Silver Star Service Banner Day

“(a) **DESIGNATION.**—May 1 is Silver Star Service Banner Day.

“(b) **PROCLAMATION.**—The President is requested to issue each year a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe Silver Star Service Banner Day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 145 the following:

“146. Silver Star Service Banner Day.”.

FOLLOW THE RULES ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 657 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 657) to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain protections against prohibited personnel practices, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 657) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 26, 2017, THROUGH MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn, to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted, on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, May 26, at 8:45 a.m.; Tuesday, May 30, at 7 a.m.; and Friday, June 2, at 9 a.m. I further ask that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, June 2, it next convene at 3 p.m., Monday, June 5; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 107, S. Res. 176, as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 8:45 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:23 p.m., adjourned until Friday, May 26, 2017, at 8:45 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ROBERT R. HOOD, OF GEORGIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE STEPHEN C. HEDGER.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

RICHARD ASHOOH, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, VICE KEVIN WOLF, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

J. PAUL COMPTON, JR., OF ALABAMA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE HELEN R. KANOVSKY, RESIGNED.

NEAL J. RACKLEFF, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE MERCEDES MARQUEZ.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

KAREN DUNN KELLEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, VICE MARK DOMS, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DAVID S. JONAS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE STEVEN CROLEY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

GILBERT B. KAPLAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE, VICE STEFAN M. SELIG, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHAEL ARTHUR RAYNOR, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ETHIOPIA.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

BRETT GIROIR, OF TEXAS, TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTOR IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, SUBJECT TO THE QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS, AND TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE HOWARD K. KOH, RESIGNED.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

HEATHER L. MACDOUGALL, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 27, 2023. (REAPPOINTMENT)

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) BRET C. BATCHELDER

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CALLISTA L. GINGRICH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE HOLY SEE.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

GEORGE NESTERCZUK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE KATHERINE ARCHULETA, RESIGNED.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 25, 2017:

THE JUDICIARY

AMUL R. THAPAR, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT.

For a complete list of nominations confirmed on May 25, 2017, see pages 8649–8651 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated June 5, 2017.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on May 25, 2017 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

JAMES DONOVAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE SARAH BLOOM RASKIN, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MAY 16, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 25, 2017

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

The Members of this people's House will be leaving for the Memorial Day recess. As they meet with their respective constituents, give them the gifts of wisdom and discernment, that in their words and actions they will do justice, love with mercy, and walk humbly with You. May they also have the attentiveness that is called for to hear the concerns of those whom they represent.

On this weekend especially, we remember those men and women who have given their lives in service to our country. Bless them with everlasting peace and give consolation and peace to those who mourn them.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. OLSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

FIGHT ON, KATIE VACEK

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, for 8½ years I have worked for the best people

in America, the people of Texas 22. The people of Texas 22 love their neighbors. They love their community, they love life, and they love God.

Texas 22 is Katie Vacek. Katie is a senior at Needville High School. Three months before using her Blue Jay wings to fly into her future, God gave her a different flight. She fell out of a tree with her boyfriend, Kernie, watching. She is now paralyzed from the waist down.

Kernie, her classmates, and the whole town rallied around Katie and her dreams. Twelve days ago, at her prom with Kernie, she danced.

Katie, I don't want to come between you and Kernie, but I want you to be my date the next time President Trump speaks in this Chamber in February of next year. We will lock this down at the Knights of Columbus on June 6 back home. Keep fighting, knowing that God is with you always.

BUDGET CUTS TO EDUCATION

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the budget released by President Trump. It is cruel and shortsighted in the extreme: cutting essential investments driving job creation, protecting our environment, funding breakthrough cures, and providing a safety net for the neediest among us.

Among the most objectionable are the President's cuts to education. Funds used for college work-study programs, loan forgiveness for those who enter public service, and dollars used by schools for mental health will not just be cut but be eliminated. For example, 21st century community learning centers, which offer learning opportunities during nonschool hours for those from our neediest communities, would be completely eliminated.

We know these programs work. An evaluation showed program participation improved math and English grades by 30 to 40 percent. In my district, Waukegan Community School District Number 60 uses these funds to offer an extended day program at seven schools to increase academic achievement and build life skills.

Mr. Speaker, this budget irresponsibly mortgages our future by short-changing our children. I urge my colleagues to reject this budget. Let's work together to chart a path that ensures our Nation's prosperity.

NATIONAL EMS WEEK

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week we observe National EMS Week to celebrate, unify, and inspire the men and women of our Nation's emergency medical services. The theme this year is Always in Service, which recognizes our EMS professionals and their constant service to communities throughout this nation.

From a young age, children are taught that, in a moment of crisis, they call 911. From illness to injury, whenever the world seems to be ending, society counts on EMS personnel to be there. They are expected to work hard and be strong, especially in times of trouble.

Mr. Speaker, as a volunteer firefighter, EMT, and a rescue technician with more than three decades of experience being on the front lines with these EMS professionals, I can personally attest to their dedication to saving lives.

The job of an EMS professional is not easy. It requires just as much compassion as it does courage. These men and women are committed to making the world better, so I say thank you. Thank you to the EMTs, paramedics, dispatchers, and supervisors across the country. Thank you for serving. Happy National EMS Week.

CBO SCORE OF TRUMPCARE PAINTS A DIRE PICTURE

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, the new American Health Care Act CBO score released yesterday reinforces that this bill is devastating to the American people: 14 million more will be uninsured within just one year, and 23 million more will be uninsured over a decade.

This analysis paints a dire picture. It confirms that TrumpCare will shift the burden of costs onto our seniors, millions of hardworking families, and patients with preexisting conditions. Those hit hardest are exactly the people who need care the most, all while giving tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires.

What is more, this analysis debunks the gimmicks Republican leaders tried to sell us, saying the bill would do no

harm to those with preexisting illnesses. In fact, patients with preexisting conditions will have less coverage, be forced to pay more, and even be priced out of the market, just as we expected.

This is far too great a toll on the American people, and we must do better.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SYRACUSE POLICE CAPTAIN RICHARD WALSH

(Mr. KATKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a dear friend and former colleague, longtime Syracuse Police Captain Richard Walsh. For nearly 20 years, I served as a Federal prosecutor in central New York. During much of this time, I had the distinct privilege of working alongside Captain Walsh and witnessed firsthand his commitment to serving the city of Syracuse.

Captain Walsh joined the Syracuse Police Department in 1970, rising to the rank of captain of detectives. He led a very successful and distinguished career, retiring in 2011 after 41 years on the job. On the day of his retirement, Captain Walsh was named the grand marshal of the Syracuse St. Patrick's Day parade, a mark of high distinction for any central New Yorker.

In addition to his diligent efforts to keep our community safe, Captain Walsh volunteered countless hours to many community organizations, including Hunger Project, Huntington Family Center, and the Rape Crisis Center. Eternally proud of his Irish heritage and roots in Tipperary Hill, he devoted many hours to the Syracuse Irish Festival, was a founding member of the St. Patrick's Day parade committee, and served as president of the Onondaga County Ancient Order of Hibernians.

Captain Richard Walsh was the true definition of a public servant. He loved his work, he had the utmost respect of his colleagues and community, and he was relentless in his efforts to make central New York a safer and a better place. His kindness and generosity will forever be remembered. May Captain Richard Walsh's name and legacy forever be remembered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Rest peacefully, my friend.

GLOBAL WEEK OF ACTION ON HUNGER AND FAMINE

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a call of action to make sure that the country recognizes that we have got to focus on and talk about the

more than 20 million people at risk of famine in South Sudan, Somalia, Yemen, and northeast Nigeria.

This is a humanitarian crisis. Starving children and families are crying out for our help. Right now, 1.4 million children are acutely malnourished and at risk of death. Worldwide, an additional 50 million people are severely hungry, surviving day to day on only what they can find.

The United Nations is calling this the largest humanitarian crisis that has faced the world since the organization was founded in 1945. Mr. Speaker, we can end this crisis if we just find the political will. That is why I am joining my colleagues in Congress and humanitarian and faith leaders around the country to mark a Global Week of Action on Hunger and Famine.

Earlier this month, we were successful in securing an additional \$990 million for famine relief in the fiscal year 2017 spending bill, thanks to a bipartisan coalition of Members and our passionate grassroots organizations. But this is not enough. The United Nations needs \$4.4 billion by July to avert catastrophe. We need other countries to step up to the plate, and we must absolutely preserve our commitment to addressing famine.

We cannot allow the Trump administration's proposed budget, which would decimate food aid, to be enacted.

MEANINGFUL REFORMS FOR THE VA

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note the veterans' bills passed by the House of Representatives this week. Amongst the legislation are bills to provide veterans with a cost-of-living adjustment for disability compensation, create a pilot program to explore magnetic resonant therapy as treatment for veterans with mental health conditions, and streamline the disability claims process at the VA, amongst other legislation.

I would like to specifically highlight the VA Scheduling Accountability Act. A 2014 investigation found that no less than 40 veterans died while on unauthorized waiting lists, waiting to receive care that they never got. This is completely unacceptable. This legislation puts into place measures to ensure every facility is in compliance with VA scheduling policies and will withhold any awards or bonuses from any centers who fail to certify their compliance.

Together with our new VA Secretary David Shulkin, whom we met with this week, I am confident that we will continue to create meaningful reforms for the VA. As we head into the Memorial Day weekend, this is just one way we

can honor veterans and those who have fallen for us.

HONORING HENRI TERMEER

(Mr. MOULTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to honor a constituent, a friend, and a beloved member of our community, Henri Termeer. Henri was a resident of my hometown in Massachusetts and the retired CEO of Genzyme, the biotech firm credited with launching the Boston biotech revolution that now leads the globe.

Henri has been described as the epitome of a renaissance man, and he embodied the nexus of business, culture, and civic responsibility. He also left a lasting imprint on those he loved. His 16-year-old daughter, Adriana, referred to him as the giving tree because of the seemingly endless energy he devoted to the causes he believed in and the lives he touched.

At dinner the night he passed away, Henri said to his guests: We are getting older and running out of runway here. We need new leaders now.

Mr. Speaker, we would all do well to aspire to be the kind of thoughtful, passionate, and impactful leader Henri was. He saved countless lives, yet he was known for his modesty. Henri was one of the kindest men I have ever known, and we will miss him.

WELCOME TO ROLLING THUNDER

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome the veterans from Rolling Thunder to Washington for their Memorial Day events. Veterans like Gus Dante of Branchburg, New Jersey, serve on Rolling Thunder's national board, and every year he and others help organize events here in Washington to commemorate those brave Americans lost in war.

For 30 years, Rolling Thunder's voices and motorcycles have been roaring in Washington, and lawmakers and the new administration are listening. Veterans' issues are front and center in the Halls of Congress, and Secretary Shulkin is reforming the Veterans Administration to restore the trust Rolling Thunder and all veterans demand.

We must keep up the fight for the rights and benefits veterans have earned in the service to the Nation. I am proud to join with Rolling Thunder in introducing two important measures: legislation to end the 40-mile rule for private care through the VA and legislation to display the POW/MIA flag on Federal properties.

Mr. Speaker, on this commemorative Memorial Day weekend, let us all recall those who answered the call of

service, especially those who did not return home.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S BUDGET

(Mr. JEFFRIES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, the Trump budget is a disaster for the very people who the President claims he wants to assist. It is reckless, reprehensible, and regressive.

The Trump budget balances itself on the backs of working families, middle class folks, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, the afflicted, and rural America. The Trump budget fails to invest in education and job training, it fails to invest in transportation and infrastructure, and it fails to invest in research and development. Instead, the Trump budget would cut Head Start, cut Medicaid, cut assistance to nursing homes, and it even cuts Meals on Wheels.

This is all being done simply to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy and the well-off—lifestyles of the rich and shameless. The Trump budget is a disaster, and we are going to do everything possible to vote it down.

PROTECTING YOUNG VICTIMS FROM SEXUAL ABUSE ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1973.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANCE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 352 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1973.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0918

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1973) to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes, with Mr. POLIQUIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from

Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, we are able to continue our efforts in protecting children by passing legislation to protect young athletes from abuse. The country was shocked at the revelations in recent years concerning the ongoing abuse endured by young athletes at the hands of their coaches and trainers in USA Gymnastics and USA Swimming. These children were betrayed by people they trusted, by people they looked up to, and by people who had a duty to protect them.

That is why I am pleased to be on the floor here today in support of the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act. This bill imposes a requirement to report child abuse for those authorized by U.S. sport national governing bodies, such as USA Gymnastics and USA Swimming, to work with minor athletes or members of these governing bodies.

As is the case with existing Federal mandatory reporting requirements, these individuals will be required to make a prompt report to law enforcement when they learn of facts that give reason to suspect that a child has suffered an incident of child abuse. This provision will ensure that the malfeasance on the part of national governing bodies, like USA Gymnastics, in failing to report allegations of abuse to law enforcement, never occurs again.

The bill further strengthens existing civil remedies for victims of sexual abuse who wish to seek civil damages from their abusers. The bill clarifies that once a victim has established a harm occurred, the court will presume damages of \$150,000. It relaxes the statute of limitations for victims. The 10-year period will now begin when the victim reasonably discovers the violation or harm, not when it accrues. It also extends the statute of limitations to 10 years after a legal disability is lifted. In other words, minors who are victims will have 10 years from the time they reach adulthood to file.

Finally, the bill expands the authority of the national governing bodies to develop practices, policies, and procedures to prevent sexual abuse, and clarifies the duties of the bodies in developing these practices.

Sports have always been a central aspect of American life. Sports teach our children about focus, teamwork, and leadership, and we should encourage our children to participate, to be a part of healthy competition; but, in doing so, we need to assure we keep these competitive atmospheres safe.

I am pleased to see that the U.S. Olympic Committee has helped to establish a new organization called the Center for Safe Sport, to prevent and

respond to emotional, physical, and sexual abuse of young athletes.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) for introducing this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1973, the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act, for several reasons.

Most importantly, this is a reasonable bill and is intended to help protect young athletes from abuse and preserve the sanctity of sports associated with the U.S. Olympic Committee, the organization responsible for preparing and training young athletes who might one day represent their country competitively all over the world.

Children deserve to fully enjoy the innocence of their youth—by exploring the curiosities of the world, taking pleasure in the arts, and participating in sports—free from hurt, harm, or danger.

Involvement in sports, and instruction and guidance from adult coaches, can positively influence a young person's growth and development, as well as his or her potential for future success into adulthood.

The sexual abuse of children and youth is intolerable in any text, and we must take appropriate measures to eliminate it from youth sports. Such exploitation betrays and harms young people, sometimes severely and irreparably.

Young people look to adults to protect them and keep them safe. We all have a responsibility to do so.

With H.R. 1973, we have an opportunity to ensure that individuals abide by this duty. Existing Federal law requires certain professionals, such as doctors, dentists, social workers, psychologists, teachers, and daycare workers, who regularly interact with children, to report suspected abuse to law enforcement.

While our discussion of this legislation today may focus primarily on sexual abuse, H.R. 1973 will require adults who interact with young athletes, in connection to national governing bodies of various sports, to report suspected abuse of any kind.

The need for this legislation is best illustrated by an ongoing scandal of widespread abuse and exploitation of young gymnasts over the course of 20 years within USA Gymnastics, a prominent governing body of the U.S. Olympic Committee.

Many complaints of sexual and emotional abuse went unreported, allowing coaches, instructors, and doctors to repeatedly victimize gymnasts as young as 6 years old. The shocking failure of anyone to report accusations through law enforcement, or even keep track of

complaints internally, made it possible for some of these predators to commit horrific acts at several gyms in several states.

For example, a cloud of allegations of abuse surrounded one particular physician in Michigan going back as far as 1997. Regrettably, allegations against him were not reported to law enforcement until recently. Following the first public complaint against him in 2015, more than 100 women have filed complaints accusing him of sexual abuse, and he now faces more than 20 criminal charges in both Federal and State courts.

While the USA Gymnastics scandal is unfortunate, let it be an example and incentive to prevent such pervasive abuse elsewhere.

Accordingly, I encourage my colleagues to join me and my chairman in supporting this important legislation.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1973, Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act.

Since my time as U.S. attorney in the Southern District of Indiana, I have been committed to battling child exploitation and abuse.

Last year, I was shocked, along with much of the country, when The Indianapolis Star published an investigative piece that exposed troubling allegations of sexual abuse at USA Gymnastics programs across the country.

According to their report, over the last 20 years, at least 368 young people, most Olympic hopefuls, were the victims of sexual abuse at the hands they trusted—coaches, trainers, doctors, and other adults associated with USA Gymnastics. They reported the abuse to USA Gymnastics, but, unfortunately, USA Gymnastics failed, in many cases, to report those allegations of abuse to law enforcement authorities.

The article shed light on their stories and inspired the legislation that is before us today. According to more than 5,600 pages of USA Gymnastics records, released by The Indy Star, some of the 54 coaches, who had been accused of sexual abuse by young athletes in their care, weren't banned from gymnastics until years after their history of abuse had been reported to and kept in complaint files by USA Gymnastics.

One USA Gymnastics doctor already referenced, Dr. Nassar, stands accused of having abused young women and girls for more than 20 years. More than 100 women have come forward today to share their stories of abuse at his hands.

I understand how challenging it is to share painful stories of sexual abuse, and I am proud of these brave gym-

nasts who shared their stories: stories that never should have happened, and stories that went inexcusably unanswered.

Their stories demand our action and our attention, not only to provide victims with the justice denied to them for so long but also to protect future generations of Olympic hopefuls.

I want to acknowledge the work of Senator FEINSTEIN of California, who is leading this bill in the Senate, and my colleagues in the bipartisan Women's Caucus, specifically Representative FRANKEL of Florida. I want to commend the chair and the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, and other members of the committee, for taking the lead in protecting young victims from sexual abuse. Our legislation is an important step forward toward protecting these young athletes.

It addresses that dangerous silence that, as The Indy Star investigative piece showed, plagued USA Gymnastics and other governing bodies of our Olympic sports—a silence that led to more girls being abused, hurt, and harmful coaches, and others, who faced little or no repercussions for their heinous actions.

The abuse should have been, first and foremost, prevented. The system utterly failed when the abuse was not detected and not promptly reported. The U.S. Olympic Committee failed and must do better, and I commend them for their work now in working to do better.

□ 0930

Our bill makes sure that national governing bodies entrusted with the health and well-being of athletes and future Olympians promptly report allegations of sexual abuse and other abuse to law enforcement authorities and implement much stronger policies and procedures to prevent this from happening again.

Most importantly, I want to applaud the victims who shared their story to protect others. I really thank them for their courage and for changing the lives of not only young athletes today, but those in the future.

I urge passage of the bill, and at this time, I thank the chairman and, again, the ranking member for their leadership.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Today, I rise as the proud cosponsor of this important legislation with my friend and colleague from Indiana, SUSAN BROOKS. I want to thank her for her work on this, the Judiciary leadership, and, of course, Senator DIANE FEINSTEIN.

Mr. Chair, imagine you are a 10-year-old girl and you have a dream. Your dream is to stand on the podium at a

summer Olympics with a medal around your neck, and you are saluting the American flag. You are willing to do a lot for that. You are willing to give up all the kinds of things that little girls like to do in their youth. You are willing to spend hours practicing your skills, to get bumps and bruises, but it doesn't stop you. Your parents trust your dream to a coach you call "Grandpa."

Here is the thing: Your dream becomes a nightmare. The Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act comes after devastating reports that at least 368 gymnasts have been sexually abused by their coaches and trainers over the course of 20 years. It is almost unimaginable.

Although USA Gymnastics received allegations of abuse, they turned a blind eye. Why? Because it was more important to them to win medals and protect their star coaches.

We have read and heard lots of stories. I am going to give you an example of one, while trying to protect the confidentiality.

By the time she was in seventh grade, our gymnast has developed an eating disorder, coping with the fact that the coach she called Grandpa made her hate her body. By the time she got to college, she had difficulty maintaining relationships, believing that she would never like being touched or physically embraced by others.

Here is a postscript. Over more than a decade, the coach we call Grandpa was able to move from gym to gym abusing girls and recording videos of them. He installed secret cameras in changing rooms and recorded 469 videos of gymnasts, many of whom were naked.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chair, to continue this, we have to ask this question: Could these young girls have been spared this trauma had proper procedures been in place? And, of course, today our answer is, hopefully, yes.

This legislation is a step in a long journey to change the culture around sexual abuse. Too often institutions, whether they are our colleges, our military, or, here, in this case, an athletic organization, prioritize preserving their reputations and their brands over the people they protect.

This legislation will require national sports bodies like USA Gymnastics to file reports of abuse as soon as possible. It will establish mandatory training and require the enforcement of policies preventing, reporting, and addressing these kinds of allegations because protecting our athletes must be a priority. Let their dreams come true.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to express my admiration and deep appreciation for the gentlewoman from Indiana for her leadership on this most important bill.

This gives us a chance to do something, which is to give a voice to those victims who have suffered in silence and yet had the courage to come forward and allow others to appreciate the depth of the impact that they have suffered, as well as an opportunity for us to assure that this kind of pattern doesn't repeat itself again.

We know it is a pattern because we have, as has been aptly demonstrated by the speakers before me, stories of young women who have been victimized because they enter a trusting relationship—one between a coach and a person in which that power dynamic is so unique, the young person putting their future in the hands—which is exploited by that person superior in the relationship.

So we now have chance to assure that that trust is not further impacted. But it is not just that relationship; it is the long-term implications of it which are so damaging.

Working with the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape, we have come to appreciate victims and how the psychological impacts, including things like substance abuse and other kinds of psychological disorders, last for years, and by the courage of coming forward, it does not necessarily end that impact on them.

In fact, it is not just situations like coach and athlete. All kinds of trusting relationships can create a dynamic—one including something that I am currently working on, massage parlors—in which individuals who put themselves in a compromising position find themselves assaulted.

Most recently, I introduced the Duty to Report Act, addressing that kind of a violation of that trusting relationship.

These are examples of opportunities for us to address, once and for all, the implications of people who are allowed to move from one situation to another when reports come forward and stop. We call that pass the trash.

Today, it is time for our body to put forward the kind of legislation that will assure that there is a duty to report so, along with due process, there can be an internal investigation to assure and reporting requirements so that these individuals are not able to victimize future young athletes, future people who put themselves in the position of trust.

Mr. Chair, I applaud my colleagues who support this legislation, and I ask that we do so with a strong voice from this House.

The CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PAULSEN) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1238. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

PROTECTING YOUNG VICTIMS FROM SEXUAL ABUSE ACT OF 2017

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1973, which aims to strengthen protections against child victims of sexual abuse.

I am a parent. In fact, today, with me, I have my son, Hudson, and one of my daughters, Ava.

Sadly, over the course of the past couple of years, countless stories of young athletes being abused, including in Indiana, have revealed glaring inadequacies in our law. These stories, many about coaches and doctors and trainers and other adults who have abused their positions of authority and trust to exploit young athletes, are appalling and, as a parent, gut wrenching. Every one of these kids deserved better.

This bill aims to ensure that acts of suspected child abuse are promptly reported to an organization's national governing body to make sure that these cases are immediately disclosed to local or Federal law enforcement authorities. Short of this requirement being codified into law, predatory individuals can continue perpetrating horrific crimes against young athletes with relative impunity.

In addition, this bill requires national governing bodies to develop specific policies and procedures for reporting sexual abuse cases to law enforcement and to keep track of individuals who leave one facility due to complaints and then go to another facility to repeat that abuse elsewhere.

I want to thank my colleague from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) for her impor-

tant work on this legislation—she is my kids' second favorite Member of Congress—and for her hard work on this important bill to protect kids all across America from abuse.

I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member on the prime subcommittee on the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding.

I thank the chairman of this committee and the manager of this bill, and, particularly, I want to express my appreciation to the bipartisan co-sponsors of this legislation—the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL)—for coming together around a concept of continuing to work to protect our children; and where we can find bipartisanship, that is really very special as relates to the message to the American people.

The Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act requires that personnel and employees of national governing bodies recognized by the U.S. Olympic Committee report suspected incidents of child abuse, including sexual abuse, to law enforcement. The importance of this is to cease, end, stop, never have it again for those victims—never report or hold it for years and years—who are impacted psychologically and impacted for the rest of their life. Really, that is what has been happening in years past.

This bill is intended to protect young athletes who, with great expectation and excitement and challenge and wonderment and aspirations for the Olympics, in their early years, desire to serve their Nation; because when they put their bodies through this rigorous engagement in sport day after day, week after week, month after month, hour after hour, minute after minute, second after second, and deny themselves other extracurricular activities, they do it for the passion of the sport, for their recognition of excellence, but also to go to the Olympics and make their Nation proud.

□ 0945

And so what we have put them through with respect to not protecting them against sexual assaults severely undermines, again, and irreparably harms them. With H.R. 1973, we have an opportunity to ensure that that never happens again.

The need for this legislation is best illustrated by the ongoing scandal of widespread abuse and exploitation of young gymnasts over the course of 20 years within USA Gymnastics—a prominent governing body of the U.S. Olympic Committee—in particular, by

a physician starting back in 1997 who engaged in such activities.

Allegations against him were not reported to law enforcement until recently; and following the first public complaint against him in 2015, more than 100 women filed complaints accusing him of sexual abuse, and he now faces more than 20 criminal charges in Federal and State courts.

Again, this legislation is to turn the light on those who have quietly abused these young men and women and, as well, done it with impunity because no vehicle was provided for these young people to be able to ensure that they would not be assaulted again.

The integrity that we bring to this process with this legislation, the comfort that we give to families and parents when they entrust their children to those who are coaches, doctors, leaders of teams, sponsors of teams is vitally important. And the protections of this bill, of reporting and ensuring that the light continues to stay on and the darkness never comes for that young athlete who seeks that golden platform or that first place or second place or third place, or even to participate, that they can do it with the affirmation that the Nation believes in their protection and their security and that they should never, never, never face this alone.

I rise to support the legislation, H.R. 1973, and I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to first express my thanks and appreciation as well to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), who is bringing this legislation forward, H.R. 1973, of which I am a proud cosponsor. The bill is the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act.

Every year, Mr. Chair, thousands of amateur athletes begin their journey with the goal of one day being able to represent the United States at the Olympics. This journey is often filled with years of dedication, of sacrifice, of multiple setbacks, all in the hopes of rising to the top of their craft.

Unfortunately, for some, this journey has also been scarred by sexual abuse, and often this abuse comes from those who are closest to our young athletes. These are the individuals that have been entrusted by families all around the country to look after them, to take care of them, to look after these loved ones during their training.

The bill today in the House that we are taking up is a step in the right direction to help ensure that athletes are better protected. It requires mandatory and immediate reporting of incidents of child sexual abuse to both local and Federal law enforcement. No organiza-

tion should be able to stand idly by when a child is placed in harm's way and becomes a victim.

The bill also directs our amateur athletic governing bodies to develop and implement rigorous training and oversight practices to prevent abuse of athletes in the future. Mr. Chair, our amateur athletes and their families should never ever have to worry about their children being abused by those who are closest to them, often in a very trusted relationship.

We need to pass this critical legislation to give families the peace of mind and prevent abuse. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, let me close by saying that protecting young victims from sexual abuse is a necessary measure that will help ensure that young athletes in this country are able to pursue their athletic dreams in a safe environment and free of exploitation and abuse.

This bill imposes an affirmative duty on coaches, trainers, instructors, doctors, and the like to protect the young athletes who have been entrusted to their tutelage. This bill establishes remedies for those who might be harmed, and this bill mandates training and oversight to encourage compliance, vigilance, and protection.

I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for facilitating the prompt consideration of this bill, and the Judiciary Committee. I also want to recognize the leadership of Senator FEINSTEIN, the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, who authored the Senate version of this bill and who has been the leading voice in Congress in demanding we address these issues.

Finally, I note that this important bipartisan legislation is supported by many advocacy groups including the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children; the National Children's Alliance; the National Center for Victims of Crime; Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network; and the United States Olympic Committee, as well as several of its national governing bodies.

For the foregoing reasons, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1973, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and all of those who have spoken in support of this bill this morning, the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act.

It is exactly as it has been described. It is an important moment for us, in a bipartisan consensus that we have reached, to protect our young athletes. It has been articulated well, the purpose behind the bill, and it is a proud moment for all of us as we stand for these young athletes to defend them as

they perform and use their God-given talents that make our Nation so proud.

So, without belaboring the point, Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend, again, Mrs. BROOKS for introducing this important legislation, and I also urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1973—Protecting Young Victims From Sexual Abuse Act.

Since my time as a US Attorney and federal prosecutor, I have been committed to battling child exploitation and abuse.

Last year, I was shocked—along with much of the country—when the Indianapolis Star published an investigative piece that exposed troubling allegations of sexual abuse at USA Gymnastics programs across the country.

According to their report, over the last 20 years, at least 368 young people—some Olympic hopefuls—were the victims of sexual abuse at the hands of adults they trusted—coaches, trainers, doctors and other adults associated with USA Gymnastics. They reported the abuse to USA Gymnastics—and unfortunately, USA Gymnastics failed, in many cases, to report their abuse to law enforcement authorities.

The article shed light on their stories and inspired the legislation that is before us today. According to the more than 5,600 pages of USA Gymnastics records released by the Indy Star, some of the 54 coaches who had been accused of sexual abuse by young athletes in their care weren't banned from gymnastics until years after their history of abuse had been reported to and kept in complaint files by USA Gymnastics.

One USA Gymnastics doctor, Dr. Nassar—abused young women and girls for more than 20 years, and more than 100 women have come forward today to share their stories of abuse at his hands.

I understand how challenging it is to share painful stories of sexual abuse, and I am proud of the brave gymnasts who have shared their stories. Stories that should never have happened, and stories that went inexcusably unanswered.

Their stories demand our attention and action.

Not only to provide victims with the justice denied to them for so long, but also to protect future generations of Olympic hopefuls.

I want to acknowledge the work of Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN of California who is leading this bill in the Senate, and my colleagues in the Bipartisan Women's Caucus who joined me to offer the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act. Our legislation is an important step towards protecting our young athletes.

Our legislation addresses this dangerous silence that, as the Indy Star investigative piece showed, plagued the USA Gymnastics. A silence that led to more girls being abused, hurt, and harmful coaches who faced little to no repercussions for their heinous actions.

The abuse should have been first and foremost, prevented. The system utterly failed when the abuse was not detected, and not promptly reported. The Olympic community failed and must do better.

Our bill makes sure that national governing bodies entrusted with the health and well-being of young athletes and future Olympians promptly report any allegations of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities and implement stronger policies and procedures to prevent this from happening again.

I applaud SENATOR FEINSTEIN and my colleagues in the House who joined the effort to move this important legislation forward, and applaud the victims who shared their story to protect others.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired. Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-20. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1973

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. REQUIRED REPORTING OF CHILD AND SEXUAL ABUSE AT FACILITIES UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF AMATEUR SPORTS ORGANIZATIONS RECOGNIZED BY THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE.

(a) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—Section 226 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13031) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “A person who” and inserting the following:

“(1) **COVERED PROFESSIONALS.**—A person who”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **COVERED INDIVIDUALS.**—A covered individual who learns of facts that give reason to suspect that a child has suffered an incident of child abuse shall as soon as possible make a report of the suspected abuse to the agency designated by the Attorney General under subsection (d).”;

(2) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “subsection (a)” and inserting “subsection (a)(1)”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (7), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) the term ‘covered facility’ means a facility over which a national governing body has jurisdiction;

“(10) the term ‘covered individual’ means an adult who is authorized by a covered facility or by a national governing body to interact with a minor or amateur athlete at the covered facility or at any event sanctioned by the covered facility; and

“(11) the term ‘national governing body’ has the meaning given the term in section 220501(b) of title 36, United States Code.”;

(4) in subsection (d), in the first sentence, by inserting “and for all covered facilities” after “reside”;

(5) in subsection (f), in the first sentence—

(A) by striking “and on all” and inserting “on all”; and

(B) by inserting “and for all covered facilities,” after “lands,”;

(6) in subsection (h), by inserting “and all covered individuals,” after “facilities,”; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require a victim of child abuse to self-report the abuse.”.

(b) **PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO REPORT.**—Section 2258 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after “facility,” the following: “or a covered individual (as described in subsection (a)(2) of such section 226) who”.

SEC. 3. CIVIL REMEDY FOR PERSONAL INJURIES.

Section 2255 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Any person who, while a minor, was a victim of a violation of section 1589, 1590, 1591, 2241(c), 2242, 2243, 2251, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, 2260, 2421, 2422, or 2423 of this title and who suffers personal injury as a result of such violation, regardless of whether the injury occurred while such person was a minor, may sue in any appropriate United States District Court and shall recover the actual damages such person sustains or liquidated damages in the amount of \$150,000, and the cost of the action, including reasonable attorney’s fees and other litigation costs reasonably incurred. The court may also award punitive damages and such other preliminary and equitable relief as the court determines to be appropriate.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “filed within” and all that follows through the end and inserting the following: “file—

“(1) not later than 10 years after the date on which the plaintiff reasonably discovers the later of—

“(A) the violation that forms the basis for the claim; or

“(B) the injury that forms the basis for the claim; or

“(2) not later than 10 years after the date on which a legal disability ends.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **VENUE; SERVICE OF PROCESS.**—

“(1) **VENUE.**—Any action brought under subsection (a) may be brought in the district court of the United States that meets applicable requirements relating to venue under section 1391 of title 28.

“(2) **SERVICE OF PROCESS.**—In an action brought under subsection (a), process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

“(A) is an inhabitant; or

“(B) may be found.”.

SEC. 4. EXPANSION OF AUTHORITIES AND DUTIES OF AMATEUR SPORTS ORGANIZATIONS RECOGNIZED BY THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE TO PREVENT THE ABUSE OF MINOR AND AMATEUR ATHLETES.

(a) **EXPANSION OF AUTHORITIES.**—Section 220523(a) of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) develop training, oversight practices, policies, and procedures to prevent the abuse, including physical abuse and sexual abuse, of any minor or amateur athlete by any adult.”.

(b) **ADDITIONAL DUTIES.**—Section 220524 of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) **IN GENERAL.**—” before “For the sport”;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) develop and enforce policies, mechanisms, and procedures to prevent the abuse, including physical abuse and sexual abuse, of any minor or amateur athlete, including—

“(A) requiring all adults authorized by a national governing body or a member of a national governing body to interact with a minor or amateur athlete at an amateur sports organization facility or at any event sanctioned by a national governing body or a member of a national governing body, to report facts that give reason to suspect child abuse, including sexual abuse, as required by relevant Federal or State law, to law enforcement authorities and other appropriate authorities, including an entity designated by the corporation to investigate and resolve such allegations;

“(B) establishing a mechanism, approved by a trained expert on child abuse, that allows an individual to easily report an incident of child abuse as described in subparagraph (A) to the national governing body or another authority, including an entity designated by the corporation;

“(C) procedures to ensure that covered individuals are instructed to avoid one-on-one situations with any amateur athlete who is a minor (other than such an athlete for whom the covered individual is a legal guardian) at an amateur sports organization facility, at any event sanctioned by a national governing body, or any event sanctioned by a member of a national governing body, without being observable or interruptible by another adult; and

“(D) oversight procedures, including regular and random audits, not to exceed once a year, conducted by subject matter experts unaffiliated with the national governing body, of all members and adults described in subparagraph (A) to ensure that policies and procedures developed under this paragraph are followed correctly and that consistent training is offered and given to all members regarding prevention of sexual abuse; and

“(11) in the case of a national governing body with jurisdiction over more than one amateur sports organization facility or event, establish a mechanism by which—

“(A) the national governing body can—

“(i) receive a report of suspected sexual misconduct by an adult authorized by a national governing body or a member of a national governing body to interact with a minor or amateur athlete at an amateur sports organization facility or at any event sanctioned by a national governing body or a member of a national governing body; and

“(ii) confidentially share a report received under clause (i) with each of the other amateur sports organizations, facilities, or members under the jurisdiction of the national governing body; and

“(B) an amateur sports organization, facility, or member under the jurisdiction of the national governing body can—

“(i) review the reports received by the national governing body under subparagraph (A)(i) to assess any allegations of sexual misconduct made in such reports; and

“(ii) withhold providing to an adult who is the subject of an allegation of sexual misconduct in a report reviewed under clause (i) authority to interact with a minor or amateur athlete at such organization, facility, or event until the resolution of such allegation.

“(b) **LIMITED LIABILITY FOR THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE, NATIONAL GOVERNING BODIES, AND AN ENTITY DESIGNATED BY THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND RESOLVE SEXUAL MISCONDUCT ALLEGATIONS.**—

“(1) *IN GENERAL*.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2), no civil or criminal action may be brought in any Federal or State court against the United States Olympic Committee, a national governing body, or an amateur sports organization, facility, or event under the jurisdiction of a national governing body, or an entity designated by the United States Olympic Committee to investigate and resolve sexual misconduct allegations described in subsection (a)(11), including any director, officer, employee, or agent of such entity, if the action arises from the execution of the responsibilities or functions described in subsection (a)(11).

“(2) *INTENTIONAL, RECKLESS, OR OTHER MISCONDUCT*.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a civil or criminal action if the United States Olympic Committee, a national governing body, an amateur sports organization, facility, or event under the jurisdiction of a national governing body, or an entity designated by the United States Olympic Committee to investigate and resolve sexual misconduct allegations described in subsection (a)(11), or a director, officer, employee, or agent of such entity acted or failed to act—

“(A) with reckless disregard for a risk of causing injury; or

“(B) for a purpose unrelated to the performance of any responsibility or function described in subsection (a)(11).

“(3) *LIMITED EFFECT*.—Nothing in this section shall apply to any act or omission arising out of any responsibility or function not described in subsection (a)(11).”

(c) *RULE OF CONSTRUCTION*.—Section 220522 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) *RULE OF CONSTRUCTION*.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to limit the ability of a national governing body to develop a policy or procedure to prevent an individual who is the subject of an allegation of sexual misconduct from interacting with a minor or amateur athlete until such time as the national governing body, or an entity with applicable jurisdiction resolves such allegation.”

(d) *REVIEW OF RECOGNITION OF AMATEUR SPORTS ORGANIZATIONS AS NATIONAL GOVERNING BODIES*.—Section 220521(d) of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking “may” each place it appears and inserting “shall”.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 115–152. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF LOUISIANA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 115–152.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Chairman GOODLATTE, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, strike line 16, and all that follows through line 3 on page 3, and insert the following:

“(9) the term ‘covered individual’ means an adult who is authorized by a national governing body or a member of a national governing body to interact with a minor or amateur athlete at an amateur sports organization facility or at any event sanctioned by a national governing body or a member of a national governing body;

“(10) the term ‘event’ includes travel, practice, competition, and health or medical treatment; and

“(11) the terms ‘amateur athlete’, ‘amateur sports organization’, and ‘national governing body’ have the meanings given such terms in section 220501(b) of title 36, United States Code.”

Page 4, line 19, strike “file” and insert “filed”.

Page 7, strike line 16 and all that follows through line 25, and insert the following:

“(C) reasonable procedures designed to avoid one-on-one interactions between an amateur athlete who is a minor and an adult (who is not the minor’s legal guardian) at an amateur sports organization facility, at any event sanctioned by a national governing body, or any event sanctioned by a member of a national governing body, without being observable or interruptible by another adult, except where the safety and welfare of the minor requires; and”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am happy to introduce this manager’s amendment to H.R. 1973, the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act. This amendment is very simple. It defines who is covered by the mandatory reporting requirement in the underlying bill. The definition harmonizes language with the underlying statute, defining this class not by location, but by simply keeping the jurisdictional reference where it belongs: in the national governing body or a member of a national governing body.

The amendment also defines the term “event” to include travel, practice, competition, and health or medical treatment. This definition is important as events in USA Gymnastics revealed abuse by USA Gymnastics’ team doctor Larry Nassar, who molested dozens of young girls under the guise of medical treatment. Moreover, other allegations of abuse show that it sometimes took place during travel to various competitions.

The amendment also clarifies duties of national governing bodies. Under the amendment, national governing bodies must implement reasonable procedures designed to avoid one-on-one interactions between minors and adults that are not within an observable or interruptible distance.

This amendment assures that the 47 different national governing bodies can implement procedures that make sense, given the sport they cover, the reach of their influence, and the resources available to them.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the bill or the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman and point out that this amendment addresses the provisions in the bill concerning one-on-one interactions between young athletes and the adults who work with them.

The existing version of the bill requires the national governing bodies instruct coaches, instructors, doctors, and the like to avoid one-on-one situations with the young athletes that cannot be observed or interrupted by another adult. Under the proposed change, national governing bodies will be required to institute and enforce reasonable procedures designed to avoid one-on-one interactions between young athletes and their coaches, instructors, and doctors that cannot be observed or interrupted by another adult.

Mr. GOODLATTE’s amendment also harmonizes language used in the bill with language in the underlying statute and makes technical and conforming changes.

I support this amendment and the changes it makes to enhance H.R. 1973, and I look forward to further discussions of these provisions with the Senate, with the goal of producing a consensus bill for enactment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Louisiana and the ranking member from Michigan in support of this amendment. I think it has an underlying premise that we should all celebrate and attempt to ensure that it is in place.

I, too, agree that I look forward to reconciling the House and Senate bill, but the amendment specifically addresses the provisions in the bill concerning one-on-one interactions between young athletes and the adults who they work with; and I believe the clear understanding that we all hope can be implemented is that we don’t have one-on-one interactions without overall supervision or other kids or other adult participants so that we do not create an atmosphere where a child can be intimidated or abused.

Under the proposed change, national governing bodies will be required to institute and enforce reasonable procedures designed to avoid one-on-one

interactions between young athletes and their coaches, instructors, and doctors that cannot be observed or interrupted by another adult.

First of all, we know that the expanse of sports is expanding. There are so many new sports, so many new opportunities for adults, many committed and dedicated adults, but the real issue is: Let's protect the children.

Mr. Chair, I rise to support the Goodlatte amendment.

□ 1000

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, in closing, I echo what has been said already, and I appreciate the comments of my colleagues and acknowledge, again, that the manager's amendment is very simple. It simply seeks to clear up language and define these terms. It is a necessary alteration to the bill, and I encourage our colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COSTA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 115-152.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 21, strike "reasonably".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, as a co-chair of the Victims' Rights Caucus, along with Congressman TED POE, we have over 70 members, bipartisan, to focus on protecting victims of crime. We also try to ensure that we protect the VOCA funding that goes for very worthwhile efforts for organizations throughout the country and to recognize and honor every year those who stand out on behalf of victims of crime.

I want to commend the chairman and the ranking member for advancing this legislation, as well as my Senate colleagues, because there is a companion piece of legislation that is attempting to address this horrible issue in which you have so often young athletes—Olympic-caliber athletes—some who actually have participated in the Olympics, who, at a very young age, find themselves victims of these horrific crimes, through no fault of their own.

Sexual assault, in any form, is a horrible crime and it leaves lasting dam-

age to its victims. Sadly, some victims of assault are children who may be incapable of truly understanding what is happening to them at the time. However, years later, when this poor child comes to understand what happened, they are faced with the reality that someone who is supposed to be looking after their well-being actually betrayed them. This leaves real and very lasting damage that can take decades, if not years, for the person to deal with.

In some instances, sexual assault victims may not discover their injuries or the violation until adulthood, years after the abuse happened, years after the processing of their own internal trauma, years after feeling strong enough finally to go public.

A perfect example of this is in child pornography. How is a young child supposed to find, process, and accuse someone of a crime that they simply didn't even know existed?

There are legitimate constitutional debates dealing with the criminal and civil process. We understand that. Current and future legal scholars will debate those. I am not a lawyer; I am a farmer. But as a farmer, I know we should be able to agree on one simple principle, and that principle is that these victims deserve their day in court, they deserve due process, and they deserve their time to face the person who assaulted them and to ask their fellow citizens or a judge for justice.

It is our responsibility to do what we can to protect child victims and to ensure that they have access to the courts. That is what this amendment is all about.

Mr. Chairman, I want to, in the effort of comity, offer this amendment, but I will ask to respectfully withdraw the amendment. This is an issue that is not going to go away. I know there are different perceptions on how we deal with this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and his support for this important legislation.

Victims should, of course, have reasonable opportunity to seek justice and face their accusers in court. This bill is a good one and fair to all parties, and I look forward to working with the gentleman to get it to the President's desk.

Mr. COSTA. I will accept that and continue to work with the gentleman and Chairman GOODLATTE from Virginia, because, at the end of the day, to have some success and to move this forward, we are going to have to have reconciliation between the Senate bill and the House bill in how this is treated. I would hope that we would gain that agreement, and then we could move the legislation for signature.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 115-152.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 25, strike "and" at the end.

Page 8, insert after line 10 the following:

"(E) requiring dedicated information and resources, which may include sexual assault hotlines and victims' support resources, to be clearly listed on the national governing body's official website; and".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chair, as a former law enforcement officer, I know all too well what happens when our institutions fail to protect our most valued and treasured among us: our children.

The recent reports of young athletes experiencing sexual assault and abuse at the hands of trusted adults are not just abhorrent, they are unacceptable.

Last year, tragically, one of our own young gymnasts in Mesa, Arizona, came forward after years of abuse by a coach at his gym.

We must do better. No child anywhere should face the risk of abuse. That is why I am proud to support the bill before us today, which will go a long way in protecting our young athletes.

My bipartisan amendment, which is cosponsored by Congresswoman SINEMA and Congressman BIGGS, simply builds on the underlying bill's spirit by requiring national governing bodies to clearly list information and resources, which may include sexual assault hotlines and victim support resources, on their official websites.

As a former cop who has dealt with vulnerable victims, I know from my experience that resources like sexual assault hotlines are a critical tool between victims, families, local health providers, and law enforcement.

Requiring governing bodies, like USA Gymnastics, to clearly list this type of information on their websites is an important step forward in ensuring support for victims and their families.

As adults and parents, we place our children in the trusted hands of coaches, trainers, and others when we support and encourage their involvement in sports.

We all know sports play such a critical role in so many of our communities. It is where we learn about teamwork, resilience, hard work, and perseverance. These spaces should be safe for children to learn, grow, and develop as healthy athletes and adults.

We have a moral obligation to ensure our kids have protection and access to the information they deserve. My commonsense amendment helps do just that.

I thank Representative SINEMA and Representative BIGGS for their support on this amendment, as well as the sponsors of H.R. 1761 for their good work on this important bill.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to this commonsense amendment, as has just been articulated.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes. There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Mr. O'HALLERAN and Mr. BIGGS for offering this amendment. It will help to prevent abuse at these national governing bodies and, as stated, it will encourage children to report abuse when they are able to quickly and easily access this information.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. O'HALLERAN for yielding and for his leadership on this important issue.

Sexual abuse is abhorrent. It is particularly abhorrent when it is conducted by an individual in a position of authority: a coach, a trainer, a teacher.

The community of Mesa, Arizona, which Mr. BIGGS and I represent, was rocked by a tragic event in which a young athlete was abused for at least 3 years before receiving help. Had he or other young athletes experiencing similar nightmares had access to resources and support, perhaps the nightmare could have ended sooner, perhaps it could have been prevented.

Our bipartisan amendment is simple. It builds on a very good bipartisan bill by requiring governing bodies to list dedicated information and resources for victims and families on official websites.

No individual should suffer from sexual abuse. No family should go without support when they are in need.

I thank the two gentlemen, my friends from Arizona, Mr. O'HALLERAN and Mr. BIGGS, for cosponsoring this amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on our amendment and to support the underlying bill.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his courtesies. I want to enthusiastically congratulate and thank the gentlemen and gentlewoman from Arizona for responding to their constituents and answering a question positively about protecting our young people.

I spoke earlier today about what happens with young people and their aspirations when they engage in sports. They want to win, but they also want to, if you will, to impress adults and to show that they can do the very best that they can do.

So I want to congratulate them for this amendment that advances the purposes and goals of protecting young victims from sexual abuse by requiring the national governing bodies to include resources and information regarding sexual assault and having sexual assault hotlines and other victim support services on their websites.

With this new technology, it will be at their fingertips. They don't have to, in essence, expose themselves. They can get this information and readily access the very people that will help them.

So I want to congratulate the manager, Mr. CONYERS, and, of course, the chairman of the committee and the proponents of the underlying bill. I want to congratulate Mr. O'HALLERAN. His efforts here are to be commended, and I thank him for this insightful amendment to the legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCARTHY) having assumed the chair, Mr. POLIQUIN, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1761) to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 352, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIQUIN). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1015

PROTECTING AGAINST CHILD EXPLOITATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 352, I call up the bill (H.R. 1761) to amend title 18, United States Code, to criminalize the knowing consent of the visual depiction, or live transmission, of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). Pursuant to House Resolution 352, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-19 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1761

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Against Child Exploitation Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN.

Section 2251 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending subsections (a) and (b) to read as follows:

"(a) Any person who, in a circumstance described in subsection (f), knowingly—

"(1) employs, uses, persuades, induces, entices, or coerces a minor to engage in any sexually explicit conduct for the purpose of producing any visual depiction of such conduct, or transmitting a live visual depiction of such conduct;

"(2) produces or causes to be produced a visual depiction of a minor engaged in any sexually explicit conduct where the production of

such visual depiction involves the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct and such visual depiction is of such conduct;

“(3) transmits or causes to be transmitted a live visual depiction of a minor engaged in any sexually explicit conduct;

“(4) has a minor assist any other person to engage in any sexually explicit conduct during the commission of an offense set forth in paragraphs (1) through (3) of this subsection; or

“(5) transports any minor in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce with the intent that such minor be used in the production or live transmission of a visual depiction of a minor engaged in any sexually explicit conduct, shall be punished as provided under subsection (e).”

“(b) Any parent, legal guardian, or person having custody or control of a minor who, in a circumstance described in subsection (f), knowingly permits such minor to engage in, or to assist any other person to engage in, sexually explicit conduct knowing that a visual depiction of such conduct will be produced or transmitted shall be punished as provided under subsection (e).”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “employs, uses, persuades, induces, entices, or coerces any minor to engage in, or who has a minor assist any other person to engage in, any sexually explicit conduct” and inserting “engages in any conduct described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (a)”;

and

(ii) by striking “, for the purpose of producing any visual depiction of such conduct,”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting after “transported” the following: “or transmitted”;

and

(C) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting after “transports” the following: “or transmits”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) The circumstances referred to in subsections (a) and (b) are—

“(1) that the person knows or has reason to know that such visual depiction will be—

“(A) transported or transmitted using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce;

“(B) transported or transmitted in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce; or

“(C) mailed;

“(2) the visual depiction was produced or transmitted using materials that have been mailed, or shipped or transported in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means, including by computer;

“(3) such visual depiction has actually been—

“(A) transported or transmitted using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce;

“(B) transported or transmitted in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce; or

“(C) mailed; or

“(4) any part of the offense occurred in a territory or possession of the United States or within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

“(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no criminal charge under subsection (a)(3) may be brought against an electronic communication service provider or remote computing service provider unless such provider has intentionally transmitted or caused to be transmitted a visual depiction with actual knowledge that such depiction is of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct, nor may any such criminal charge be brought if barred by the provisions of section 2258B.”

SEC. 3. LIMITED LIABILITY FOR CERTAIN PERSONS WHEN RESPONDING TO SEARCH WARRANTS OR OTHER LEGAL PROCESS.

Section 2258B of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “from the response to a search warrant or other legal process or” before “from the performance”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(C), by inserting “the response to a search warrant or other legal process or to” before “the performance of any responsibility”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part B of House Report 115–152, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1761.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 1761, the Protecting Against Child Exploitation Act of 2017, and urge my colleagues to do the same. I would like to note that May is National Missing Children's Month and today marks National Missing Children's Day. It is an honor to be on the floor here today as we continue our mission to protect these innocent victims.

We have made great strides toward ending child exploitation. However, gaps still exist in our laws that are contrary to Congress' goal of protecting children and criminalizing the production of images of child sexual abuse.

H.R. 1761 takes necessary steps to close an unfortunate loophole created by a Fourth Circuit decision in *United States v. Palomino-Coronado*—a case in which a defendant was able to walk free from Federal conviction despite photographic evidence he had engaged in the sexual abuse of a 7-year-old child.

On May 3, 2012, Prince George's County police officers responded to a home in Laurel, Maryland, based on a report of a missing 7-year-old child known as “B.H.” Officers found the child at the fence that separated her house and her neighbor's house. Upon investigation, it was uncovered that the neighbor, Anthony Palomino-Coronado, a 19-

year-old male, had sexually molested the child.

At trial, the jury found the defendant guilty of knowingly employing, using, persuading, inducing, enticing, or coercing a minor in sexually explicit conduct, for the purpose of producing a visual depiction of that conduct—in other words, for the production of child pornography. The defendant appealed his conviction, alleging insufficient evidence.

Incredibly, the Fourth Circuit vacated the defendant's conviction, finding there was insufficient evidence the defendant's sexual abuse of the 7-year-old girl was “for the purpose of” creating an image of such conduct. The court found that, though the defendant engaged in sexual conduct with a child, “the fact that only one image was produced militates against finding that his intent in doing so was to take a picture.”

Essentially, the court decided that the defendant had engaged in sexual conduct with a 7-year-old and taken a picture but had not engaged in sexual conduct with a 7-year-old to take a picture. To me, this is a preposterous, offensive result.

Under the Fourth Circuit's reasoning in *Palomino*, a defendant could admit to sexually abusing a child, and memorializing the conduct, but could argue that he should, nonetheless, escape Federal conviction because he lacked the requisite purpose or specific intent, prior to initiating the sexual abuse. Indeed, defense attorneys have begun to raise these *Palomino* defenses in other courts.

In response to *Palomino*, H.R. 1761 establishes additional bases of liability to the crime of production of child pornography. Specifically, the bill clarifies existing law by prohibiting the knowing production of, or knowingly causing the production of, a visual depiction of a real minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct.

Additionally, H.R. 1761 amends current law to prohibit the knowing transmission of, or knowingly causing the transmission of, a live visual depiction of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct while also criminalizing the knowing creation of the visual depiction of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct.

This language will serve to fix this judicially created loophole and ensure our court system will not have to spend time evaluating this meritless defense and will make certain predators such as this will not be able to escape Federal consequences.

Mr. Speaker, with this bill, Congress' intent is clear. We must continue to protect our children, the most vulnerable and innocent members of society. I commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of the Judiciary Committee, for introducing this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) may control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and rise in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill restructures section 2251 of title 18 of the United States Code as apparently requested by the unit at the Department of Justice that enforces the laws against child pornography.

H.R. 1761 is intended to address limitations in the prosecution of cases pursuant to section 2251, as identified by the Department.

While we all agree that no child pornography offense should go unpunished, we cannot overlook the consequences of mandatory minimum sentencing.

Section 2251(a) prohibits the use of a child to produce child pornography and related conduct, including overseas production and advertising child pornography.

Pursuant to this bill, two new offenses would be added to this section to prohibit the production of child pornography and the transmission of live depictions of a child engaged in sexually explicit conduct, such as live-streaming abuse online.

This measure would also modify the existing offense that prohibits having a minor assist in sexually explicit conduct for the purpose of producing or transmitting child pornography. As amended, this offense would prohibit having a minor assist in sexually explicit conduct that violates each of the three newly enumerated production offenses, except the transportation of a minor for use in child pornography production.

In addition, it would amend the prohibition against the production of child pornography abroad to forbid the live transmission of child pornography produced abroad.

The jurisdictional requirement for each of the offenses enumerated in section 2251, except the production of child pornography abroad, would be codified in a separate subsection. Other portions of the bill would be modified to follow the restructure of the statute for consistency.

Unfortunately, current law sets forth a series of mandatory minimum terms of imprisonment for production of child pornography offenses. First-time offenses are punishable by mandatory imprisonment of at least 15 years; offenders with a prior conviction face mandatory imprisonment for at least 25 years; and offenders with two or more prior convictions must be sentenced to imprisonment of at least 35 years.

By modifying and expanding section 2251 to include several new ways in which to violate the prohibition against the production of child pornography, the bill would subject new classes of defendants to mandatory minimum sentences. Although the bill does not establish new mandatory minimum sentences, it would—in this way—expand the application of the existing mandatory minimums, which I oppose.

Mandatory minimums have been studied extensively and found to distort rational sentencing systems, discriminate against minorities, waste taxpayers' money, and violate common sense. Under mandatory minimum sentences, regardless of the nature and circumstances surrounding the offense, the role of the offender in the particular crime, and the history and characteristics of the offender, a judge must impose a sentence set by the legislature.

Even if everyone involved in a case—from the arresting officer, prosecutor, and judge to the victim—believes that the mandatory minimum would be an unjust sentence for a particular defendant in a case, it still must be imposed. Mandatory minimum sentences are the wrong way to determine punishment under this or any other statute.

During the Judiciary Committee's consideration of this bill, the committee rejected an amendment that would have eliminated the applicable mandatory minimums in the current statute but would still have allowed judges to sentence these offenders to lengthy sentences up to the existing statutory maximums.

Because those changes were not made, the bill continues to present problems with mandatory minimums.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I must oppose this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1030

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue to help save those who have been trafficked across not only just America, but around the world.

Mr. Speaker, they didn't list her name in the report, and that makes sense. It all happened before she even reached the age of 16. So to protect her identity, they called her Tonya.

She ran away from home and ended up living with a man they called Eddie. Eddie was the stepdad of one of her classmates. Tonya and Eddie started a relationship. Tonya felt that she really loved him. Eddie took advantage of that, and he pressured Tonya into a life no child should have to live.

Tonya was saved in large part by luck. A tip to the police led to action

by the Federal special agent. And now Eddie is behind bars finishing the second year of his 12-year prison sentence. Meanwhile, Tonya is just trying to return to a normal life.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say this story wasn't true, that these fictitious names didn't reflect hard reality. I wish I could say it was isolated. I wish I could say that this type of thing doesn't happen here in America, but it does.

It repeats itself with different details even more disturbing than Tonya's story in towns and cities across our Nation. It is not just sex trafficking. It is forced labor. It is exploitation. It is slavery. And every single instance cries out against the moral truth written on every human heart.

Now, the numbers are staggering. 20.9 million people are trafficked globally. Of that number, over a quarter are children. The majority are pressed to work for little to no wages. And 4.5 million of these people are victims of forced sexual exploitation.

Here in America, there were 7,572 cases of human trafficking reported in 2016. That is an increase of 35 percent over just the year before. My home State of California is particularly dire. Of all the cases in the Nation, 1,323 come from California.

Though we need no explanation for why we are passing anti-trafficking and exploitation legislation today, I think it helps that we understand the magnitude of this evil.

We have, in this body, voted on 11 bills so far. Today we will vote on two more by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON). Altogether, these bills address many aspects of this problem: international trafficking, recording and transmission of child pornography, abuse uncovered on the U.S. Olympic teams, the handling of trauma cases in our justice system.

I don't believe that these bills alone will end human trafficking or exploitation in and of themselves, but they will help. They will help prevent these crimes, they will help the victims recover, and they will bring us closer to a world where every person, especially those who need us most, won't be abused but will be truly loved.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his work in this effort.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1761.

I first want to point out that the case outlined by the chair of the Judiciary Committee that failed in Federal court could have been brought in State court and the defendant would have been subjected to extremely long, lengthy prison time for the heinous conduct that he had participated in.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation expands the use of preexisting mandatory minimum sentences. Although the bill does

not technically create new mandatory minimums, it does expose additional defendants to preexisting mandatory minimum sentences of 15, 25, and 35 years.

While I support the underlying goal of punishing sex offenders—and they should be punished harshly—the use of mandatory minimums has time and time again been shown to be inappropriate.

This expansion of mandatory minimum sentences comes on the heels of the Attorney General's memorandum of May 12, 2017, which has been roundly criticized for directing all Federal prosecutors to pursue the most serious charges and maximum sentences, to include mandatory minimum sentences. This directive takes away from Federal prosecutors and judges the ability to individually assess the unique circumstances of each case, including any factors that may mitigate against imposing mandatory minimum sentences.

This law is particularly appalling because it would apply to people who I think we should all agree should not be subject to these long mandatory minimum sentences. I am talking about teenagers. Teenage sexting is widespread. Under this law, teenagers who engage in consensual conduct and send photos of a sexual nature to their friends or even to each other may be prosecuted and the judge must sentence them to at least 15 years in prison.

The law explicitly states that the mandatory minimums will apply equally to an attempt or a conspiracy. That means if a teenager attempts to obtain a photo of sexually explicit conduct by requesting it from his teenage girlfriend, the judge must sentence that teenager to prison for at least 15 years for making such an attempt. If a teenager goads a friend to ask a teenager to take a sexually explicit image of herself, just by asking, he could be guilty of conspiracy or attempt, and the judge must sentence that teenager to at least 15 years in prison.

Under the Federal code, the term "sexually explicit conduct" includes actual or simulated conduct. That means if a teenager asks another teenager for a photo simulating sex, even if the minor is fully clothed, that attempt would violate the law and the teenager must get a sentence of at least 15 years mandatory minimum for making that attempt.

This law does not allow the judge to consider whether or not the conduct may have been consensual between minors. This circumstance is irrelevant when the sentence is mandatory.

For decades now, the extensive research and evidence has demonstrated that mandatory minimum sentences fail to reduce crime, discriminate against minorities, waste the taxpayers' money, and often require a judge to impose sentences so bizarre that they violate common sense.

Unfortunately, there are already too many mandatory minimums in the Federal code. If we ever expect to do anything about the problem and actually address this major driver of mass incarceration, the first step we have to take is to stop passing new mandatory minimums or bills that expand existing mandatory minimums.

Mr. Speaker, we have to recognize that mandatory minimums in the code did not get there all at once. They got there one at a time, each part of a larger bill, which, on balance, might seem like a good idea. Therefore, the only way to stop passing new mandatory minimums is to stop passing bills that contain or broaden the application of mandatory minimums.

Giving lip service to the suggestion that you would have preferred that the mandatory minimum had not been in the bill and then voting for the bill anyway not only creates that new mandatory minimum, but it also guarantees that mandatory minimums will be included in the next crime bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would not be controversial if it did not contain mandatory minimums, but, unfortunately, it does. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1761.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am honored today to speak in support of my legislation, the Protecting Against Child Exploitation Act, which aims to close a court-created loophole, and as the title suggests, further protect our children from predators.

When I first arrived to Congress after almost 20 years of litigating constitutional law cases and drafting legislation for municipalities to control the proliferation of sexually oriented businesses, I was deeply concerned to learn that this particular loophole even existed in current Federal law, which essentially allows a child rapist to admit to sexually abusing a child and yet still evade punishment.

The background is important to reiterate. As my chairman stated moments ago, this comes from a 2015 case, *United States v. Palomino-Coronado*, where the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit reversed the conviction of a child sex offender simply because the court determined the perpetrator lacked specific intent to record the disgusting images that were found on the offender's smartphone. This is despite the fact that the defendant admitted to sexually abusing the 7-year-old child from next door and memorializing the conduct.

In its opinion, the court decided the lack of purpose or specific intent was enough to overturn the conviction, even though the defendant himself took the photo of the heinous act and subsequently admitted to sexually abusing this child. This is absolutely in clear contradiction of our responsi-

bility and this Congress' intention to protect America's children.

In Scripture, Romans 13 refers to the governing authorities as "God's servants, agents of wrath to bring punishment on the wrongdoer." I, for one, believe we have a moral obligation, as any just government should, to defend the defenseless.

My legislation presents a simple fix and updates title 18 of the U.S. Code to ensure future defendants are not able to circumvent the law by simply claiming a lack of intent, especially after knowingly creating a visual depiction of a minor engaged in sexually conduct.

More specifically, my legislation amends section 2251 of title 18 to prohibit the production and transmission of a visual depiction of a real minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct.

Furthermore, it amends current law to include prohibiting the depiction of a minor assisting any person in engaging in a sexually explicit act.

Lastly, to clarify potential circumstances of misinterpretation of the statute and to ensure the statute is not used erroneously to prosecute internet services providers when they have not engaged in wrongdoing, my legislation emphasizes that to be criminally liable under section (a)(3), an internet service provider must have actual knowledge that the child pornography is on its server and that it must intentionally transmit that image or intentionally cause its transmission.

We also take the step of prohibiting any criminal or civil liability for internet service providers who are required to transmit child pornography to law enforcement in response to a legal process, such as a search warrant in child exploitation cases. Of course, we would never anticipate a prosecution of an internet service provider for merely responding to a legal process, but it is my hope that explicitly providing for this immunity in the statute will further enhance the relationship between internet service providers and law enforcement to work together to combat these predators.

In answer to the opposition that we have heard here, it is important to reiterate this legislation does not create new mandatory minimums. However, I would like to address the comments regarding the current law on mandatory minimum penalties under the production of child pornography statute.

There is simply no evidence that Federal prosecutors are abusing this statute. I think we should all recognize that producing child pornography is a horrific crime. It often means luring young children into acts that no one, man, woman, or child, should be forced to do.

It is not a photograph of a nude child. It is something far worse. Each photo is a crime scene. Such a horrific act by the perpetrator requires the maximum amount of legal deterrents.

While mandatory minimums have reached much scrutiny in the drug statutes, in this venue for this statute, there could be no doubt that the penalties that exist under current law are appropriate. Child sexual exploitation is vastly underreported. The number of images of child pornography keeps growing and the images are becoming more and more depraved. The harm is too great to these victims not to have significant penalties available to deter this conduct and punish the producers of child pornography.

Every time an image of child pornography is viewed, the victim gets revictimized. Once an image is on the internet, it is irretrievable and can continue to circulate forever. This permanent record of a child's sexual abuse can alter his or her life forever. Many victims of child pornography suffer from feelings of helplessness, fear, humiliation, and lack of control, given that their images are available for others to view in perpetuity.

□ 1045

These images are becoming more sadistic and violent, and the age of the average victim is becoming younger and younger. It is a horrifying fact that it is not uncommon for even toddlers and infants to now be subjects of these images.

It is also important that there is no confusion about one fact: The very creation of these images is repulsive, regardless of whether or not the abuse was done with a specific intent of creating an image or if the intent to memorialize this conduct was a secondary thought.

Consider the facts of the case that led to this bill. As was mentioned, an adult male had sexual relations with a 7-year-old girl who lived next door and decided to photograph it. That is the production of child pornography. There is no question about it. No one should be permitted to escape responsibility merely by asserting they did not have a specific intent to create the image before they abused the child. The act of taking a photo or making a video is enough to demonstrate intent.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this bill does. It is appropriate that we are doing all this on the day that we recognize as National Missing Children's Day. I am going to urge all my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the opponents and proponents of this legislation because they have said much the same thing.

H.R. 1761 is a bill that stands against everything we stand against. It is for protecting against child exploitation, and we all agree with that. We agree,

as well, that the bill has existing mandatory minimums and the attempt of the proponent of this bill to ensure that the decision that occurred in Palomino would not occur again.

Some clarification has occurred, and that is that the bill, or the law, now, with H.R. 1761 explicitly prohibits the creation of a visual depiction or live transmission of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct. That is, of course, a meritorious and unanimously supported position. The mandatory minimums continue and also are added to, now, a number of other offenses. As have been indicated, those offenses can be upwards of 20 years, and they can be for a variety of offenses added under this bill.

So the bill is well intended, and the initial prohibition could draw support in a bipartisan manner, but the continued adding of offenses to mandatory minimums rather than language that would have left the sentencing to the discretion of the Federal court—which, by the way, many Federal judges have come to this Congress and to the Committee on the Judiciary to ask for and indicate the value of discretion as relates to their sentencing. This is not a death penalty case, so, clearly, the discretion of the court and the wisdom of the court could be utilized for the appropriate new offenses and the appropriate sentencing.

So while the bill is well intended, it is overbroad in scope and will punish the very people it indicates it is designed to protect: our children. H.R. 1761 would expand and modify the meaning of sexual exploitation of children, thereby granting new offenses that may be prosecuted under section 2251 of the Federal criminal code, which generally prohibits the production of child pornography.

As indicated, it works to fix the Fourth Circuit decision in Palomino, which reversed the defendant's conviction because the decision was that there was no proof of intent. The structure of the statute, however, would significantly be modified by H.R. 1761, separating section 2251(a) into five enumerated offenses, codified as 2251(a)(1) through (5). Based on the language in this bill, to criminalize the knowing consent of the visual depiction or live transmission of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct, a teenager sexting another teenager could be swept up under the statutory power of this new measure.

Research shows that 91 percent of teenagers, tweens, have access to the internet and/or a smartphone. Hence, given the rampant advancement in technology and, consequently, its usage among this demographic, we must exercise prudence when introducing legislation that is seemingly ignorant of the growing trend of communication among teenagers.

H.R. 1761 ignores the life-altering impact it would have on our juveniles

who engage in otherwise stupid and immature behaviors and, in most cases, consensually explicit sexual conduct if we begin to criminalize such conduct. While this bill seeks to protect minors—and I congratulate the proponent for that intent—in the same vein, it drastically alters the penalty for minors who may face mandatory minimums in sentencing, and, therefore, it is flawed in its design and intended purpose.

Let me be very clear: Legislators have very good intentions, but we cannot stand on the floor and guarantee how it will be interpreted. We cannot guarantee that one teenager will not be caught up in this new legislation. Court interpretation, prosecutors' interpretation, all that will be subjected to mandatory minimums, which is in the underlying bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIQUIN). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to consider these concerns.

I heard the gentleman speak of his effort to ensure that the internet provider would have to show intent or have intentionally engaged.

Again, the interpretation of these bills are subject to interpretation, and the clearer we can be here on the floor of the House, the more we can be appropriate in its application.

My point is, in concluding, I hope we will ultimately have legislation that comes back to the floor of the House that we all may be able to join in and that the elements that do not impact and protect our teenagers will be eliminated and we can be assured that internet providers are protected as well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just say a couple of important points in rebuttal to what we have heard.

For one thing, there has been no evidence that the cases referenced by the gentlewoman involving conduct between minors are being prosecuted at the Federal level. I have not seen even one that has been cited. The point here is that prosecutorial discretion has been a sufficient buffer.

In committee, our colleagues on the other side have invoked stories of juvenile offenders being charged for consensual conduct and placed on sex offender registries unjustly; however, these are all cases that were prosecuted at the local level. Not one that has been mentioned has been a Federal case.

It is important to note that, for offenders under 18, the Federal Department of Justice policy on charging juveniles means that juvenile prosecutions very rarely occur, and only if no State court can assume jurisdiction. In

fact, certification from the Attorney General himself is necessary to proceed against a juvenile.

Again, I know of no such case in which a juvenile has been prosecuted federally under any child pornography statute. So while we appreciate and understand the concerns about mandatory minimum sentencing and its abuse, particularly with the drug statutes, again, it is important to reiterate here, that is not the case with child pornography.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would oppose these arguments and trust that my colleagues will see the wisdom in supporting this very important and timely legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House cannot rely on prospective discretion to protect juveniles under this statute. We simply can't rely on it, participate in, given the new policy of the Attorney General. We are under a new regime here at the Federal level, and I can't depend on relying on the prosecutorial discretion to protect juveniles under this statute.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is well intended, and I share my colleagues' desire to protect children from being victimized by their depiction in pornography. However, I also believe that we must address the serious problem presented by the bill, namely, that it would expand the application of the existing array of mandatory minimum sentences that the code provides for these offenses.

This aspect of H.R. 1761 directly conflicts with the growing bipartisan realization that mandatory minimums are unjust and unwise; this is so even for egregious offenses for which judges should be allowed to impose sentences—often severe and even beyond the minimums—based on the facts and circumstances of each case. I want to leave it up to the judges.

In considering legislation to better protect our children from the types of exploitation addressed by this bill, we must not ignore the sentencing implications of these revisions to the statute. In light of the bill's failure to address these serious concerns, I oppose H.R. 1761 and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

We should consider even stronger legislation that addresses all these concerns. We are not through with the subject matter by this bill coming before us today. There is more work to be done. I thank my colleagues for this very important discussion.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, the concerns stated today are misplaced. The child pornography stat-

utes have never been the subject of abuse by Federal prosecutors, and there is no evidence that that would happen in the future. However, the abuse that is being allowed and that we must address today is that of our children, and that abuse is being allowed because of a loophole that was, sadly, created by a Federal court.

Today we have an opportunity to correct that wrong. We have an opportunity to do what we all acknowledge to be the right thing: to defend the most defenseless among us. It is, indeed, an honor for us to take this action on the week that commemorates National Missing Children's Week and here, even, on this day, National Missing Children's Day.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting the Protecting Against Child Exploitation Act. We hope that everyone will do the right thing here today.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115-152.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 3, insert after "section 2258B," the following:

"(h) Notwithstanding subsection (e), a person who violates paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a) and is 19 years of age or younger at the time the violation occurred may, in the alternative, be punished for a violation of this section by imprisonment for not more than 1 year or a fine under this title, or both, if—

"(1) the minor is 15 years of age or older and not more than 4 years younger than the person who committed the violation, at the time the sexually explicit conduct occurred; and

"(2) the sexually explicit conduct that occurred was consensual."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 352, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1100

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I associate myself with the words of the ranking member, Mr. CONYERS.

I look forward to strengthening these laws and, as well, working on legislation to continue to protect our children, our innocent children, from sexual abuse, sexual assault, and the devastation that it has on their lives.

So I rise to continue that theme and to indicate, as I said earlier, that some

of the clarifications in the underlying bill are important, and important to clarify, and important to provide prohibitions that will be clear in possible further court interpretations. But I maintain that we cannot predict the court interpretations, and the better and clearer that we are to protect our children, I believe, is a route that we should take.

The bill would add new classes of offenses. But section 2251 does not provide for Romeo and Juliet exceptions; i.e., the penalties apply even when conduct is consensual and when the victim and offender are close in age. For example, a 19-year-old and a 17-year-old who videotaped themselves engaged in a sexual act, then emailed the video to their own email accounts, the 19-year-old would be subject to mandatory minimums. That is the basis of the amendment, the Jackson Lee amendment.

The Jackson Lee amendment is a Romeo and Juliet exception. The amendment is a reasonable approach to treatment of adolescent behavior that should not be left to prosecutors. The pervasiveness of personal technology, such as cell phones and tablets, have given rise to teenage sexting. Research has shown that teenage sexting is widespread, even among middle school-age youth.

Under section 2251, teenagers prosecuted for talking and sending messages, and then taking and sending messages, would be subject to mandatory prison sentences of at least 15 years and sex offender registration.

In light of the recent troubling statements by Attorney General Sessions, Congress should provide an alternative to existing mandatory penalties in sexting cases, particularly with juveniles. We cannot say that a juvenile will not be prosecuted federally. They could be, under this particular statute.

So this is a carve-out, a Romeo and Juliet carve-out, to ensure that it does not happen, to protect against the possibility of it happening.

A study conducted by Drexel University found that more than half of the undergraduate students who took part in an online survey said they had sexted when they were teenagers, and 30 percent said that they included photos in that message, meaning that they had sent sexual texts.

Therefore, I ask that my colleagues come together and support the Jackson Lee amendment for a Romeo and Juliet carve-out.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, it is not only unnecessary, but it is fashioned in such a manner

which may potentially create the type of loophole that we are looking to close.

Under current law, so-called Romeo and Juliet cases, such as those between 19- and 50-year-olds, could be prosecuted under any of the child pornography laws—possession, production, or distribution. That has always been the case.

However, I reiterate that we know of no such instance that has been brought under any of these Federal provisions under the circumstances covered by this amendment, which further supports the fact that Federal prosecutors do not appear to be bringing such cases. There is just simply no evidence that has been produced to suggest otherwise. For that reason, the amendment is completely unnecessary, and it is based upon no evidence at all.

On the contrary, the underlying bill is based upon a real case where a real 7-year-old girl was sexually abused and photographed by a real sexual predator.

Our colleagues on the other side have also continually referred to Attorney General Sessions' recent charging memoranda which suggests that under the policy in his memo prosecutors will suddenly be forced to aggressively prosecute 19-year-olds who are engaging in consensual sexual conduct under this statute. But that notion is preposterous and is also based on no evidence.

As an initial matter, the minority completely ignores the fact that a prosecutor makes an initial determination as to whether to commence or decline prosecution. And this is distinct from the subsequent decision of what charges should be brought, which would only occur if the decision to prosecute is made in the first place.

According to the U.S. attorneys' manual, in making the initial determination to commence a prosecution, a prosecutor must consider whether "a substantial Federal interest would be served by the prosecution," and whether, "in his or her judgment: One, the person is subject to effective prosecution in another jurisdiction; or, two, there exists an adequate noncriminal alternative to prosecution."

The Sessions memo doesn't change any of that, and it is absurd to think that the memo will cause the Department of Justice to suddenly shift its prosecutions to aggressively go after Romeo and Juliet cases. This is especially ridiculous, as Attorney General Sessions had made clear from the outset, that the priorities of DOJ and this administration are to prosecute violent crimes and violent offenders.

I think that the minority just fundamentally misunderstands and mischaracterizes not only the Sessions memo but this legislation. For that reason, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose the Jackson Lee amendment.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me quickly say that I respect the gentleman, but I take great issue in calling a Member's amendment, or the analysis of that amendment, ridiculous, because it is not ridiculous. It is an extremely reasonable amendment. And unless he has some powers that I am not aware of, no one can predict when a prosecutor will determine that they will prosecute. We cannot. We pass criminal justice laws every day and cannot predict.

Whether or not it is based upon the Sessions memo, which as far as anyone who can read knows that we are going back to a stricter enforcement of everything criminal against everyone. That is clear.

The Jackson Lee amendment recognizes that not all sex offenses are the same. And currently, section 2251 is a one-size-fits-all sentencing scheme. It fits all, even a 19-year-old.

The Jackson Lee amendment would provide a better alternative. Punishment will be available involving offenses. When defendants are no more than 19 years old, they would have other alternatives. The judge would have discretion. That is simply what we are asking for.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article entitled, "Keep Mandatory Minimums Out of the Juvenile Justice System." This bill does not do that; and I also include an article entitled, "Teenage Sexting is Not Child Porn."

[June 16, 2014]

OP-ED: KEEP MANDATORY MINIMUMS OUT OF THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM
(By Lizzie Buchen)

Across the country, mandatory minimum sentences are falling out of favor. From Sen. Rand Paul to Attorney General Eric Holder, people from both ends of the political spectrum are blaming these harsh and punitive sentences for driving our skyrocketing incarceration rates and exacerbating racial disparities in the criminal justice system. But in this era of smart sentencing reform—particularly toward young people—a disturbing piece of legislation is coasting through the California legislature, threatening to wrench the state in the opposite direction. Senate Bill 838, authored by state Sen. Jim Beall (D-Santa Clara), would break new ground by establishing the first mandatory minimum sentences in the state's juvenile justice system.

The juvenile justice system was founded on the understanding that young people who commit offenses are often struggling in situations outside of their control, are highly amenable to rehabilitation and have the potential to lead productive and law-abiding lives. Mandatory minimum sentences automatic sentences of incarceration or confinement, meted out regardless of the facts of the case are completely at odds with these foundational principles. They are determined not by the youth's past circumstances or potential life ahead, but by what he or she has done. The only result is punishment, a sharp contrast to the rehabilitative ideals of the juvenile justice system.

Mandatory minimum sentences are completely incompatible with how juvenile court

works. When a youth has committed an offense, juvenile court judges tailor sanctions to best meet a youth's unique needs for rehabilitation by weighing a comprehensive set of factors, including the severity of the crime, the statement of the victims, and the circumstances of the youth's life—including mental health issues and experience with abuse, homelessness and extreme poverty. The judge then chooses from a wide range of community-based and residential options, allowing him or her to tailor the sanction to best treat the youth and protect the community. In line with this focus on rehabilitation, the sentences are indeterminate, with terms based on the youth's progress.

Proponents of mandatory minimum sentences, including supporters of California's youth mandatory minimum bill, claim that these sentences deter crime. But the evidence tells us this is a dubious notion at best. Although this bill would introduce the first mandatory minimum sentences in California's juvenile justice system, such sentences have been in place in the adult system for decades—and are widely recognized as failures. A large and growing body of research has found that mandatory minimum sentences have come at enormous social, financial and human costs, with little benefit to public safety. There is no evidence that these sentences have a significant deterrent effect. If anything, these harsh punishments are counterproductive, putting the public at risk by disrupting families, impoverishing communities of human capital, making it more difficult for people to return to law-abiding society and diverting precious public resources away from social services and toward costly incarceration.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 4, 2016]

TEENAGE SEXTING IS NOT CHILD PORN

(By Amy Adele Hasinoff)

Teenagers who sext are in a precarious legal position. Though in most states teenagers who are close in age can legally have consensual sex, if they create and share sexually explicit images of themselves, they are technically producing, distributing or possessing child pornography. The laws that cover this situation, passed decades ago, were meant to apply to adults who exploited children and require those convicted under them to register as sex offenders.

Though most prosecutors do not use these laws against consensual teenage sexters, some do. The University of New Hampshire's Crimes Against Children Research Center estimates that 7 percent of people arrested on suspicion of child pornography production in 2009 were teenagers who shared images with peers consensually.

Almost two dozen states, including New York, Illinois and Florida, have tried to solve the legal problems that surround sexting with new legislation, and others, like Colorado, are considering new sexting laws. These reforms typically give prosecutors the discretion to choose between child-pornography felony charges or lesser penalties like misdemeanor charges or a mandatory educational program.

These new laws may seem like a measured solution to the problem of charging teenage sexters with child pornography felonies. However, once they have the option of lesser penalties, prosecutors are more likely to press charges—not only against teenagers who distribute private images without permission, but also against those who sext consensually.

Given the extensive research that shows that young people who are nonwhite, low income, gay or transgender are disproportionately prosecuted for many crimes, there is

good reason to suspect that laws that criminalize teenage sexting are being unfairly applied as well. As legislators have tried to cope with the legal fallout, they have also opened up more types of images to scrutiny: While child pornography laws apply only to sexually explicit images, many new sexting laws criminalize all nude images of teenagers, including photos of topless teenage girls.

A better solution would be to bring child pornography laws in line with statutory rape laws by exempting teenagers who are close in age and who consensually create, share or receive sexual images. Vermont tried to enact major reform to its child pornography laws in 2009, but abandoned the effort after a national backlash and settled instead on a new misdemeanor law.

In February, New Mexico passed a limited version of child pornography reform, which shields teenagers who receive a sexual image from a peer from facing child-pornography possession charges. Teenagers who create or share sexual images can still be convicted of child pornography production or distribution.

Both existing child pornography laws and new sexting-specific laws criminalize a common behavior among teenagers. Studies have shown that roughly one-third of 16- and 17-year-olds share suggestive images on their cellphones. Among young adults, rates are above 50 percent. In the past, partners wrote love letters, sent suggestive Polaroids and had phone sex. Today, for better or worse, this kind of interpersonal sexual communication also occurs in a digital format. And it's not just young people: An article in an AARP magazine describes sexting as "fun, easy and usually harmless."

Like any sexual act, consensual sexting is somewhat risky and requires trust, but it is not inherently harmful as long as partners respect each other's privacy and are attentive to consent. Studies have found that around 3 percent of Americans report that someone has distributed private sexual images without their permission, and around 10 percent of sexters report negative consequences. The risk of distribution is significantly higher among those who were coerced into sexting.

The victim of a sexual privacy violation can be traumatized and humiliated, and is often blamed for his or her victimization. Unfortunately, the criminalization of sexting worsens this problem because teenagers know that if they report the incident they may be punished at school and possibly charged with the same offense as the perpetrator. In most jurisdictions, distributing a sexual image of a teenager is illegal, regardless of whether one is consensually sending a nude selfie to a partner or maliciously distributing a private photo of another person without permission.

Though some people believe that prohibiting sexting discourages the practice and protects teenagers from harm, research on abstinence-only sex education demonstrates that those policies actually increase unwanted pregnancies and sexually transmitted infections. Abstinence-only messages about sexting are likely to be counterproductive as well.

What parents and educators need to do instead is help young people learn how to navigate sexual risk and trust. Whether or not it is criminalized, we cannot prevent sexting, just as we cannot prevent teenagers from having sex. What we need to focus on is preventing acts of sexual violation, like the distribution of a private image without permis-

sion, pressuring a partner to sext or sending a sexual image to an unwilling recipient. Though not all teenagers are sexting, those who are (and those who will when they are older) need to learn how to practice safer sexting, which means that it always has to be consensual.

As State Senator George Muñoz, a prominent supporter of the amendment that established New Mexico's new sexting regime, told *The Guardian*, "Our laws have to change with technology." To keep up with those changes, the first step is to decriminalize consensual sexting by creating exceptions in child pornography laws for teenagers who are close in age.

Once we do this, we can concentrate on developing better ways to deal with the new digital forms of harm.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about my amendment to H.R. 1761, "Protecting Against Child Exploitation Act."

As Ranking Member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, I offer this amendment to help make H.R. 1761 a better bill to achieve its intended purpose.

Though troubled by any sexually explicit activity that may exploit and otherwise, harm our children, I believe that H.R. 1761, the "Protecting Against Child Exploitation Act," is deadly and counterproductive to ensuring protection of our youth population in our new technology era.

This bill will exacerbate overwhelming concerns with the unfair and unjust mandatory minimum sentencing that contributes to the overcriminalization of juveniles and mass incarceration generally.

Simply put, this bill will add to the already tragic realities of many juveniles. Rather than proceeding with the caution befitting an expansion of the mandatory sentencing penalty, H.R. 1761 is being rushed to the House Floor, without a single hearing and without the opportunity to consider amendments directly relevant to whether our system of criminalizing juveniles for sexting is fair, just, and sound policy.

Though presented as a proposal to protect children, H.R. 1761 excessively penalizes juveniles and creates life altering criminal charges when engaged in 'sexting'.

Rather, it raises new constitutional concerns; and it does not address documented and systemic unfairness and racial disparity in the imposition of mandatory sentencing and its overbroad sweep of criminalizing juveniles.

My amendment fixes that problem. It creates an alternative punishment (not more than one year of imprisonment) under section 2251 for teenagers who participate in "sexting" and might otherwise be subject to mandatory minimum sentences of at least 15 years in prison.

The Jackson Lee amendment is a thoughtful, narrowly-drawn provision that provides judges with a sensible sentencing option for teenagers no more than 19 years old who participate in sexting that may be applied in the judges' discretion, in appropriate cases.

The Jackson Lee amendment is a reasonable approach to treatment of adolescent behavior that should not be left to prosecutors. The pervasiveness of personal technology, such as cellphones and tablets, has given rise

to teenage "sexting." Research has shown that teenage sexting is widespread, even among middle school-aged youth. Under section 2251, teenagers prosecuted for taking and sending such messages would be subject to mandatory prison sentences of at least 15 years and sex offender registration. In light of the recent troubling statements made by Attorney General Sessions, Congress should provide an alternative to existing mandatory minimum penalties in "sexting" cases.

A study conducted by Drexel University found that more than half of the undergraduate students who took part in an online survey said that they sexted when they were teenagers. Thirty percent said they included photos in their messages and 61 percent did not know that sending nude photos via text could be considered child pornography. Another online survey published in 2008 found that almost 40 percent of teenagers between ages 13 and 19 had sent "sex" messages, almost 50 percent had received a sext message, and 20 percent posted nude or semi-nude content online.

The Jackson Lee amendment recognizes that not all sex offenses are the same. Currently, section 2251 employs a one-size-fits-all sentencing scheme. Under section 2251, a 19 year-old, who engages in "sexting" (sending or receiving a sexually explicit photo or video of a minor) with a willing, 17 year-old girlfriend or boyfriend, would be subject to the same mandatory minimum sentence as a 50 year-old man, who engages in the same conduct with a 17 year-old.

The Jackson Lee amendment would provide a better alternative. The alternative punishment would be available in prosecutions involving offenses under section 2251(a)(2) or 2251(a)(3), when the defendant is no more than 19 years old, the difference in age between the defendant and victim is no more than four years, and the sexually explicit conduct depicted in the photo or video was consensual. Judges would not be required to sentence teenagers pursuant to the alternative punishment.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman and congratulate her on this very important amendment.

This amendment creates alternative sentencing specifically for teenagers who participate in sexting and could, as a result of this bill and the application of current mandatory minimum sentences, be subject to mandatory sentences of at least 15 years. We should not, as she has already stated so well, leave it to prosecutors to determine whether teenagers take part in teenage behavior.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I have tremendous respect for my colleagues on the other side, Mr. CONYERS and Ms. JACKSON LEE. I understand her amendment is heartfelt and has the proper motive and attention.

I would just suggest, again, that the risk of this amendment outweighs any

potential benefit because it creates the kind of loopholes that we are trying here desperately to prevent.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1761, the Protecting Against Child Exploitation Act. Although I support the goal of the bill, which aims to strengthen existing laws that criminalize engaging in sexual acts with a child that result in the production of an image or video, I am concerned that its overly broad language could cause unintended consequences that go beyond the sponsors' intentions. Make no mistake, our children deserve the strongest possible protection against such heinous acts and abuse. I am deeply concerned; however, that the bill does not take into consideration situations between consenting teenagers. Teenagers today have access to more technology than ever before, and far too many of them do not comprehend the seriousness of exchanging sexually explicit images of themselves with one another. Although I do not condone such behavior, I cannot support a bill that does not distinguish between those situations and the morally reprehensible crimes against children. I commend my colleague, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, for offering an amendment that would make consensual activity between a minor who is fifteen years old or older and an adult who is nineteen years old or younger punishable as a misdemeanor, rather than a felony. The amendment was narrowly tailored to make sure that the punishment for such consensual situations is proportionate to the severity of the crime. I was disappointed that the House did not adopt the Jackson-Lee amendment, and I cannot support the underlying bill without the inclusion of this important policy provision.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and passage of H.R. 1773.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 180, nays 238, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

YEAS—180

Adams	Beatty	Bonamici
Aguilar	Beyer	Boyle, Brendan
Amash	Bishop (GA)	F.
Barragán	Blumenauer	Brady (PA)
Bass	Blunt Rochester	Brown (MD)

Brownley (CA)	Hanabusa	Pascarell	Jenkins (KS)	Mooney (WV)	Scott, Austin
Bustos	Hastings	Payne	Jenkins (WV)	Mullin	Sensenbrenner
Butterfield	Heck	Pelosi	Johnson (LA)	Murphy (PA)	Sessions
Capuano	Higgins (NY)	Perlmutter	Johnson (OH)	Noem	Shimkus
Carbajal	Himes	Pingree	Jones	Nunes	Shuster
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Pocan	Jordan	Olson	Simpson
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Polis	Joyce (OH)	Palazzo	Smith (MO)
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)	Katko	Palmer	Smith (NE)
Castor (FL)	Jayapal	Raskin	Kelly (MS)	Panetta	Smith (NJ)
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Rice (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Paulsen	Smith (TX)
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond	King (IA)	Pearce	Smucker
Cicilline	Kaptur	Rosen	King (NY)	Perry	Stefanik
Clark (MA)	Keating	Roybal-Allard	Kinzing	Peters	Stewart
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz	Knight	Peterson	Stivers
Clay	Kennedy	Ruppersberger	LaHood	Pittenger	Taylor
Cleaver	Khanna	Rush	LaMalfa	Poe (TX)	Tenney
Clyburn	Kildee	Ryan (OH)	Lamborn	Poliquin	Thompson (PA)
Cohen	Kilmer	Sánchez	Lance	Posey	Thornberry
Connolly	Kind	Sarbanes	Latta	Ratcliffe	Tiberi
Conyers	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky	Lewis (MN)	Reed	Tipton
Cooper	Kuster (NH)	Schiff	LoBiondo	Reichert	Trott
Correa	Labrador	Schneider	Long	Renacci	Turner
Courtney	Langevin	Scott (VA)	Loudermilk	Rice (SC)	Upton
Crist	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David	Love	Roby	Valadao
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Serrano	Lucas	Roe (TN)	Wagner
Cuellar	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
Davis (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Shea-Porter	MacArthur	Rogers (KY)	Walden
Davis, Danny	Lee	Sherman	Marchant	Rohrabacher	Walker
DeFazio	Levin	Sinema	Marino	Rokita	Walorski
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Sires	Marshall	Rooney, Francis	Walters, Mimi
Delaney	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter	Massie	Rooney, Thomas	Weber (TX)
DeLauro	Lipinski	Smith (WA)	Mast	J.	Webster (FL)
DeBene	Loebach	Soto	McCarthy	Ros-Lehtinen	Wenstrup
Demings	Loftgren	Speier	McCaul	Roskam	Westerman
DeSaulnier	Lowey	Suozi	McClintock	Ross	Williams
Deutch	Lujan Grisham,	Takano	McHenry	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)
Dingell	M.	Thompson (CA)	McKinley	Rouzer	Wittman
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)	McMorris	Royce (CA)	Womack
Doyle, Michael	Lynch	Titus	Rodgers	Russell	Woodall
F.	Maloney, Sean	Tonko	Meadows	Rutherford	Yoder
Ellison	Matsui	Torres	Meehan	Sanford	Yoho
Engel	McCollum	Tsongas	Messer	Scalise	Young (AK)
Eshoo	McEachin	Vargas	Mitchell	Schrader	Young (IA)
Españillat	McGovern	Veasey	Moolenaar	Schweikert	Zeldin
Esty (CT)	McNerney	Vela			
Evans	Meng	Velázquez			
Foster	Moore	Visclosky			
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Walz			
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Wasserman			
Gabbard	Nadler	Schultz			
Gallego	Napolitano	Neal			
Garamendi	Norcross	Watson Coleman			
Gonzalez (TX)	O'Halloran	Welch			
Green, Al	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)			
Green, Gene	Pallone	Yarmuth			
Grijalva					
Gutiérrez					

NAYS—238

Abraham	Chaffetz	Fortenberry
Aderholt	Cheney	Fox
Allen	Coffman	Franks (AZ)
Amodei	Cole	Frelinghuysen
Arrington	Collins (GA)	Gaetz
Babin	Collins (NY)	Gallagher
Bacon	Cramer	Garrett
Banks (IN)	Comstock	Gibbs
Barletta	Conaway	Gohmert
Barr	Cook	Goodlatte
Barton	Costa	Gosar
Bera	Costello (PA)	Gottheimer
Bergman	Cramer	Gowdy
Biggs	Crawford	Granger
Bilirakis	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Bishop (MI)	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (LA)
Bishop (UT)	Davidson	Graves (MO)
Black	Davis, Rodney	Griffith
Blackburn	Denham	Grothman
Blum	Dent	Guthrie
Bost	DeSantis	Harper
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Harris
Brat	Diaz-Balart	Hartzer
Bridenstine	Donovan	Hensarling
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Herrera Beutler
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Hice, Jody B.
Buchanan	Duncan (TN)	Higgins (LA)
Buck	Dunn	Hill
Bucshon	Emmer	Holding
Budd	Estes (KS)	Hollingsworth
Burgess	Farenthold	Hudson
Byrne	Faso	Huizenga
Calvert	Ferguson	Hultgren
Carter (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Hunter
Carter (TX)	Fleischmann	Hurd
Chabot	Flores	Issa

Jenkins (KS)	Mooney (WV)	Scott, Austin
Jenkins (WV)	Mullin	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (LA)	Murphy (PA)	Sessions
Johnson (OH)	Noem	Shimkus
Jones	Nunes	Shuster
Jordan	Olson	Simpson
Joyce (OH)	Palazzo	Smith (MO)
Katko	Palmer	Smith (NE)
Kelly (MS)	Panetta	Smith (NJ)
Kelly (PA)	Paulsen	Smith (TX)
King (IA)	Pearce	Smucker
King (NY)	Perry	Stefanik
Kinzing	Peters	Stewart
Knight	Peterson	Stivers
LaHood	Pittenger	Taylor
LaMalfa	Poe (TX)	Tenney
Lamborn	Poliquin	Thompson (PA)
Lance	Posey	Thornberry
Latta	Ratcliffe	Tiberi
Lewis (MN)	Reed	Tipton
LoBiondo	Reichert	Trott
Long	Renacci	Turner
Loudermilk	Rice (SC)	Upton
Love	Roby	Valadao
Lucas	Roe (TN)	Wagner
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
MacArthur	Rogers (KY)	Walden
Marchant	Rohrabacher	Walker
Marino	Rokita	Walorski
Marshall	Rooney, Francis	Walters, Mimi
Massie	Rooney, Thomas	Weber (TX)
Mast	J.	Webster (FL)
McCarthy	Ros-Lehtinen	Wenstrup
McCaul	Roskam	Westerman
McClintock	Ross	Williams
McHenry	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)
McKinley	Rouzer	Wittman
McMorris	Royce (CA)	Womack
Rodgers	Russell	Woodall
Meadows	Rutherford	Yoder
Meehan	Sanford	Yoho
Messer	Scalise	Young (AK)
Mitchell	Schrader	Young (IA)
Moolenaar	Schweikert	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Cummings	Maloney,	Nolan
Johnson (GA)	Carolyn B.	Qigley
Johnson, Sam	McSally	Swalwell (CA)
Kihuen	Meeks	
Kustoff (TN)	Newhouse	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1132

Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. WILSON of South Carolina, ARRINGTON, BURGESS, BISHOP of Michigan, GARRETT, ROGERS of Alabama, YOHIO, and DIAZ-BALART changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. RICHMOND changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 368, noes 51, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

AYES—368

Abraham	Denham	Kelly (PA)
Adams	Dent	Kennedy
Aderholt	DeSantis	Kildee
Aguilar	DesJarlais	Kilmer
Allen	Deutch	Kind
Amodei	Diaz-Balart	King (IA)
Arrington	Dingell	King (NY)
Babin	Doggett	Kinzinger
Bacon	Donovan	Knight
Banks (IN)	Doyle, Michael	Krishnamoorthi
Barletta	F.	Kuster (NH)
Barr	Duffy	Labrador
Barragán	Duncan (SC)	LaHood
Barton	Duncan (TN)	LaMalfa
Beatty	Dunn	Lamborn
Bera	Emmer	Lance
Bergman	Engel	Langevin
Biggs	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Bilirakis	Españillat	Larson (CT)
Bishop (GA)	Estes (KS)	Latta
Bishop (MI)	Esty (CT)	Lawrence
Bishop (UT)	Farenthold	Lawson (FL)
Black	Faso	Levin
Blackburn	Ferguson	Lewis (MN)
Blum	Fitzpatrick	Lieu, Ted
Blunt Rochester	Fleischmann	Lipinski
Bost	Flores	LoBiondo
Boyle, Brendan	Fortenberry	Loeb sack
F.	Foster	Lofgren
Brady (PA)	Fox	Long
Brady (TX)	Frankel (FL)	Loudermilk
Brat	Franks (AZ)	Love
Bridenstine	Frelinghuysen	Lowe
Brooks (AL)	Gabbard	Lucas
Brooks (IN)	Gaetz	Luetkemeyer
Brown (MD)	Gallagher	Lujan Grisham,
Brownley (CA)	Gallego	M.
Buchanan	Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray
Buck	Garrett	Lynch
Bucshon	Gibbs	MacArthur
Budd	Gohmert	Maloney, Sean
Burgess	Gonzalez (TX)	Marchant
Bustos	Goodlatte	Marino
Butterfield	Gosar	Marshall
Byrne	Gottheimer	Mast
Calvert	Gowdy	Matsui
Capuano	Granger	McCarthy
Carbajal	Graves (GA)	McCaul
Carson (IN)	Graves (LA)	McClintock
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	McCollum
Carter (TX)	Green, Gene	McHenry
Cartwright	Griffith	McKinley
Castor (FL)	Grothman	McMorris
Chabot	Guthrie	Rodgers
Chaffetz	Hanabusa	McNerney
Cheney	Harper	Meadows
Ciçilline	Harris	Meehan
Clark (MA)	Hartzer	Meng
Coffman	Heck	Messer
Cohen	Hensarling	Mitchell
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Moolenaar
Collins (GA)	Hice, Jody B.	Mooney (WV)
Collins (NY)	Higgins (LA)	Moulton
Comer	Higgins (NY)	Mullin
Comstock	Hill	Murphy (FL)
Conaway	Himes	Murphy (PA)
Connolly	Holding	Napolitano
Cook	Hollingsworth	Neal
Cooper	Hoyer	Noem
Correa	Hudson	Norcross
Costa	Huizenga	Nunes
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	O'Halloran
Courtney	Hunter	O'Rourke
Cramer	Hurd	Olson
Crawford	Issa	Palazzo
Crist	Jeffries	Palmer
Crowley	Jenkins (KS)	Panetta
Cuellar	Jenkins (WV)	Pascrell
Culberson	Johnson (LA)	Paulsen
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Pearce
Davidson	Jones	Pelosi
Davis, Rodney	Jordan	Perlmutter
DeFazio	Joyce (OH)	Perry
DeGette	Kaptur	Peters
Delaney	Katko	Peterson
DeLauro	Keating	Pingree
DelBene	Kelly (IL)	Pittenger
Demings	Kelly (MS)	Poe (TX)

Poliquin	Scalise	Titus
Polis	Schiff	Tonko
Posey	Schneider	Torres
Price (NC)	Schrader	Trott
Quigley	Schweikert	Tsongas
Raskin	Scott, Austin	Turner
Ratcliffe	Scott, David	Upton
Reed	Sensenbrenner	Valadao
Reichert	Serrano	Vargas
Renacci	Sessions	Vela
Rice (NY)	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Rice (SC)	Shea-Porter	Visclosky
Roby	Shimkus	Wagner
Roe (TN)	Shuster	Walberg
Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Walden
Rogers (KY)	Sinema	Walker
Rohrabacher	Sires	Walorski
Rokita	Slaughter	Walters, Mimi
Rooney, Francis	Smith (MO)	Walz
Rooney, Thomas	Smith (NE)	Weber (TX)
J.	Smith (NJ)	Webster (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Welch
Rosen	Smucker	Wenstrup
Roskam	Soto	Westerman
Ross	Speier	Williams
Rothfus	Stefanik	Wilson (SC)
Rouzer	Stewart	Wittman
Roybal-Allard	Stivers	Womack
Royce (CA)	Suzoi	Woodall
Ruiz	Taylor	Yarmuth
Ruppersberger	Tenney	Yoder
Russell	Thompson (CA)	Yoho
Rutherford	Thompson (MS)	Young (AK)
Ryan (OH)	Thompson (PA)	Young (IA)
Sánchez	Thornberry	Zeldin
Sanford	Tiberi	
Sarbanes	Tipton	

NOES—51

Amash	Green, Al
Bass	Grijalva
Beyer	Gutiérrez
Blumenauer	Hastings
Bonamici	Huffman
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee
Castro (TX)	Jayapal
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.
Clay	Khanna
Cleaver	Lee
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)
Conyers	Lowenthal
Davis, Danny	Masse
DeSaulnier	McEachin
Ellison	McGovern
Evans	Moore
Fudge	Nadler

NOT VOTING—11

Cummings	Kustoff (TN)	Meeks
Davis (CA)	Maloney,	Newhouse
Johnson, Sam	Carolyn B.	Nolan
Kihuen	McSally	Swalwell (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1140

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed her vote from “aye” to “no.” So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING YOUNG VICTIMS FROM SEXUAL ABUSE ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 1973) to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 3, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

YEAS—415

Abraham	Costello (PA)	Hartzler
Adams	Courtney	Heck
Aderholt	Cramer	Hensarling
Aguilar	Crawford	Herrera Beutler
Allen	Crist	Hice, Jody B.
Amodei	Crowley	Higgins (LA)
Arrington	Cuellar	Hill
Babin	Culberson	Himes
Bacon	Curbelo (FL)	Holding
Banks (IN)	Davidson	Hollingsworth
Barletta	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Barr	Davis, Danny	Hudson
Barragán	Davis, Rodney	Huffman
Barton	DeFazio	Huizenga
Bass	DeGette	Hultgren
Beatty	Delaney	Hunter
Bera	DeLauro	Hurd
Bergman	DelBene	Issa
Beyer	Demings	Jackson Lee
Biggs	Denham	Jayapal
Bilirakis	Dent	Jeffries
Bishop (GA)	DeSantis	Jenkins (KS)
Bishop (MI)	DeSaulnier	Jenkins (WV)
Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Johnson (GA)
Black	Deutch	Johnson (LA)
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)
Blum	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	Doggett	Jones
Blunt Rochester	Donovan	Jordan
Bonamici	Doyle, Michael	Joyce (OH)
Bost	F.	Kaptur
Boyle, Brendan	Duffy	Katko
F.	Duncan (SC)	Keating
Brady (PA)	Duncan (TN)	Kelly (IL)
Brady (TX)	Dunn	Kelly (MS)
Brat	Ellison	Kelly (PA)
Bridenstine	Emmer	Kennedy
Brooks (AL)	Engel	Khanna
Brooks (IN)	Eshoo	Kildee
Brown (MD)	Españillat	Kilmer
Brownley (CA)	Estes (KS)	Kind
Buchanan	Esty (CT)	King (IA)
Buck	Evans	King (NY)
Bucshon	Farenthold	Kinzinger
Budd	Faso	Krishnamoorthi
Burgess	Ferguson	Kuster (NH)
Bustos	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Butterfield	Fleischmann	LaHood
Byrne	Flores	LaMalfa
Calvert	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Capuano	Foster	Lance
Carbajal	Fox	Langevin
Cárdenas	Frankel (FL)	Larsen (WA)
Carson (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Larson (CT)
Carter (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Carter (TX)	Fudge	Lawrence
Cartwright	Gabbard	Lawson (FL)
Castor (FL)	Gaetz	Lee
Castro (TX)	Gallagher	Levin
Chabot	Gallego	Lewis (GA)
Chaffetz	Garamendi	Lewis (MN)
Cheney	Garrett	Lieu, Ted
Chu, Judy	Gibbs	Lipinski
Ciçilline	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Clark (MA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Loeb sack
Clarke (NY)	Goodlatte	Lofgren
Clay	Gosar	Long
Cleaver	Gottheimer	Loudermilk
Clyburn	Gowdy	Love
Coffman	Granger	Lowenthal
Cohen	Graves (GA)	Lowe
Cole	Graves (LA)	Lucas
Collins (GA)	Graves (MO)	Luetkemeyer
Collins (NY)	Green, Al	Lujan Grisham,
Comer	Green, Gene	M.
Comstock	Griffith	Luján, Ben Ray
Conaway	Grijalva	Lynch
Connolly	Grothman	MacArthur
Conyers	Guthrie	Maloney, Sean
Cook	Gutiérrez	Marchant
Cooper	Hanabusa	Marino
Correa	Harper	Marshall
Costa	Harris	

Mast	Reed	Smucker
Matsui	Reichert	Soto
McCarthy	Renacci	Stefanik
McCaul	Rice (NY)	Stewart
McClintock	Rice (SC)	Stivers
McCollum	Richmond	Suozzi
McEachin	Roby	Takano
McGovern	Roe (TN)	Taylor
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Tenney
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (CA)
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Thompson (MS)
Rodgers	Rokita	Thompson (PA)
McNerney	Rooney, Francis	Thornberry
Meadows	Rooney, Thomas	Tiberi
Meehan	J.	Tipton
Meng	Ros-Lehtinen	Titus
Messer	Rosen	Tonko
Mitchell	Roskam	Torres
Moolenaar	Ross	Trott
Mooney (WV)	Rothfus	Tsongas
Moore	Rouzer	Turner
Moulton	Roybal-Allard	Upton
Mullin	Royce (CA)	Valadao
Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Vargas
Murphy (PA)	Ruppersberger	Veasey
Nadler	Rush	Vela
Napolitano	Russell	Velázquez
Neal	Rutherford	Visclosky
Noem	Ryan (OH)	Wagner
Norcross	Sánchez	Walberg
Nunes	Sanford	Walden
O'Halleran	Sarbanes	Walker
O'Rourke	Scalise	Walorski
Olson	Schakowsky	Walters, Mimi
Palazzo	Schiff	Walz
Pallone	Schneider	Wasserman
Palmer	Schrader	Schultz
Panetta	Schweikert	Waters, Maxine
Pascarell	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman
Paulsen	Scott, Austin	Weber (TX)
Payne	Scott, David	Webster (FL)
Pearce	Sensenbrenner	Welch
Pelosi	Serrano	Wenstrup
Perlmutter	Sessions	Westerman
Perry	Sewell (AL)	Williams
Peters	Shea-Porter	Wilson (FL)
Peterson	Sherman	Wilson (SC)
Pingree	Shimkus	Wittman
Pittenger	Shuster	Womack
Pocan	Simpson	Woodall
Poe (TX)	Sinema	Yarmuth
Poliquin	Sires	Yoder
Polis	Slaughter	Yoho
Posey	Smith (MO)	Young (AK)
Price (NC)	Smith (NE)	Young (IA)
Quigley	Smith (NJ)	Zeldin
Raskin	Smith (TX)	
Ratcliffe	Smith (WA)	

NAYS—3

Amash	Hastings	Massie

NOT VOTING—12

Cummings	Maloney	Nolan
Higgins (NY)	Carolyn B.	Speier
Johnson, Sam	McSally	Swaikwell (CA)
Kihuen	Meeks	
Kustoff (TN)	Newhouse	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1147

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I mistakenly voted "no," when I meant to vote "yes" on rollcall No. 285.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, the man who has served as a father figure to me for the past twenty years has taken a turn for the worse in his battle against cancer and his health is rapidly deteriorating. As such, I have

returned home and will miss votes today, Thursday, May 25. Had I been present, I would have voted: "NAY" on rollcall No. 283, "YEA" on rollcall No. 284, and "YEA" on rollcall No. 285.

TO AMEND SECTION 1214 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PROVIDE FOR STAYS DURING A PERIOD THAT THE MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD LACKS A QUORUM

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1083) to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAETZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1083

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. STAYS BY MSPB DURING PERIODS WITH NO QUORUM.

Section 1214(b)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(i)" before "The Board may"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) If the Board lacks the number of members appointed under section 1201 required to constitute a quorum, any remaining member of the Board who was appointed, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall, upon request by the Special Counsel, extend the period of any stay granted under subparagraph (A)."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY JODY B. HICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 1214(b)(1)(B)(ii) of title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be added by section 1(2) of the bill, strike "shall" and insert "may".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOURLY OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING BRIAN C. COOPER ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. WOMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Brian C. Cooper, who is retiring from the Office of the Parliamentarian after 35 years on Capitol Hill.

Brian is a native of Baltimore, Maryland, and a graduate of Frederick Douglass High School and the Community College of Baltimore County, where he received his degree in commercial and graphic arts.

Brian began his Capitol Hill career in September of 1992, when he was hired in the stockroom of the Longworth Building, working in publication and distribution services.

Throughout the eighties and early nineties, Brian held a variety of positions on Capitol Hill, including roles on the Small Business Committee and the Government Operations Subcommittee. Through this experience, Brian learned the intricacies of the legislative process and the inner-workings of House operations, skills that would serve him well when, in 1995, he was hired as an Assistant Clerk to the Parliamentarian.

Brian would spend the next 22 years in the House Parliamentarian's Office and became Chief Clerk to the Parliamentarian in 2009. For over two decades, Brian has been a fixture at the House rostrum, dutifully assisting the presiding officer in timekeeping, recognizing Members on the floor, and preparing and reviewing reams of legislative paperwork for the House.

Brian has prepared the House Chambers for both visiting dignitaries and State of the Union addresses alike, and everything in between. If that wasn't enough, Brian also created the first computer network for the Parliamentarian.

An accomplished artist, Brian remains active in artistic endeavors, which run the gamut from pencil drawings, watercolors, and oils, to photography and architectural design. His retirement will offer new opportunities to continue these pursuits. A devoted Orioles fan, it is my hope that Brian will spend some of his well-earned free time at Camden Yards.

A consummate professional, Brian has spent his career on Capitol Hill committed to assisting with an orderly and accurate legislative process, observed in a fair and nonpartisan manner. He is a quintessential legislative resource for this entire body, and I am certain the House of Representatives has known few individuals more dedicated to its proper functioning and legacy than Brian Cooper.

On behalf of everyone affiliated with this, the people's House, including my colleagues gathered in front of me here as I speak, Brian, we are happy to celebrate this important milestone in your life, and we thank you for your dedicated service to the House and to America.

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, the President's fiscal year 2018 budget calls for the elimination of the Minority Business Development Agency. This is shameful and counterproductive to the progress that minority-owned firms have achieved.

I led on this issue by sending two bipartisan letters to the House Appropriations Committee, joined by over 70 Members, advocating for Congress to fund the MBDA at fiscal 2017 levels, and recommending that the MBDA provide annual policy reports to Congress.

The agency has one of the highest returns on investment in the Federal Government, helping minority-owned firms secure \$40 billion in contracts and capital over the last 10 years. The 8 million minority businesses in the United States contribute \$1.4 trillion in economic output to the economy. My home State of California leads the Nation with 1.6 million minority-owned firms, which represents 45 percent of all businesses in my State.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to continue funding the Minority Business Development Agency so that we can continue to see this progress in our economic growth and for the communities of our Nation.

NATIONAL MISSING CHILDREN'S DAY

(Mr. BIGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, today is National Missing Children's Day. This day of recognition was started by President Reagan in 1983 to raise awareness of the threat of child abduction, and reminds us today that we still have work to do.

Following the tragic murder of 9-year-old Amber Hagerman in 1996, Congress authorized the AMBER Alert system to create a coordinated alert system to assist law enforcement in finding abducted children in the important first hours after an abduction. Since its inception, more than 800 children have been recovered through the use of the AMBER Alert system.

However, the original legislation did not include Indian Tribes as eligible

users of the program, and we saw the tragic effects of this exclusion when 11-year-old Ashlynn Mike was abducted and murdered on the Navajo Nation.

For this reason, I have introduced the AMBER Alert in Indian Country Act. This act will include our 567 Federally recognized tribes as partners in the AMBER Alert Program to ensure that everyone is able to utilize this important tool. My bill is a bipartisan effort and it is endorsed by criminal justice, child safety groups, and Indian Tribes around the country.

Mr. Speaker, the AMBER Alert has helped many families experience the joy of being reunited with an abducted child. It is time we extend this alert to Indian Country so that no child is outside the jurisdiction of this vital program.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so we can continue to protect our children.

AMERICA NEEDS A RAISE

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, America needs a raise.

It has been years since we have increased the Federal minimum wage, which is an abysmal \$7.25. All over this country, we see ballot measures passing in red States and blue State increasing the minimum wage, like Alaska and Arkansas. We have seen the minimum wage go up in New Jersey and all over the country. While people in Congress may not realize that America needs a raise, people across the United States do.

Today I am going to participate in a press conference to say that we are going to propose a bill to raise the minimum to \$15 an hour and index it. This is a simple recognition that if you work full time, you shouldn't live in poverty. If you work full time, you shouldn't have to rely on food stamps, you shouldn't have to rely on housing assistance, and you shouldn't have to rely on medical assistance.

I believe in those programs and I support them, but if you work hard every day, you shouldn't have to rely on government assistance just to put food on the table.

Mr. Speaker, two-thirds of the people who benefit from an increase in the minimum wage are women. This is a gender issue. This is a general inequality problem.

We have to fight. America needs a raise, Mr. Speaker. Let's do it.

□ 1200

REMEMBERING DR. AMY REED

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that we say goodbye to Dr. Amy Reed, a recognized physician, exemplary mother and wife, and dedicated patient advocate.

Dr. Reed didn't ask for the situation she found herself in following a procedure in 2013, but it was immediately evident to anyone that met her—and her family—that she was going to be a fighter, not only for herself but for others.

Through her loving husband's, Hooman's, campaign to bring awareness to the dangers of power morcellators, there is no doubt that women's lives around this country have been saved and device manufacturers and regulators have been forced to review their safety protocols and standards.

This is Amy's gift, and we are eternally grateful. My thoughts and prayers are with her dedicated husband and partner, their six children, and her entire family. Let our community embrace them in their time of sorrow and vow to carry Amy's legacy and mission forward.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today, Attorney General Jefferson Beauregard Sessions spoke in Memphis, Tennessee. I felt like I was listening to something out of the fifties or sixties. He put out all the platitudes about being tough on crime and locking people up and thinking that was going to help solve the crime problem.

He didn't talk at all about the cost of crime and the Bernie Madoff-like budget that we have been presented by the Trump administration, cutting minority business centers, cutting SNAP funding, cutting LIHEAP funding, and cutting opportunities for Medicaid, healthcare, and education.

There are causes to crime that should be attacked. There is a smart way to attack crime, and there is a dumb way to attack crime. The dumb way is to return to the era where we failed because we locked up so many people at \$30,000 a year that the only people who are happy about his approach are the private prison industry who make money out of people's misery and crime.

MEMORIAL DAY

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to honor our country's fallen servicemen and -women. This weekend, we will observe Memorial Day, a day dedicated to those who

have fought and died selflessly to protect our country.

Since 1868, Americans have celebrated what was once called Decoration Day to honor the fallen. Every year since then, we have honored those who have fallen at Gettysburg, at San Juan Hill, in the Argonne Forest, on the shores of Normandy and Guadalcanal, at Inchon, at Ia Drang, in the desert at Objective Norfolk, on the streets of Fallujah, and in Zabul Province.

This important day is not only meant to commemorate those who lost their lives fighting for our country but also to highlight why they were called upon to serve our country in battle. They fought to preserve the great privilege of freedom that we must never take for granted.

America's promise of liberty would not be possible without the courage and sacrifice of our men and women in uniform. We owe these patriots a debt that can never be repaid but that must be remembered always, not just on Memorial Day.

This day of remembrance is a solemn occasion, and, therefore, let us not only say prayers for the fallen, let's also celebrate their lives and give heartfelt thanks to God and their families for their sacrifices in protecting our Nation, the world's bastion of liberty and freedom.

CHILD RESCUE COALITION

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I supported the Protecting Against Child Exploitation Act to help stop the unspeakable cruelty of child pornography.

The trade of child pornography on the internet is not just information streaming across wires, it is abuse; and those who trade in child pornography are compounding the physical abuse of innocent victims who are depicted in these horrible images. They are real children next door and across the country.

An astounding 28 percent of American youth will be sexually victimized at some point in their lives. Thankfully, the Child Rescue Coalition in Boca Raton, Florida, is already fighting back. They are using real-time data to help law enforcement track sexual predators from the darkest corners of the internet to their front door.

Child Rescue Coalition has used their cutting edge technology as a critical partner with law enforcement and child advocates to help rescue over 2,000 lonely, afraid, and hurt children across the world.

I thank my constituent, Carly Yoost, for the heroic work of the Child Rescue Coalition—shielding, rescuing, and

safeguarding children from sexual exploitation.

THE FIGHT TO STOP HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue support for this week's focus on combating human trafficking.

Some of the people most vulnerable to trafficking are unaccompanied alien children who cross our southern border. These children are oftentimes released to sponsors or relatives, and sometimes they simply disappear. Once released, unaccompanied alien children receive one follow-up phone call, and many are never contacted, leaving them potentially vulnerable to trafficking.

No child should fall into the hands of traffickers because of our lack of surveillance. When I was in practice as a physician, if I ever suspected that a child had been abused, I was required by law to notify authorities. We should require no less of our Federal agencies.

Today, I am asking the Office of Refugee Resettlement to redouble their efforts to make certain these children never end up in the care of the wrong people.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank our Denton County sheriff, Tracy Murphree. Just last weekend, they conducted a significant human trafficking operation that led to 11 arrests. I am grateful for them and for all law enforcement officials for taking the steps to end this abuse.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR AN IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to go home and join my community in honoring the fallen as we come together and say thank you. But as I go home, as well, I will be visiting with so many constituents who will be asking the question: Why?

This week in the Budget Committee, a very callous statement by the OMB Director about diabetes victims or individuals who have that disease who are sitting on their couch and eating nonnutritious food, because the budget that the President has offered wants to take 23 million people off of healthcare, take \$880 billion away from seniors who are in nursing homes who need Medicaid, and shutting down the Meals on Wheels. That is inhumane and cruel.

At the same time, they will be asking me about the ridiculous, if you will, actions of the President firing the FBI

Director because he was involved in the Russian investigation, asking the National Security Agency Director to block or to avoid talking about Russian collusion, and the National Intelligence Director asking him to cover up such things.

I believe now it is time for an impeachment inquiry that goes along with the other investigations, along with the U.S. commission, along with the legislation on the special prosecutor because a special counsel can be fired. Our constituents are asking for the truth, and we need to give the truth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR VETERANS

(Mr. SUOZZI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Mental Health Services for All Veterans Act.

Last week, on May 18, just before noon, a man in his car did a U-turn in Times Square, New York, and mowed down 23 people, killing a young woman. This man is obviously mentally ill. This man is also a Navy veteran.

He is not alone. Every day in America, roughly 22 veterans commit suicide. In fact, according to a study by the GAO, 60 percent of troops that have been discharged for misconduct in recent years suffered from a mental illness.

It is simply too difficult for many veterans in this country to receive mental health counseling, and we need to make mental health counseling available for every single veteran in this country, regardless of whether they were in the National Guard, in the Reserves, or in Active Duty.

It is obvious when someone loses a limb or is injured tragically in war to identify that their injury is service related. But for veterans who go home at night and are alone by themselves suffering with a mental illness, too many are suffering alone, and it is not easy to identify these problems—especially when they are in crisis—to show up at a counseling center or to show up at a VA and demonstrate that their injury, their mental illness, is service related.

We need to change this in this country. We need to make mental health services available for every single veteran in this country, regardless of their status and regardless of their income, in every single circumstance.

VA SCHEDULING

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the passage of the Veterans Administration Scheduling Accountability Act.

All too often, I hear from veterans across the 22nd District of New York who have waited months, and some years, to have their claims addressed.

In their service to our great Nation, our veterans sacrifice so much. They should never die waiting for care they deserve and need. That is why the House took important steps to reform the scheduling and appeals process while expanding access to the important resources that our veterans depend on. This bill will hold every VA accountable. We seek to correct a wrong that has hurt so many of our veterans.

On behalf of the veterans in the 22nd District, I thank my colleague, Representative JACKIE WALORSKI, and my colleagues in the House, for putting our Nation's heroes first and unanimously passing this important piece of legislation right before Memorial Day.

NATIONAL ASTHMA AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, May is Asthma Awareness Month. As co-chair of the House Asthma and Allergy Caucus, I would like to talk about what we can do for our constituents living with asthma.

About 24 million Americans have asthma, and more than one-quarter are children. Asthma costs our health system more than \$56 billion every year, along with billions lost in lost productivity.

In New York, where more than one and a half million live with asthma, we are all too familiar with these staggering costs which come on top of a heartbreaking human toll: about 3,600 Americans die every year because of asthma.

I have asked appropriators to fund the CDC's National Asthma Control Program which helps States monitor and treat asthma at \$29 million. This program has brought down asthma-related costs by billions and literally saves lives.

Since the program's inception, deaths from asthma episodes have fallen nearly one-quarter. So this works. It is money well spent, and we can't afford not to have it.

In honor of Asthma Awareness Month, I implore my colleagues to support this program and bring Americans living with asthma much-needed relief.

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNIVERSITY WITHOUT WALLS

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 45th anniversary of the University of Massachusetts Amherst University Without Walls, one of the oldest and most highly regarded adult bachelor's degree completion programs in the Nation.

Founded in 1971, UWW provides non-traditional students with access to the resources of our best universities. It has developed into a national leader in adult education, having graduated nearly 4,300 students, including basketball legend, Julius Erving.

One of the first programs in the Nation to offer an innovative blend of on-line and classroom learning, UWW provides an excellent education to students, including many veterans who are unable to complete a traditional college degree due to financial constraints, family obligations, or personal hardship.

The key to success is the incredible team of UMass Amherst faculty and staff who have dedicated their lives to teaching and supporting adult students as they balance family, community, and academic responsibilities.

I wish to personally thank all of the faculty, staff, and UWW students for their dedication to excellence.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S BUDGET

(Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to President Trump's proposed budget. This budget proposal confirms our worst fears about the priorities of his administration.

The budget is cruel, it is short-sighted, and would be a disaster for efforts to strengthen the middle class in my district and across this country.

It will hurt hardworking families and communities throughout New Hampshire. It guts public education, after-school programs, and student loan support. It jeopardizes clean air, clean water, and our response to the opioid epidemic that is reaching crisis proportions.

It eliminates critical programs for the most vulnerable, like the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program which keeps low-income seniors and families warm in the cold winter months and SNAP which helps families feed their children, and decimates successful economic development programs like the Northern Border Regional Commission and community development block grants.

The last thing we should be doing is eliminating effective programs that create jobs and boost our economic competitiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose these misguided cuts.

□ 1215

SEXUAL ASSAULT IN CALIFORNIA

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Nolan Bruder's younger sister believed that she could trust her big brother. So when this 19-year-old brother offered her marijuana "dabs" and the opportunity to get high, she accepted, trusting him. But with Nolan's pushing, she became so stoned that she no longer recognized the man in front of her, that it was her older brother.

Taking advantage of her drugged state, he sexually assaulted his own 16-year-old sister. This is repugnant, Mr. Speaker.

On May 17, Nolan was sentenced for rape of an intoxicated person. The sentence? A mere 240 days in prison and then probation. Why? Because the judge decided that prison would severely impact Bruder.

Well, Mr. Speaker, isn't that the point?

Even evidence showed the defendant had no remorse and was smug at the trial.

I was a prosecutor and a judge in Texas for over 30 years. I met a lot of rape victims and learned that their lives were forever devastated by rapists.

Mr. Speaker, sexual assault is never the fault of the victim, contrary to what Judge Follett thinks. Judge Follett got it wrong, Mr. Speaker. He got it wrong in this case. It is time for him to pack his toothbrush and leave the bench.

And that is just the way it is.

INTRODUCING THE UNITED STATES-ISRAEL AGRICULTURE STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP ACT

(Mr. SOTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the United States-Israel Agriculture Strategic Partnership Act, H.R. 2659, a bipartisan bill that permanently authorizes the U.S.-Israel Binational Agricultural Research and Development program, otherwise known as BARD, which is celebrating its 40th anniversary.

I thank my co-introducer, Congressman YOHO, as well as you, Mr. Speaker, for being a cosponsor, and many others in the Florida delegation.

I could wax ecstatic and poetic about BARD, but let me just say this: the program works. It inspires healthy competition of good ideas. It is beneficial to both countries and provides a fantastic return on investment; over \$440 million worth of benefits for the United States and \$300 million of benefits for Israel.

BARD is focused on urgent goals like increasing agricultural productivity, particularly in hot and dry climates.

BARD is training the next generation of innovators through ag science workshops and postdoctoral fellowships. It funds programs in over 25 States, including our great State of Florida. It strengthens our relationship with our best ally in the Middle East: Israel.

This is a forward-looking, common-sense, bipartisan bill supported by experts and advocates on both sides of the aisle.

MEMORIAL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the heels of Memorial Day to discuss what we must learn from those we specifically remember on this and every Memorial Day going forward.

All among us, every single person in this Chamber, every single person that visits here, we all have those days of the year where the history that is buried down deep inside of us is stirred up for whatever reason that may be. For some of us maybe it is that we lost a loved one right around Christmas and now we can't get through the holidays without remembering that person each year and the ways in which that person touched our life.

Maybe for others it was right around your birthday when you lost a loved one or somebody passed, and on each year on the celebration of your own life, you find yourself remembering the loss of that life, the loss of that friend.

Maybe for you that history is buried down inside and gets stirred up because of a certain smell in the air that brings you back to a time and place in your life. It can be hearing a special song that had meaning and somehow connected that person to you.

For others, maybe it is driving past a certain restaurant or an intersection

or a park that really weighs heavily on your heart.

I find those feelings each and every day as I look down at my wrist and I read these bracelets with the names of friends who left this world in the most honorable way that any person can: in defense of our Nation.

Men like Army Ranger Medic Jonathan Peney. On his fourth tour in Afghanistan, he died on June 1, 2010, from wounds that he sustained while giving medical aid to another wounded Ranger. He was only 22 years old. When I speak to his mother, I know just how much she misses him.

Or Army Sergeant Justin Allen. He was killed on July 18, 2010. I can remember the last thing that I said to him. I remember the mission vividly that we were on, and I remember the Rangers who spoke about him the next day on the flight line as we sent him home.

I remember Bradley Rappuhn and Andrew Nicol and the compound that we were assaulting when they passed.

You know, for me and many others across this Nation, the day that stands out above all for us is a day that is just a few days from now. It is Memorial Day, the day that America has specifically set aside to remember the men and women that relinquished their life while serving in the United States Armed Forces. And it rests as the day that is most heavy on our hearts.

This day is so heavy on my heart that, to my shame, one year I asked my wife, Brianna, that she and our children, Magnum and Maverick, not accompany me to the cemetery that I was going to be speaking at that Memorial Day. I asked that she stay at home with our two little boys.

I made that request because I didn't want my little boys to have to see me in pain. And at that point in life, I just wasn't strong enough. I wasn't strong enough to tell them why their daddy had tears or was crying on that day.

And today I try to be more courageous, and I try to tell my boys why I have tears on that and every Memorial Day. And whenever I hear the slow solemn hum of taps, whether it is on Memorial Day or Veterans Day or in the presence of some newly fallen comrade or playing on a TV in the background, I have to pause and wipe my eyes and regain my composure.

Or when I hear that cold crack of a 21-gun salute, I do find myself too numb to the sound of gunfire to be startled by it, but it still reverberates to my core as though I was struck by the shots myself. That is the pain that I feel.

You know, those little boys of mine, they need to know that there were brave men and brave women who showed strength and courage and patriotism with every fiber of their being on their behalf so that they may live free. That they may live free.

Think about that. They served never thinking about personal gain or personal sacrifice, but thinking about their personal contribution to our Nation. And as we find ourselves on the heels of Memorial Day, I believe every Member of this House, every Member of Congress, must reflect on every tear shed across this Nation, every empty seat at every dinner table, every name etched onto a piece of stone that is for a son or daughter of America who gave everything for the freedom and the life of others.

We in this Chamber must think daily about all the men and women who have fought and died for this cause, this Nation that they loved more than their own breath.

I think about those that I knew personally, those that I have heard about. I think about those who came long before me. And I ask myself every single day: Would they be proud of the work that we do in this Chamber, how we represent our Nation and the values that they fought for that they gave their life for? Would they want us as a member of their team?

I used to tell folks that, to date, in our theaters of war, I have lost 67 close friends. That used to be true. But the reality is I no longer know how many friends I have lost. I have stopped counting. What I know is that we must live the way that they lived every day: without excuse, without regret. Full throttle, as one of my friends used to say.

For some of them, their blood has stained my own uniform. Some of them I lost simply being on the same mission. And some were on other missions in other places around the world. And each year on Memorial Day and many other days, I think most often of one of my friends specifically, Ranger Sergeant First Class Lance Vogeler, who, after four tours in Iraq and eight tours in Afghanistan, made the ultimate sacrifice on October 1, 2010, while in battle just a few short days after my own injury.

I know that he is deeply missed by me and all of his friends, and certainly by his wife and his two children that he left behind. You know, I can remember him telling me about them one night as we were in Afghanistan and he and I sat against a fence in the dark of night waiting for a helicopter to come and pick us up. I can remember him telling me about his family. I wasn't there when he passed, but I am told that his last words were of his wife and of his children.

I think often if he would be proud of the way that this place conducts itself. He is the definition of a hero. He is exactly what Memorial Day honors. And knowing him, I know that none of us here can measure up, but I want to know that we honor him and every other hero who is remembered officially in just a few days with our actions in here each and every day. We

owe it to men like him to fight to make America the strongest version of itself that it could ever be.

I want us to honor each of those close friends that I have lost in our theaters of war and every other who has traded their life for our freedom, for our America, with their own actions on each day.

As we approach Memorial Day, I always remember well a lot of things about those friends. I remember their smiles. And I remember the jokes that we would play on each other. I can remember hiding somebody's gear or adding a big rock into their pack without them knowing, just to weigh it down, make them sweat a little bit more. And I can remember where they were from. I can remember the time that we spent training together, shooting together, jumping out of aircraft together, roping from helicopters together, blowing things up together. I can remember their hobbies, and I can remember their plans for what they wanted to do whenever they returned home. I can remember the pictures that they themselves would carry in their breast pocket of the ones that they loved most, just like the one that I would carry of my wife, Brianna, and our one son that I had at that time. I can remember their lifesaving actions on the battlefield. I can remember their acts of valor, and I can remember the way that we each confidently put our lives in each other's hands.

□ 1230

I remember some who are no longer with us today who placed themselves in the line of fire to carry me from the battlefield that I not become a casualty of war. I can remember their loyalty and their determination and their grit, and, for some of them, I can remember their last breaths. I can remember saluting their casket with the most beautiful flag that I have ever seen draped gracefully across it, and I can remember seeing that flag folded and handed to those whose pictures they had been carrying. I can remember seeing the way that those family members would cling to that flag.

As I remember these moments, I want to see, more than anything, that the way we, here in the House of Representatives, conduct ourselves honors the way those who gave the last beat of their heart conducted themselves on our behalf. If statues of those men and women surrounded our floor here, would they look onto each of us each day and would they swell with pride over our service, or would their hearts sink? Would they turn away and be ashamed? Would they look on and be proud?

The goal of American heroes has always been country first, themselves second. They knew, those who gave on behalf of this place, that the establishment of this country, the maintenance

of America, its safety, the protection of each and every citizen is not a product of chance. It is not a product of luck. It is not a product of indifference. So they stood between every American and evil with purpose and resolve regardless of what it was going to cost them.

They knew the job was never easy, it was never safe, it was always dangerous, and it was almost always deadly. While they may have disagreed on how to conduct a mission, I know they never wished for the failure of their comrade or, for that matter, the failure of any American ever. They certainly never wished for the failure of the leaders of our Nation.

My office is in the Rayburn House Office Building, and in one of our entrances is the name of each who has fallen in the war on terror listed year by year. All of those friends of mine are listed there. When I see them, I stop, and I think about them every single time. I wish that the name of every single American who has fallen well in defense of our Nation adorned each and every wall of this Chamber in here, as it does in my office building, that we would look on each time we speak on this floor and question ourselves as to whether our motives are as pure as their motives were.

Every American child, every adult, every man and woman has the limitless opportunities to enjoy their life, to become whatever it is in the world they want to be, to achieve whatever they have the courage to attempt and the determination and the fortitude to spend themselves in fully to accomplish. That limitless opportunity each citizen has and each of us in here in the House is afforded has been paid for with the blood and the spirit of men and women who traded their own life to fulfill an oath to our great Nation.

Their oath was the same that we as Members of Congress vow to fulfill: to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; to bear true faith and allegiance to the same; to take that obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, so help us God.

And though we take that same oath, I know we do not always show the same commitment. Those heroes never thought about what was easy or popular to masses or what they would get out of their actions. It was not reelection on the line for them. It was their life on the line, and they gave it freely.

As I think about Memorial Day, I wish we could, daily, see every heroic name across our walls here and recall the harrowing stories of the Second World War and the over 400,000 U.S. Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine, Coastguardsman, and each and every Merchant Marine who fought and died in Europe and in the Pacific and in Africa for the freedom of the entire world

from being ruled by an evil and intolerant empire. They died in places named Ardennes Forest and Midway and Guadalcanal.

I wish we thought about each vote we took and looked at the names of our over 36,000 servicemembers who would never return home from the frozen mud of Korea and think is that what they fought for at the Chosin Reservoir. I wish we could recount the names and the stories of the over 58,000 servicemembers who died in combat or while captured or who went through torture and starvation before giving their life or while missing as a part of the Vietnam war in places like Khe Sanh and Saigon.

I wish we saw the names of the servicemembers who put their country first and themselves second while serving in the Dominican Republic or Iran or El Salvador or Beirut or Grenada or Panama or the Persian Gulf as we thought about what we will say when we are given the chance to speak on this floor and if our words would be worth even one second of their life.

I wish we could think about the Delta operators or the Army Rangers or the Black Hawk pilots who gave it all in the dusty sands of Somalia, Medal of Honor recipients like Master Sergeant Gary Gordon and Sergeant First Class Randall Shughart, who volunteered to go into a situation that they knew would claim their life in order to save their fellow fighters. They were devoted to their duty, and their duty was to their brothers and to their country.

Or those who fought and died in Bosnia and Kosovo and on the USS Cole, and all those who fought in places that we may never know because of threats to us that we never even knew existed, we need to ask if they would give the last beat of their heart for the way in which we legislate our country.

Most personally for me, I would think deeply on the thousands of soldiers, sailors, marines, airmen, coastguardsmen who defended this country with the last beat of their heart in a place like Iraq or Afghanistan or Syria, would they be proud. These were the men and women who I served alongside, men and women who served selflessly and repeatedly year after year, knowing full well the hazards of their profession.

I couldn't be more proud than to have the few moments that I did with the best and the most honorable that our Nation has ever produced, who sacrificed their whole self because it was best for the men and women to their left and to their right in battle, because it was best for the freedom and the liberty and the security of every person. I don't know how to ever make the pain of their loss go away. I do know how to honor them. We do it with the way that we live each day going forward that they do not have the opportunity to live.

They would want every American to cherish the gift of freedom that they have been given by God, which was defended by those angels whose names are now etched in row after row of plain white markers in Arlington National Cemetery. They would want us all to live exactly as they lived: with no regrets, loving this country more than we loved ourselves, fighting as hard as they fought, never quitting, never giving up. We owe it to them to do so, to not ask ourselves what we can take for ourselves, but to ask what we, ourselves, can give.

I want my kids to grow up honoring these men and these women who have sacrificed. I want my young boys to know that they get to give me a hug or a smile, but there are men and women who are willing to risk never having one more of those from their own families, and I want them to live the way that those heroes lived. I want my children to know it is honorable to have the courage to mourn them, and I want them to have the resolve to not squander the opportunities which have been paid for with the selfless blood of every American warrior.

I get grief in my heart when I think of all those who have gone in defense of our flag, but I also think about each of the great warriors that they were, and I smile because there can be no more honorable way to leave this world than in a pile of brass while fighting for the greatest nation ever to be established on the face of this Earth.

We here need to think of the thousands who gave their lives selflessly, without expectation of anything in return, true selfless servants serving simply to do what was best for the United States of America. Some were infantrymen; some were mortarmen; some were engineers or tankers or something else. They were men and women who, through the ages, created the reputation and the legacy and the tradition that made me say: "That is what I want to be. That is how I want to serve. That is how I want to help."

Here, we must learn from those who we think about most on Memorial Day. We need to look at them and their names and their lives and their stories and their sacrifice and demand the same thing out of ourselves. They pushed through the cold. They pushed through the snow. They pushed without adequate supplies. They fought back tanks. They always pushed forward in the face of bombarding artillery. They pushed so hard that their weapon would overheat. They pushed through trench foot. They did it with fixed bayonets, which they used to defend their own foxholes and then used them to carve our enemy out of their foxholes. They stayed in the fight when they were wounded, even though it would certainly mean a bitter end that was very far from home.

They did not stop because they were tired. They did not stop because they

were exhausted or freezing or hungry. They did it even though they had to sleep on the ground or sleep in the field or sometimes never sleep at all. They only stopped when the job was done. They only stopped when the mission was accomplished. This is the grit with which Americans have always defended America.

We have taken that same oath in this House, and American heroes, they set the precedent for every generation about how to do that job. To do it for them was not just a job or a paycheck, it was a calling. It was a calling that few have the stomach to undertake and that, certainly, even fewer still are capable of ever doing. It requires uncommon characteristics such as courage and valor and selflessness.

Today those words are thrown around very lightly by many, but those we remember on Memorial Day have actually lived and breathed the definition of these characteristics.

They did it by flying aircraft or driving armored vehicles. They did it by setting sail with the most powerful fleet ever seen on our seas. They did it by yoking their bodies with a rifle or a pistol, by carrying hundreds of rounds of ammunition and hundreds of pounds of gear, wearing a helmet and explosives, carrying everything that they required to save the life of another servicemember as well as everything that they needed to survive for days or months on end.

They did it while being targeted by snipers, while having bombs or mortars or grenades hurled at them, while having an RPG fired at them. They did it while walking in fields of mines and improvised explosive devices. They did it by carrying that load for miles and days across mountains, across rolling hills, and through fields and forests and rivers.

They did it while carrying letters for their friends, which they promised to deliver to their family should anything ever happen to them. They did it while missing births and birthdays and ball games and bath times and holidays and every other good time that they missed with their families. They did it in the face of mortal combat. They did it while holding both the lives of their friends and the lives of our enemies in their hands.

We honor those we remember who are not with us today by taking no charge more seriously than honoring their sacrifice with the lives that we now live. What those heroes have done in defense of our Nation can never be taken away from them. We must remember that so, too, what we do here in defense cannot be taken away by the years that pass if we endeavor to be warriors, willing to defend America at any and all costs.

Those we remember are a testament to the importance of the values and ideals sewn into the fabric of our Na-

tion, the absolutes. And all I can say is: Thank God for men and women like that, for creating such patriots for us to revere as the standard by which all other Americans should serve America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1245

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), my friend.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a Floridian, I have to take a moment to share my gratitude to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) for the remarks he just shared.

During my occupancy of the rostrum, my own eyes welled with tears as I thought of the empty chairs at the table in my own district and all throughout the country as people, as families have made sacrifice and sent those to fight for us.

I can only be reminded, hearing the gentleman from Florida's remarks, that each and every day in this House we do fall short of that great patriotism that is reflected by our servicemen and -women: We could do better; we could be more worthy of the sacrifice; we could resist the influences of special interests more; we could make the tough decisions that are necessary; we could put America on a better footing forward.

It is my belief and my sincere hope, by hearing the words of my colleague, by raising our gaze to an even broader and more accepting patriotism, that we can do it. And I believe Mr. MAST will be one of the people that lead us in that regard.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for those remarks. Mr. GAETZ represents the First District of Florida, a brother in arms, since I represent the First District of Texas.

We are very grateful for BRIAN MAST and what he has given for his country, what he has been willing to give for his country; and it is an honor to serve with him in the trenches—sometimes literal trenches around here—a great, honorable patriot for America.

On Monday, that is what we will celebrate, Memorial Day, and I want to talk further about that.

Right now I want to touch on an issue that has occupied a lot of people's concern and time this week over CBO scoring, rather important, but it should not be.

The Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Tax Commission do the scoring. Historically, the projections by

CBO seem all too often to be far too out of line that any governmental entity would base important critical decisions over people's lives, their healthcare—it will certainly affect their lives—and base it on a group that, as they have explained: We set up models. And we feed the garbage—they don't use that term. But, as far as I am concerned, they feed garbage in and they get garbage out.

And projections: Oh, we have to wait and see what CBO says. People waiting with bated breath: Oh, is it going to be in line?

For heaven's sake, anybody that waits on a score for the JTC or the CBO in dealing with the tax reform that we should do doesn't have much sense. And there is nothing wrong with not having much sense. It just hurts the country when people without much sense are here in Washington making decisions about people's lives and encroaching on their liberty and freedom.

So we have people like BRIAN MAST, and we have those who have given all, the last measure of devotion, for our liberty. Then we turn around and have a Federal Government that passes laws about healthcare reform and decides that they have to have all of the medical records here in the Federal Government.

And do you know what? We need to have a Consumer Finance Protection Bureau to protect people from unscrupulous bankers, so we are going to get everybody's banking records.

Well, as a former judge and as a former prosecutor, if you wanted somebody's banking records, you had to have sworn proof rising to the level of probable cause that a crime was committed and this person committed it, and then you got the records when a judge signed off on it. Not now. Not with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. They just get everybody's records.

And then, without reining in ObamaCare and if we did not rein in the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Washington continues to gather people's medical records through sweetheart deals with private entities, a hypothetical I raised many years ago as ObamaCare was being pushed through, came ever closer—really, is here—to the point that we could reach a day—it is not quite here. We have still got a chance to save America from the Orwellian nature of ObamaCare and the CFPB combined.

But years ago I said, you know, if we don't stop this craziness, we are going to reach a point where you could get a letter from the Federal Government, saying: Hey, we have got your medical records, but we notice that you made a purchase at the grocery store this last week and bought some bacon, a pound of bacon. We know, from having your medical records, that your cholesterol, weight is not at a very healthy point

right now, so you are either going to have to quit eating bacon or we are going to be penalizing you substantially, since we are in charge of your healthcare, your health insurance. We are in charge of it.

That is where we have been heading. And it is something the Founders, who would not have seen the advent of the computers and the IT age, but what they did foresee, whatever developments in technology that came along, they foresaw this ongoing battle to keep government from controlling people's lives and eliminating their liberty. That is what they saw coming. They didn't have to see the technology. They knew what was coming if we didn't keep the Federal Government reined in.

I know there are groups out there that are gathering information that say: Well, this Member of Congress, this Senator, he doesn't get many bills passed. Well, if you look at most of the things we have passed, other than funding bills, so often they are creating more government agencies and more government power. Each time we do, no matter how noble the purpose is, we are taking just a little bit of freedom and a little bit of liberty away from individuals and giving more power to the government.

Why I think it is appropriate to bring this up as we approach Memorial Day is people have not fought throughout our history—going back to 1775, 1776, on to 1783 and the winning of the American Revolution, on through each of the wars that has been fought in the name of liberty—they didn't fight so that we could come to the floor and pass more and more bills and create more and more government. Even when we are told, "Oh, but CBO says this will only cost \$5 million this year, or only cost \$5 million, so it is not that big a deal," it is still eroding people's liberty. It is still taking away freedom and giving more control to the government.

So, as we look briefly at some of the history on CBO scoring, this is an article by Paul Teller, Special Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs. He says:

A new report from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation calculated average monthly premiums for health insurance in the 39 States that use healthcare.gov. The research found that from 2013 to 2017 the average ObamaCare premium increased by 105 percent across the country. The report also looked at the cost spikes by State.

While we await further analysis of the CBO score for the American Health Care Act as passed by the House, this information is an important reminder about the negative impact of ObamaCare.

Besides just how unaffordable ObamaCare has been for hardworking Americans, you might consider three key things about today's CBO score in the context of this new report.

Number one, the original CBO estimate of ObamaCare premiums, November 30, 2009,

said that premiums for the "nongroup" exchange markets would increase slightly and "would be about 10 percent to 13 percent higher in 2016."

CBO has the gall to act like they are so important and so accurate, but over and over, if you look at critical projections they have made and for people to have said, and CBO, in 2009, you know, by 2016, you might have a 10 to 13 percent increase in your premiums is, or would be, laughable except for the crying of Americans across the country who can't afford the premiums that have gone up 2, 3, 4, or 10 times.

One of our small-business employers said he paid, a couple of years ago, \$53,000 for his employees' health insurance, and the following year it was \$150,000 for his employees. That leaves him without personal income because he had such a dramatic increase in the premiums. But how could that be? CBO said maybe a 10 to 13 percent increase over that 7-year period.

It comes back to show, once again, as I told Bloomberg this morning, it appears those folks, figuratively speaking, couldn't find their rear end with both hands.

Number two, even if you assume CBO's AHCA estimate is completely accurate, the first score, March 17, 2017, showed that the bill would bring down nongroup premium costs over the next 10 years. While CBO did say that premiums would rise slightly over the transition period, attributed to the repeal of the individual mandate, by 2020 the AHCA would change the trajectory of premiums and "By 2026, average premiums for single policyholders in the nongroup market under the legislation would be roughly 10 percent lower."

□ 1300

So you hang around and wait for 10 years under the original AHCA and you might have a 10 percent decrease 10 years from now, which is absurd. They were so desperately wrong on their projections.

And I don't have it in front of me. It may be in one of these articles here, but I think originally their projection of cost of ObamaCare was about 1.1, \$1.2 trillion over 10 years; and then, of course, the President got upset, because he had said: Oh no, it is going to be under \$1 trillion for 10 years.

He calls the Director of CBO over to the Oval Office. They have a conversation and, amazingly, the Director of CBO comes out and says: You know what? After meeting with the President, while I—things came clearer for me, and turns out it probably will be \$800 billion or so. It will be like the President said. I just needed to speak to the President to all of a sudden have a lot more clarity than I did before I went to the Oval Office. But it is under \$1 trillion, like the President said, now that I think about it with more clarity.

And then, of course, after ObamaCare passed, very quickly we started learning, no, it wasn't going to be under a

trillion; it was going to be over a trillion; maybe 1.7, 1.9. And before long, we start seeing projections more like \$2.6 trillion over 10 years. And even one that I had seen that said, you know, maybe 3.6, roughly \$4 trillion over 10 years.

As I have said a number of times, you know, any scoring agency whose margin of error is plus or minus 400 percent really shouldn't be relied on by anyone trying to create meaningful law in Congress. That is why for a number of years I have been pushing for the elimination of CBO for a better system, where, as Americans, we believe in competition—or we used to.

Now, I know we have got some folks that can't compete. They need a safe space if somebody is going to compete with them. But what made America great was American competitiveness. We could compete with anybody and prevail.

So why wouldn't we have scorers compete so that we could score the scorers, so that every critically important bill to the American public didn't get sidetracked by some bogus models?

And I am not saying they do it intentionally. You don't have to do it intentionally to have a margin of error plus or minus 400 percent. You can be legitimately that bad at projecting what things will cost; and it has happened throughout the time that we have had projections.

So what I was proposing—and I got my friend, who was the chairman of the Budget Committee, to agree to sit down to dinner with a dear friend of his, Dr. Arthur Laffer, former economic adviser to Reagan, now an adviser to President Trump, and also a friend of both of ours, Steve Moore, who had been the senior editor with *The Wall Street Journal*. I asked if the Budget Committee chairman would sit down with me and Arthur Laffer and Steve Moore and talk about CBO.

This has been a number of years ago. We sat down at the Capitol Hill Club one evening and, of course, my friend, Dr. Tom Coburn, walks by and says: Okay. Is this one of those puzzles? Figure out which piece doesn't belong here? I get chairman of the Budget Committee, I get *Wall Street Journal* guy, Steve Moore, I get economic adviser Art Laffer. Louie, what are you doing at this table?

But it was my idea. We needed to come up with a way to have competitive scoring by competitive scorers, and then get to where we can score the scorers, so that when we look at a score that is presented to us on a bill that is being proposed, you can look at the score of that scoring entity. And if they have a score, say, of 10 percent, being right within 5 percent, plus or minus margin of error, then we can probably take very seriously their scoring in the future.

My friend—at that time he was Chairman RYAN—was very open to dis-

cussing it, but really kind of felt like we needed to keep CBO and have an official government scorer.

But since then, Dr. Laffer called sometime later to let me know that he had received a private grant, and that he, his firm, and his son would be working on a model that could work for Congress, the House and Senate, to begin having competitive scoring and scoring the scorers so we could have something more reliable, so that we didn't have a bunch of bureaucratic melees from models created that kept us from doing what was good for America.

So, as I think has been pointed out before, whether you ask CBO, "How much Federal revenue would we have come in if we had 100 percent income tax or 200 percent income tax," or if you said, "Tell us how much Federal revenue comes in if we create a 200 percent income tax," since they are not allowed to consider reality and history, but only the models they create mechanically, it's probably a good chance that they would probably dutifully come in and say: You know what? If you set up a 200 percent income tax in the United States of America, then next year you will bring in twice as much money to the Federal Treasury as all Americans make in that year.

Because they are divorced from reality, it doesn't work into their models they create.

In talking to my friend, I hope he doesn't mind my sharing it. I hope he will invite me to have spaghetti with his family at his home in Nashville again sometime. I love visiting with him there, being with his great family.

But he was very encouraging. I was a little depressed. He said: You are a big-idea guy. Don't get discouraged when you propose big ideas like the CBO, getting rid of them, having competitive scoring, or having a—

See, we get beat up every time we say: You know what? Like DAN WEBSTER had found, we have 82 Federal programs charged with getting people to and from appointments, and we don't need 82 Federal agencies. Most of them have white, 20-seat vans, carry three people when they ever carry anybody.

But if we try to eliminate one of the 82, well, you Republicans hate seniors or children or puppies or whatever it is. You are evil. So we keep 82 Federal programs to get people to and from agencies; whereas, if we could create—maybe it is a standing committee and we pull people from different committees—a public assistance committee where we have all 82 of those in every area of public assistance, we see all the duplication because it is all in the same committee, then we can start getting some kind of reasonable Federal Government back under control. Another idea that we just need to move on.

But I have been joined by my friend, and I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

AFRICAN-AMERICAN HISTORY COMMISSION

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Texas for yielding to me.

I just want to take a few moments to thank the House for the work they did recently on H.R. 1242, and I want to urge the Senate to take action on this bill as well.

So I rise today in support of H.R. 1242, entitled 400 Years of African-American History Commission Act. I am a cosponsor of this legislation. I worked with my colleagues to pass this act in the House, and I look forward to the Senate also passing this bill.

I believe it is important for all citizens of the United States to recognize the unique history, sacrifices, and remarkable contributions that African Americans have made to build our great Nation.

I am invigorated by this legislative intention to identify and educate the public on the arrival of Africans and their role in building this great country. It is equally important to understand the generational impact that slavery and laws that enforced racial discrimination have had on our United States.

While there have been many successful and inspirational African Americans with enumerable contributions, we must address ongoing disparities in employment and education by focusing on achieving six milestones for success. These milestones include: entering school ready to learn; reading at grade level by third grade; graduating from high school ready for college or career; completing postsecondary education or training; successfully entering the workforce; reducing violence and providing a second chance for returning citizens.

I applaud the many organizations actively working to address these opportunity gaps faced by African Americans. In my community of the Second Congressional District of Nebraska, I appreciate the efforts of Willie Hamilton, president and founder of Black Men United. He is a true grassroots leader.

In addition, I want to highlight some other organizations and work that is ongoing in the district I serve to implement a coherent cradle-to-college-and-career strategy for improving the life outcomes of all young people. These organizations include: the Urban League of Nebraska; the START Center, that is run by my friend, Julian Young; the Omaha Empowerment Network, coordinated by Willie Barney; the Eastern Nebraska Community Action Partnership; the 100 Black Men of Omaha; the Malcolm X Foundation; the Operation Youth Success; members of the Midlands Mentoring Partnership; the efforts of the City of Omaha through the

Black Male Achievement Program, previously coordinated by Cameron Gales, another friend of mine.

Like all complicated issues facing Americans, we need this type of strong community support, along with smart bipartisan legislation to address these problems.

As the African-American History Commission develops programs, I hope they will consider inspiring communities to continue building partnerships between local organizations, government, businesses, and foundations. This will connect young African-American men and women with support networks, mentoring programs, and the skills and training they need to succeed in the classroom and in the workforce.

While we learn from and celebrate the past, we must also look to a much brighter future for all Americans.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate those important observations. I would like to point out something that is not getting enough attention, as the media seems to be driven over issues like charge of misdemeanor assault on a reporter, or a Russian connection, these kind of things.

This story by Luke Rosiak, May 22, "Democratic Aide Suspected of Major Security Breach Under Government Protection in Pakistan." There are some really critical issues here. These Pakistani individuals—we don't know if they have fled now from the U.S., some gone back to Pakistan, but they have been working for our Democratic colleagues in the House—some of them—like my friend DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, been working for her since 2005; may have worked for the DNC.

Now, there are allegations of stealing, perhaps a couple of hundred thousand dollars or more of computer equipment from people here at the Hill; accessing the government information they should not have been allowed to access. They were banned from accessing the House system. One of them, particularly the one that has been working for Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, apparently, according to the story, had stolen or taken a laptop of hers, hidden it, and a Capitol policeman found it.

It is kind of important to us, even though the DNC never let the FBI, CIA, NSA, or any Federal agents examine the DNC computer system before they said: Oh, yeah, it is definitely the Russians.

Really? How can you say it is definitely the Russians? You didn't even examine it.

But that is the way things have been going lately. But this is regarding Congressional computer systems, and we need to get to the bottom of how badly our system has been compromised.

In addition to the thefts and, you know, making over \$4 million since 2010, having people they owed money

to—at least one—put on the system, now we learn he may have never visited the Hill, and still gotten over \$200,000. Just a lot of issues need to be dried up, cleared up, but those are major issues that need to be clarified.

No evidence of Russian collusion, but there is definitely evidence of Pakistani collusion and corruption through the fine Democratic Congress Members that they worked for. We just don't know how badly they corrupted the system. We know they got money that they surely should not have. But let's have an investigation into that.

In the meantime, we owe it to all of those who gave their last full measure of devotion for this country, we owe it to them to do a better job here in Congress, passing better laws of giving people more liberty and more freedom for those who died for it.

□ 1315

There is one thing that is absolutely certain, and Jesus knew what He was talking about—John 15:13: "Greater love has no one than this: to lay down one's life for one's friends." He knew. He did it.

And for all of those, Mr. Speaker, who have laid down their lives for Americans and for those around the world for their liberty, we just say thank you. Thank God for you. May God continue to bless America by giving us such patriots in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 375. An Act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 719 Church Street in Nashville, Tennessee, as the "Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 26, 2017, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1425. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting the proceedings of the 117th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Charlotte, North Carolina, July 24-27, 2016,

pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1332; (Public Law 90-620 (as amended by Public Law 105-225, Sec. 3); (112 Stat. 1498) (H. Doc. No. 115-44); ; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1426. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Isopropylazam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0143; FRL-9960-76] received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1427. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flazasulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0112; FRL-9961-54] received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1428. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenazaquin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0029; FRL-9961-99] received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1429. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's interim final rule — Determination to Defer Sanctions; Arizona Department of Environmental Quality [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0255; FRL-9963-07-Region 9] received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1430. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment and Approval of Base Year Emissions Inventories for the Imperial County, California Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area; Correction [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0772; FRL-9962-82-Region 9] received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1431. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans (Negative Declarations) for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Connecticut, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont; Revisions to State Plan for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: New Hampshire [EPA-R01-OAR-2017-0202; A-1-FRL-9962-41-Region 1] received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1432. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Revisions to Allegheny County Health Department Rules [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0064; FRL-9962-77-Region 3] received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1433. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation

of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Control of Nitrogen Oxide Emissions from Coal-Fired Electric Generating Units [EPA-R03-OAR-2016-0238; FRL-9962-73-Region 3] received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1434. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Redesignation of the Belding Area in Ionia County to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0044; FRL-9962-72-Region 5] received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1435. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; South Carolina: Air Emissions Reporting [EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0217; FRL-9962-30-Region 4] received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1436. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Redesignation of the Cleveland Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0395; FRL-9963-01-Region 5] received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1437. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Managing Director/Financial Operations, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 1 of the Commission's Rules [MD Docket No.: 17-123] received May 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1438. A letter from the Chief, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Business Data Services in an Internet Protocol Environment [WC Docket No.: 16-143]; Technology Transitions [GN Docket No.: 13-5]; Special Access for Price Cap Local Exchange Carriers [WC Docket No.: 05-25]; AT&T Corporation Petition for Rulemaking to Reform Regulation of Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier Rates for Interstate Special Access Services [RM-10593] received May 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1439. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a six-month periodic report, covering November 15, 2016 to May 15, 2017 on the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, and has been continued by the President each year, most recently on November 8, 2016, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1440. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's tem-

porary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2017 Recreational Accountability Measures and Closure for Atlantic Migratory Group Cobia [Docket No.: 101206604-1758-02] (RIN: 0648-XF106) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1441. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02] (RIN: 0648-XF287) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1442. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Several Groundfish Species in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 150916863-6211-02] (RIN: 0648-XF064) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1443. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2017 Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pollock, Atka Mackerel, and Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amounts [Docket No.: 150916863-6211-02] (RIN: 0648-XF108) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1444. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish Managed Under the Individual Fishing Quota Program [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02 and 161020985-7181-02] (RIN: 0648-XF270) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1445. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 150818742-6210-02] (RIN: 0648-XF206) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1446. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 150818742-6210-02] (RIN: 0648-XF224) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1447. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Trawl Catcher Vessels in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02] (RIN: 0648-XF273) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1448. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Adjustment of Georges Bank and Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic Yellowtail Flounder Annual Catch Limits [Docket No.: 170207156-7225-01] (RIN: 0648-XF219) received May 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1449. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; 2017 Management Measures and a Temporary Rule [Docket No.: 161222999-7413-01] (RIN: 0648-BG59) received May 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1450. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 150818742-6210-02] (RIN: 0648-XF244) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1451. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan [Docket No.: 161222999-7201-01] (RIN: 0648-BG58) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1452. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Policy, International Security Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a progress report; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 10. A bill to create hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red

tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-153, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISHCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, Committees on Agriculture, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, Transportation and Infrastructure, Rules, the Budget, and Education and the Workforce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 10 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CLAY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SABLÁN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LEE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. DeGETTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. DeSAULNIER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SPIER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. BEYER, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BASS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MENG,

Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECK, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. EVANS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CRIST, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. WALZ, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 15. A bill to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa):

H.R. 2650. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BARR (for himself and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 2651. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of horseracing by requiring a uniform anti-doping and medication control program to be developed and enforced by an independent Horseracing Anti-Doping and Medication Control Authority; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 2652. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct an independent review of the deaths of certain veterans by suicide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2653. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to carry out programs and activities to ensure that Federal science agencies and institutions of higher education receiving Federal research and development funding are fully engaging their entire talent pool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. AMASH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. BUCK):

H.R. 2654. A bill to amend the provisions of title 40, United States Code, commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act, to raise the threshold dollar amount of contracts subject to the prevailing wage requirements of such provisions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 2655. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to expand intellectual property education and training for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on

Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 2656. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to establish an Office of Public Participation and Consumer Advocacy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. AMASH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. WITTMAN, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 2657. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to exempt from inspection the slaughter of animals and the preparation of carcasses conducted at a custom slaughter facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 2658. A bill to provide humanitarian assistance for the Venezuelan people, to defend democratic governance and combat widespread public corruption in Venezuela, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Mr. YOHO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. CRIST, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 2659. A bill to authorize the establishment of a program for cooperative research and development in agriculture with the Government of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALMER (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. DAVIDSON):

H.R. 2660. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide exclusive original jurisdiction to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia of certain cases relating to the powers of the Executive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CHENEY (for herself and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 2661. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey to a State all right, title, and interest in and to a percentage of the amount of royalties and other amounts required to be paid to the State under that Act with respect to public land and deposits in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 2662. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to improve the recruitment and retention of employees in the Indian Health Service, restore accountability in the Indian Health Service, improve health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARCHANT (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2663. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make changes to documentation of eligibility for Medicare home health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. SABLON):

H.R. 2664. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to train certain Department of Labor personnel how to effectively detect and assist law enforcement in preventing human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 2665. A bill to reduce the pay of Members of Congress in any year following a fiscal year for which there was a Federal budget deficit; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. SOTO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 2666. A bill to amend the PROTECT Act to make Indian tribes eligible for AMBER Alert grants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2667. A bill to restrict the use of funds for the long-range standoff weapon until the Secretary of Defense completes a Nuclear Posture Review that includes an assessment of the capabilities and effects of the use of the long-range standoff weapon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. LEE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2668. A bill to reduce the number of nuclear-armed submarines operated by the Navy, to prohibit the development of a new long-range penetrating bomber aircraft, to prohibit the procurement of new intercontinental ballistic missiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KIND, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 2669. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to allow all eligible voters to vote by mail in Federal elections, to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for automatic voter registration; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 2670. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect more victims of domestic violence by preventing their abusers from possessing or receiving firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KEATING, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 2671. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the credit for increasing research activities, to increase such credit for amounts paid or incurred for qualified research occurring in the United States, and to increase the domestic production activities deduction for the manufacture of property substantially all of the research and development of which occurred in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. BOST, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. KINZINGER):

H.R. 2672. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Carter Street in Fairview, Illinois, as the "Sgt. Douglas J. Riney Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. BOST, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. KINZINGER):

H.R. 2673. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 514 Broadway Street in Pekin, Illinois, as the "Lance Corporal Jordan S. Bastean Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 2674. A bill to establish a grant program in the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to fund the establishment of centers of excellence to support research, development and planning, implementation, and evaluation of effective programs in financial literacy education for young people and families ages 8 through 24 years old, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COOPER, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 2675. A bill to require adequate information regarding the tax treatment of payments under settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 2676. A bill to require States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding use of force incidents involving law enforcement officers and civilians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2677. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for behavioral and mental health outreach and education strategies to reduce stigma associated with mental health among the Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander population; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself and Mr. TROTT):

H.R. 2678. A bill to require all Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives to complete annual ethics training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2679. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve service-connected disability determinations for purposes of loan discharge; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CRIST (for himself and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 2680. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit against tax for certain small businesses hiring new employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2681. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age range at which the earned income tax credit is allowed to former foster children and other individuals without qualifying children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2682. A bill to support foster youth in successful parenting by reducing unintended pregnancies and promoting the well-being of expectant or parenting foster youth and their children; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. JONES, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HIMES, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 2683. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to delay the inclusion in consumer credit reports and to establish requirements for debt collectors with respect to medical debt information of veterans due to inappropriate or delayed billing payments or reimbursements from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Ms. LEE, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 2684. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to modify the exception to the work requirement; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 2685. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to establish a pilot program for providing portable benefits to eligible workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 2686. A bill to codify the Small Business Administration's Growth Accelerator Fund Competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 2687. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with an option to provide medical assistance to individuals between the ages of 22 and 64 for inpatient services to treat substance use disorders at certain facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 2688. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide the same level of Federal matching assistance for every State that chooses to expand Medicaid coverage to newly eligible individuals, regardless of when such expansion takes place; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Mrs. TORRES):

H.R. 2689. A bill to prescribe procedures for effective consultation and coordination by Federal agencies with federally recognized Indian Tribes regarding Federal Government activities that impact Tribal lands and interests to ensure that meaningful Tribal input is an integral part of the Federal decision-making process; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GUTIÉRREZ (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VELA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GALLEGÓ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SOTO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SIREs, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 2690. A bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 2691. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 to provide for expedited project implementation relating to the comprehensive Everglades restoration plan; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:

H.R. 2692. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the time limitation for use of eligibility and entitlement to educational assistance under certain programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 2693. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to limit attorney fees and penalties in citizen suits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DENT, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 2694. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to enhance protections regarding voter registration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Ms. BARRAGÁN):

H.R. 2695. A bill to establish an Office of Environmental Justice in the Environmental Protection Agency and to authorize an environmental justice small grants program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Ms. BARRAGÁN):

H.R. 2696. A bill to establish the Office of Environmental Justice in the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 2697. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require additional disclosures by creditors when lending to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 2698. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow veterans affected by school closures to continue receiving monthly stipends under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program for a certain period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 2699. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to more effectively provide mental health resources for members of the Armed Forces at high risk of suicide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 2700. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax as an incentive to partner with educational institutions to improve workforce development and job training for students and a credit against income tax for certain expenses of job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2701. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters, Special Troops and the 3133rd Signal Service Company, in recognition of their unique and highly distinguished service as a "Ghost Army" that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 2702. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to establish a commercialization assistance pilot program under the SBIR program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HASTINGS,

Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2703. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into agreements with public and private entities to provide pro bono legal services to homeless veterans and veterans at risk of homelessness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. WALZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. KIND, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 2704. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend military commissary and exchange store privileges to certain veterans who have been awarded the Purple Heart and to their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. RUSSELL):

H.R. 2705. A bill to limit the applicability of the final rule entitled "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium- and Heavy-Duty Engines and Vehicles-Phase 2" to the extent such final rule relates to trailers that do not themselves emit greenhouse gases in connection with a propulsion system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BUDD, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Ms. TENNEY):

H.R. 2706. A bill to provide requirements for the appropriate Federal banking agencies when requesting or ordering a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, to provide for additional requirements related to subpoenas issued under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 2707. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish an Ombudsman within the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 2708. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to repeal the limitation on the number of veterans authorized to be enrolled in programs of independent living services and assistance administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 2709. A bill to increase the participation of historically underrepresented demographic groups in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education and industry; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2710. A bill to establish a commission to study how Federal laws and policies affect

United States citizens living in foreign countries; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, House Administration, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. YODER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. NOLAN, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 2711. A bill to designate a National Memorial to Fallen Educators at the National Teachers Hall of Fame in Emporia, Kansas; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 2712. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign support for Palestinian terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 2713. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. PALMER):

H.R. 2714. A bill to facilitate the use of outcome-based performance standards by the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2715. A bill to require refunds for delayed or lost baggage; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2716. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make certain grants to assist nursing homes for veterans located on tribal lands; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 2717. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize certain aliens who have earned a Ph.D. degree from a United States institution of higher education in a field of science, technology, engineering, or mathematics to be admitted for permanent residence and to be exempted

from the numerical limitations on H-1B non-immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. BERA, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 2718. A bill to allow certain student loan borrowers to refinance Federal student loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 2719. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to conduct coastal community vulnerability assessments related to ocean acidification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 2720. A bill to require notice of cost-free Federal procurement technical assistance in connection with registration of small business concerns in procurement systems; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 2721. A bill to allow seniors to file their Federal income tax on a new Form 1040SR; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 2722. A bill to encourage the development, certification, and adoption of environmentally sustainable swine waste disposal technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 2723. A bill to provide protections for workers with respect to their right to select or refrain from selecting representation by a labor organization; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Texas):

H.R. 2724. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to replace the diversity visa program with a new program under which an immigrant visa can be obtained by paying a fee of \$1,000,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 2725. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 2726. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to train individuals for employment in the renewable energy and energy efficiency industries; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 2727. A bill to support the education of Indian children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 2728. A bill to require labeling of ingredients of cleaning products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 2729. A bill to direct the National Security Council, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Attorney General, to ensure that a mitigation process and protocols are in place in the case of a disclosure of classified information by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 2730. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to eliminate premium subsidies for crop insurance for tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 2731. A bill to amend the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 to eliminate the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make value-added agricultural product market development grants to support the development, production, or marketing of alcoholic beverages and to rescind a portion of the Commodity Credit Corporation funds made available for such grants; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 2732. A bill to prohibit travel-related transactions to, from, and within North Korea by persons subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. STEFANK):

H.R. 2733. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot grant program to acquire and renovate abandoned homes for homeless veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2734. A bill to require the Department of Commerce to address the trade deficits between the United States and other countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2735. A bill to make certain footwear eligible for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 2736. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish free and comprehensive mental health care to former members of the Armed Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2737. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a study to evaluate the effectiveness of programs, especially in regards to women veterans and minority veterans, in transitioning to civilian life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2738. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the approval of certain programs of education for purposes of educational assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 2739. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish additional protections for victims of crimes punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 2740. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Rabbi Michael Ber Weissmandl in recognition of his acts of valor during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 2741. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide mandatory minimum terms of imprisonment for certain trafficking offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2742. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to adopt an electronic system to help expedite the placement of children in foster care or guardianship, or for adoption, across State lines, and to provide funding to aid States in developing such a system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2743. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require that proprietary institutions of higher education derive not less than fifteen percent of revenues from sources other than funds provided under title IV of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2744. A bill to revise the 90-10 rule under the Higher Education Act of 1965 to count veterans' education benefits under such rule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr.

CONYERS, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 2745. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a special enrollment period for pregnant women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 2746. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish a Federal renewable electricity standard for retail electricity suppliers and a Federal energy efficiency resource standard for electricity and natural gas suppliers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2747. A bill to catalyze market-based economic growth in developing countries, create opportunities for the private sector of the United States to effectively engage in foreign assistance programs, improve planning and coordination among relevant United States departments and agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CRIST, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. MAST, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 2748. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Marine Debris Act to promote international action to reduce marine debris, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MASSIE, Ms. LEE, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.J. Res. 102. A joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the proposed export to the

Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of certain defense articles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. LOUDERMILK):

H.J. Res. 103. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Improve Tracking of Workplace Injuries and Illnesses"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. POCAN):

H.J. Res. 104. A joint resolution to provide limitations on the transfer of air-to-ground munitions from the United States to Saudi Arabia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. LEE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution supporting efforts to enact a bold jobs and infrastructure package that benefits all Americans, not just billionaires; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H. Res. 357. A resolution reaffirming the strategic partnership between the United States and Canada, recognizing bilateral cooperation that advances United States national interests, and urging increased bilateral cooperation on security, economic issues, and energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CRIST, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H. Res. 358. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 25 as "National Moonshot Day" and recognizing the importance of conquering scientific challenges from medicine to space and beyond; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H. Res. 359. A resolution urging the European Union to designate Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization and increase pressure on it and its members; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland):

H. Res. 360. A resolution honoring the 100th anniversary of the 82nd Airborne Division; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BEYER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. CLAY):

H. Res. 361. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National Gun Violence Awareness Day" and "National Gun Violence Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCEACHIN (for himself, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. BARRAGÁN):

H. Res. 362. A resolution affirming the need to achieve environmental justice, commending the work of environmental justice advocates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WALZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. EVANS):

H. Res. 363. A resolution supporting a Federal, publicly funded universal school meal and nutrition program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 364. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the need to eliminate partisan redistricting and gerrymandering; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 365. A resolution recognizing the denial of full voting rights in Congress for active duty service members, National Guard members, reservists, veterans, and their families who are District of Columbia residents; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself and Ms. LEE):

H. Res. 366. A resolution recognizing and commemorating St. Joseph's School and their service to the El Paso community; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms.

JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. CRIST, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CORREA, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):

H. Res. 367. A resolution establishing the Select Committee on Gun Violence Prevention; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H. Res. 368. A resolution disapproving of the irresponsible actions and negligence of President Trump which may have caused grave harm to United States national security; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H. Res. 369. A resolution recognizing May 29, 2017, as "National 529 Day"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

48. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, relative to House Resolution No. 6031, commemorating the 80th anniversary of the American System of Conservation Funding; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

49. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 25, H.D. 1, urging the United States Congress to restore free and fair elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 15.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 2651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 2652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2653.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 2654.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because this legislation adjusts the formula the federal government uses to spend money on federal contracts, it is authorized by the Constitution under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress its spending power.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 2655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 2657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This act is justified by the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution which, by granting Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states, also allows Congress to prevent or prohibit federal interference with Americans' ability to slaughter and process meat. This act is also justified by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution, which recognize that rights and powers are retained and reserved by the people and to the States.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 2659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 2660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section 1 gives Congress the power to "ordain and establish" inferior Courts.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.R. 2661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 2662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 2664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 2665.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 6

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2666.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the Constitution

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2667.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution provides the Congress with the necessary authority under Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2668.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution provides the Congress with the necessary authority under Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2669.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 4, Clause 1

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 2670.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 2671.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 3)

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 2672.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 7

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 2673.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 7

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 2674.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2675.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 2676.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 2677.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2678.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2679.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 2680.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2681.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2682.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2683.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 2684.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 2685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 2686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

or

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 2687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 2688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §8, cl. 3.

By Mr. GUTIÉRREZ:

H.R. 2690.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 2691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution, Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:

H.R. 2692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 2693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 Clause 14

The Congress shall have Power to the United States Constitution which empowers Congress "To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;"

And; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power to the United States Constitution which empowers Congress "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the gov-

ernment of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

And; The Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution:

Which guarantees, in part, that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws," which the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled to be inclusive of those laws pertaining to the right to vote.

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 2695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 2696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 2697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 2698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 2699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 2700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 2701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, clause 6, Congress is empowered "to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures."

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 2702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution for foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 2703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Clause 12 and Clause 16 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK:

H.R. 2705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 2706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution, and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress the ability to make laws necessary to carry out that power. Additionally, Article I, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be made law; and therefore it implicitly allows Congress to amend any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 2707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 2708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: the Commerce Clause

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 10

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H.R. 2711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 2712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, the Congress "shall have Power. . . to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . . ." According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Congress "shall have Power . . . To . . . regulate Commerce . . . among several States" According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Congress "shall have Power . . . To . . . Make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 2716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 2719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 2720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution. Amendment 16 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 2722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution; the general welfare clause.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 2723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the authority enumerated in Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 2724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 Clause 4 "To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States."

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 2725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Clause I "Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;"

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 2726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 2727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 2728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 2729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 2730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 2731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 2732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the Commerce Clause:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 2733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 2735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 related to the regulation of commerce with foreign Nations.

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 2736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Con-

stitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 2739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 2741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 2742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 2744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 2745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United

States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 2747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. AMASH:

H.J. Res. 102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.J. Res. 103.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Improve Tracking of Workplace Unjuries and Illnesses" (81 Fed. Reg. 29624 (May 12, 2016)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.J. Res. 104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 1, which includes an implied power for the Congress to regulate the conduct of the United States with respect to foreign affairs; and U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, which authorizes the Congress to: (1) "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States," and (2) "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 60: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 113: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 173: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 184: Mr. KEATING and Mr. LOEBACK.

H.R. 305: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 351: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 360: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 392: Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. LEE, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 422: Mrs. LOVE, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 426: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 490: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 502: Mr. MAST and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 545: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 564: Mr. DENT and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 632: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 641: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 664: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 741: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 754: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 756: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DONOVAN, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 778: Mr. COMER.

H.R. 788: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 795: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 801: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 821: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 849: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 850: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 873: Mr. BACON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 918: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 959: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 1057: Mrs. TORRES and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1116: Mr. BUCK, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1154: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 1158: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 1168: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1205: Mr. TONKO, Mr. KING of New York, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1212: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1235: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 1267: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1288: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1298: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1318: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1339: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1361: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1393: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. GORMERT.

H.R. 1405: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 1406: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1421: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1447: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1456: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1520: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1550: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1552: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1558: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 1649: Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1681: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 1698: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1699: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 1719: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1759: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1772: Mr. ROSS and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1811: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1818: Mr. TURNER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. YODER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, and Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 1836: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1838: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1886: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 1891: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1896: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1897: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1904: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1953: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1970: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 2023: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2051: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2062: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KIHUEN, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 2077: Mr. STIVERS and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 2092: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 2119: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 2141: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2158: Mr. POLIS and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 2170: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 2173: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2180: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 2189: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2194: Mr. BACON and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2223: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2258: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SIREs, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2286: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 2295: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2327: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2336: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2337: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2358: Mr. HECK and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2369: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 2372: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 2391: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 2412: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 2413: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2414: Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2417: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KHANNA, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. PETERS, Ms. LEE, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KEATING, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2422: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 2428: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2431: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. BRAT.

- H.R. 2432: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2452: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2465: Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COLE, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2492: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 2499: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2508: Mr. POLIS and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2520: Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 2523: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2526: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2534: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2581: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2583: Mr. POLIS and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2603: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2610: Mr. SOTO.
- H.R. 2630: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2645: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.J. Res. 51: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. LAMALFA.
H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. KIND, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 15: Mr. ESTES of Kansas and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H. Res. 30: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H. Res. 161: Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Res. 201: Mr. DESANTIS.
H. Res. 267: Mr. DUNN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HOLINGSWORTH, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BACON, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. MAST.
- H. Res. 279: Mr. MAST.
H. Res. 319: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. GARRETT.
H. Res. 328: Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 337: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H. Res. 351: Mr. KIND, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WELCH, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LEE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. NADLER.
H. Res. 354: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BEYER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DENT, and Ms. BORDALLO.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE RETIREMENT OF BRIAN C. COOPER FROM THE HOUSE PARLIAMENTARIAN'S OFFICE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise as both the Dean of the House and as a former employer of Brian Cooper to congratulate him on his impending retirement from the House of Representatives after 35 years of service, and to thank him for his years of dedicated service to the House.

Brian is a Baltimore native and the youngest of seven children of his parents Deloris and Ellsworth Cooper. Brian loves the Charm City so much that he has lived in the same house his whole life.

He is a proud graduate of Frederick Douglass High School in Baltimore (the very same high school attended by Supreme Court Justice and civil rights icon Thurgood Marshall). After high school Brian received a scholarship to the Community College of Baltimore, now known as Baltimore City Community College, where he received his degree in commercial and graphic arts.

Brian's first Capitol Hill job began in the fall of 1982 when he began work in the stock room for Publications and Distribution Services. Thereafter, in the 1980s and early 1990s, Brian worked for the House Post Office, the House document room, the Small Business Committee and the Government Operations Committee. At Government Operations, Brian served under both Jack Brooks and myself as Chair (the latter from 1991 through 1994). In that capacity Brian worked as staff assistant, handled filing and archiving of committee materials, and prepared documents for committee hearings and markups. I can personally testify that Brian's work was respected and appreciated by Members on both sides of the aisle.

In 1995, Brian joined the Office of the House Parliamentarian as Clerk where he spent a full 22 years, rising to become Chief Clerk to the Parliamentarian in 2009. Brian's most visible duties included assisting presiding officers during sessions of the House and handling timekeeping and legislative paperwork at the rostrum. In addition, Brian provided invaluable assistance in creating the first office computer network, supervising House pages, and preparing for joint meetings and joint sessions. It is no understatement to say that Brian observed and participated in a great swath of American political history during that time period.

Brian remains active in many artistic endeavors—including watercolor, oils, photography, and architectural design—which I understand he plans to continue in his retirement. Brian also plans to use his well-deserved retirement to travel to Italy and spend

more time with family (including his many nieces and nephews).

As a devoted Baltimore sports fan, Brian has enjoyed the highs and suffered the lows of the local teams. He is a particularly avid fan of the Baltimore Orioles, and I am sure he appreciates the good start they are off to this year.

I know from personal experience and observation that Brian is the consummate professional. Members and staff on both sides of the aisle know Brian to be committed to an orderly and accurate legislative process observed in a fair, nonpartisan manner. In this age of increasing polarization and legislative gridlock, Brian is a committed institutionalist. He is the rare individual consistently striving to continue the customs and traditions of the House, and committed to pass on his institutional knowledge to his successors.

The House and the Congress will greatly miss Brian's services, but we will greatly benefit from his work and legacy.

TRIBUTE TO BRIAN C. COOPER

HON. STEVE WOMACK

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Brian C. Cooper, who is retiring from the Office of the Parliamentarian after 35 years on Capitol Hill.

Brian is the son of Deloris and Ellsworth Cooper, and the youngest of seven children. He is a native of Baltimore, Maryland, and has lived in the city (in the same house he grew up in) for his entire life. Brian is a graduate of Frederick Douglass High School, whose notable alumni include the Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall. Brian received a scholarship to the Community College of Baltimore (now Baltimore City Community College), where he received his degree in commercial and graphic arts.

Brian's first job on Capitol Hill came in September of 1982, when he was hired in the stock room of the Longworth Building, working in Publication and Distribution Services. Throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, Brian held a variety of positions on Capitol Hill, including work at the House Post Office and Document Room, before moving up to become staff assistant for the Small Business Committee and later the Government Operations Committee. In these roles, Brian learned the intricacies of the legislative process and the inner workings of House operations—skills that would serve him well when, in 1995, he was hired as an Assistant Clerk to the Parliamentarian.

Brian would spend the next 22 years in the House Parliamentarian's Office, and became Chief Clerk to the Parliamentarian in 2009. For

over two decades, Brian has been a fixture at the House rostrum, dutifully assisting the presiding officer in timekeeping, recognizing Members on the floor, and preparing and reviewing reams of legislative paperwork for the House. Brian has also prepared the House for joint meetings to receive foreign dignitaries and other guests, and joint sessions of the House, including state of the Union addresses. As clerk, Brian also supervised House "documentarian" pages, and created the first computer network for the Parliamentarian.

An accomplished artist, Brian remains active in his artistic endeavors, which run the gamut from pencil drawings, watercolors, and oils, to photography, and architectural design. His retirement will offer new opportunities to continue these pursuits. His other retirement plans include travel and spending more time with family—including his numerous nieces and nephews. A devoted Baltimore sports fan, Brian will surely find his way to Camden Yards many times in the upcoming years to cheer on his beloved Orioles.

A consummate professional, Brian has spent his career on Capitol Hill committed to assisting with an orderly and accurate legislative process, observed in a fair and nonpartisan manner. Brian is a quintessential institutionalist, always striving to continue the traditions and customs of the House, and to pass on his institutional knowledge to others. The House of Representatives has known few individuals more dedicated to its proper functioning and legacy than Brian Cooper.

HONORING DR. VALERIE PITTS

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dr. Valerie Pitts on her retirement after a stellar 35-year career in public education, most recently as Superintendent of the Larkspur-Corte Madera School District for the past 12 years. Dr. Pitts dedicated her professional tenure to supporting and promoting quality public education. She is passionate about ensuring equity for students, a climate of inclusion, high academic standards, engaging curriculum, and an ethos of continuous improvement.

Born, raised, and educated in Larkspur, California, Dr. Pitts went on to earn a Bachelor's Degree in Music, a Master's Degree in Education, and a Doctorate in Education with an emphasis in Organizational Leadership, all from Bay Area universities. She spent her educational career in Marin County, first as a teacher for eight years at San Rafael High School before moving into curriculum support and administration for the duration. In 2005, Dr. Pitts returned to her home district in Larkspur where she spent the next dozen years.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Throughout her tenure, Dr. Pitts shared her considerable educational experience, skills, and knowledge to amass a list of accomplishments that numerous students, families, and staff will enjoy for years to come.

Among her many achievements, Dr. Pitts led the Larkspur-Corte Madera School District during a time of exponential growth in student enrollment, wherein she managed major facilities improvements funded by taxpayer dollars and created state-of-the-art learning environments and curriculum for the district. This included the installation of a solar energy project that is projected to save the district \$2 million over 20 years.

While serving as Superintendent in the Larkspur-Corte Madera School District, Dr. Pitts also acted as Superintendent for the Sausalito—Marin City School District during transitions in leadership. This generosity of spirit was extended to her fellow superintendents around the County and in other school districts through her work on the Joint Legislative Advisory Committee and many other county leadership roles.

Dr. Pitts' legacy of professional and civic contributions will leave indelible benefits to Marin County for years to come. She is a student focused leader, whose commitment to equity and excellence in public education is outstanding. It is appropriate that she has been selected for many honors, including the prestigious Marin County's 2017 Educator of the Year award as she retires from an exceptional career in public education, at the Golden Bell Award Ceremony on May 25, 2017, and hosted by the San Rafael Elks Lodge No. 1108, Marin County School Boards Association, Marin Association of Superintendents, and Marin County Office of Education.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in expressing deep appreciation for Dr. Pitts' long and extraordinary professional service, congratulate her on being named the 2017 Educator of the Year, and extend to her best wishes on her retirement.

**CELEBRATING THE VOLUNTEER
EFFORTS IN IMPROVING THE AL-
TOONA USPS CENTER**

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate four talented young Pennsylvania students who volunteered their time and artistic abilities to the beautification of the Altoona Mail Processing Center.

Portage Area High School students Makayla Klein, Christopher Hartline, Kaylee Koval, and Alexis Miller were selected by their instructor to design and paint a mural in the lobby of the postal center. They submitted several designs for consideration, and, upon selection, collaborated to carry out the chosen design. The design that was selected by the postal center was a striking image of a bald eagle with wings spread and talons out. On the left wing is the emblem of the United States Postal Service, and on the right wing an American flag.

On April 7th and 8th, 2017, Makayla, Christopher, Kaylee, and Alexis volunteered their time to complete the mural on the lobby wall of the postal center. The mural was dedicated to the hardworking men and women of the Altoona Mail Processing Center, and their commitment to ensuring the efficient and accurate handling of our mail and postage. The students who carried out this tremendous project deserve nothing but our gratitude and admiration.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to thank Makayla, Christopher, Kaylee, and Alexis for their hand in the improvement of the Altoona Mail Processing Center. Congratulations on a job well done and for your beautiful contribution which will be enjoyed by thousands in the community for years to come.

**IN RECOGNITION OF COLLEEN
CLARE GALLAGHER**

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank and pay tribute to a long-time member of my team. Colleen Clare Gallagher first joined my team during my first campaign for Congress, back in 2010. She was an intern then, but she quickly proved her value and is today our Director of Operations, critically important to every aspect of our office's operations and our team's success. Colleen grew up in the 7th District. Her parents had seven daughters and raised them all in Havertown, Delaware County.

More important than her professional talent and ability, to me and my entire team she's become a valued and trusted friend, colleague, and leader.

Mr. Speaker, in the coming weeks Colleen will be departing my office to embark upon a new chapter in her life. I wish her continued happiness and success for the future.

**THANKING MATTHEW HERRMANN
FOR TEN YEARS OF SERVICE TO
THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS
AND THE PEOPLE OF GUAM**

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Matthew Herrmann for ten years of service to the people of Guam and the United States Congress. Over the last decade, Matt has served diligently in my office here in Washington, D.C. and he has been instrumental to enacting numerous public policies that have benefitted my constituents in Guam and our nation as a whole.

Matt joined my office in May of 2007 as my Military Legislative Assistant and he went on to become my Legislative Director and then Chief of Staff. He concurrently serves as an Adjunct Professor at American University here in Washington, D.C. where he teaches a

course on the impact of technology on the American political system. Prior to joining my office, Matt was the Executive Officer to the Director at the National Guard Bureau Office of Legislative Liaison.

During his time in my office, Matt has overseen many legislative responsibilities and he has provided me with invaluable counsel in fulfilling my role as Guam's only representative in Congress. He has been my key advisor on issues impacting our military, veterans, and foreign policy. I have especially appreciated his commitment to enhancing the role and resourcing of the National Guard, efforts for which his actions have been widely recognized. His guidance has also been critical to securing millions in dollars for Guam as well as ensuring that programs such as the realignment of Marines from Okinawa to Guam moves forward in a way that not only satisfies the Department of Defense's needs, but also has a positive benefit to the people of Guam and the entire Asia-Pacific region.

Matt was also instrumental to my success in including the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act as a provision of the FY17 National Defense Authorization Act, which was signed in to law by President Barack Obama on December 23, 2016. This was historic legislation that finally authorized, after more than 70 years, the payment of claims to the patriotic Chamorro Americans on Guam who endured brutal enemy occupation during World War II.

Matt's professionalism, understanding of the complexities of the legislative process, and personable demeanor have been critical to his successes here on the Hill and in turn helped me best represent people of Guam. Further, on a personal note, Matt has also been a close mentor and confidant to many current and former staff members and he was always willing to lend his personal and professional experiences to guide and direct them. He has fostered strong bipartisan relationships with Congressional staffers, officials in the Administration, as well as key stakeholders in the private and non-government industries, and he will be deeply missed here on Capitol Hill.

Mr. Speaker, Matt's departure from my office will leave a void that will be difficult to fill. I will miss his counsel and the light heartedness he brought to my office every day. I am proud of the growth and experiences that he has had while working on behalf of my constituents and the American people. So on behalf of the people of Guam, I extend my sincere un dangkulo na si Yu'os Ma'ase (with deepest gratitude) to him, and I wish him well as he begins this next chapter in his life.

SENIOR CORPS WEEK

HON. BRENDAN F. BOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in honor of Senior Corps Week 2017, to recognize the extraordinary work being done by hundreds of thousands of seniors across this country through Senior Corps.

Through its Foster Grandparent Program, Senior Companion Program, and nationwide RSVP volunteer programs, seniors are making a huge difference in the lives of millions.

In my home state of Pennsylvania alone, these programs and the over 11,000 seniors that support them have provided tutoring and mentoring services to almost 4,000 students; helped 1,500 homebound seniors live independently through the Companion program; and supported the work of an additional 1,300 local organizations with their efforts.

The RSVP program in particular, with installations in my district in both Philadelphia and Montgomery County helps by counseling Medicare recipients, helping adults improve their literacy skills, mentoring at-risk youth, delivering Meals on Wheels, staffing domestic hotlines, and so much more.

Despite all the amazing work these programs support, President Trump's budget calls for the complete elimination of its parent organization—the Corporation for National and Community Service.

This makes no sense. Not only would doing so have almost no real impact on the federal budget—CNCS makes up less than three hundredths of 1 percent of total spending—it would be a devastating blow to our seniors and communities. It is also completely inconsistent with the sense of service and civic duty on which our country is built.

I call upon my colleagues to reject this harmful budget, and stand with me in support of the great work of Senior Corps.

HONORING BETSY A. CODY

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, we rise to honor the long career of public service provided to the Congress of the United States by Betsy A. Cody of the Congressional Research Service.

Mr. Speaker, there is no issue that Members of Congress disagree on more than western water policy. The very complicated details of western water policy have the ability to not only divide us by party, but they divide us by state and even by regions within a state.

One of the few things that all Western Members do agree on is our deep gratitude for the invaluable expertise we have received from Ms. Cody over the past 30 years. We are happy that she is moving on to a much deserved retirement this month, but we will greatly miss the reservoir of knowledge that she has provided to our offices.

Betsy's non-partisan research, analysis, and policy advice has been the foundation for the water debates and legislation that the Congress has produced over the past 30 years. Betsy's talent is that she is able to break down these very complex issues involving historic water rights, agriculture, endangered species, infrastructure, precipitation patterns, interstate disagreements, federal programs, and many more intricate subjects quickly and concisely. Betsy is famous for her western water briefings for new Members and staff, her "In-

Focus" fact sheets that simplify complex pieces of legislation, and the hundreds of in-depth research memos and reports that she has produced over the years.

Betsy's best trait, which is something she shares with her colleagues at the Congressional Research Service, is that her research and advice is not political or biased. Betsy is trusted by both sides of the aisle for being fair and impartial, which has been demonstrated in her five times testifying before committees in both houses.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Cody exemplifies what Adams, Jefferson, and later La Follette had envisioned when they created the Library of Congress and the Legislative Reference Service in order to provide Members with expert research and analysis to inform our legislative work. Betsy has been an invaluable resource to us, our staff, and those of numerous other Members. We will not only miss her knowledge, but we will also miss her kindness.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. CALVERT of California and myself, we ask our colleagues to join us in congratulating Betsy A. Cody on her retirement, and thanking her for her long career of public service to the Congress and to our country.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF CAPTAIN JON D. PEPPETTI, JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS, U.S. NAVY

HON. KEITH J. ROTHFUS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Captain Jon D. Peppetti, who is retiring after 22 years of service to our nation with the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the United States Navy. Captain Peppetti was born in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, grew up primarily in Cresson, Pennsylvania, and attended Bishop Carroll High School in Ebensburg, Pennsylvania. He graduated Phi Beta Kappa from the University of Notre Dame in May 1992. He later earned a J.D. from the University of Pittsburgh School of Law, and an LL.M. in International and Comparative Law from the George Washington University Law School.

In 1995, Captain Peppetti began his dedicated service to our nation as a commissioned officer in the U.S. Navy. During the next 22 years, Captain Peppetti served in a wide variety of roles throughout the United States and overseas. His assignments included Naval Legal Service Office Southeast; Navy Recruiting Command; Amphibious Group Three; Naval Legal Service Office Europe and Southwest Asia; Amphibious Squadron Four deployed onboard USS *Wasp* (LHD 1); Carrier Strike Group Twelve deployed onboard USS *Enterprise* (CVN 65); Navy Office of Legislative Affairs; U.S. Naval Forces Southern Command/U.S. Fourth Fleet; and Naval Supply Systems Command. He also served as Deputy Executive Assistant to the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, and as a White House Social Aide in support of the President and First Lady. He concluded his career as Legal Counsel to the Chief of Naval Personnel.

Captain Peppetti's expertise and understanding of the complexities of the law of the sea and the law of armed conflict directly enhanced the ability of the U.S. Navy to fulfill its missions throughout the world. As the U.S. Navy confronted myriad diverse challenges, he delivered sage counsel to senior leaders and warfighters that facilitated our nation's ability to conduct naval operations. His profound knowledge and experience greatly contributed to our national security.

For his outstanding service to our nation, Captain Peppetti earned numerous awards, including the Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal, Navy Commendation Medal, and Navy Achievement Medal.

I commend Captain Peppetti for his commitment to our country and the sacrifices he made on its behalf. On the occasion of his retirement from the U.S. Navy, I thank him and his family for his honorable service to our nation and wish him fair winds and following seas as he concludes a distinguished career.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FEDERALLY-INSURED CREDIT UNIONS

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize the 50th anniversary of the National Association of Federally-Insured Credit Unions (NAFCU), one of the most effective trade associations advocating on behalf of the nation's federally-insured credit unions.

In 1966, around 50 credit union leaders came together in Los Angeles to explore how to better have their interests addressed at the federal level and the possibility of creating a trade association located in our nation's capital to meet that need. That idea took root and NAFCU was formed as the National Association of Federal Credit Unions in April of 1967. Soon thereafter NAFCU was the first national credit union trade association to be headquartered in the Washington, D.C., area.

Since its inception, NAFCU has steadily grown in size and expanded its team, representing now over 800 credit unions and employing over 60 individuals, and even updating its name to the National Association of Federally-Insured Credit Unions earlier this year. Most importantly NAFCU's influential presence has not gone unnoticed and the association has become well-known for its ability to identify, examine, and represent issues of concern to federally-insured credit unions before Congress.

NAFCU has crossed many milestones in its 50 years, from the enactment of the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund (NCUSIF) to the passage of the Credit Union Membership Access Act in 1998. In recent years, they have been at the forefront in fighting for regulatory relief for our nation's credit unions. As a Member of Congress, I have had the pleasure of working with NAFCU on numerous occasions, working to provide regulatory relief and

take on crucial issues impacting our credit unions. I congratulate NAFCU on its 50th anniversary and I look forward to working with them in the future.

TAYLOR SANDER BBQ CHAMPION

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate 14-year-old Taylor Sanders on her tremendous achievement in winning the "Kids BBQ Championship" on the Food Network. I am delighted that she represented our Naples, Florida, community in front of a national audience with excellent cooking skills and selfless character.

The \$10,000 reward for her victory is well deserved for all of her hard work. She is a very considerate and mature young person, as illustrated by her donating a portion of her reward to a charity, Take a Soldier Fishing. This is a wonderful organization and I am proud that she chose to honor our soldiers.

Taylor's barbeque skills and generosity show sophistication beyond her years. I know that our Southwest Florida community is extremely grateful for her contributions.

CARLYLE LAKE 50TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the 50th Anniversary of Carlyle Lake in Clinton County in my home state of Illinois.

The thought of Carlyle Lake was created due to the extreme flooding caused by the Kaskaskia River. A group of men residing in the area decided to create the Kaskaskia River Valley Project in 1933. This project then led to the idea of a man-made lake. The Flood Control Act of 1938 granted authorization for the construction of what eventually became Carlyle Lake. Due to the commencement of World War II the original construction plan was put to a halt.

In 1950, after the war subsided, attorney Eldon E. Hazlet took interest in the construction of the lake. He formed the Kaskaskia Valley Association, whose member's sole purpose was to convince the public for the need of a lake. After gaining enough public support, the Army Corps of Engineers made a revised plan of construction for the lake. Twenty years after the date of the original authorization; the Federal government signed off on the construction of Carlyle Lake in 1958. The Carlyle Lake Project was completed in April 1967, and the dam was dedicated in June of the same year.

Over the years Carlyle Lake has become a popular attraction for those in the area as well as for tourists. Visitors can enjoy the scenery, lie on the beach, or rent a boat out to coast

on the water. The creation of this lake has allowed the economy to prosper. It has also led to the creation of the Eldon Hazlet State Park; they named this park after him because of his leadership in the advancement of Carlyle Lake. Tourists and townspeople can fish, camp, and hike in this state park.

The City of Carlyle has planned a celebration of the Lakes' 50th year. The celebration will begin on June 9th and go through the 11th. Throughout the weekend visitors can enjoy a carnival, music festival, vintage car show, and much more. The weekend will come to a close with a commemoration ceremony for Carlyle Lake.

I ask that we all join in that celebration as we pay tribute to the history and the people who made Carlyle Lake. I salute Carlyle Lake on its 50th Anniversary.

IN RECOGNITION OF EZELL
AGNEW FOR HIS LIFETIME OF
SERVICE TO THE YPSILANTI
COMMUNITY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ezell Agnew for his lifetime of service on behalf of the Ypsilanti community. Mr. Agnew's work with Washtenaw Community College, the Perry Childhood Learning Center, and the City of Ypsilanti has helped make the city a great place to live and is worthy of commendation.

Mr. Agnew began working as a groundskeeper at Washtenaw Community College on the day that it opened in 1966. For over 40 years, Mr. Agnew was a friendly presence around the college who labored tirelessly to ensure that the grounds remained well-kept and clean. In addition to his career at WCC, Mr. Agnew also collaborated with the City of Ypsilanti to clean up the downtown area and provide assistance to the city as a volunteer and part-time employee. Since his retirement with WCC, Mr. Agnew has selflessly volunteered his time to beautify and maintain the Perry Early Childhood Learning Center's school grounds. He also tends to Perry's community garden and is well-known around the school for his dedication to this role. This has helped create a positive learning environment for Perry's students.

Mr. Agnew's outstanding efforts on behalf of the Ypsilanti community have helped beautify the city for decades. Additionally, his positive attitude and kind-hearted nature has made him a beloved figure in the community, and the support from students and staff of the Perry Early Childhood Learning Center underscores the impact that his actions and volunteer work has had on the city and its residents. His proactive work in helping the City of Ypsilanti and its schools is emblematic of Mr. Agnew's personality, and it is my hope that he continues his efforts on behalf of the community in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ezell Agnew for his lifetime of work and support of Ypsilanti and its resi-

dents. Mr. Agnew has helped make Ypsilanti a great place to live for generations of individuals.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NUCLEAR
CRUISE MISSILE RECONSIDERATION
ACT OF 2017 AND THE
SMARTER APPROACH TO NUCLEAR
EXPENDITURES ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two pieces of legislation, along with Senator MARKEY in the Senate, that bring us closer to a more rational U.S. nuclear posture.

The Nuclear Cruise Missile Reconsideration Act of 2017 would limit Department of Defense and Department of Energy spending on the next generation air-launched nuclear cruise missile (ALCM), known as the Long Range Standoff weapon (LRSO), until the Trump administration submits a Nuclear Posture Review to Congress. The Air Force plans to replace 575 existing ALCMs with 1,000 or more LRSOs. The total cost to build this missile and life-extend its warhead (known as the W80-4) is projected at \$20-30 billion.

The Smarter Approach to Nuclear Expenditures (SANE) Act would enable the U.S. to maintain a strong nuclear deterrent without shortchanging combat readiness and operations by strategically sizing our nuclear weapons programs. This bill would save us more than \$100 billion over 10 years by dialing back redundant nuclear weapons systems.

Current U.S. nuclear weapons planning calls for spending \$400 billion over the next decade and at least \$1 trillion over the next 30 years to maintain and recapitalize our entire arsenal. This escalation would build a nuclear force far exceeding what the Pentagon and security experts have said is necessary to meet our national security objectives.

We are headed down an unsustainable path. Our all-the-above approach to recapitalizing every leg of the nuclear triad will inevitably push out Army, Navy, and Air Force conventional priorities, including what we need to counter terrorism and protect our servicemembers. We have to make some tough decisions for the sake of fiscal stability, and these bills are a step in the right direction.

RECOGNIZING FATHER LEWIS
BROWN

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Father Lewis Brown on the 50th Anniversary of his ordination and recognize his 22 years of service as a United States Navy Chaplain.

Father Lew grew up in Elmira, New York as a member of St. Mary's Southside Parish.

After graduating from Elmira Notre Dame High School, he attended St. Andrew's Theological College and Seminary and St. Bernard's School of Theology and Ministry.

In 1967, Father Lew was ordained by Bishop Fulton J. Sheen at Sacred Heart Cathedral in Rochester, New York. He worked in different parishes and churches for more than 15 years, until beginning his tenure as a chaplain in the United States Navy in 1985. During his time in the Navy, Father Lew encouraged sailors and aviators with his kind spirit and strong faith. He served all around the globe, from Okinawa, Japan to Arlington National Cemetery in Virginia.

Since retiring from active duty in 2007, Father Lew has worked in both the Rochester Diocese and my family's church—the All Saints Parish in Corning, New York. He has had a profoundly positive impact on my life and I am constantly reminded of one particular piece of advice that he gave me several years ago: "Trust in the Lord; you propose, He'll dispose."

Father Lew has made our local community a better place by working with various organizations, including Catholic Charities USA and Big Brothers Big Sisters of America. In addition, he continues to serve his fellow veterans by devoting his time to the Bath VA Medical Center. In recognition of his outstanding service and commitment to Catholic school education, Father Lew received the Seton Neumann Award from All Saints Academy in 2013.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Father Lewis Brown on the 50th Anniversary of his ordination and thanking him for his years of service to our country and local community.

HONORING DIANE PATRICK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Diane Patrick Elementary School in the Arlington Independent School District for their recognition as a "Capturing Kids' Hearts National Showcase School" for the 2016–2017 academic year.

Diane Patrick Elementary School opened in August 2015 with the aim of ensuring that its students were provided exceptional learning opportunities in a safe and emotionally supportive learning environment. From its inception, Diane Patrick Elementary's campus was designed with the students' interests at the forefront.

Prior to its construction, school leaders performed extensive research on which program to implement, examining the most successful programs at the highest performing schools across the country. The leaders at Diane Patrick Elementary School ultimately chose to work with the Flippen Group to bring their "Capturing Kids Hearts" program to its campus. As a part of the program, teachers and staff use innovative methods that increase students' connectedness with both peers and adults on campus, and create an environment where students are excited to learn.

For its dedication to the "Capturing Kids Hearts" program, Diane Patrick Elementary earned national recognition as a "Capturing Kids' Hearts National Showcase Schools" award recipient for the 2016–2017 school year from the Flippen Group. Showcase schools were selected based on how well the schools implemented their processes as well as demonstrating progress in attendance, discipline, climate/culture, and academics. As part of the selection process, a Flippen group team visited each nominated campus to gather data and perform interviews. A survey was performed to get feedback on the climate and culture of the campus, as well as its conduciveness to learning.

I honor Diane Patrick Elementary School for their outstanding dedication to creating a safe and emotionally supportive learning environment.

FORT BEND SCHOOLS WIN EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION AWARDS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Fort Bend Independent School District (ISD) of Sugar Land, TX, for winning up to \$70,000 at the H-E-B Excellence in Education Awards.

The Fort Bend ISD Board of Trustees won \$25,000 for the school boards award, while a teacher and a principal were also awarded for their leadership. Richard Embrick of David Crockett Middle School won the Rising Star Award, which recognizes teachers with less than 10 years of experience and awards \$5,000 for the winner and a \$5,000 grant for the school. Julie Diaz of Travis High School won the award for secondary school principal and received \$10,000 for herself and a \$25,000 grant for her school as well. Fort Bend ISD took home \$70,000 of the \$430,000 awarded at the ceremony. The winners are selected out of 58 finalists by a panel of judges comprised of school administrators and university and community leaders. Great job Fort Bend ISD!

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Fort Bend ISD for winning \$70,000 at the H-E-B Excellence in Education Awards. Our children benefit from their commitment to education and we appreciate their hard work.

RECOGNIZING GARY PICHON'S BIKE RIDE

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Gary Pichon, who just completed a 3,000-mile bike ride around our country.

Gary set out on a mission, not for the thrill of ride, but to see what he could learn about

the landscape and people of our great nation. As he mapped a course across the states, Gary soaked up the beauty of America's cityscapes and countrysides.

In the towns that he traveled through, people were kind and ready to work. He also noted the plight of rural Americans, who are resilient and strong and often underappreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I echo Mr. Pichon's respect for the hardworking Americans who give our nation enduring character. Mr. Pichon and I call northeast Georgia home and could not ask for better neighbors in a finer nation.

Gary's ride from coast to coast serves as a reminder of the diversity that makes our nation beautiful and the unassuming kindness that fuels our nation's endurance.

HONORING ALAN MCGRAW

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I celebrate the extraordinary work of my friend Alan McGraw, mayor of my home of Round Rock, Texas. On May 25, he will step down after three successful terms leading this growing and dynamic Central Texas city.

Mayor McGraw's devotion to public service has made Round Rock a great place to live and work. He focused on bringing jobs to the area, prioritized keeping citizens safe through support of public safety officials, and improved transportation and quality of life for the citizens of Round Rock. From planned resorts to a downtown revitalization project to a state-of-the-art convention center, Round Rock has become a city on the cutting edge of urban development.

Round Rock has benefitted from Mayor McGraw's love of the outdoors. His connection with the owners of Bass Pro Shops brought the retail giant to Round Rock, further strengthening the local economy. McGraw's forward-thinking leadership resulted in the construction of the Round Rock Sports Center which has entrenched the City as the Sports Capital of Texas, further diversifying Round Rock's position in sports tourism.

While effective city leadership isn't easy, Texans aren't afraid of a challenge and Mayor McGraw has embraced every opportunity, no matter how daunting, to improve Round Rock. He shepherded the city through recent economic downturns and has worked tirelessly to inject realism to regional transit planning. His leadership has been a reflection of the very best values of the Lone Star State.

While McGraw isn't tired of the privilege of leading Round Rock, he knows that everything has its season and that it's time to allow the next generation of leaders to take the stage. Retirement from office won't give him much idle time. He'll fill his days at his law practice, start up an archery retail business, and spend time with his beloved wife Kathy and two children.

Mayor Alan McGraw has done what all public servants are elected to do: put the needs of the people first. He's led Round Rock to

new heights and positioned my home town to continue its progress into a bright future. I salute his leadership, congratulate him on his retirement, and wish him nothing but the best for the years ahead.

**HONORING WILLIAM PETITE ON
HIS RETIREMENT AFTER MORE
THAN 17 YEARS OF SERVICE TO
OUR NATION**

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I offer my sincere congratulations to my constituent, William Petite, on his upcoming retirement after more than 11 years of federal civilian service and 6 years of military service.

Mr. Petite began his service to our Nation in 1969, when he enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps to serve in the Vietnam War, during which he earned, among other decorations, the Purple Heart. He later enlisted in the U.S. Army and served as a Non-Commissioned Officer on armored vehicles until his discharge in 1981.

Mr. Petite later began working with tracked vehicles as a mechanic, supervisor, and in quality control with Boeing. He subsequently worked with Northrop-Grumman and Letterkenny Army Depot until 2009, when he accepted a position as a Quality Assurance Specialist with the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) working out of BAE in York, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Petite's workload focused on the Bradley Fighting Vehicle ACAT-1 program; specifically, he aided in the initial development and updates to the Bradley program surveillance plan. His colleagues describe him as a dedicated, persistent, and outstanding leader who took great pride in supporting the customer, the Warfighter, and contributing to the defense of our Nation.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, I thank and congratulate William Petite on his service to our Nation and wish his family continued great success in the years to come.

**IN RECOGNITION OF THE OPENING
OF THE AMAZING WORLD OF DR.
SEUSS**

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to include in the RECORD entitled "Oh, the places you'll go when visiting the new Seuss museum" that was published in the Boston Globe on May 25, 2017. This article comes ahead of the grand opening of The Amazing World of Dr. Seuss in Springfield, Massachusetts this June. This impressive museum honors the legendary work of Springfield native Theodor Geisel, better known to the world as Dr. Seuss. Geisel inspired genera-

tions of children and adults with his stories that have become iconic in American folklore.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that everyone will have the chance to visit this exemplary place and enjoy the marvels that Dr. Seuss created.

[From the Boston Globe, May 25, 2017]

OH, THE PLACES YOU'LL GO WHEN VISITING
THE NEW SEUSS MUSEUM

(By James Sullivan)

SPRINGFIELD.—Theodor Geisel loved his father, but he was a practical man. Not for him your fantastic tales of elephants and giraffes and a brass band, as the boy daydreams in Geisel's first children's book, "And To Think That I Saw It on Mulberry Street." The boy in the tale, inspired by Geisel's childhood, tells his father the truth: He'd seen a plain old horse and wagon.

Geisel—better known by his pen name, Dr. Seuss—may have had to leave this horse-and-wagon town, the place where he was born in 1904, to free the full potential of his extravagant imagination. Yet throughout his life the Springfield of his youth remained a touchstone.

Now, 15 years after the city unveiled its Dr. Seuss National Memorial Sculpture Garden at the Springfield Museums, crews are scrambling to put the finishing touches on the Amazing World of Dr. Seuss, the first museum dedicated to the life and work of the revered children's author and illustrator. Opening on the first weekend of June, it's not on the real Mulberry Street, but it's just a few blocks away.

"He left here at a certain age, but this was always his hometown, make no mistake," said Leagrey Dimond one of Geisel's two stepdaughters from Audrey Stone Dimond, his second wife. Dimond was in Springfield recently to help set up the museum displays, which include a recreation of Geisel's cozy living-room workspace in the family's hill-top home in La Jolla, Calif.

"This was our soapdish," Dimond said, holding up one artifact as she led a group of sneakpeekers through the galleries.

The Seuss museum will be housed in the William Pynchon Memorial Building, a two-story stone-block Georgian colonial located on the Springfield Museums quad, in the former home of the local history museum. Inside, the rooms feature expertly rendered murals from Seuss's books, painted by a team of UMass honors-college students under the direction of artist John Simpson. There are oversize figures from his books and a tribute to Geisel's childhood home in Springfield, and the second floor walls will be lined with one-of-a-kind Seuss artworks, many of them doodled specifically for his stepdaughters.

"You never knew when he'd come in and drop a little something on your bed," recalled Dimond, 59, who owns a small bookstore in San Francisco. Her sister, Lark Grey Dimond-Cates, is the sculptor who designed the memorial garden on the lawn in the quad, which includes bronze statues of the Lorax, Horton the Elephant, the Cat in the Hat, and other famous Seuss creations.

"People ask where he got his ideas from," said Dimond, who was 10 years old when her mother married her "step-pop." "Who knows? What matters is they were there."

Geisel, who had no biological children, had pet names for his stepdaughters. He called Dimond "Lee Groo," or "Snunny." (He dedicated his book of tongue-twisters, "Oh Say Can You Say?," to "Lee Groo, the Enunciator.")

But for all of the wacky wordplay for which he was renowned, Geisel was also a vo-

racious reader of books for grown-ups. He loved a good mystery, Dimond recalled, and "he could recite from memory entire pieces of Shakespeare."

She fully expects the museum to attract plenty of adults who are just as enthralled as the children.

"As you grow older, you love him in more and more ways," she said.

Simpson, the art director (who is married to the president of the Springfield Museums, Kay Simpson), said it's been a joy for him to bring the pages of Seuss's books to life on the walls of the museum. As a Springfield native whose favorite story growing up was "Yertle the Turtle," "it's been the greatest honor to lose myself in his lines and marks," he said.

Each room is a new immersion. The yellow walls of Geisel's home studio are the same yellow they were in La Jolla, said painting contractor Walt Reynolds, who was on his hands and knees on a drop cloth, finishing the trim. The ceiling in the basement, which will be a children's activity room, will be painted purple, he said. All the walls will be coated with polyurethane, for easy cleanup.

"My grandkids are dying to come in," said Reynolds. "Hopefully my grandkids' grandkids will see this."

Until now, Dimond has been reluctant to call attention to her place in Geisel's life. She did name her bookstore Thidwick, after the "Big-Hearted Moose" of the 1948 Dr. Seuss book. But it's one of his lesser-known works.

With the opening of the museum, it was time to ensure that the Dr. Seuss legacy will have its permanent home, she said: "I emptied out my house. I kept one lamp, a blue sheep, and a couple of pictures."

She's never felt the need to speak publicly about the private life of her step-pop. Anything you need to know about what he was like in person is contained in the books, she said.

"The kindness, the warmth, the wit, the sense of fun—it's all there. He can absolutely speak for himself."

NEIL ETSON

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Neil Etsen, a World War II veteran, as well as a small business owner and entrepreneur in Southern Illinois for over 50 years. He is being honored by the Rotary Club of Richland County for his service during World War II, where he served honorably as a Staff Sergeant with the 766th Military Police Battalion.

After the War, Neil made a home for him and his family in Olney, IL, where he founded an energy company, Etsen Oil Corporation. Etsen Oil Corporation operated successfully for over 50 years and provided many jobs in his community. Neil has been very involved in the energy sector as a Board Member of the Canadian Oil Corporation, a Steering Committee Member for the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, and on the Committee on National Preservation Drake Well Museum in Titusville, Pennsylvania.

Neil has continued to serve his country, church, and community throughout his many

years in Southern Illinois. He has been active on the Richland County Board, the City of Olney Zoning Board, and a member of the Richland County Development Corporation. He is also the author of two children's books.

Neil and his wife of 66 years, Frances, have three children and ten grandchildren. I would like to thank Neil for his service to his country and commend him on a lifetime of dedication to his community.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH CARVALHO

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an extraordinary man, Joseph John "Joe" Carvalho. Joseph passed away on May 22, 2017 at the age of 88. A resident of Hacienda Heights, California, he was a pillar of the community and will be deeply missed.

Joe was born on June 3, 1928, in Tiverton, Rhode Island and grew up in North Dighton, Massachusetts. He served in the Navy for two years and obtained the rank of Engineer Third Class while working in a POW camp in World War II. In 1951, he enrolled in the Massachusetts Maritime Academy where he received his degree in Marine Engineering. Upon graduation, he served with the Merchant Marines for two years.

Joe married the love of his life Audrey Enos on November 21, 1953. They moved to California and welcomed the birth of their children: Catherine, Cynthia, Barry, Pamela, and Janet. He worked for the Department of Water and Power for 33 years as an Electrical Engineer. At 55, Joe retired and worked for the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics Organizing Committee while also maintaining his own real estate business. He was a founding member of Saint John Vianney Parish and was a dedicated usher and volunteer. He was a dedicated Red Sox fan and was able to see his dreams realized with the 2004, 2007, and 2013 World Series Championships. Joe's greatest joy was his family. He became known as Poppi to his five grandchildren: Danielle, Tara, Nicole, Hope Willard, and Brennan Carvalho, and two great grandchildren: Emma and Quinn Massari.

On Friday, May 26, 2017, a memorial honoring Joe's extraordinary life will be held in Hacienda Heights, CA. Joe will always be remembered for his incredible work ethic, generosity, contributions to the community and love of family. His dedication to his family, work, and community are a testament to a life lived well and a legacy that will continue. I extend my condolences to Joe's family and friends. Although Joe may be gone, the light and goodness he brought to the world remain and will never be forgotten.

CHILD PROTECTION BILLS

HON. LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1842, 1862 and 1761. While I support these bills, I do not support the mandatory minimum requirements in them.

As a mother I constantly worry about the wellbeing of my children, and as a legislator I am concerned about the wellbeing of all our nation's children. These bills are very well meaning and I thank my colleagues for all the hard work done on them. No one here wants to see a child sexually assaulted or abused. Violence against children can have long lasting physical and emotional effects on a child. These bills go a long way and making sure those who commit these heinous crimes are punished.

While these bills address important issues and help to further protect our children, the mandatory minimum provisions are concerning to me. These bills would expand the number of individuals subject to mandatory minimums. Mandatory minimums are an unfair one size fits all solution that often do not take into account circumstances of a crime. Drug related mandatory minimums have led to increased prison population. Many of these people were given harsh and overly punitive prison time. We should not be looking for ways to increase the use of mandatory minimums, but ways to return discretion to judges.

Congress should not be legislating sentencing. This discretion should be left in the hands of judges. Judges are able to adapt sentences to fit the individual circumstances of particular crimes and offenders. My hope is that we are able to work together to protect our nation's children and give our judges the judicial discretion they need when it comes to sentencing those convicted in a court of law.

HONORING THE TOURISM INDUSTRY

HON. NEAL P. DUNN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an industry that is recognized nationwide during the first full week of May, but recognized locally in my district by the Bay County Chamber of Commerce during the entire month of May: travel and tourism.

If tourism is the body, then our visitors are the blood sustaining life. From our award-winning restaurants and warm and welcoming hospitality businesses, to our entertainment events featuring world-renowned artists and the alluring charms of small town life, each and every member of the tourism industry is critical to making our communities thrive. I commend you for your work and am thankful for your contributions to making our communities an incredible place to call home.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COMMISSION ON AMERICANS LIVING ABROAD ACT OF 2017

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are an estimated 8 million constituents scattered across the world who promote our culture and values while strengthening our nation's global influence as they live and work abroad. For years, I have worked to ensure that overseas Americans can fully exercise their rights as U.S. citizens by having their voices heard loud and clear by Congress. Eight years ago, I formed the Congressional Americans Abroad Caucus because I wanted to bring awareness and focus to the concerns of those residing abroad. U.S. citizens remain just that, citizens, regardless of where they choose to live and should not be ignored by virtue of residence.

Our constituents living and working abroad have consistently voiced concerns about the impact federal policies have on them like voting, immigration, access to financial institutions, and taxation. The time has come to comprehensively study and address the effects of federal policies on Americans living overseas.

That is why today I am reintroducing the Commission on Americans Living Abroad Act, which creates an Executive Commission with the main purpose of examining those concerns. The Commission creates a 10 member panel to examine the impact of federal policymaking on U.S. citizens abroad. The resulting study would then be used by Congress and the Executive Branch when considering the best steps we can take to engage the abroad community and ensure their voices are heard. This process will bring clearer awareness of the federal issues impacting Americans abroad and will open a path for coordination with those communities towards more robust representation.

Each of our constituents has a right to have their interests represented and to have a role in the political process. The Commission on Americans Living Abroad would establish a foundation from which we can work to better serve the needs of our global constituents. I welcome and urge my colleagues to lend their support to this bill.

IN HONOR OF MEMORIAL DAY

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, next week, on May 29, 2017, our nation will celebrate Memorial Day, a day of remembrance for those who have died in service of the United States.

We set aside this day to pay solemn tribute to the patriots who gave their last full measure of devotion for this country that we love.

Let us honor and remember our servicemen and women who answered America's call to

service and paid the ultimate price to keep us here at home safe.

We honor their loved ones. Mothers. Fathers. Sisters. Brothers. Sons. Daughters. Friends. We thank you for your sacrifice as well.

As a grateful nation, we have an obligation and a duty to be there for those who provided the ultimate sacrifice, and for their brothers and sisters in service.

Let us never forget our obligation to provide our troops the tools they need to carry out their mission; to care for all those who have served; to honor all those whom we've lost; to keep faith with our military families; to never stop searching for those who are missing, or trying to bring home our prisoners of war.

May God bless our fallen heroes and their families and all who serve in the United States Armed Forces.

HONORING DR. DONALD F. BOESCH

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding environmental conservationist and researcher in my home state of Maryland. Dr. Donald F. Boesch has served as the President of the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science (UMCES) since 1990, and he will be retiring from that position later this year. Throughout his tenure, UMCES has led the charge to study and conserve our state's natural environments, particularly the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed.

UMCES has its roots in a small research laboratory opened at the mouth of the Patuxent River in the Chesapeake Bay in 1925, and was relaunched under its current name and mission in 1997 to provide undergraduate and graduate students with hands-on learning and internships in marine biology, ecology, and environmental subjects. With five locations across the State of Maryland, from its original site in Solomons Island in Calvert County to laboratories in the Appalachians, Baltimore, College Park, and Cambridge on the Eastern Shore, UMCES forms a critical part of the University System of Maryland's commitment to research and to training the next generation of environmental scientists. Its hundred faculty members are conducting ground-breaking research and teaching UMCES's eighty-five graduate students.

Alongside UMCES's academic mission, it also fulfills a public policy role with its faculty advising policymakers in Maryland and in the federal government. UMCES scientists have been instrumental in calling attention to the challenges facing the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed and in proposing ways to clean up this regional and national treasure. Under Dr. Boesch's leadership, UMCES has been especially active in raising awareness about the Chesapeake and its importance to regional ecosystems and supporting our regional economy.

Dr. Boesch began his career by earning his undergraduate degree in biology from Tulane

University in his native New Orleans. Later, he received his doctorate in oceanography from the College of William and Mary in Virginia. He spent time in Australia on a Fulbright scholarship before conducting research at the Virginia Institute of Marine Science. In 1980, Dr. Boesch returned to New Orleans to become the inaugural Executive Director of the Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium and to teach marine science at Louisiana State University. He came to Maryland in 1990 to lead UMCES and now caps a very successful tenure of twenty-seven years at the helm. During that time, Dr. Boesch advised Maryland governors from both parties, has been as a member of the Governor's Chesapeake Bay Cabinet, and has served on the Maryland Commission on Climate Change. In 2010, President Obama appointed him to the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling. He has served as Chair of the Ocean Studies Board for the National Academy of Sciences and is the author of two books and dozens of scholarly papers.

The people of Maryland have been so fortunate to have Dr. Boesch leading UMCES these past twenty-seven years. We have been blessed to have his intellect, his dedication, and his wise leadership benefiting our students and our researchers. All those who treasure the Chesapeake owe Dr. Boesch much gratitude for his contributions to preserving the Bay and its watershed. I join in congratulating him on a very successful tenure and in wishing him well as he prepares to step down later this year.

COMMENDING 2017 HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES ENLISTED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

HON. A. DONALD McEACHIN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. McEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize greater Richmond area high school seniors who plan to enlist in the United States Armed Forces following graduation. These students have demonstrated an extraordinary commitment to scholastic achievement. It is with profound enthusiasm I commend the following student leaders on the selfless choice to answer our Nation's call to service:

Adams, Solomon; Bailey, James; Bontilao, Dominique; Broughton, Adam; Delao, Natty; Flournoy, Paul; Gascott, Andrew; Hall, Liam; Herrera, Jordy; Johnson, Forrest; Jones, Savion; Lewis, Antonique; Lindsay, David; McClain, Lakeeya; McCullers, Orlando; McGriffin, John; Monteeria, Darius; Saddler, Kioni; Sauvager, Alexandra; Gordon, Shama; Smith, Robert III; Taylor, Gabriel; Turner, Nathaniel; Viera, Sabrina; Whiting, Shamon; Williams, Fat Tae; Wilson, Armone; Witherspoon, Kendell; Woods, Ashley; Wren, David; Wynn, Kahli; Aggabao, Richard; Barba, Rigoberto; Barquero, Iyan; Briggs, Colin; Broussard, Micha; Burleigh, Emon; Cassidy, Christopher; Cheek, Austin; Cruz, Alexa; Decriscio, Donald; Dunn, Taylor; Fleming, Lauryn; Garcia, Alejandro; Hoffer, Tyler; Howe, Kyle; Lofton,

Jerron; Marentes, Saul; Marshburn, Donald; Nunes, Amy; Parker, Dajohn; Perkins, Cierra; Ramirez, Alonso; Scruggs, Carlos; Spraggs, Armani; Tabora, Ivan; Taylor, Matthew; Williams, Darius; Williams, Taeyah; Yeomans, Jesse; Gadsen, Breyona; Glatt, Matthew; Grella, Julia; Hamilton, Brian; Hollen, Joseph; Hopkins, Jonathan; McLean, Alphonsje; Peyton, Calvin; Ratliff, Isis; Speer, Harrison; Taylor, Daryl; Vinson, Simone; Green, Vivian; Washington-Allen, Dominic; Williams, Kyle; Clary-Hayman, Tiana; Feggins, Roman; Chapman, Ravon; and Tunstall, Anthony.

On this day, I acknowledge your courage and commitment to our country and express my sincere gratitude for your willingness to serve honorably. I look forward to joining the Blue Star Families of Richmond and Henrico Co. Public Schools to honor these exceptional students during the "Our Community Salutes Reception and Awards Ceremony" on Tuesday, May 30, 2017 at Hermitage High School in Henrico Co., Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting these brave, young women and men for the courageous decision to join the United States Armed Forces upon their high school graduation.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY AND THE JOHN F. KENNEDY HYANNIS MUSEUM

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 100th Anniversary of the birth of President John F. Kennedy and the exceptional work of the John F. Kennedy Hyannis Museum in preserving his legacy.

President Kennedy, one of Massachusetts' most celebrated sons and the youngest president to be elected to office, had a deep and abiding love for his family's home in Hyannis Port. The John F. Kennedy Hyannis Museum is devoted to preserving the legacy of President Kennedy and his deep and lasting bond with the marshes, beaches, sea breeze, and way of life on Cape Cod.

Since the John F. Kennedy Hyannis Museum first opened its doors in 1992, it has hosted and designed numerous exhibits that highlight the life of President Kennedy and the legacy of his family. The Museum's multimedia displays give the visiting public a glimpse into the life of one of the most influential and recognizable leaders in the world. In addition to the well-known role of the Kennedys in American history, the Museum annotates the personal side of the unforgettable President—providing visitors with a deeper perspective on and edification of John F. Kennedy: the father, son, brother, husband, and friend. Lining the walls of the galleries are images of the Kennedys relaxing on the beach, enjoying evenings with friends, and recreating on the compound lawns.

Though President Kennedy was tragically taken from the American people on November

22, 1963, his legacy and impact on the country lives on—thanks in no small part to the efforts of the John F. Kennedy Hyannis Museum. To this day, it remains a renowned destination in downtown Hyannis. In celebration of the anniversary of his birthday, the museum is hosting numerous events including a commemoration concert in collaboration with the Cape Symphony.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor the John F. Kennedy Hyannis Museum on the occasion of the 100th Anniversary of the birth of President Kennedy. I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the Museum on its many years of devotion to preserving the legacy and connection of the Kennedy family to Cape Cod.

HONORING THE CAREER OF MRS.
MARY HENDERSON

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Mrs. Mary Henderson. Mrs. Henderson has devoted 50 years of outstanding service to the Dos Palos-Oro Loma Joint Unified School District. During these years, she has been a truly brilliant educator, serving her community and teaching generations of children in the Central Valley.

Mrs. Henderson has selflessly devoted her entire professional career to public education. She began her career in 1967, serving as a paraeducator for eight years before becoming a teacher in 1975. Mrs. Henderson has been educating, impacting, and improving the lives of hundreds of children for five decades, demonstrating a remarkable dedication to education. In addition to teaching our children, Mrs. Henderson is deeply committed to improving literacy in our community. She has spent countless hours working with adults as well as children, teaching them how to read.

Mrs. Henderson has been described by those who know her as an exceptional, skilled, and caring teacher. She provides her students with both endless patience and rich knowledge, and she always has kind words of encouragement. Mrs. Henderson is fondly remembered by generations of grateful students whose lives she has touched. Beyond her service as an educator, she is also an active member of Friends of the Library, supporting libraries in Merced County by volunteering at libraries and working on book donation programs and fundraising events.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Mrs. Mary Henderson for the 50 years of extraordinary and dedicated service. Through her teaching, compassion, and example, Mrs. Henderson has left a lasting impact on her community. It is fitting and appropriate that May 26th, 2017 be declared "Mary Henderson Day" in Dos Palos, California.

RECOGNIZING JULIA MATTOCKS
ON HER 99TH BIRTHDAY

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Julia Frances Mattocks, who celebrates her 99th birthday this Sunday.

Ms. Mattocks, Galesburg's 'Rosie the Riveter', serves as a role model in our community due to her tireless work ethic and dedication to serving others. As the United States entered the war after the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, she stepped up and did her part to protect Americans abroad. With her sister Helen, Julia completed rivet work on B-17 Flying Fortresses, and worked at the Lockheed Vega plant in Burbank making Quonset huts for the military and airplane parts at Gale Products. Ms. Mattocks ultimately sacrificed her hearing in one ear and received chemical burns across her arms due to her work on behalf of our country. I celebrate and admire the role that she—and many other women—played in supporting our nation during a time of war.

Ms. Mattocks is a true inspiration for many people, and her passion and dedication makes her a uniting force within our community. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for Julia's contributions and service to our community and our nation. I wish her a Happy 99th Birthday, with more to come.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS

HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, today I stand in recognition of international students and scholars, and the U.S. institutions of higher education they attend, all of which are bearing the brunt of this Administration's rhetoric and actions. To ensure our nation's security, economic well-being, and academic leadership, we must remain an open and welcoming nation.

According to the Association of International Educators, international students and their families contributed nearly \$33 billion to the U.S. economy during the 2015–2016 academic year. International students who have spent time in the United States become informal ambassadors when they return home, carrying an appreciation for common values, counteracting stereotypes about the U.S., and enhancing respect for cultural differences. They also act as cultural liaisons for U.S. students and help them succeed as global citizens.

Actions taken by this Administration have generated a great deal of uncertainty within U.S. academia. Many currently-enrolled international students and scholars will choose not to travel home at the end of the academic

year, for fear they might not be allowed to return in the fall. Unsurprisingly, for prospective students, nearly 40 percent of higher education institutions reported application declines in international students for the first time in many years.

We must stop the anti-immigrant rhetoric and make the United States an open and welcoming country for the bright, ambitious international students who contribute greatly to our country.

I urge my colleagues and the Administration to recognize the vital contribution international students and their families make when we welcome them to this great country.

To the international students and scholars who may be unsure about coming, I say: Your contributions are valued and you are welcome here.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. THOMAS
C. PLEGER

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to acknowledge the life of a devoted community leader and dedicated educator, Dr. Thomas Pleger, who passed away at the age of 48 on Sunday, May 7, 2017.

Thomas was born on April 24, 1969, to Ernest and Barbara Pleger, and grew up just across the border from Menominee, Michigan in Marinette, Wisconsin. He earned his doctoral degree in archaeology and anthropology from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and spent 21 years teaching at various private and public institutions throughout the region. Following his tenure as Campus Executive Officer and Dean at UW Baraboo-Sauk County, Thomas followed his passion for education into the Upper Peninsula where, on July 1, 2014, he became the eighth president of Lake Superior State University, a position he would hold until his untimely passing.

As the president of Lake Superior State University, Thomas is remembered for his warmth, generosity, and tireless devotion to the school and its students. Lake Superior State University experienced a tremendous period of growth under Dr. Pleger's stewardship, including the implementation of a One Rate tuition plan, the financial restructuring of the university, the advancement of the R.W. Conside Hall Renovation project, and the procurement of funding for the proposed Center for Freshwater Research and Education. These accomplishments eventually led to him earning an appointment to Governor Rick Snyder's 21st Century Economy Commission, where he applied his extensive background in education to identify Michigan's economic priorities for the next 20 years.

Beyond the campus, Dr. Pleger's leadership translated into real results for his community. Indeed, it was not uncommon for Thomas to lend a listening ear or life advice to prospective students, and he was known to connect on a personal level, with a lighthearted sense of humor. Today, Dr. Pleger is survived by his wife, Teresa, father, Ernest, brother, Tim, sons

Matt, Andrew, Chad, and Collin, and his sister, Amy Pfister. Not only will Lake Superior State University bear the positive impact of Dr. Pleger for generations to come, but communities around the country will benefit from the countless lives he touched.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Pleger's outstanding career in education cannot be overstated, and his family and community can take great pride in knowing that the Upper Peninsula is a better place thanks to his life's work. On behalf of Michigan's First Congressional District, I ask you to join me in recognizing an outstanding public servant whose contributions will continue to bless Yoopers for many years to come.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of international students, scholars, and the U.S. institutions of higher education they attend who have been unfairly penalized by the administration's efforts to limit travel to our country.

I'd like to share with you the story of Khalid Al-Awadhi, an undergraduate student at CU Boulder from the United Arab Emirates, who is studying electrical and computer engineering.

Khalid is president of CU International, a campus organization that helps international students adjust to campus life. He is well known for his welcoming demeanor and enthusiasm. Khalid is driven by his commitment to make CU Boulder a better learning experience for all international students. The personal connections he has built have truly made a difference for the experience of hundreds of students on campus by building bridges and connecting cultures.

May is a critical month on the college calendar. Many currently-enrolled international students and scholars will choose not to travel home at the end of the academic year, for fear they might not be allowed to return in the fall. In addition, the anti-immigrant rhetoric and uncertainty created by our broken immigration system makes the United States less attractive to the students and scholars who we want to contribute to our campuses and communities.

To ensure our nation's security, economic wellbeing, and academic leadership, we must remain an open and welcoming United States. So, to the international students and scholars who may be unsure about coming to study at institutions like CU Boulder and Colorado State, I say: Your contributions are valued and you are welcome here.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT LEE HENDEE

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of Ohio's 15th Congress-

sional District and the citizens of Wilmington, Ohio to honor the life and memory of Robert Lee Hendee. A pioneer of Southwest Ohio's radio, in his 50 years as a behind-the-scenes support and an on-air personality, Lee became a familiar name and voice in his Wilmington community.

Lee embodied the American Dream. Following his education at the International School of Broadcasting in Dayton, Ohio, he went on to work at WKFI in Wilmington, WSRW in Hillsboro, and WBZI in Xenia, before ultimately fulfilling his dream of owning his own radio station in 2015.

As the owner and founder of the nonprofit WALH in Wilmington, Lee brought the power of radio to his community; he interviewed residents and celebrities alike, and unified his neighbors by bringing them information and giving them a voice. I always appreciated the opportunity to stop by the station and catch up with him. His devotion to Wilmington was undeniable.

Aside from being the man with the voice, he was an avid sports fan and was fiercely dedicated to creating positive change in the lives of young people. He was the proud owner of Ultimate Impact Wrestling, a longtime boys' baseball and girls' softball coach, and a talented bowler.

Lee touched the lives of countless people with his infectious spirit and memorable voice. He will be fondly remembered by those who loved him, especially his mother, his brother and sister, his wife, his four children and his six grandchildren.

RECOGNIZING THE RETURN TO EL PASO ROOTS EVENT

HON. BETO O'ROURKE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise and join with my colleague, the Honorable BARBARA LEE, to acknowledge and celebrate the "Return to El Paso Roots" event, which will take place May 26 through 29, 2017 in El Paso, Texas. This historically significant event salutes the African American families, friends, and students who attended the historic Douglass School, the first school for African Americans in El Paso.

Andrew Morelock established the school in 1883 as a refuge and haven for the children of African American El Pasoans barred from attending schools with white children. First named Franklin School, it became Douglass School in tribute to the noted abolitionist and statesman, Frederick Douglass. The school sought to allow children to thrive in a fully supportive community committed to their success and academic achievement. Douglass School provided much more than a quality education; it also provided community and a sense of well being and belonging for its students.

The school desegregated in 1955 following the Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court decision, and the site is now an historical site in El Paso. Douglass students excelled, and the school produced a notable array of successful graduates, including the

family of my esteemed colleague, Congresswoman LEE.

During the "Return to El Paso Roots" event, former students, families, friends, and El Paso residents will come together in celebration at the historic McCall Neighborhood Community Center. The late Leona Ford Washington, a retired Douglass schoolteacher, founded the Center in 1983. She dedicated her life to the needs and development of the El Paso African American community. It is pertinent to highlight the history of the McCall Neighborhood Center as it prepares to host many events for "Return to El Paso Roots".

The McCall Neighborhood Center is the former home of Marshall and Olalee McCall. Mr. McCall was the first African American postal worker in El Paso, and his wife, Mrs. McCall, was a principal at Douglass School. Following Mrs. McCall's tenure as principal from 1937 through 1944, the home served as a daycare center as well as her music studio. The McCall Neighborhood Center is an important foundation in the El Paso community.

In this celebration, we acknowledge and honor the tremendous contributions of the African American community to the success and development of El Paso, and the work they have done to make our community, the State of Texas, and our country a more just world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join Congresswoman LEE and me in saluting the Douglass School students, families, and friends who will come to El Paso to commemorate and celebrate this remarkable community.

IN RECOGNITION OF MAE JEMISON FOR HER OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENTS AS AN ASTRONAUT AND SCIENTIST

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mae Jemison, a physician, scientist and astronaut whose pioneering career has furthered our understanding of the world around us. Dr. Jemison has achieved excellence across a number of disciplines as a result of her hard work and perseverance.

After receiving a medical degree from Cornell Medical College and completing her medical training, Dr. Jemison served as a Peace Corps Medical Officer, treating Peace Corps volunteers in Liberia and Sierra Leone. She was then accepted into NASA's astronaut program in 1987, providing launch support and assistance until her space mission aboard the Space Shuttle *Endeavor* in September 1992. During her mission, Dr. Jemison conducted scientific experiments on bone cell research and the effects of weightlessness on the human body, which contributed to advancements in our understanding of life sciences. She then resigned in 1993 from NASA, and has since founded several companies, including BioSentient Corp., which develops treatments for chronic pain and stress disorders.

Dr. Jemison has had an extraordinary career and has affected countless lives through

her work. In addition to breaking down barriers as the first black woman in space, Dr. Jemison has utilized her medical background and business acumen to develop novel medical treatments for a variety of illnesses. She has also excelled in academia, working as a professor at Dartmouth and Cornell, and is the founder of the Dorothy Jemison Foundation for Excellence, a nonprofit that promotes science education initiatives. Collectively, Dr. Jemison has had an indelible impact on a variety of disciplines through her work, and she continues to inspire new generations of scientists.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in honoring Dr. Mae Jemison for her outstanding career. Dr. Jemison's work with NASA, in medicine and in business has impacted and inspired countless individuals.

HONORING SPC. JACOB D.
MARTIR'S SERVICE AND SACRIFICE

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, as we near Memorial Day, I rise to honor SPC. Jacob D. Martir, for his honorable service to our nation and his ultimate sacrifice during the early days of the Iraq War.

Jacob was a native of eastern Connecticut, growing up in Willimantic and Norwich. A former student of Norwich Free Academy, he enlisted in the United States Army in 2000 at the age of 17. Joining the armed services was his lifelong dream. Nearing completion of his first tour in the Army, he reenlisted for four more years in 2002, despite the added risk of serving after 9/11.

In March of 2004, Jacob deployed to Iraq with Alpha Troop, 2nd Battalion, 5th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division. On August 18, 2004, while patrolling in Sadr City, one of Baghdad's most violent neighborhoods throughout the war, Jacob was tragically killed by small arms fire. His sacrifice, coming four months after the tragic "Black Sunday" in which eight soldiers were killed in Sadr City, was part of a years-long effort to clear the area of Iraqi insurgents. He was 21 years old and left behind a loving mother, Lydia Gutierrez, and five siblings. For his courageous service, Jacob was posthumously awarded the Purple Heart and Bronze Star, and he was buried with full military honors at Maplewood Cemetery in Norwich.

Jacob's life is a reminder of the greatest American values. His call to serve was instinctive and unrelenting even through a time of great danger. At just twenty-one years old, he marched bravely into one of the most dangerous places in the world to defend and serve his nation and protect his fellow soldiers.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in solemn remembrance of Jacob Martir and his family, and thanking them for Jacob's service to eastern Connecticut and our nation.

NATIONAL POPPY DAY

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize tomorrow, and each Friday before Memorial Day, as National Poppy Day.

National Poppy Day encourages all Americans to wear a red poppy flower as a symbol to remember the fallen and support the living heroes who have worn our nation's uniform.

Following World War I, the red poppy became an internationally recognized symbol of the blood shed by those who fought for their countries.

Although it originated almost a century ago, the poppy is just as relevant today.

Throughout our history, countless Americans have laid down their lives to protect and defend the country and the people they love.

America's living veterans have served in WWII, Korea, Vietnam, the Persian Gulf, Kosovo, Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, and many other conflicts around the world.

They fought for us and many bare scars that will stay with them for life.

As Americans, we have an obligation to remember the service and sacrifice of these brave men and women and their families, who have helped build the country we love today.

By recognizing National Poppy Day, we stand with these brave men and women and with the families of all those who did not make it home.

While we all agree with the sentiment, the symbolism behind the poppy is better known around the world than it is here in the United States.

It is worn in England and Canada, on Remembrance Day, also known as Armistice Day and Poppy Day, to commemorate members of the armed forces who have died in the line of duty.

This year the United States commemorates the 100th anniversary of its entrance into World War I.

The American Legion, our largest wartime veterans organization which has a track record of promoting National Poppy Day, is approaching its 100th anniversary.

There is no more appropriate time for us, as a nation, to recognize this historic symbol of service.

As the proud author of H. Res. 309, a resolution recognizing National Poppy Day, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in promoting this visible recognition of those who have served our nation in uniform.

IN HONOR OF THE DEEP EAST TEXAS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I, along with Representative BRIAN BABIN and

Representative LOUIE GOHMERT, recognize the 50th anniversary of the Deep East Texas Council of Governments and Economic Development District, better known as "DETCOG."

In November of 1966, over fifty community officials and leaders, concerned with the economic growth and development of East Texas and the quality of life of its residents, gathered together to lay the groundwork for the Deep East Texas Economic Development District.

The Honorable Charles Wilson, a Member of the Texas Senate and later a Member of the United States House of Representatives, was unanimously elected Chair, and later President, of the new organization.

The Deep East Texas Economic Development District continued its meetings throughout 1967. It employed its first Executive Director in August and opened its first office in September. In 1968, the District even became a Regional Planning Commission under the laws of the State of Texas, and in 1972, it adopted the new name of Deep East Texas Council of Governments and Economic Development District.

DETCOG has facilitated the development of effective responses to such issues as community and economic development, affordable housing, aging and disability services, public safety and emergency response, disaster recovery, information and referral services, volunteerism, transportation and the environment that have had a profound and positive impact on the Deep East Texas Region.

Over the past half-century, DETCOG's activities have improved the quality of life for all residents in the 12-county region known as Deep East Texas, including the counties of Angelina, Houston, Jasper, Nacogdoches, Newton, Polk, Sabine, San Augustine, San Jacinto, Shelby, Trinity and Tyler.

Representative BABIN, Representative GOHMERT, and I are proud to congratulate the Deep East Texas Council of Governments and Economic Development District on its 50th Anniversary and its legacy of outstanding service to the governments and citizens of the Deep East Texas region.

IN HONOR OF ROY REESE'S 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to recognize a fine Hoosier and my friend, Roy Reese, on the occasion of his 80th birthday, which he will celebrate on Tuesday, June 13, 2017. Mr. Reese has been a pillar of his community in Wheatfield, Indiana, for nearly half a century, and having known him for many years, I can attest to his steadfast dedication to improving the quality of life for his fellow citizens. I congratulate Roy as he celebrates this momentous occasion with his many family members and friends.

Roy Reese was born in Stevenson, Alabama, on June 13, 1937. A proud American and true patriot, Roy joined the United States Air Force in 1954 and eventually became the

crew chief for large cargo helicopters before returning to civilian life in 1958. Upon his return, Roy began his career with Operating Engineers Local 150 and has been a proud union member with the organization for more than fifty-four years. In addition, Mr. Reese has also utilized his vast agricultural knowledge which has helped him to become a successful farmer.

Roy has also proven himself to be a devoted public servant, as well as an esteemed member of his church. A lifelong Democrat, Mr. Reese served on the Gilliam Township Advisory Board for twenty-four years. A proud veteran as well as a man of great faith, he is also a lay speaker at Tefft United Methodist Church and has also served as chaplain for American Legion Post 228 in Francesville, Indiana. In addition, Roy has been a member of Masonic Lodge No. 642, located in Wheatfield, for more than fifty years.

I would be remiss if I did not share one specific example of the type of person Roy Reese is. While he is well-known in his community and in his church for his selfless service, Roy truly epitomizes what it means to be a good neighbor, regardless of the season. In fact, Roy has always taken it upon himself to clear snow from his neighbors' driveways during the cold winter months, a service illustrative of his generous spirit.

However, Roy Reese is first and foremost a family man. I am certain Roy would confirm that his greatest source of pride is his loving family. Roy wed his beloved wife, Bonnie, on January 20, 1958, and the couple has spent the past fifty-nine years by each other's side. Roy and Bonnie are the proud parents of four sons, Daniel, Michael, Richard, and Roy Douglas Reese. They are also the loving grandparents of seventeen and the adoring great-grandparents of fourteen.

Mr. Speaker, Roy Reese has been a dedicated member of and inspiration to his community throughout his life, and on this special occasion, it is fitting that I take this time to honor him and to commend him for all that he has done for so many for so long. At this time, I ask that you and all of my distinguished colleagues join me in wishing Roy a Happy 80th Birthday and many more joyous years to come.

400 YEARS OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN HISTORY COMMISSION ACT

HON. DON BACON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1242 entitled, "400 Years of African-American History Commission Act." As a co-sponsor of this legislation, I worked with my colleagues to pass this act in the House and look forward to the Senate also passing this bill. I believe it is important for all citizens of the United States to recognize the unique history, sacrifices, and remarkable contributions that African Americans have made to build our great nation.

I am invigorated by this legislative intention to identify and educate the public on the ar-

rival of Africans and their role in building this great country. It is equally important to understand the generational impact that slavery and laws that enforced racial discrimination had on the United States. While there have been many successful and inspirational African Americans with enumerable contributions, we must address ongoing racial disparities in employment and education by focusing on achieving six universal milestones for success.

These six universal milestones include:

1. Entering school ready to learn;
2. Reading at grade level by third grade;
3. Graduating from high school ready for college or career;
4. Completing post-secondary education or training;
5. Successfully entering the workforce; and
6. Reducing violence and providing a second chance for returning citizens.

I applaud the many organizations actively working to address persistent opportunity gaps faced by African Americans. In my community of the 2nd Congressional District of Nebraska, I appreciate the efforts of Willie Hamilton, president and founder of Black Men United. He is a true grass roots leader. In addition, I want to highlight some other organizations, and work ongoing in the district I serve to implement a coherent cradle-to-college-and-career strategy for improving the life outcomes of all young people. These organizations include Urban League of Nebraska, The START Center, the Omaha Empowerment Network coordinated by Willie Barney, Eastern Nebraska Community Action Partnership, 100 Black Men of Omaha, Malcom X Foundation, Operation Youth Success, Members of the Midlands Mentoring Partnership, the efforts by the City of Omaha through the Black Male Achievement program previously coordinated by Cameron Gales. Like all complicated issues facing Americans, we need this type of strong community support along with smart bipartisan legislation to address any problem.

As the African-American History Commission develops programs, I hope they will consider inspiring communities to continue building partnerships between local organizations, government, businesses and foundations. This will connect young African American men and women with support networks, mentoring programs, and the skills training they need to succeed in the classroom and in the workforce. While we learn from and celebrate the past, we must also look to a much brighter future for all Americans.

INTRODUCTION OF THE VOTE BY MAIL ACT OF 2017

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we are in the middle of national civics lesson, with unprecedented levels of citizen and grassroots activism driving political and policy conversations in communities across the country. It is ironic, then, that many states are trying to make it harder for Americans to participate in our democracy. On November 8, 2016, ac-

cording to the Brennan Center for Justice, fourteen states had new restrictions on voting in place for the first time in a presidential election. Restrictions like these have historically targeted minority and low-income voters. This disturbing trend in state action has mirrored the weakening of campaign finance restrictions and voting rights laws by the U.S. Supreme Court in recent years. Even as we witness a growing civic engagement, legal and political barriers rise to unjustly diminish individual voices.

Expanding vote by mail is a clear and cost effective measure to make voting easier, not harder. Mail-in voting states Oregon, Washington, and Colorado saw among the highest voter turnout in the 2016 general election, especially notable for Oregon with nearly 250,000 new automatically registered voters. The Vote By Mail Act of 2017 will build on Oregon's successful reforms at the national level. The legislation will require states to mail ballots to all eligible voters in federal elections at least two weeks before the election. Every registered American voter would have the ability to return their ballots through the mail, using prepaid envelopes, or drop them off at secure predetermined drop-off locations like a public library or county elections office.

This bill also shifts the burden of registration from the individual to the government. It calls on state governments to collaborate with state motor vehicle agencies to maintain updated voter registration rolls for all citizens who apply for a driver's license and who do not ask to remain unregistered.

The Vote By Mail Act of 2017 is a vital step to restoring the mandate of American democracy.

IN RECOGNITION OF MAJOR DAVID ANDERSON

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Major David Anderson of the Caldwell County Sheriff's Office. On behalf of the people of Western North Carolina, I would like to thank Major Anderson for his 30 years of service to Caldwell County.

Major Anderson began his law enforcement career in 1986 when he graduated from the U.S. Army Military Police School at Fort McClellan, Alabama. The following year he joined the 21st Airborne Military Police Company at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. He then worked for the Lenoir Police Department as a patrol officer and field training officer from 1990 until 1993.

In 1993 Major Anderson joined the Caldwell County Sheriff's Office and was assigned to the Patrol Division as Deputy Sheriff. He was promoted to Sergeant in 1994, to Lieutenant in 1998, and to Captain of the Patrol Division in 2006. Major Anderson was appointed to Major/Chief Deputy by Sheriff Alan Jones in 2008 and served in this position until his retirement. As Chief Deputy, Major Anderson supervised budgetary and personnel matters and oversaw the daily operations of the Sheriff's

office. In addition to these duties, Major Anderson conducted an extensive research project to document the history of the Caldwell County Sheriff's Office.

Throughout his career, Major Anderson has received numerous medals, service awards, and commendations including the Advanced Law Enforcement Certificate, Advanced Service Award, Officer of the Year, and the Medal of Valor. Major Anderson is a lifelong resident of Caldwell County, where he lives with his wife and children.

Through his dedication to the people and history of Caldwell County, Major Anderson has enriched the community that he so faithfully served. I am honored to recognize Major Anderson on his retirement and convey the sincere congratulations and best wishes of the people of North Carolina.

TRIBUTE TO RAYMOND MAGNON

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Raymond Magnon, who passed away in California on Monday, April 24, 2017. Raymond, or Ray as he was known to friends and family, proudly served our nation as a plane mechanic in the Air Force during the Korean War and he will be deeply missed.

Ray was born to Frank and Caroline Magnon in Niles, Ohio. In 1944, when Ray was 14 years old, his family moved from Ohio to Riverside where he attended Poly High School, served in the Air Force as a plane mechanic during the Korean War, and later attended Chaffey College. After college, Ray worked at Lockheed and at a local fiberglass company. Shortly after Ray started his career working as an electrician, he would eventually start his own company, Service Electric. Over the years, Service Electric would provide the electrical construction for many notable buildings in the city of Riverside, including Tyler Mall. At one point in the 1970s the company was the largest electrical contractor in California, employing hundreds of electricians and staff.

Later in life, Ray ventured into commercial real estate development. In 1977, he founded The Magnon Companies which developed and built many of the buildings constructed in Riverside, including buildings in the Sycamore Canyon Business Park, Hunter Park, and other areas of the city. Ray also was responsible for the construction of several apartment buildings in Canyon Crest including Bunker Hill. Ray had many passions in life such as Formula 1 races, tennis, traveling to Europe, collecting sports cars, and a fondness for classic jazz and crooner songs. One of his strongest passions was being a business leader in the community and working to advance important causes for our region.

Ray is survived by his wife, Kelly Magnon, their son, Ryan Magnon and by his daughters from his previous marriage to Elaine Timmons Taber; Patti Oldham, Cheryl Cliff and Deanna Magnon. Ray was preceded in death by his

son, Douglas Magnon. He is also survived by many loving grandchildren, nieces, nephews and step-children. I had the distinct privilege of knowing Ray for many years and I will deeply miss him. I extend my heartfelt condolences to the entire Magnon family. Although Ray may be gone, his selfless dedication to our nation will long be remembered.

YOUTH SEXUAL ABUSE

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, this week we considered an important issue that needs to be addressed: youth sexual abuse. Some research shows that as many as 1 in 5 girls and 1 in 20 boys will be victims of sexual abuse. Congress can and should do more to reduce the prevalence of this heinous behavior.

Unfortunately, some of the bills we considered this week use the wrong tools to address this problem. Those bills include the Strengthening Children's Safety Act (H.R. 1842), the Global Child Protection Act (H.R. 1862), and the Protecting Against Child Exploitation Act (H.R. 1761). All of these bills double down on our country's misguided practice of enforcing mandatory minimum sentencing, which research has shown does not dissuade crime and can tie the hands of judges when mitigating factors warrant lighter sentencing.

Let me be clear—sexual abuse of children is a horrible offense that cannot be tolerated, and I support efforts to address this issue, including the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act (H.R. 1973), which I was proud to vote in favor of this week. My opposition to H.R. 1842 and H.R. 1761 reflects my opposition to mandatory minimum sentencing. I would welcome the opportunity to work with my colleagues to improve these measures for the future to best protect our youth.

RECOGNIZING MARY ANN STARBUCK

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mary Ann Starbuck on her retirement.

Ms. Starbuck has dedicated her life to helping individuals and families across the Southern Tier of New York. For nearly 23 years, she served as Chief Executive Officer of CareFirst NY, a community-based program that provides hospice services, palliative care, and grief support to local residents. Her work has touched countless lives and has had a profoundly positive impact on our entire community.

Ms. Starbuck has been a tireless advocate for legislation to improve and increase access to hospice care. I have had the pleasure of working with her to promote several pieces of

legislation to improve and strengthen hospice care, and I have always been encouraged and inspired by her conviction and determination.

As a result of her outstanding leadership, the Hospice Action Network recently presented CareFirst NY with the Advocacy Innovator Award. This award recognized the efforts of the staff, volunteers, and board of CareFirst NY to further the mission of hospice through advocacy.

I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Marry Ann Starbuck on her years of service and wishing her all the best in her well-deserved retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF DRUG AND VETERAN COURTS

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of one of the most effective tools against the opioid crisis—drug and veteran treatment courts.

The opioid crisis is the worst drug epidemic our country has ever experienced. Around two and a half million people are now addicted to opioids, and 91 of them die from overdoses each day.

Drug and veteran courts are proven approaches in this fight. Instead of incarcerating those with drug addiction and mental illness, these courts provide treatment based accountability. This strategy has saved over one and a half million lives, billions in taxpayer dollars, and has proven one of the most effective means to reduce recidivism and drug use.

May is National Drug Court Month, so there is no better time for my colleagues to stand and join me in support of drug and veteran courts in the Fiscal Year 2018 appropriations process. Thank you.

SPENCER REITZ EARNS EAGLE SCOUT AND BRONZE PALM AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Spencer Reitz of Sugar Land, TX, for earning both his Boy Scout Eagle Rank Award and the Bronze Palm.

Eagle Rank is one of the highest achievements a Boy Scout can earn, and a Bronze Palm goes one step beyond that. To earn Eagle Rank, Spencer had to earn 21 merit badges, and develop and provide leadership to others in a service project. He earned the Bronze Palm by remaining active in his troop for an additional three months and earning five additional merit badges. For his service project, Spencer enhanced an existing playground at the Children's Center for Autism at the Texana Center. He is a part of Troop 1631.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again

to Spencer Reitz for earning his Boy Scout Eagle Rank Award and Bronze Palm. We are so proud and confident of his continued success in future endeavors.

**FLUORSPAR MINER'S MEMORIAL
REVEAL**

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the Fluorspar Miner's Memorial of Hardin County in my home state of Illinois.

In 1971 a tragic accident occurred at the Barnett mining facility ending the lives of seven miners: Gale Bates, Randal "Jock" Belford, Orval Holbrook, Jerry Jenkins, James R. Lane, William "Bill" and Wayne Long. These men gave their lives to a lifestyle that has impacted so many families in the region.

The Ohio River Scenic Byway, the City of Rosiclare, and many local partners decided to dedicate a memorial to these fallen miners as well as all Fluorspar miners and their families. The memorial displays a life size bronze statue of a Fluorspar miner and his wife—a black granite memorial honoring the seven fallen miners, interpretive panels to tell the story of Fluorspar mining in the area, landscaping and a separate memorial garden wall commemorating area families and businesses.

The memorial will provide travelers and younger generations with information on this tragic accident and the importance of the fluorspar industry and its importance to Southern Illinois and the nation. The Miner's Memorial celebrates the strong past of the City of Rosiclare due to the mining of fluorspar.

I ask that we all join in that celebration as we pay tribute to the history and the people who made the Fluorspar Miner's Memorial, and I salute the completion of the Fluorspar Miner's Memorial.

**HONORING COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN
MARYLAND PRESIDENT DR.
BRADLEY GOTTFRIED**

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, next month the College of Southern Maryland in my district will bid farewell to Dr. Bradley Gottfried, who will step down as its president. Dr. Gottfried has led the College for the past eleven years with great care and dedication to its mission of expanding higher educational opportunities to those living in Charles, Calvert, and St. Mary's Counties and throughout the region.

The College of Southern Maryland began as a public community college serving Charles County residents in 1958 and has since grown into one of our state's most highly respected institutions of higher education serving commuter and remote learning students. Offering associates degrees in the arts, sciences, and teaching, the College served a total of more

than 11,000 credit students at four campus locations last year and an additional 20,000 students online. It hosts six women's and six men's intercollegiate NCJAA Division III athletic teams and nurtures a strong school pride among its students and alumni. The College also trains many students who are serving in the military or who have been recently discharged as veterans. Many of its graduates transfer to four-year colleges to pursue bachelor degrees.

During Dr. Gottfried's tenure as President, the College has expanded to launch its Regional Hughesville Campus and its Center for Trades and Energy Training, which provides direct access to specialized training in career fields that have substantial growth potential, such as HVAC, electrical, construction, and plumbing. The College has also partnered with Southern Maryland businesses to create college-to-career pipelines that help students learn in-demand skills in cybersecurity, robotics, and digital media, among others. He has been praised both for his sound management of the College's finances and for his long-term vision for the College and how it can best serve its students. I've been proud to work closely with Dr. Gottfried to secure funding for the College of Southern Maryland's STEM Workforce Initiative, to enable the College to add to its nursing and health care resources and technology, and to expand courses supporting those training for careers in construction and transportation in our region.

Dr. Gottfried is someone who believes strongly in the importance of community colleges, as I do, to impact lives positively and add to the range of higher education options available for Maryland students. He came to the College of Southern Maryland with a long and experienced career as an academic and community college administrator. Having earned a Ph.D. in Zoology from Miami University, Dr. Gottfried taught for many years and then became President of Sussex County Community College in New Jersey in 2000. He has also become a noted and accomplished historian of the Civil War and has written extensively on the Battle of Gettysburg. The entire College of Southern Maryland community and its partners across the region have been very fortunate to have Dr. Gottfried leading the school these past eleven years, and he will be greatly missed.

I join in congratulating Dr. Gottfried on his retirement and wishing him and his wife Linda all the best in the future. I also wish to congratulate incoming President Dr. Maureen Murphy, currently at Brookdale Community College in New Jersey, on her selection to take the reins from Dr. Gottfried and continue the work of making the College of Southern Maryland one of the premier community colleges in the country.

**IN RECOGNITION OF INFORUM FOR
ITS SUCCESS IN PROVIDING
MENTORSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL
OPPORTUNITIES TO
WOMEN**

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Inforum for its work on behalf of women. Since its founding 55 years ago, Inforum has provided effective mentorship and education opportunities for women throughout Michigan.

Originally founded in 1962 as the Women's Economic Club, the organization has grown and evolved over the years to meet its mission of empowering women to lead and succeed. Inforum hosts a variety of high-performing women leaders for lunches and roundtables to exchange ideas and foster leadership skills. Additionally, Inforum sponsors the Inforum Center for Leadership, an educational initiative that provides professional development through its training programs for mid-career women leaders. These include its Executive Leadership professional development program, a four-month program that combines individual instruction, group exercises, and personalized feedback to provide women with the skills to assume more senior and influential roles in their careers. Collectively, over 1,100 women have graduated from this program since its launch in 2003.

Inforum has provided countless women with critical skills and training to succeed in the 21st century workforce. Its talent initiatives and programs provide targeted professional development to women of all backgrounds, including veterans and early-career women. As a result of its success, Inforum has expanded throughout Michigan to better serve its members. Today, the organization hosts additional branches in Lansing, Grand Rapids, the Saginaw/Bay City area and southwest Michigan. The growth of the Inforum Center for Leadership, along with its long track record of educating and empowering women, is a testament to the organization's success, and it is my hope that Inforum continues to effectively serve a broad range of women throughout their careers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to Join me in honoring Inforum for its record of providing career skills and training that allows women to achieve success. Inforum provides resources and hosts a variety of programs that provide professional development for women.

**INTRODUCTION OF THE YOUNG
AMERICANS FINANCIAL LITERACY
ACT**

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to re-introduce the Young Americans Financial Literacy Act. Financial literacy

is critical to ensuring future financial responsibility. Studies have shown that 87 percent of Americans believe finance education should be taught in schools and 92 percent of K–12 teachers believe that financial education should be taught in school, but only 12 percent of teachers actually teach the subject. Yet, according to a 2016 survey, only 1 in 3 states require high school students to take a personal finance course, and only five States require high school students to take a semester long personal finance course.

I believe that Congress has an opportunity and a responsibility to address the pressing needs of individuals faced with the loss of their financial stability and the challenges of economic uncertainty. This should include financial literacy education reform and long-term solutions to prevent future personal financial disasters. Research-based financial literacy education programs are needed to reach individuals at all ages and socioeconomic levels, particularly those facing unique and challenging financial situations, such as high school graduates entering the workforce, soon-to-be and recent college graduates, young families, and to address the unique needs of military personnel and their families. High school and college students who are exposed to cumulative financial education show an increase in financial knowledge, which in turn drives increasingly responsible behavior as they become young adults.

According to the Government Accountability Office, giving Americans the information they need to make effective financial decisions can be key to their well-being and to the country's economic health. The recent financial crisis, when many borrowers failed to fully understand the risks associated with certain financial products, underscored the need to improve individuals' financial literacy and empower all Americans to make informed financial decisions. This is especially true for young people as they are earning their first paychecks, securing student aid, and establishing their financial independence. Therefore, focusing economic education and financial literacy efforts and best practices for young people between the ages of 8 through 24 is of utmost importance.

I believe America should be leading the world with the best-educated students who will

drive our economic innovation and success, so please join me in cosponsoring the Young Americans Financial Literacy Act. This act:

Establishes a grant program in the Bureau of Consumer Financial protection to develop and implement financial literacy programs for young people ages eight to twenty-four;

Incentivizes the development of partnerships between institutions or higher education, local educational agencies, non-profit organizations, and financial institutions to develop programs aimed at young Americans in different phases of their life;

Ensures the development of evidence-based instructional material that is geared towards targeted groups and addresses unique life situations, including bankruptcy, foreclosure, student loans, credit card misuse; and

Conducts ongoing assessment and accountability of the program over the short-and long-term to ensure that grand money achieves the greatest impact.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the Young Americans Financial Literacy Act.

EAGLE SCOUT KENT DURANTE

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Kent Durante, who received his Eagle Scout pin posthumously this past Saturday.

Kent lost his brave battle with cancer last November before he could fulfill his dream of becoming an Eagle Scout. Last weekend, he was honored at a ceremony along with two of his fellow scouts, where they achieved the highest rank Boy Scouts can achieve.

For over a century, the Boy Scouts of America have had an honored tradition of teaching young men essential life skills including outdoor survival and leadership skills. As told to me, these times were cherished by Kent as, even after his diagnosis, he continued to remain active in his troop and even graduated cum laude from Estero High School.

It is understood in the scouting community that only about 4 percent of scouts attain the

rank of Eagle. It is humbling to know that Kent is among this distinguished group. I would like to honor Kent for this well-deserved award.

HONORING STATEN ISLAND'S WORLD WAR II VETERANS

HON. DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2017

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 2017, the North Central Kiwanis Club will host a dinner honoring Staten Island's World War II veterans. I rise today, Mr. Speaker, with immense gratitude for the patriotic sacrifice our WWII veterans gave to our country in its triumph over evil.

After the bombing of Pearl Harbor by Japanese forces on December 7, 1941—the “date which will live in infamy,” as President Roosevelt so eloquently stated—the United States declared war on the Axis Powers, joining the United Kingdom, Soviet Union, Free French Forces, and China in their fight against brutality, barbarity, and oppression. We owe our lives to the servicemen who, without a moment's hesitation, leapt to defend their country and the world from Nazism and fascism. Moreover, many even lied about their age just so they could join the fight. The world will never forget their valor and courage.

Life. Democracy. Freedom. Many take these for granted. If not for the veterans of the Second World War, those values would simply be an impossible dream. In a speech to the House of Commons on August 20, 1940, Prime Minister Winston Churchill declared, “Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few.” I cannot think of a better statement to describe what this nation owes to its WWII veterans. It is simply not possible to repay the insurmountable debt we owe to them.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to provide my everlasting thanks to the men who answered their country's call in the moment when they were needed most. They are the saviors of our nation and for that, I salute them.

SENATE—*Friday, May 26, 2017*

The Senate met at 8:45 and 1 second a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BILL CASSIDY, a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

**APPOINTMENT OF ACTING
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 26, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BILL CASSIDY, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CASSIDY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY,
MAY 30, 2017, AT 7 A.M.**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 7 a.m. on Tuesday, May 30, 2017.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:45 and 32 seconds a.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 30, 2017, at 7 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, May 26, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 26, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL K. SIMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We thank You also for the many blessings we enjoy as Americans. While listening to constituents, may the needs of all citizens be made known, so that the laws and policies to be enacted by the Members of this people's House might best serve the Nation.

Bless the families of those men and women who have served our Nation in uniform, and paid the ultimate price of defending the ideals of the United States. May all Americans be inspired to be of service however we might be able.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(a) of House Resolution 352, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 25, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 25, 2017, at 4:53 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 114.

That the Senate passed S. 585.

That the Senate passed S. 12.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 26, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 26, 2017, at 8:52 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 110.

That the Senate passed S. 917.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 657.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy:

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY, New York

Mrs. MURPHY, Florida

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 12. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 114. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit an annual report regarding performance awards and bonuses awarded to certain high-level employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 585. An act to provide greater whistleblower protections for Federal employees, increased awareness of Federal whistleblower protections, and increased accountability and required discipline for Federal supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 25, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 375. To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 719 Church Street in Nashville, Tennessee, as the "Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

H.R. 366. To amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's vehicle fleet, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(b) of House Resolution 352, the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. on Tuesday, May 30, 2017.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 30, 2017, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1453. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received

May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1454. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Clarification of When Products Made or Derived From Tobacco Are Regulated as Drugs, Devices, or Combination Products; Amendments to Regulations Regarding "Intended Uses"; Further Delayed Effective Date; Request for Comments; Extension of Comment Period [Docket No.: FDA-2015-N-2002] (RIN: 0910-AH19) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1455. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02] (RIN: 0648-XF268) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1456. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 161020985-7181-02] (RIN: 0648-XF334) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1457. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; 2017 Commercial Run-Around Gillnet Closure [Docket No.: 101206604-1758-02] (RIN: 0648-XF151) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1458. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.: 150916863-6211-02] (RIN: 0648-XF229) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1459. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery off the Southern Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 16; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: 131113952-7147-03] (RIN: 0648-BD78) received May 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BERGMAN (for himself and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 2749. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the oversight of contracts awarded by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H.R. 2749. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to preserve the independent funding the Office of Financial Research; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 2751. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish U.S. Immigration and Customs and Enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 2752. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 2753. A bill to provide for loan repayment for teachers in high-need schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. EMMER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2754. A bill to authorize the award of a military service medal to members of the Armed Forces who were exposed to ionizing radiation as a result of participation in the testing of nuclear weapons or under other circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 2755. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to beach monitoring, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Ms. SANCHEZ):

H.R. 2756. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to strengthen trade enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 2757. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a National Center for Violence Prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 2758. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct annual surveys of veterans on experiences with medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CORREA, Mr. VELA, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 2759. A bill to establish naturalization offices at initial military training sites; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CORREA, Mr. VELA, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 2760. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to identify aliens who have served, or are serving, in the Armed Forces of the United States when those aliens apply for an immigration benefit or are placed in an immigration enforcement proceeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 2761. A bill to amend section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow certain alien veterans to be paroled into the United States to receive health care furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER,

Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NOR-TON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr.

PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ELLISON, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H. Res. 370. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that a standing committee (or subcommittee thereof) hearing be held whenever there is a moment of silence in the House for a tragedy involving gun violence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. ELLISON):

H. Res. 371. A resolution recognizing the commencement of Ramadan, the Muslim holy month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and commending Muslims in the United States and throughout the world for their faith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 2749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 2750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is empowered to regulate interstate commerce under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 2751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 2752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 2753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 2754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; Article I, Section 8, Clause 14; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2756.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 2757.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate commerce; as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 2758.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 2759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the U.S. Constitution;

(3) To provide and maintain a navy, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 13 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(4) To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 2760.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the U.S. Constitution;

(3) To provide and maintain a navy, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 13 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(4) To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

(5) To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 2761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the U.S. Constitution;

(3) To provide and maintain a navy, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 13 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(4) To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

(5) To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 170: Mr. LAMALFA and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 247: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 291: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 305: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 490: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 669: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 746: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 820: Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 849: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1094: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1134: Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1136: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROUZER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1231: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1361: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1384: Mr. KIHUEN and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1450: Mr. ROSS and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1626: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 1873: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 2059: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2135: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRIST, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KIND, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PALONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2170: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2282: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 2285: Mr. RUSH and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 2303: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 2304: Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 2353: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 2366: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 2435: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2455: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2456: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2472: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 2500: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 2522: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2589: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. WALZ, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2645: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2657: Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 2662: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 2694: Mr. CRIST and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 2703: Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 2747: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. POSEY.
H. Res. 218: Mrs. WAGNER.
H. Res. 279: Mr. VARGAS.
H. Res. 320: Mr. LEVIN.
H. Res. 346: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—
ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 2 by Mr. SWALWELL of California on H.R. 356: Mrs. Napolitano and Mr. Gutiérrez.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE SERVICE OF BRIAN COOPER, CHIEF CLERK TO THE PARLIAMENTARIAN

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Brian Cooper, Chief Clerk to the Parliamentarian, who is retiring after more than three decades of service to our country.

Brian Cooper has dedicated his career to ensure the good management and orderly function of the U.S. House of Representatives.

As Chief Clerk to the Parliamentarian, much of his work has gone unnoticed.

But it has not gone unappreciated.

From time-keeping to processing bills to preparing for joint sessions of Congress, Brian Cooper has played an integral role in maintaining the integrity of the House of Representatives.

After more than three decades of service, this public servant has more than earned his wings of retirement.

Brian Cooper made the House work better and he will be missed by his many friends and colleagues, whom I join in wishing him well as he embarks on a new chapter in his life of service to others.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN MISSISSIPPI SOLDIER ARMY STAFF SERGEANT (SSG) KENNETH RAY BRADLEY

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Army Staff Sergeant (SSG) Kenneth Ray Bradley who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our nation on May 28, 2003, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. SSG Bradley died of a heart attack while serving in Baqubah, Iraq.

SSG Bradley was assigned to Company B 588th Engineer Battalion, Fort Hood, Texas. The Utica native was a 19-year Army veteran.

According to the Associated Press, SSG Bradley enjoyed music. Cleveland Washington, SSG Bradley's first cousin, said he liked musical instruments.

"He was left-handed," Washington said. "He blew the trumpet and played the guitar. He always liked music and was in a band."

People who grew up with SSG Bradley and served with him in the Army memorialized him on the "Fallen Heroes of Operation Iraqi Freedom" website.

Sergeant First Class (SFC) Lee of Washington said he was a great leader. "I remem-

ber that he was a great NCO and a great leader," SFC Lee said. "He is a true hero and will never be forgotten. God bless his family, friends, and brothers-in-arms."

Sergeant First Class (SFC) Frye of Fort Benning, Georgia, said SSG Bradley would not be forgotten. "You are never forgotten, brother, and your passing caused me so much grief. Your words touched my heart," SFC Frye said. "I remember those days you talked of spending time with your family prior to being ordered to go to Iraq. The fact that your life was cut short, and we're all robbed of your love, hurts me to this day. I only pray your family has found peace in your memories and what a great man you were."

Melvin Waters of Woodbridge, Virginia, offered his condolences to the family. "I would like to convey my sincerest sympathy to Claudia, Brian, and Sandra," Waters said. "Kenney is truly missed by many and he will always live in our thoughts and good deeds."

Specialist (SPC) George Sanchez served with SSG Bradley. "I am currently attending St. Mary's University as a disabled veteran," SPC Sanchez said. "The days I feel like quitting, I think of SSG Bradley, and my other fallen brothers-in-arms. Then I pick myself up and keep going for them. I dedicate my education to their memory. Your sacrifice is not in vain, my friend."

SSG Bradley bravely fought to protect the freedoms we all enjoy. His service to our nation will not be forgotten.

STEM OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 2017

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be introducing the STEM Opportunities Act of 2017. A very similar bill passed the House as part of the America Competes Act of 2010, but unfortunately didn't make it into the enacted law. As a result, every Congress since then, I have worked hard to keep the legislation updated and to convince my colleagues of the urgency of the challenges this bill addresses. Today I am reintroducing this bill with 20 cosponsors. And my colleague Senator HIRONO is introducing a Senate companion bill. The goal of our legislation is to develop and implement evidence-based policies to promote the progress of women and minorities in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) studies and research careers.

The need for full engagement in STEM by women and underrepresented minorities goes beyond enabling individuals to fulfill their dreams of becoming a scientist. Our economic future relies on what we do now to nurture the STEM talent that will be necessary to meet

the demands of an increasingly technological and knowledge-based economy. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that STEM employment is the fastest growing sector, with computer science and engineering jobs among the fastest growing STEM occupations.

If things continue as they are now, however, I fear we will be ill equipped to fill these jobs. We are seventeen years into the 21st century and the demographics of the STEM workforce do not reflect the diversity of the nation. In 2015, women earned only 19 percent of bachelor's degrees in engineering and 18 percent in computer science. Black and Hispanic students are similarly underrepresented in these fields at the undergraduate level, and the problem is even more pronounced in STEM faculty. Women hold only 23 percent of all tenured and tenure-track positions, while Black and Hispanic faculty combined hold a dismal 6.4 percent of these positions. We need to leverage all of our human capital if we are to achieve the necessary capacity to innovate and to discover.

The STEM Opportunities Act is focused on addressing the leaky pipeline for those who have already chosen a STEM path. First, so that we better understand the nature and scope of the challenges, the STEM Opportunities Act requires more comprehensive demographic data collection on the recipients of federal research awards and on STEM faculty at U.S. universities. These data would be available to researchers to study the participation and trajectories of women and underrepresented minorities in STEM so that policy makers can design more effective policies and practices to reduce barriers.

Next, this bill requires the development of consistent federal policies, such as no-cost award extensions, for recipients of federal research awards who have caregiving responsibilities, including care for a newborn or newly adopted child and care for an immediate family member who is sick. The bill also requires consistent federal guidance to grant reviewers and program officers on best practices to minimize the effects of implicit bias in the review of federal research grants. It requires NSF to provide guidance to universities and OSTP to provide guidance to Federal laboratories to aid them in identifying any cultural and institutional barriers limiting the recruitment, retention, and achievement of women and minorities in academic and government STEM research careers and developing and implementing current best practices for reducing such barriers. Finally, the legislation authorizes NSF to award grants to universities to implement or expand research-based practices targeted specifically at increasing the recruitment and retention of minority students and faculty.

Mr. Speaker, in developing this legislation, we solicited extensive input from governmental and non-governmental stakeholders to ensure that the guidance and requirements reflect today's needs and opportunities without unduly

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

burdening our research universities. The result is a bill that attempts to systematically address the full suite of issues facing both female and minority STEM researchers, from work-life balance policies, to campus climate, to better data collection, to recruitment and retention practices. This bill proposes concrete and evidence-based solutions to the indisputable reality that our nation continues to fall well short of engaging our entire talent pool in STEM careers. That disparity in our STEM workforce will continue to have real and increasing consequences to our social, economic, and national security if we do not begin to implement scalable solutions soon.

I want to thank Senator HIRONO for joining me in introducing a Senate companion bill, and all of the Members of the House and Senate who have already cosponsored this legislation. I urge the rest of my colleagues to join us and to help us move this legislation forward into law.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALL-
EN MISSISSIPPI ARMY NA-
TIONAL GUARD SERGEANT (SGT)
DANIEL RYAN VARNADO

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Mississippi Army National Guard Sergeant (SGT) Daniel Ryan Varnado who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our great nation on May 23, 2005, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. SGT Varnado was killed when his military vehicle was struck by an improvised explosive device in Haswa, Iraq. Also killed were Specialist (SPC) Bryan Edward Barron, Sergeant (SGT) Audrey Daron Lunsford, and Sergeant First Class (SFC) Saburant Parker.

SGT Varnado was assigned to C Company, 1st Battalion, 1-155th Infantry Regiment, Mississippi Army National Guard, Biloxi, Mississippi. SGT Varnado, a Saucier resident, joined the Mississippi Army National Guard in November 2000.

According to a website created in his memory, SGT Varnado played baseball growing up for Harrison Central High School in Lyman until he graduated in 1999. He also played baseball for Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College while pursuing a degree in education. SGT Varnado wanted to be a baseball coach.

The website's author describes SGT Varnado as the perfect husband, father, son, and friend. He is also described as a person with faith and a love for the Lord which kept him strong in times of war. Additionally, the author says he will be deeply missed.

The Army National Guard Readiness Center in Gulfport has been named in honor of SGT Varnado.

Mississippi Army National Guard Brigadier General (BG) John Rhodes was the 1-155th infantry battalion commander in 2005. BG Rhodes recently said SGT Varnado will always be remembered along with those who died with him.

"SGT Daniel Ryan Varnado, SPC Bryan Edward Barron, SGT Audrey Daron Lunsford,

and SFC Saburant Parker are remembered in many ways, but we knew them as warriors who represented something larger than themselves," BG Rhodes said. "They operated in a hostile environment and faced the dangers of combat on a regular basis. Yet, if given the choice, they would not have wanted it any other way. They sacrificed their lives trying to provide a better life for people who they did not even know. This is who they were and what they represented. They exemplified the modern day Mississippi Riflemen. Stand Fast, Mississippians! Stand Fast!"

During Operation Iraqi Freedom, Lieutenant Colonel (LTC) Andrew Robertson served as company commander of Charlie Company, 1-155th Infantry Regiment, MS Army National Guard, Biloxi, Mississippi, serving operational control under 2-11 Armed Cavalry Regiment (ACR), U.S. Army. He says there were no greater people than the Charlie Company soldiers who endured being in the most dangerous and highest casualty area of operation as part of OIF III under Task Force 155 Heavy Brigade Combat Team.

"In 2005, there were no greater Americans than our fallen patriots, Charlie Company Infantrymen and their families. None greater. This, I believe, America needs to know," LTC Robertson said.

SGT Varnado is survived by his wife, Sharon Shavers, and son, Kannon Varnado.

SGT Varnado's sacrifice to protect our freedoms will always be remembered.

IN RECOGNITION OF REV. JOHN
BEATTY KAHL'S 25 YEARS OF
SERVICE

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Reverend John Beatty Kahl for his 25 years of dedicated service to our community as an ordained minister.

Rev. Kahl attended Lenoir Rhyne College where he graduated magna cum laude with a triple major in math, physics, and chemistry. As a driven scholar, he received the American Institutes of Chemistry Award his senior year of college and became a member of multiple academic honor societies. While in college, he enlisted in the Navy and went on to Officer Candidate School where he was commissioned as an officer.

After graduation, Rev. Kahl served his country for four and a half years as an officer in the United States Navy. During his service as a Submariner on the USS *Key West*, he felt God pulling on his heart to pursue another career. This calling led Rev. Kahl to attend Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary, where he graduated cum laude. He was ordained as a minister on May 29, 1992 at Lenoir Rhyne College. Now, he is not only the head pastor at New Life Lutheran Church, but also the principal at Christ the King Christian Academy. He and his wife, Cindy, have two children, Joshua and Lisa.

Rev. Kahl has shown immense commitment to God and his country over the years. He is

a man of principled values and strong faith who continues to embody the true meaning of public service. It is my hope that he will remain an active leader in the community for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in honoring Rev. John Beatty Kahl for his 25 years of service to his community

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALL-
EN MISSISSIPPI ARMY NA-
TIONAL GUARD SERGEANT
FIRST CLASS (SFC) SABURANT
PARKER

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Mississippi Army National Guard Sergeant First Class (SFC) Saburant Parker, known to his friends as "Sabot" (sab-oh), who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our great nation on May 23, 2005, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. SFC Parker was killed when his military vehicle was struck by an improvised explosive device in Haswa, Iraq. Also killed were Specialist (SPC) Bryan Edward Barron, Sergeant (SGT) Audrey Daron Lunsford, and Sergeant (SGT) Daniel Ryan Varnado.

SFC Parker, a Foxworth native, was assigned to C Company, 1st Battalion, 1-155th Infantry Regiment, Mississippi Army National Guard, Biloxi, Mississippi. SFC Parker served in the Mississippi Army National Guard for 16 years and served with the 155th Separate Armored Brigade in Bosnia. SFC Parker was also employed as a loader operator at Angie Lumber Company in Angie, Louisiana, and wrestled on the weekends for Southern Championship Wrestling. He was the 2004 champion of the cruiser weight division.

Major General (MG) Harold A. Cross, Mississippi Army National Guard Adjutant General, posthumously awarded SFC Parker the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star and the Mississippi Medal of Valor during a memorial service held at Hurricane Creek Baptist Church in Hattiesburg. He spoke to the audience during the service and was quoted in an Associated Press article.

"Once again we come together in a small community to honor a soldier," MG Cross said. "It comes to mind that over 1.2 million people have paid the ultimate sacrifice in our 228-year history that we might be free."

Mississippi Army National Guard Brigadier General (BG) John Rhodes served as the 1-155th infantry battalion commander in 2005. BG Rhodes recently said SFC Parker will be remembered along with those who died with him.

"SFC Parker, SPC Bryan Edward Barron, SGT Audrey Daron Lunsford, and SGT Daniel Ryan Varnado are remembered in many ways, but we knew them as warriors who represented something larger than themselves," BG Rhodes said. "They operated in a hostile environment and faced the dangers of combat on a regular basis. Yet, if given the choice, they would not have wanted it any other way."

They sacrificed their lives trying to provide a better life for people who they didn't even know. This is who they were and what they represented. They exemplified the modern day Mississippi Riflemen. Stand Fast, Mississippians! Stand Fast!"

During Operation Iraqi Freedom, Lieutenant Colonel (LTC) Andrew Robertson served as company commander of Charlie Company, 1-155th Infantry Regiment, MS Army National Guard, Biloxi, Mississippi, serving operational control under 2-11 Armed Cavalry Regiment (ACR), U.S. Army. He says there were no greater people than the Charlie Company soldiers who endured being in the most dangerous and highest casualty area of operation as part of OIF III under Task Force 155 Heavy Brigade Combat Team.

"In 2005, there were no greater Americans than our fallen patriots, Charlie Company infantrymen and their families. None greater. This, I believe, America needs to know," LTC Robertson said.

SFC Parker's daughter, Sheliah Parker, shared that her father's service made the family proud. "I'm very proud," Sheliah said. "He is the reason why I pushed myself so hard to become the first college graduate in the family. He is the reason I wanted to succeed. I think about him every day."

SFC Parker is survived by his wife, Kitza, daughters, Merissa and Sheliah, stepson, Ramsey Cumpton, mother, Ora Lee Hayes, brother, Mark Parker, and sister, Sable Parker.

SFC Parker's sacrifice to protect our nation will always be remembered.

LUBIN WALTER HUNTER

HON. LEE M. ZELDIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Lubin Walter Hunter on his 100th birthday, and to thank him for his years of dedicated service to our community, state and nation.

Lubin Walter Hunter, the oldest living member of the Shinnecock Indian Nation and oldest living veteran in the Town of Southampton, was born and raised on the Shinnecock Indian Reservation in Southampton, NY.

Mr. Hunter proudly served our country during World War II as a B17 Navigator Gunner with the Army's Air Forces in the Pacific Arena. Just prior to enlisting in a cadet program, Mr. Hunter was employed as a "shipper and corker" on both the USS *Iowa* and *Missouri* battleships in the Brooklyn Navy Yard. After the war, he earned a Bachelor of Arts from Brooklyn College while working as a social worker.

In his retirement, Mr. Hunter returned to serve his tribal community by becoming an Elder at the Shinnecock Presbyterian Church, serving as Director of the Senior Nutrition Program. Mr. Hunter was also elected as a member of the Shinnecock Tribal Council, and served as a Health Committee Advisory Board member of the Shinnecock Family Preservation Center. Additionally, Mr. Hunter was a founder of the Shinnecock Golfers Association.

Today, I would like to wish Mr. Hunter happy birthday, and thank him for his service to our nation and the Shinnecock people.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN MISSISSIPPI ARMY NATIONAL GUARD SPECIALIST (SPC) BRYAN EDWARD BARRON

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Mississippi Army National Guard Specialist (SPC) Bryan Edward Barron who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our great nation on May 23, 2005, when his military vehicle was struck by an improvised explosive device in Haswa, Iraq. Also killed were Sergeant (SGT) Audrey Daron Lunsford, Sergeant First Class (SFC) Saburant Parker, and Sergeant (SGT) Daniel Ryan Varnado.

SPC Barron was assigned to C Company, 1st Battalion, 1-155th Infantry Regiment, Mississippi Army National Guard, Biloxi, Mississippi.

SPC Barron, a Biloxi native, was hoping to be home from Iraq in time for his daughter's first birthday when he was killed. A relative told the Associated Press that SPC Barron left behind two daughters.

"I can say this. He died a hero," his brother-in-law, Ken Daniels, said in 2005. "He was a true American. He found it worthwhile. He found it worth the risk to put his life in danger."

SPC Barron was memorialized with the naming of the Natchez Army National Guard Readiness Center in his honor. Many family members, soldiers, and friends were on hand for the dedication of the building.

Mississippi Army National Guard Brigadier General (BG) John Rhodes served as the 1-155th infantry battalion commander in 2005. BG Rhodes recently said SPC Barron will be remembered along with the others who died with him.

"SPC Bryan Edward Barron, SGT Audrey Daron Lunsford, SFC Saburant Parker, and SGT Daniel Ryan Varnado are remembered in many ways, but we knew them as warriors who represented something larger than themselves," BG Rhodes said. "They operated in a hostile environment and faced the dangers of combat on a regular basis. Yet, if given the choice, they would not have wanted it any other way. They sacrificed their lives trying to provide a better life for people who they did not even know. This is who they were and what they represented. They exemplified the modern day Mississippi Riflemen. Stand Fast, Mississippians! Stand Fast!"

During Operation Iraqi Freedom, Lieutenant Colonel (LTC) Andrew Robertson served as company commander of Charlie Company, 1-155th, Infantry Regiment, MS Army National Guard, Biloxi, Mississippi, serving operational control under 2-11 Armed Cavalry Regiment (ACR), U.S. Army. He says there were no greater people than the Charlie Company soldiers who endured being in the most dan-

gerous and highest casualty area of operation as part of OIF III under Task Force 155 Heavy Brigade Combat Team.

"In 2005, there were no greater Americans than our fallen patriots, Charlie Company infantrymen and their families. None greater. This, I believe America needs to know," LTC Robertson said.

SPC Barron's daughter, Hayley Barron, shared how proud she is of her father's service. "I am tremendously proud," Hayley said. "What he has done, laid the foundation for my sister and me for years to come. He went to Iraq for a very good purpose."

SPC Barron is survived by his wife, Amanda, daughters, Hayley Barron, Jaden Barron, mother, Cynthia Barron, sisters, Sandy Barron, Jodie Barron, Susie Barron, and brother, Cory Barron.

SPC Barron's sacrifice to protect the freedoms we all enjoy will not be forgotten.

CELEBRATING THE LONG CAREER AND RETIREMENT OF BEVERLY ROWE

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Beverly Rowe of Rolla, Missouri, as she retires after more than forty-nine years of public service. Her longstanding career at Fort Leonard Wood was dedicated to assisting military service members and their families in many capacities.

Ms. Rowe began her career on October 30, 1967, as a military personnel clerk, preparing reassignment orders for prior-service and medically evacuated soldiers returning to active duty, and soldiers assigned to the Special Processing Detachment. She managed the Hometown Recruiting Assistance Program, Junior Enlisted Travel, and United States Military Academy Preparatory School candidates. She also served as the basic training assignment lead clerk and with the AG Trainee/Student Personnel Section.

Beverly was promoted to the position of supervisory travel assistant with the Central Port Call Office in February 1984.

In September 1993, Ms. Rowe began working in the Retirement Services Office as a contact representative, a survivor benefit counselor, and processed enlisted and officer retirement applications. She was later selected as the Retirement Services Officer.

Most recently, Ms. Rowe became the Transition Services Manager in June 2012, working with the Soldier for Life Transition Assistance Program.

Ms. Rowe completed college courses at Central Texas College, Drury University, and the University of Colorado-Denver while working at Fort Leonard Wood. Upon retirement, she plans to continue living in Rolla and volunteering at Leach Theater.

She has a lifetime of service at Fort Leonard Wood, providing expertise, stability, continuity of operations, and critical support on a daily basis. I celebrate with Beverly Rowe as she enters retirement after more than forty-nine years.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALL-
EN MISSISSIPPI U.S. MARINE
CORPS SERGEANT (SGT) JONA-
THAN WYATT LAMBERT

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of U.S. Marine Corps Sergeant (Sgt) Jonathan Wyatt Lambert who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our great nation on May 26, 2003, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. Sgt Lambert died on June 1, 2003, at Landstuhl Regional Medical Center, Germany, from injuries he sustained when the Humvee he was riding in rolled over.

Sgt Lambert was assigned to the Headquarters Battalion, 1st Marine Division, Camp Pendleton, California. The 1993 Booneville High School graduate enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps in 1995. Sgt Lambert served in the Marine Corps for four years. After working in wireless data communications, Sgt Lambert reenlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps in November 2000.

A proud Eagle Scout, Sgt Lambert was inspired to join the Marines by his uncle, Carroll Brown, who served in the U.S. Marine Corps in Vietnam. He liked to listen to his stories.

Shortly before his death, Sgt Lambert wrote an article that appeared on Memorial Day in his hometown newspaper, The Banner-Independent. "I am a Marine," he wrote. "It has always been a dream for me to be in the Marines. I love the challenge. I continuously work and sweat for it. I feel that I need to give back to my nation what so many have gave before me."

Sgt Lambert left behind a wife, Betty Oswald Lambert, and daughter, Kinsey Jade Lambert, of Rienzi. Though he died the day before her second birthday, Kinsey Jade recently said how much she enjoys hearing the stories about her father. She is proud of his service. "I'm proud of him for being in the military," Kinsey Jade said. "I respect that. He did it for our country."

"I have always been proud. He was my hero," Mrs. Lambert said. "He was the one who was going to keep the evil from coming to America. He was loved."

In 2013, Sgt Lambert was memorialized with the renaming of a portion of Highway 4 in Prentiss County in his honor.

Sgt Lambert's funeral was held at Little Brown Freewill Baptist Church. Mrs. Lambert says more than one hundred cars were in the funeral procession which followed the route where her son grew up in New Site.

Sgt Lambert was the recipient of the following awards: Marine Corps Achievement Medal, Marine Corps Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal (2), Sea Service Deployment Ribbon, Meritorious Mast (2), Army Achievement Medal, Rifle Expert Badge, Pistol Expert Badge, Certificate of Commendation (Individual Award), Letter of Appreciation (2nd AWD).

In addition to his wife and daughter, Sgt Lambert is survived by his parents, Johnny and Becky Lambert, sister, Misty Terry, and niece Allie Eaton.

Sgt Lambert's sacrifice to protect the freedoms we all enjoy will not be forgotten.

WHY RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND
HUMAN RIGHTS ARE CRITICAL
TO U.S. NATIONAL INTERESTS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, over the past forty-two years, much has changed in Vietnam. The Vietnamese people are a little richer, but still have few rights.

The Vietnamese Communist Party has opened up a bit to the outside world, but remains closed to democratic reforms and the rule of law.

U.S.-Vietnamese relations have warmed because Vietnam fears China's increasing economic power and its incursions in the South China Sea, but we see few human rights improvements emerge from better relations.

Over the past two years, Human Rights Watch has used the words "dismal" and "abysmal" to describe Vietnam's human rights record. Vietnam scored a 7, the lowest score, on Freedom House's "Freedom in the World" index.

From sex and labor trafficking to the censorship of the press and Internet; from restrictions on independent labor unions to severe repression of faith communities, the Vietnamese Government and Communist Party is one of the world's worst abusers of human rights.

For too long Vietnam has gotten a free pass on human rights. Diplomats are so focused on the fact that Vietnam is "not China" that this oppressive police state is granted trade and security benefits without condition. There is a silent human rights crisis going on in Vietnam that must be addressed.

Human rights should be a top talking point when President Trump meets next week with Vietnam's Prime Minister Nguyen Xuan Phuc. Doing so will advance U.S. economic and security interests and it will be warmly welcomed by the Vietnamese people.

The President has a real opportunity to bring about tangible reforms in Vietnam if he links better U.S.-Vietnam relations to tangible human rights improvements.

I have been to Vietnam. I have met with its rights advocates and young activists for decades now, like imprisoned rights activist Nguyen Van Dai. I know there is a younger generation in Vietnam—66% of Vietnam is under the age of 40—that looks to the U.S. as a land of opportunity and freedom. They want the same liberties enjoyed by their relatives in California, Texas, Virginia, Louisiana and so many other places where former Vietnamese refugees have flourished.

The Vietnamese people want the U.S. to be a voice for freedom—because their voice is silenced.

No government that represses its own people or restricts fundamental freedoms can be a trusted ally of the United States. No government that censors the Internet, tortures and jails dissidents, and crushes civil society should be given generous trade or security benefits without conditions.

The President will face pressure from his advisors and the business community to look at Vietnam through the lens of trade deals and the containment of China. Hopefully, he will be able to see the situation more clearly than past Administrations.

Failing to press for real and concrete human rights improvements underestimates U.S. leverage and will disappoint the young generation in Vietnam who are that country's dynamic future.

It should be clear by now that Vietnam needs the U.S. markets and security commitments much more than the U.S. needs Vietnam's markets and security cooperation.

If history is any guide, the President's, championing of individual rights will meet with some success. If his interest in human rights is sustained, those successes could be tangible and far-reaching.

The Vietnamese government has responded to concerns expressed by the last two Administrations when they linked human rights improvements to better U.S.-Vietnam relations. Whether to gain entry into the World Trade Organization (WTO), the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) or to address U.S. concerns over religious freedom abuses, the Vietnamese government took steps toward reform when pressed by past American Presidents.

It is when the U.S. loses interest in human rights that conditions regress.

The Communist leaders in Hanoi take our trade benefits and security commitments and continue repressing those seeking political reform and universal freedoms.

The business of the Communist Party is staying in power and repressing those they believe will challenge their power. They will not embrace human rights improvements or the rule of law unless it is a firm condition of better relations with the U.S.

I am circulating a letter for the signatures of other Members of Congress detailing the strategic opportunities available for the United States and the Vietnamese people if the President pursues a robust human rights agenda.

The letter urges the President to pursue Internet freedom, religious freedom, independent labor unions, and the release of prisoners of conscience—as a condition of U.S. assistance.

These fundamental freedoms are directly related to U.S. interests in a better business climate, less corruption, investor confidence, expansion of economic freedom, and civil society development.

I also wrote to Secretary Rex Tillerson to urge more robust human rights diplomacy in Vietnam, particularly on the issue of religious freedom.

I urged the Secretary to use the authorities given him by the Frank Wolf International Religious Freedom Act and the Global Magnitsky Act, legislation I introduced, that was passed into law last year to hold individual government officials accountable for human rights abuses and restrictions on religious freedom.

The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF) recommended that Vietnam be designated as a "Country of Particular Concern" for severe and egregious religious freedom restrictions. That report provides compelling evidence of egregious and ongoing religious freedom violations in Vietnam.

The President should follow USCIRF's recommendation and immediately designate Vietnam as a CPC for its religious freedom violations. This designation carries with it potential sanctions and visa denials for Vietnamese government officials complicit in religious freedom abuses.

No Vietnamese government official who tortures political dissidents or restricts the activities of religious communities should profit from access to the U.S. or our financial system.

Let me say that the violence and intimidation faced by Hmong and Montagnard Christians, by Khmer Krom Buddhists, by the independent Hoa Hao and Cao Dai groups is outrageous. The torture faced by Ms. Tran Thi Hong is shocking. She was on her way to meet religious freedom Ambassador David Saperstein to advocate for the release of her husband Pastor Nguyen Cong Chinh.

If there are religious prisoners, if forced renunciations of faith are happening, if pagodas and churches and places of worship are forcibly closed—how does Vietnam not meet the criteria for CPC? We know it does. Politics should not play a part in designations.

I will be working closely with the State Department to make sure international religious freedom is a diplomatic priority. This fundamental freedom is not merely a humanitarian issue with little strategic value—it is critical to our security and prosperity.

Research shows that countries that embrace and protect religious freedom are more economically successful, protect women's rights, and experience less terrorism and political instability. There is not a single country that respects religious freedom that poses a security threat to the U.S. In fact, just the opposite is true—countries who are the worst violators of religious freedom are often those who seek to do Americans the most harm and seek to tear down democratic values and institutions. These facts alone should give us pause in expanding relations with Vietnam.

President Trump should not prop up Vietnam's Communist old guard because they are not Vietnam's future. That future lies with Nguyen Van Dai and the many bloggers and advocates of political reform and human rights who seek our freedoms more than our trade.

U.S. policy must send the unmistakable message to the Government of Vietnam that human rights improvements are fundamental to better relations, critically linked to our mutual economic and security interests, and will not be ignored or bargained away.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN MISSISSIPPI ARMY NATIONAL GUARD SERGEANT (SGT) AUDREY DARON LUNSFORD

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Mississippi Army National Guard Sergeant (SGT) Audrey Daron Lunsford who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our great nation on May 23, 2005,

during Operation Iraqi Freedom. SGT Lunsford was killed when his military vehicle was struck by an improvised explosive device in Haswa, Iraq. Also killed were Specialist (SPC) Bryan Edward Barron, Sergeant First Class (SFC) Saburant Parker, and Sergeant (SGT) Daniel Ryan Varnado.

SGT Lunsford, a Sardis native, was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 1–155th Infantry Regiment, Mississippi Army National Guard, McComb Mississippi.

SGT Lunsford enlisted in the Army after he graduated from high school in 1993. He served as a U.S. Army Ranger. After completing four years of service in the Army, SGT Lunsford became an officer with the Sardis Police Department and a firefighter for the Tunica Fire Department.

In January 2005, SGT Lunsford enlisted in the Mississippi Army National Guard. His wife, Vangi, says he reenlisted because he wanted to provide for his family, including his daughter, Paris Audrey, should something happen to him. Vangi says her husband was committed to fighting for freedom.

"Daron wanted to fight for our family's freedom," Vangi said. "He also wanted to fight for others who couldn't go to the battlefield."

Brigadier General (BG) John Rhodes served as the 1–155th infantry battalion commander in 2005. He recently praised SGT Lunsford and the soldiers who died with him on that day.

"SGT Audrey Daron Lunsford, SPC Bryan Edward Barron, SFC Saburant Parker, and SGT Daniel Ryan Varnado are remembered in many ways, but we knew them as warriors who represented something larger than themselves," BG Rhodes said. "They operated in a hostile environment and faced the dangers of combat on a regular basis. Yet, if given the choice, they would not have wanted it any other way. They sacrificed their lives trying to provide a better life for people who they did not know. This is who they were and what they represented. They exemplified the modern day Mississippi Riflemen. Stand Fast, Mississippians! Stand Fast!"

During Operation Iraqi Freedom, Lieutenant Colonel (LTC) Andrew Robertson served as company commander of Charlie Company, 1–155th Infantry Regiment, MS Army National Guard, Biloxi, Mississippi, serving operational control under 2–11 Armed Cavalry Regiment (ACR), U.S. Army. He says there were no greater people than the Charlie Company soldiers who endured being in the most dangerous and highest casualty area of operation as part of OIF III under Task Force 155 Heavy Brigade Combat Team.

"In 2005, there were no greater Americans than our fallen patriots, Charlie Company infantrymen and their families. None greater. This, I believe, America needs to know," LTC Robertson said.

SGT Daron is survived by his wife Vangi, daughter, Paris Audrey, mother Martha Sue Lunsford, and siblings; Donna Miller, Danny Lunsford, David Lunsford, Kim Lunsford Diffree, Michael Lunsford, and Alton Lunsford.

SGT Lunsford's devotion to America and the sacrifice he made will not be forgotten.

RECOGNIZING PROFESSOR
JEFFREY FAHRENWALD

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Professor Jeffrey Fahrenwald who is retiring from Rockford University. Professor Fahrenwald has become a pillar in the Rockford community, and he will be greatly missed.

Professor Fahrenwald is the Director of the MBA program at Rockford University, where he has taught in areas of human relations, management, leadership and international studies. He has enriched our community through his leadership in small business development, in addition to serving on numerous not-for-profit boards. Professor Fahrenwald's contributions to our community have not gone unnoticed, and he was named one of our region's "People You Should Know" in 2011, and "Citizen of the Year" in 2014 by the Rockford Chamber of Commerce for all his tireless work to empower those living in the Rockford community.

It is because of dedicated and selfless leaders such as Professor Fahrenwald that I am especially proud to serve Illinois 17th Congressional District. Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Professor Jeffrey Fahrenwald on his well-earned retirement and thank him for all of his contributions and service to our community.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN SOLDIER ARMY STAFF SERGEANT (SSG) DAVID DWAYNE SELF

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of fallen soldier Army Staff Sergeant (SSG) David Dwayne Self who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our nation on May 16, 2011, during Operation Enduring Freedom. SSG Self died from wounds sustained after his unit was attacked with an improvised explosive device in Spin Ghbarga, Zabul province, Afghanistan, during his fourth tour of duty. SSG Self was one of four American soldiers killed in the insurgent attack.

SSG Self was assigned to the Fires Squadron, 2nd Stryker Cavalry Regiment, Vilseck, Germany. SSG Self graduated from Pearl High School in 2000 before enlisting in the U.S. Army. According to an article written by Nate Rawlings, SSG Self was a, "quiet, steady non-commissioned officer who knew his job well." Rawlings also shared, "we never heard him complain about anything" and praised SSG Self's ability to work calmly under pressure. As an example of SSG Self's calmness under pressure, Rawlings said SSG Self once evacuated his wounded gunner after an artillery shell exploded underneath their vehicle.

He is survived by his father and step mother, Eddie F. Self and Kathleen Self; his mother, Linda Rhodes; his sister, Kimela Shull; and

his step sisters, Lorene Thomas and Sherry Wilmouth.

The sacrifice of this brave soldier will always be remembered.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PRAMILA JAYAPAL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that crimes against children are particularly egregious. It is our duty as members of Congress to do everything we can to prevent these crimes and hold offenders accountable. However, I felt compelled to vote against H.R. 1842, H.R. 1862, and H.R. 1761, as each of these flawed bills would increase the application of mandatory minimum sentences in the U.S. criminal justice system. Judges already have the ability to impose harsh sentences in these cases as they see fit. Mandatory minimum sentences make it impossible for judges to take context or circumstance into consideration, which eliminates judicial discretion and compromises the futures of those at the hands of our justice system. Mandatory minimums create a glaring disproportionality between crime and according punishment and subsequently expand prison populations, strain resources and structures of support, and disproportionately impact communities of color. Because of my stance on this issue and my steadfast resolve to fight any expansion of mandatory minimum sentences, I have voted against each of these bills. I remain committed to protecting our children and doing everything in my power to prevent crimes against children from happening, but expanding mandatory minimums is not the answer. I look forward to working with my colleagues across the aisle as we continue to pursue critical reforms to the criminal justice system.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN MISSISSIPPI MARINE PRIVATE FIRST CLASS (PFC) STEPHEN PHILLIP BALDWIN

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Marine Private First Class (PFC) Stephen Phillip Baldwin who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our great nation on May 5, 2005. PFC Baldwin was killed in an explosion, while he was conducting combat operations in Nasser Wa Salaam, Iraq. He was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 8th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

During his military service, he received the Purple Heart, Combat Action Ribbon, National Defense Service Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Navy Sea Service Deployment, and Navy and Marine Corps Overseas Service Ribbon. He was also awarded the Rifle Marksman badge.

PFC Baldwin was born on May 7, 1986, in Saltillo, MS. He earned his Eagle Scout badge before graduating from high school in 2004 and leaving for boot camp. He was 19 years old at the time of his death.

PFC Baldwin is survived by his parents, Danny and Stephanie Baldwin.

The sacrifice of this brave Marine will always be remembered.

RECOGNIZING GREG GARRISON

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute the distinguished "Voice of the Heartland", Greg Garrison, who has announced that he will retire from his radio program on June 9, 2017. I wish to express my admiration and appreciation for Mr. Garrison and his constant dedication to his conservative Hoosier values.

Greg's commitment to the rule of law and justice began before he took to the airwaves, serving the community through his law firm Garrison Law, which focuses on personal injury, business, and commercial law. It was through his diligent work in his practice that he gained fame during the high profile prosecution of boxer Mike Tyson in 1992. That case lead to opportunities to offer legal analysis nationwide for major trials such as O.J. Simpson and Timothy McVeigh, and on various media platforms such as 60 Minutes, the Today Show, 48 Hours, the FOX News Channel, Rivera Live and ESPN.

Greg became a Hoosier treasure through his radio program that began twenty years ago. His program, Garrison, became an institution of measured thought and Hoosier values. He connected with his listeners through his warm demeanor that sounded more like a friend than a commentator. He was a positive influence on the lives of the countless Hoosiers that spent their mornings listening to him.

I have known Greg for almost as long as he has been on the air. As Secretary of State, I was a guest on his show on several occasions, speaking about the need to improve election integrity with the adoption of the state's photo ID law. We also discussed investigations into voter fraud and redistricting reform. As a member of Congress, my appearances were more frequent as a regular on his program until he cut back his hours and moved to a later timeslot. I will always remem-

ber he asked tough, but fair questions teeming with Hoosier common sense.

While it will be sad to not hear his voice over Indianapolis' airwaves every day, he will not be disappearing from the scene completely. He plans to be on the radio every now and again and he plans to stay active in his law practice. But his daily presence will be missed.

Congratulations to Greg on twenty years of service to the Hoosier state and a happy and well-deserved retirement.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN SOLDIER ARMY SERGEANT (SGT) MARK ALLEN MAIDA

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 26, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of fallen soldier Army Sergeant (SGT) Mark Allen Maida who paid the ultimate sacrifice while defending our nation on May 27, 2005, during Operation Iraqi Freedom. SGT Maida died of wounds he suffered when an improvised explosive device detonated near his vehicle in Diyarrah, Iraq.

SGT Maida was assigned to the 2nd Squadron, 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment, attached to Mississippi's 155th Brigade Combat Team, 2nd Marine Expeditionary Force, Fort Irwin, California. SGT Maida chose to join the Army shortly after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. He joined the Army on October 31, 2001, and was assigned to Fort Irwin, California, where he assisted in training soldiers in preparation for deployment to Iraq. Fallen Heroes Project writes that SGT Maida was originally scheduled for discharge in October of 2004, and he was planning to attend Madison Area Technical College. Instead, his service was extended, and he was deployed to Iraq in January of 2005.

SGT Maida was born in Madison, Wisconsin on November 15, 1982 to parents Ray and Diane Maida. He graduated from Memorial High School in 2001. According to Fallen Heroes Project, Chris Maida, a veteran, attempted to talk his brother out of enlisting. Chris said, "He just laughed. He loved life and he wasn't afraid of anything." The Chicago Tribune writes that SGT Maida was "known for a great sense of humor and loved hunting, fishing and the outdoors; but most of all he loved his family and friends."

SGT Maida's survivors include his parents, Ray and Diane Maida; a sister, Juliann Mutch; two brothers, Aaron Maida and Christopher Maida; one grandmother, Olga Herman; two nieces and two nephews.

The sacrifice of this brave soldier will always be remembered.

SENATE—Tuesday, May 30, 2017

The Senate met at 7 and 20 seconds a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RICHARD BURR, a Senator from the State of North Carolina.

—————

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 30, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule 1, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RICHARD BURR, a Senator from the State of North Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BURR thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

—————

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY,
JUNE 2, 2017, AT 9 A.M.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9 a.m. on Friday, June 2, 2017.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7 and 45 seconds a.m., adjourned until Friday, June 2, 2017, at 9 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 30, 2017

The House met at 11 a.m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 30, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANDY HARRIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We thank You once again that we can come before You and ask guidance for the men and women of this assembly. Send Your spirit of peace, honesty, and fairness during this week of constituent visits.

Bless the people of this great Nation with wisdom, knowledge, and understanding, that they might responsibly participate in our American democracy.

Please keep all who work for the people's House in good health. We thank You for their generosity and the tremendous jobs so many did this past weekend so millions of Americans could enjoy a wonderful Capital concert celebrating Memorial Day.

Bless us this day, and every day, and may all that is done be for Your great honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(a) of House Resolution 352, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 657. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain protections against prohibited personnel practices, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(b) of House Resolution 352, the House stands adjourned until 10:30 a.m. on Friday, June 2, 2017.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, June 2, 2017, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1460. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report entitled "OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2018", pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 901(a)(7)(B); Public Law 99-177, Sec. 251(a)(7)(B) (as amended by Public Law 114-113, Sec. 1003); (129 Stat. 3035); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1461. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report entitled "OMB Sequestration Preview Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2018", pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 904(c); Public Law 99-177, Sec. 254 (as amended by Public Law 112-25, Sec. 103(1)); (125 Stat. 246); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1462. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Frederick B. Hodges, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1463. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-54, "Defending Access to Women's Health Care Services Temporary Amendment Act of 2017", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1464. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-67, "Electric Company Infrastructure Improvement Financing Amendment Act of 2017", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1465. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's semiannual report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5(a) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1466. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Semiannual Management Report to the Congress for the period of October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978 as amended (5 U.S.C. App Sec. 5); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1467. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of a federal nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1468. A letter from the Chairman, United States International Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Annual Performance Report for FY 2016 and Annual Performance Plan for FY 2017-18, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867) and 5 U.S.C. 306(a); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 2; (124 Stat. 3866); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1469. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to the Congress concerning the extension of the waiver authority for Belarus, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1); Public Law 93-618, Sec. 402(d)(1); (88 Stat. 2056) and 19 U.S.C. 2439(b); Public Law 93-618, Sec. 409(b); (88 Stat. 2064); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 2762. A bill to require that waivers and authorizations for certain Federal employees relating to ethics requirements are made public and submitted to the Office of Government Ethics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 2763. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Innovation Research program and Small Business Technology Transfer program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MENG, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 2764. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a small business start-up tax credit for veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COOK, and Mr. DUNN):

H.R. 2765. A bill to provide for the issuance of a forever stamp to honor the sacrifices of the brave men and women of the Armed Forces who are still prisoner, missing, or unaccounted for, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2766. A bill to require that, in cases in which the annual trade deficit between the United States and another country is \$10,000,000,000 or more for 3 consecutive years, the President take the necessary steps to create a more balanced trading relationship with that country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 2767. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require senior procurement executives, procurement center representatives, and the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization to assist small business concerns participating in the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 2768. A bill to designate certain mountain peaks in the State of Colorado as "Fowler Peak" and "Boskoff Peak"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 2763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, §8, cl.2; Art. I, §8, cl.7; and Art. I, §8, cl.12.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 2764.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2765.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2766.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Office thereof.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 2767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 grants Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states, and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution this power.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 2768.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause), which confers on Congress the power to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the property belonging to the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 93: Ms. BARRAGÁN and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 351: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 463: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 619: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 750: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 849: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H.R. 1017: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 1141: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1143: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1203: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 1225: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BEYER, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1317: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1375: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1698: Mr. CLAY, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 1704: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 1752: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 1928: Mr. OLSON, Mr. HECK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2004: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 2029: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 2056: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 2176: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 2198: Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 2240: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 2372: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 2422: Mr. PALAZZO and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2472: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 2542: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2645: Mr. RASKIN.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SANFORD, and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. DEFazio, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H. Res. 135: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. COOK.

H. Res. 218: Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Mr. SUOZZI.

H. Res. 227: Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 309: Mr. RASKIN.

H. Res. 311: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H. Res. 347: Miss RICE of New York.

H. Res. 354: Mr. OLSON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 370: Ms. BASS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE DELAWARE & LEHIGH NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR AS A SMITHSONIAN AFFILIATE

HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, today I have the privilege of recognizing the Delaware & Lehigh National Heritage Corridor as it becomes an Affiliate of the Smithsonian Institution.

Earlier this year, the heritage corridor completed a five year merger process with the National Canal Museum. As a result of this merger, the Canal Museum's Smithsonian Affiliate status will transfer to the Delaware & Lehigh National Heritage Corridor.

The Delaware & Lehigh National Heritage Corridor, also known as the D&L Corridor, is part of our nation's National Heritage Area system. The corridor spans 165 miles from the mountains of northeast Pennsylvania through the Lehigh Valley, and it preserves and showcases the cultural resources that are an integral part of this region's history. As part of its efforts, the D&L Corridor has developed a curriculum offered to 4th and 5th grade students in the area, titled "Tales of the Towpath," which provides them with the opportunity to explore mid-19th Century life along the Lehigh and Delaware canals. By merging with the National Canal Museum, the D&L Corridor is able to utilize the museum's artifacts and exhibits—including Pennsylvania's only mule-drawn canal boat—to bring its curriculum to life.

In addition to the National Canal Museum, the D&L Corridor also includes other important sites such as the National Museum of Industrial History, Historic Bethlehem Museums and Sites, Mercer Museum and Fonthill Castle, and numerous other National Historic Landmarks. For these reasons, the D&L Corridor has achieved a Smithsonian-National Heritage Area Partnership, which is the first of its kind in the United States.

The D&L Corridor has worked tirelessly to preserve and promote the rich history and culture of our beloved region in Pennsylvania, and I am proud that it now has even greater resources to share with those who visit. I wish them the utmost success as they pursue this endeavor.

IN RECOGNITION OF MICHAEL SIMPSON FOR HIS WORK ON BEHALF OF THE DETROIT COMMUNITY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Michael Simpson, owner and proprietor of Nu Jazz Swingers. Mr. Simpson has contributed to the vibrant jazz culture in Detroit through his work with NJS and in the community.

Originally founded in 1976 as the Flying Diamond, the club was renamed the Nu Jazz Swingers the following year and has established itself as one of the premier jazz clubs in southeast Michigan. NJS became a popular destination for African-American members of the United Auto Workers, who frequented the club after their shifts at nearby auto manufacturers. Michael Simpson, the club's owner and DJ, also played an important role in popularizing jazz music by featuring music played by Louis Armstrong, Michael Franks, Bob James and other prominent jazz performers. This helped the club cultivate a loyal following and a reputation as one of the leading juke joints in southeast Michigan. Additionally, Mr. Simpson and NJS are active in the surrounding community, hosting annual Halloween and Christmas parties for children and families in nearby neighborhoods. Mr. Simpson has also supported Detroit youth athletics through donations and sponsorships of local teams.

Mr. Simpson's work has been critical to creating a long-lasting establishment in NJS that has contributed to the cultural expression of the African-American community in Detroit. Through its popularization of jazz musicians, as well as its Jazzy ballroom nights and other events, NJS has become a well-known destination and has influenced the culture of Detroit and the surrounding areas. Mr. Simpson's charitable acts have also provided important aid to local families in need, and his holiday party raises thousands of dollars each year for individuals in the community. Collectively, Mr. Simpson's actions have had a significant impact on the City of Detroit and its residents and are worthy of commendation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Michael Simpson. Mr. Simpson's work as an owner and DJ with NJS has been a key influence on Detroit's cultural life.

IN HONOR OF THE NIAGARA FALLS AIR RESERVE STATION ATTAINING 187,000 ACCIDENT FREE FLYING HOURS

HON. CHRIS COLLINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station for their accomplishment of attaining a total of 187,000 accident free flying hours. Since I have been in Congress, Congressman BRIAN HIGGINS and I have worked together to ensure this base is protected for future generations.

The Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station sits near the North East international border, near one of the largest populated areas in Canada. In 1970, the base made the transition from the C-119 to C-130 aircraft; a large tactical aircraft primarily used for troop transportation and supply drops, the C-130 can withstand rough terrain and has been a major tactical component for the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station.

Not only does the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station provide national security and give those in Western New York a chance to serve their county, it also provides a significant economic boost to Western New York. The base employs over 2,600 people and has an economic footprint of more than \$200 million in the Western New York Community. It has been an honor, alongside Congressman HIGGINS, to fight to protect this base, and keep its location in Niagara Falls.

These brave men and women were called to active duty to participate in Operations Desert Shield, Desert Storm, Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. Their professionalism, teamwork and pride for their country enabled them to achieve 187,000 accident free flying hours since 1961. These men and women are not just exemplary servicemen and women. They are your neighbors, your scoutmasters, your children's coaches, your friends. You notice when they are gone, because they bring their leadership and teamwork skills to everything they do.

The 914th Airlift Wing Vision statement is, "Attain the highest state of readiness in support of the nation and our community through the development of our Airmen to deliver exceptional performance." From the flight crew, to the maintenance crew, everyone must be fully prepared for whatever comes their way. In order for this to happen, they train efficiently, and regard safety as their top priority. I, along with Congressman HIGGINS, applaud their accomplishment, and thank them for their relentless commitment and service to our country.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

REMARKS IN OPPOSITION TO H.R.
1862

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 1862, the Global Child Protection Act of 2017.

Studies completed by the Centers for Disease Control show that 1 in 4 women and 1 in 6 men are sexually abused before the age of 18. Furthermore, these numbers may not be completely accurate—acts of child sexual abuse are often not reported, and experts agree that incidence is higher than what is discovered by authorities. These acts can be detrimental to youth, multiple studies have shown that child sexual abuse victims are twice as likely to develop mental health conditions. In my home state of Georgia, 800 children suffered from sexual abuse in 2015.

As a member of the Congressional Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus, I am in strong support of giving law enforcement any and every legal tool they need to protect children and punish abusers. However, as someone who is passionate about criminal justice reform, I cannot support the current version of this bill.

Crimes against children are pathetic and disgusting, and those who hurt children must be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. While we want to protect these vulnerable individuals, it is also important to consider the legal ramifications of this bill. We are considering a bill that would impose a mandatory minimum sentence of life imprisonment in many cases. Repeat offenders should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. However, I do not believe that mandatory minimum sentences are an effective solution. Congress does not know the facts of every case—but the judges will. That is why I do not support legally binding judges to give mandatory sentences—but instead giving the judges the freedom to consider each option available.

Again, I fully support the goal of this bill—punishing those who commit horrible crimes against children. However, if we are going to make such substantial changes to U.S. federal code, I believe that this bill requires more discussion. In its current form, I cannot support H.R. 1862.

I would encourage my colleagues to vote NAY on this resolution.

THE BALANCING TRADE ACT

HON. MARCY KAPTUR
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the "Balancing Trade Act," an important bill that requires U.S. policy to take the trade deficit seriously.

This legislation provides actionable steps to re-balance our trade deficits with countries with which we have a deficit of \$10 billion or more for three consecutive years. Following

the Trump administration's recent Executive orders on U.S. trade policy, and recent letter to Congress to renegotiate NAFTA, this legislation offers actionable steps to the Administration.

Bad trade deals have contributed to a loss of nearly 4 million American jobs and a deficit of \$43.6 billion. President Trump promised a trade deal that would get Americans back to work and reduce our deficit. By prioritizing our worst trade deals, we are ensuring that some of these promises are met.

An old adage reminds us: there are two kinds of failures: "by those who think and don't do, and the other by those who don't think and do." Our "free trade" deals have been a major failure of the second order.

Persistent, massive trade deficits are a drag on the U.S. economy and impair job creation. Now more than ever we need a trade policy that grows the economy and creates jobs in the United States.

RECOGNIZING DAVID FLAUM

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate David Flaum on receiving the prestigious Rochester Rotary Award.

Mr. Flaum currently serves as Chief Executive Officer and President of Flaum Management Company, which he founded in 1985. He has dedicated his career to managing and developing real estate, from retail centers to office buildings and industrial facilities. Mr. Flaum has been directly involved in the restoration of many commercial buildings in our region, which has created new jobs and contributed to the revitalization of our local economy.

In addition to his professional work, David and his wife, Ilene, have generously supported various charitable causes and organizations. Mr. and Mrs. Flaum established the Bob Witmer Campership Fund, which provides free summer camp experiences to underprivileged children, and the David and Ilene Flaum Eye Institute.

Mr. Flaum is the 80th recipient of the Rochester Rotary Award, which is the oldest civic award in our area. The award is given to outstanding individuals who exemplify the motto, "Service Above Self" and make significant business, professional, cultural, or civic contributions to our community. There is no question that David embodies these ideals. His vision, dedication, and generosity have made our region a better place to live and will continue to benefit local families and businesses for years to come. It is a privilege to call David my friend.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating David Flaum on this well-deserved recognition and wishing him all the best in his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF MAE JEMISON
FOR HER OUTSTANDING
ACHIEVEMENTS AS AN ASTRO-
NAUT AND SCIENTIST

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mae Jemison, a physician, scientist and astronaut whose pioneering career has furthered our understanding of the world around us. Dr. Jemison has achieved excellence across a number of disciplines as a result of her hard work and perseverance.

After receiving a medical degree from Cornell Medical College and completing her medical training, Dr. Jemison served as a Peace Corps Medical Officer, treating Peace Corps volunteers in Liberia and Sierra Leone. She was then accepted into NASA's astronaut program in 1987, providing launch support and assistance until her space mission aboard the Space Shuttle *Endeavor* in September 1992. During her mission, Dr. Jemison conducted scientific experiments on bone cell research and the effects of weightlessness on the human body, which contributed to advancements in our understanding of life sciences. She then resigned in 1993 from NASA, and has since founded several companies, including BioSentient Corp. which develops treatments for chronic pain and stress disorders.

Dr. Jemison has had an extraordinary career and has affected countless lives through her work. In addition to breaking down barriers as the first black woman in space, Dr. Jemison has utilized her medical background and business acumen to develop novel medical treatments for a variety of illnesses. She has also excelled in academia, working as a professor at Dartmouth and Cornell, and is the founder of the Dorothy Jemison Foundation for Excellence, a nonprofit that promotes science education initiatives. Collectively, Dr. Jemison has had an indelible impact on a variety of disciplines through her work, and she continues to inspire new generations of scientists.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in honoring Dr. Mae Jemison for her outstanding career. Dr. Jemison's work with NASA, in medicine and in business has impacted and inspired countless individuals.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present at recorded votes due to medical reasons.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on rollcall No. 283, YEA on rollcall No. 284, and YEA on rollcall No. 285.

REMARKS IN OPPOSITION TO H.R.
1842**HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 1842, the Strengthening Children's Safety Act of 2017.

Crimes against children are abhorrent, and those who commit them should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. In 2015, in my home state of Georgia, 22,163 children were victims of abuse. Eight hundred of those children were subjected to sexual abuse. I recognize the merits of H.R. 1842. However, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I cannot support a bill which brings sweeping changes to Federal code without a thorough review process. This bill creates mandatory minimum sentences, which will effectively remove discretion from the judges who should be making sentencing decisions—not Congress.

This bill has good intentions, and as a member of the Congressional Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus, I am in favor of strengthening the laws that protect our nation's children. However, this bill also enacts major changes in the criminal law, and I do not believe it is right for our committee to pass this bill without holding the appropriate hearings. I believe that the testimony of experts in the fields relevant to this bill would be of great use and would help ensure that this committee does not pass a bill that will impose unfair, mandatory sentences on individuals.

This committee does not know the facts of every child abuse case—but the judge that hears those cases will. That is why I believe we should not bind judges to give mandatory minimum sentences. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to vote NAY on this resolution.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable conflict, I missed the following vote on May 25. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 285

SUPPORTING TAIWAN'S PARTICIPATION IN WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Taiwan's true, meaningful participation in the World Health Organization (WHO).

It is unfortunate that, almost 13 years after Congress made it an annual requirement to

have an unclassified report from the Secretary of State on the U.S. plan for Taiwan to gain observer status at the WHO, and eight years since Taiwan was first invited to the World Health Assembly (WHA)—the governing forum of the WHO—as an observer, it remains necessary for Members to again raise their voices on this issue.

Since 2009, Taiwan has been allowed to attend the annual meeting of the WHA as an observer, but last year, its invitation was held up due to pressure the People's Republic of China wished to place upon the incoming administration of Taiwan's president, Tsai Ing-wen. The current WHO Director-General has shown hostility to Taipei before. When last year's invitation arrived, it contained insulting, unnecessary language referring to the October 1971 UN General Assembly resolution replacing the United Nations delegation from Taipei with the delegation from Beijing, as the basis for Taiwan's attendance. Additionally, the invitation stated that Taiwan's participation should be conditioned on the "one-China" principle. This, too, was unnecessary, as President Tsai has stated Taiwan's commitment to the status quo across the Taiwan Strait.

This year's WHA is currently taking place in Geneva. It began on May 22 and will conclude May 31. As of yet, no invitation has been issued to Taiwan.

As my colleagues are aware, it is the stated policy of the United States, over successive administrations, that Taiwan should be allowed meaningful participation in international organizations where it cannot become a full member. I submit that Taiwan's current level of participation is neither satisfactory, nor meaningful.

Mr. Speaker, this situation is unacceptable. As an advanced democracy, economy, and society, with one of the most-developed health care systems in the world, a proven track record controlling infectious diseases, and a history of providing humanitarian relief, Taiwan has much to offer. Neither Taiwan, nor the international community, is served by restricting Taiwan's access to timely information and important resources.

The situation necessitates that we reiterate our full support for Taiwan's inclusion at the WHA and in the other work of the WHO. The WHO Secretariat should continue to uphold its independence and impartiality, and should not be at the service of any particular member state. I ask my colleagues to join me in encouraging the administration to work with Taiwan and our member friends at the WHO to secure Taiwan's invitation and meaningful participation at the WHA now and in the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF INFORUM FOR ITS SUCCESS IN PROVIDING MENTORSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL OPPORTUNITIES TO WOMEN

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Inforum for its work on behalf of

women. Since its founding 55 years ago, Inforum has provided effective mentorship and education opportunities for women throughout Michigan.

Originally founded in 1962 as the Women's Economic Club, the organization has grown and evolved over the years to meet its mission of empowering women to lead and succeed. Inforum hosts a variety of high-performing women leaders for lunches and roundtables to exchange ideas and foster leadership skills. Additionally, Inforum sponsors the Inforum Center for Leadership, an educational initiative that provides professional development through its training programs for mid-career women leaders. These include its Executive Leadership professional development program, a four-month program that combines individual instruction, group exercises, and personalized feedback to provide women with the skills to assume more senior and influential roles in their careers. Collectively, over 1,100 women have graduated from this program since its launch in 2003.

Inforum has provided countless women with critical skills and training to succeed in the 21st century workforce. Its talent initiatives and programs provide targeted professional development to women of all backgrounds, including veterans and early-career women. As a result of its success, Inforum has expanded throughout Michigan to better serve its members. Today, the organization hosts additional branches in Lansing, Grand Rapids, the Saginaw/Bay City area and southwest Michigan. The growth of the Inforum Center for Leadership, along with its long track record of educating and empowering women, is a testament to the organization's success, and it is my hope that Inforum continues to effectively serve a broad range of women throughout their careers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Inforum for its record of providing career skills and training that allows women to achieve success. Inforum provides resources and hosts a variety of programs that provide professional development for women.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE BERKNER HIGH SCHOOL ORCHESTRA

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize several important people in the Richardson Independent School District music community: First, the students and band directors of the Lloyd V. Berkner High School Full Orchestra under the leadership of Craig Needham and Jason Schayot for receiving an invitation to the 2016 Midwest International Band and Orchestra Clinic in Chicago, Illinois; second, the Liberty Junior High School Symphonic Band under the direction of Christopher Pineda for receiving an invitation to be a guest performing band at the Midwest Clinic, hosted by Berkner High School alumnus and outstanding music educator, Frank Ticheli; and, third, Frank Troyka, a Former Head Band Director at Berkner High School, nationally renowned clinician, music educator, and teacher, for his induction into the 2016 Bands of

America Hall of Fame, which recognizes individuals who have greatly impacted the nation's bands and music education. Again, congratulations for your outstanding achievement and national recognition

IN HONOR OF INVENTORS MONTH,
MAY 2017

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues that May is National Inventors Month. It's a special privilege to do so as Co-Chair of the Congressional Inventions Caucus.

Our Founders were aware of the importance of invention and inventors, enshrining invention and protecting the rights of inventors across the country in Article 1, Section 8 of our Constitution. This not only has served the purpose of protecting one's exclusive property rights, it also has achieved the Founders' goal of stimulating "progress in science and useful arts."

From the beginning, invention has driven forward progress for our country and helped elevate American innovators to the forefront of the world stage. This has benefited not only our country but the world—curing disease, ex-

tending life and bringing joy and opportunity to billions.

Without patents and other protections, protected in our Constitution and laws at every letter, this innovation could not be possible. As President Abraham Lincoln, himself a patent-holder, put it, our patent system adds the fuel of interest to the fire of genius.

Our country has a rich legacy of inventors who have combatted some of history's greatest challenges and used their unique gifts to upend the workings of the world. American innovators like Edison, Bell, George Washington Carver and the Wright Brothers have become household names across the country. On top of that, well-known inventions from the Internet to the garage owe themselves to the American spirit.

American innovation and ingenuity is a foundation for our nation's prosperity. This National Inventors Month, I hope we will all consider the contribution inventors have made to our nation.

IN CELEBRATION OF ROBERT IAN
MALONEY ON HIS GRADUATION

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to pay tribute to Robert "Ian"

Maloney. Ian is a May 2017 graduate of Georgetown Preparatory School. Georgetown Preparatory School is the world's oldest Catholic and Jesuit school for boys. Ian's time at Georgetown Preparatory School closes the chapter on a stellar high school career. At Prep, Ian maintained a four year "A" average and was recognized as a National Hispanic Scholar, a member of the National Honor Society, and President of the Black Student Association. Volunteer work, tutoring inner city students, renovating homes for Habitat for Humanity, feeding homeless families at Thanksgiving were but a few of his selfless community activities. Aside from academics, Ian has also been a scholar athlete, lettering in tennis and leading as Captain of the Varsity team. In fact recently, Ian was certified by the internationally recognized Professional Tennis Registry as an Instructor.

As the chapter closes on Georgetown Prep, it opens for Ian at Brown University. Of the 32,720 students who applied to Brown University's class of 2021, Ian was accepted early decision. According to the Dean of Admission, "this admitted student group is extraordinary in every way. . . ."

Mr. Speaker, Robert "Ian" Maloney is extraordinary in "every way." He is a young man of integrity, intellectual excellence, and caring for others. Please join me in saluting Ian and wishing him every success as he brings great pride to his family and our country as a member of the Brown University class of 2021.

SENATE—*Friday, June 2, 2017*

The Senate met at 9 and 8 seconds a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CORY GARDNER, a Senator from the State of Colorado.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The assistant bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 2, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CORY GARDNER, a Senator from the State of Colorado, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GARDNER thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
JUNE 5, 2017, AT 3 P.M.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until Monday, June 5, 2017, at 3 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9 and 33 seconds a.m., adjourned until Monday, June 5, 2017, at 3 p.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, June 2, 2017*

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. COMSTOCK).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 2, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BARBARA COMSTOCK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Gene Hemrick, St. Joseph's Catholic Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Lord, spring is a time of renewed life. We pray You bless our Congress with that which is the heart of life: divine wisdom, understanding, counsel, fortitude, knowledge, awe, and reverence of Your creatures and creation.

May these gifts accompany them in their endeavors to form a unified, strong Nation.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(a) of House Resolution 352, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(b) of House Resolution 352, the House stands adjourned until noon on Tuesday, June 6, 2017, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 32 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 6, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first and second quarters of 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ITALY AND PORTUGAL, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 6 AND APR. 12, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Steve Scalise	4/7	4/10	Italy		1,424.40		(³)				1,424.40
Hon. Cedric Richmond	4/7	4/10	Italy		1,424.40		(³)				1,424.40
Hon. Marcia Fudge	4/7	4/10	Italy		1,424.40		(³)				1,424.40
Hon. Jeff Denham	4/7	4/10	Italy		1,424.40		(³)				1,424.40
Hon. Drew Ferguson	4/7	4/10	Italy		1,424.40		(³)				1,424.40
Hon. Tom Graves	4/7	4/10	Italy		1,424.40		(³)				1,424.40
Hon. Paul Mitchell	4/7	4/10	Italy		1,424.40		(³)				1,424.40
Hon. Glenn Thompson	4/7	4/10	Italy		1,424.40		(³)				1,424.40
Hon. Kevin Yoder	4/7	4/10	Italy		1,424.40		(³)				1,424.40
Brett Horton	4/7	4/10	Italy		1,424.40		(³)				1,424.40
Bart Reising	4/7	4/10	Italy		1,424.40		(³)				1,424.40
Eric Zulkosky	4/7	4/10	Italy		1,424.40		(³)				1,424.40
Chris Bond	4/7	4/10	Italy		1,424.40		(³)				1,424.40
Dan Sadlosky	4/7	4/10	Italy		1,424.40		(³)				1,424.40
Ellen Gosnell	4/7	4/10	Italy		1,424.40		(³)				1,424.40
Hon. Steve Scalise	4/10	4/12	Portugal		650.62		(³)				650.62
Hon. Cedric Richmond	4/10	4/12	Portugal		650.62		(³)				650.62
Hon. Marcia Fudge	4/10	4/12	Portugal		650.62		(³)				650.62
Hon. Jeff Denham	4/10	4/12	Portugal		650.62		(³)				650.62
Hon. Drew Ferguson	4/10	4/12	Portugal		650.62		(³)				650.62
Hon. Tom Graves	4/10	4/12	Portugal		650.62		(³)				650.62
Hon. Paul Mitchell	4/10	4/12	Portugal		650.62		(³)				650.62
Hon. Glenn Thompson	4/10	4/12	Portugal		650.62		(³)				650.62
Hon. Kevin Yoder	4/10	4/12	Portugal		650.62		(³)				650.62
Brett Horton	4/10	4/12	Portugal		650.62		(³)				650.62
Bart Reising	4/10	4/12	Portugal		650.62		(³)				650.62
Eric Zulkosky	4/10	4/12	Portugal		650.62		(³)				650.62
Chris Bond	4/10	4/12	Portugal		650.62		(³)				650.62
Dan Sadlosky	4/10	4/12	Portugal		650.62		(³)				650.62
Ellen Gosnell	4/10	4/12	Portugal		650.62		(³)				650.62
Committee total					31,125.30						31,125.30

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. STEVE SCALISE, May 12, 2017.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

June 2, 2017

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE, Vol. 163, Pt. 6

8621

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NORWAY, THE UNITED KINGDOM, POLAND, AND ESTONIA, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 16 AND APR. 23, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Paul Ryan	4/17	4/19	Norway		541.00		(³)				541.00
Hon. Mac Thornberry	4/17	4/19	Norway		541.00		(³)				541.00
Hon. Brian Mast	4/17	4/19	Norway		541.00		(³)				541.00
Hon. Don Bacon	4/17	4/19	Norway		541.00		(³)				541.00
Hon. Martha Roby	4/17	4/19	Norway		541.00		(³)				541.00
Hon. Jeb Hensarling	4/17	4/19	Norway		541.00		(³)				541.00
Hon. Ron Kind	4/17	4/17	Norway		541.00		(³)				541.00
Hon. Paul Irving	4/17	4/19	Norway		541.00		(³)				541.00
Hon. Brian Monahan	4/17	4/19	Norway		541.00		(³)				541.00
Jeff Dressler	4/17	4/19	Norway		541.00		(³)				541.00
Brendan Buck	4/17	4/19	Norway		541.00		(³)				541.00
Casey Higgins	4/17	4/19	Norway		541.00		(³)				541.00
Will Miller	4/17	4/19	Norway		541.00		(³)				541.00
Sophia Lafargue	4/17	4/19	Norway		541.00		(³)				541.00
Robert Fitzpatrick	4/13	4/19	Norway		1,623.00		*5,411.00				7,034.00
Hon. Paul Ryan	4/19	4/21	United Kingdom		1,075.00		(³)				1,075.00
Hon. Gregory Meeks	4/18	4/21	United Kingdom		1,212.00	(³)	4,912.00				6,124.00
Hon. Mac Thornberry	4/19	4/21	United Kingdom		1,075.00		(³)				1,075.00
Hon. Brian Mast	4/19	4/21	United Kingdom		1,075.00		(³)				1,075.00
Hon. Don Bacon	4/19	4/21	United Kingdom		1,075.00		(³)				1,075.00
Hon. Martha Roby	4/19	4/21	United Kingdom		1,075.00		(³)				1,075.00
Hon. Jeb Hensarling	4/19	4/21	United Kingdom		1,075.00		(³)				1,075.00
Hon. Ron Kind	4/17	4/17	United Kingdom		1,075.00		(³)				1,075.00
Hon. Paul Irving	4/19	4/21	United Kingdom		1,075.00		(³)				1,075.00
Hon. Brian Monahan	4/19	4/21	United Kingdom		1,075.00		(³)				1,075.00
Jeff Dressler	4/19	4/21	United Kingdom		1,075.00		(³)				1,075.00
Brendan Buck	4/19	4/21	United Kingdom		1,075.00		(³)				1,075.00
Casey Higgins	4/19	4/21	United Kingdom		1,075.00		(³)				1,075.00
Will Miller	4/19	4/21	United Kingdom		1,075.00		(³)				1,075.00
Sophia Lafargue	4/19	4/21	United Kingdom		1,075.00		(³)				1,075.00
Angel Morales	4/17	4/21	United Kingdom		2,150.00		*1,897.00				4,047.00
Hon. Paul Ryan	4/21	4/22	Poland		285.00		(³)				285.00
Hon. Gregory Meeks	4/21	4/22	Poland		285.00		(³)				285.00
Hon. Mac Thornberry	4/21	4/22	Poland		285.00		(³)				285.00
Hon. Brian Mast	4/21	4/22	Poland		285.00		(³)				285.00
Hon. Don Bacon	4/21	4/22	Poland		285.00		(³)				285.00
Hon. Martha Roby	4/21	4/22	Poland		285.00		(³)				285.00
Hon. Jeb Hensarling	4/21	4/22	Poland		285.00		(³)				285.00
Hon. Ron Kind	4/21	4/22	Poland		285.00		(³)				285.00
Hon. Paul Irving	4/21	4/22	Poland		285.00		(³)				285.00
Hon. Brian Monahan	4/21	4/22	Poland		285.00		(³)				285.00
Jeff Dressler	4/21	4/22	Poland		285.00		(³)				285.00
Brendan Buck	4/21	4/22	Poland		285.00		(³)				285.00
Casey Higgins	4/21	4/22	Poland		285.00		(³)				285.00
Will Miller	4/21	4/22	Poland		285.00		(³)				285.00
Sophia Lafargue	4/21	4/22	Poland		285.00		(³)				285.00
Robert Fitzpatrick	4/19	4/22	Poland		855.00						855.00
Hon. Paul Ryan	4/22	4/23	Estonia		235.00		(³)				235.00
Hon. Gregory Meeks	4/22	4/23	Estonia		235.00		(³)				235.00
Hon. Mac Thornberry	4/22	4/23	Estonia		235.00		(³)				235.00
Hon. Brian Mast	4/22	4/23	Estonia		235.00		(³)				235.00
Hon. Don Bacon	4/22	4/23	Estonia		235.00		(³)				235.00
Hon. Martha Roby	4/22	4/23	Estonia		235.00		(³)				235.00
Hon. Jeb Hensarling	4/22	4/23	Estonia		235.00		(³)				235.00
Hon. Ron Kind	4/22	4/23	Estonia		235.00		(³)				235.00
Hon. Paul Irving	4/22	4/23	Estonia		235.00		(³)				235.00
Hon. Brian Monahan	4/22	4/23	Estonia		235.00		(³)				235.00
Jeff Dressler	4/22	4/23	Estonia		235.00		(³)				235.00
Brendan Buck	4/22	4/23	Estonia		235.00		(³)				235.00
Casey Higgins	4/22	4/23	Estonia		235.00		(³)				235.00
Will Miller	4/22	4/23	Estonia		235.00		(³)				235.00
Sophia Lafargue	4/22	4/23	Estonia		235.00		(³)				235.00
Angel Morales	4/21	4/23	Estonia		470.00		(³)				470.00
Committee total					36,369.00		12,220.00				48,584.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

* Airfare all inclusive.

HON. PAUL RYAN, May 23, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Cordell Hull	3/4	3/6	Israel		97.47		11,721.38				11,818.85
Hon. Ron DeSantis	3/4	3/6	Israel		275.00		11,651.38				11,926.38
Committee total					372.47		23,372.76				23,745.23

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JASON CHAFFETZ, Chairman, May 23, 2017.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1470. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's affirmation of interim rule as final rule — Asian Longhorned Beetle: Update List of Regulated Articles [Docket No.: APHIS-2015-0097] received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1471. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1472. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to the Congress for the period October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1473. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Office of Inspector General report entitled "Semiannual Report to Congress", pursuant to the Public Law 95-452; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1474. A letter from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta, transmitting the 2016 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1475. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Freedom of Information Act Regulations received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1476. A letter from the Regulatory Ombudsman, FMCSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment of 2015 [Docket No.: FMCSA-2016-0128] (RIN: 2126-AB93) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1477. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the Haskell, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9494; Airspace Doc. No.: 16-ASW-19] received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1478. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31131;

Amdt. No.: 3744] received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1479. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31133; Amdt. No.: 3746] received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1480. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31132; Amdt. No.: 3745] received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1481. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31130; Amdt. No.: 3743] received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1482. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Hailey, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9355; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ANM-8] received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1483. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Ruston, LA [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9151; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASW-15] received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1484. A letter from the Labor Member and Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Congressional Justification of Budget Estimates for Fiscal Year 2018, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

1485. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's FY 2018 Congressional Budget Justification for the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f(f); Aug. 29, 1935, ch. 812, Sec. 7(f) (as amended by Public Law 93-445, Sec. 416); (97 Stat. 436); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

1486. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the draft of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018"; jointly to the Committees on

Armed Services, Veterans' Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, Foreign Affairs, the Budget, the Judiciary, and Rules.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. Supplemental report on H.R. 10. A bill to create hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-153, Pt. 2).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 220. A bill to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 497. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain exchanged non-public lands, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 115-155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 660. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation to manage its infrastructure assets (Rept. 115-156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1135. A bill to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program (Rept. 115-157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1967. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to authorize pumped storage hydropower development utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs; with an amendment (Rept. 115-158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2372. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the rules relating to veteran health insurance and eligibility for the premium tax credit; with an amendment (Rept. 115-159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2579. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage; with an amendment (Rept. 115-160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2581. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the

provision of social security numbers as a condition of receiving the health insurance premium tax credit; with an amendment (Rept. 115-161, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2581 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 2769. A bill to prevent the application of the provisions of the individual mandate to individuals residing in rating areas with no qualified health plans offered on the Exchange; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 2770. A bill to allow individuals living in areas without qualified health plans offered through an Exchange to have similar access to health insurance coverage as Members of Congress and congressional staff; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. COOK, Mr. COLE, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 2771. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to revise an exemption to the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of that Act for certain seasonal workers in national parks and forests, and to amend title 41, United States Code, to include an exemption for contracts providing services directly related to recreational activities to the general public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MOORE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H. Res. 372. A resolution recognizing the significance of National Caribbean American Heritage Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 373. A resolution expressing support for the designation of June 2017 as "National Gun Violence Awareness Month" and calling on Congress to address gun violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

50. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to Resolution No. 40-34 (COR), urging expansion of the "Radiation-Exposed Veterans Compensation Act"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

51. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to Resolution No. 39-34 (COR), seeking compensation for cancer and other illnesses caused by exposure to ionizing radiation; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 2769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 2770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 2771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 48: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 83: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 104: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 105: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 113: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 358: Mr. PALMER and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 392: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 468: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 548: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 553: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 619: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 669: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 696: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 721: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 749: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 820: Ms. ROSEN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 858: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 901: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 911: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 916: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KNIGHT, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 930: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HOLDING, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LAR-

SON of Connecticut, Mr. SIREs, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 942: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1017: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1038: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 1059: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1090: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1141: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1225: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 1243: Mr. MAST, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1267: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1279: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 1310: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1318: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1414: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1422: Mr. COFFMAN and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 1599: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1666: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1669: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1671: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1673: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1676: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1698: Mr. O'HALLERAN and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1703: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1704: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1733: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1739: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1802: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 1828: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1889: Mr. HIMES and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1939: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1955: Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1957: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2051: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2091: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 2147: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2207: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2240: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 2408: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUCHSON, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2418: Ms. LEE and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2422: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BEYER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. KILMER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MENG, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2475: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 2495: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 2498: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2500: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2505: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 2515: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2581: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 2587: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 2616: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2652: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 2669: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2694: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 2703: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.J. Res. 7: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.J. Res. 101: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Ms. MENG.
H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. POE of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. BARTON.
H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H. Res. 218: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. VEASEY.
H. Res. 257: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. GABBARD.
H. Res. 282: Mr. CUELLAR.
H. Res. 318: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 347: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 349: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. EVANS.
H. Res. 361: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

47. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Mayor and City Council of Franklin, Louisiana, relative to a Resolution urging the United States Congress to enact legisla-

tion that will enable local governments to collect revenues already due that are essential to the maintenance and expansion of local and regional economies, the creation of thousands of new jobs, the enhancement of the quality of life, and the preservation of limited local revenue sources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

48. Also, a petition of City Council of Cincinnati, OH, relative to Resolution 37-2017, opposing House Resolution 1628, the American Health Care Act of 2017; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE LIFE OF ALMON
WILLIAM MARTIN

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Sergeant Almon William Martin, father of William Martin, Craig Martin, and Leslie Lederer and husband of Audrey June Martin. Sergeant Martin dedicated his life to serving his community and our Nation, serving in World War II as a tech sergeant in Europe and was interred at Arlington National Cemetery upon his passing in 2008.

Before serving in the United States Army, Sergeant Martin studied at Ohio Wesleyan University in Delaware, Ohio and completed his B.A. in Business Administration shortly after the conclusion of WWII. He then worked for the Gleason Corporation/Ingersoll Rand in Buffalo, New York where he advanced to the position of vice president and divisional manager for the state of New York and Northern Pennsylvania. Sergeant Martin stayed with the company until his retirement in 1985. Throughout his retirement, Sergeant Martin also served as a mentor to upcoming businessmen through the Small Business Administration Volunteer program and used his business experience to help small businesses in the Fort Myers area start up, organize, and expand.

Sergeant Martin was an active member of his community, serving in organizations like Amigos, Central Park Men's Club, Chi Phi Fraternity, Lions Club, Kenmore Rotary Club, and the Buffalo Kiwanis Club. Martin also served in the Construction Industry Association and was the vice president of the University Club of Buffalo, New York. An engaged citizen, Martin was active in politics and encouraged his neighbors to engage in politics at the local level. He coached little league baseball and football and was an active member of the Kenmore United Methodist Church.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize a life so fully lived. Almon Martin instilled the values of service, hard work, integrity, and service into his children, employees, and mentees, values that we should all strive to uphold in our daily lives. I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in paying tribute to a valued soldier and citizen, Sergeant Almon William Martin.

HONORING GONZALES CHIEF OF
POLICE PAUL D. MILLER

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Gonzales Chief of Police Paul D.

Miller on the occasion of his retirement after thirty-four years of distinguished service to the community of Gonzales.

Chief Miller has dedicated his entire career to the people of Gonzales, and our communities on the central coast of California. His career began in the Monterey County Sheriff's Explorer Program in 1978 where Chief Miller achieved the rank of Captain, the highest rank in that program. After completing the Explorer Program, Chief Miller joined the Gonzales Police Department (GPD), first as a reserve officer, and then a full-time officer in 1985. After being recognized as the Department Officer of the Year in 1987 and 1991, Chief Miller was promoted to the rank of Sergeant in 1992. He was recognized a third time as Officer of the Year in 1995, and as Department Supervisor of the Year in 2006 and 2007. In 2010, he was appointed as Chief of Police for the City of Gonzales, where he served with distinction for seven years.

A champion of proactive community policing, Chief Miller provided important leadership that helped the GPD make important strides in reducing gang violence and maintaining Gonzales as one of the safest cities on the Central Coast. Under the leadership of Chief Miller, the GPD weathered one of the toughest recessions in history, coordinated the construction of a new 10,000 square-foot police station, and took a leadership role in securing key grants for the police departments of South Monterey County. Chief Miller also guided the department as the lead South County police agency in securing several important grants that helped provide important tools to help break the cycle of gang violence that continues to plague our communities on the central coast. One of these key grants included \$500,000 in funding for the city of Gonzales through the California Gang Reduction Intervention and Prevention (CalGRIP) Program.

Mr. Speaker, as a former prosecutor who has worked closely with local police to prosecute violent criminal gang members, I know from experience that the work of taking and keeping these and other dangerous people off the streets of our communities is not easy. It requires dedication, perseverance, and the selfless willingness to put oneself in harm's way in service to others. Chief Paul Miller certainly embodies these qualities, and I wholeheartedly thank him for this service, and congratulate him on his well-deserved retirement. There is no doubt that his commitment to justice, security, and prosperity for his community will be missed.

IN RECOGNITION OF SAINT
LAURENCE PARISH

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Saint Laurence Parish in Upper Darby, Pennsylvania as it celebrates its 100th anniversary on June 10, 2017.

In 1917, Reverend Maurice C. Cowl became the first pastor of the Saint Laurence Parish. As Delaware County grew, the parish school opened its doors in 1919 and soon served many families.

The Saint Laurence School is still an award-winning institution in the community, committed to academic excellence. The parish school seeks to integrate Catholic values of service and respect. With the dedication and devotion of nearly ten pastors in the last hundred years, the Saint Laurence Parish is proud to serve nearly two thousand registered households in the Upper Darby and Havertown areas today.

Mr. Speaker, we are grateful for the work of the Saint Laurence Parish, its parishioners, and Reverend Sean F. O'Neill and I hope the church will continue to grow and thrive.

RETIREMENT OF PATRICIA
BROUGHTON

HON. NANETTE DIAZ BARRAGÁN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Patricia Broughton, a dedicated public servant who is retiring after serving five members of Congress in the Los Angeles Harbor Region. This week is Patricia's last week as my San Pedro caseworker. I like to call her a miracle worker.

Patricia is retiring after a 29 year long distinguished career advocating for the interests of constituents and our community. I extend my sincerest appreciation to her for her decades of dedicated service to the Los Angeles Harbor Region and our nation.

Patricia was born in Uniontown, Pennsylvania. She spent her formative years in Japan and returned to the United States in 1963. After her studies, she moved to Long Beach, California, and began her congressional career in 1989.

Over the years, Patricia has developed a reputation in the Los Angeles Harbor Region as a champion for constituents. My predecessors—including former Representatives Janice Hahn, Jane Harman, the late Steve Horn, and the late Glen Anderson—and I have received countless letters of appreciation from

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

those whose lives were positively impacted by Patricia, and in 2011 the Wilmington Coordinating Council awarded her their "Outstanding Civil Servant" award.

As I mentioned, Patricia is a miracle-worker, and has handled virtually every type of case that is referred to a congressional office. She has solved complex Social Security and Medicare claims for seniors, helped disabled veterans who were not receiving their earned disability checks, and assisted those who had trouble with the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Internal Revenue Service.

Patricia has been a voice for those in need and a source of comfort for those trapped in the bureaucratic maze that is the federal government. For example, Patricia successfully helped a Vietnam veteran get compensation with the Department of Veterans Affairs for a \$200,000 claim.

Among her many other responsibilities and accomplishments include organizing workshops for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals beneficiaries, and resolving thousands of casework files.

Patricia is also devoted to the humane treatment of animals. She heroically rescued a dog that was hit by a car and abandoned in front of my predecessor's district office, taking the injured dog home and making it a part of her family.

Her coworkers and I have enjoyed working with her and will miss her warm heart and signature elegance. Her compassion, persistence, and dedication have left a lasting mark on thousands of residents in my district and the Los Angeles Harbor Region.

I am sure that I speak for the dozens of people who have worked with Patricia throughout her career in congratulating her upon her retirement and extending our heartfelt gratitude for her remarkable dedication to public service.

CONGRATULATIONS ON THE RETIREMENT OF COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR SHANE LAKE

HON. KURT SCHRADER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Command Sergeant Major Shane Lake on his retirement from the Oregon Army National Guard.

Born in Farmington, New Mexico Command Sergeant Major Lake enlisted in the United States Army in 1990. Currently, he serves as the State Command Sergeant Major for the Oregon Army National Guard. While serving his country, Command Sergeant Major Lake also worked to earn a Bachelor of Science in Social Science with a minor in Psychology from Portland State University, and works as a Field Sales Engineer in the electronics industry.

Among his countless assignments throughout his exemplary military career, Command Sergeant Major Lake spent multiple overseas deployments to the Middle East and completed a number of humanitarian missions throughout the world. A highly decorated vet-

eran, just some of his service awards include the Bronze Star Medal, Meritorious Service Medal with three Oak Leaf Clusters, the Iraq Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal, and the Army Commendation Medal to name a few.

Command Sergeant Major Lake represents our very best that the great state of Oregon and our country have to offer. The State of Oregon, the Oregon National Guard, and his soldiers will miss the experience and leadership he brought to every mission.

I humbly thank Command Sergeant Major Lake for his many years of service to the State of Oregon as well as to our country. May his deserved retirement treat him well.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 2ND ANNUAL BARN BLAST

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to use this time to recognize the 2nd Annual Barn Blast, a local fundraising event in Leesburg, Virginia, for the INMED Family & Youth Opportunity Center. The INMED Opportunity Center is a program aimed to liberate children from the irreparable damages of hunger, abuse, and insecurity. They strive to equip struggling children with the skills and vision they need to build a future filled with opportunity and hope, and I am grateful for their service to our youth, the next generation of leaders.

INMED Opportunity Center, located in Sterling, Virginia, is a part of a program of INMED Partnerships for Children, an international humanitarian organization, established in 1986. The INMED Partnerships for Children was founded with the goal of tackling the pressing needs of children in the developed and developing world. The Opportunity Center serves as a crucial part of this larger organization as it offers a plethora of programs to support families in need in Loudoun County. Some examples include after-school academic and enrichment programs, summer camps, family education and support, career skills training, homelessness support, and mentoring.

This second annual fundraiser is an event that has garnered a great deal of popularity and community involvement. Located at the Murray Hill Estate in Leesburg, the event features live music, barbecue, dancing, and live and silent auctions. It is entertaining, community events, like the 2nd Annual Barn Blast event, that have helped this organization thrive and build its essential presence in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in recognizing the 3rd Annual Barn Blast and the INMED Family & Youth Opportunity Center and in thanking them for their commitment and service to our community. The efforts and contributions from the staff, volunteers, corporate sponsors, and our community are truly exemplary, and I wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

TOWN OF MILAN, MAY 28, 2017

HON. JOHN J. FASO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a speech I delivered in Milan on May 28, 2017.

Memorial Day. A day of remembrance to our fallen soldiers. A day when all Americans are reminded of those who gave their lives to defend our freedoms. This day is perhaps best honored by the phrase uttered by Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg. They gave to the cause of liberty, he said, "their last full measure of devotion."

Memorial Day is significant in that it is an enduring reminder of those who gave their lives for our nation. We live in a time when only a small percentage of American families have someone who is serving on either active duty or in the reserves. As such, it is all the more important that we gather together on this solemn day to honor their sacrifice.

So on this day, our obligation is not just to remember. It is also to teach our children and grandchildren that our liberty is more than just the words of the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution and its Bill of Rights. Those documents are the foundation stones of our system of government and the truth that governments derive their powers from the people and not the other way around. And further that the inalienable rights we enjoy as a free people come from God and not from government.

But none of this would be possible without the sacrifice of those we remember today. Inscribed on statuary at the National Archives Building in Washington is the phrase "Eternal Vigilance is the Price of Liberty." We need to constantly remind ourselves that freedom is not free. Our liberties are guaranteed us by our Constitution and Bill of Rights; but they were also made possible by the determination of multiple generations of Americans who answered their nation's call and who defended our liberties to the last breath on the fields of battle.

We stand on the shoulders of the fallen today. We owe them our eternal gratitude; our respect; and that their collective sacrifice is forever etched onto our collective memories.

I recently read a quote attributed to the son of a U.S. soldier killed in Afghanistan. He said of his father: "his life was not taken: it was given to his country."

His life was not taken: it was given to his country. He gave his life to defend our nation, so that others of us can live in freedom and liberty. That truly sums up what we should always remember about those we honor on Memorial Day. May God Bless our fallen soldiers; may God Bless our Veterans; and may God Bless the United States of America.

HONORING NATHAN RILEY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Nathan Riley. Nathan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and

leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1376, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Nathan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Nathan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Nathan has served his troop as the Senior Patrol Leader, become a Brotherhood member of the Order of the Arrow, and earned the rank of Warrior in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say. Nathan has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Nathan led a team in constructing a 52-foot free span truss bridge, first by removing the old, deteriorated wooden bridge, then designing and constructing two concrete revetments, assembling 2,800 pounds of steel trusses, decking the bridge, and having it all laid into place by a 90-ton crane. The project earned Nathan the Eagle Scout Service Project of the Year award from the Heart of America Council.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Nathan Riley for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH AND HOUSTON PRIDE WEEK

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate LGBTQ Pride Month and the remarkable progress that has been made in making our country more diverse and tolerant and embracing of differences in the 17 years since the cruel murder of Matthew Shepherd, a college student from Laramie, Wyoming.

As a country, America has made and continues to make great progress in the area of social equality, as evidenced most dramatically by the seismic shift in public support for marriage equality over the past decade.

Today, supporters of marriage equality dramatically outnumber opponents by 61–35 percent; a near total reversal from 2004, when opponents outnumbered supporters 58–39 percent.

Our country made progress in bringing our LGBTQ brothers and sisters, mothers and fathers out of the shadows with the repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” which I was proud to support.

Our nation is now stronger and our people are safer thanks to the sacrifices made by these brave Americans, who no longer need to choose between service and silence.

There have been other changes for the better.

In April 2015, President Obama issued a landmark Executive Order prohibiting discrimination against LGBTQ persons in the workplace.

This civil rights victory ensures the tax dollars used to pay government contractors support contractors that are committed to equal employment opportunity for all persons regardless of sexual orientation.

This legislation marks a major shift from a time when the U.S. Civil Service Commission prohibited the hiring of LGBTQ persons to a time when the Secretary of Defense has selected an openly gay man as his chief of staff.

And we are making progress in realizing the goal of making the H.R. 2282, the “Equality Act of 2017,” the law of the land so LGBTQ people will finally be guaranteed explicit, permanent protection under the nation’s existing civil rights laws against discrimination in vital areas of life, like employment, access to public spaces, housing, credit, education, jury service, and federally-funded programs.

It is unacceptable that in 31 states LGBTQ people can get married on Sunday and remain at risk of being fired or evicted on Monday simply because of who they are.

Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 48th Anniversary of the LGBTQ Civil Rights Movement, where activists such as Frank Kamney led the struggle for the voices of the LGBTQ community to be heard.

Frank Kamney’s courageous demonstrations inspired others to resist mistreatment and we witnessed in 1969 what happens when a community says enough is enough.

Our country has made progress since the Stonewall uprising of 1969, and with the support of equal rights for all communities by leaders such as President Barack Obama, more and more voices are being heard.

Mr. Speaker, although more remains to be done to realize the full promise of America that all are equally treated and protected by the law, it is undeniable that America is closer to realizing that promise than it was during the dark days of Stonewall.

So there is much reason for joy and optimism when my home city of Houston hosts “Wonderland,” Houston’s Pride Week celebration later this month, from June 18 to 25, 2017.

According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the 16th largest LGBTQ community in the nation is located in the Houston metropolitan area, which I am privileged to represent.

The Houston LGBTQ community is culturally diverse, economically dynamic, and artistically vibrant.

Houston Pride Week has been an annual event for the last 38 years, since 1979, and promotes the individuality of Houston’s ever-growing LGBTQ community.

The Pride Festival and Parade are at the center of a celebration annually attended by more than 600,000 people from Houston and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, as the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. reminded us, “Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that.”

All Americans should be deeply concerned over the increase in violence and acts of hate perpetrated against members of the LGBTQ community we have witnessed in recent months.

Especially troubling is the rise in bigotry and violent crimes against transgender people, particularly transgender women of color.

According to statistics compiled by the Human Rights Campaign, at least 22 transgender people in the United States lost their lives due to fatal violence, the most ever recorded.

Sadly, we are on pace to break this record in 2017, as 11 transgender persons have been killed in the first five months.

Mr. Speaker, I invite all Americans to visit Houston during Houston Pride Week to observe how we live out our conviction that “Love Will Conquer Hate.”

Progress is made through the efforts of courageous men and women who actively engage their communities and face adversity to ensure that the rights of all are clearly recognized and protected.

People like the legendary Bayard Rustin, who organized the 1947 Journey of Reconciliation which inspired the Freedom Rides of the 1960s and helped Dr. King organize the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and who was the driving force behind the historic 1963 March on Washington.

Texas natives such as Sheryl Swoopes, a 3-time WNBA Most Valuable Player and champion for the Houston Comets, and former Houston Mayor Annise Parker.

These leaders have set an example of what can happen when we lift the limits of inequality and support our fellow Americans in their pursuits of their inalienable rights.

Other members of the LGBTQ community whose contributions have enriched American culture and made our country better include the great poet Langston Hughes; Mandy Carter, 2008 national co-chair of Obama Pride and lifelong activist; Billy Strayhorn the musician and gifted composer whose 30-year collaboration with Duke Ellington gave the world some of the greatest jazz music ever; Tom Waddell, army medical doctor and Olympic athlete; and James Baldwin, one of the towering figures in the history of American literature.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to acknowledge the achievements of just a few of the countless number of Americans who overcame prejudice and discrimination to make America a more welcoming place for succeeding generations of LGBTQ community members.

RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN WILLIAM PERLSTEIN

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of a uniquely distinguished community leader, Captain William Perlstein, who has served the State of California as a Commander for the Highway Patrol. Bill began his career as a traffic officer in Hayward. He soon combined his career in law enforcement with his love of aviation, and trained to become a flight officer/paramedic, working on a CHP helicopter out of the Golden Gate Division. Subsequently, he became an instructor with the California Highway Patrol Academy and trained individuals on emergency medical procedures. As an instructor, he developed new emergency medical response programs, which helped to save lives across California.

Bill also encouraged transparency in policing and was promoted to work in the California Highway Patrol’s legislative affairs, working to

develop cooperation with traffic and law enforcement advisory groups. Bill eventually was promoted to provide technical advice to the California State Legislature and advocate for the California Highway Patrol at the Capitol. In this role, he was able to protect California police officers and ensure equal protection under the law. Bill also managed finances for the California Highway Patrol and provided leadership, guidance, and supervision to area personnel.

Most recently, Bill became Commander for the California Highway Patrol's Monterey Area. In this role he was able to establish goals, and develop strategies and tactics to keep the Monterey Bay area safe. Bill supervised employees and provided training and area management. He also ingrained himself within the community by joining the several organizations, including becoming a member of the steering committee for the Monterey County Gang Task Force; serving as treasurer of the Monterey County Chief Law Enforcement Officers Association; joining the Board of Directors of the Monterey Rape Crisis Center; and participating in the esteemed Leadership Monterey, a program aimed at providing the continuity of community stewardship.

Throughout his entire career, Bill has been dedicated to the safety and welfare of California citizens, including his own family: three wonderful children, Stephen, Matthew and Juliet, and his wife of twenty-four years, Stephanie.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize a distinguished law enforcement officer who has dedicated his life to supporting California families. I ask my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing a true public servant who embodies the spirit and values of a committed law enforcement officer, and to congratulate him on a well-deserved and well-earned retirement.

RECOGNIZING THE 15TH INTERNATIONAL FESTIVAL OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 15th International Festival of Language and Culture (IFLC).

For the past 14 years, the IFLC has been showcasing both the diversity of our world and the talent of our youth. The IFLC draws participants from over 160 countries, with over 1,000 student performers each year at numerous regional events across the globe. This year the IFLC will be hosting 100 students and their teachers from 20 different countries in our nation's capital.

In its 15th year, Washington, D.C. will be one of many world capitals co-hosting this international event. In honor of this year's theme, "Universal Compassion," students will exhibit their culture and traditions through poetry, songs, and dances as an expression of friendship, optimism, and hope. In a world of conflict and despair, this special event shows that celebrating diversity and peaceful coexist-

ence is possible, and that we can come together around our shared humanity.

I want to congratulate the students, parents, teachers, and volunteers of IFLC for their efforts. This event will continue to show the world that we can live and work together for a better future.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize the 15th IFLC.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MS. DYAN HAMILTON FRENCH COLE

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Ms. Dyan Hamilton French Cole, a New Orleans native and well known community and civil rights activist. Ms. Cole, affectionately known as "Mama D," passed away on May 20, 2017, at the age of 72.

Ms. Cole was a lifelong New Orleanian, and graduated from Joseph S. Clark High School. She was a relentless community activist, who would frequently attend city council meetings or other places where elected leaders were gathered to advocate for quality housing, recreation, and justice. Nearly every day, she headed to Orleans Parish Criminal District Court to advocate for young black men who were appearing in court that day.

Ms. Cole is best known for her support of the Stalling Gentilly Playground and serving as the first female President of the New Orleans Chapter of the NAACP in January 1975.

After Hurricane Katrina, when Ms. Cole refused to evacuate, she organized crews she called the "Soul Patrol," to go through her native 7th Ward and other neighborhoods, saving people, feeding them and finding them clothes, assistance and other relief. Ms. Cole housed numerous people at her home on North Dorgenois Street that some people referred to it as Recovery Camp Dorgenois.

On December 6, 2005, Ms. Cole was one of the representatives from New Orleans invited to testify before the House Select Committee on Hurricane Katrina. Ms. Cole spoke passionately of the disgraceful lack of assistance in the aftermath of the storm and the racial discrimination that flowed in the city.

Ms. Cole loved the city and the people of New Orleans. Her legacy will forever be a part of the city and her dedication to community embodies the spirit of New Orleans. Ms. Cole's survivors include a son, Byron Cole; a sister, Audrey Jackson; six grandchildren; and two great grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I celebrate the life and legacy of Ms. Dyan Hamilton French Cole, a beloved mother, sister, grandmother, great-grandmother, and example to aspiring community activists everywhere.

HONORING JOHN REED FOR 75 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE DAVENPORT HOTEL

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. John Reed of Spokane, WA for his 75 years of service to the historic Davenport Hotel.

John has been putting smiles on faces of those who come in and out of the Davenport Hotel for generations. He started working at the Davenport Hotel in 1943, at the age of 13, as a busboy in the Italian Gardens. Louis Davenport, the owner, taught him how to set up a table. His hard work and commitment provided him with an opportunity to become the doorman for the hotel, a position which he still holds at the age of 87. When asked if he plans to retire his response is "not any time soon."

Both local residents and guests of the Davenport can't help but smile when they are greeted by John, who wears a three piece suit, complete with a long red coat and black top hat to work. He has greeted John F. Kennedy, Bobby Kennedy, and George H.W. Bush in his time with the hotel and has said, "I enjoy being a doorman here and meeting and greeting people, and I'm proud to be a part of the Davenport."

Today, the Davenport will honor John with a board room in his name. His legacy and commitment to service will live on through this naming and his smile will always be remembered.

IN RECOGNITION OF CORLISS UDOEMA

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my constituent, Corliss Udoema, who is a successful entrepreneur and holds the unique distinction of being selected as the 2017 Virginia Small Business Person of the Year by the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA).

Corliss began her career in the federal government, where she worked with the U.S. Marine Corps, Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Army. Then after a successful 32-year career with the federal government, Corliss started Contract Solutions, Inc. (CSI) in 2006. CSI is a small business whose mission is to assist federal, state and local governments, private for-profit and non-profit clients, by offering professional staffing and management support services. Since its inception, CSI has thrived, as it has evolved from a one-person company to a multi-million-dollar business. CSI has proven to be a model for other businesses to emulate, which is why in 2013 it was chosen to participate in the U.S. Small Business Administration's esteemed Mentor-Protégé Program, designed to enable

successful companies to develop strong protégé firms by providing newer firms still in their nascent with various forms of business development assistance.

I am impressed by Corliss's dedication and how in just a mere decade she has transformed CSI from a small startup business into a tremendous success and engine of economic growth. Starting and operating any small business, let alone one as successful as CSI, is an incredibly arduous process, as small business owners face many challenges and obstacles. The success of CSI is a testimony to Corliss's hard work, commitment, and innovative ideas. In addition to her extensive and distinguished career in the federal government and private sector, Corliss has always found time to serve her community. She is the founder and president of Agape Love in Action, a nonprofit organization which provides support for those in need, and serves as a minister at Mount Olive Baptist Church in Centreville, Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Corliss Udoema for her extraordinary achievement. I look forward to her ongoing contributions to Prince William County's diverse and innovative small business community and I wish her the best in her future endeavors.

HONORING TANNER COOK

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Tanner Cook. Tanner is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1376, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Tanner has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Tanner has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Tanner has served his troop as the Den Chief, become a Brotherhood member of the Order of the Arrow, and earned the rank of Brave in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say. Tanner has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Tanner led a team in designing and constructing an outdoor worship center at Antioch Community Church in Kansas City, Missouri, leveling the area with paving stones, building a retaining wall, 15 benches, fire pit, and a walking path to the worship center.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Tanner Cook for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO GAIL BAXTER

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the lifelong service and success of Gail Baxter, the Superintendent of South Whittier School District, in my Congressional District in California.

The description of Mrs. Baxter you'd hear from those who know her best is that of a humble visionary whose inspirational leadership has empowered the students she serves to achieve beyond their dreams. She has been the catalyst for a 21st century transformation for South Whittier. Throughout her twenty-seven year career serving as an elementary school principal, Director of Special Education Programs, Associate Superintendent of Educational Services, and eventually Superintendent, Mrs. Baxter led the effort to incorporate new technologies into every district classroom to prepare students for the future they face. Always pushing the envelope, Mrs. Baxter intertwined a core curriculum with the changing technologies of the day.

Mrs. Baxter is the type of public servant we need in education, someone who promotes strong collaboration between educators and parents to inspire students to achieve. It is in that spirit that, on behalf of all the families who've benefitted from her service, I wish Gail a happy retirement and thank her for inspiring generations of students in the South Whittier School District.

IN RECOGNITION OF SUBSTITOOTH FAIRY

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Substitooth Fairy in Delaware County, Pennsylvania for earning a Chester and Delaware County SCORE 2017 Small Business Award.

SCORE is a non-profit organization that helps small businesses by providing them with mentorship and educational workshops. The small businesses that earn the SCORE Small Business Award "have demonstrated unique vision, innovation and achievement in support of America's economy and small business community."

Substitooth Fairy deserves this designation. When dental practices are short-staffed, they provide them with supplementary dental professionals. This allows those practices to maintain an efficient office, keep patients happy, and also creates new employment opportunities for dental professionals.

I congratulate Substitooth Fairy on their award. I am proud to serve them and the other small businesses in Pennsylvania's 7th District.

RECOGNIZING FOOD BANK OF THE SOUTHERN TIER

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Food Bank of the Southern Tier for being named Food Bank of the Year by Feeding America.

Feeding America is the nation's largest domestic hunger-relief organization, and Food Bank of the Year is the highest honor that it confers on a member organization. Food Bank of the Southern Tier is the smallest food bank ever to receive this honor, and also the first in New York.

Food Bank of the Southern Tier distributes food and grocery products to people in need throughout six counties in upstate New York through a network of more than 160 partner agencies. It also administers several direct service food distribution programs.

Food Bank of the Southern Tier was established in 1981 and continues to strive toward its mission of working together to build and sustain a hunger-free community, distributing over 11 million pounds of food and grocery items in 2016 alone.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Food Bank of the Southern Tier for being named Food Bank of the Year for its outstanding and dedicated service to the community of the Southern Tier of New York.

HONORING LANDON BEYER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Landon Beyer. Landon is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1333, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Landon has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Landon has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Landon has served his troop as the Senior Patrol Leader and earned the rank of Warrior in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say. Landon has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Landon constructed a boardwalk path in the Parkville Nature Sanctuary in Parkville, Missouri, to help preserve a muddy section of the trail.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Landon Beyer for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING PARTICIPANTS AND
MEMBERS OF THE D.C. CONGRES-
SIONAL ART COMPETITION COM-
MITTEE AND JURY

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the D.C. students who submitted artwork for the annual D.C. Congressional Art Competition. I also seek recognition for the members of the committee who volunteered to make this event a success, as well as the competition jurors—members of the community who judged the students' artwork. The competition will take place tomorrow, Saturday, June 3, 2017 at the Washington Center for Internships and Academic Seminars.

The Congressional Art Competition has taken place in all Congressional districts since 1982 to encourage students interested in participating in the arts. This year, my office received 120 submissions from students in grades 8–12 from public, charter, and private schools across the District.

The members of the D.C. Congressional Art Competition committee are from a variety of backgrounds in the community—academia, small business and local government. I am happy to recognize the following committee members for their tireless work in putting together this year's Congressional Art Competition:

Thomas Atkins, is a former member of my staff who has continued to serve as an advisor each year for this competition. We depend on Mr. Atkins because of his background and know-how in supervising our art competition when he was on our staff.

Yaida Ford, an attorney for Ford Law Pros P.C., has been a valued presence in our art competition in the past, and has come through yet again this year. She ensures that her firm can purchase valuable and useful gifts for the winners.

Tiffani Gomez, of Blick Art Materials, helps run art drives for the competition and gets the word out to students who may not have heard about the competition from our office. She was particularly helpful in getting out the word on social media.

Jennifer Littrell, Program Lead at Children's National Health System, is particularly helpful in getting the word out for the competition via creative flyers and other publications.

Patricia O. Mitchell is a Senior Systems Developer for Amtrak. I have known Patricia for many years and she has done essential work for the committee. Ms. Mitchell helps the committee reach out to food vendors for the reception.

Greg Scott is the Gallery & Exhibition Coordinator for the Children's National Health System. Our office partners with Children's National and they regularly hang the artwork of the student participants. Mr. Scott is also a curator and will be very helpful in the setup of the event.

Zoma Wallace, Art Bank Coordinator for the D.C. Commission on the Arts and Humanities, helps with day-to-day logistics for this event.

Her work and input is so valued that she also serves as a juror. Ms. Wallace held this dual role last year, and we are happy to have her on both teams again.

The following individuals served as jurors—judging the students' artwork and selecting the winners. I am deeply grateful to have each of them, for bringing their unique perspectives and individual talents to the panel:

Iwan Bagus is a photographer and professor at the University of the District of Columbia and American University. We are fortunate that Mr. Bagus has been serving on this competition's jury for many years and also helps secure prizes for the winners.

Aaron Bryant, Mellon Curator of Photography at Smithsonian National Museum of African American History and Culture, has been serving on the jury for the last two years. From his extensive work in the humanities, Mr. Bryant brings a wealth of knowledge as a judge this year.

Sarah Muse, Creative Coordinator for the Smithsonian American Art Museum, is a new member of the jury for 2017. We are happy to have her expertise on our judging panel this year.

Kevin Nunley is Vice-President of Student Affairs at The Washington Center. Our office enjoys a special partnership with The Washington Center, which has hosted the event for the last two years at their venue.

Jack Rasmussen is Director and Curator of the American University Museum at the Katzen Arts Center, and is also a new member of the 2017 jury. We are fortunate to have his expertise and insight as a judge this year.

Lissa Rosenthal-Yoffe is Executive Director at D.C. Arts and Humanities Education Collaborative and has been generous in serving on the jury for the last two years.

I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the committee members, jurors, participants and winners in this year's Congressional Art Competition.

IN RECOGNITION OF MAURICE EL-
AMIN FOR HIS DISTINGUISHED
CAREER WITH THE SOCIAL SECUR-
ITY ADMINISTRATION

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Maurice El-Amin for his outstanding career with the Social Security Administration. Mr. El-Amin has served the SSA with distinction during his career with the agency.

Mr. El-Amin has compiled an outstanding record of public service during his 33-year career with the SSA. He began his career with the agency as a Claims Representative in Dearborn, Michigan, where he helped residents access the Social Security benefits that they earned. Mr. El-Amin excelled in this position and has served in a variety of key positions in the Midwest, including as Operations Supervisor and District Manager in the SSA's Chicago office. Since 2012, Mr. El-Amin has worked as Area Director for Metro Detroit,

where he oversees the operation of 22 offices in Southeast Michigan and in the greater Toledo area. During this time, he has overseen a modernization of many of the SSA's services, including promoting increased use of on-line filing and eServices to facilitate improved service for Metro Detroit and its residents.

Mr. El-Amin's work has been key to ensuring that the SSA is able to meet the increased demands of the Midwest region. As Area Director, Mr. El-Amin oversaw the work of over 450 employees whose tireless efforts played a crucial role in the evolution of the SSA. He has also been actively involved in the agency's recruitment efforts and mentorship programs, which have been critical to attracting a new generation of talented public officials. Additionally, Mr. El-Amin has served as the Executive Liaison for the SSA Chicago Region's Black Advisory Affairs Council, which advises the Commissioner of Social Security on issues important to the SSA's African American employees. Mr. El-Amin's experience and perspective will be missed as he retires from the SSA after a long and distinguished career.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Maurice El-Amin for his work on behalf of the Social Security Administration. Mr. El-Amin's public service has played a significant role in helping the SSA effectively serve Americans throughout the country.

TRIBUTE TO MR. SCOTT GLABB

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a few moments today to honor one of my constituents, Mr. Scott Glabb, for his contributions to Orange County youth over the last twenty years.

Mr. Glabb has been an important figure as a teacher and wrestling coach at Santa Ana High School. After wrestling in college for Pacific University and Eastern Washington University, Mr. Glabb took his talents to Santa Ana High School in 1990, where he became a teacher and head wrestling coach.

Leading by example, Mr. Glabb's dedication has led Santa Ana High School to the California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) Championships year after year. Mr. Glabb also coached two individual National High School Champions: Tony Perez in 1998, and Jose Leon in 1999. He had similar success through coaching two female Wrestling State Champions: Lizette Tenorio in 2009, and Berenice Blanco in 2012.

Mr. Glabb focused on more than winning, and has always made an effort to better his students. He has taken kids from a challenging neighborhood and made them leaders. Because of his guidance, many have gone on to pursue higher education.

Recently, Mr. Glabb was inducted into both the California's Chapter National Wrestling Hall of Fame and the California State Wrestling Hall of Fame. Mr. Glabb's tremendous efforts are not left unnoticed and his accolades are well-deserved. More important than his awards is his impact, which made our community a better place.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Mr. Glabb and the positive impact he has made on the Santa Ana community.

HONORING THE VIETNAM VETERANS OF AMERICA CHAPTER
400

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary men and women from Oakland who gave their lives serving our country in the Vietnam War. I recognize their invaluable sacrifice and offer my gratitude for their bravery during a contentious time in American history.

Unfortunately, Vietnam veterans have not received the proper recognition for their service. Prejudice overshadowed praise, as many of the stigmas associated with the war wrongfully biased the public against the soldiers. Veterans have endured decades of misplaced criticism, blame and ignorance—this must be corrected.

It is time that we, as Americans, give these brave veterans the commendation they deserve. We must honor those who made the ultimate sacrifice to preserve our freedom and that of our country. It is critical that we acknowledge the important servicemen and women, as they are fundamental to the preservation of our democracy.

Since 1979, the Vietnam Veterans of America has served to support and advocate on behalf of this generation of Veterans. The organization has worked tenaciously to promote greater public awareness of the issues surrounding Vietnam-era veterans in attempts to reform the public's general perceptions. The VVA has given veterans a voice in our government, advocating on behalf of the injured, ill, and all others in need. By holding government agencies accountable, the VVA ensures equitable and beneficial policies for this generation and those past.

As someone whose father served in the Army, organizations like the VVA are incredibly important to me. I personally understand the sacrifices that these men and women make on a daily basis and believe they deserve my utmost respect.

I commend the Vietnam Veterans of America for installing the Vietnam War memorial honoring the 100 men from Oakland who were killed in action. This monument will serve as an important reminder of the sacrifices made to assure our freedom and the freedom of others. The memorial will help properly commemorate not only Vietnam Veterans, but all who dedicate their lives to serve and protect us on a daily basis.

On behalf of the 13th District, I thank the Vietnam Veterans of America for its dedication to aiding and bettering the lives of well-deserving Veterans in America.

IN RECOGNITION OF KATIE
SIMMONS HICKEY

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to acknowledge one of my constituents, Kate Simmons Hickey, for her exemplary leadership and steadfast commitment in her efforts to raise awareness for Leukemia and Lymphoma. She got involved with the Leukemia and Lymphoma Society in 2015 when she learned about the Man and Woman of the Year campaign. That year she was named the LLS Woman of the Year for the National Capital Area and the First National Runner Up.

Ms. Hickey, a lifelong resident of Great Falls and Langley High School graduate, was inspired to work with the Leukemia and Lymphoma Society after her father-in-law, Marty, passed away and her best friend went into remission from Lymphoma. She became involved in the Man and Woman of the Year campaign, which is a national 10-week fundraising competition, and two years ago, Ms. Hickey raised \$280,000 within that time frame, making her the second highest fundraiser in the nation and the strongest fundraiser in our region. Today, she has assumed a leadership role at the LLS and is responsible for picking Woman and Man of the Year candidates. Each year she aims to raise \$2.5 million in the 10-week period, and I commend her for her leadership and dedication to the LLS.

Along with her efforts with the LLS, Ms. Hickey is also heavily involved in her local community. She currently serves on the Celebrate Great Falls Board of Directors, an organization which for nearly 20 years has been responsible for planning community events and preserving many long time traditions in Great Falls.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in extending our sincerest congratulations to Ms. Hickey for all the work she has done for LLS and the Great Falls community. I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

HONORING THEA MEI LEE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR THE AFL-CIO ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of myself, and my colleagues PETER A. DEFazio, DEBBIE DINGELL, MARCY KAPTUR, BARBARA LEE, SANDER M. LEVIN, JAMES P. MCGOVERN, BILL PASCRELL JR., MARK POCAN, and ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT. It is our honor to rise today to join the many family, friends, and colleagues in extending our deepest thanks and appreciation to Thea Mei Lee, as she marks her retirement as Deputy Chief of Staff at the AFL-CIO.

Over the past twenty years, Thea has made an indelible impact on the AFL-CIO, fighting

for trade and economic policies for working families that would promote shared prosperity and sustainable growth. Thea began working for the AFL-CIO in March 1997 as the Assistant Director for the Trade Task Force, and was subsequently promoted to the positions of Director of Public Policy, Chief International Economist and Deputy Chief of Staff.

Thea led the fight against harmful trade agreements and policies negotiated in a manner damaging to working people's interests, including the North American Free Trade Agreement, the Central American Free Trade Agreement, Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China, the World Trade Organization; the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement, the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, the U.S.-China BIT, and many others.

Her work was instrumental to the defeat of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas, and the Multilateral Investment Agreement—harmful trade agreements that would have advanced profits over people and the planet.

She has testified on behalf of America's working people before both the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate. And, she has contributed valued work to the conversation around fair trade, including co-authoring A Field Guide the Global Economy.

She has often made the case for a fair and inclusive economy—eloquently and passionately on the PBS News Hour, CNN, Good Morning America, and NPR's All Things Considered among others. In 2013, she was named a "Top Lobbyist" by The Hill.

Thea has fought to ensure that all workers around the globe are treated with dignity and afforded fundamental labor rights as recognized by the International Labor Organization. And, she has mobilized workers, helping turn out thousands of working people to protest unjust WTO policies at "The Battle in Seattle."

The AFL-CIO sets a national standard in the fight for working Americans, in large part because of Thea's work. She has left her mark on this outstanding organization and a legacy that will continue to inspire others to ensure that fair trade benefits working Americans. Her career should encourage all elected officials to continue to focus on building a better, stronger, more inclusive economy for all the people of the United States.

We are honored to stand today to extend our heartfelt thanks and congratulations to Thea Lee for her outstanding leadership and good work as well as our very best wishes for many more years of health and happiness as she enjoys her retirement.

HONORING KOLLIN LARS
WILLIAMSON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Kollin Lars Williamson. Kollin is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop

1333, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Kollin has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Kollin has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Kollin has served his troop as the Patrol Leader, become a Brotherhood member of the Order of the Arrow, and earned the rank of Warrior in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say. Kollin has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Kollin led a team in restoring a section of trail in the Green Hills of Platte Wildlife Preserve in Parkville, Missouri, laying down mulch for a two hundred foot portion of the trail.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Kollin Lars Williamson for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING MAUDY SIMPSON-WRIGHT

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable hero, Maudy Simpson-Wright.

Maudy Simpson-Wright as born September 22, 1954 to the late Leroy and Annie Bell Simpson in Sumner, MS. She was the first born of twelve children. She faced many challenges in her up-rearing, but thanks to God she had a praying mother and grandparents (Clarence & Maudy Roby) of Minter City, MS. In 1960, she moved to Falcon, MS and lived with her uncle. Later that year, Maudy's mother met an married Lonzo Smith and moved into a new home. Maudy graduated in 1968 from Falcon Elementary School and graduated in 1972 from Quitman County High School. She attended Miller-Hawkins-Business College, Memphis, TN from August 1972–July 1973.

Her mother became sick and she came back home to take care of her. Sadly she passed away in December of 1983; this was heart-breaking for all twelve children left without a mother, but Maudy's grandmother stepped up to the plate.

In August 1973, she was blessed with a job as a secretary at Falcon Elementary School where she remained for 22 years until the school closed. The school then moved to Southside Elementary where she worked five more years and retired. Maud would later hold positions at the Grand Casino, Coahoma Community College, QCDO Daycare, and the Quitman County Sheriff Department. Currently, she is a Parent Coordinator at Quitman County Middle School.

She is a graduate of Coahoma Community College and Mississippi Valley State University. She has also completed coursework at Tougaloo College.

She met and married Mr. Booker Wright, Jr. in 2004. She has one son, Daryel Levon

Toles, and one granddaughter, Desiree Orange, whom she loves very much. Together, they have many grandchildren, nieces, nephews, cousins and other parent's children. She is a member of New St. John MB Church, Darling, MS under the leadership of Pastor Jimmy Jones.

Maudy loves Psalms 23, because of what it states: "The Lord is my Shepherd and I shall not want."

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Maudy Simpson-Wright, because she is definitely the epitome of an unsung hero.

IN RECOGNITION OF ELITE PUREED MEALS

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Elite Pureed Meals of Broomall, Pennsylvania for earning a Chester and Delaware County SCORE 2017 Small Business Award.

SCORE is a non-profit organization that helps small businesses by providing them with mentorship and educational workshops. Small businesses that earn a SCORE award "have demonstrated unique vision, innovation and achievement in support of America's economy and small business community."

Elite Pureed Meals deserves this designation. Colleen McCloskey was inspired to create Elite Pureed Meals while she operated an in-home care service. She witnessed a client lose a dangerous amount of weight due to swallowing difficulties and the unappealing food prepared for someone with that symptom. Colleen knew how important it was for him to have access to nutritious and appealing meals. She dedicated her small business to securing that access. Elite Pureed Meals prepares and delivers frozen pureed meals to those with swallowing disorders, helping them maintain a balanced diet and stay healthy.

I congratulate Elite Pureed Meals on their award. I am proud to serve them and the other small businesses in Pennsylvania's 7th District.

SULLIVAN COUNTY VETERANS CEMETERY

HON. JOHN J. FASO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a speech I delivered at the Sullivan County Veterans Cemetery on May 29, 2017.

Ladies and gentlemen, distinguished hosts, our Gold Star Mothers, and all honored guests: Thank you for gathering here with us on this observance of Memorial Day. It is my great privilege and distinct honor to speak to you today.

Memorial Day. A day of remembrance to our fallen soldiers. A day when all Americans are reminded of those who gave their

lives to defend our freedoms. This is perhaps best honored by the phrase uttered by Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg. They gave to the cause of liberty, he said, "their last full measure of devotion."

Here in the 19th Congressional District, the history of our Sullivan County neighbors has made an everlasting contribution to the principles of self-sacrifice, patriotism and freedom we commemorate each Memorial Day.

Sullivan County is the namesake of Major General John Sullivan, an officer of the Revolutionary War. Sullivan was a lawyer, politician, prisoner of war and military tactician who was selected by George Washington to carry out a difficult campaign against British forces and Loyalists in what was then the borderlands of New York and Pennsylvania. Sullivan was a towering figure who believed in the American experiment and rejected the entreaties of the British to lure him to their side. He had his feet planted firmly in the soil of this continent.

During the Civil War, New York provided more men and munitions to the Union cause than any other state. But it was Sullivan County that let the men march. Over 80 percent of all the leather goods used by the Union side where conditioned in the tanning vats of Sullivan County, including Monticello's 143rd Infantry Regiment. It has been said with justification that "the Civil War was won with boots tanned in Sullivan County." Each step of the journey to preserve the Union and destroy the evil of slavery began here.

Here at the Veterans Cemetery, we have a visual reminder in the form of Sgt. Kenneth Von Ronn's M60A3 tank. Sgt. Von Ronn was killed in action in Operation Iraqi Freedom. He was laid to rest in this place, downhill from his tank, fittingly inscribed on the marker as a "trooper and his mount." The vehicle today stands guard for all those here, opposing America's enemies for all eternity.

At Arlington National Cemetery, the 3rd US Infantry, the Old Guard, adorns thousands upon thousands of rows of headstones with American flags each Memorial Day. Each austere monument stands in perfect symmetry with the next. This is an act of gratitude to each individual warrior and the nation as a whole.

Memorial Day is an enduring reminder of those who gave their lives for our nation. We live in a time when only a small percentage of American families have someone who is serving on either active duty or in the reserves. As such, it is all the more important that we gather together on this solemn day to honor their sacrifice.

So too on this day, our obligation is not just to remember. It is also to teach our children and grandchildren that our liberty is more than just the words of the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution and its Bill of Rights. Those documents are the foundation stones of our system of government and the truth that governments derive their powers from the people and not the other way around. And further that the inalienable rights we enjoy as a free people come from God and not from government.

But none of this would be possible without the sacrifice of those we remember today. Inscribed on statuary at the National Archives building in Washington is the phrase "Eternal Vigilance is the Price of Liberty." We need to constantly remind ourselves that freedom is not free. Our liberties are guaranteed us by our Constitution and Bill of Rights; but they were also made possible by the determination of multiple generations of

Americans who answered their nation's call and who defended our liberties to the last breath on the fields of battle.

We stand on the shoulders of the fallen today. We owe them our eternal gratitude; our respect; and that their collective sacrifice is forever etched onto our collective memories.

I recently read a quote attributed to the son of a U.S. soldier killed in Afghanistan. He said of his father: "His life was not taken: It was given, to his country."

His life was not taken: it was given, so that others can live in freedom and liberty. That truly sums up what we should always remember about those we honor on Memorial Day. May God bless our fallen soldiers and may God bless the United States of America.

HONORING JACK SCHLEETER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jack Schleeter. Jack is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1376, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jack has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jack has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jack has served his troop as an Assistant Senior Patrol Leader, become a member of the Order of the Arrow, and earned the rank of Warrior in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say. Jack has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Jack constructed two 8 x 12 foot planters outside St. Stephen Lutheran Church in Liberty, Missouri, filling the planters with 6 bushes and 24 perennials.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jack Schleeter for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. CECILIA LAIDEMITT

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Mrs. Cecilia Laidemitt, the Associate Superintendent of Personnel and Administrative Services for the South Whittier School District. After a dedicated and impactful 52 years with the district, Mrs. Laidemitt is retiring at the end of this school year.

Mrs. Laidemitt is appreciated and admired by many in this community, and has set a high bar for those to follow her. From a young age, Mrs. Laidemitt knew teaching was her dream. She attended Whittier College, and later received her teaching credentials and began her career at Los Altos Elementary School.

Over the years she has served in a number of roles including teacher, principal, and Director of Curriculum. In each position she has brought her inspiring attitude and passion for learning. Mrs. Laidemitt often stated how she "loved seeing the light go on for students." And it's this passion that has made her successful and cherished.

Her dedication and hard work has not gone unnoticed in the community; she is beloved by all she encounters. A truly admirable public servant, I wish Mrs. Laidemitt a happy and well-deserved retirement. You are an inspiration to us all, and your wisdom and kindness will be greatly missed.

IN RECOGNITION OF KRISTIN WEAVER

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an extraordinary Veterans Service Officer (VSO) in Northern Virginia, Kristin Weaver, for the incredible impact she has had on individuals, families, and communities in Virginia's 10th District and beyond.

Ms. Weaver is currently an American Legion Veterans Service Officer, representing the 16th District in Virginia, which includes the Cities of Manassas and Manassas Park and the counties of Culpeper, Fauquier, Loudoun, Prince William, Rappahannock and Stafford. In this role for the past 5 years, she has assisted 20 to 30 veterans per month on a variety of issues, including helping with disability claims, assisting with health and/or financial issues, and more.

It is also important to note that in addition to the excellent services Ms. Weaver provides to veterans on a daily basis, she also places an importance on training other VSOs. In fact, over the last five years she has trained approximately 350 VSOs in course work covering all types of veterans' benefits. Additionally in that time, Ms. Weaver has gone above and beyond in her role, often opening her home on Saturdays to help as many veterans as possible. It is important that we recognize and help our service members, military retirees, and their families who have all made sacrifices for our great country, and I am very thankful for Ms. Weaver's hard work.

Her dedication to improving the lives of veterans in Northern Virginia is evident through her years of service. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking Ms. Kristen Weaver for all she has done. I wish her the best as she continues her work helping veterans and with all of her future endeavors.

DISAPPROVING PRESIDENT'S DECISION TO WITHDRAW FROM PARIS CLIMATE AGREEMENT

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to the Presi-

dent's misguided, short-sighted, and disastrous decision to withdraw the United States from participation in the Paris Climate Agreement.

Since the end of World War II, the United States has proudly carried the mantle of global leader of the international community.

American leadership brought us the United Nations, the World Bank, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the Marshall Plan, which helped rebuild a continent decimated by war and secure a peace that has lasted for more than 70 years.

As a senior member of Congress, a member of the Helsinki Commission, and member of the American delegation to the 80th Inter-Parliamentary Meeting of European Union and United States Legislators, one of my responsibilities is to work with the delegation's European counterparts on cooperative efforts to address and resolve issues of mutual concern.

This is becoming increasingly difficult because in less than 150 days, President Trump has done more to damage relations with our allies and the standing of the United States in the world than all of his predecessors combined.

On his maiden trip abroad as the leader of the United States, Trump embarrassed our country and alienated our allies by failing to affirm our commitment to Article 5 of the NATO charter which regards an attack on any NATO member as an attack on all of them.

Driving a wedge between the United States and its European allies has been the long sought strategic objective of the Russians since the formation of NATO in 1949.

Compounding his disastrous performance at the NATO summit, the President has now renounced America's commitment to the landmark Paris Climate Agreement, which encourages all nations to set and reach national climate goals every five years.

The U.S. played the pivotal role in drafting the agreement, forging consensus, and securing the assent of 195 nations.

In withdrawing from the agreement, Trump has elected to place the United States in the company of Syria and Nicaragua as the only countries not to accept by the Paris Agreement.

As U.S. Senator Lindsey Graham stated, by withdrawing from the Paris Agreement, Trump is affirming that "he believes climate change is a hoax."

Mr. Speaker, climate change is not a hoax invented by the Chinese, and the Paris Agreement is an example of America's indispensable global leadership.

Almost every credible scientific voice tells us human activity has and continues to have a dramatic impact on climate change.

Moreover, scientists have warned that inaction by the major industrialized nations of the world could lead to global catastrophe.

According to NASA researchers, 16 of the 17 warmest years in the last 13 and a half decades have occurred since 2001.

Evaporation patterns have shifted producing more frequent and powerful storms.

The United States is the world's second largest contributor to carbon dioxide emissions in the atmosphere.

Experts say the resulting polluted runoff is degrading water quality.

As the founder of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I believe we have a duty to leave the planet we inherited in better shape for the generations that follow.

According to the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), changing weather conditions is cited as one of the main causes of trauma to children.

According to the AAP, between 2000 and 2009, there have been three times as many extreme weather events as occurred between 1980 and 1989 and that following climate-related natural disasters, high numbers of children are found to exhibit symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder.

Children under one year of age are especially vulnerable to heat-related climate change and there is more than a 90 percent chance that by the end of the 21st century average summer temperature will exceed the highest temperatures yet recorded in many regions.

According to the World Health Organization, more than 88 percent of diseases attributable to climate change occur in children younger than five.

By 2030, climate change is expected to lead to 48,000 more children under the age of 15 dying from diarrheal disease in 2030, primarily in Asia and sub-Saharan Africa.

And in the world's poorest regions, where the disease burden is disproportionately high, children will be the most affected by climate change influenced infectious diseases such as malaria, dengue fever, West Nile virus, chikungunya, Lyme disease, Rocky Mountain spotted fever, diarrheal illness, amebic meningoencephalitis and coccidioidomycosis.

The President has often questioned the value of the Paris Agreement but has yet to provide any scientific or empirical basis to reject the consensus of experts that human activity is a leading contributor to climate change.

Indeed, if the President had any legitimate concerns regarding the efficacy of the Paris Agreement, he could and should work with

America's partners to address and resolve them.

He has made no attempt to do so.

According to a recent Gallup poll, 54 percent of Americans believe that climate change is a serious problem.

As a Member of Congress, I have always acted on the basis of facts and promoted policies that are both aspirational and grounded in reality.

I have endeavored to always seek the truth by discerning what is real from what is fake.

And when it comes to the issue of climate change, I have listened to the scientists.

The President's isolated and short-sighted view threatens to quash years of deliberation and work by corporate leaders, scientists, educators, social actors and others who work tirelessly to protect the planet.

Withdrawing from the Paris Agreement would be disastrous, not only because it jeopardizes America's status as a world leader, but also because such action will undermine our competitiveness in the emerging clean-environment global economy.

According to studies, China is the world leader in renewable energy investment, pouring more than \$78 billion into renewable energy projects last year alone.

In contrast, the United States invested less than \$24 billion last year.

Many jobs are at stake, and that means non-participation in the Paris Agreement could undermine American economic interests.

We cannot afford to be left behind as the rest of the world moves toward a clean economy future.

A resounding bipartisan chorus has called for continued American observance of the Paris Agreement.

From Republican and Democratic Governors to Members of Congress to our NATO allies, the chorus of voices counseling against withdrawal continues to grow.

Americans want their country to lead the battle against climate change and for a healthy planet.

The President needs to recognize that he represents the entire country; not just the Trump Organization.

Trump needs to remember that he is the President of the United States of America.

If the President truly wants to ensure this nation's continuing greatness, then he will reverse his decision to renounce America's continued participation in the Paris Climate Agreement.

HONORING CARSON SCHUTTER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Carson Schutter. Carson is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1333, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Carson has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Carson has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Carson has served his troop as the Senior Patrol Leader, become a Brotherhood member of the Order of the Arrow, and earned the rank of Warrior in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say. Carson has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Carson removed an old foot bridge and built a new, extended foot bridge in Parkville Nature Sanctuary in Parkville, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Carson Schutter for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

SENATE—Monday, June 5, 2017

The Senate met at 3:01 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TODD YOUNG, a Senator from the State of Indiana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Mighty God, the source of all life and the light of all seeing, lift our thoughts from the smallness of our labors to the greatness of Your majesty.

We pray for the victims of the terrorism in the United Kingdom.

Teach our lawmakers to love in the presence of hate, to forgive in the presence of injustice, and to illuminate in the presence of darkness. Make them light bearers in the midst of darkness as they strive to live lives that reflect Your glory. Lord, may the promise of Your love be experienced in all their relationships.

Be for us all a helper and a shelter in the time of storm.

And Lord, we thank You for the life and legacy of Jim Bunning.

We pray in Your righteous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TODD YOUNG, a Senator from the State of Indiana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. YOUNG thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REUNIFICATION OF JERUSALEM

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 176, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 176) commemorating the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

LONDON TERROR ATTACK

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let me first express the profound sadness that we all felt this past week about the terrorist attacks in London. My heart is with the people of that great city and with the victims of this string of attacks and their families. They are all in our prayers.

The morning after the attack, I was walking down the street in New York, and I saw a husband and wife—they looked like out-of-towners—with three beautiful little girls, and the girls were skipping along happily. When they are with their parents when they are little, they get so happy. I thought: God, what if a bomb blew up and killed them. It just got to me.

So we really feel for these people who were just taken from us much too soon by vicious, almost inexplicable viciousness.

In this moment of trial for one of our fiercest friends and allies, the United States also stands shoulder to shoulder with the citizens of the UK in our joint fight against terrorists and those who support them.

We wish a swift recovery to the injured and comfort to the victims and their families. We certainly hope the perpetrators are swiftly brought to justice.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. President, on infrastructure—another matter—we know President Trump will spend this week unveiling his infrastructure proposal in several phases. We will have to wait and see what the full details of the plan are be-

fore we judge it, but we Democrats welcome a discussion on infrastructure.

We believe the Federal Government ought to invest more, not less, in rebuilding our roads, bridges and highways, our schools, electric grids, and our water and sewer systems. We should be investing in expanding broadband, which is so vital for our rural areas and a number of urban areas that are still underserved.

So we have several concerns about the President's upcoming proposal, considering the President actually cut infrastructure investment significantly in his budget proposal to Congress. How can you be for infrastructure and then cut all of these proposals in your budget? That is what he did.

Now, unfortunately based on recent reports, the entire focus of the President's infrastructure proposal this week is on privatization, which sounds like a nice word. But when you scratch beneath the surface, it means much less construction and far fewer jobs, particularly in our rural areas. It also means Trump tolls from one end of America to the other.

If President Trump wants the private sector to finance the construction of infrastructure, it is going to demand a price. That is how the private sector works. The financiers will look to turn a profit. Let's remember that there is no such thing as a free lunch. If the financiers put in money, they are going to want to take it back.

How are they going to turn a profit on infrastructure? Tolls, tolls, and more tolls—tolls paid by American workers, salesmen, truckdrivers, vacationers, and commuters; tolls paid by working families, middle-class families, and consumers of all stripes. A private-sector-driven infrastructure plan means tolls, tolls, tolls paid by average working Americans.

It also means that infrastructure that can't be built with tolls—like repairing our crumbling schools, for instance—will get left behind. Moreover, a scheme that relies on private investment will leave rural areas of America behind. My friend the Republican Senator from Wyoming, a member of the Republican leadership, Mr. BARRASSO, who understands the needs of his very rural State said: "Funding solutions that involve public-private partnerships do not work for rural areas." That is not CHUCK SCHUMER speaking, although New York has the third largest rural population in America. That is Senator BARRASSO speaking.

Let me repeat what he said: "Funding solutions that involve public-private partnerships do not work for rural areas."

That is the Republican Senator from Wyoming, saying an infrastructure proposal that involves privatization ignores a huge portion of the United States—rural areas—where infrastructure investment is greatly needed. When a Republican Senator says that, we all ought to pay attention at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Privatization also ignores the ongoing maintenance needs of many of our Nation's more populated areas. Sure, maybe if the toll is high enough, a private company could build a shiny new bridge, but they won't do anything to fix the crumbling railroad switches, potholes, and water main breaks that are plaguing so many of our cities, particularly in the older areas—the Northeast, the Midwest.

One aspect the President highlighted today is privatizing our air traffic control systems. This would put the same airline companies that have added baggage fees and change fees and shrunk leg room in charge of the air traffic control system. Worse still, it would let the airlines charge consumers even more than they charge now.

If air traffic control is privatized, where are the protections for consumers? What will prevent costs of flying from going way up? Under a private system, what stops airlines from raising fees and taxes on consumers?

So privatization, whether it is for the construction of roads and bridges or in aviation, often leaves the average American with the short end of the stick and gives big corporations way too much power.

So, again, we will wait and see what the President proposes. We want to discuss infrastructure. We want to work with him on infrastructure. But if it is all or mostly privatization with minimal public investment, it will not be an effective way to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure. It will cost middle-class families more, and it will not create the kind of jobs our economy needs.

Let's not forget that the President proposed a trillion-dollar infrastructure bill in the campaign. We Democrats were encouraged to hear this. It is one of the first things I talked with President-Elect Trump about on the phone, but so far we have been disappointed.

Senate Democrats put forward a real, trillion-dollar infrastructure plan that would create millions of jobs and actually fix our crumbling roads and bridges while investing in every corner of America. We stand ready and willing to work with the President on a real plan that actually achieves what he promised on the campaign trail. But, unfortunately, if this week, on infrastructure, is all about privatization, it is going to be another broken promise that President Trump made to the working people of America.

JAMES COMEY TESTIMONY

Mr. President, later this week, former FBI Director James Comey will be testifying before the Senate Intelligence Committee. I am glad he is doing so in the open and on the record. I hope he is as forthcoming as possible. Transparency and openness is absolutely vital if we are to get to the bottom of the events of the past few months. Knowing James Comey a little bit, transparency and openness have always been his way.

I would expect that Mr. Comey's appearance before the Senate Intelligence Committee will not be his last appearance before Congress. I know the Senate Judiciary Committee has made a similar request of Mr. Comey. I support their request, and I hope he will go before them as well.

PARIS AGREEMENT

Finally, Mr. President, a few words about the Paris climate accord. I was deeply disappointed by President Trump's decision last week to start the process for withdrawing the United States from the Paris Agreement, an agreement signed by every sovereign nation, except Syria and Nicaragua—Nicaragua, by the way, because they thought the agreement didn't go far enough.

The decision will ultimately be viewed—the decision by Trump to pull out of the Paris climate accord—as one of the worst decisions of the 21st century because of the huge damage it will do to our economy, our environment, and our geopolitical standing.

Pulling out of the Paris Agreement doesn't put America first. It puts America alone and last. It puts America last in recognizing science, in being a world leader in protecting our own communities and working in concert with the family of nations in safeguarding the planet we all inhabit for future generations.

Climate change is an issue where time unfortunately is not on our side. Every year that we don't work toward lowering our carbon emission standards is another year of irrevocable damage to the environment. Future generations will look back on this decision as a failure of historic proportions.

President Trump's decision to withdraw is also a sucker punch to American workers, who should be building the next generation of wind turbines and solar panels. Now other countries, including China, our economic rival, will seize the mantle of innovation and clean energy away from America.

Listen to this. This astounded me. Just last month, Ernest & Young published the latest edition of a report ranking nations by how attractive they are for renewable energy investment. For the first time, China and India both outrank the United States. So on one of the newer technologies that will ultimately be cheaper than the exist-

ing technologies, we are already falling behind and will fall further behind. Imagine that China and India are now ranked by Ernst & Young as being better places for renewable energy investment. That is not going to help American jobs next year and certainly over the next decade.

It is a devastating loss to our economy, and the workers who would have benefited greatly from America's leading the way forward in a new industry will lose out.

Moreover, if the United States doesn't have a seat at the table with the nations in the Paris Agreement, other nations could agree on policies that hurt American businesses and American workers, even more than this self-inflicted wound by President Trump.

Now, I am glad that States like my State of New York and cities and businesses across the country are already stepping up, reaffirming their commitment to the goals set in Paris and pledging to continue to make progress in the fight against climate change. Our economy and our communities will be better for it.

I seriously hope that the President reconsiders his decision for the sake of our planet, for the future of the American economy, and for the future of American jobs, which thrive on the kind of innovation President Trump has just turned his back on.

Thank you, and I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

LONDON TERROR ATTACK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, over the weekend, our friends and allies suffered yet another tragic loss as terrorists struck in London, claiming several innocent lives and injuring dozens more. Our steadfast allies, the British, have confronted terrorism for decades, and our friends have endured so much these past several months at the hands of terrorists. Our hearts go out to them.

The Senate holds the victims of the attack and their families in our thoughts, and we once again express our gratitude to all of the first responders, medical professionals, and citizens who bravely stepped in to help.

Our fight against terrorism will go on, and together we will target terrorist networks and propagandists. We will continue to stand by the British people, especially in this time of great difficulty.

Mr. President, this week marks the 50th anniversary of the beginning of the Six-Day War. Confronted by the massing Arab armies and the closing of the Tiran Straits, Israel responded, and in a fight for survival, ultimately prevailed. As a result, the city of Jerusalem was finally reunified after years of division. The reunification of the

city allowed for people of all faiths to worship and to access the respective holy sites throughout Jerusalem.

In honor of this significant anniversary for our close ally, many Senators from both sides of the aisle—including the Democratic leader and myself—are joining together in a resolution to mark the occasion today.

While we know Israel continues to face a number of threats, bipartisan adoption of this resolution will serve as yet another indication of the commitment of the United States of standing by our friends in Israel. I look forward to supporting it later this afternoon and working to strengthen our relationship with that nation in the years to come.

REMEMBERING JIM BUNNING

Mr. President, on May 26, the Commonwealth of Kentucky lost a legendary figure with the passing of Senator Jim Bunning. For more than two decades, Jim was my colleague here in Congress. Before that, he was a storied Major League Baseball pitcher, earning him a spot in Cooperstown. Today, I remember Jim Bunning, a Hall of Famer in life.

Jim's career in the majors spanned 17 seasons, where he pitched primarily for the Tigers and the Phillies. In that time, he earned 224 career wins and struck out 2,855 batters. Of his many impressive accomplishments on the diamond, Jim's two greatest pitching achievements were his no-hitter in 1958 and the perfect game he threw in 1964, a feat that has only been accomplished 23 times in all of baseball history.

In recognition of his career with the Phillies, the team retired Jim's No. 14 jersey, and his baseball career was finally capped off by his election to the Hall of Fame in 1996 by the Veterans Committee.

Anyone would be proud with such a resume, but for Jim it was only the first act. Jim moved back to Fort Thomas in northern Kentucky. Over the next three decades, he served at all levels of government, from the Fort Thomas City Council to the Kentucky State Senate, to both Chambers of the U.S. Congress, including 12 years in the House and 12 in the Senate. Jim dedicated his life to serving the people of Kentucky, and Kentuckians are truly grateful for his work.

He was a man of principle from start to finish. He stayed true to himself. As Congressional Quarterly once wrote, "All agree . . . that [Bunning] is unafraid to go his own way." Throughout his career, Jim took many principled stands, even if it meant standing alone. In his farewell address to the Senate, he said: "I have been booed by 60,000 fans in Yankee Stadium, standing alone on the mound, so I never cared if I stood alone in Congress, as long as I stood by my beliefs and my values."

That summed up Jim Bunning, but in his life, Jim really never did stand

alone. Through trials and hardships, he always had his loving wife Mary by his side. Jim would have been the first to tell you that his success in life would not have been possible without Mary. She stood with him through both the glory and the hardships of his baseball career, and was, in Jim's words, his "rock," his "best fan," and his "best friend." Together, they helped raise the nine children Jim is survived by today. He is also survived by 35 grandchildren—one of whom, by the way, once worked in my office—and 21 great-grandchildren. It is clear the two most important things to Jim were always his family and his deeply held Catholic faith.

Jim was a man of strong beliefs and good character. Never one to make excuses, he worked hard at whatever he put his mind to; first, in baseball as a legendary pitcher and then as a voice for the people of Kentucky for over 30 years. With an unshakeable commitment to his family and the firm principles guiding him, Jim was truly a "hall of famer" in life.

On behalf of the entire Senate family, I would like to offer heartfelt condolences to Mary, their family, friends, and all who knew and loved Senator Jim Bunning.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to talk about a subject that is near and dear to the Presiding Officer's heart, as well as to this Senator, because we both have had the privilege of serving on the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee.

Congress finds itself facing a year of deadlines, and the two most talked about are the debt ceiling and continued funding for the government. But if that were not enough, a very important deadline is looming that affects the safety of the traveling public. By the end of September, Congress must reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration or risk the shutdown of the agency's core safety mission.

This Senator has the privilege of being the ranking member of the Senate Commerce Committee, and I have the privilege of working with the chairman, Senator THUNE, on a comprehensive and long-term FAA reauthorization bill. Unfortunately, what prevented the long-term bill from passing Congress last year is threatening to do the same again this year.

This morning, the White House formally announced its intention to pri-

vate the air traffic control function of the FAA, a move the White House claims will be self-sustaining. This so-called plan for ATC privatization includes an entity that would be run in large part by—you guessed it—the major airlines, and that entity would receive, free of charge, government-owned FAA assets, and that entity would collect user fees to finance its operations.

Well, this is how many of us interpret this proposal: Let's hand over to the airlines all the people and the equipment essential to the safe operation of our Nation's air traffic control system and trust them—the airlines—to manage our skies and the increasing air traffic. On top of that, here on the other side, they say: Well, let's finance the airlines' control of our skies through user fees paid for by the general aviation community.

We know that several airlines in the past year have had to cancel thousands of flights and strand passengers at airports for hours because they couldn't effectively manage their IT systems. How can we trust airlines to govern an entity that manages our skies when they can't even manage their own basic IT systems?

The FAA, our government's Federal Aviation Administration, safely and effectively manages the largest and most complex airspace in the world. Supporters of air traffic control privatization can cite other countries all they want that have privatized, but none of those privatized systems hold a candle to the complicated and densely populated air traffic system the FAA has accomplished.

Rather than helping the FAA continue its progress toward modernizing our air traffic control system through NextGen—that is being implemented as we speak, and in 3 years, the process of handing off most of the air traffic to satellites instead of ground-based radar—that is in just 3 years. On the other hand, the transition to a privatized air traffic control entity is only going to disrupt and delay the FAA's modernization efforts.

One has to ask, if it isn't broken, what exactly is the administration trying to fix?

We actually have real issues that need to be addressed in this FAA bill, such as continuing to safely integrate drones into our Nation's airspace, reforming the process for aircraft certification, and, very importantly, helping the FAA hire more air traffic controllers. We need to work to ensure that consumers, the flying public, have real protections in place that protect them when things go wrong. I wish the administration would focus on those issues, which received nearly unanimous support in the Senate last year, rather than try to up-end the world's safest air traffic control system.

Let's not get sidetracked by proposals that have neither bipartisan

consensus in Congress nor agreement among aviation stakeholders. Last year we came very close to enacting a bipartisan and comprehensive FAA bill. It passed the Senate 95 to 3, although it didn't have air traffic control privatization. I know we can do it again, and I look forward to working with Senator THUNE and the members of the committee, who will have the first crack at this when we bring up the FAA bill. Hopefully we can go with a consensus bill that will give us an authorization for the FAA for many years—5 to 7 years into the future—so that we can have the certainty of the authorization with which to continue to build a safe airline and air safety record and implement the next generation of air traffic control.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question now occurs on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 138 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Cassidy	Enzi
Baldwin	Cochran	Ernst
Barrasso	Collins	Feinstein
Blumenthal	Coons	Fischer
Blunt	Corker	Franken
Boozman	Cornyn	Gardner
Brown	Cortez Masto	Gillibrand
Burr	Cotton	Graham
Cantwell	Crapo	Grassley
Capito	Cruz	Harris
Cardin	Daines	Hassan
Carper	Donnelly	Hatch
Casey	Durbin	Heinrich

Heitkamp	McCaskill	Schatz
Heller	McConnell	Schumer
Hirono	Moran	Scott
Hoeven	Murphy	Shaheen
Inhofe	Murray	Shelby
Isakson	Nelson	Stabenow
Johnson	Paul	Strange
Kaine	Perdue	Tester
Kennedy	Peters	Thune
King	Portman	Udall
Klobuchar	Reed	Van Hollen
Lankford	Risch	Warner
Leahy	Roberts	Warren
Lee	Rounds	Whitehouse
Manchin	Rubio	Wicker
Markey	Sanders	Wyden
McCain	Sasse	Young

NOT VOTING—10

Bennet	Menendez	Tillis
Booker	Merkley	Toomey
Duckworth	Murkowski	
Flake	Sullivan	

The resolution (S. Res. 176) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the preamble is agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 24, 2017, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table.

The Senator from Nevada.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nevada.

S. RES. 176

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. Res. 176, which was just adopted by the Senate.

This important resolution reaffirms the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995, which recognized Jerusalem as the capital of Israel by moving the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

As many of my colleagues know, this week marks 50 years since Jerusalem was unified during the Six-Day War, and I am pleased to have joined Leader MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER as an original cosponsor of this resolution to commemorate this important anniversary. I thank them for their leadership on this issue, and I am proud to stand beside them in our commitment to one of our oldest and strongest allies, Israel.

This resolution sends a message to our friends in Israel, and that message is this: We support moving our Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

Let me explain why this issue is so important to me.

It has been 22 years since the Jerusalem Embassy Act became law. However, our country's promise to move

the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem is yet to be fulfilled. It has been 22 years, and we still have not moved our Embassy. We have had 22 years to enforce this law, and year after year we continue to turn a blind eye to what we are expected—and what we promised—to do. Jerusalem is the capital of Israel, and that is where the U.S. Embassy should be located. Now is the time to move the Embassy as we committed to do so many years ago.

By the way, many Nevadans feel the same way I do. One Nevadan who supports relocating the Embassy said in a letter to me:

It is never wrong to do the right thing. And moving our embassy to Jerusalem is the right thing to do.

As we commemorate the reunification of Jerusalem, I encourage my colleagues to honor our commitment and to show Israel, one of our oldest and closest allies, that we stand with them today more than ever.

Today's vote represents an important step in the right direction, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in finally enacting what is current law.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, often, upon returning from a week in my State when the Senate is out of session, I like to talk about some of the things I saw in Ohio. Much of that week I spent at roundtables at Akron Children's Hospital, in Cleveland, Dayton, Cincinnati, Columbus, Toledo, and Youngstown—over the last couple of weeks but especially last week—talking about what Medicaid cuts would mean to my State. I throw in with Governor Kasich, the Republican Governor, who has admonished his colleagues—first in the House and now in the Senate—to not repeal the Affordable Care Act, to not throw, literally, 900,000 people who have insurance in Ohio today off insurance, as the House bill would do. At the same time, one thing we also know is that the average 60-year-old in Ohio will see her premiums go up \$1,600 a year.

We all know the terrible problem opioid addiction has inflicted on hundreds of thousands of people in our country. Unfortunately, my State has had more opioid deaths pretty much every month—certainly, over the last year—than any State in the United States of America. Today 200,000 Ohioans are getting opioid treatment who

are able to get that treatment because they have insurance under the Affordable Care Act.

Think about the 26-year-old who is on her mother's health insurance plan who gets opioid treatment. Think about the family with the 5-year-old with a preexisting condition who will no longer be able to get insurance and who gets insurance because of the Affordable Care Act, because we fixed the preexisting condition exclusion. If the House version were to pass, or something similar to it, that family would lose its insurance. There was example after example. That is one of the reasons the House of Representatives had so much trouble repealing the Affordable Care Act and one of the reasons that the 12 or 13 Senators are meeting—maybe tonight, for all I know; they never tell us—just down the hall, down there in Senator MCCONNELL's office, to try to figure out how to repeal the Affordable Care Act and find a way to hold 52 Republican Senators together.

Think about that. They are meeting in secret. First, it was the House of Representatives, when they repealed the Affordable Care Act, when they voted on what is called the American Health Care Act. I think that is what they called it, the AHCA. When they voted on it, they came up with a bill at 8 o'clock at night. They sprung it on the floor the next day. Almost nobody had a chance to read it. There were no hearings, no discussions—not even reading the bill. They jammed it through by twisting arms—the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, who used to be a Member of the House, the Speaker of the House, all of them—to get this bill through. They hadn't even taken the time to hear from the Congressional Budget Office to tell how much this bill would cost and how many people would lose their insurance. It turns out they estimated that more than 20 million people would lose their insurance. That came after the vote in the House.

They are doing the same thing in the Senate. They are doing this meeting behind closed doors. It is a bunch of Republican leaders together. No Democrats are invited. No Democrats are asked their opinions. It is all about doing something to live up to this campaign promise that they are going to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act.

Listen to Governor Kasich. They have no idea what they are going to do with these 20 million people, with 900,000 people in my State—900,000 people who have health insurance, most of whom are working. These are people who have jobs. They just aren't lucky enough to have jobs like we have, where their health insurance is paid for.

Think about the morality of this—200-plus Republican Members of Con-

gress, all of whom get health insurance paid by taxpayers, by all of you in the Gallery and anybody watching this. We get insurance here paid for by taxpayers, and they are going to just snatch it away from those 200,000 families in my State who are getting opioid addiction treatment because of the Affordable Care Act. What is the morality of that?

Then, worse than that is that they do it without reading the bill. They do it, pretty much, in the middle of the night, and they are doing the same thing here. Clearly, the American public is on to this. The public overwhelmingly thinks this is a bad idea.

But they move forward because there is a huge tax break involved for the drug industry, a huge tax break for the medical device industry, and huge help for the insurance industry. That is why they do it, because in the end so much of what happens in this body is so that the wealthiest 1 or 2 or 5 percent get their tax cuts, get their tax breaks, and the middle class gets stuck with the bill and the middle class loses the benefits it gets. That is the moral outrage that so many Americans feel about this process.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 110, S. 722.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 110, S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 110, S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

Todd Young, Joni Ernst, Bill Cassidy, Ron Johnson, Tom Cotton, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, Mitch McConnell, Richard Burr, Luther Strange, James M. Inhofe, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, John Cornyn, Bob Corker, John Barrasso.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING WILLIAM BARCLAY BATES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to William Barclay Bates, a father, grandfather, great-grandfather, and veteran of the Second World War. Bill, as he liked to be called, passed away last December in Jackson, WY, at the age of 91. Next week, his family will gather at Wyoming Veterans Cemetery in Casper, WY, to commemorate his life and honor his contributions to our country. I wish to add a few words to what they will say about this brave and stalwart man.

Bill's life story typifies many of his generation. He was born on December 14, 1924, in Los Angeles, CA, to Jeffrey Otto and Clara Virginia Bates. His father, Jeff, served in the American Expeditionary Force in Russia during World War I. His mother, Clara, was a telephone operator. When Bill was 5, he moved with his family to McAlester, OK. This was during the middle of the Great Depression, and times were tough. Bill's father owned a radio repair shop and later ran a roller rink to provide for the family. As Bill said some years later, "We never had much money, but neither did anyone else. We never missed any meals, but we ate a lot of beans, and a soup bone on Sunday was a real treat."

In September 1941, at the age of 17, Bill enlisted in the Army. It was 3 months before Pearl Harbor. After basic training, Bill applied for and was accepted to airplane gunnery school. Following completion of his training, a request came in for a gunner for a group headed to Africa. As Bill later told the story, his captain "flipped a coin between two candidates, me and Bill Haygood. I lost and Bill Haygood went to North Africa and was killed within six weeks. A flip of a coin decided that I would live through the war."

Instead of going to Africa, Bill was sent to Europe with the Eighth Air Force, 446th Bomb Group. The 446th Bomb Group, which came to be known as the Bungay Buckaroos, led the Eighth Air Force on the first heavy bomber mission on D-Day, June 6, 1944, and later supported Allied ground forces as they moved east toward Berlin through France and Germany.

Bill served as a waist gunner and flew missions in B-17s and B-24s. In total,

he flew 33 combat missions. This was very dangerous work. Of his original flight crew, only Bill and one other were still alive at the war's end. For his service, he received the Air Medal with three bronze oakleaf clusters and the Distinguished Flying Cross.

After receiving an honorable discharge as a staff sergeant in 1945, Bill returned to Oklahoma, studied business on the G.I. bill, and became a certified public accountant.

In 1951, he married Dorothy Lee Hartman in Fort Sill, OK. Like Bill, Dorothy grew up in Oklahoma during the Great Depression. She was working as a nurse in Tulsa when they met. A year after Bill and Dorothy married, their son Bruce was born. Seven years later, another son, Jeff, was born.

In 1962, Bill and his family moved from Tulsa to Casper, WY, so Bill and Dorothy could pursue their love of the outdoors. During this time, Bill continued his work as an accountant, serving in the Casper Chamber of Commerce and as president of the Wyoming chapter of certified public accountants. He grew his firm, Bates and Hocker, into the largest accounting firm in the State of Wyoming.

After Bill retired, he and Dorothy moved to California, Arizona, and then Utah, returning to Casper every summer to hunt, fish, and enjoy Wyoming's cool summers. Bill became an avid safari hunter, traveling to Africa 15 times to hunt game.

After Dorothy passed away in 2012, Bill returned to Wyoming, where he spent many happy days in Jackson near his son Jeff and daughter-in-law Vickie. He passed away on December 5 of last year, surrounded by family and loved ones. He is survived by his sons Bruce and Jeff, daughters-in-law Debbie and Vickie, six grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren.

I said at the outset that Bill's life story typifies many of his generation. He grew up during the Great Depression, when times were hard and money scarce. He served with valor in World War II, where he risked his life many times for his country and fellow servicemen. After the war, he went to college, got married, and started a family. He built a business and served in the community. He was a faithful husband and a steadfast provider for his children.

Men like Bill Bates are the reason America and her allies prevailed in World War II. Men like Bill Bates are the reason we enjoy such a prosperous and free country today. I am grateful for this opportunity to add a few words in Bill's memory and wish his family the very best.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall

vote No. 138 on adoption of S. Res. 176. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

As a cosponsor of S. Res. 176, I would have joined many of my colleagues in voting for its adoption. Noting this week marks the 50th anniversary of the Six-Day War and the reunification of the city of Jerusalem, this resolution recognizes that there has been a continuous Jewish presence in the city of Jerusalem for 3,000 years and that the holy city is home to people of Jewish, Muslim, and Christian faiths. This resolution reaffirms longstanding U.S. positions, including that the permanent status of Jerusalem must be negotiated between the parties through final status negotiations for a two-state solution. This resolution further reaffirms the importance of the U.S.-Israel relationship and our shared value of promoting religious freedom. ●

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 16-77, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$750 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J. W. RIXEY,
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-77

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$0 million.

Other \$750 million.

Total \$750 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE): None.

Non-MDE includes: Continuation of a blanket order training program inside and outside of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia that includes, but is not limited to, flight training, technical training, professional military education, specialized training, mobile training teams (MTTs), and English language training. These blanket order training cases will cover all relevant types of training offered by or contracted through the U.S. Air Force or Department of Defense Agencies (DOD), to include participation in CONUS DOD-sponsored education, as well as MTTs that will travel to Saudi Arabia. This training for the Royal Saudi Air Force (RSAF) and other Saudi forces will include such subjects as civilian casualty avoidance, the law of armed conflict, human rights command and control, and targeting via MTTs and/or broader Programs of Instruction (POIs). Program management, trainers, simulators, travel, billeting, and medical support may also be included.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force.

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: FMS Case NFS—\$44M, FMS Case NFT—\$48M, FMS Case NFU—\$82M, FMS Case TGP—\$53M, FMS Case THB—\$93M, FMS Case THD—\$73M, FMS Case THE—\$69M, FMS Case THF—\$39M, FMS Case THG—\$93M.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid. Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 2, 2017.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Saudi Arabia—Blanket Order Training

The Government of Saudi Arabia requested a possible sale of continued blanket order training program inside and outside of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia that includes, but is not limited to, flight training, technical training, professional military education, specialized training, mobile training teams (MTTs), and English language training. These blanket order training cases cover all relevant types of training offered by or contracted through the U.S. Air Force or Department of Defense (DoD) Agencies, to include participation in CONUS DOD-sponsored education, as well as MTTs that will travel to Saudi Arabia. This training for the Royal Saudi Air Force (RSAF) and other Saudi forces will include such subjects as civilian casualty avoidance, the law of armed conflict, human rights command and control, and targeting via MTTs and/or broader Programs of Instruction (POIs). Program management, trainers, simulators, travel, billeting, and medical support may also be included. The estimated program cost is \$750 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of an important partner which has been and continues to be a leading contributor of political stability and economic progress in the Middle East.

This training would support the United States' continued commitment to Saudi Arabia's security and strengthen the U.S.-Saudi

Arabia strategic partnership. Assisting the RSAF supports Saudi Arabia in deterring hostile actions and increases U.S.-Saudi Arabia military interoperability. It also helps their ability to work with coalition partners during training, exercises, and operations. Saudi Arabia will have no difficulty absorbing this training and support.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Saudi Arabia.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale. All defense articles/services have been approved for release.

CONFIRMATION OF AMUL R. THAPAR

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I could not support Judge Amul Thapar's nomination to fill the vacancy on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. I was extremely concerned about Judge Thapar's views about how the law applies to the issue of money in politics. According to Judge Thapar, "there is simply no difference between saying that one supports an organization by using words and saying that one supports an organization by donating money." His opinion on the role of money in politics in *Winter v. Wolnitzek* was so extreme that, even in this post-Citizens United era, it was unanimously overruled by the Sixth Circuit. Judge Thapar's willingness to dismiss ethical rules created to avoid partisanship and to ensure impartiality is troubling and prevented me from supporting his nomination.

Ever since the Supreme Court rulings in *Citizens United v. FEC* and *McCutcheon v. Federal Election Commission*, No. 12-536, our political system has been infiltrated by dark money. The untraceable and unlimited amount of money pouring into elections has changed our political system for the worse, and Americans across party lines agree. Eighty-four percent of Americans think that money has too much influence in politics, and over half of Americans think that politicians only promote policies in support of their donors and not their voters. President Trump has nominated a judge who wants to erode what few protections currently exist to limit money in politics and whose views are outside of the mainstream.

Judge Thapar's views on money in politics may be among the reasons why the conservative Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation included Judge Thapar on the short list of possible Supreme Court nominees that they prepared for President Trump. I find President Trump's outsourcing of the judicial selection process to third-party organizations alarming. Traditionally, Presidential administrations have consulted with Senators of both

parties as they selected judicial nominees. The Trump administration consults with partisan organizations instead.

The very fact that this vacancy existed is another example of Republican obstructionism and the unnecessary politicization of the judiciary. Former-President Obama nominated Judge Lisabeth Tabor Hughes to fill this vacant seat in March 2016. Much like the Supreme Court seat vacated by the death of Justice Antonin Scalia, Republicans refused to hold a hearing or fill the seat.

The seat should have been filled long ago, but regardless, Judge Thapar is not the right person to fill it now.

OREGON JEWISH MUSEUM AND CENTER FOR HOLOCAUST EDUCATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to acknowledge an exciting moment in Oregon's history: the grand opening of the new Oregon Jewish Museum and Center for Holocaust Education in Portland. The 15,000-square-foot museum now has a permanent place in our State where anyone can come to learn and experience Jewish culture and history.

Jews have lived in Oregon for more than 165 years. Many immigrated here to escape the horrors of the Holocaust; others came with the hope of finding a new life in a new land. I am the son of immigrants who fled Nazi Germany, so this history is especially personal. As a proud American Jew, I know that for each dark chapter in our history, there is a story of perseverance, of hope, of triumph. The rich traditions and culture within the Jewish community must be preserved and taught for generations to come. That is why I am so proud of the work done by the community in Oregon and by the Portland museum staff and board to bring this museum to an even grander scale.

The museum has come a long way from its initial beginnings when it was known as the museum without walls. From the first exhibition, "Jews of Greece," at the Multnomah County Central Library in 1990, interest grew and so has the museum's footprint. Now, with this new state-of-the-art facility, the museum will continue to educate and open the minds of many about the experiences of Oregon's vibrant Jewish community. In fact, it continues to be the only community repository for displaying that experience in my home State.

It is my distinct honor to recognize the Oregon Jewish Museum and Center for Holocaust Education. It brings incredible exhibitions to our State, provides a full-time Holocaust educator to help those who want to learn more about this tragic piece of history, and remains the steward of the Oregon Holocaust Memorial in Portland's Wash-

ington Park. I am greatly appreciative for all this museum does and will do for Oregon.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, with amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1083. An act to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1761. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to criminalize the knowing consent of the visual depiction, or life transmission, of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1973. An act to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the order of the Senate of January 3, 2017, the Secretary of the Senate, on May 30, 2017, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) had signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 657. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain protections

against prohibited personnel practices, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2017, the enrolled bill was signed on June 2, 2017, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1761. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to criminalize the knowing consent of the visual depiction, or live transmission, of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1973. An act to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 61. A bill to remove the sunset provision of section 203 of Public Law 105-384 and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-88).

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1129. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-89).

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 88. A bill to ensure appropriate spectrum planning and interagency coordination to support the Internet of Things (Rept. No. 115-90).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 18. A resolution reaffirming the United States-Argentina partnership and recognizing Argentina's economic reforms.

S. Res. 114. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on humanitarian crises in Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, and Yemen.

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

H.R. 601. A bill to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of assistance provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to promote quality basic education in developing countries, to better enable such countries to achieve universal access to quality basic education and improved learning outcomes, to eliminate duplication and waste, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):
S. 1290. A bill to help individuals receiving assistance under means-tested welfare programs obtain self-sufficiency, to provide information on total spending on means-tested welfare programs, to provide an overall spending limit on means-tested welfare programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 184. A resolution relative to the death of James Paul David "Jim" Bunning, former United States Senator for the Commonwealth of Kentucky; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 122

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 122, a bill to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt.

S. 200

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 200, a bill to prohibit the conduct of a first-use nuclear strike absent a declaration of war by Congress.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms.

KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency may not regulate vehicles used solely for competition, and for other purposes.

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 292

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 292, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 301

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 301, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit governmental discrimination against providers of health services that are not involved in abortion.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 339, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish a procedure for approval of certain settlements.

S. 376

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 376, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 407, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 459

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from New Jersey

(Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 459, a bill to designate the area between the intersections of Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest and Davis Street, Northwest and Wisconsin Avenue, Northwest and Edmunds Street, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as "Boris Nemtsov Plaza", and for other purposes.

S. 486

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 486, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the non-application of Medicare competitive acquisition rates to complex rehabilitative wheelchairs and accessories.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 534

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 534, a bill to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 569

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) were added as cosponsors of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 766

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 766, a bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to improve and enhance authorities relating to the employment, use, status, and benefits of military technicians (dual status), and for other purposes.

S. 774

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 774, a bill to address the psychological, developmental, social, and emotional needs of children, youth, and families who have experienced trauma, and for other purposes.

S. 782

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 782, a bill to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes.

S. 882

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 882, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the entitlement to educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs for members of the Armed Forces awarded the Purple Heart, and for other purposes.

S. 888

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 888, a bill to amend the Higher Education Opportunity Act to add disclosure requirements to the institution financial aid offer form and to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make such form mandatory.

S. 889

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 889, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make technical improvements to the Net Price Calculator system so that prospective students may have a more accurate understanding of the true cost of college.

S. 910

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 910, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes.

S. 915

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 915, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 926, a bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 1027

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1027, a bill to extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000.

S. 1057

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1057, a bill to amend the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998 to address harmful algal blooms, and for other purposes.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1094, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1094, *supra*.

S. 1112

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1112, a bill to support States in their work to save and sustain the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period, to eliminate disparities in maternal health outcomes for pregnancy-related and pregnancy-associated deaths, to identify solutions to improve health care quality and health outcomes for mothers, and for other purposes.

S. 1114

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1114, a bill to nullify the effect of the recent Executive order laying a foundation for discrimination against

LGBTQ individuals, women, religious minorities, and others under the pretext of religious freedom.

S. 1186

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1186, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to designate certain entities as centers of excellence for domestic maritime workforce training and education, and for other purposes.

S. 1191

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1191, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to refine how Medicare pays for orthotics and prosthetics and to improve beneficiary experience and outcomes with orthotic and prosthetic care, and for other purposes.

S. 1278

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1278, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union.

S.J. RES. 40

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 40, a joint resolution to provide limitations on the transfer of air-to-ground munitions from the United States to Saudi Arabia.

S. RES. 114

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 114, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on humanitarian crises in Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, and Yemen.

S. RES. 168

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 168, a resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia.

S. RES. 174

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 174, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International and celebrating the Lions Clubs International for a long history of humanitarian service.

S. RES. 176

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 176, a

resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem.

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 176, *supra*.

S. RES. 179

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 179, a resolution expressing support for the designation of June 2, 2017, as "National Gun Violence Awareness Day" and June 2017 as "National Gun Violence Awareness Month".

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 184—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF JAMES PAUL DAVID "JIM" BUNNING, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr.

INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STRANGE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 184

Whereas Jim Bunning served the people of Fort Thomas, Kentucky in the Fort Thomas City Council for 2 years;

Whereas Jim Bunning served the people of Kentucky in the Kentucky State Senate for 4 years;

Whereas Jim Bunning served the people of Kentucky's 4th District with distinction for 12 years in the United States House of Representatives, and as Chair of the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security;

Whereas Jim Bunning served the people of Kentucky with distinction for 12 years in the United States Senate;

Whereas Jim Bunning pitched a no-hitter for the Detroit Tigers against the Boston Red Sox at Fenway Park on July 20, 1958, the first in the National League in 84 years and the first in the major leagues since the 1956 World Series;

Whereas Jim Bunning pitched a perfect game for the Philadelphia Phillies against the New York Mets on June 22, 1964, which was the first regular-season perfect game in the major leagues since 1922;

Whereas Jim Bunning was inducted into the National Baseball Hall of Fame in 1996; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Jim Bunning, former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family member of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Jim Bunning.

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF JAMES PAUL DAVID "JIM" BUNNING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 184, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 184) relative to the death of James Paul David "Jim" Bunning,

former United States Senator for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 184) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, June 6; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Elwood nomination as under the previous order; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the provisions of S. Res. 184, as a further mark of respect to the late Jim Bunning, former United States Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:33 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, June 6, 2017, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL

HENRY KERNER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE SPECIAL COUNSEL, OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL, FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE CAROLYN N. LERNER, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. DEANNA M. BURT

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN

THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN R. HOGAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JANSON D. BOYLES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. STEVEN W. AINSWORTH

BRIG. GEN. BRUCE E. HACKETT

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL C. O'GUINN

BRIG. GEN. MIYAKO N. SCHANELY

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN W. AARSEN

COL. KRIS A. BELANGER

COL. DOUGLAS A. CHERRY

COL. ELLEN S. CLARK

COL. ROBERT S. COOLEY, JR.

COL. DIANNE M. DEL ROSSO

COL. WILLIAM B. DYER III

COL. JOSEPH A. EDWARDS II

COL. DARIUS S. GALLEGOS

COL. HOWARD-CHARLES W. GECK

COL. MICHAEL T. HARVEY

COL. MARTIN F. KLEIN

COL. WILLIAM S. LYNN

COL. JOSEPH A. MARSIGLIA

COL. ROBERT F. PLECZKOWSKI

COL. DUSTIN A. SHULTZ

COL. MARK A. TOWNE

COL. IRENE M. ZOPPI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. GREGORY L. KENNEDY

BRIG. GEN. ANDREW P. SCHAFER, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER P. CALLAHAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JAMES P. BEGLEY III

BRIG. GEN. SYLVESTER CANNON

BRIG. GEN. THOMAS M. CARDEN, JR.

BRIG. GEN. RICHARD H. DAHLMAN

BRIG. GEN. WENDUL G. HAGLER II

BRIG. GEN. ROBERT T. HERBERT

BRIG. GEN. JON A. JENSEN

BRIG. GEN. JOHN F. KING

BRIG. GEN. DIRK R. KLOSS

BRIG. GEN. FRANCIS M. MCGINN

BRIG. GEN. WALTER L. MERCER

BRIG. GEN. PAUL D. ROGERS

BRIG. GEN. SEAN A. RYAN

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL A. STONE

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL C. THOMPSON

BRIG. GEN. GISELLE M. WILZ

BRIG. GEN. GARY S. YAPLE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ANN M. BURKHARDT

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

ANGELA M. MIKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

MATTHEW V. CHAUVIERE

JASON D. HOSKINS

MICHAEL S. LAIDLAW

LAUREN A. MAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MICHAEL E. BRUHN
MARK E. CLEVELAND
JOSEPH R. DELL
CHRISTOPHER ESTRIDGE
JEREMY N. HOOPER
ANDREW M. KACZMAREK
ANDREW C. LATTIMORE
ANTONIO D. LOVE
ROBERT D. PELTZER
WAYNE S. PETERS
CHRISTOPHER VAUGHN
BRADLEY D. WEAST
VICTOR D. WEEDEN, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JEFFREY W. DRAKE
AMY M. FISHER
BRANDI L. FOSTER
RYAN M. GASSMAN
CODY JOHN HESS
THEODOSIA FLORIA HILL
KERRY E. HUTCHINGS
JENNIFER LEE IDELL
MICHAEL TODD KEELEY
CRISTY A. LONG
EZEKIEL S. MALONE
JOSHUA LEE MILLER
RAYMOND A. MILLER, JR.
EDWARD J. MORRIS
MARLON A. MUTHUVEERAN
PAWEL NOWACKI
MARLO P. OBCEMEA
JENNIFER M. PEARL
NOAH H. PLAISANCE
PHILLIP K. POPE
JOSEPH DANYLE POPHAM, JR.
MARC A. RITTBERG
BRENDA TALINA ROBERTS
JAVIER A. RODRIGUEZ
MARK A. SABROSKI
TIMOTHY A. SCHMIDT
RANDALL C. SHIFFLETT
GARY N. SUTTLES
DANIEL T. TOWNSEND
MERLINDA B. VERGONIO
JACK VILARDI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

WILLIAM JOHN ACKMAN
ALEX D. ADAMS
ALPHANSON R. ADAMS
ANDREW JAMES ADAMS
MICHAEL J. ALBLINGER
PAUL S. ALBUQUERQUE
JEREMIAH J. ALDER
JOSH R. ALDRED
TAMMARA L. ALEXANDER
BRANDON P. ALFORD
JENNIFER ANNETTE ALICKSON
DANIEL C. ALIX
MARK E. ALLARD
ANDY G. ALLEN
GERALD D. ALLEN, JR.
ROBERT W. ALLEN
CHRISTOPHER A. ALLIE
JOSEPH N. ALLISON
DAVID C. ALVAREZ
PHILLIP N. ALVAREZ
SALOMON ALVAREZ III
RUBEN R. AMEZAGA
SUNIL LALITKUMAR AMIN
CLIFFORD WALDO ANDERSON
JOEL RICKS ANDERSON
KEVIN S. ANDERSON
PAUL R. ANDREWS, JR.
ROCCO J. ANGIOLELLI
CHRISTOPHER LEE ANTENEN
MARCUS C. ANTONINI
RYAN R. ARCHAMBAULTMILNER
MARCEL T. AREL
MICHAEL A. ARGUELLO
RYAN W. ARMSTRONG
ROBERT C. ARNETT
PATRICK H. ARNN
KREG T. ARNOLD
TIFFANY L. ARNOLD
JOHN PAUL CABIGAS ARRE
JOSHUA A. ARROWOOD
MICHAEL A. ARTIFON
MICHAEL D. ASKEGREN
DANIEL V. ATIENZA
PHILIP Z. ATKINSON
GREGORY BRIAN AUERBACH
CHAD A. BACKES
STEVEN A. BAILEY
CHARLES JAMES BAIRD
MICHAEL H. BAIRD
HEIDI ANNETTE BAKER
JASON R. BAKER
MATTHEW T. BALLANCO
STEPHEN L. BARBOUR
LUKE ADAM BARGER
NEIL BRYAN BARNAS

ROBERT J. BARNES
CHRISTOPHER LEE BARNETT
AARON R. BARRETT
JOHN M. BARRY
DWAIN JASON BARTELS II
DONALD F. BARTHOLOMEW III
JOSE L. BASABE, JR.
DOUGLAS M. BAUER
AARON C. BAUM
BRIAN K. BEAUTER
ROBERT O. BECKENHAUER
NICHOLAS S. BEDELL
JONATHAN MICHAEL BEHA
ERIC EDWARD BEIN
JOSHUA M. BEKKEDAHL
NIKITA S. BELIKOV
BRYAN M. BELL
CLIFTON M. BELL
DYLAN A. BELL
THOMAS N. BELLAIRS
MATTHEW BRENT BELOTE
TIFFANY H. BENDORF
DAVID M. BENNETT
CORY D. BERG
TYLER A. BERGE
TROY DAVID BERGHUIS
BENJAMIN C. BERGREN
TANNER BERGRUD
CHRISTOPHER J. BERGSTROM
RYAN A. BERNIER
JONATHAN P. BESS
CHRISTOPHER W. BEST
MARK J. BIEDA
CHRISTOPHER J. BILLAU
JOSEPH A. BINCAROUSKY, SR.
ROBERT G. BINGHAM
OWEN D. BIRCKETT
MICHAEL JOSEPH BLACK
COLBY J. BLACKWOOD
JOSHUA P. BLAKEMAN
BRENT R. BLANDINO
JEFFERY ANDREW BLANKENSHIP
TIMOTHY R. BLOCKYOU
GREGORY MICHAEL BLOM
NIA K. BLUFORD
DANIEL T. BLUM
DANA L. BOCHTE
ERIC D. BOGUE
ANDREW J. BOGUSKY
TRAVIS R. BOHANAN
GREGORY R. BOLAND
MATTHEW D. BOONE
JOHN M. BOOS
MATTHEW R. BORAWSKI
GREGORY M. BORSCHOWA
STACIE LYNN BORTZ
KELLY BORUKHOVICH
JONATHAN W. BOTT
DOUGLAS P. BOTTOMS
JOSHUA P. BOUDREAUX
ERIK EDWARD BOWMAN
PAMELA A. BOYARSKI
MACKEY W. BOZARTH
LYDIA A. BRADLEY TYLER
ALLEN GEORGE BRANCO III
DAVID T. BREDESEN
KYLE BENJAMIN BRESSETTE
MICHAEL T. BREWER
DAMEION DAWAYNE BRIGGS
EVAN J. P. BRIGGS
LEE M. BRLETICH
JEREMY M. BROCKMAN
TIMOTHY W. BROKAW
ANDREW L. BROWN
BRANDON R. BROWN
JOSEPH W. BROWN
BENJAMIN D. BRYAN
MARCUS W. BRYAN
KYLE R. BUCHER
BRADLY P. BUCHOLZ
CHARLES F. BUEKER
JOEL B. BUELOW
BENJAMIN R. BURDETTE
KENNETH WILSON BURGI
WILLIAM J. BURICH
SEAN PATRICK BURKE
MATTHEW P. BURNISTON
NICOLE MARIE BURNSIDE
MATTHEW J. BURROWS
CHARLES C. BURSI
BENNET ALAN BURTON
CLARENCE E. BURTON, JR.
MATTHEW G. BUTLER
SCOTT D. BUTLER
CHRISTOPHER J. BYRNE
MARIO P. CABIAO
CHARLES J. CAGGIANO, JR.
IAN E. CALDERON
GREGORY JULIEN CAMERON
JEFFREY S. CAMERON
DUSTIN CANEDY
AARON CAPIZZI
JAMES L. CAPRA
MATTHEW P. CARDUCCI
GERARD J. CARISIO
CATALEYA CARLSON
CHRISTOPHER S. CARLSON
ERIK A. CARLSON
KEVIN M. CARLSON
SPEIGHT H. CAROON
ROBERT R. CARREON
JAMES S. CARROLL

ANTHONY L. CARSON
CHRISTIAN H. CARTER
JONATHAN A. CARTER
NICHOLAS J. CARTER
CHRISTOPHER T. CASTLE
ROBIN CHRISTOPHER CASTLE
MARITZEL G. CASTRELLON
HARVEY CATCHINGS, JR.
AARON B. CAVAZOS
KURT M. CEPEDA
ALFRED W. CHAFFEE
JUSTIN W. CHANDLER
RYLAN M. CHARLTON
PAUL A. CHASE
BRIAN L. CHATMAN
ORLANDO L. CHAVEZ
SAMUEL C. CHIPMAN
ADAM G. CHITWOOD
PETER M. CHOI
THOMAS CHOU
JOSEPH A. CHRISTENSEN
WOO SUK CHUN
MARC L. CHURCH
ERIKA R. CHUTE
ADAM T. CIARELLA
BRANDON J. CIELOHA
MATTHEW A. CISAR
LIAM J. CLANCY
CRISTAL NICOLE CLARK
JACK AXEL CLARK
TRACY R. CLINTON
JOSHUA M. COAKLEY
PAUL H. COBEAGA
AARON L. COCHRAN
STACI N. COLEMAN
JEFFREY P. COLLINS
MATTHEW D. COLLINS
TROY S. COMBS
CHRISTOPHER M. CONANT
NICHOLAS A. CONDON
ALAN W. CONDOR
JUSTIN MICHAEL CONELLI
BROOKS R. CONN
JOSHUA D. CONNELL
JOHN PAUL CONNER
ALEX N. CONSTANTINE
JASON B. CONSTANTINE
DIAMOND D. COOKSON
BRETT JAMES COOPER
MATTHEW COOPER
ROLLY G. COOPER
NEIL J. COPENHAVER
MATTHEW G. COPPOLA
REBECCA SUE CORBIN
MATTHEW S. CORDANI
AARON S. CORNINE
ANTHONY C. COSTANZA
MAXWELL COVER
RYAN DARRELL COX
KEITH R. CRAINE
WESLEY M. CRAWLEY
BENJAMIN P. CRAYCRAFT
JEFFREY J. CREPEAU
JESSICA RYAN CRITCHER
AARON M. CROFT
MATTHEW J. CROSMAN
DARRELL SCOTT CROWE
JOHN F. CUDDY
CRAIG J. CUDE
SEAN P. CULLEN
DAVID A. CUMINGS
JAMES RICHARD CURRAN
JASON B. CURTIS
RUSSELL JAMES DABEL
DENIS A. DALLAIRE
GERRIT H. DALMAN
ADAM C. DALSON
WILLIAM LEE DALTON, JR.
DAVID J. DAMRON
MICHAEL J. DAMRON
BRANDON LEWIS DAVENPORT
DAVID C. DAVIDSON
JEFFREY C. DAVIS
SCOTT P. DAVIS
SETH S. DAVIS
CINDY D. DAWSON
ADRIAN S. DE LA FUENTES
NICHOLAS M. DEANGELIS
JONATHAN A. DEARMOND
MICHAEL L. DECKARD
MARK ALAN DEGENHARDT
RAYMUND P. DELEON
DAVID DELMAGE
GEORGE H. DELONG
WINELL S. DEMESA
HEATHER G. DEMIS
CHANDLER A. DEPENBROCK
ERIC L. DEPRIEST
BRIAN L. DESAUTELS
NICHOLAS FRANCIS DEW
JANET D. DEWESE
MARK E. DEYOUNG
CHRISTOPHER J. DIAZ
LERIA M. DIAZ
JOSEPH ANTHONY DICIOLLA
JOSHUA DAVID DIEHL
CHRISTOPHER A. DIETER
MICHAEL JOHN DIMARIA, JR.
NEIL W. DIMMITT
MATTHEW W. DOLAN
JAMES W. DOLSON
MELISSA L. DOMBROCK

JAINA L. DONBERG
ANDREW I. DORN
CHRISTOPHER J. DOROUGH
JOSHUA SCOTT DORR
ROSS E. DOTZLAF
MICHAEL JOSEPH DOUGLAS
TIMOTHY J. DOWLING, JR.
JEFFREY L. DOWNING
PHILLIP H. DREW
ANDREW D. DUBOIS
CHRISTOPHER F. DUFF
JACOB J. DUFF
YON P. DUGGER
JAMES CHRISTIAN DUNCAN
CHRISTOPHER G. DUPIN
MICHELLE LYNN DURAND
RYAN T. DURAND
BRAD M. DVORAK
JASON RICHARD DYMOND
RYAN O. EADS
JOHN DOMENIC EASTON
MICHAEL T. EDWARDS
J. T. EGGINTON
JARED M. EKHOLM
MATTHEW P. ELDREDGE
DARIN S. ELGERSMA
JUSTIN J. ELLIOTT
TRAVIS T. ELLIOTT
BRETT J. ELLIS
RYAN W. ELLIS
RAYMOND J. ELMORE
MICHAEL J. EMERSON
REBECCA M. EMERSON
MARK E. ENRIQUES
STEPHEN A. ESCHMANN
JONATHAN JOSIAH ESSES
WILLIAM A. ESTEP
PETER S. EULER
ROBERT C. EVANS
STEPHEN A. EVELYN
CHRISTOPHER J. EVEY
JAMES E. FAGAN
JEFFREY T. FALCONE
ERIC KASMER FANCHER
MICHAEL D. FANTON
FRANCIS T. FAPPIANO
JONATHAN D. FARISS
JOHN C. FARMER
MATTHEW THOMAS FARRER
MICHAEL FAZIO
RYAN E. FERDINANDSEN
ANGELO T. FERNANDEZ
CARLOS J. FERRER
RUSSELL B. FETTE
JOHN M. FIANDT
JAMES G. FINUCANE
ROBERT A. FISHER
BRIAN THOMAS FLANIGAN
JESSE L. FLEENER
BRYAN M. FLORIO
JONATHAN R. FOX
LARRY P. FOXWORTH
BRYAN JOSHUA FRAM
MATTHEW R. FRANCHETTI
NAOMI L. FRANCHETTI
TERESA A. FRANK
TIMOTHY E. FRANK
KYLE K. FRANS DAL
DANE GEORGE FRANTA
DANIEL L. FRANZ
JACLYN CORRINE FREDERICK
JOHN D. FREDERICK
JONATHAN M. FRENCH
JEFFREY RAY FRIES
KELLY DAVID FRIESEN
SCOTT S. FROHARDT
STEVEN A. FROMM
JOSHUA B. FRY
JACOB T. FULGHAM
MANDI L. FULLER
MARC K. FULSON
MUSA S. FURR
DONALD J. FYFFE
PAUL W. GAGLIARDI
JAMES R. GAISER
MEGAN ROSE GALUS
JUSTIN L. GAMEL
STEPHEN J. GANT
HENRY A. GARAY
BRIAN J. GARRETT
JENNIFER GARRISON
VIRNON S. GARRISON
JOHN DAVID GARVIN
MATTHEW BODELL GARVIN
CHRISTOPHER D. GAUSEPOHL
BRENTON R. GAYLORD
DAVID ALAN GEBBIE
DREW L. GEHLER
DANE J. GEHRMANN
GABRIEL D. GELDERT
CHRISTOPHER L. GENELIN
KEVIN P. GEOFFROY
EUGENE J. GEORGESCU
WILLIAM R. GERY
RUSSELL H. GHEESLING
ANTHONY DUWAYNE GIBSON
BRETT E. GIBSON
MATTHEW A. GIDLEY
LINDSEY ERIN GIGGY
JUSTIN D. GILBERT
MYLES HAROLD GILBERT
DAREN PAUL GILLESPIE

SCOTT W. GILLILAND
 SETH IM GILPIN
 AJAY K. GIRI
 JASON A. GIRON
 ANTHONY E. GLESSNER
 PATRICK J. GODINEZ
 JESSE ALAN GOENS
 BRENT FAIRS GOLDEN
 ERIC M. GOLDEN
 JOSEPH W. GOLDSMITH
 RYAN C. GOODLIN
 BRANDON E. GORAB
 JOSEPH C. GORMAN
 STEPHEN WAYNE GOTER
 EVAN GRABELL
 KEVIN E. GRAHAM
 AMY RAE GRANT
 STEVEN R. GREEN, JR.
 BRANDON L. GREENAWALT
 CHONG H. GREGORY
 NEIL WELLS GREGORY
 DARRELL L. GROB
 JOSEPH R. GROSS, JR.
 CHARLIE WEST GROVER, JR.
 BENJAMIN J. GRUSIN
 PETER GRUTERS
 PETER J. GRYN
 JASON M. GUADALUPE
 JESSICA A. GUARINI
 JONATHAN R. GUERRERO
 MICHAEL CRAIG GUERRERO
 KRISTOPHER D. GUFFEY
 ANNA E. GUNNGOLKIN
 JONATHAN A. GUNTHER
 LUPE GUTIERREZ
 JASON ROBERT GUYETTE
 CHRISTINE G. L. GUZMAN
 LORI M. HAAS
 ALAN M. HAEDGE
 ERIK J. HAEUPTLE
 PHILIP M. HAFDAHL
 BRECK B. HALE
 JACOB E. HALE
 CHRISTOPHER HALEY
 GIDEON STACY HALL
 LUCAS HALL
 MEGAN F. HALL
 TERRY L. HALL
 CHRISTOPHER N. HALLE
 CHRIS ALAN HALSRUD
 JESSE WILSON HAMEL
 JEREMY T. HAMILTON
 IAN W. HAMLYN
 THOMAS C. HAMLYN
 MATTHEW L. HANE
 JAMES CHRISTOPHER HANNAN
 BRIAN E. HANS
 SEAN J. HANSEN
 COLIN Q. HANSON
 PETRINA A. HANSON
 DARION L. HARDEN
 ALLISON S. HARDWICK
 MICHAEL J. HARDWICK
 ANIL HARIHARAN
 ROBERT CARSTEN HARLAN
 THOMAS B. HARNEY
 BRANDEE J. HARRAL
 MAXWELL F. HARRELL, JR.
 CHRISTOPHER S. HARRIS
 JOHN J. HARRIS
 MARK L. HARRIS
 RYAN S. HARRIS
 BRYANT D. HARRISON
 PATRICK C. HARTMAN
 ADAM C. HAUER
 DANIEL STEPHEN HAUGH
 MICHAEL E. HAYEK
 CASEY J. HAYES
 JOSEPH J. HAYES, JR.
 THOMAS E. HAYES
 BRAD L. HAYNES
 KEVIN L. HAYNIE
 QUINCY M. HEARNES
 KEVIN M. HEATH
 AARON M. HEDRICK
 ANDREW M. HEIDEL
 RUSSELL T. HEIFNER
 MICHAEL M. HELGESON
 DANIEL K. HELLER
 ROBERT C. HEMBACH
 ALLAN J. HENLEY
 JENNIFER M. HENSLEY
 RYAN L. HERMAN
 WILLIAM A. HERMANN
 ALFONSO S. HERNANDEZ
 ERICKA L. HERNANDEZ
 DAVID R. HERNDON
 HALLIE A. HERRERA
 TYLER J. HESS
 KATHERINE Y. HETLAND
 DANIEL PAUL HIGHLANDER
 DAWN L. HILDEBRAND
 ROBERSON O. HILL
 KENNETH J. HILLS
 JENNIFER P. HINES
 RYAN MCHENRY HISEROTE
 TERRY WARREN HJERPE
 BRENDAN JOSEPH HOCHSTEIN
 JASON R. HOCK
 JOSHUA B. HOLADAY
 MICHAEL B. HOLL
 JOHN D. HOLLAND

JAMES WILLIAM HOLLER
 MICHAEL J. HOLLINGSWORTH
 JASON M. HOLMAN
 BRIAN D. HOLT
 SEAN E. HOOK
 BRENDAN PATRICK HOPKINS
 JILL E. HOPKINS
 KENNETH W. HORTON
 BRIEN W. HOUSE
 CHRIS T. HOUSTON
 CLARENCE C. HOUSTON, JR.
 BRYAN G. HOWARD
 BRANDON J. HOWELL
 CHRISTOPHER J. HOWELL
 KENNETH B. HOWELL
 RYAN A. HOWELL
 KEVIN T. HOY
 MATTHEW THOMAS HOYT
 DUSTIN RYAN HUDSON
 MATTHEW T. HUDSON
 RYAN T. HUDSON
 SHANE D. HUGHES
 SHANNON MADDOX HUGHES
 MELISSA LEURIDAN HULL
 MATTHEW A. HUMPHREY
 TENAYA GOC HUMPHREY
 PETER ANTHONY HUNT
 JASEN W. HUNTER
 ROB STEPHEN HUSMANN
 MICHAEL ANTHONY HYLAND
 SEAN C. IANACONE
 DAVID STEVEN ILLSLEY
 CARL J. JACKSON, JR.
 RICARDO JAIME
 RUSSELL JAMES
 BENJAMIN A. JANS
 CHRISTOPHER D. JEFFERSON
 JOSHUA DAVID JENSEN
 PEDRO JIMENEZ
 STEPHEN P. JOCA
 RYAN R. JODOI
 BRANDY M. JOHNSON
 CLIFTON H. JOHNSON
 JASON K. JOHNSON
 MICHAEL A. JOHNSON
 PAUL STEPHEN JOHNSON
 ROBERT JOHNSON
 ROBERT JOSEPH JOHNSON
 SHEILA N. JOHNSTON
 CHRISTOPHER O. JONES
 CLARK RODMAN JONES
 CLAYTON L. JONES
 MARK N. JONES
 MELODY R. JONES
 SEAN M. JONES
 THOMAS DANIEL JONES
 TOBIAH MICHAEL JONES
 TOMMY GEORGE JONES
 WILLIAM R. JONES
 PETER SUNGJEAN JOO
 NICHOLAS B. JORDAN
 DANIEL JOSEPH JOYCE
 PABLO RAUL JUAREZ
 MATTHEW G. JUDGE
 NICHOLAS JUREWICZ
 GREGORY P. KANTZ
 MARYANN L. KARLEN
 JUSTIN D. KEATING
 JONATHAN KINGSTON KEEN
 ADAM T. KEITH
 COLLEEN BROOKE KELLAM
 DANIEL A. KENAN
 MICHAEL DAVID KENNEDY
 PATRICK J. KENNEDY
 VICTOR ALAN KENT
 PATRICK E. KILLINGSWORTH
 TED TAE WOO KIM
 JONATHAN SAMUEL KINARD
 BERNARD ROBERT KING
 JONATHAN D. KING
 MICHAEL H. KINGRY
 RANDOLPH B. KINSEY
 JOSHUA MICHAEL KIRKUM
 JOSHUA D. KITTLIE
 NATHAN H. KITZKE
 DARWYN D. KLATT
 JEFFREY ROBERT KLEIN
 MICHAEL JOSEPH KLIETZ
 BENJAMIN S. KLINE
 DANIEL L. KLINE
 JASON T. KNAB
 JORDAN W. KNAUB
 SCOTT M. KONZEM
 SCOTT S. KORELL
 SEAN KRASSOW
 JOSHUA R. KRUM
 KARSON KUHLMAN
 JOSEPH LA MONICA
 RICHARD S. LACA
 VILACHACK LADARA
 STEPHEN VINCENT LANCE
 STACI A. LANDERS
 AMANDA JO LANGENBRUNNER
 NICHOLAS P. LAPLANT
 DONAVAN S. LASKEY
 DEWITT TALMADGE LATIMER IV
 PAUL A. LATOUR
 CHARLES D. LAUBACH
 RYAN C. LAUGHTON
 JENNIFER M. LAW
 PAUL J. LAWSON
 FRANCISCO ARNALDO LEACH

KRISTA L. LEAMAN
 RYAN LOUIS LEBLANC
 RAVEN JUN LECLAIR BONACICH
 JEFFREY J. LEDEBOER
 DANIEL E. LEE
 JAMES D. LEE
 JASON KYLE LEE
 MICHAEL ALLAN LEE
 JOHN M. LEGER
 GEOFFREY LEVINE
 GRETCHEN T. LEWIS
 MATTHEW D. LEWIS
 NATHAN P. LEWIS
 ROBERT L. LIDOWSKI
 NATHANIEL C. LIEFER
 LYNN M. LIGHTFOOT
 JOSE CARLOS LINARES
 ULYSSES LINARES
 JACOB L. LINDAMAN
 WILLIAM GREGORY LITTLE
 DOMINIC GENE LITWIN
 JEREMY ALAN LOCK
 JOSHUA L. LOGIE
 JAMES S. LONG II
 JUSTIN L. LONG
 SUSANNE L. LONSBERRY
 MICHAEL F. LOOS
 LYDELL Z. LOPEZ
 BRANDON T. LOSACKER
 ALAN KEVAN LOUIE
 BRIAN R. LOW
 BRYAN S. LOWE
 JEREMY E. LOYD
 NATHAN A. LOYD
 MICHAEL DAVID LUCAS
 ANDREW J. LUECKENHOFF
 DARIN E. LUPINI
 JEREMY J. LYDIC
 JOHN LYFORD V
 CHRISTOPHER R. MACDONALD
 JENNIFER MORGAN MACK
 KATHERINE C. MACK
 BRANDON K. MACKAY
 ERIC R. MADDOX
 STEPHEN D. MADDOX
 JOHN J. MADSEN
 DAVID T. MADSON
 JOSEPH L. MAGUADOG
 ANDREW J. MAGUIRE
 DAVID M. MAHAN
 JUSTIN MAHONEY
 LOGAN ORION MAILLOUX
 ZARINE E. MALESRA
 JOHN T. MALLORY
 TYRONE C. MANEGDEG
 TIMOTHY P. MANNING
 RYAN P. MANSFIELD
 ERNEST M. MARAMBA
 CHRISTOPHER J. MARRIOTT
 MARY KATHERINE MARSHALL
 CHRISTOPHER R. MARSLENDER
 ADRIAN I. MARTIN
 ALICE MARIE MARTIN
 TERRY R. MARTIN, JR.
 OSCAR R. MARTINEZ
 MATTHEW F. MATIS
 ANDREW J. MAUS
 AARON M. MAYER
 VICTORIA J. MAYO
 DORINDA MUSITANO MAZZA
 RYAN MICHAEL MCADAMS
 DAVID M. MCALROY
 DEREK J. MCCAFFERTY
 JASON BRUCE MCCLURE
 MICHAEL J. MCCOURT
 JOHN P. MCCOY
 JAMES R. MCCUE
 SEAN W. MCCURDY
 LOUIS P. MCDANELD
 LLOYD E. MCDONALD
 SHANNON A. MCDUGALD
 KRISTI MCELMURRY
 ERIC T. MCEWEN
 CHESTER D. MCFARLAND
 ROBERT A. MCGOWAN II
 MICHAEL D. MCGRATH
 KALY M. MCKENNA
 BARRY V. MCKEOWN
 MICHAEL K. MCKINNEY
 TROY ANDREW MCCLAIN
 WALTER MCMILLAN IV
 CHARLES MANLEY MCNIEL
 AMY L. MCQUITTY
 DANIEL P. MCVAY
 AMBER E. MCVIEGH
 SCOTT E. MEARS
 JAMES CROMARTIE MELVIN
 CHAD MESSINIO
 RANDY M. METZGER
 CASEY DANIEL MEYER
 DALLAS P. MIKAELSEN
 BRIAN Y. MILLER
 JEFFERY M. MILLER
 JESSE P. MILLER
 RYAN S. MILLER
 HERBERT F. MILLET III
 JONATHAN L. MILLS
 PATRICK J. MILLS
 BRYAN J. MINATEL
 JOSEPH S. MIRANDA
 CHRISTOPHER STEPHAN MISER
 JARED L. MITCHELL

LYDANKO V. MITCHELL
 RYAN P. MITTELSTET
 GENTRY L. MOBLEY
 DANIEL T. MODROW
 THOMAS HAROLD MONCRIEF III
 WILLIAM PAUL MONCRIEFF
 DANIEL R. MONTES
 REBEKAH G. MONTGOMERY
 ROBERT ANTHONY MOORS
 NICHOLAS L. MORGANS
 STARGELL A. MOSLEY
 MICHAEL E. MOSS
 KARI K. MOTT
 NATHAN CHANDLER MOTT
 PETER RICHARD MOUGHAN III
 ERIC DWAYNE MOWLES
 DUSTIN J. MOWREY
 HEATHER MARIA MUELLER
 JEREMY S. MULLEN
 BRYAN DANIEL MUNDHENK
 CHRISTOPHER J. MUNDY
 SCOTT DANIEL MUNN
 SHYAM R. MUNSHI
 DOUGLAS JAMES MURPHY
 MATTHEW MILNER MURPHY
 STEPHANIE ANN MURPHY
 TREVIN A. MURRAY
 MEGAN M. MURTISHAW
 MATTHEW R. MUSTAIN
 NATHANIEL ROSS NADDELL
 SUNIL K. NAIR
 RYAN A. NATALINI
 FRANCIS SHANE NAVARRO
 JAY M. NEESE
 MATTHEW BRETT NEFF
 JACK A. NELSON
 ROBERT A. NELSON
 SCOTT E. NELSON
 THOMAS R. NELSON
 JOEL JEFFREY NEUBER
 ERIC S. NEUBERT
 JASON M. NEWCOMER
 JOSEPH D. NEWKIRK
 THOMAS MICHAEL NEWLON
 JUSTIN FRANKLIN NEWTON
 LOC H. NGUYEN
 JOSEPH D. NICHOLS
 JONATHAN D. NIEBES
 JASON DONALD NIEDERHAUSER
 LETTITIA BEATRICE NIELSEN
 ROBERT RAYMOND NOEL II
 KALEB CRAIG NORDGREN
 NICHOLAS BENTON NORGAARD
 JUSTIN W. NORTON
 JOSHUA B. NUCCIO
 JEFFREY DAVID NUNEZ
 DAMIAN XAVIER OCHS
 JONATHAN C. ODELL
 ROBERT J. OLIPANE
 RYAN P. OLISH
 JONATHAN H. OLIVA
 NATHAN P. OLSEN
 JAMES R. OLSON
 MATTHEW D. OLSON
 SCOTT A. OLSON
 JOHN P. OMEARA
 PAOLA S. ONDINA
 SHANNON E. ONEAL
 TOMOYUKI D. ONO
 SAMUEL RICHARD OPPELAAR II
 MICHAEL G. OPRESKO
 SEAN V. ORME
 RACHELLE RENEE OSBORN
 DAVID FRANKLIN OSTERHAUS
 TOMAS G. OWEN
 KELLY A. PADDEN
 LISA JOE PAGANO WALLACE
 LUIS F. PALACIOS
 DAVID NILES PALMER
 JAY TODD PANKEY
 DAVID F. PAOLILLO
 BRIAN E. PARADISE
 JASON NOEL PARKER
 SHAUN C. PARKER
 WILLIAM EVERETT PARKER IV
 JEFFREY M. PARRISH
 STEVEN MARVIN PAYNE
 RYAN M. PEARCE
 JEFFREY JAMES PEDERSEN
 WINSSEN PEELE
 ZACH ALBERT PELLONARI
 CHRISTINA P. PEREZ
 MIKE A. PEREZ
 MATTHEW M. PERRIE
 THOMAS JAMES PERRY
 REDAHLIA S. PERSON
 ERIC R. PESCHELL
 CHRISTOPHER L. PHILLIPS
 ROBERT L. PHILLIPS II
 BRENTON M. PICKRELL
 CHRISTIAN J. PIERCE
 JAMES E. PIKE III
 DAVID F. PINA
 JAMES R. T. PINSON
 BRADLEY M. PIROLO
 NATHAN A. PITCHER
 DONELL D. PITTMAN III
 MATTHEW P. PLATT
 SETH D. PLATT
 RANDALL D. PLETZER
 MITCHELL R. POHLMAN
 JOSEPH CARLYLE POMAGER

MARTIN POON
 DANIELLE N. POPE
 MATTHEW THOMAS POPE
 NATASHA N. PORCHER
 LAURA M. PORTER
 ROBERT A. PORTER
 FAITH K. POSEY
 JOHN D. POWELL
 CHRISTOPHER A. PRENTISS
 DANIEL L. PRESLAND
 NATHAN W. PREUSS
 JAMES W. PRITCHETT
 ZACHARY A. PROBST
 MATTHEW T. PROCHAZKA
 NELSON J. PROUTY
 DOUGLAS M. PRUITT
 JASON G. PRUITT
 CHRISTOPHER M. PUGH
 THOMAS R. PURDIE
 CHRISTOPHER R. PUSTKA
 ROBERT C. RADESKY, JR.
 LEVI A. RAINS
 JACK J. RAITT II
 KELLY DEAN RAKES
 JE HUI RALEY
 JUSTIN BERNARD RAMSEY
 RUTH J. RANDOLPH
 JESSICA YE RAPER
 JOSHUA D. RASMUSSEN
 LANCE JAY RATTERMAN
 TIMOTHY J. RAWSON
 VINCENT A. REA
 STEVEN B. REAGAN
 ADAM T. RECTOR
 VERNON F. REDDICK
 SHAWN M. REDMOND
 JEREMY W. REGANS
 BRADLEY GLEN REICK
 CHRISTOPHER A. REID
 PETER J. REILEY
 ERIC B. REINHART
 CHARLES F. RESTALL
 JACK W. RHODES III
 JOHN C. RICE, JR.
 EDWARD FRANCIS RICHARDS
 BRIAN MICHAEL RICKERT, JR.
 MICHAEL E. RIDLEY
 JUSTIN M. RIESTER
 GREGORY A. RILEY
 RYAN X. RILEY
 PHILIPP E. RISSEEUW
 MATTHEW A. RITENOUR
 AARON W. RITTGERS
 NATHAN A. RIVINIUS
 MICHAEL J. ROBB
 ANDREW JAMES ROBERTS
 JASON EDMOND ROBERTS
 DAVID M. ROBERTSON
 CHRISTOPHER R. ROBINSON
 ERIC H. ROBINSON
 MATTHEW H. ROBINSON
 JAMES P. RODGERS
 MARCUS RODRIGUEZ ARCHILLA
 CLEVE P. RODRIGUEZ
 VIDA JACOB ROEDER
 WILLIAM JOHN ROEDL
 WAYNE C. ROHE
 DON E. ROLLEG
 JOSEPH ROMANRAMIREZ
 CHRISTOPHER M. RONDEAU
 GARY EDWARD ROOS
 KRISTOPHER W. RORBERG
 BETH ANN ROSARIO
 RYAN A. ROSE
 TAMMY A. ROSE
 WILLIAM E. ROSE
 EVAN P. ROTH
 BILLIE K. ROTHWELL
 BRANDI ROUNTREE
 JAMES M. ROWLAND
 SAMUEL J. ROYAL
 JAMES T. RUBY
 MICHELLE C. RUEHL
 KENYATTA HENTS RUFFIN
 SCOTT T. RUPPEL
 CHRISTINA F. E. RUSNOCK
 MARION M. RUSSELL
 JOHN D. RYAN
 THOMAS M. RYAN, JR.
 TIMOTHY C. RYAN
 MICHAEL J. SACKENHEIM
 BENJAMIN E. SAKRISSON
 ERICK L. SAKS
 ANDREW C. SALLLOUM
 AARON R. SANDERS
 MARIETTA ELIZABETH SANDERS
 MICHAEL FRED SANDERS
 RICHARD PAUL SANDWICK
 MATTHEW P. SANERA
 MATTHEW A. SARTORI
 JONATHAN SAWTELLE
 TIMOTHY R. SAXTON
 JASON P. SCALZITTI
 COLLEEN SUE SCHAEILLING
 JASON LEE SCHENCK
 RYAN F. SCHIFFNER
 CHRISTOPHER C. SCHLAGHECK
 SCOTT PAUL SCHLEGELMILCH
 KEVIN WALTER SCHMAEMAN
 ERIK J. SCHMID
 RYAN T. SCHMID
 KURT A. SCHMIDBAUER

MICHAEL B. SCHMIDT
 DAREK M. SCHMIEDEBUSCH
 MATTHEW M. SCHMUNK
 BENJAMIN J. SCHNEIDER
 SCOTT D. SCHOFIELD
 RAYMOND W. SCHOLZ
 DANIEL J. SCHONE
 DANIEL B. SCHRECK
 RICK G. SCHUESSLER
 CLAYTON W. SCHUETTY
 JOHN M. SCIUTO
 JOHN REBER SCOTT
 DONALD A. SEABLOM
 ETHEL N. SEABROOKHENNESSY
 CHRISTOPHER E. SEAMANS
 DANIEL CHARLES SEBECK
 JUSTIN D. SETTLES
 KRISTEN D. SHADDEN
 MICHAEL AYOUB SHAHEN
 CHARLES C. SHAW
 DALBERT R. SHAW
 AARON B. SHEETS
 DAVID A. SHEPHERD
 JEREMY W. SHEPPARD
 BRETT A. SHILLING
 JASON WILLIAM SHIRLEY
 MICHAEL J. SHIRLEY
 ADAM JOSEPH SHOCKLEY
 EVAN M. SHOLLY
 ETAI SHPAK
 AARON W. SICK
 NICHOLAS D. SIGLER
 CARLY M. SIMS
 JOHN S. SISLER
 CHRISTOPHER J. SKOUTAS
 BRIAN L. SLADE
 JAMES C. SLAYTON
 IAN M. SLAZINK
 WILLIAM E. SLOTTTER
 MATTHEW N. SLUSER
 GAIL M. SMICKLAS
 ARCHIE SMITH, JR.
 DAVID J. SMITH
 GREGORY GERALD SMITH
 JARED J. SMITH
 JENNIFER A. SMITH
 JOCELYN M. SMITH
 KATRINA E. SMITH
 KENNETH J. SMITH
 MARK H. SMITH
 MELISSA R. SMITH
 PEYTON S. SMITH
 DAVID M. SORRELS
 JACOB S. SOTIRIADIS
 CHERONDA V. SPANN
 BRYAN THOMAS SPARKMAN
 CHARLES C. SPAULDING
 JAMES IRA SPEAKES
 GRANT E. SPEAR
 DAVID J. SPELLMAN
 MARK E. SPENCER
 SCOTT W. SPICER
 AARON JOSEPH SPRECHER
 JUSTIN B. SPRING
 SCOTTY LYNN SPROLES
 ANTHONY T. ST AUBYN
 KRISTA N. ST ROMAIN
 ADRIENNE L. STAHL
 JOSEPH H. STALLINGS
 DAVID M. STAMPER
 BRIAN J. STANISZEWSKI
 CHRISTOPHER R. STAPENHORST
 DALE A. STARK
 SEAN DANIEL STAVELY
 MATTHEW J. STEELE
 MATTHEW B. STEENMAN
 PAMELA TAN STEIN
 BRIAN K. STEINKE
 CHAUNCEY A. STERN
 JACOB T. STEVENS
 ANDREW J. STEWART
 CHAD R. STEWART
 TIMOTHY L. STOKES
 ANDREW T. STOLEE
 ZACHARY A. STOLP
 BRIAN BENEDICT STONE
 SAMUEL J. STONE
 JEREMY L. STOVER
 LUKE R. STOVER
 DENNIS M. STRASSER
 ALLYSON P. STRICKLAND
 WILLIAM L. STRICKLAND
 MATTHEW STRICKLER
 JOHN ROBERT STRIPLING
 CHRISTOPHER C. STROLE
 JESPER R. STUBENDORFF
 JESSE D. STUBBS
 JOSHUA A. STULTS
 BRENT R. SUERDIECK
 JACOB P. SULLIVAN
 JOSHUA S. SULLIVAN
 MARGARET ANN SULLIVAN
 ANTHONY SUTTON
 PERRY C. SWEAT
 CHRISTOPHER D. SWEENEY
 KEVIN P. SWEENEY
 EDWARD W. TALLEY
 JARED B. TANNER
 MATTHEW E. TARNOWSKI
 EVAN T. TATGE
 BRIAN J. TAYLOR
 CHARLIE JAMES TAYLOR

NATHAN WILLIAM TAYLOR
SCOTT TAYLOR
THOMAS M. TAYLOR
STEPHEN E. TEEPLE
CHRISTOPHER LOUIS TEKE
JOEL G. THESING
AARON HOUSTON THOMAS
BRIAN C. THOMASSON
ANDREW PAUL THOMPSON
DAVID M. THOMPSON
ERIC W. THOMPSON
JARED D. THOMPSON
JASON I. THOMPSON
SCOTT MICHAEL THOMPSON
TIMOTHY A. THOREN
ADAM F. THORNTON
LEIGH R. THORNTON
RYAN K. THORNTON
GRANT D. THRELFALL
ANDREA GAIL TILESTON
BRIAN A. TILESTON
PAUL W. TINKER
MATTHEW E. TIPTON
DOUGLAS J. TODD
JOHN D. TOEPHER
JOSHUA IAN TOLK
JARED A. TOMLIN
KATHRYN M. TOMS
STEVEN C. TORRES
CHAD C. TOSSELL
NATHANIEL W. TOTTEN
CLINT MATHEW TOWNSEND
JAMES D. TOWNSEND
ERIC M. TRAD
JOSEF H. TRAINOR
KEVIN K. TRAN
MERIDEE J. TRIMBLE
MATTHEW K. TROMANS
JASON E. TROUTMAN
STEPHANIE A. TRUSTY
DENNIS TRUTWIN
ARRON J. TULICK
MATTHEW W. TULL
KARLOS G. L. TUNGOL
ANTHONY P. TYDINGCO
TODD V. TYLER
SCOTT MATTHEW TYLEY
KURT J. UMLAUF
ROMAN TIMOTHY UNDERWOOD
DANIEL A. URBAN
PETER J. USHER
ORION Q. VAIL
CRAIG J. VAN BEUSEKOM
STEVEN W. VANDEN BOS
JOHN F. VANDENBEMDEN
MICAH B. VANDERVEEN
RAYMUNDO M. VANN, JR.
KRISALYN J. VAUGHN
THOMAS VELLEUX
RICK E. VERMILLION
TASHA E. VICK
JOSEPH ANDREW VIDEĆ
BRIE H. VIHLEN
CHRISTOPHER B. VOGLER
ERIC L. VOLK
LIM DINH VU
MICHAEL J. VYN
JOHN D. WADDELL
NATASHA L. WAGGONER
RONNIE R. WALDEN
JESSE GEORGE WALES
DAVID ODIS WALKER
MICHAEL M. WALKER
NATHANIEL S. WALKER
NICKLAUS M. WALKER
JOHN SILAS WALLACE
SCOTT T. WALLACE
GREGORY J. WALSH
JOHN T. WALSH
KURT CARL WAMPOLE, JR.
RYAN R. WARD
JASON W. WARE
JUSTIN J. WARNAAR
CLINTON G. WARNER
ABBE H. WARREN
JENNIFER M. WARREN
JERAD T. WARREN
KIMBERLY ANN KUHN WATSON
KEVIN J. WEAVER
AARON M. WEBB
CHRISTOPHER K. WEE
MICHAEL PATRICK WEEKS
ROBERT B. WEHMEYER
CHRISTOPHER SCOTT WEIR
MICHAEL ROY WELCH
BRIAN M. WELDE
DALE J. WELLER
KURT H. WELLHAUSEN
ANDREW A. WELLS
MICHAEL E. WELSER
DAVID T. WELT
JONATHAN F. WENTZEL
JOSHUA TYE WERNER
TYLER THOMAS WESTERBERG
BRYAN L. WETZEL
ALEX R. WHITE
BRANDON C. WHITE
CHRISTOPHER J. WHITE
ETHAN A. WHITE
JASON THOMAS WHITE
RYAN J. WHITE
STEVEN L. WHITSON

JEFFREY NEAL WHITTAKER
DANIEL J. WILCOX
NATHANIEL D. WILDS
JAMIE HOUSTON WILEY
BRIAN A. WILKEN
AARON W. WILLIAMS
EDWARD WAYNE WILLIAMS
JARED M. WILLIAMS
JASON O. WILLIAMS
JASON PAUL WILLIAMS
MICHAEL C. WILLIAMS
MICHAEL D. WILLIAMS
MICHAEL L. WILLIAMS
NATHAN A. WILLIAMS
VICTORIA CAROLINE WILLIAMS
RYAN E. WILMES
JUSTIN P. WILSON
KEVIN D. WILSON
JESSE R. WINKELS
CHRISTOPHER S. WIREMAN
DERICK J. WOLF
ALEX C. WOLFARD
CRISTOPHER R. WOOD
EMILY A. WOOD
SCOTT F. WOOD
SCOTT C. WOODBREY
BRIAN GREGORY WOOLLEY
HEATHER M. WOOTEN
MATTHEW C. WROTEN
MATTHEW C. WUNDERLICH
JODY L. WYNANS
BRIAN H. YATES
MARY C. YELNICKER
NATHAN P. YERRICK
JOHN M. YORK
TIMOTHY E. YOUNG
MICHAEL ANQUIN YUVIENCO
KARENA K. ZALOUDEK
SCOTT A. ZARBO
CHRISTOPHER J. ZAWORSKI, JR.
RICHARD W. ZEIGLER
TIMOTHY W. ZENS
JONATHAN LAWRENCE ZENTNER
SCOTT A. ZICARELLI
ANDREAS ZIEGLER
TODD M. ZIELINSKI
SARAH J. ZIMMERMAN
MICHAEL D. ZOLLARS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MEGAN E. ANDERSON
ELLIOT R. BLACKMAN
LISSETTE R. BOOKER
DANIELLE L. BRADFORD
JENNIFER L. CHENOWETH
BROOKS H. CRANE
JODY MICHAEL CRISP
KIMBERLY A. EDWARDS
AMBER J. EL AMIN
MATTHEW STEVEN EVERETTE
DOSSY B. FELTS, JR.
WILLIAM M. FRECHETTE
NICHOLAS R. FREESE
THOMAS ANTHONY GANGI
JASON M. GLITZ
GAYLAN A. GRAY
TY JOSHUA HANSON
JOSEPH S. HENNEY
RACHEL S. JACKSON
JAMES WEIR JORDAN, JR.
CHERRIZA S. KELLOGG
MAURICE DELANE LEWIS II
DAVID M. LUTZ
RALPH W. ONESKO
FREDRIC M. ORCUTT II
THERESA ANN PAXTON
CHANDRAMOULI RAJARAM
RUSSELL J. RAMSEY
ONEEKA R. RIVERS
SEAN D. ROTBART
SAMUEL FULTON SELLS
JIMMIE DALE SOUTHWOOD
CHARLIE D. STEVENS
JERRY W. THOMPSON, JR.
TAVEYA TAMARR WARE
RAJEEV S. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

DORI M. BAKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MARK D. DELVECCHIO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 1552:

To be colonel

ENRIQUE J. GWIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 1552:

To be colonel

MATTHEW J. WHAT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSE G. BAL

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOSEPH B. DORE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

CHRISTOPHER M. CHUNG

To be major

HEATH D. HOLT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

DEVIN G. MCCANE
SHARRI L. ORMSBEE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

JANNA X. GADDY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

BRADLEY H. STEPHENS
AMILYN M. TAPLIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

TERRY KIM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

JEFF A. BURCHFIELD
NEIL G. CAMPBELL
DUSTIN R. CRAPSE
HUNG M. DIEP
JEREMY T. GEROT
EDWARD J. GOMEZ
JOHN P. HORN
DECIRAY R. HUQ
EDWARD M. KASPAR
ALLAN C. KEITT
KERI L. MOLINA
PAUL J. STAMBAUGH
JOHN R. TATUM II
JOSHUA E. THOMPSON
FORREST C. VAUGHN IV
BRIAN D. WIECK

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

MIGUEL A. SANTISTEBAN

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 25, 2017:

THE JUDICIARY

AMUL R. THAPAR, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DAVID L. NORQUIST, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMPTROLLER).
KARI A. BINGEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.
ROBERT STORY KAREM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. SEAN L. MURPHY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JOHN A. OKON
CAPT. MICHAEL W. STUDEMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. EDWARD L. ANDERSON
CAPT. STUART P. BAKER
CAPT. MICHAEL D. BERNACCHI, JR.
CAPT. FRANK M. BRADLEY
CAPT. DANIEL L. CHEEVER
CAPT. YVETTE M. DAVIDS
CAPT. BRIAN P. FORT
CAPT. PETER A. GARVIN
CAPT. WILLIAM J. HOUSTON
CAPT. SARA A. JOYNER
CAPT. FREDERICK W. KACHER
CAPT. TIMOTHY C. KUEHHAS
CAPT. CARL A. LAHTI
CAPT. ANDREW J. LOISELLE
CAPT. DOUGLAS G. PERRY
CAPT. FRED I. PYLE
CAPT. ERIK M. ROSS
CAPT. PAUL J. SCHLISE
CAPT. JAMES P. WATERS III

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. BRADFORD J. SHWEDO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. GIOVANNI K. TUCK

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE VICE CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 3034:

To be general

LT. GEN. JAMES C. MCCONVILLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE DEPUTY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 3037 AND 3064:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. STUART W. RISCH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS C. SEAMANDS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MARK E. BLACK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MATTHEW V. BAKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. CHRIS R. GENTRY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ROBERT A. KARMAZIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARION GARCIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH E. WHITLOCK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MIGUEL A. CASTELLANOS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. WINDSOR S. BUZZA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. RANDALL V. SIMMONS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL D. WICKMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. CARL A. ALEX
BRIG. GEN. FRANCIS M. BEAUDETTE
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER F. BENTLEY
BRIG. GEN. GARY M. BRITO
BRIG. GEN. PATRICK W. BURDEN
BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH R. CALLOWAY
BRIG. GEN. PAUL T. CALVERT
BRIG. GEN. PAUL A. CHAMBERLAIN
BRIG. GEN. RONALD P. CLARK
BRIG. GEN. BRIAN P. CUMMINGS
BRIG. GEN. EDWIN J. DEEDRICK, JR.
BRIG. GEN. RODNEY D. FOGG
BRIG. GEN. ROBIN L. FONTES
BRIG. GEN. MARIA R. GERVAIS
BRIG. GEN. KAREN H. GIBSON
BRIG. GEN. DAVID P. GLASER
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM H. GRAHAM, JR.
BRIG. GEN. JAMES B. JARRARD
BRIG. GEN. GARY W. JOHNSTON
BRIG. GEN. MITCHELL L. KILGO
BRIG. GEN. RONALD KIRKLIN
BRIG. GEN. JOHN S. KOLASHESKI
BRIG. GEN. VIET X. LUONG
BRIG. GEN. PATRICK E. MATLOCK
BRIG. GEN. BRIAN J. MENNES
BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY L. MILHORN
BRIG. GEN. JAMES J. MINGUS
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER J. SHARPSTEN
BRIG. GEN. JOHN P. SULLIVAN
BRIG. GEN. FRANK W. TATE
BRIG. GEN. DANIEL R. WALRATH
BRIG. GEN. BRIAN E. WINSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624, 3037, AND 3064:

To be brigadier general

COL. SUSAN K. ARNOLD
COL. JOSEPH B. BERGER III
COL. ROBERT P. HUSTON

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. RICHARD J. LEBEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. TODD W. LEWIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be brigadier general

COL. GEORGE N. APPENZELLER

COL. TELITA CROSLAND

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEVEN R. RUDDER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LAURA J. RICHARDSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE SERVING AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601, 3037, AND 3064:

To be lieutenant general

BRIG. GEN. CHARLES N. PEDE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. PHILLIP G. SAWYER

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. BRIAN D. BEAUDREAULT

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JAMES E. THOMPSON, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JOHANNA K. REAM, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL R. AGUIRRE AND ENDING WITH PETER LAWRENCE ZALEWSKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF KALIE K. ROTT, TO BE COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATION OF NORMA A. HILL, TO BE MAJOR.
ARMY NOMINATION OF FRANK C. PESCATELLO, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BASIM M. YOUNIS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF STANLEY F. GOULD, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SCOTT W. FISHER, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GARY L. BEATY AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL A. M. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 24, 2017.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL J. CONVEY AND ENDING WITH PHILIP A. HORTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 24, 2017.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SOPHIA DALCE AND ENDING WITH BURKE LENZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 24, 2017.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DAWN E. ELLIOTT, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF D012528, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BENJAMIN W. HILLNER, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CELINA S. PARGO, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PAUL R. AMBROSE, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES L. DUNGCA AND ENDING WITH NATHAN S. LANHAM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 24, 2017.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHARLES R. BURNETT, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PABLO F. DIAZ, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CRAIG A. NAZARETH, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BRIAN C. MCLEAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RAYMOND C. CASTELINE, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DANIEL J. SHANK, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER W. DEGN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JASON T. KIDDER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF TITO M. VILLANUEVA, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PHILIP J. DACUNTO, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF STEPHEN R. NOVEMBER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF LUISA SANTIAGO, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ROBERT J. BONNER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MOHAMAD EL SAMAD, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF LANA J. BERNAT, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PATRICK K. SULLIVAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DEREK L. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH JAMES M. YATES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RODNEY ABRAMS AND ENDING WITH D010081, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTINE N. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH CHARLETTE K. WOODARD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARK S. JIMISON AND ENDING WITH SHAWN P. WONDERLICH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 27, 2017.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JASON G. LACIS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF KEVIN J. GOODWIN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JAVIER E. VEGA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF SERGIO L. SANDOVAL, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF MICHAEL S. STEVENS, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF PATRICK J. MULLEN, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RAYMOND L. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH DOUGLAS S. WOODHAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 10, 2017.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF SUSAN M. MCGARVEY, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF SHEILA I. ALMENDRAS-FLAHERTY, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ADRIAN D. RAGLAND, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER R. DESENA, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF KENNETH L. DEMICK, JR., TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL C. BRATLEY, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF EVAN M. COLBERT, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF LUCIANA SUNG, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF WILLIAM A. SCHULTZ, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF WILLIAM L. MCCOY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRIS F. WHITE, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF KARL M. KINGRY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL A. POLITO, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF RAYMOND J. CARLSON, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER M. ALLEN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF AARON L. WITHERSPOON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JOHN E. FRITZ, TO BE CAPTAIN.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, June 6, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 7

Time to be announced

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

S-216

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the USDA Forest Service.

SD-124

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization, focusing on administration perspectives.

SR-253

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, Annie Caputo, and David Wright, each to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and Susan Parker Bodine, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-406

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, and Russell Vought, of Vir-

ginia, to be Deputy Director, both of the Office of Management and Budget, and Brock Long, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

SD-342

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

SH-216

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services, and David Malpass, of New York, to be an Under Secretary, Andrew K. Maloney, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary, and Brent James McIntosh, of Michigan, to be General Counsel, all of the Department of the Treasury.

SD-215

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Army.

SD-192

2 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SD-138

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-192

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine Department of Defense nuclear acquisition programs and the nuclear doctrine.

SR-222

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Russell Vought, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SD-608

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on National Parks

To hold hearings to examine working to improve the National Park Service workplace environment.

SD-366

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Veterans Choice Program and the future of care in the community.

SR-418

3 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Library of Congress and the Architect of the Capitol.

SD-124

JUNE 8

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2018 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 782, to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and the nominations of Noel J. Francisco, of the District of Columbia, to be Solicitor General of the United States, and Makan Delrahim, of California, Steven Andrew Engel, of the District of Columbia, and Stephen Elliott Boyd, of Alabama, each to be an Assistant Attorney General, all of the Department of Justice, David C. Nye, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho, Scott L. Palk, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma, Vishal J. Amin, of Michigan, to be Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President, and Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

SD-226

9:45 a.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018.

SD-215

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Commerce.

SD-192

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine fostering economic growth, focusing on the role of financial institutions in local communities.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Derek Kan, of California, to be Under Secretary of Transportation for

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Policy, David J. Redl, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, and Robert L. Sumwalt III, of South Carolina, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board.

SR-253

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine cost reductions in emerging energy technologies with a specific focus on how recent trends may affect today's energy landscape.

SD-366

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine beyond Iraq and Syria, focusing on ISIS's global reach.

SD-419

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine certain intelligence matters relating to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SH-216

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine economic aspects of the opioid crisis.

LHOB-1100

1 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

JUNE 13

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for

fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Justice.

SD-192

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 1250, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to improve the recruitment and retention of employees in the Indian Health Service, restore accountability in the Indian Health Service, improve health services, S. 1275, to improve the housing conditions and promote useful land uses within tribal communities, and an original bill entitled, "HUD/VA Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing".

SD-628

JUNE 14

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Water and Power

To hold hearings to examine S. 440, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, S. 677, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, S. 685, to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System and the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System in the States of Montana and North Dakota, S. 930, to require the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration to establish a pilot project to provide increased transparency for cus-

tomers, S. 1012, to provide for drought preparedness measures in the State of New Mexico, S. 1029, to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to exempt certain small hydroelectric power projects that are applying for relicensing under the Federal Power Act from the licensing requirements of that Act, and S. 1030, to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to submit to Congress a report on certain hydropower projects.

SD-366

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine military caregivers, focusing on families serving for the long run.

SD-106

JUNE 27

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Labor.

SD-138

POSTPONEMENTS

JUNE 8

10 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management

To hold hearings to examine agency approaches to reorganization, focusing on Office of Management and Budget's memorandum on the Federal workforce.

SD-342

SENATE—Tuesday, June 6, 2017

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the fountain of wisdom, You are more majestic than the mountains. Give our lawmakers the reverence for You that will motivate them to do Your will. May they labor to enhance Your glory, striving to make our Nation and world stronger and better. Lord, help them to honor Your Name, cherishing the fact that they belong to You. Show them how to use today's fleeting moments to accomplish Your purposes. Sanctify their thoughts, words, and deeds. May they set You always before them as their guide, keeping You close so that they will not be shaken.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, every week, it seems we hear more news about the failures of ObamaCare. For instance, 2 weeks ago, we learned that nearly 70,000 people in parts of Missouri and Kansas will lose their last insurance provider on the ObamaCare exchanges in 2018. From rural towns to Kansas City, these Americans are being left without options. Last week, we learned that thousands of ObamaCare customers in Nebraska will be left with only one provider on the exchanges and that the remaining insurer hasn't even decided if it is going to stay through 2018. This week, we learned that the number of health insurers participating in ObamaCare exchanges had declined by nearly one-quarter from 2016 to 2017.

It has become painfully clear that ObamaCare is failing to live up to its promises and is collapsing right in

front of our eyes. If this failed ObamaCare status quo continues, more Americans are likely to lose their insurance options, more Americans are likely to continue seeing their premiums rise, and more Americans are likely to get caught in the downward spiral of ObamaCare.

It is time for our friends on the other side of the aisle to get serious about moving beyond the problems of this law. They spent years defending the system, promising it will get better over time and claiming others were exaggerating ObamaCare's flaws, but here is the reality our Democratic colleagues seem to be missing: ObamaCare did not get better. The problems are real and have continued to get worse.

Now Democrats are trying to blame the failures of ObamaCare on anything but—anything but—the broken healthcare law itself. They can try to shift the blame, but the American people are not going to fall for it.

Many Kentuckians have called for us to move away from ObamaCare to bring relief to families. An official report released last month showed that since ObamaCare's full enactment in 2013, average premiums in Kentucky have skyrocketed by 75 percent.

A woman from Lancaster, KY, wrote to my office recently to express her frustration. With high premiums and a staggering deductible, she asked:

Why is there a law forcing me to pay for something I can't afford? Either I can eat and pay my mortgage, or pay for insurance.

Far too many Americans face these painful choices every day because of ObamaCare. As the system continues to collapse around us, this Kentuckian and many more like her are left to deal with the consequences.

The ObamaCare status quo is unsustainable and unacceptable. Our country can do better, and our country really must do better. I hope Senate Democrats will join us as we move beyond the system's failures. They can either continue to defend this broken system with its higher costs and diminishing choices, or they can work with us to move beyond ObamaCare toward smarter healthcare solutions. What is clear is that we have to act. Otherwise, more Americans will be stuck paying the price of ObamaCare's continuing failures.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION BILL

Mr. McCONNELL. Now, Mr. President, on another matter, like those

who have called for relief from ObamaCare, many Americans across the Nation are counting on us to ensure better quality healthcare for our veterans. This is a critical issue for each of us no matter what State we come from, no matter what party we represent. Our veterans have sacrificed too much. In return, they deserve our support. We must keep the commitment we have to them when it comes to ensuring that the VA is providing the quality healthcare they rely on.

Unfortunately, as we all know, many VA facilities across the Nation have long failed to provide our Nation's heroes with the timely and effective medical attention they need. Already, Congress has taken a number of steps to improve these facilities for our veterans and to keep the faith for those who have willingly and courageously fought on our behalf.

Now we can build on those efforts by passing the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act. As the name implies, this legislation will enhance accountability measures at the VA and better enable the Department to remove—to remove—employees who are failing to meet the standards expected of them.

This bill, in conjunction with the continued administration efforts like those Secretary Shulkin announced yesterday, will further improve medical services offered to our veterans at VA facilities all across our country. It was unfortunate to see this legislation held up in a previous Congress, but I am proud that the Republican Senate has made its passage among our top priorities.

I once again recognize Veterans' Affairs Committee chairman JOHNNY ISAKSON and Senator RUBIO for the part they played in moving this very important bill forward and remaining vigilant on behalf of America's veterans. I know we are all eager to advance it today and send it on down to the White House for the President's signature.

NOMINATION OF COURTNEY ELWOOD

Mr. McCONNELL. Now, Mr. President, one final matter, today we will confirm Courtney Elwood, the nominee for general counsel at the Central Intelligence Agency. As Chairman BURR pointed out at her hearing, Ms. Elwood has an impressive legal background. She graduated from Yale Law School before clerking under Chief Justice William Rehnquist on the Supreme Court, and she served as a former advisor to both Vice President Cheney and

President Bush, as well as to the Attorney General.

In her role at the CIA, Ms. Elwood will be providing sound legal advice to Director Pompeo, ensuring accountability at the Agency as a whole, and overseeing a number of priorities that are key to supporting our Nation's intelligence community. Her nomination has already earned bipartisan support. I am sure that once she is confirmed, she will serve our country well in this new role.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first I want to talk about infrastructure. This week, the administration is laying out a few "proposals" on infrastructure. So far, it has been a major disappointment. President Trump pitched a trillion-dollar infrastructure plan in his campaign and continued to mention it in the days after the election. We Democrats welcomed the idea.

One of my first conversations with the President after he was elected was about infrastructure.

I said: You called for a trillion-dollar infrastructure program.

He said to me: At least that.

I said: Sounds good to me. Let's work on it.

We have made overtures to the White House saying we would be willing to work with the President on infrastructure. I said it to the President directly several times. Democrats have been pushing for new money for infrastructure for a very long time. We even put out our own proposal, a trillion-dollar infrastructure plan, hoping it would spark a discussion.

We Democrats continue to welcome a serious and constructive dialogue on this issue, but unfortunately the President continues to disappoint. We sent our plan several months ago, and we have heard nothing for those months. Now the President seems to be intent on pushing forward an infrastructure plan on his own, one with few details, that is mostly private sector driven—that means tolls—and with minimum investment, and that would ignore a huge section of our infrastructure. The President doesn't seem to be talking to anyone but a few people in his inner circle. Some of them are financiers. Of course, they have been financing private sector infrastructure for a long time, but that is not the way we have worked in America since Henry Clay, a former—not quite a Republican. We didn't have any then, but he was a Whig—the predecessor party—and he came up with this idea of internal improvements. I remind my dear friend,

the majority leader, Mr. CLAY was from Kentucky.

Internal improvements were supposed to connect what was then the east coast with the far West—Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio—with roads over Appalachia, and ever since, we have had bipartisan support on the Federal Government building infrastructure and putting in the dollars for it but not from President Trump, at least thus far.

The President's plan is a recipe for Trump tolls from one end of America to the other. That is not what the American people are crying out for. They don't want more tolls. They want us to rebuild our crumbling water systems, bridges, schools, roads, broadband, not finance new tollroads.

Unfortunately, the President surrounds himself with bankers and financiers. These are folks who used to work at investment banks. They look at infrastructure as an investment to be made by corporations in the private sector, but infrastructure has never been a business investment.

Infrastructure has been something the government has invested in for decades and even centuries because the benefits of infrastructure have great—what the economists call externalities. The benefits for having a good highway is not just for the people who use the highway, but if a factory locates nearby because it can get its goods there more frequently and quickly, that is a benefit. A road itself might not generate short-term profits, but a factory might locate nearby and bring jobs and economic vibrancy to an area. The private sector might not build high-speed internet all the way out to the house at the end of the road if there isn't a profit there, but our rural people are as entitled to high-speed internet as our people in urban areas and, I might add, there are large parts of my city, New York City, where that last mile isn't done because there are poorer residents and it is less profitable.

That is why there has always been the role of government to stimulate infrastructure investment, to provide support for necessary maintenance and construction which the private sector would ignore. To connect that house at the end of the road to high-speed internet so children living in it can learn, thrive, and benefit in a global economy benefits America, even if someone isn't making a huge profit immediately from the building of that broadband. It is the same with the highway, the same with the bridge, the same with water and sewer, the same with the school with internet.

The bottom line is, if the President wants to sit down with Democrats, of course we want to do it, but if he continues to take this path with a plan cooked up by Wall Street advisers, it will not succeed or it will result in such a small measure that it will not be effective.

Again, I say to the President—there is talk, I read in the newspapers—they want to do this by reconciliation, no Democratic votes, just 52 Republican votes in the Senate. The same problem they had with healthcare, the same problem they are having with tax reform, will repeat itself with infrastructure if you don't do it in a bipartisan way.

Our colleagues constantly remind us that ObamaCare didn't work because it was done by one party, but now they are letting Trump lead them to do the same thing on just about every major issue. It is a formula for failure President Trump is advocating. He hasn't been down here in Washington that long. It is up to our Republican colleagues to teach him that working in a bipartisan way is the only way you can really get things done.

So my view is, we need bipartisanship, but the President might not get—just remember that many Republicans are very negative, initially at least, with a private sector-driven infrastructure bill because they represent rural areas.

Here is what a Republican Senator from Wyoming, Mr. BARRASSO—fine man—said: "Funding solutions that involve public-private partnerships do not work for rural areas."

My friend, the Republican Senator from West Virginia, has said: "As a person who represents an almost all-rural State . . . I'm concerned about how we are going to be able to incent the private dollars to go to the less-populated, less-economically developed areas of our country, because the investments are just as important."

The bottom line is this, an investment bank infrastructure plan like the one the President is proposing is a sure loser in Congress. A Goldman Sachs infrastructure plan just will not work, except for a few. It would turn over a public good to the whims of private finance, who will not build infrastructure where America needs it. They will build it where they can make a buck, and that means tolls paid by working Americans and middle-class Americans. That means rural areas will not get the support they need. That means any project that can't generate user fees or taxes—like repairing our schools or water sewer systems—will not get done.

There is no free lunch. When the private sector wants to finance infrastructure, they naturally—that is our free enterprise system—want to get repaid, but who is going to repay them? The average American: the truckdriver who is scratching out a living, the salesman or saleswoman who is scratching out a living, the family who is going on vacation and has to stop every 30 miles for another big toll, the small business that depends on roads to get the goods to and from that business location.

If the President truly wants to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure, he

has to approach this issue in a bipartisan way. There are several Republicans who don't want the Federal Government to spend any more money on infrastructure, but the majority of Senators of both parties probably do. The President needs to sit down with Democrats and work something out if he wants to get something done. He hasn't sat down with Democrats. He doesn't seem to want to. There are even reports that the President is considering doing infrastructure on reconciliation. That means just Republican votes, a huge mistake.

Republicans have been tied in a knot here in Washington. The President has been tied here in a knot in Washington because he insists on going at it alone.

Look at the entire Trump administration agenda. President Trump ran against both the Democratic and Republican establishments—a populist, if you will, but he has thrown his lot, since he has become President, with hard-right conservatives and is now pursuing an agenda entirely through the partisan process Republicans once decried—healthcare, reconciliation; taxes, the same. Now infrastructure? The one area where we kept the President out of it, the appropriations process worked swimmingly well. Leader MCCONNELL and I, Senators COCHRAN and LEAHY, and the House Members got together in a bipartisan way and we worked it out. We each thought we had some victories. It worked, but I had to stand at this desk and tell our Republican colleagues to keep the President out of it because it will bullocks everything up. Fortunately, they did. Maybe we can do that again.

I would say to the President: Mr. President, you can spend your entire first-term agenda trying to jam through partisan bills. That would be a shame because America needs to get moving again. On infrastructure, this is an issue where we really have some common ground. That is why Senate Democrats put forward a trillion-dollar infrastructure plan that would create millions of jobs and actually fix our crumbling roads and bridges, invest in every corner of America, with particular attention to rural America.

We stand ready and willing to work with the President on that plan or something similar that actually achieves what he promised on the campaign trail.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, another matter: healthcare. According to reports, Republican Senators were planning to use the State work period last week to rewrite their healthcare bill. Well, now we are back in session, and unfortunately my friends on the other side of the aisle don't seem to be any closer to having a bill. If they do have one, they are hiding it and going

down the same path as House Republicans—drafting a bill that will impact tens of millions in secret, no transparency, no committee hearings, no debate.

Even with all this secrecy, more and more Republicans seem increasingly pessimistic about finding a Republican-only bill that can get 50 votes in the Senate. Over the weekend, the senior Republican Senator from North Carolina, Mr. BURR, said: "I don't see a comprehensive health-care plan this year."

Just yesterday, Senator THUNE, a member of the Republican leadership, said the Republicans may rush a healthcare bill to the floor before they know if it has the support of their caucus.

Well, my friends on the other side of the aisle are learning how difficult it is to refigure our healthcare system under a process with only votes from one party—the so-called reconciliation process—and do it in a way that actually improves our healthcare, not devastate it, as the House bill would.

I hope my Republican friends will realize the only way we will get votes necessary to pass a healthcare bill is to drop repeal and work with Democrats to improve our healthcare system, not to sabotage it. We stand ready and willing to work with our Republican colleagues to further stabilize the insurance markets, build on the progress we have made in healthcare. In fact, we are running out of time before the 2018 rates are locked in.

Most insurance companies are saying they are raising rates because of the uncertainty Republicans continue to inject into the market. The President has not come out permanently for cost-sharing, which would reduce premiums and keep people in the market. They just sort of do it one at a time, and that is going to make the markets worse.

The public already unfortunately will blame those in charge—our Republican friends and the President—for the mess, as much as they would like to look past—as much of our colleagues on the another side of the aisle want to point fingers. People want something done now. They don't want fingers of blame pointed back at what happened 5 years ago or 8 years ago.

We Democrats don't want to tear everything down and start over again. Let's keep all the progress—the 20 million more Americans insured, the kids who can stay on their parents' plan, the protections for folks with pre-existing conditions—and find ways to make even more progress on bringing down costs for consumers and improving the quality of care.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Elwood nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Courtney Elwood, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I came to the floor to talk about other matters, and I will get to those in a moment. I can't help but be struck by the Democratic leader's sudden interest in addressing healthcare reform.

It is a fact that even if Hillary Clinton were elected President of the United States, we would be revisiting the failed promises of the Affordable Care Act. For example, premiums, since 2013, have gone up 105 percent in the individual market. Those are people who don't have employer-provided coverage or aren't on Medicare or Medicaid. Small businesses and individuals who have to go out and purchase their healthcare have seen premiums go up 105 percent.

We hear stories every day—and I will recount some of those from Texas—where people say they have zero choices. For example, in Iowa, we learned there are no insurance companies that are willing to sell health insurance on the individual market. That isn't because of anything that President Trump or the Republican majority have done. These are the failures of ObamaCare.

President Obama made extravagant promises about ObamaCare, none of which has really proven to be true. He said he would bring down premiums \$2,500 for a family of four. Well, these folks in the individual market have seen their premiums go up 105 percent since 2013. He said that if you like your policy, you could keep your policy. That proved not to be true because unless you bought the government-approved healthcare policy, insurance companies couldn't sell it on the exchanges. He said: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor.

But as people found out when their policies changed, frequently the doctors in the network they could see changed. People saw premiums go up. They lost coverage they liked, and they lost the doctor they had confidence in.

So the suggestion of the Democratic leader that somehow this current situation is a result of President Trump or congressional action is ludicrous. I think people understand that, but I just couldn't resist responding a little bit to what he had to say, because sometimes when people don't respond they assume there isn't a response, and clearly there is.

TRIBUTE TO TEXAS MILITARY ACADEMY
APPOINTEES

Mr. President, it is good to be back at work here in Washington after a work week at home. I had the honor, starting on Memorial Day, of spending some time with Texas's newest recruits to our country's military academies.

Every year, now for the 11th year, I have had the privilege of hosting an academy sendoff ceremony in "Military City U.S.A.," my hometown of San Antonio. This annual gathering recognizes the bright young Texans who have accepted an appointment to one of the premier military academies that serve our Armed Forces, and I am always proud to celebrate the incredible achievement they have made so far in their young lives and encourage them as they begin a life of public service. It is truly inspirational, and it is my favorite event of the year.

This year about 272 young Texans have answered the call to get a service academy education and a career in military service. It is a good deal if you can qualify for it because basically you get a free ride to one of these premier service academies, and we train the next generation of military leaders, which is good for all of us.

My wife Sandy and I look forward to this event each year, and we find that Memorial Day is a fitting time to send off these young men and women, while we at the same time remembering the ultimate sacrifice made by those who gave their lives answering that same call to service.

I try to recruit a top-tier speaker to these events, somebody who will challenge and inspire these young men and women, and this year was no exception. ADM William McRaven, the Chancellor of the University of Texas System, spoke to these incoming midshipmen about lessons he learned in public service and his 37 years in the U.S. Navy as a Navy SEAL.

He spoke candidly that this would be the greatest challenge of their young lives but also the most rewarding. He said it would be a decision they would never regret. He also spent some time—appropriately, on Memorial Day—talking about the heroes who have sacrificed all to serve the military in the greatest country in the world. So all in all, Memorial Day was a great day, and it was a great event for these young men and women.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION BILL

Mr. President, as we come back the week after Memorial Day, I know I am not the only one encouraged to find better and more effective ways to serve our country. Fortunately, this Chamber in the Senate will have a chance to do that. Soon we will vote on a bill that will reform the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, a Department riddled with inefficiencies and marked too often by scandal and corruption.

This is a huge government department. At last count, some 330,000 people worked for the Veterans' Administration and, unfortunately, we have all become familiar with the horror stories of fake scheduling, indicating that people actually were being seen who were not seen, huge wait times, and people literally dying as a result of not getting the treatment they earned by virtue of their service in the military through the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The legislation we will vote on is called the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act. It will protect the Veterans' Administration employees who care deeply for veterans by protecting them as whistleblowers. It also provides managers with the tools they need to address poor performance and misconduct. To sum it up, this bill will make it easier for VA employees to be held accountable, and that is something the Veterans' Administration and our veterans desperately need, and it has for some time. It will make the VA work better for the men and women who have served us so well.

I should point out that at a time when I suspect people doubt whether there is any bipartisanship in the Congress or in Washington, this is a bipartisan piece of legislation. It was voted out of the Veterans' Affairs Committee by a voice vote 2 weeks ago, which essentially is by unanimous consent.

It has growing support among groups focused on helping our returning warriors to get the treatment, care, and support they need. That is because the VA bill will do what it is supposed to do and, unfortunately, hasn't always done well, which is to serve our veterans.

Like all of us, I have the honor of meeting with our veterans regularly and working with them to help them succeed after giving so much of themselves to keep our country safe.

One other example of bipartisan legislation that was signed last week by the President of the United States is a bill called the American Law Enforcement Heroes Act, a bill that I introduced to help connect veterans to opportunities in law enforcement in their local communities. So it is another example—perhaps, not in the headlines. There is not a big partisan food fight

over it. So maybe most people are not aware of it. But I think it is important to remind people that, amid all of the distractions they see in Washington and in the news, there is important work being done to benefit people who certainly deserve it, and that would be the case for our veterans.

I am thankful for the work of the chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, Senator ISAKSON, as well as the diligent and thoughtful work of the Senator from Florida, Mr. RUBIO, on this important veterans bill. I look forward to passing this bill soon.

Mr. President, I also look forward this afternoon to confirming the nominee for general counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency. Director Pompeo has been there for some time now, having been nominated by President Trump and confirmed. He is an outstanding choice to be the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Like every organization, it seems these days, the CIA needs a good lawyer to lead its effort to make sure that it conducts itself precisely in accordance with the rule of law.

Ms. Elwood is extraordinarily qualified. She served during the administration of President George W. Bush as Counselor to the Attorney General, Deputy Counsel to the Vice President, and Associate Counsel to the President. I am confident that she will serve as a sharp, independent mind to the CIA. I hope we will confirm Courtney Elwood soon, and I trust we will.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Finally, Mr. President, as we redouble our work on the failed ObamaCare law and seek to replace it with market-driven solutions so people can actually buy insurance they want at a price they can afford, I want to briefly remind my colleagues why we are fixing it. I alluded to that at the beginning, and I will close with a few more reminders.

Just last week it was reported that only three insurance companies that offered plans on the ObamaCare exchanges will return to the Houston area in 2018. In 2016, just last year, there was more than twice that number. So we see that the pool of available choices for Americans on the exchanges has shrunk and continues to shrink in places such as Iowa, where it has gone away entirely and where there is no insurance company willing to sell insurance on the ObamaCare exchanges. Houston, after all, is the Nation's fourth most populous city. So if you see that sort of trend there, it can and will happen everywhere.

ObamaCare continues to fail the American people by not delivering on its promises. I have said before that in my previous life I was attorney general of the State of Texas. One of the most important jobs the attorney general's office does is consumer protection, protecting consumers from fraudsters and

those who would try to deceive them and cheat them out of their hard-earned money. I have said, because I believe it to be true, that ObamaCare represents one of the largest cases of consumer fraud I have ever seen. When President Obama made the extravagant promises he made and yet we have the evidence of its failure, it is clear that the American people were misled when it came to ObamaCare.

Many people aren't getting the access to healthcare they thought, and those who are using ObamaCare exchanges are finding it increasingly expensive. The premiums, as I indicated earlier, have gone up 105 percent in 39 States with ObamaCare exchanges, since 2013 alone. Then, with the deductible, most people find that their out-of-pocket costs before the insurance actually kicks in keeps going up and up and up, to the extent that many people essentially find themselves without the benefit of the insurance they are paying so much for because the deductible is so high. We know the insurers on the exchanges just keep passing the cost on to the customer, with rate increases up almost 50 percent in many cases. That is just in the Houston area, which I am talking about. Obviously, the 105 percent in 2016 is a nationwide number. We know that nationwide, as well, only one in three counties has only one insurer on the ObamaCare exchange as of 2017. This is just simply unsustainable, and it is irresponsible.

That is why my colleagues and I are committed to doing something about it. Our friend, the Democratic leader, was in here claiming that the instability in the market and the fact that premiums are so high and insurance companies are leaving are as a result of the instability created by political uncertainty now. Well, that is clearly not the case. ObamaCare has been with us since 2016, and it has been a terrible failure for the people who buy their insurance on the individual markets. That is why we are committed to doing everything we can to replacing it with patient-centered options that actually work to help people get the type of coverage they want at a price they can afford.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on the nomination of Courtney Elwood to be CIA general counsel. This is an important job that got even more important in the past week. As I will explain, this position

may play a crucial role in determining whether history is erased or preserved for generations of Americans to come.

As Senators know, last week the current chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee demanded that several key government agencies get rid of their copies of the torture report prepared by Senator FEINSTEIN and her colleagues. I am going to take a few minutes to describe what this has to do with Courtney Elwood.

In short, it starts with the CIA's history of torture, which was carefully documented and sourced by the Intelligence Committee under Senator FEINSTEIN's leadership. This is the issue that is being debated—the CIA's history of torture. That is why it is critically important that the CIA get back its copy of the report. If Courtney Elwood is confirmed, the decision on whether to do so may be up to her. Here is why: The CIA Director, Mr. Pompeo, who said at his confirmation hearing that he would read the report, has gotten rid of the CIA's copy. He did so despite the fact that the current chair of the Intelligence Committee had no authority to demand that of him. Mr. Pompeo got rid of the report despite a personal promise to read it, and he did this even though it may have violated the law. It certainly violated a fundamental principle important to the American people that in this country, we don't erase history.

Now, this can be fixed. The CIA can get the report back. It can do what Senator FEINSTEIN told the government to do back in 2014, which is to distribute this report, read it, and learn from it. Will Director Pompeo get the report back on his own? There is no reason to think so. But if there is one thing Director Pompeo said again and again in his remarks during the confirmation process, it is that he told the Senate Intelligence Committee repeatedly that he is going to rely on the advice of his lawyers.

That is exactly where Courtney Elwood comes in. What will her advice be to Director Pompeo? What will she advise him about whether to allow this attempt to erase history to stand or whether it is going to get fixed and the report is going to be brought back? The Senate doesn't have any idea this morning. We do know that Ms. Elwood's responses to questions on the torture issue were troubling and that we need to look at those responses in a whole new light based on what happened last week.

Ms. Elwood said that she read the unclassified executive summary of the torture report, but based on her responses to questions, the 500-page executive summary was not adequate for her. It was not sufficient for her to conclude whether the CIA's interrogation techniques violated the law. Clearly, she needed to read the classified report. Ms. Elwood, in both her written

answers and at her hearing, said that she would read the classified report. But now, because of what the current chair of the Intelligence Committee and the Director of the CIA have done, it is not going to be available. It is not going to be available for her to read.

Many Members of this body have spoken out about the torture report and the need for its lessons to be learned so this country never again engages in the kind of illegal, damaging program that Senator FEINSTEIN has documented. But now there is an issue that goes beyond what the Senate has thought this was all about. Now there is an individual nominee for whom these lessons are critical. This nominee told our committee that she had not yet studied whether the CIA's torture techniques were legal. She told us she would read the report, and now the report is gone. What could be more troubling than that?

What is at issue here is one of the most disturbing and undemocratic events ever to take place in the U.S. Senate. The current chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee has told the executive branch to get rid of its copies of the report, and at least some of the agencies have sent their only copies to the committee. I am going to be clear: The current chair does not have the authority to do this.

First, in December of 2014, the full, final, classified report was filed as a Senate report. It is therefore not a committee document. Second, no one can retroactively change the status of a historical Senate report. The report was finalized, filed, and transmitted to the executive branch during the 113th Congress. Only in the 114th Congress did the current chair assume the chairmanship and begin to assert control over the report.

Think about the implications here. How can this body allow Members of Congress who don't like what a previous Congress has done to unilaterally try to erase history? How many other congressional reports would be at risk? There are other reports that have not yet been fully declassified. Should the Senate worry about whether or not they will be protected? Should Americans be concerned that the country's historical records are going to be erased before the public ever sees them?

My view is that this effort by the current chair of the committee is an assault on one of the fundamental values of our democracy. In this country, we don't eradicate the historical record just because we find it uncomfortable. There is a reason insecure dictators do it, and there is a reason this kind of thing has never happened here. It is because we are a confident democracy that has always looked to our own history and all our flaws as we seek to build a better Nation.

We are better than this. I urge my colleagues to defend these principles. I

urge them to vote against this nomination.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to add my support this morning for Courtney Elwood as the next general counsel of the CIA—not that she really needs it. In her many years of public service and private practice, Courtney has earned the esteem of her colleagues across both parties and two administrations. David Kris, an Obama appointee, calls her “a first-class lawyer.” Ben Powell, a Bush appointee, calls her “one of the finest lawyers of her generation.” Caroline Krass, another Obama appointee, calls her “an excellent choice.” And Wan Kim, another Bush appointee, says she is “careful, brilliant, and highly accomplished.”

In other words, you don’t need me to tell you Courtney Elwood is a first-rate attorney. In fact, you don’t need anyone to tell you that because her accomplishments speak for themselves.

She graduated from Yale Law School in 1994 and went on to clerk for both Judge Mike Luttig on the Fourth Circuit and then-Chief Justice William Rehnquist at the Supreme Court. After spending some time in private practice, she worked for 6 years in the George W. Bush administration, rising from associate counsel to the President, to deputy counsel to the Vice President, to Deputy Chief of Staff and Counselor to the Attorney General.

We are not talking about a rookie lawyer who is inexperienced in the ways of Washington or in the corridors of power. Her commitment to the law is unquestioned and unquestionable. She is just the person we need for this position.

The general counsel of the CIA will help Director Pompeo navigate the many twists and turns of the thorny legal terrain as our intelligence community defends our country against a wide range of threats: terrorism, cyber warfare, and good, old-fashioned espionage. We need people of the highest caliber serving at our national security agencies, and there is broad agreement that Courtney Elwood fits the bill.

I am happy to support her nomination, and I thank her and her family for answering the call to serve once again.

(The remarks of Mr. COTTON pertaining to the introduction of S. 1297 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, in the critical debate about the balance between national security and rights to privacy, the truth must be paramount. Time and again, President Trump has misled the American public about national security matters, including torture, surveillance, and intelligence.

Trump has claimed that “torture works” and that “we should go much stronger than waterboarding,” despite widespread evidence that enhanced interrogation techniques are not effective in acquiring intelligence or gaining cooperation from detainees. Without any evidence, President Trump alleged that President Obama illegally wiretapped the phones of Trump Towers. Former FBI Director James Comey soundly rejected this conspiracy theory, a statement that likely played a role in his firing. President Trump repeatedly dismissed intelligence that Russia interfered in our 2016 elections and derided our intelligence community for its assessments. His rejection of truth, to stoke fear and resentment in the American public, is unethical and dangerous. It is a threat to American freedoms.

In this extraordinary environment, the CIA’s leadership must not only provide objective and sound intelligence assessments to the President, it must faithfully ensure that the President is adhering to the law. The role of the General Counsel is particularly critical at this moment, when our sitting President has openly denounced or displayed alarming ignorance of existing laws on intelligence matters. As the CIA General Counsel’s guidance is provided entirely in secret, with no public transparency, it is imperative that the American public have as clear an understanding as possible of the nominee’s prior record of legal interpretation.

On this point, Courtney Elwood’s history under President George W. Bush is troubling. At the Department of Justice, Ms. Elwood was involved in discussions regarding the legal justification for the “warrantless wiretapping program,” in which the Bush administration collected telephonic and email communications of U.S. persons on U.S. soil without a court order. The Bush administration, in memos that are now declassified, argued that the President has inherent constitutional power to monitor Americans’ communications without a warrant in a time of war. Given the perennial nature of America’s war footing, this argument afforded the President a virtually unlimited authority to surveil Americans. When asked for her views on this legal justification in testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Ms. Elwood asserted that the program was “carefully reasoned” and that the Justice Department was “thorough in its analysis.”

Ms. Elwood’s record on torture is also cause for concern. While I was pleased with Ms. Elwood’s testimony that the reinstatement of torture would be illegal under existing law, I am concerned with her prior work on cases involving the detention of enemy combatants, military commissions, and the constitutionality of national

security programs under President Bush. For these reasons, I cannot support her nomination.

Mr. COTTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I am here to speak about a topic which, wherever I go, people speak about—the replacement of the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare, as people call it. Clearly, we need action.

I had a Facebook post maybe a week or two ago from Brian in Covington, LA. He said: My family plan is \$1,700. The quote goes on to say how his family cannot afford that \$1,700.

Rates are going up, which I have said time and time again. My friend back in Baton Rouge, he and his wife are 60, 61. The quote for their insurance last year was \$39,000—for 1 year. That is clearly not affordable. This is not just in Louisiana; it is in Washington, DC, it is in California, it is across our Nation where individual market quotes are going up that they cannot support.

Most recently, Connecticut insurers—there are two—are proposing rate increases that are 15.2 percent and 33.8 percent, on average, respectively. They are quoting 22 percent over 2017. In Maryland, some insurers are going to raise rates as much as 59 percent for those individual plans.

I am a physician. I learned a couple of things in my 20 or 30 years of practice. One, to lower costs, the patient must have the power; and, two, the insurance must be affordable; and, three, that the insurance they receive must be adequate. President Trump totally got this. On the campaign trail, President Trump said time and again—what I call his contract with the voter. He wanted folks to maintain coverage with lower premiums, care for those with preexisting conditions, and eliminating mandates. I think President Trump just knew it. I shorthand this, if you will, saying, if we focus on lowering premiums and making sure it passes the Jimmy Kimmel test. The late-night comedian, when his child was born with a terrible heart problem, immediately got the care that child needed. So if we can have insurance that passes the Jimmy Kimmel test—lowering premiums, taking care of the rest of President Trump’s goals, then I think we can accomplish it. We need to talk to experts, actuaries, those who design insurance plans, to make sure we come up with something.

There is something else the President said that I want to focus on. This is

just before he took the oath of office. He said people covered under the law—meaning the Republican replacement—can expect to have great healthcare. “It will be much simplified.” One of the complaints about the Affordable Care Act is it is so complicated. Even online, 16 pages online, with your W-2, if you don’t get it, you get booted out. The President said we must have a much simpler way of going about this—much less expensive and much better.

What could this look like? Let me propose some conservative solutions that could be in a Republican plan that would achieve the President’s goal. First, the patient has to have the power. In my 30 years of practice, I found that if the patient has the power, the system lines up to serve her. One example is price transparency. If we can put in that a provider has to publish the provider’s price, so the patient getting the blood test knows the cost of the blood test at that moment and can compare it to someone down the street, we will lower cost.

One example just came up in a newspaper out of New Orleans. Nola.com is their website. A woman went in and got blood tests. She received a bill weeks later and her bill was for \$324. She found she could have gotten the same blood test for \$34 right down the street. A woman from Texas came up. She said she heard me speak of price transparency—the power of negotiating, if you will. The doctor ordered an MRI on her son’s shoulder. She called up the different places where she could have it done and she got a price of \$667. On my Facebook page is a little video of her speaking: I got it for \$667. Then I remembered what you said: If you pay cash, you get a discount. I called them back. I said, if I pay cash, will you give me a lower price? They said: Pay us cash, we will cut that \$667 to \$400. The patient had the power. So she ended up paying far less for the procedure the doctor ordered. That is one conservative solution, give the patient the power.

Secondly, let States innovate. We need to take all of this power that ObamaCare brought to Washington, DC, and push it back out to the States. If we do that, we are going to accomplish something. Let’s just acknowledge that there are 700,000 people or so in Alaska. If you took a map of the State of Alaska and put it over the lower 48, it would stretch from roughly Georgia to the Pacific Ocean. Washington, DC, has almost the same population as Alaska, and you can walk across the city in a morning. Clearly, you need different solutions for an area you can walk across and an area you cannot fly across in the same time that you would walk across Washington, DC. We have to return power back to the patients. We have to engage doctors and patients so those patients with complex conditions get their

healthcare managed. I use the example of a diabetic. She perhaps developed childhood diabetes, and now she is 35 years old. If a doctor is managing her condition, she works, stays at home, her complications are minimal, and her life is much better. If her condition is not managed, she comes to the emergency room three times a month with diabetes out of control. That just shoots a hole in the bucket of fiscal responsibility and also in her health. Instead of working, keeping a family, she is coming to the hospital, getting care through the emergency room, which she cannot afford to pay for, and that cost is shifted to everyone else. That is not the way to manage that. We need to engage doctors with patients.

Another conservative solution is we need more competition between insurers so there is not just one insurance company in the market that can therefore set prices but rather we have multiple. So if we give the patient the power by giving the patient a tax credit that she can use to purchase the insurance she wishes to have, that will create competition as more insurers enter the market. If we have that competition—those market forces—prices come down.

When the President said we have to make things simpler, I think that also includes how we enroll people in insurance. We figured that out on Medicare. Under Medicare, if someone turns 65, they are on Medicare. It could not be simpler. They get a letter. They are on Medicare. If they don’t want to, they can call: Hey, I don’t want to be on Medicare. But as a rule, they are on Medicare.

Fortune 500 companies have figured out the same thing. In order to enroll people into retirement plans they say: Listen, you are in the 401(k) plan unless you choose not to be. That makes it simpler to get a 95-percent enrollment in retirement plans. Now, you could say: Hey, listen, you have to fill out a bunch of forms. If you don’t fill out these forms, you are not going to be enrolled. But that would not work for Medicare. It would not work for 401(k)s. It has not worked under ObamaCare.

We need to take those same sort of solutions we have found for both Medicare and enrolling people in their retirement and do it for the Republican alternative.

The Republican alternative would say: We make it easy to enroll. You are in unless you are out. So if you are eligible for a tax credit, you would receive it. You would then have the insurance. If you were passive about it, you would have a default policy. But if you are active, you could do more with it. But by doing so, you actually increase the number of people insured.

Now, when you increase the pool of those insured, you lower premiums. We had Blue Cross look at our proposal to

make it easy to enroll: You are in unless you are out. That would lower premiums by 20 percent, just by expanding the number of those who are insured—20 percent.

So when President Trump says he wants to continue coverage, caring for those with preexisting conditions without mandates and lowering premiums, doing this feature where you are in unless you call us and tell us you don’t want to be and making it simple achieves all four goals.

We would increase coverage. By that, we would lower premiums, taking care of those with preexisting conditions. Now, again, it is using the mechanism that is already used in Medicare and in Fortune 500 companies, making it easy to enroll. There are some who don’t want to give States the options. They don’t want to give patients the options. They don’t want to make it simple to enroll. They want to replace, if you will, the tyranny of ObamaCare—where all of this power is taken to Washington, DC, and States and people were told what they had to do—with a different sort of tyranny, telling States what they can’t do.

I think we ought to give as much power to the States, as much latitude to the patients to come up with the solutions that work for them. That is the conservative way to go.

But I will say, in speaking with conservatives, that I very much invite our Democratic colleagues to come to the table. There are some of my Democratic colleagues who have said they just want Republicans to work through this, thinking that it might be a political train wreck that would work to their advantage. But in those States there are Americans whose premiums are becoming unaffordable.

I mentioned earlier that in Connecticut premiums are rising 15 and 34 percent this year. In Oregon, it is as high as 22 percent, and Maryland is as high as 60 percent.

Now, who cares if the person is a Democrat or a Republican? If her premium is increasing 60 percent, she cannot afford it. So I challenge my Democratic colleagues to get off the sidelines and engage. Try to do something not for political purposes but for the purpose of that person who is at home struggling to pay the bills and deciding that she can no longer afford insurance, but, perhaps unbeknown to her, she has a cancer brewing inside her. Just when she decides she can no longer afford coverage because premiums have risen 60 percent, that is when her cancer is discovered.

We have to address this. It will take us on either side of the aisle—both Democrats and Republicans—to work together. I will finish with a quote from a fellow from Covington, Brian, on my Facebook page. He said that his family plan is \$1,700 a month, for him, his wife, and his two children. The

ACA, the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, has brought him to his knees. I hope we can get something done. The middle class is dwindling away. Can everyone just come together and figure this out?

This is a cry for help. It is a challenge to Republicans and Democrats to come up with a plan that is not a red plan or a blue plan but an American plan to address his needs, his wife's needs, and those similar to him across the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

HONORING THE GHOST ARMY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, thank you and Senator CASSIDY. We just came back, as we all know, from the Memorial Day recess. I wanted today not to only reflect on that but also to reflect on our anniversary of D-day and the day that our Allies invaded France in 1944. In doing so today, I would like to speak and pay tribute to all of those—including, but not limited to, Americans, but especially Americans—who risked their lives to defend our freedoms.

In particular, I come today to recognize a special group of dedicated soldiers. You probably have not heard of them, but they are referred to as the Ghost Army—the Ghost Army. This is a unit that served in World War II. It was comprised of the 23rd Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133rd Signal Service Company. The personnel of this U.S. Army unit were handpicked. They were handpicked for their artistic and creative characteristics, and you will see why in just a moment.

They handled top secret information, and they were among some of America's most promising artists, engineers, and signals professionals. The mission of the Ghost Army was very simple: Fool Adolph Hitler—fool Adolph Hitler by using what was called tactical deception. The Ghost Army's deceptive creation of fake battles, inflatable tanks, theatrical props, and other inventive equipment falsified troop movements, and had our enemies chasing ghosts—hence the name the Ghost Army.

Beginning in Normandy 2 weeks after D-day and ending in the Rhine River Valley, the Ghost Army staged over 20 fake battles—fake battlefield deceptions. The German Army did not know whether they were coming or going, thanks to the Ghost Army. These performances, of course, were illusions. They were called illusions by the soldiers. They occurred in the most dangerous spot in the war, on the frontline of battle.

Now, without the Ghost Army's dedication and fearless perseverance, Allied successes at the Battle of the Bulge and the final battles in Po Valley, Italy, would not have been possible. The 23rd unit was composed of only 1,184 men—1,200 men. They put them-

selves at risk every day at the forefront of danger, and they fought tirelessly. They used ingenious, innovative methods to mislead the enemy, ultimately leading the Allies to many victories in Europe. Because of their bravery, because of the bravery of the 1,200 men in the Ghost Army, up to 30,000 American soldiers and 10,000 German soldiers were able to return home alive.

So why are we waiting until today to honor these 1,184 brave Americans? Because until recently the Ghost Army's mission was classified. It was top secret. Nobody except the members of the Ghost Army knew anything about it. This has finally changed. That is one of the reasons I am here today. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Ghost Army soldier bill, a bipartisan effort led by Senators MARKEY, COLLINS, and KING. This long overdue legislation will award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23rd Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133rd Signal Service Company.

It is a privilege to share that, in my home State of Louisiana, the Ghost Army is being recognized at the New Orleans Museum of Art. Soldier's art is on display depicting many watercolor portraits, as well as graphite portraits, of civilians, soldiers, and refugees during World War II. It is a legacy that our great State now gets to honor.

Specifically, I want to recognize six brave men from Louisiana, my State, who were members of the Ghost Army. Hilton Howell Railey of New Orleans is a prominent journalist and the author of "Touch'd with Madness." He recruited several of the handpicked 23rd. Mr. Railey trained and deployed the 3133rd Signal Service Company, which served in Italy.

There is Jim Stegg of New Orleans, a longtime faculty member at Tulane. He was an artist; in fact, there is a retrospective of his work at the New Orleans Museum of Art's Ghost Army exhibit.

Also, there is Mr. Murphy P. Martin, of St. Martinville, LA; Mr. Thomas L. Raggio, of Lake Charles, LA; Mr. Roy L. Ravia, of Calcasieu Parish, in my State; Mr. Alvin J. Picard, of Vermilion Parish; and last but certainly not least, Mr. Anderson B. Wilson, of Slidell, LA.

Unfortunately, Mr. Wilson is the only Ghost Army soldier still alive in Louisiana. I had the rare privilege and the rare honor of speaking with Mr. Wilson this morning. In December of 1943, President Roosevelt authorized the Ghost Army unit. Only 2 weeks later, in January 1944, Mr. Wilson was on his way to Camp Mack Morris, TN, to join the Ghost Army. Who says the Federal Government can't move quickly when it wants to?

Mr. Wilson trained there until May, when his unit was shipped out of New York to Liverpool, England. It was the largest convoy that at the time had

ever crossed the Atlantic Ocean. From there, Mr. Wilson and his team traveled more than any other unit. From England they went to France. They went to Belgium. They went to Holland. They went to Luxembourg, and they went to Germany.

Mr. Wilson and his comrades fought fearlessly through the war's end as members of the Ghost Army. In July 1945, Mr. Wilson finally came home. However, while he came home safely, he could not even disclose, he couldn't even talk about—even to his own family—the honorable service unit he was a part of. Now, it is humbling to me to hear a man's sacrifice, to go through what he went through and not even be able to talk about it with his family, but he kept his word out of honor to his country.

The willingness of Mr. Wilson and his fellow soldiers to risk their own lives to defend the freedom we have today—well, it, too, is humbling.

Mr. Wilson returned home in 1945. And I hope he is listening right now. He has been a little under the weather. He was in the hospital when I spoke to him today. It wasn't until the 1990s, when Mr. Wilson was married with two grown children, that he could ever talk about his service to this great country, share his stories, share his experiences, share his fight to keep the freedoms all of us take for granted every day.

Mr. Wilson's story only gives a snapshot of the sacrifices and honorable work these men of the Ghost Army gave to the Allied forces victory. And I, for one—and I know all Americans join me—thank them for their service and for the freedoms they protected.

I am proud of this Ghost Army legislation, and I hope to see it move forward and pass so that these fine Americans can receive the recognition they have long deserved.

God bless the members of the Ghost Army. And if you are listening, Mr. Wilson, God bless you.

RECESS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:01 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Elwood nomination?

Mr. WICKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.
The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 139 Ex.]

YEAS—67

Alexander	Feinstein	Moran
Barrasso	Fischer	Murkowski
Bennet	Flake	Murphy
Blunt	Gardner	Nelson
Boozman	Graham	Perdue
Burr	Grassley	Portman
Capito	Harris	Risch
Carper	Hatch	Roberts
Casey	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeben	Rubio
Cochran	Inhofe	Sasse
Collins	Isakson	Scott
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kaine	Strange
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	King	Thune
Crapo	Klobuchar	Tillis
Cruz	Lankford	Toomey
Daines	Lee	Warner
Donnelly	Manchin	Wicker
Duckworth	McCain	Young
Enzi	McCasikill	
Ernst	McConnell	

NAYS—33

Baldwin	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Heller	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Leahy	Shaheen
Cantwell	Markey	Stabenow
Cardin	Menendez	Tester
Coons	Merkley	Udall
Durbin	Murray	Van Hollen
Franken	Paul	Warren
Gillibrand	Peters	Whitehouse
Hassan	Reed	Wyden

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session and proceed to the consideration of S. 1094, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1094) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—OFFICE OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION

Sec. 101. Establishment of Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection.

Sec. 102. Protection of whistleblowers in Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 103. Report on methods used to investigate employees of Department of Veterans Affairs.

TITLE II—ACCOUNTABILITY OF SENIOR EXECUTIVES, SUPERVISORS, AND OTHER EMPLOYEES

Sec. 201. Improved authorities of Secretary of Veterans Affairs to improve accountability of senior executives.

Sec. 202. Improved authorities of Secretary of Veterans Affairs to improve accountability of employees.

Sec. 203. Reduction of benefits for Department of Veterans Affairs employees convicted of certain crimes.

Sec. 204. Authority to recoup bonuses or awards paid to employees of Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 205. Authority to recoup relocation expenses paid to or on behalf of employees of Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 206. Time period for response to notice of adverse actions against supervisory employees who commit prohibited personnel actions.

Sec. 207. Direct hiring authority for medical center directors and VISN directors.

Sec. 208. Time periods for review of adverse actions with respect to certain employees.

Sec. 209. Improvement of training for supervisors.

Sec. 210. Assessment and report on effect on senior executives at Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 211. Measurement of Department of Veterans Affairs disciplinary process outcomes and effectiveness.

TITLE I—OFFICE OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION

SEC. 101. ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 323. Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the Department an office to be known as the ‘Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection’ (in this section referred to as the ‘Office’).

“(b) **HEAD OF OFFICE.**—(1) The head of the Office shall be responsible for the functions of the Office and shall be appointed by the President pursuant to section 308(a) of this title.

“(2) The head of the Office shall be known as the ‘Assistant Secretary for Accountability and Whistleblower Protection’.

“(3) The Assistant Secretary shall report directly to the Secretary on all matters relating to the Office.

“(4) Notwithstanding section 308(b) of this title, the Secretary may only assign to the Assistant Secretary responsibilities relating to the functions of the Office set forth in subsection (c).

“(c) **FUNCTIONS.**—(1) The functions of the Office are as follows:

“(A) Advising the Secretary on all matters of the Department relating to accountability, including accountability of employees of the Department, retaliation against whistleblowers,

and such matters as the Secretary considers similar and affect public trust in the Department.

“(B) Issuing reports and providing recommendations related to the duties described in subparagraph (A).

“(C) Receiving whistleblower disclosures.

“(D) Referring whistleblower disclosures received under subparagraph (C) for investigation to the Office of the Medical Inspector, the Office of Inspector General, or other investigative entity, as appropriate, if the Assistant Secretary has reason to believe the whistleblower disclosure is evidence of a violation of a provision of law, mismanagement, gross waste of funds, abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health and safety.

“(E) Receiving and referring disclosures from the Special Counsel for investigation to the Medical Inspector of the Department, the Inspector General of the Department, or such other person with investigatory authority, as the Assistant Secretary considers appropriate.

“(F) Recording, tracking, reviewing, and confirming implementation of recommendations from audits and investigations carried out by the Inspector General of the Department, the Medical Inspector of the Department, the Special Counsel, and the Comptroller General of the United States, including the imposition of disciplinary actions and other corrective actions contained in such recommendations.

“(G) Analyzing data from the Office and the Office of Inspector General telephone hotlines, other whistleblower disclosures, disaggregated by facility and area of health care if appropriate, and relevant audits and investigations to identify trends and issue reports to the Secretary based on analysis conducted under this subparagraph.

“(H) Receiving, reviewing, and investigating allegations of misconduct, retaliation, or poor performance involving—

“(i) an individual in a senior executive position (as defined in section 713(d) of this title) in the Department;

“(ii) an individual employed in a confidential, policy-making, policy-determining, or policy-advocating position in the Department; or

“(iii) a supervisory employee, if the allegation involves retaliation against an employee for making a whistleblower disclosure.

“(I) Making such recommendations to the Secretary for disciplinary action as the Assistant Secretary considers appropriate after substantiating any allegation of misconduct or poor performance pursuant to an investigation carried out as described in subparagraph (F) or (H).

“(2) In carrying out the functions of the Office, the Assistant Secretary shall ensure that the Office maintains a toll-free telephone number and Internet website to receive anonymous whistleblower disclosures.

“(3) In any case in which the Assistant Secretary receives a whistleblower disclosure from an employee of the Department under paragraph (1)(C), the Assistant Secretary may not disclose the identity of the employee without the consent of the employee, except in accordance with the provisions of section 552a of title 5, or as required by any other applicable provision of Federal law.

“(d) **STAFF AND RESOURCES.**—The Secretary shall ensure that the Assistant Secretary has such staff, resources, and access to information as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Office.

“(e) **RELATION TO OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL.**—The Office shall not be established as an element of the Office of the General Counsel and the Assistant Secretary may not report to the General Counsel.

“(f) **REPORTS.**—(1)(A) Not later than June 30 of each calendar year, beginning with June 30,

2017, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the activities of the Office during the calendar year in which the report is submitted.

"(B) Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include, for the period covered by the report, the following:

"(i) A full and substantive analysis of the activities of the Office, including such statistical information as the Assistant Secretary considers appropriate.

"(ii) Identification of any issues reported to the Secretary under subsection (c)(1)(G), including such data as the Assistant Secretary considers relevant to such issues and any trends the Assistant Secretary may have identified with respect to such issues.

"(iii) Identification of such concerns as the Assistant Secretary may have regarding the size, staffing, and resources of the Office and such recommendations as the Assistant Secretary may have for legislative or administrative action to address such concerns.

"(iv) Such recommendations as the Assistant Secretary may have for legislative or administrative action to improve—

"(I) the process by which concerns are reported to the Office; and

"(II) the protection of whistleblowers within the Department.

"(v) Such other matters as the Assistant Secretary considers appropriate regarding the functions of the Office or other matters relating to the Office.

"(2) If the Secretary receives a recommendation for disciplinary action under subsection (c)(1)(I) and does not take or initiate the recommended disciplinary action before the date that is 60 days after the date on which the Secretary received the recommendation, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a detailed justification for not taking or initiating such disciplinary action.

"(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) The term 'supervisory employee' means an employee of the Department who is a supervisor as defined in section 7103(a) of title 5.

"(2) The term 'whistleblower' means one who makes a whistleblower disclosure.

"(3) The term 'whistleblower disclosure' means any disclosure of information by an employee of the Department or individual applying to become an employee of the Department which the employee or individual reasonably believes evidences—

"(A) a violation of a provision of law; or

"(B) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 308(b) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(12) The functions set forth in section 323(c) of this title."

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 3 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"323. Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection."

SEC. 102. PROTECTION OF WHISTLEBLOWERS IN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking sections 731, 732, 734, 735, and 736;

(2) by redesignating section 733 as section 731; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new sections:

"§ 732. Protection of whistleblowers as criteria in evaluation of supervisors

"(a) DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF CRITERIA REQUIRED.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection, shall develop criteria that—

"(1) the Secretary shall use as a critical element in any evaluation of the performance of a supervisory employee; and

"(2) promotes the protection of whistleblowers.

"(b) PRINCIPLES FOR PROTECTION OF WHISTLEBLOWERS.—The criteria required by subsection (a) shall include principles for the protection of whistleblowers, such as the degree to which supervisory employees respond constructively when employees of the Department report concerns, take responsible action to resolve such concerns, and foster an environment in which employees of the Department feel comfortable reporting concerns to supervisory employees or to the appropriate authorities.

"(c) SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEE AND WHISTLEBLOWER DEFINED.—In this section, the terms 'supervisory employee' and 'whistleblower' have the meanings given such terms in section 323 of this title.

"§ 733. Training regarding whistleblower disclosures

"(a) TRAINING.—Not less frequently than once every two years, the Secretary, in coordination with the Whistleblower Protection Ombudsman designated under section 3(d)(1)(C) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), shall provide to each employee of the Department training regarding whistleblower disclosures, including—

"(1) an explanation of each method established by law in which an employee may file a whistleblower disclosure;

"(2) the right of the employee to petition Congress regarding a whistleblower disclosure in accordance with section 7211 of title 5;

"(3) an explanation that the employee may not be prosecuted or reprised against for disclosing information to Congress, the Inspector General, or another investigatory agency in instances where such disclosure is permitted by law, including under sections 5701, 5705, and 7732 of this title, under section 552a of title 5 (commonly referred to as the Privacy Act), under chapter 93 of title 18, and pursuant to regulations promulgated under section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-191);

"(4) an explanation of the language that is required to be included in all nondisclosure policies, forms, and agreements pursuant to section 115(a)(1) of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 (5 U.S.C. 2302 note); and

"(5) the right of contractors to be protected from reprisal for the disclosure of certain information under section 4705 or 4712 of title 41.

"(b) MANNER TRAINING IS PROVIDED.—The Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that training provided under subsection (a) is provided in person.

"(c) CERTIFICATION.—Not less frequently than once every two years, the Secretary shall provide training on merit system protection in a manner that the Special Counsel certifies as being satisfactory.

"(d) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish on the Internet website of the Department, and display prominently at each facility of the Department, the rights of an employee to make a whistleblower disclosure, including the information described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (a).

"(e) WHISTLEBLOWER DISCLOSURE DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'whistleblower disclosure' has the meaning given such term in section 323 of this title."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended—

(1) by striking the items relating to sections 731 through 736; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new items:

"731. Adverse actions against supervisory employees who commit prohibited personnel actions relating to whistleblower complaints.

"732. Protection of whistleblowers as criteria in evaluation of supervisors.

"733. Training regarding whistleblower disclosures."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 731 of such title, as redesignated by subsection (a)(2), is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

"(A) making a whistleblower disclosure to the Assistant Secretary for Accountability and Whistleblower Protection, the Inspector General of the Department, the Special Counsel, or Congress;"; and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (F) as subparagraphs (B) through (E), respectively; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated by clause (ii), by striking "complaint in accordance with section 732 or with" and inserting "disclosure made to the Assistant Secretary for Accountability and Whistleblower Protection,"; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "through (F)" and inserting "through (E)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) WHISTLEBLOWER DISCLOSURE DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'whistleblower disclosure' has the meaning given such term in section 323(g) of this title."

SEC. 103. REPORT ON METHODS USED TO INVESTIGATE EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 540 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary for Accountability and Whistleblower Protection shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on methods used to investigate employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs and whether such methods are used to retaliate against whistleblowers.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the use of administrative investigation boards, peer review, searches of medical records, and other methods for investigating employees of the Department.

(2) A determination of whether and to what degree the methods described in paragraph (1) are being used to retaliate against whistleblowers.

(3) Recommendations for legislative or administrative action to implement safeguards to prevent the retaliation described in paragraph (2).

(c) WHISTLEBLOWER DEFINED.—In this section, the term "whistleblower" has the meaning given such term in section 323 of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 101.

TITLE II—ACCOUNTABILITY OF SENIOR EXECUTIVES, SUPERVISORS, AND OTHER EMPLOYEES

SEC. 201. IMPROVED AUTHORITIES OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO IMPROVE ACCOUNTABILITY OF SENIOR EXECUTIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 713 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§713. Senior executives: removal, demotion, or suspension based on performance or misconduct

“(a) **AUTHORITY.**—(1) The Secretary may, as provided in this section, reprimand or suspend, involuntarily reassign, demote, or remove a covered individual from a senior executive position at the Department if the Secretary determines that the misconduct or performance of the covered individual warrants such action.

“(2) If the Secretary so removes such an individual, the Secretary may remove the individual from the civil service (as defined in section 2101 of title 5).

“(b) **RIGHTS AND PROCEDURES.**—(1) A covered individual who is the subject of an action under subsection (a) is entitled to—

“(A) advance notice of the action;

“(B) be represented by an attorney or other representative of the covered individual’s choice; and

“(C) grieve the action in accordance with an internal grievance process that the Secretary, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary for Accountability and Whistleblower Protection, shall establish for purposes of this subsection.

“(2)(A) The aggregate period for notice, response, and decision on an action under subsection (a) may not exceed 15 business days.

“(B) The period for the response of a covered individual to a notice under paragraph (1)(A) of an action under subsection (a) shall be 7 business days.

“(C) A decision under this paragraph on an action under subsection (a) shall be issued not later than 15 business days after notice of the action is provided to the covered individual under paragraph (1)(A). The decision shall be in writing, and shall include the specific reasons therefor.

“(3) The Secretary shall ensure that the grievance process established under paragraph (1)(C) takes fewer than 21 days.

“(4) A decision under paragraph (2) that is not grieved, and a grievance decision under paragraph (3), shall be final and conclusive.

“(5) A covered individual adversely affected by a decision under paragraph (2) that is not grieved, or by a grievance decision under paragraph (3), may obtain judicial review of such decision.

“(6) In any case in which judicial review is sought under paragraph (5), the court shall review the record and may set aside any Department action found to be—

“(A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with a provision of law;

“(B) obtained without procedures required by a provision of law having been followed; or

“(C) unsupported by substantial evidence.

“(c) **RELATION TO OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.**—Section 3592(b)(1) of title 5 and the procedures under section 7543(b) of such title do not apply to an action under subsection (a).

“(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘covered individual’ means—

“(A) a career appointee (as that term is defined in section 3132(a)(4) of title 5); or

“(B) any individual who occupies an administrative or executive position and who was appointed under section 7306(a), section 7401(1), or section 7401(4) of this title.

“(2) The term ‘misconduct’ includes neglect of duty, malfeasance, or failure to accept a directed reassignment or to accompany a position in a transfer of function.

“(3) The term ‘senior executive position’ means—

“(A) with respect to a career appointee (as that term is defined in section 3132(a) of title 5), a Senior Executive Service position (as such term is defined in such section); and

“(B) with respect to a covered individual appointed under section 7306(a) or section 7401(1)

of this title, an administrative or executive position.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 7461(c)(1) of such title is amended by inserting “employees in senior executive positions (as defined in section 713(d) of this title) and” before “interns”.

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 713 and inserting the following new item:

“713. Senior executives: removal, demotion, or suspension based on performance or misconduct.”.

SEC. 202. IMPROVED AUTHORITIES OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO IMPROVE ACCOUNTABILITY OF EMPLOYEES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter I of chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 713 the following new section:

“§714. Employees: removal, demotion, or suspension based on performance or misconduct

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—(1) The Secretary may remove, demote, or suspend a covered individual who is an employee of the Department if the Secretary determines the performance or misconduct of the covered individual warrants such removal, demotion, or suspension.

“(2) If the Secretary so removes, demotes, or suspends such a covered individual, the Secretary may—

“(A) remove the covered individual from the civil service (as defined in section 2101 of title 5);

“(B) demote the covered individual by means of a reduction in grade for which the covered individual is qualified, that the Secretary determines is appropriate, and that reduces the annual rate of pay of the covered individual; or

“(C) suspend the covered individual.

“(b) **PAY OF CERTAIN DEMOTED INDIVIDUALS.**—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any covered individual subject to a demotion under subsection (a)(2) shall, beginning on the date of such demotion, receive the annual rate of pay applicable to such grade.

“(2)(A) A covered individual so demoted may not be placed on administrative leave during the period during which an appeal (if any) under this section is ongoing, and may only receive pay if the covered individual reports for duty or is approved to use accrued unused annual, sick, family medical, military, or court leave.

“(B) If a covered individual so demoted does not report for duty or receive approval to use accrued unused leave, such covered individual shall not receive pay or other benefits pursuant to subsection (d)(5).

“(c) **PROCEDURE.**—(1)(A) The aggregate period for notice, response, and final decision in a removal, demotion, or suspension under this section may not exceed 15 business days.

“(B) The period for the response of a covered individual to a notice of a proposed removal, demotion, or suspension under this section shall be 7 business days.

“(C) Paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of section 7513 of title 5 shall apply with respect to a removal, demotion, or suspension under this section.

“(D) The procedures in this subsection shall supersede any collective bargaining agreement to the extent that such agreement is inconsistent with such procedures.

“(2) The Secretary shall issue a final decision with respect to a removal, demotion, or suspension under this section not later than 15 business days after the Secretary provides notice, including a file containing all the evidence in support of the proposed action, to the covered individual of the removal, demotion, or suspension. The decision shall be in writing and shall include the specific reasons therefor.

“(3) The procedures under chapter 43 of title 5 shall not apply to a removal, demotion, or suspension under this section.

“(4)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B) and subsection (d), any removal or demotion under this section, and any suspension of more than 14 days under this section, may be appealed to the Merit Systems Protection Board, which shall refer such appeal to an administrative judge pursuant to section 7701(b)(1) of title 5.

“(B) An appeal under subparagraph (A) of a removal, demotion, or suspension may only be made if such appeal is made not later than 10 business days after the date of such removal, demotion, or suspension.

“(d) **EXPEDITED REVIEW.**—(1) Upon receipt of an appeal under subsection (c)(4)(A), the administrative judge shall expedite any such appeal under section 7701(b)(1) of title 5 and, in any such case, shall issue a final and complete decision not later than 180 days after the date of the appeal.

“(2)(A) Notwithstanding section 7701(c)(1)(B) of title 5, the administrative judge shall uphold the decision of the Secretary to remove, demote, or suspend an employee under subsection (a) if the decision is supported by substantial evidence.

“(B) Notwithstanding title 5 or any other provision of law, if the decision of the Secretary is supported by substantial evidence, the administrative judge shall not mitigate the penalty prescribed by the Secretary.

“(3)(A) The decision of the administrative judge under paragraph (1) may be appealed to the Merit Systems Protection Board.

“(B) Notwithstanding section 7701(c)(1)(B) of title 5, the Merit Systems Protection Board shall uphold the decision of the Secretary to remove, demote, or suspend an employee under subsection (a) if the decision is supported by substantial evidence.

“(C) Notwithstanding title 5 or any other provision of law, if the decision of the Secretary is supported by substantial evidence, the Merit Systems Protection Board shall not mitigate the penalty prescribed by the Secretary.

“(4) In any case in which the administrative judge cannot issue a decision in accordance with the 180-day requirement under paragraph (1), the Merit Systems Protection Board shall, not later than 14 business days after the expiration of the 180-day period, submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that explains the reasons why a decision was not issued in accordance with such requirement.

“(5)(A) A decision of the Merit Systems Protection Board under paragraph (3) may be appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit pursuant to section 7703 of title 5 or to any court of appeals of competent jurisdiction pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(B) of such section.

“(B) Any decision by such Court shall be in compliance with section 7462(f)(2) of this title.

“(6) The Merit Systems Protection Board may not stay any removal or demotion under this section, except as provided in section 1214(b) of title 5.

“(7) During the period beginning on the date on which a covered individual appeals a removal from the civil service under subsection (c) and ending on the date that the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit issues a final decision on such appeal, such covered individual may not receive any pay, awards, bonuses, incentives, allowances, differentials, student loan repayments, special payments, or benefits related to the employment of the individual by the Department.

“(8) To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall provide to the Merit Systems

Protection Board such information and assistance as may be necessary to ensure an appeal under this subsection is expedited.

“(9) If an employee prevails on appeal under this section, the employee shall be entitled to backpay (as provided in section 5596 of title 5).

“(10) If an employee who is subject to a collective bargaining agreement chooses to grieve an action taken under this section through a grievance procedure provided under the collective bargaining agreement, the timelines and procedures set forth in subsection (c) and this subsection shall apply.

“(e) WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION.—(1) In the case of a covered individual seeking corrective action (or on behalf of whom corrective action is sought) from the Office of Special Counsel based on an alleged prohibited personnel practice described in section 2302(b) of title 5, the Secretary may not remove, demote, or suspend such covered individual under subsection (a) without the approval of the Special Counsel under section 1214(f) of title 5.

“(2) In the case of a covered individual who has made a whistleblower disclosure to the Assistant Secretary for Accountability and Whistleblower Protection, the Secretary may not remove, demote, or suspend such covered individual under subsection (a) until—

“(A) in the case in which the Assistant Secretary determines to refer the whistleblower disclosure under section 323(c)(1)(D) of this title to an office or other investigative entity, a final decision with respect to the whistleblower disclosure has been made by such office or other investigative entity; or

“(B) in the case in which the Assistant Secretary determines not to refer the whistleblower disclosure under such section, the Assistant Secretary makes such determination.

“(f) TERMINATION OF INVESTIGATIONS BY OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Special Counsel (established by section 1211 of title 5) may terminate an investigation of a prohibited personnel practice alleged by an employee or former employee of the Department after the Special Counsel provides to the employee or former employee a written statement of the reasons for the termination of the investigation.

“(2) Such statement may not be admissible as evidence in any judicial or administrative proceeding without the consent of such employee or former employee.

“(g) VACANCIES.—In the case of a covered individual who is removed or demoted under subsection (a), to the maximum extent feasible, the Secretary shall fill the vacancy arising as a result of such removal or demotion.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘covered individual’ means an individual occupying a position at the Department, but does not include—

“(A) an individual occupying a senior executive position (as defined in section 713(d) of this title);

“(B) an individual appointed pursuant to sections 7306, 7401(1), 7401(4), or 7405 of this title;

“(C) an individual who has not completed a probationary or trial period; or

“(D) a political appointee.

“(2) The term ‘suspend’ means the placing of an employee, for disciplinary reasons, in a temporary status without duties and pay for a period in excess of 14 days.

“(3) The term ‘grade’ has the meaning given such term in section 7511(a) of title 5.

“(4) The term ‘misconduct’ includes neglect of duty, malfeasance, or failure to accept a directed reassignment or to accompany a position in a transfer of function.

“(5) The term ‘political appointee’ means an individual who is—

“(A) employed in a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5 (relating to the Executive Schedule);

“(B) a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5; or

“(C) employed in a position of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, or successor regulation.

“(6) The term ‘whistleblower disclosure’ has the meaning given such term in section 323(g) of this title.”.

(b) CLERICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CLERICAL.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 713 the following new item:

“714. Employees: removal, demotion, or suspension based on performance or misconduct.”.

(2) CONFORMING.—Section 4303(f) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) any removal or demotion under section 714 of title 38.”.

SEC. 203. REDUCTION OF BENEFITS FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EMPLOYEES CONVICTED OF CERTAIN CRIMES.

(a) REDUCTION OF BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter 1 of chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 719. Reduction of benefits of employees convicted of certain crimes

“(a) REDUCTION OF ANNUITY FOR REMOVED EMPLOYEE.—(1) The Secretary shall order that the covered service of an employee of the Department removed from a position for performance or misconduct under section 713, 714, or 7461 of this title or any other provision of law shall not be taken into account for purposes of calculating an annuity with respect to such individual under chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that the individual is convicted of a felony (and the conviction is final) that influenced the individual’s performance while employed in the position; and

“(B) before such order is made, the individual is afforded—

“(i) notice of the proposed order; and

“(ii) an opportunity to respond to the proposed order by not later than ten business days following receipt of such notice; and

“(C) the Secretary issues the order—

“(i) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual responds under subparagraph (B)(ii), not later than five business days after receiving the response of the individual; or

“(ii) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual does not respond, not later than 15 business days after the Secretary provides notice to the individual under subparagraph (B)(i).

“(2) Any individual with respect to whom an annuity is reduced under this subsection may appeal the reduction to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management pursuant to such regulations as the Director may prescribe for purposes of this subsection.

“(b) REDUCTION OF ANNUITY FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEE.—(1) The Secretary may order that the covered service of an individual who the Secretary proposes to remove for performance or misconduct under section 713, 714, or 7461 of this title or any other provision of law but who leaves employment at the Department prior to the issuance of a final decision with respect to

such action shall not be taken into account for purposes of calculating an annuity with respect to such individual under chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that individual is convicted of a felony (and the conviction is final) that influenced the individual’s performance while employed in the position; and

“(B) before such order is made, the individual is afforded—

“(i) notice of the proposed order;

“(ii) opportunity to respond to the proposed order by not later than ten business days following receipt of such notice; and

“(C) the Secretary issues the order—

“(i) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual responds under subparagraph (B)(ii), not later than five business days after receiving the response of the individual; or

“(ii) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual does not respond, not later than 15 business days after the Secretary provides notice to the individual under subparagraph (B)(i).

“(2) Upon the issuance of an order by the Secretary under paragraph (1), the individual shall have an opportunity to appeal the order to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management before the date that is seven business days after the date of such issuance.

“(3) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall make a final decision with respect to an appeal under paragraph (2) within 30 business days of receiving the appeal.

“(c) ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 37 business days after the Secretary issues a final order under subsection (a) or (b) with respect to an individual, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall recalculate the annuity of the individual.

“(d) LUMP-SUM ANNUITY CREDIT.—Any individual with respect to whom an annuity is reduced under subsection (a) or (b) shall be entitled to be paid so much of such individual’s lump-sum credit as is attributable to the period of covered service.

“(e) SPOUSE OR CHILDREN EXCEPTION.—(1) The Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall prescribe regulations that may provide for the payment to the spouse or children of any individual referred to in subsection (a) or (b) of any amounts which (but for this subsection) would otherwise have been nonpayable by reason of such subsections.

“(2) Regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall be consistent with the requirements of section 8332(o)(5) and 8411(l)(5) of title 5, as the case may be.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘covered service’ means, with respect to an individual subject to a removal for performance or misconduct under section 719 or 7461 of this title or any other provision of law, the period of service beginning on the date that the Secretary determines under such applicable provision that the individual engaged in activity that gave rise to such action and ending on the date that the individual is removed from or leaves a position of employment at the Department prior to the issuance of a final decision with respect to such action.

“(2) The term ‘lump-sum credit’ has the meaning given such term in section 8331(8) or section 8401(19) of title 5, as the case may be.

“(3) The term ‘service’ has the meaning given such term in section 8331(12) or section 8401(26) of title 5, as the case may be.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 717 the following new item:

“719. Reduction of benefits of employees convicted of certain crimes.”.

(b) APPLICATION.—Section 719 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), shall apply to any action of removal of an employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 719 or 7461 of such title or any other provision of law, commencing on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. AUTHORITY TO RECOUP BONUSES OR AWARDS PAID TO EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by section 203, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 721. Recoupment of bonuses or awards paid to employees of Department

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may issue an order directing an employee of the Department to repay the amount, or a portion of the amount, of any award or bonus paid to the employee under title 5, including under chapters 45 or 53 of such title, or this title if—

“(1) the Secretary determines that the individual engaged in misconduct or poor performance prior to payment of the award or bonus, and that such award or bonus would not have been paid, in whole or in part, had the misconduct or poor performance been known prior to payment; and

“(2) before such repayment, the employee is afforded—

“(A) notice of the proposed order; and

“(B) an opportunity to respond to the proposed order by not later than 10 business days after the receipt of such notice; and

“(3) the Secretary issues the order—

“(A) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual responds under paragraph (2)(B), not later than five business days after receiving the response of the individual; or

“(B) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual does not respond, not later than 15 business days after the Secretary provides notice to the individual under paragraph (2)(A).

“(b) APPEAL OF ORDER OF SECRETARY.—(1) Upon the issuance of an order by the Secretary under subsection (a) with respect to an individual, the individual shall have an opportunity to appeal the order to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management before the date that is seven business days after the date of such issuance.

“(2) The Director shall make a final decision with respect to an appeal under paragraph (1) within 30 business days after receiving such appeal.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter, as amended by section 203(a)(2), is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 719 the following new item:

“721. Recoupment of bonuses or awards paid to employees of Department.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 721 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to an award or bonus paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to an employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act may be construed to modify the certification issued by the Office of Personnel Management and the Office of Management and Budget regarding the performance appraisal system of the Senior Executive Service of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 205. AUTHORITY TO RECOUP RELOCATION EXPENSES PAID TO OR ON BEHALF OF EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by section 204, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 723. Recoupment of relocation expenses paid on behalf of employees of Department

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may issue an order directing an employee of the Department to repay the amount, or a portion of the amount, paid to or on behalf of the employee under title 5 for relocation expenses, including any expenses under section 5724 or 5724a of such title, or this title if—

“(1) the Secretary determines that relocation expenses were paid following an act of fraud or malfeasance that influenced the authorization of the relocation expenses;

“(2) before such repayment, the employee is afforded—

“(A) notice of the proposed order; and

“(B) an opportunity to respond to the proposed order not later than ten business days following the receipt of such notice; and

“(3) the Secretary issues the order—

“(A) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual responds under paragraph (2)(B), not later than five business days after receiving the response of the individual; or

“(B) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual does not respond, not later than 15 business days after the Secretary provides notice to the individual under paragraph (2)(A).

“(b) APPEAL OF ORDER OF SECRETARY.—(1) Upon the issuance of an order by the Secretary under subsection (a) with respect to an individual, the individual shall have an opportunity to appeal the order to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management before the date that is seven business days after the date of such issuance.

“(2) The Director shall make a final decision with respect to an appeal under paragraph (1) within 30 days after receiving such appeal.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 721, as added by section 204(b), the following new item:

“723. Recoupment of relocation expenses paid on behalf of employees of Department.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 723 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to an amount paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to or on behalf of an employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs for relocation expenses on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 206. TIME PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF ADVERSE ACTIONS AGAINST SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEES WHO COMMIT PROHIBITED PERSONNEL ACTIONS.

Section 731(a)(2)(B) of title 38, United States Code, as redesignated by section 102(a)(2), is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “14 days” and inserting “10 days”; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking “14-day period” and inserting “10-day period”.

SEC. 207. DIRECT HIRING AUTHORITY FOR MEDICAL CENTER DIRECTORS AND VISN DIRECTORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7401 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) Directors of medical centers and directors of Veterans Integrated Service Networks with demonstrated ability in the medical profession, in health care administration, or in health care fiscal management.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 7404(a)(1) of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” before “The annual”; and

(2) in subparagraph (A), as designated by paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “and 7401(4)” after “7306”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) Section 5377 of title 5 shall apply to a position under section 7401(4) of this title as if such position were included in the definition of ‘position’ in section 5377(a) of title 5.”.

SEC. 208. TIME PERIODS FOR REVIEW OF ADVERSE ACTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES.

(a) PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS, PODIATRISTS, CHIROPRACTORS, OPTOMETRISTS, REGISTERED NURSES, PHYSICIAN ASSISTANTS, AND EXPANDED-FUNCTION DENTAL AUXILIARIES.—Paragraph (2) of section 7461(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) In any case other than a case described in paragraph (1) that involves or includes a question of professional conduct or competence in which a major adverse action was not taken, such an appeal shall be made through Department grievance procedures under section 7463 of this title.”.

(b) MAJOR ADVERSE ACTIONS INVOLVING PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT OR COMPETENCE.—Section 7462(b) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, within the aggregate time period specified in paragraph (5)(A),” after “is entitled”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “At least 30 days advance written notice” and inserting “Advance written notice”; and

(ii) by striking “and a statement” and inserting “a statement”; and

(iii) by inserting “and a file containing all the evidence in support of each charge,” after “with respect to each charge.”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking “A reasonable time, but not less than seven days” and inserting “The opportunity, within the time period provided for in paragraph (4)(A)”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following new paragraph (3):

“(3) After considering the employee’s answer, if any, and within the time period provided for in paragraph (5)(B), the deciding official shall render a decision on the charges. The decision shall be in writing and shall include the specific reasons therefor.”;

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following new subparagraph (A):

“(A) The period for the response of an employee under paragraph (1)(B) to advance written under paragraph (1)(A) shall be seven business days.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “30 days” and inserting “seven business days”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(5)(A) The aggregate period for the resolution of charges against an employee under this subsection may not exceed 15 business days.

“(B) The deciding official shall render a decision under paragraph (3) on charges under this subsection not later than 15 business days after the Under Secretary provides notice on the charges for purposes of paragraph (1)(A).

“(6) The procedures in this subsection shall supersede any collective bargaining agreement to the extent that such agreement is inconsistent with such procedures.”.

(c) OTHER ADVERSE ACTIONS.—Section 7463(c) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “the same notice and opportunity to answer with respect to those charges as provided in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 7462(b)(1) of this title” and inserting “notice and an opportunity to answer with respect to those charges in accordance with

subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 7462(b)(1) of this title, but within the time periods specified in paragraph (3)";

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, within the aggregate time period specified in paragraph (3)(A),” after “is entitled”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “an advance written notice” and inserting “written notice”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking “a reasonable time” and inserting “time to answer”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph (3):

“(3)(A) The aggregate period for the resolution of charges against an employee under paragraph (1) or (2) may not exceed 15 business days.

“(B) The period for the response of an employee under paragraph (1) or (2)(B) to written notice of charges under paragraph (1) or (2)(A), as applicable, shall be seven business days.

“(C) The deciding official shall render a decision on charges under paragraph (1) or (2) not later than 15 business days after notice is provided on the charges for purposes of paragraph (1) or (2)(A), as applicable.”.

SEC. 209. IMPROVEMENT OF TRAINING FOR SUPERVISORS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall provide to each employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs who is employed as a supervisor periodic training on the following:

(1) The rights of whistleblowers and how to address a report by an employee of a hostile work environment, reprisal, or harassment.

(2) How to effectively motivate, manage, and reward the employees who report to the supervisor.

(3) How to effectively manage employees who are performing at an unacceptable level and access assistance from the human resources office of the Department and the Office of the General Counsel of the Department with respect to those employees.

(b) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section:

(1) *SUPERVISOR.*—The term “supervisor” has the meaning given such term in section 7103(a) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) *WHISTLEBLOWER.*—The term “whistleblower” has the meaning given such term in section 323(g) of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 101.

SEC. 210. ASSESSMENT AND REPORT ON EFFECT ON SENIOR EXECUTIVES AT DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(1) measure and assess the effect of the enactment of this title on the morale, engagement, hiring, promotion, retention, discipline, and productivity of individuals in senior executive positions at the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

(2) submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the Secretary with respect to the measurement and assessment carried out under paragraph (1).

(b) *ELEMENTS.*—The assessment required by subsection (a)(1) shall include the following:

(1) With respect to engagement, trends in morale of individuals in senior executive positions and individuals aspiring to senior executive positions.

(2) With respect to promotions—

(A) whether the Department is experiencing an increase or decrease in the number of employees participating in leadership development

and candidate development programs with the intention of becoming candidates for senior executive positions; and

(B) trends in applications to senior executive positions within the Department.

(3) With respect to retention—

(A) trends in retirement rates of individuals in senior executive positions at the Department;

(B) trends in quit rates of individuals in senior executive positions at the Department;

(C) rates of transfer of—

(i) individuals from other Federal agencies into senior executive positions at the Department; and

(ii) individuals from senior executive positions at the Department to other Federal agencies; and

(D) trends in total loss rates by job function.

(4) With respect to disciplinary processes—

(A) regarding individuals in senior executive positions at the Department who are the subject of disciplinary action—

(i) the length of the disciplinary process in days for such individuals both before the date of the enactment of this Act and under the provisions of this Act described in subsection (a)(1); and

(ii) the extent to which appeals by such individuals are upheld under such provisions as compared to before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(B) the components or offices of the Department which experience the greatest number of proposed adverse actions against individuals in senior executive positions and components and offices which experience the least relative to the size of the components or offices' total number of senior executive positions;

(C) the tenure of individuals in senior executive positions who are the subject of disciplinary action;

(D) whether the individuals in senior executive positions who are the subject of disciplinary action have previously been disciplined; and

(E) the number of instances of disciplinary action taken by the Secretary against individuals in senior executive positions at the Department as compared to governmentwide discipline against individuals in Senior Executive Service positions (as defined in section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code) as a percentage of the total number of individuals in senior executive positions at the Department and Senior Executive Service positions (as so defined).

(5) With respect to hiring—

(A) the degree to which the skills of newly hired individuals in senior executive positions at the Department are appropriate with respect to the needs of the Department;

(B) the types of senior executive positions at the Department most commonly filled under the authorities in the provisions described in subsection (a)(1);

(C) the number of senior executive positions at the Department filled by hires outside of the Department compared to hires from within the Department;

(D) the length of time to fill a senior executive position at the Department and for a new hire to begin working in a new senior executive position;

(E) the mission-critical deficiencies filled by newly hired individuals in senior executive positions and the connection between mission-critical deficiencies filled under the provisions described in subsection (a) and annual performance of the Department;

(F) the satisfaction of applicants for senior executive positions at the Department with the hiring process, including the clarity of job announcements, reasons for withdrawal of applications, communication regarding status of applications, and timeliness of hiring decision; and

(G) the satisfaction of newly hired individuals in senior executive positions at the Department

with the hiring process and the process of joining and becoming oriented with the Department.

(c) *SENIOR EXECUTIVE POSITION DEFINED.*—In this section, the term “senior executive position” has the meaning given such term in section 713 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 211. MEASUREMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS DISCIPLINARY PROCESS OUTCOMES AND EFFECTIVENESS.

(a) *MEASURING AND COLLECTING.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall measure and collect information on the outcomes of disciplinary actions carried out by the Department of Veterans Affairs during the three-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this Act and the effectiveness of such actions.

(2) *ELEMENTS.*—In measuring and collecting pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall measure and collect information regarding the following:

(A) The average time from the initiation of an adverse action against an employee at the Department to the final resolution of that action.

(B) The number of distinct steps and levels of review within the Department involved in the disciplinary process and the average length of time required to complete these steps.

(C) The rate of use of alternate disciplinary procedures compared to traditional disciplinary procedures and the frequency with which employees who are subject to alternative disciplinary procedures commit additional offenses.

(D) The number of appeals from adverse actions filed against employees of the Department, the number of appeals upheld, and the reasons for which the appeals were upheld.

(E) The use of paid administrative leave during the disciplinary process and the length of such leave.

(b) *REPORT.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than December 31, 2017, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the disciplinary procedures and actions of the Department.

(2) *CONTENTS.*—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The information collected under subsection (a).

(B) The findings of the Secretary with respect to the measurement and collection carried out under subsection (a).

(C) An analysis of the disciplinary procedures and actions of the Department.

(D) Suggestions for improving the disciplinary procedures and actions of the Department.

(E) Such other matters as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) *APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.*—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 1094 is agreed to.

Under the previous order, there will now be 3 hours of debate, equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise today on the 73rd anniversary of the invasion of Normandy, Omaha Beach, and Sword Beach by 156,000 brave Americans who saved our freedom and liberty, for the American

people as well as all of Europe, who put an end to the reign of Adolph Hitler, and remind me every day as chairman of the Veterans' Committee why I am here in the U.S. Senate—and that is to see to it that we take care of those who have taken care of us.

Somebody asked me this morning: Is it coincidence that D-day was 73 years ago today? I said: It is Divine providence that we are on the floor today paying back those brave 156,000 who invaded those beaches to make the Veterans' Administration a more favorable agency than it is already.

I am proud to be on the floor to lead a part of the debate with Senator TESTER—my ranking member on the committee and my dear friend—on a bill that I think is of great significance. It is the Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act.

The best quote is not one I could come up with or I doubt that JON could come up with. The best quote really was come up with by the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, the IAVA. When asked, they said: "This is the strongest VA accountability measure that can be signed into law." I want to reiterate that: the strongest accountability measure of the VA that can be signed into law. Which means we are reaching into every corner of problems in the VA which have existed over the last years. We are making sure we make the corrections necessary to make the VA an accountable organization, and we are doing it in a bipartisan fashion together, Democrats and Republicans alike.

As I have said very often, there aren't Republican casualties and Democratic casualties on the battlefield. They are American citizens who have fought and died for this country. So there is no room for partisanship when it comes to providing them with the benefits that are necessary and seeing to it that they get what they deserve.

I thank all the members of the committee; in particular, Ranking Member TESTER for his work; Senator MORAN, who did such great work for us on the accountability measure; Senator RUBIO, who is not a member of the committee but did a great job in terms of accountability, and he will speak later on the floor—as I am sure others will—about this.

We have had a great committee working for a long period of time. We passed a bill—almost—last year and then failed at the last few moments of the session to get it done. So we are back a second time, but we are back with a bill that has come unanimously from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and I hope will leave this Senate floor unanimously so we send a clear signal to our veterans: We will hold ourselves accountable to you.

What specifically does the legislation do that is important? One, it makes

what President Trump referred to in an Executive order about 3 weeks ago, the veterans whistleblower protection act, a reality and codifies it into law. Second, it removes many of the bureaucratic hurdles currently in place, making it easier for the VA Secretary to remove employees of all departments in the VA who are found guilty of wrongdoing or misconduct, and I underscore found guilty of wrongdoing or misconduct.

The bill shortens the removal process for employees of the VA and ensures an individual appealing removal from the VA is not kept on VA's payroll indefinitely while they appeal. The Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act also prohibits the VA from awarding bonuses to employees found guilty of misconduct. The bill would remove the bureaucratic Merit System Protection Board from appeals by the senior management—top management—of the Veterans' Administration.

The Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act establishes the Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection to make it permanent in the United States of America.

In essence, and very simply, this bill ensures and codifies into law the accountability of this agency and its operation to the American people and to the veterans of the United States of America for all they have done for each and every one of us.

It is very important to appreciate that this does not come to us by some Senator or some Representative coming up with a bunch of crazy ideas at the last minute. This is a response to what we have seen happen over and over again over the past few years. Most, if not all, of the employees in the Veterans' Administration are hard-working, dedicated, committed individuals, but there have been, from time to time, questions that have arisen about the handling of certain situations: the situation that took place in Phoenix, AZ, in terms of appointments; the rash number of suicides and mishandling of pharmaceuticals in the Atlanta office of Clairmont, near where I am in my office in Atlanta, GA; the situation of transfers in Philadelphia, PA, where people were transferred rather than disciplined and were paid their moving expenses and cost-of-living adjustments upward—all to get rid of somebody in one office but move them to another, instead of handling them in the way in which they should have been, which holds them accountable, rather than making sure they work somewhere else. We took instances where people themselves were breaking the law and violating the law, and we are now holding them accountable because of what is written into the VA accountability and whistleblower act.

Simply put, we have taken the worst performance, in isolated cases in the

past few years, and did what was right. We have corrected it where it needed to be corrected, we have eliminated it where it needed to be eliminated, and we have given the authority to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and employees under the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to discipline people who work for them and hold them accountable for doing the wrong thing and encourage them to do the right thing.

I reiterate, though, that we are not singling out an agency which has a large number of people who are not performing. We are singling out an agency which has had some situations where a few employees have done some egregious things that need to be addressed. They were addressed but couldn't be addressed under the current status of the law, which now will be able to be addressed under the status of the new law and held accountable for their actions.

Nothing happens when one person does it. Everything happens when people come together as a team. It has been a pleasure for me to have a great teammate in this effort; that is, JON TESTER from Montana. I have been on the committee 12 years, and I think JON has been on the committee 8 or 9 years.

You are on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, first of all, because you want to be on it. It is what we refer to as a B committee, which means it is a second tier. A lot of times it is a fill-in committee for Members of the Senate or the House, but for me and for JON, it is our principal and primary responsibility. We know to whom we owe everything, and that is our veterans to whom we owe everything.

JON TESTER has been a great teammate. He has been great to work with. He has helped us get through some times of difficulty and some good times of common understanding and settlement, and I appreciate that very much.

I want JON to tell me what the people of Montana are telling him about our Veterans' Administration and the need for stronger accountability in the VA of Montana. Tell us what they are saying in Montana, JON.

Mr. TESTER. I thank Chairman ISAKSON.

Before I answer the question, I want to echo and say thank you very much for your leadership on this committee. It has been great to work with you. You have a reputation of being a man of honesty, integrity, and fair dealing, and you have once again lived up to that reputation. I could not ask for a better chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee than you. I very much appreciate the work you have done on this bill.

I, too, want to thank Senators RUBIO, MORAN, SHAHEEN, BLUMENTHAL, ANGUS KING, DONNELLY, BALDWIN, and DUCKWORTH. There are a number of folks on both sides of the aisle who

have stepped up—some on the committee, some off the committee—who have done such a great job making sure we ended up here today.

Chairman ISAKSON knows this. We got a bill over from the House, we sat down together, and we negotiated. We gave and took and massaged the bill. We ended up with a bill that probably JOHNNY would not have written and probably I wouldn't have written, but it is a bill that is going to work, and it is going to give the VA what they need to hold people accountable.

I also echo what JOHNNY said. Veterans across this country are very happy with the care they get at the VA, and it is because of the great people on the ground within the VA, but every once in a while we get a bad apple, and the VA needs to be able to remove that bad apple because that bad apple reflects poorly on everybody within the VA. So this bill is about making sure the VA has the tool it needs to hold itself accountable and hold itself accountable to the veterans.

What I hear from the folks in Montana is: How come it took so long?

We have been at this for a while, and I hope it is worth the wait. I think we have a good bill here. I think we have a bill that really holds folks accountable while protecting workers' rights moving forward.

The VA is a different kind of animal than any other agency. We owe it to the people who put it on the line for this country. When things don't go just right, we have a problem, and we have a problem that needs to be fixed and not fixed yesterday—fixed today. These folks have given their all to this country, and they have earned these healthcare benefits. We need to make sure that when they need them, they have them and there aren't any mistakes made.

What I also hear from veterans in Montana, other than it took so long, is: How can we rebuild the VA to make it all it can be? I think this bill is going to help with that, too, by making sure we have the best of the best there, by making sure we have training for our hospital administrators and being able to hire hospital administrators—that is part of this bill, too—while holding the VA accountable when folks screw up in areas of misconduct.

So there is a bunch in this bill. I think this bill will fit the needs, not only of veterans in a rural or frontier State like Montana but in more populated areas like Atlanta, GA. I think it gives the Secretary of the VA the tools at his disposal to be able to make the VA as strong as it can possibly be.

I will say that this bill would not have happened without the good work of JOHNNY and his staff and my staff coming together and getting stuff done. I think this is one of the days in the Senate where we can look back and say that folks came together as Demo-

crats and Republicans and did the right thing for the veterans of this country.

JOHNNY, I am curious to know from you what kind of stuff you are hearing in Georgia about this bill and bringing accountability to the VA.

Mr. ISAKSON. Senator TESTER, like you, I get my best information at the Legion, the IAVA, and from folks around my State. I am a member of the American Legion post at Loganville, GA, and go every once in a while to the bar and get a drink just to find out what is going on. I find out more there in an hour socializing than I find out by reading every newspaper in the United States of America.

Let me tell you what some of the organizations are saying—because these veterans service organizations are the voice of the American people who served in our military, and they are the people who communicate to us in committee.

The VFW wants the Secretary to weed out misperformers and especially the criminals, regardless of whether the crime was committed on or off duty.

The VFW wants a bill passed because maintaining the status quo does not work for those who have borne the battle and borne the fight.

They want to make sure the VA holds their employees to the standards the veterans of America feel they have committed themselves to as veterans serving in our military.

The American Legion applauds the bipartisan effort to provide Secretary Shulkin the additional tools to increase accountability and address poor performance within the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I underscore this, because in the bill JON and I ensure we motivate management to understand it is their job to seek out nonperformance and correct it before it runs amuck. So this bill incentivizes management of the Veterans' Administration to find those employees who are not performing well and turn them around and reward those employees who are turned around to be an example they set for all the rest of the employees.

The Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act will give Secretary Shulkin the authority he needs to hold Department employees responsible for their actions. "We strongly agree with the Senate to take the bill immediately and pass it," said Dan Caldwell of Concerned Veterans of America.

So, once and for all, all around our State our VSO organizations are getting a response to the questions they have asked of all of us, and that is what this bill does.

There is misinformation out there. There are rumors flying around in Montana, some flying around in Georgia. Can the Senator help clear up some of the errors?

Mr. TESTER. There is a lot of misinformation about this bill. I will tell you what this bill does not do. It does not trample on workers' rights. This bill maintains bargaining rights of union workers at the VA. One of the problems we had with the House-passed bill was it did away with the ability of members to use the bargaining process. This does not. It maintains it. It does not gut due process protections. It keeps all the existing due process protections under current law. Unlike the House bill, it doesn't shorten or eliminate the appeals process for employees who are fired. Moreover, we provide a judicial review to employees who are directed to repay a bonus and other protection. Finally, this bill does not allow VA supervisors to get away with firing anyone who just challenges them. Evidence is still required in order to take action, and that evidence must go through general counsel for review before an action is proposed.

This is all critically important, as we go forth, to give accountability and yet be able to protect the rights of the workers who are doing the job. I think we found the sweet spot there.

More important than anything else in this bill—and it does a lot of things—it is really about a culture of accountability at the VA.

Can the Senator tell us here in the Senate what else this bill does for veterans?

Mr. ISAKSON. I want to talk about the culture the Senator just mentioned. He is exactly right. The main thing the American people are going to see from the Veterans' Administration now is a culture throughout that organization of excellence to serve the veterans the way they should be served. And where there might be an isolated problem, make sure it is sought out, rooted out, and corrected within the agency. Our veterans deserve the highest quality care.

Secretary Shulkin has asked for more authority to hold accountable those who are not meeting standards. He wants to recognize those who have not only met but exceeded standards as well.

This bill gives VA the authority to expedite the removal of a bad employee, but it doesn't motivate them to get rid of people, it gives them the parameters by which people should be dealt with if, in fact, they are behaving poorly. It shortens the process for removing an employee to 15 days. That doesn't mean you act recklessly or quickly, it means you act expeditiously to see to it that if you have a problem, it is addressed quickly for the benefit of all the agencies.

It removes the Merit Systems Protection Board from the appeal process for senior executives. There is some bad talk out there about removing the Merit Systems Protection Board for all employees. It doesn't do that at all.

But the most senior employees of the Veterans' Administration deserve to be held accountable without lots of hoops you have to go through before ever getting to them. So by taking the Merit Systems Protection Board away from those senior executives, you are holding them totally accountable in the bright light of day for their own actions, without some hoop to go through for the agency trying to remove them.

It prohibits bonuses and relocation expenses for employees guilty of wrongdoing. I mentioned this in my earlier remarks, and I will reiterate. This deals with things like what happened in Pennsylvania, where two employees were reassigned for a discipline, yet they were given bonuses and cost-of-living adjustments in their pay upward for doing something wrong. That sends exactly the wrong signal to any employee in the Veterans' Administration.

For anyone doing a good job, it pats them on the back and lets them know they can do an even better job.

It expedites the hiring of VA medical center directors, which is absolutely critical. We have far too many people in the VA healthcare system today who are acting. They are acting director or acting assistant. We don't need any more "acting" in the Veterans' Administration; we need performance.

That is what this bill ends up being about—the performance of delivery of quality healthcare to our veterans, rewarding those employees who are doing a good job, encouraging those who aren't to do a better job, and seeing all American veterans get the services they deserve to get.

The need for this bill does not come out of thin air. I say to Senator TESTER, can you tell me why the VA and veterans need this legislation to strengthen accountability at the VA?

Mr. TESTER. I sure can. I talked previously about this. It has been a while. It has been 3 years. We talked about this accountability issue a lot in the Veterans' Affairs Committee and here on the floor. I think the context is important for folks who do make the claim that there is no need for this particular bill, that we are simply playing politics. That couldn't be further from the truth.

If you remember, back in August of 2014, in response to systemic failures in the Veterans Health Administration, the Senate overwhelmingly passed the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014. We were both members of the committee back then. We both helped draft that bill. It passed by a vote 91 to 3. As my colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee are well aware, the bill included a provision to hold senior executives of the VA more accountable. That provision was in response to multiple reports from both the Obama administration and an independent VA inspector general docu-

menting the need to bring greater accountability to the VA.

While much of the attention has been focused on senior-level employees, hospital administrators, and the like, there are employees across the system who need to be effectively held accountable for misconduct and inappropriate behavior. Last Congress, the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee reported bipartisan legislation that would give the VA greater authority to improve accountability for all employees. Unfortunately, we never got floor time for that bill.

This Congress, the House passed a VA accountability bill that, at least in my view, needed some fixing. I appreciate that my Republican colleagues worked closely with us—with me—on these changes, and we got to this point today.

But make no mistake about it—veterans in Montana and all the major veterans service organizations support giving the VA the authority to expedite disciplining and firing bad employees. Let me say that one more time. Every major veteran service organization supports giving the VA the authority to expedite disciplining or firing bad employees. The President and the VA Secretaries—both McDonald and Shulkin—have asked for this authority. Former VA Secretary McDonald repeatedly asked Congress to give him the tools he needed to hold employees accountable. Secretary Shulkin has followed and done the same. So we have this bill up today.

I would like to end where I started, and that is by thanking Chairman ISAKSON for his leadership and his willingness to work together in a bipartisan way to reach a compromise and make "collaboration" a good word again, to get to a point where we can get a bill, as the IAVA said, that can pass and that can pass the Senate and that hopefully will pass the Senate within the next few hours.

I thank Chairman ISAKSON.

Mr. ISAKSON. I thank Senator TESTER.

I started my remarks a few minutes ago by saying that this will be the 73rd anniversary of D-day. Nobody who charged Omaha Beach or climbed those cliffs in Normandy had second thoughts about what they were doing or asked questions about their leadership or tolerated anything but the best they could out of themselves. Because of that, they won.

Today, our veterans are winning. Our committee—the Senate is going to pass in I think a unanimous or near-unanimous fashion a piece of legislation that is a byproduct of a good bipartisan effort to see to it that we correct the problems of the past, give the Secretary of the VA the ability to do it in the future, and if he or she doesn't do it, it gives us the ability to change them so they are held accountable as well.

It has been a pleasure to work with you and a privilege to work for our veterans.

On this special day, we honor those who served America 73 years ago by the beginning of the end of World War II, thank them for their service, and thank all veterans who provide service to the people of the United States of America.

I want to end by noting that we have 32 sponsors of this legislation, which is almost exactly one-third of the Senate, Republican and Democrat alike. That sends the proper signal that this is the right bill at the right time for the right people—veterans of the United States of America.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I want to start by commending my colleagues from Georgia and Montana for their compassion and care for our veterans and specifically for their continued efforts to ensure we have accountability at the VA. They worked hard on this legislation. I hope the Senate moves expeditiously to vote for it and to help our veterans to be able to have the kind of responsibility and accountability they deserve.

REMEMBERING LES SPAETH

Mr. President, I also rise today to talk about veterans. I am going to focus on World War II veterans.

Last Monday was Memorial Day. I was in Mason, OH. I was in Warren County, OH. My mom grew up there, and my family still has a lot of ties there. I was there at a ceremony for the veterans memorial, one of the most beautiful memorials in the State of Ohio. I happened to be there about 15 years ago when it was first began, and it was great to be back. At the ceremony, I got to see a World War II buddy of mine. His name is Les Spaeth. He is also a good friend of my father's and grandfather's. As always, seeing him brought back great memories, and I was able to speak about him during my remarks.

Two days later—a few days ago—we got word that Les Spaeth died at age 92. I want to take a moment to pay tribute to this man who gave so much to his country and to his community.

Les was a marine corporal during World War II. He signed up after graduating from Mason High School in 1942. He served in the Pacific, including the occupation of Japan after the war, helping that country make a difficult transition to democracy. Thanks in large part to American soldiers like him, by the way, the transition worked. Japan has become one of our greatest allies.

Les came back to Mason, OH, and started a small business called Spaeth Brothers Cleaners. He had that optimism so many of the World War II generation had. He had the courage to

take a risk and help build jobs and help the economy of his hometown. My dad did the same thing after World War II.

Les was a businessman, but he was also a public servant for more than half a century. He served six terms as Warren County auditor. He served on the Board of Elections for 25 years. He chaired the Warren County Republican Party for 17 years.

He was very active in the community in so many other ways too. He was one of the very first volunteer firefighters in Mason, OH, starting way back in 1948. He was elder at his church, Heritage Presbyterian, where his service will be held. For 70 years, he was a freemason and member of the American Legion. He helped set up the American Legion Buckeye Boys Program, a great program where they are teaching young men about State, local, and Federal government and values and leadership. His whole life was centered around his community—through the family business, through military service, through elected office, and through volunteerism.

In 2009, Mason High School started having a distinguished alumni graduation speaker every year. For all the reasons I talked about a moment ago, a few years ago, in 2013, I wrote a letter and recommended that they honor Les Spaeth. They agreed with me. That spring of 2013, it was time to receive his award. He gave a beautiful speech. He talked about his love for this country and counting our blessings as Americans. He received a standing ovation from the graduating class. I know that meant a lot to him. That ovation shows the respect and esteem people in Warren County have for Les Spaeth across generations.

On behalf of Ohio, I want to express my condolences to the family of Les Spaeth. I also want to thank them for sharing Les with the rest of us in Ohio for these past 92 years. He was a dedicated servant to the people of Warren County, an American hero for his military service, and a good friend to so many.

73RD ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

As was noted, as we talk about World War II, today is also the 73rd anniversary of D-day. As Chairman ISAKSON just said, it was really the beginning of the end of that war. And 73 years ago this morning, Les Spaeth was in theater in the Pacific, as I said, risking his life for all of us. But in Europe on that same morning, the largest amphibious invasion in the history of the world was taking place. Men as young as 18 years old were crossing the channel, carrying packs weighing 80 pounds. More than 160,000 Allied soldiers—mostly Americans—and more than 5,000 ships backed by more than 10,000 aircraft were fighting to liberate Europe from Hitler. The outcome was far from certain. The Nazis had spent 2 years fortifying the coast to prepare

for this moment. It was Hitler's so-called Atlantic Wall. The beautiful coastline of France was covered in barbed wire, land mines, and bunkers.

A little more than a month before D-day, by the way, the Allies had conducted a trial run. They practiced on beaches in western England that were most like those of Normandy. The practice run was a disaster. In fact, Germans spotted the Allied ships and attacked them. Hundreds of American troops died in that practice session.

COL George Taylor told his troops as they were about to land on Normandy: "Only two kinds of men are going to be on this beach—the dead, and those about to die. So get moving." This was tough stuff. They had an enormous task, and the stakes could not have been higher.

Erwin Rommel—and Rommel was leading the Nazi defense at that time—said at that time: "The fate of Germany depends on . . . the first 24 hours of this invasion." He was right.

Well-known historian Douglas Brinkley said that D-day was "the single most important moment in the 20th Century." It was one of the bloodiest too. It was the beginning of the end of the most difficult war in human history, and the lives of millions of people depended on the outcome.

They depended on the success of brave, young Americans like Eugene Lyons of University Heights, OH. Eugene was a medic. His ship hit a mine in the English Channel and sank off the coast. He swam to shore while German planes shot at him, missing him by a matter of inches. Or the Napier brothers of Warren County, like Les Spaeth. Five brothers all served during World War II. Two of them were there on the beaches that day; one died. Or Jim "Pee Wee" Martin from Dayton, OH, who served in the 506th Parachute Infantry Regiment and parachuted behind German lines before dawn that day. Jim received both the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star for his service that day. Or Sigmund Czelusniak of North Royalton, OH, who was wounded by a mortar shell on Omaha Beach. Sigmund later said, as he lay wounded: "In my heart, I didn't think I'd ever come back."

More than 10,000 Allied troops did not come back.

While those brave men and hundreds of thousands of others were fighting, President Franklin D. Roosevelt took to the airwaves, as you would expect a President to do. As you know, he was known for what were called fireside chats. These were informal speeches he would give to the Nation during difficult times. But on that day, he did something very different. Instead of giving a speech, he was called to lead the Nation in prayer. This prayer brought our country together. It strengthened our resolve. It comforted us at a very difficult and frightening

time for our country, and it briefly encapsulated, as you will hear in a second, what our purpose was—not just in World War II but what our purpose was as Americans. He made an indelible mark on our history.

Three years ago, after the 70th anniversary of D-day, then-President Obama signed into law legislation that I had authored to add the words of this famous prayer to the World War II Memorial in Washington, DC. Since then, the site for the plaque has been approved. The architect is continuing to work with the National Park Service on the design. I have been told that the Park Service intends to present the design options to the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission during their meetings this summer. Construction could begin as soon as December and be completed by next June.

Frankly, I am discouraged this has taken so long because this prayer belongs on the World War II Memorial, and Congress has said so. I urge the Park Service to move as expeditiously as possible to complete this project, to bring those words to so many veterans and others who visit that beautiful memorial.

As has been my tradition since the time we were trying to get that legislation passed, I would like to read the words President Roosevelt spoke on D-day 73 years ago.

He started by saying:

My fellow Americans: Last night, when I spoke with you . . . I knew at that moment that troops of the United States and our allies were crossing the Channel in another and greater operation. It has come to pass with great success thus far. And so, in this poignant hour, I ask you to join with me in prayer.

This was his prayer:

Almighty God: Our sons, pride of our nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our Republic, our religion, and our civilization, and to set free a suffering humanity. Lead them straight and true; give strength to their arms, stoutness to their hearts, steadfastness in their faith.

They will need Thy blessings. Their road will be long and hard. For the enemy is strong. He may hurl back our forces. Success may not come with rushing speed, but we shall return again and again; and we know by Thy grace and by the righteousness of our cause our sons will triumph. They will be sore tried, by night and by day, without rest—until the victory is won. The darkness will be rent by noise and flame. Men's souls will be shaken with the violences of war.

For these men are lately drawn from the ways of peace. They fight not for the lust of conquest. They fight to end conquest. They fight to liberate. They fight to let justice arise, and tolerance and goodwill among all Thy people. They yearn but for the end of battle, for their return to the haven of home.

Some will never return. Embrace these, Father, and receive them, Thy heroic servants, into Thy kingdom.

And for those of us at home—fathers, mothers, children, wives, sisters, and brothers of brave men overseas, whose thoughts

and prayers are ever with them—help us, Almighty God, to rededicate ourselves in renewed faith in Thee in this hour of great sacrifice.

Many people have urged that I call the nation into a single day of special prayer. But because the road is long and the desire is great, I ask that our people devote themselves in a continuance of prayer. As we rise to each new day, and again when each day is spent, let words of prayer be on our lips, invoking Thy help to our efforts.

Give us strength, too—strength in our daily tasks, to redouble the contributions we make in the physical and material support of our armed forces.

And let our hearts be stout, to wait out the long travail, to bear sorrows that may come, to impart our courage unto our sons wheresoever they may be.

And, O Lord, give us faith. Give us faith in Thee; faith in our sons; faith in each other; faith in our united crusade. Let not the keenness of our spirit ever be dulled. Let not the impacts of temporary events, of temporal matters of but fleeting moment—let not these deter us in our unconquerable purpose.

With Thy blessing, we shall prevail over the unholy forces of our enemy. Help us to conquer the apostles of greed and racial arrogances. Lead us to the saving of our country, and with our sister nations into a world unity that will spell a sure peace—a peace invulnerable to the schemings of unworthy men. And a peace that will let all men live in freedom, reaping the just rewards of their honest toil.

Thy will be done, Almighty God. Amen.

Those were the words he spoke and the words that will soon be inscribed on the World War II monument.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

PARIS AGREEMENT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak about the administration's decision to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement.

In 1992, under President George H.W. Bush, the Senate unanimously approved a treaty to allow the United States to join the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Since then, we have been engaged in a global conversation with nations around the world to tackle the challenges of climate change and ensure that we leave future generations a planet that is not plagued by catastrophic drought, famine, floods, wildfire, and a rising sea level.

After years of intense negotiation, the world finally reached an international agreement that resulted in a global commitment, and 195 countries from around the world, except for 2, came together. Nicaragua abstained; they wanted a stronger agreement. Syria was another country that stepped aside and didn't take part, for obvious reasons. Representing more than 90 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions, these 195 countries committed to reducing their carbon emissions to prevent the average global temperature from rising by more than 2 degrees.

I cannot fathom why any President of either political party would want to isolate the United States from the rest of the world, from our allies and trading partners, by leaving this agreement.

President Trump justified this decision with concern for American jobs and American business. Yet, since the election, American business leaders have called him on the phone, sent a barrage of public letters, and paid for full-page ads in newspapers, trying to get the message through to him in any way possible that American business strongly supports the Paris Agreement, which President Trump has walked away from.

Tech companies and retailers, insurance companies, and even energy companies, such as ExxonMobil and BP, support global engagement on climate. In fact, the World Economic Forum estimated that the Paris Agreement represents a \$23 trillion investment potential due to the growing demand in every corner of the world for clean energy. Between consumers who want clean energy and local regulations that require it, the demand for clean energy will continue to grow here in the United States and around the world.

While pulling out of the Paris Agreement might seem like a way to protect jobs, for example, in the coal industry, the truth is that when these jobs do go away, it is mostly due to other things: market forces and automation.

I have been down in the coal mines of Southern Illinois, Central Illinois. I have seen the way they mine coal today. For those who have not been there and paid close attention, it may come as a surprise. It is largely automated. Massive machinery, known as continuous miners, literally chew away at the walls of coal, transporting it back up to the surface for transport.

Back in the day, hundreds, if not thousands, of coal miners would head for their jobs with little more than a pick or an ax or a shovel or some drill. Today, it is an automated industry, and fewer jobs are creating more and more coal opportunities because automation is a big part.

In addition, there is a change in the global energy market. Because of fracking in States like North Dakota and South Dakota, we have seen an increase in the availability of natural gas at lower prices. Last year, for the first time in modern history, we had more electricity generated in 1 month in America from natural gas sources than from coal sources.

We have turned a corner when it comes to the availability of alternatives in energy. Between consumers who want access to clean energy and local regulations that require it, clean energy is going to continue to grow in demand.

Meanwhile, even in my own home State of Illinois, which is the fourth

largest coal-producing State in the Nation, we already have thousands more workers in the solar industry than in the coal industry.

Clean energy jobs are growing. Remaining engaged on climate change spurs new investment and strengthens American competitiveness for jobs in the future. These jobs include designing more efficient solar panels, wind turbines, batteries, and manufacturing the components for export all over the world. Why should other nations get to lead this growing industry of clean energy and the United States step away? We can create those jobs right here in America—American jobs for American workers in clean energy opportunities. We should lead the world in the creation of clean energy jobs.

This decision by the Trump administration to turn its back on this revolution in energy is going to cost us dearly. When the coal jobs do decline, we have responsibilities to retrain the workers for clean energy jobs and other opportunities in the future. The Paris Agreement ensured that we have credibility as leaders, access to global markets, and reduced financial risk for our citizens and businesses associated with changing climate.

By walking away from the agreement, America is not just giving up an environmental commitment, but it is giving up economic opportunity. We have given away our leadership, isolated ourselves from the rest of the world. They are not going to wait for us; they are going to move forward and look for other leaders than the United States. This President talked about making America first. His decision to walk away from the Paris Agreement puts America dead last when it comes to energy in the 21st century.

Climate change is a dire threat to the global economy and global stability. It will cause catastrophic consequences for global health, food security, and habitat on land and in the ocean. My constituents in Illinois are already experiencing the adverse effects of changing climate.

In recent years, our State—and, I might add, many others—has seen historic storms, floods, and droughts, causing millions of dollars in damage. Climate models suggest that if current global warming trends continue, Illinois will have a climate similar to the Texas gulf coast by the end of this century. For Illinois farmers, these changes to the environment have a direct effect on their livelihood and for all of us, a direct impact on our food supply.

Climate change also has significant national security implications that affect our shores—ones we simply can't ignore. The crisis in Syria, the flow of refugees from unstable parts of the world, is an early warning of the link to climate change and how humanitarian crises, particularly from less

stable parts of our shared planet, are going to get worse if we continue to let climate change go unaddressed.

Back in 2011, when pro-democracy protests began in Syria, many of those joining were displaced farmers who had suffered 4 years of drought, made worse by the effects of climate change. The National Academy of Sciences published findings earlier this year showing that extreme drought in Syria between 2006 and 2009 was more likely due to climate change and that the drought was a factor in the uprisings in 2011.

Last year, Pulitzer Prize-winning New York Times columnist Tom Friedman wrote about massive migration out of parts of West Africa through the Sahara Desert to Libya, where people were hoping to eventually cross the dangerous trek across the Mediterranean Sea to Europe. He wrote: "Just as Syria's revolution was set off in part by the worst four-year drought in the country's modern history—plus overpopulation, climate stresses and the Internet—the same is true of this African migration wave."

Former CIA Acting Director Mike Morell recently called President Trump's decision to pull the United States from the Paris climate agreement the worst decision made by this President so far.

Mr. Morell pointed out that pulling out not only cedes American leadership in the world, but it harms our own national security by ignoring the impact of climate change on failed and fragile states that are homes to instability and violence. He further noted that we face three possible threats to our existence: nuclear war, a natural or man-made biological threat, or climate change. President Trump's dangerous decision, if not reversed, will contribute to that threat.

Anyone in this Chamber claiming to be serious about national security simply cannot be credible without addressing the long-term threats posed by weak states and climate change in the decades to come.

It is amazing to me that people around the world have come together to recognize the danger and the urgent need to act on climate change everywhere in the world except right here in the United States of America.

I don't understand the other political party. I can remember a time when we would have a debate on climate change on the floor. We would be talking about the Environmental Protection Agency, created by a Republican President, Richard Nixon, and we would have Senators from both sides of the aisle actively debating climate change, realizing that it is a threat to our future. Those days have changed.

Any debate now about environment is strictly one-sided. Was the science changed when it comes to global warming and climate change? Not at all. Ninety-eight percent of scientists agree

that we have global warming, and the reasons for it relate directly to greenhouse gas emissions.

So what has changed? Why isn't this a bipartisan debate anymore? The politics have changed. They have changed dramatically with the way we finance political campaigns in this country. Groups have emerged—one in particular, the Koch brothers, who have made their fortune in carbon industries and who have promised any Republican who steps out of line on climate change this: You are in for a fight; you are going to face a primary. Don't you dare stand up and talk about climate change here on the floor of the Senate.

That is where we are today. We have come to a standstill, and now we have a President who has decided to walk away from this issue. This President has chosen politics over science and greed over responsibility. His decision is a fateful decision for our children, our grandchildren, and generations to come.

There may be some momentary applause in some places because President Trump has walked away from this global agreement to deal with this global challenge, but I could tell you the cheers are short-lived. When we see the price that we are going to pay—and that our kids will pay—for this gross irresponsibility, there will not be a lot of cheering.

I have said this on the floor before, and I will say it again because I am waiting for someone on the other side to come to challenge me: The Republican Party of the United States of America is the only major political party in the world today that refuses to take climate change seriously. I have said that over and over, and I expect Senators from the Republican side to come to the floor and say: That is not true; we take it seriously. But they don't. Or I expect them to come to the floor and say: No, there is another major political party that also denies climate change.

One Republican Senator, after I said this on the floor repeatedly, pulled me off to the side in the corridor, looked around, and whispered: There is a party in Australia that also doesn't believe in climate change.

You think to yourself: So it has come to that. We have isolated ourselves in the eyes of the world when it comes to protecting this world for generations to come. We are going to pay a heavy price for that, but the biggest price is going to be paid by future generations.

Can we make a little sacrifice today, drive more energy-efficient cars and trucks, and think about ways to heat our homes and to light up our rooms that don't consume so much energy? Well, of course, we can. We have already done it, and we can do so much more. Walking away from the Paris Agreement is not the path that should lead America into the 21st century.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, earlier today, Majority Leader MCCONNELL came to the Senate floor to, once again, be critical of the Affordable Care Act, a law that has resulted in more than 20 million Americans gaining health insurance. The law has lowered the uninsured rate to the lowest in American history. This law has put an end to insurance discrimination based on preexisting conditions or gender. It is a law that has made sure that Americans suffering from mental health or substance abuse addiction can get treatment. It is a law that extended the solvency of Medicare by a decade and decreased prescription drug costs for seniors by more than \$1,000 for each senior in America. It is a law that has helped to reduce—cut in half—the number of bankruptcies filed in America because so many were the result of medical bills that people just couldn't pay. I was proud to vote for this law.

Is it perfect? Of course not. Can it be improved and strengthened? Yes, it should be. Improvements can be made the same way we have made improvements in Medicare, Social Security, and in so many other programs over the years, but not by repealing Social Security, not by repealing Medicare but by sitting down on a bipartisan basis to try to find a way to make sure that we don't deny health insurance coverage to 23 million people in America because of the repeal of the Affordable Care Act and to find a way not to raise costs on older Americans, which the bill that passed the House of Representatives would do, and to find a way to make this law better for people living in rural America.

My hometown is in downstate Illinois. I, as a Congressman and Senator, have represented a lot of small towns in sparsely populated counties. They value many things. They sure value their schools, their basketball teams and football teams. I will tell you what they value as much, if not more, than anything else—their local hospital.

The local hospital makes such a difference in smalltown America. It is not only a lifesaver—it saves you from driving another 50 or 100 miles for quality care—but it is also a source of great employment. Probably the best paying jobs in town are at the local hospital. If you want to keep a business or attract one, a local hospital is a good selling point.

Do you know what the bill that passed the House of Representatives will do to the rural and smalltown hospitals in Illinois?

Don't take my word for it. Ask the Illinois Health and Hospital Association. They anticipate losing 60,000 jobs in Illinois because of the healthcare repeal bill that passed the House of Representatives, and they know that many hospitals downstate and many in the inner city are going to be forced to cut

back in services, if not close, as a result of it.

What can we do to make this a better bill, to make the Affordable Care Act work more effectively? Let me give you a couple of ideas. First, we don't have anything in the law today that deals with prescription drug prices. We are at the mercy of people—pharmaceutical companies, investment bankers, and others—who come and control these pharmaceutical patents. They can literally raise the cost of these drugs beyond the reach of many families.

I had a young man come see me. He is in high school. He has been fighting diabetes since he was a little boy. He and his mother talked about the dramatic increase in the cost of insulin that he has faced over the last several years. Insulin has been around a long time. This is not a new wonder drug. It is a critical, lifesaving drug, but the prices and costs of insulin are going through the roof, and there is no way under current law for us to deal with it. Should we take that up? Of course, we should.

Blue Cross Blue Shield in Illinois told me recently that they spent more money last year on pharmaceutical costs than they did on inpatient hospital care, and the costs continue to go up. We need good, lifesaving drugs. We need to reward the companies that find them with a profit. But as to those who want to gouge prices and take advantage of people of modest income or folks who don't have insurance, there has to be a way to answer that and to deal with it honestly.

Yesterday, I went with eight other Senators up to the National Institutes of Health. It is out in Bethesda, MD. It is the premier medical research facility in the world. We are lucky to have it right here in the United States.

Time and again they told us about breakthrough drugs that were making a big difference that started with research at the National Institutes of Health. I asked at one point: Is it too much to ask the pharmaceutical companies that take your basic research idea and turn it into a profitable product to give some of those profits back to the NIH to continue their research? They said: We have tried to do it, but the pharmaceutical companies walk away. They don't want to give us a penny for our future research.

Well, that is wrong. We ought to be investing in that research, rewarding the pharmaceutical companies for their development of these products, as well, but making certain we continue this leadership in the world when it comes to medical research and pharmaceuticals.

The individual market on health insurance is one that troubles us because it is the area where people who don't have health insurance through their place of employment or don't qualify

for a government health insurance plan—like Medicare, Medicaid, veterans care, or the like—go to buy insurance on the insurance exchange. This is where the premiums have gone up. Now, why have the premiums gone up in that one sector? Because when it comes to individuals, those who are older and sicker are the first to sign up, but the healthier, younger ones are the last.

We can sit down on a bipartisan basis and find ways to create an incentive so that we can increase the participation in this insurance pool and bring down the premium costs for those who are paying.

The third thing we need to do is to make sure that no matter where you live in the United States, there is an option to choose when it comes to buying your health insurance. One of the things we can do is to take one of the most popular medical care programs in history—the Medicare Program itself—and duplicate it in a public option available to people across the United States. Do you want to buy a health insurance program that looks like Medicare, a not-for-profit program? This would be your chance.

So those are three ideas that I think we could bring forward in an effort to make the Affordable Care Act even more responsive.

Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican Leader, comes to the floor frequently to talk about the choice to expand the Medicaid Program, as allowed under law in many States. I would welcome the opportunity to expand that program.

Most people do not understand the Medicaid Program. Oh, that is health insurance for poor people. Well, in a way, it is, but it is so much more. For example, one out of every two births in Illinois is paid for by the Medicaid Program to keep mom healthy so she delivers a healthy baby and to keep that baby healthy as soon as it is born. It is paid for by Medicaid in 50 percent of the cases of new births. But that is not the most expensive thing.

The most expensive thing under Medicaid is for your mom and your grandmother who is in a nursing home, living on Social Security and Medicare, and they need help. So they qualify for Medicaid to pay for the medical care they need so they can continue to live wholesome lives.

The third area, of course, is medical insurance for the disabled who have ongoing needs. Those three areas make up Medicaid. When the Republican proposal that came out of the House wanted to cut \$600 or \$700 billion and give tax cuts to wealthy people, they took it out of Medicaid.

So which of the groups that I just described to you would you take health insurance away from—mothers with new babies, elderly folks in nursing homes with no resources, or the disabled who live in our communities?

I would think it is a step in the wrong direction to hit any of these groups. That is why Medicaid was expanded in so many States and why we should continue to find ways to expand it in a responsible fashion.

As I go back home and talk to people about this Republican alternative that passed the House of Representatives, it is very clear they oppose it.

I have challenged those Congressmen who voted for the Republican repeal bill to find one medical advocacy group in my State that supports their effort. There are none. The Illinois Health and Hospital Association, the Illinois Medical Association, the Illinois Nurses Association, and the Illinois pediatricians all oppose it.

The AARP, or American Association of Retired Persons, opposes it because the bill removed the protection for elderly people when it came to the cost of premiums. The AARP believes—and I am afraid the facts bear it out—that what passed the House of Representatives will dramatically increase health insurance premiums for people between the ages of 50 and 64. We can do better, but we need to do it on a bipartisan basis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, just a little less than 2 weeks ago, President Trump released his proposed budget for fiscal year 2018, which would begin October 1. He named his plan "A New Foundation for American Greatness." While unveiling this budget, Director Mulvaney, the OMB Director, declared that "We are no longer going to measure compassion by the number of programs or the number of people on those programs, but by the number of people we help get off of those programs."

When I read this and looked at the budget, I was reminded of the story of the two hikers who got to the top of a mountain. They stood near a big cliff and one hiker said: It is a beautiful vista.

The other hiker said: I am so exhausted from hiking all the way up; I wish I could get down quickly.

The first hiker then said: Let me help you with that. And he shoved him off the cliff.

That is what this budget does. It doesn't help people get off programs through education and training; it shuts down the programs. It shoves people off the cliff.

In this budget, millions of struggling, rural, middle-class, low-income, and working Americans are thrown off the cliff. They are thrown out of these programs as these programs are just struck down, not because programs have served their purpose and are no longer needed but because the President wants to do two things. He wants to build a lot more in terms of the

military, and he wants to give a tax giveaway of some \$6 trillion in the budget, with most of it going to the very richest Americans. This is not an “America first” budget; this is a “billionaires first” and a “rural and working Americans last” budget.

We see this vision implemented through dramatic cuts to food stamps, children’s healthcare, job training, after-school programs, scientific research, and other anti-poverty programs. One program after another designed to help American families who are devastated will be eliminated, all in the name of building a wall, building more missiles and more bombs, and giving this massive, massive giveaway of the Treasury to the privileged and powerful.

Now there is good news. The good news is that I think we are going to have a bipartisan coalition we can build to defeat this budget. Even some of our colleagues in the House Freedom Caucus, who often talk about slashing government spending and eliminating programs, are saying that this proposal and its impact on rural Americans and rural America is draconian and unacceptable. It is not often that you hear folks throughout the entire political spectrum come together to say the same thing—that this budget is shortsighted and ill-conceived—but that is where we are now.

This budget tells us a lot because a budget is an expression of values. When President Trump placed this budget before us, we gained insight into his values. What we quickly learned is that President Trump doesn’t place value on struggling and working American families, helping them climb a ladder to a better point. What this budget does tell us is that our President is all about raiding the National Treasury for the privileged and the powerful—quite the opposite of what we heard when he was campaigning.

Franklin Roosevelt once said that, as a nation, “The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have little.” By “enough” he meant, do we provide a ladder of opportunity for families to get their economic footing, to be able to buy a house, to be able to find a job, to be able to educate their children?

In this budget, President Trump puts out a different test. With this budget, he is saying that the test of our progress is whether we destroy programs for working Americans in order to fund a \$6 trillion giveaway to the privileged and powerful. That is Donald Trump’s test of progress, and I think we find very few in the country who might agree with that vision of making economic and educational progress for working Americans much more difficult. It is not an “America first” budget. It is not a foundation for

American greatness. It is more akin to a great train robbery, a great raid on the National Treasury to benefit those who are already at the very top.

It is a budget that hurts children. It is a budget that hurts struggling, hard-working Americans. It cuts 20 percent from the Children’s Health Insurance Program, critical for the health of our children. Shouldn’t every child in America have access to affordable healthcare? That is a value I can get behind. But slashing healthcare for children and making it harder for them to succeed in life—I can’t agree with that.

Let’s make children hungrier by cutting the basic food stamp program or school programs that 44 million Americans rely on, cutting it by \$193 billion. Making children hungrier doesn’t help them learn. Helping children learn is a value I can get behind. Making it harder for them to succeed in school may be a Trump value, but it is not mine, and I don’t think it is shared by many Members of this Chamber.

We find that he proposes to get rid of the subsidization of interest on student loans, making the cost of college even more unaffordable for low-income and working graduates. He freezes the Pell grants that already have not kept pace with inflation. He proceeds to wipe out the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program that erases student loans after a decade of service to the public. All of this is about making college more expensive. I can get behind the value of making higher education more affordable, whether it is apprenticeship training, career technical education, or a 4-year college program. I can get behind making those programs more affordable, making community college programs more affordable because some form of education, whether it is in the technical education world or community college world or a 4-year program—some aspect of that is important to virtually every job in America.

Making it more affordable is what virtually every other developed country has done. In Germany, going to a public university is free in terms of tuition—not so here in the United States of America. Our students are burdened by massive, massive debt. It is growing and growing and growing. I can get behind the value of saying we shouldn’t make college a financial gauntlet because it is so essential to the success of our children. But Trump has a different value. His value is let’s make it harder. Let’s make it more difficult. Let’s put students further into debt. Those are not values I can support. Again, I think very few in this Chamber would share in that.

The list goes on and on. This isn’t just an attack on the ladder of opportunity for working Americans; this is an attack on rural America. During the last couple of years, I served as the ranking member of the Appropriations

Subcommittee on Agriculture and Rural Development and FDA, and in that time I have seen the tremendous impact many of these programs have had in providing opportunity and strengthening the economy in rural America. I value making rural America stronger, but that is not the value Trump put into his budget. He put into this budget: Let’s undercut, let’s undermine, let’s make it more difficult for rural America. This is truly a “rural America last” budget.

It eliminates funding for Essential Air Service. The Essential Air Service is essential to key small towns across our Nation, including one in my home State. If the Essential Air Service is wiped out, the economy of that town, Pendleton, would be dramatically impacted.

It slashes the Contract Tower Program that supports even more airports—six of them in my State—rural airports that need that contract tower support to be able to remain open. Small towns from Aurora to Klamath Falls would be dramatically impacted.

How about rural infrastructure? He takes out the rural water and wastewater disposal program. As I hold townhalls around my State—and I go to every county every year, all 36. Before I hold a public townhall where people can ask any question they want, I meet with the local county commissioners, city commissioners, and all the locally elected. In virtually every county, every year, I hear about the challenge of water infrastructure, expanding the clean water supply or waste water treatment. These two challenges are enormous. Yet here is President Trump wiping out the rural water and wastewater programs.

How about critical housing programs? Well, here is the issue. In our rural communities, often the economy is hindered by the lack of availability of affordable housing. I have been in town after town after town saying: We have interest by a company to move here because of some of the key assets we have. Then they decide not to because they don’t have affordable housing in the community for them to be able to hire the staff they need. So we have these programs at the Federal level—direct single-family housing loans, direct multifamily housing loans, low-income housing repair loans, farm labor housing loans, self-help housing grants. Here again, the Trump budget wipes them out.

The Community Development Block Grant Program provides flexible strength for rural communities to address local problems. We talk a lot about flexibility in the Senate, enabling local areas to decide how best to use funds. The CDBG, the Community Development Block Grant, does exactly that. Yet it is not valued by our President, who probably doesn’t even know what the program is, but he wiped it out.

How about the Rural Business-Cooperative Service that offers programs to support business development and job training? It is gone too. His budget slashes USDA's rural development programs by about \$1 billion, a little less than \$1 billion. This is a part of the agency where programs focus on supporting economic development, housing, and infrastructure in rural communities.

Then we have the impact on rural healthcare. This budget impacts rural healthcare in several different ways. It cuts the Rural Hospital Outreach Grant Program that helps small rural hospitals get resources to create collaboratives for long-term care facilities or with ambulance services. It eliminates the State offices of rural health.

In addition, this budget destroys healthcare for 23 million Americans, and many of those live in rural America. In fact, in Oregon, about one out of three individuals, almost one out of three in our small towns find healthcare through the Oregon Health Plan, the Oregon Health Plan funded by Medicaid. Rolling back Medicaid would throw some 400,000 people off of healthcare in Oregon just by itself, and that would make a huge impact in rural Oregon.

I have been holding a lot of townhalls in rural Oregon. This year I have had over 12 in what you would see on a map as pretty red counties, and people are coming up to me at townhalls and saying that they are scared to death about this budget's impact on healthcare. They are not just scared; they are terrified. And they are not just terrified; they are angry because they finally have the peace of mind that if a loved one gets sick, that loved one will get the care they need, that loved one will not end up bankrupt. That is a huge improvement in quality of life, but this budget from the President destroys that peace of mind.

It is not just impacting those who directly benefit from the Oregon Health Plan; it also impacts everybody else in the rural communities because the health plan has enabled our rural clinics and hospitals to do much better financially.

Out in the northeast corner of my State—it is a very remote and beautiful place—a person told me that his local clinic had gone from 20-some employees to about 50 employees, roughly doubling the healthcare provided. Why were they able to do that? Because they had had so much uncompensated care before people had access to insurance. Now that has dropped dramatically, and their finances are much better. So they are able to hire a lot more people and provide a lot more healthcare to this rural part of the State. But that changes with this Trump budget.

Let me list a few more details about some of these areas, starting with the

USDA Rural Development Water Programs.

Last year, 14 projects in my State received \$10.7 million in loans and \$6.5 million in grants in order to provide reliable, clean drinking water and waste disposal, affecting 12,000 folks in rural Oregon. Vernonia, which is in northwest Oregon, relied on these programs so as to finally improve the town's wastewater system—a project almost 20 years in the making. I have visited Vernonia a number of times. In 1996 it suffered a terrible flood, and then, again, in 2007, there was another major flood. The floods overwhelmed Vernonia's wastewater treatment systems and lagoons and caused overflows on public and private properties as well as into the nearby Nehalem River. Thanks to loans and grants from the USDA's rural water programs, the town of Vernonia was able to purchase new equipment, upgrade its wastewater systems, and protect the water for its residents. That is just one community that has benefited.

Let's talk a little bit more about housing. The budget singles out many housing programs to cut.

It eliminates the USDA Rural Development's direct housing loan programs and most of the housing grant programs and community facilities programs, which include programs like the rural Single Family Housing Direct Loans, the rural Multi-Family Housing Direct Loans, the self-help housing program, housing repair loans, and the Farm Labor Housing Program.

With so many States and so many communities across our Nation suffering from a shortage of affordable and available housing, how can we consider it a positive thing to slice and dice these programs?

Last year, 6,000 rural Oregonian families were living in 211 affordable apartment complexes thanks to USDA financing. But keeping these programs and strengthening our housing initiatives isn't just good for our Nation's families. It is also critical for the economic development of rural towns and communities. As I have mentioned so often, I have heard from town leaders that they have a potential deal within their grasp, and it falls out of their grip because of the shortage of housing. We need to do better in this area, not worse.

Let's talk about another program—the Forest Service Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program. This program is an all-lands approach to collaboratively encouraging science-based ecosystem restoration of priority forest landscapes.

Let me put it more simply.

Often, in terms of forest health, we have a challenge. The work in the woods can be quite expensive to improve forest health, and, often, you have disputes between the environmental community and the timber

community on just how this should be done. A collaborative brings together these elements—the environmental side and the timber side—with the goal of both making the forest healthier and providing a steady supply of sawlogs to the mill.

This is something that happened in the Fremont-Winema National Forest, and it has given environmental and conservation groups confidence that Fremont-Winema is on a track to having a healthier ecosystem. At the same time, their work has helped to ensure that there is a balance between the timber industry and environmental protection, which means that timber is still coming and will keep coming to the local mill, which will help to create local jobs, like at the Collins Mill in Klamath Falls. That mill is able to continue employing more than 80 workers because of the steady supply of logs that makes its way from Fremont-Winema due to the eco-friendly forest management practices.

This “billionaires first” and “rural America and workers last” budget is going to die here in the Senate because there is going to be a bipartisan coalition of Democrats and Republicans who say that undermining the success of our families in order to provide a massive giveaway—a raid, if you will, on the National Treasury—and a handout to the privileged and powerful is, simply, the wrong way to go. This is, really, Robin Hood in reverse. This is a situation in which the working families are undermined to provide a \$6 trillion raid on the Treasury, with most being given away to our richest American families.

I do not know that there is anyone in this Chamber who is not already aware that we have massive income inequality here in the United States of America. I do not think there is any Senator among the 100 Senators of the Senate who is unaware that we have a massive wealth gap in America. It has gotten larger and larger and larger until it has become equal to that level or near that level at which it was before the Great Depression. That is not a way for America to thrive—to raid working families in order to provide even more giveaways to those who have the most.

I must say that this budget does not surprise me. It does not surprise me that the President submitted this. The President himself is a billionaire. The President lives in that world of billionaires, and he was persuaded to think that helping the billionaires to have even millions more would, somehow, be good for America.

I would like to take the President to real working America so that he may see the real impact on the ground of destroying rural health clinics, see the real impact on the ground of destroying rural water systems, and see the real impact on the ground of destroying rural housing programs. We need to

get the President outside of his billionaire bubble and seeing the impact so that, somehow, he gets a grip on what it means to guide this country in education policy and economic policy and so that we strengthen that ladder of opportunity rather than destroy it.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). The Senator from South Dakota.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, everyone remembers President Obama's famous—or perhaps infamous—promise that he would sign a healthcare bill that would “cut the cost of a typical family's premiums by up to \$2,500 per year.” Well, as everyone knows, that didn't happen. Between 2009 and 2016, the average family with employer-sponsored health insurance saw its premiums rise by \$4,767. That is just the beginning.

Two weeks ago, the Department of Health and Human Services released a report comparing the average individual market insurance premium in 2013—the year when most of ObamaCare's regulations and mandates were implemented—with the average individual market exchange premium in 2017 in the 39 States that used healthcare.gov—so 2013 to 2017 individual market premiums. Here is what they found. Between 2013 and 2017, the average individual market monthly premium in the healthcare.gov States increased by 105 percent. In other words, on average, individual market premiums more than doubled in just 5 years.

In my home State of South Dakota, premiums increased by 124 percent or \$3,588 over 5 years. As I said, that is according to HHS reporting on the premiums in the individual market exchanges over the course of the past 5 years. So \$3,588 in South Dakota is money that South Dakota families had to take from other priorities, like saving for retirement or investing in their children's education.

Three States saw their premiums triple over those 5 years. The average monthly premium in Alaska went from \$344 to \$1,041. That is an increase of \$697 per month or more than \$8,300 a year. Think about that. Over the past 5 years, the average individual market yearly premium has increased by \$4,800 in Arizona, by \$3,648 in Louisiana, by \$5,064 in North Carolina, by \$4,488 in Tennessee, and by \$5,292 in West Virginia. Those kinds of premium increases are just not sustainable.

Some people, of course, received tax credits to help offset their premium payments, but many others are left to face these massive premium hikes by themselves. And most people do not have the money to easily absorb a 105-percent premium increase or more in many States, as I pointed out, over 5 years.

Of course, premium increases show no signs of slowing down. Numbers for 2018 are emerging, and they are not looking good. Insurers on the New York exchange are requesting double-digit rate hikes. A Connecticut insurer requested an average rate hike of 33.8 percent. One Virginia insurer requested an average rate increase of 38 percent. Another has requested an average 45-percent rate hike. In Oregon, the average rate hike requested is 17.2 percent. Companies offering plans on the exchange here in Washington, DC, are requesting average rate hikes ranging from 13 percent to nearly 40 percent. In Maryland, average increases range from 18 percent to almost 59 percent. One insurer in Maryland has requested a rate increase of up to 150 percent—150 percent for just one year.

As if the premium hikes aren't bad enough, many Americans don't have a cheaper option to choose. In 2017, roughly one-third of U.S. counties have just one choice of insurer on their ObamaCare exchange—one choice in one-third of all the counties in America. So you pretty much have to take whatever rate they are going to quote you when that is the only option in town. Talk about a lack of competition.

Several States, including Alabama, Oklahoma, Alaska, and Wyoming, have just one choice of insurer for the entire State. The entire State—in those States that I just mentioned—has one choice of insurer. Things are only getting worse.

In 2018, a number of counties may lack any ObamaCare insurer at all. On Friday, the Omaha World-Herald announced that 100,000 Nebraskans could end up with zero options for individual market coverage in 2018. Iowa is facing a similar situation. In April, Wellmark Blue Cross and Blue Shield announced that it will withdraw from the individual market in Iowa in 2018. Days later, Aetna announced that it would pull out of the Iowa exchange. In the wake of these announcements, Medica, the last ObamaCare insurer for most of Iowa, announced that it will likely leave the State in 2018. That would leave 94 of the 99 Iowa counties with no ObamaCare insurer next year.

Republicans in the Senate are currently working on legislation to repeal and replace ObamaCare. Why? Because, as I just pointed out, ObamaCare is broken. This law is not working. This law has never worked. It shows absolutely no sign that it is going to work in the future, particularly if those premium increases are any indication. From first to last, this law has been a disaster—high premium costs, high deductibles, customers losing health plans, customers losing doctors, fewer choices, failed co-ops, unraveling exchanges. I could go on and on because the list of the failures goes on and on.

Given all of this, it is hard to believe the Democrats are still defending this

disastrous law. I sometimes wonder just what it will take for my Democrat colleagues in the Senate to accept the staggering amount of evidence that says this law has failed. Do premiums have to triple? Do they have to quadruple? Does every American on the exchanges have to be reduced to just one choice of insurer or be without an insurer at all?

ObamaCare was going to reduce premiums. It didn't. People were going to be able to keep their healthcare plans. They regularly found out that they couldn't. Buying insurance was going to be like shopping for a TV on Amazon—well, maybe if Amazon had only one brand of television.

The responsible thing to do when a government program has turned out to be a disaster is to repeal it. That is what Republicans are working to do with ObamaCare. We are working to repeal this law and replace it with real healthcare reform. My colleagues in the House have made a good start. We are working to build on their bill in the U.S. Senate. Chairmen ALEXANDER, ENZI, and HATCH have been leading the charge on this. I am grateful to them and their staffs for all of their hard work.

Republicans are committed to restoring the millions of Americans trapped on the ObamaCare exchanges and lifting the burdens this law has foisted onto taxpayers. We are committed to addressing ObamaCare's skyrocketing premium increases. We are committed to preserving access to care for Americans with preexisting conditions. We are committed to making Medicaid more sustainable by giving States greater flexibility while insuring that those who rely on this program don't have the rug pulled out from under them. We need to make healthcare more affordable, more personal, more flexible, and less bureaucratic.

It would be wonderful if at least some Democrats would join us in this effort and stop prioritizing partisanship over the needs of the American people. Republicans know that the American people are suffering under ObamaCare, and we are committed to bringing them relief. They are ready for healthcare reform that actually works, and that is what Republicans intend to deliver.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it is fitting that today, June 6, the anniversary of D-day in Europe and the Battle of Midway in the Pacific, we are talking about our country's veterans in the

debate that is going on in the Senate. The brave men and women who have served our country deserve the very best care our Nation can give them. That is why I rise today in support of the VA Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act, which I believe will pass by a voice vote in the Senate later this afternoon.

This bipartisan bill will help improve the quality of care our veterans receive by reforming the Department of Veterans Affairs and making it easier for the Secretary of the VA to fire poorly performing employees. The legislation will allow the VA to hold its employees more accountable. It will also create new protections for whistleblowers—those who report wrongdoing. And it would ensure that any employee who is terminated has an adequate opportunity to appeal their dismissal.

For years, the VA has been plagued by reports of inefficiency and long wait times. I might say that often we find those reports are true, but that is completely separate from the quality of medical care that is given through the VA healthcare system. If you talk to almost any veteran, they are very pleased with the quality of that medical care. It is the administrative stuff getting in the way, and that is what there has been such an outrage about.

Well, this VA bill is going to help the VA get rid of the bad actors while protecting the good ones. I want to make it clear that the vast majority of VA employees perform their work admirably in an often thankless environment. These dedicated public servants work hard to provide the day-to-day care our veterans deserve, and they should be protected. That is why, while I believe it is important to hold poorly performing employees accountable, I also believe that it is important to protect the rights of the employees who may have been wrongly terminated, especially at the lower levels, by giving them the opportunity to appeal a supervisor's decision to fire them. This bill we are going pass does that. It is supported by dozens of veterans service organizations, the Office of Special Counsel, the Secretary himself. So I urge our colleagues to join me and join so many of us in voting in favor of the bill.

I would also say that on this very famous day, this anniversary, June 6, I have been to the beaches of Normandy, I have been to Omaha Beach. As a matter of fact, while there, it is impossible to walk into that cemetery on the cliff overlooking the beach—it is impossible to walk into that beautiful, beautiful American cemetery and not become very, very emotional, realizing what happened in 1944.

I felt so strongly about this that at one point I wanted to put on my jogging shoes and run the 4 miles of that Omaha Beach. I wanted to reach back into time, having been there where so many sacrificed so much.

Then, of course, the Battle of Midway, the time which turned the battle in the Pacific, where a young admiral showed his courage and his superiority in planning. As a result, that battle turned around the course of the war in the Pacific with Japan. What a day to remember, June 6.

I yield the floor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, we are all united in support of a strong and effective VA that is able to provide topnotch services and support to the veterans who have served our country nobly. None of us can be satisfied with the current state of the Department, and I share the frustration of constituent veterans who are unable to get the basic care and treatment they need, from widows and families who have lost loved ones while under the care of the VA, and from dedicated VA employees who are frustrated with the waste and inept management that prevent them from providing the care they believe our veterans deserve. The revelations about the continuing problems at the District of Columbia VA medical center should serve as a new wake-up call that immediate attention is needed to make the VA right.

I supported the nomination of Dr. David Shulkin to be VA Secretary and gave him my full support to make changes to the organization to address the management problems and lapses in care that plague the VA. There is no question that the VA needs reforms that will make it more responsive to the needs of our veterans, and more accountable when it does not adequately serve them.

The VA Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act attempts to address these issues by making it easier for management to discipline and remove VA employees. It is essential that managers have this authority to remove employees who violate their duty to care for our veterans. It is also important that our removal process be implemented in a fair and impartial manner. The House bill failed to provide those protections, and I appreciate Senator TESTER's work on this issue and his efforts to improve the bill that the House passed. I am concerned, however, that some provisions in the bill weaken the worker protections that are necessary to avoid arbitrary or politically motivated disciplinary actions. Our Nation's civil service protections are intended to allow Federal workers to do their jobs free of intimidation or political interference. Employees can be disciplined or removed, but only with due process that exposes the full facts of the case. Reforms that rely on fear of arbitrary discipline or removal are not truly reforms, but will create a toxic environment within the agency. While I have concerns about some of the provisions of this bill, we must provide veterans the care and support they need from the VA.

I admire the dedication and commitment of our Federal workers at the VA, many of whom are veterans themselves. Most care deeply and go the extra mile to serve those who have served. I know that Secretary Shulkin recognizes the enormous talent in our Federal workers, and I believe he should strive to create a stronger team by rapidly filling the 45,000 vacant civil service positions currently at the VA and by building on the strong sense of purpose that motivates our VA Federal workforce and cares for our veterans.

Mr. NELSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET PROCESS

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, we have 50 workdays in the Senate before the end of this fiscal year—50 days. That does not include the 5 weeks we will be gone during the August State work weeks. I rise tonight to talk about what happens September 30. September is the end of the fiscal year. That means we have to have the Federal Government funded for fiscal year 2018, which starts October 1 of this year.

Like most years—as a matter of fact, like every year since 1980—the Federal Government will probably not be funded by the end of this fiscal year in the manner it was supposed to be, according to the law that was done in 1974, the Budget Act of 1974. In the last 43 years, the Federal Government has only been funded four times, according to that bill. We have used 178 continuing resolutions, and therefore ongoing omnibuses and so forth, where six people get in a room, basically decide how we are going to spend \$1 trillion.

This is the only enterprise I can find anywhere in the world that funds its operations this way. The problem is, we have a system that is absolutely totally broken. It is a fraud that is being perpetrated on the American people. We have been asked, between now and September 30—this is the way the budget process works. By the way, we should have started this back in January, but we couldn't do it because we were working on the fiscal year 2017 budget to do reconciliation so we could work on healthcare.

Now we are going to, when that gets done, do a budget for 2018. We will do a reconciliation and hopefully do a tax package behind that, but wrapped up in all of that, here comes September 30 and 50 workdays from today to fund the Federal Government. Between now and then, in 50 days, we are asked to do a budget for fiscal year 2018, to do full

authorizations for 16 different entities, committees, and then do appropriations for 12 committees.

By the way, over the last 43 years, you have to fund 12 appropriations bills to fund the Federal Government. It was 13 appropriations bills up until around 2000. Since then, it has been 12, but of those 12, the average number of appropriations bills this body has appropriated each year is 2½.

Now, by any measure, that is unacceptable, but we are now asked, between now and September 30, in a very truncated manner, to do the budget, do all 16 authorizations and all 12 appropriations. Now, I am not a betting man, but I will go to Vegas and short that idea right now. There is no way we are going to fund this government according to that policy—no way. It will not happen. It can't happen. It has not happened in 43 years that way except four times.

Every single year this process breaks down. Like I said, we have used 178 continuing resolutions. What does a CR do? It ties the hands of our military leaders, where they can't move money from one bucket to the other to help accommodate it. So what we have right now is a process that just has not worked. Yet, because of that, the Federal Government has exploded in size.

In 2000, the Federal Government spent \$2.4 trillion running the Federal Government. Last year, we spent \$3.9 trillion. Those are constant 2016 dollars. Over the next 10 years, we are going to spend \$53 trillion running the Federal Government. We are going to borrow a significant part of that—another \$10 trillion.

The irony is, the debate we are having between now and September 30 is to fund the government, not on the full \$4 trillion we are going to spend next year running the Federal Government, we are going to have this debate on only about \$1.1 trillion, the discretionary side of the budget.

If you do the math, in the last 8 years and, oh, by the way, in the next 10 years, according to the current CBO baseline budget, we borrow over 30 percent of what we spend as a Federal Government. Well, discretionary spending over the next 10 years is going to be less than that. So what that means is, over the last 8 years and over the next 10 years, every dime we have spent on discretionary spending has, by definition, been borrowed.

There is no other way to look at it. That means that every dime we have spent for our military, which is about \$600 billion today, every dime we spend on our VA, which is a little less than \$200 billion, and every dime we spend on all other domestic expenditures, including healthcare, by the way, comes to \$1.1 trillion. Every dime of that today is borrowed money. That means we have to go to China and the rest of the world to fund all of our discretionary spending.

Now, by anybody's estimate—conservative, liberal, whatever—that is not acceptable. Here is why it is not acceptable: It cannot be sustained over a long period of time. Yet we are sitting here with a budget today that goes for the next 10 years that says we are going to continue operating business as usual and add another \$10 trillion to this already burdensome debt of \$20 trillion.

The debt crisis and the budget problem are interlinked. There is no way that we can solve the debt crisis unless and until we solve the budget process. The difficulty comes in trying to align the prospects within the process itself of getting to a determination.

Right now, the budget process doesn't work for this very reason: The budget itself is not a law. It is a resolution, which means the majority party can cram down the throat of the minority its version of a political budget. That is all it is.

Then you go to an authorization process, and, in the authorization process today, we have over \$310 billion of Federal expenditures that are not authorized, including the State Department. Last year, we didn't even do an authorization for our military. Even then, after passing the appropriations bill in the Armed Services Committee 30 to 0, we could not get that bill on the floor of the Senate. We tried six times. So it was not authorized or appropriated last year, but it got wrapped up in an omnibus, and that same thing will more than likely happen this year.

This can be fixed. It is not that difficult. Several of us have been working behind the scenes, looking at other best practices around the world—other countries, companies, and even States. We have looked at best practices. What we found was that nobody else tries to fund their government or their enterprise the way we try to fund the Federal Government. This goes back to article I and article II of our Constitution.

Article I says that funding the Federal Government is the responsibility of Congress. Yet we have absconded with that. The 1921 act that created the Office of Management and Budget went well beyond what I think is called for in the original Constitution. So what we are looking at today is a legislative underreach and an executive overreach relative to funding government, out of necessity because of the dysfunction right here in the Senate relative to how we fund our government. There is no question that we will not fund this government without a continuing resolution and/or an omnibus come September 30.

The fix is not that unreasonable. All we need is a politically neutral platform that brings all expenses into the budget process—all \$4 trillion today. That would include discretionary and mandatory and that the budget become

a law, which means that we have to get bipartisan support for the budget.

Then, lastly, if we don't get the budget done by a certain date and we don't fund the government by the end of the fiscal year, then, severe consequences are borne by the people who have the responsibility to fund the government, and that is the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the people in the administration who are responsible for their part of it.

It is not that complicated. Many other countries do it. Most other countries do it. In fact, in some countries, if they don't fund the government by the end of their fiscal year, their constitutions actually say that the government gets disbanded and they have an election. Well, that is not what I am calling for here. I don't think we have to do anything that severe.

There are colleagues of mine right here in this body, on both sides, who have contributed—Senators WHITEHOUSE, ENZI, CORKER, LANKFORD, TILLIS, ERNST, ROUNDS, SULLIVAN, DAINES, and others—and who are weighing in on this. Governors, who have executive experience running large financial enterprises at the State level, have come into this body and bring enormous wealth of experience about how to get this done.

My argument is that right now, during this period of dysfunctionality when we see firsthand the reality of not being able to take care of domestic needs, military needs, or any other discretionary enterprises that we want to fund because of our own budgeting intransigence, I can find no other time better than what we have right now to raise the question on both sides of the aisle. This is not a partisan conversation. Both sides are guilty, but let's come up with a politically neutral platform that would allow both sides, during the budget process, to talk about tax increases, tax expenditures, spending cuts, all the spending that we have, and all the responsibility we have in the Federal Government or in the Congress of funding the Federal Government. Why not?

We have one suggestion that says: Pick a time in the future. Decide what percentage of your GDP should be covered by debt—no more than that—and have a limit on that, and then pick a roadmap back from that point in time to today with guardrails around that. That suggestion comes from the other side of the aisle, and I applaud that suggestion and I think it is very workable. I think we can find ways to make all of this work. This should not be a partisan conversation.

I sit on the Armed Services Committee, and I sat on Foreign Relations the last 2 years. Both of those committees are really very strong bipartisan efforts by every Member.

That is what is needed here, and yet the Budget Committee, ironically, is

one of the most partisan committees. The reason it is so is because of the law itself, because the budget is not a law. It is a resolution. My contention is that this is the root of this problem. It is one of the causative factors that cause this debt to be uncontrollable and to cause a dysfunction in this body from even being able to attempt to bring that under control.

The solution is not just taxing more. It is not just spending more. It is not just growing more. The problem is much bigger than that. The debt problem will never be solved unless and until we solve this budgeting process.

As we close in on the next 50 days, as we check off every single day, I want my colleagues in here to be reminded of what we are going to have to do to fund the government come October 1. Please, let's not get right up to September 30 with a gun to our head that says: Either do it this way, spend this money this way, or do not fund the government tomorrow. That is total irresponsibility, just like I believe this budget process is a fraud perpetrated by Washington on the people of America and it is not honest relative to what we have to face up to in terms of our responsibilities.

We cannot afford to do all that we are doing. That is just pure fact. The world is no longer going to be able to loan us the money that we need over the next 10 years—another \$10 trillion. There is some \$200 trillion of total debt in the world. Only \$60 trillion of the \$200 trillion is sovereign debt, and we have one-third of that sovereign debt today. Now, most other countries have curtailed their borrowing. We are one of the few that continue to just race along this path of borrowing money at this breakneck pace and adding another \$10 trillion. We could, potentially, have over half of the world's sovereign debt in the next 10 years. That cannot happen. The world bond risk and the bond markets will not, potentially, allow that to happen.

So today is the day. As we go through the next 50 days, I believe we need to look for opportunities on both sides of the aisle to find a bipartisan way to stop this nonsense and to get to where we can fund the government in a responsible way each year, not just 1 year, and to get away from the past 43 years of total failure in terms of funding the Federal Government, such that when we get to September 30 of each year, we have already approved the budget and we have the appropriations lined up and funded for the needs that we have all agreed here in Congress need to be met.

I can think of no other call on this body higher than this right now because it puts us at risk of doing the very things that we need to do; that is, to take care of our domestic needs, to take care of the people who need the safety net, to take care of these legacy

programs of Social Security and Medicare, and yet defend our country. Because of this debt, we are limiting the opportunities that we have, and we will not solve that until we address this budget process.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The Senator from Washington.

TRUMP CARE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes this afternoon to talk about TrumpCare, specifically, about what families back in my home State of Washington are saying about the harm that this bill will do and why, despite how often Republicans say they are struggling to find a way to jam TrumpCare through the Senate, now is the time to keep the pressure on.

I have had to say this far too often: Right now people across the country are scared, and they have a right to be. The policies in TrumpCare would turn our healthcare system into a minefield of higher costs and worse care for our families. If you are a young person who needs mental healthcare, you could pay thousands more a year on top of what you are already paying for insurance. If you are a senior, your premiums could increase by as much as 850 percent. If you need maternity care, the independent analysis by the Congressional Budget Office shows you could pay as much as \$1,000 more a month.

Under TrumpCare, 23 million people across the country would lose coverage, and, because insurance companies would have far more power to lower their standards and offer skimpy, snake-oil plans, we would go back to the days when a trip to the emergency room could result in a truly devastating financial hit.

I have just described some of the biggest impacts TrumpCare would have. None of them help patients and families. They instead do serious harm.

But you know who would benefit from TrumpCare? Special interests in the healthcare industry that would get a massive tax break and, of course, President Trump, who is desperate for a political win.

For these reasons and many more, people across our country are rejecting TrumpCare. They don't want the dramatically higher healthcare costs. They don't want this bill to create even more chaos in our healthcare system than Republicans already have, and they certainly don't think they should have to pay more, all to appease President Trump and those at the very top.

Senate Republican leaders have said they expect their final product will look a whole lot like the version of TrumpCare that passed in the House. In fact, some of them said they expect to keep as much as 80 percent of the House-passed version of TrumpCare. So it is no wonder that they are now having trouble figuring out how to cobble

together enough votes to jam this disastrous bill through the Senate. If that is truly the case, then, I would again encourage them to drop this reckless repeal effort, to stop creating chaos in our healthcare system, which is driving up our premiums, and to work with Democrats on real solutions.

We are ready, like we have always been, to find ways to bring down families' healthcare costs while making sure they get the same quality of care and finding ways to get families more affordable coverage. Unfortunately, we have not heard from any Republicans who are willing to reverse course. That is why, despite how much trouble Republicans may be having with their disastrous policies, I am here today urging anyone who rejects TrumpCare and what it means for our families' health and financial security to fight as hard as they can against this bill. Keep making those calls, keep rallying, and keep sharing your stories.

Since the election, I have heard from family after family in Washington State about what the future holds for their healthcare. One of those is a constituent of mine named Marcy Jefferson. Her husband is a small business owner, and they purchase individual insurance.

Well, in 2014 Marcy was diagnosed with cancer. She has had to have not one but two stem cell transplants since then, and her chemotherapy costs are over \$3,000 each month.

Before the Affordable Care Act, Marcy's health insurance had no out-of-pocket limit. Without limits on how much insurance companies can charge patients—a protection that TrumpCare would take away—Marcy says she and her husband will most definitely face bankruptcy.

Marcy also says that the ACA "literally saved my life—and we could not afford the type of care I am receiving without it."

There are stories like Marcy's in literally every community in our country—in red States, in blue States, in purple States. It is appalling that instead of working with us to make healthcare more affordable and with higher quality and expanding coverage, instead of listening to people like Marcy and joining us at the table, Republicans are trying to jam through the Senate a plan that would do the opposite—one that would threaten lives and devastate our families financially.

So I am going to do everything I can to fight back, and I will keep working hard against the deeply harmful TrumpCare plan that Republicans are determined to get signed into law. Families like Marcy's are bravely speaking up and making clear just how damaging TrumpCare would be, and that is exactly what Democrats here in the Senate are going to do as well.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Before I close, Mr. President, I want to take a couple of minutes to talk

about President Trump's latest budget proposal, because even after last week's stunning move by President Trump to obstruct our fight against climate change and seeing another confirmation the week before that that 23 million Americans would lose their healthcare coverage under TrumpCare, we cannot lose sight of the grand scope of President Trump's cruel attack against working families. Nowhere has the President's broken promises to working families been more evident than in his recent budget proposal.

President Trump spent his campaign promising workers he would stand with them, promising seniors he would protect their care, promising the middle class he would make the economy work for them. Then he came to Washington, DC, and crafted a budget that is a perfect summary of all the way those promises are broken.

In fact, the President's budget director came up to Capitol Hill just 2 weeks ago to try to defend the budget, to try to explain how it didn't break promises, but he couldn't do it because it can't be done.

From his promises not to cut Medicaid or Social Security to his promise to provide "insurance for everybody" that was better and at lower cost, promise after promise was not just broken but shattered.

So I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to reject President Trump's anti-worker, anti-student, anti-woman, anti-senior agenda. Thankfully, we are seeing signs that is happening. Democrats, Republicans, and Independents have been criticizing this budget here in DC and across the country. One senior Republican Senator called it "dead on arrival," and he is exactly right.

The families we represent want us to work together, to invest in our workers and in our middle-class families, to protect patients, to stand with women, to grow our economy from the middle out, and not simply give more tax cuts to the wealthy or well connected. We were able to do this before. Recently, Democrats and Republicans came together to pass a spending bill that rejected President Trump's extreme agenda and worked for families and the middle class. We were able to come together on bipartisan budget deals that increased investments. So I am hopeful that Republicans will stand with us on the side of the people they represent, push aside this awful budget from the President, and work with us to do this again. I stand ready to do that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the VA Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act—bipartisan legislation that will help ensure that our veterans receive the care they deserve.

We owe our veterans more than we can ever repay for their dedicated service. Part of this debt is providing our veterans with timely, high-quality healthcare.

In my home State of North Dakota, our VA medical center is located in Fargo. It not only serves the veterans in North Dakota, but it also serves the western half of Minnesota as well. If there is one thing that our veterans have made very clear about the health center in Fargo—from both North Dakota and Minnesota—our veterans have made clear that it is an outstanding healthcare center that provides high-quality service. Our veterans love the Fargo VA. They do a great job.

It is important to note that the vast majority of VA employees are dedicated to serving our veterans and are working diligently to provide services to veterans in their communities. However, as recent events have shown, there are a number of instances where poor performance or misconduct by a VA employee has had tragic consequences.

In cases like these, the VA needs to have the ability to address these situations and to do it in a fair but expeditious manner. This bipartisan legislation will provide the VA Secretary with the necessary tools to do just that and ensure that VA employees are putting our veterans first. Specifically, this legislation establishes in law the Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection within the VA, a post which was created earlier this year through Executive order. It authorizes the Secretary of VA to reprimand, suspend, demote, or remove VA employees at any level and hasten the appeal and review process. Additionally, it establishes protections for whistleblowers.

These reforms are important for our veterans. That is why the legislation has garnered the support of many veterans organizations. It has garnered the support of our North Dakota VA Commissioner, as well as the veterans service organizations, including the American Legion, AMVETS, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, the Military Officers Association of America, and others. It has also garnered the support of cosponsors on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber.

Seventy-three years ago, over 160,000 brave Allied troops landed on the beaches of Normandy. I can think of no more an appropriate day to pass legislation that honors our commitment to our veterans and helps ensure they receive the care they have earned.

I thank the committee chair, Senator ISAKSON of Georgia, and also Senator TESTER of Montana for their outstanding bipartisan leadership on this important legislation.

I particularly also want to thank Senator MARCO RUBIO of Florida, who

is the primary sponsor of this legislation and has been a champion for veterans issues. I know this accountability issue is one he has spoken about consistently, often, and passionately on behalf of our veterans. I thank him for his leadership on this very important legislation.

At this time, I yield to the prime sponsor of this bill, Senator MARCO RUBIO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator for his kind comments. This issue is one that I think matters to all 100 Members of this Chamber and every American.

I, too, find it timely that here we are, 73 years to the day of the incredible sacrifices that were made on that beach in Normandy and that we have the opportunity to honor the men and women who have served for us, then and since then, particularly those who are now in need of services, with the passage of what is truly landmark legislation, and I will talk about that in a moment. It is the hope of all of us who are supporting this that it will help bring accountability for generations of those who have served and will serve to protect our great Nation.

We live in a time of an outrage culture, where in order to make the news every evening, you have to be involved in some controversy or say something over the top. That is just the way things are these days. So when something positive happens, it doesn't get a lot of coverage. It is my sense that while we are not doing this for purposes of getting coverage, many Americans tonight, as they watch the news or go on the internet, will have no idea that the Senate took this up. I think that is unfortunate because in addition to the importance of this piece of legislation, it is a testament that despite all of the important issues, noise, and arguments we hear every day on television, that our Republic still works and that men and women of good faith can come together across political ideology and partisan lines on an issue that wasn't easy to work with for a couple of years.

I hope there is an opportunity to point to this and say that on something that was important—this is not a symbolic resolution; this is a change in the laws of our country that will bring accountability to one of the most important functions that our government provides to the men and women who serve in uniform, and that is the Veterans' Administration. That is why I preference my comments on all this and the fact that this is not getting a lot of attention because this is not controversial. If there were a big fight on the floor about this and people were bickering or arguing, it would get more coverage, but the fact that we were able to come together across party

lines on this issue and get it done should not be a reason not to recognize its importance. That is not why we are doing it. We are doing it to make a change.

I think it is important to preface my remarks by saying that it has been an honor and a pleasure to work with Chairman ISAKSON and with the ranking member, Senator TESTER, and all the members of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee on what is now truly bipartisan legislation that is before the Senate. I remain grateful to the committee for their efforts to help bring needed accountability reforms to the Department. This is an issue, as I said, that we have been working on for several years, and I am pleased that we are now on a path to enact real change.

This spring marks 3 years since light was shed on the veterans who died while they were stuck on secret waiting lists at the Department of Veterans Affairs. After it was revealed that the Phoenix, AZ, VA facility had widespread mismanagement and misconduct by employees, Congress came together and acted promptly. In the wake of that deplorable situation, this Chamber responded in a bipartisan way by passing the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014.

While many of those reforms have begun to make a difference, we knew even then that it would not be enough. As reflected in the legislation that is now before us, in this law we are seeking to address those shortcomings and doing so in deference to what the courts have decided is consistent with the Constitution of the United States.

As virtually every Member of this Chamber—if not everyone—has done, over the years I have met with veterans throughout my home State of Florida, and I have found that many share a common frustration and disappointment and often express resignation that meaningful accountability has yet to come or occur at the VA. It is my hope that will begin to change with this vote today. These men and women, our veterans, have sacrificed much for our country, and it is our duty to take care of them when they come home after taking care of us. Sadly, for many, this solemn obligation and promise has not been kept.

Plain and simple, ineffective governance is unfair to our veterans and to the American taxpayer. The VA must be properly managed so that it can provide timely, quality care to veterans and be held accountable to all Americans.

Let me follow up what I just said by making it abundantly clear that the overwhelming majority of the people who work at the VA are good, hard-working employees who serve our veterans well. Many of them are veterans themselves. This is not a punitive measure, nor is it meant to degrade the work they are doing under very dif-

ficult circumstances. But it has become clear that under the current law, the VA often is unwilling or unable to hold individuals appropriately accountable for their actions and/or misdeeds—usually not because they don't want to but because under the law they just can't. Even in instances in which disciplinary action against an employee was attempted, the complexity and the lengthiness of the process prevented meaningful consequences.

The unfortunate reality is that those few but significant number of negligent employees often went unpunished. To shield such employees from the consequences brings down the entire Department, demoralizes the workforce, and undermines the core mission of the VA. That comes not from political talking points but from many of the men and women who themselves work at the VA.

We cannot and must not allow bureaucratic redtape to get in the way. Our VA is staffed by those who belong there and are willing to perform the important tasks of serving our heroes.

It is our hope and my belief that this law will change the VA, and it will change it for the better. Simply put, the law gives the VA Secretary the authority to reprimand, to suspend, to demote, or to remove any employee if their behavior or their performance warrants such an action.

Importantly, these reforms establish a period of adequate notice, response, and final decision on a disciplinary action initiated by the Secretary and is under an enforceable and capped timeframe. So while the employee is getting due notice and the opportunity to defend themselves, it doesn't drag on forever.

It also provides a new avenue for whistleblowers so they can come forward without fear of retaliation through the establishment of an Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection. This is critical because, as we have seen, in order to uncover many of these abuses at the Department, we oftentimes need to rely on information directly from those who have seen it happen and are involved.

In summary, this bill will protect our veterans while also serving as a means to protect the countless well-performing, dedicated VA employees and whistleblowers in the Department who are frustrated that just a handful of bad apples are standing in the way of providing the service they signed up to provide. This bill will also ensure that VA employees' due process rights are respected and not infringed upon. This is not an anti-VA employee law; it is designed to reward those who work hard and perform and to identify and remove those who do not.

I am proud to say this bill would not have been possible without the support of our current VA Secretary. We worked closely with him and his office

to ensure that the provisions would provide the tools they need now and for future Secretaries so they can carry out their important mission.

In addition to the Secretary, the bill has been endorsed by the Office of Special Counsel, Project On Government Oversight, and several veteran service organizations, including the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Concerned Veterans for America, the Reserve Officers Association, the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, American Veterans, and the Military Officers Association of America. These organizations serve our veterans admirably, have valuable knowledge of veterans' needs, and they agree that this legislation provides overdue reforms to the VA's current broken civil service system. We are all grateful for their help, for their support, and for helping and informing us in tweaking this law so that it actually solves problems.

There are two more points that I want to make.

I am proud that we were able to come together as a unified body—Republicans and Democrats—to show the Nation that the Republic can still work and that we can work together to solve problems. Hopefully, that spirit will carry over into other issues that confront our Nation.

With today's vote, I think we move one step closer to achieving the worthy goal of bringing accountability and, as a result, an improvement in the VA. I thank my colleagues for joining this fight to better serve our Nation's veterans.

I close by thanking the people who worked day in and day out on this, including the staffs for Chairman ISAKSON and Ranking Member TESTER. Adam Reece and Jorge Rueda worked tirelessly on the bill. I thank Hazen Marshall and Tom Hawkins with Senator MCCONNELL's office. I thank our cloakroom staff—Laura Dove, Chris Tuck, and Tony Hanagan—for their work in getting this bill here today.

On my own personal staff, I thank J.R. Sanchez, who has worked on this personally for 2½ to 3 years. I don't know what he is going to do with his time now because he has spent so much time and passion on this, and he knows many of these veterans personally.

This is a good day, and I look forward to eventually getting this bill over to the President's office so that accountability and improvement in performance can finally come to the VA and so that the men and women who have taken care of us will finally be taken care of the way they deserve.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I thank Senator RUBIO, who has been a steadfast leader on this issue for years.

People have heard the term "years" mentioned. It is plural. We have

worked on this thing for a long time. It started coming together last year, but it fell apart at the last minute. Thanks to the Senator's work and the work of the committee and the staffs on both committees and the leadership on the Democratic side—Mr. TESTER's and mine—we found a way to do what, as I said in my opening remarks earlier—3 hours ago—is an act of Divine Providence. None of us really ever planned that this bill would come to the floor on the 73rd anniversary of the invasion of Normandy.

It was a great day in American history and world history when the evil German empire—Adolf Hitler—was destroyed by the Allied Forces and the United States of America. It is only appropriate that on the anniversary of that date 73 years later, we say to those who have worn the uniform and who wear the uniform, who represent us every day and fight for us and ask nothing in return: We will see to it that you get what you were promised in terms of healthcare and benefits, and we will be sure you have a mechanism to hold it accountable in order to give you the type of service as a veteran that you gave to us when you fought for our country.

I will repeat what has been said by the others in thanking the staff members who have worked so hard. This has not been an easy battle. It has appeared easy because nobody has been down here, arguing. All of the arguments are over. The veterans won. Doing the right thing won. It all would not have happened had it not been for a lot of hard-working staff.

I thank JON TESTER and his staff, on the Democratic side, for all of their work on this. I want to particularly thank the Republican staffers who worked countless, tireless hours in order to make this take place: Staff Director Tom Bowman, Amanda Meredith, Adam Reece, Gretchan Blum, Kristen Hines, Maureen O'Neill, Leslie Campbell, David Shearman, Jillian Workman, Thomas Coleman, John Ashley, Mitchell Sylvest, and Heather Vachon.

We could not have done what we did nor would we have been here today without their help. Yet, as has always been true, we would not as a country have been here today nor would we have ever existed had it not been for the brave men and women who bore the battle—who fought the battle—who defended our country and made sure we had the opportunity to become what is now acknowledged around the world—the greatest government on the face of this Earth.

On this day, the anniversary of the invasion of Normandy on D-day, we are guaranteeing our veterans the type of service that they fought for and deserve. God bless America, and God bless the veterans who proudly serve America day in and day out in every uniform around the world.

In the absence of another speaker, I yield back the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 1094), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

GASPEE DAYS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I come to the Senate floor every year around this time to discuss an important incident in the history of Rhode Island largely overlooked in the history books, certainly overlooked in consequence to its importance.

We have to understand that we Rhode Islanders have always had a pretty fierce independent streak. The Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations was founded by Roger Williams and others fleeing the harsh ideological conformity of the Massachusetts theocracy. Our 1663 charter, describing the colony as a "lively experiment," is the first formal document in all of history granting to a political entity the separation of church and state, along with unprecedented freedoms of speech.

Rhode Island was the first colony to declare its independence from Britain, on the Fourth of May, 1776—2 months before the rest of you did on the Fourth of July—and we were the last colony to join the Union, waiting for an independent Bill of Rights. Like I said, an independent streak.

Colonial Rhode Islanders chafed at the inequities of British rule, especially the disruption of our liberty at sea. We are the Ocean State. Living and working on the water has always been a Rhode Island way of life. As tensions with the American Colonies grew, however, King George III stationed revenue cutters, armed Customs patrol vessels, in the waters of Narragansett Bay to prevent smuggling, enforce the payment of taxes, and impose British sovereignty.

In 1764, after a British ship called the HMS *St. John* stole goods from Newport merchants, a group of Rhode Islanders seized control of Fort George on Goat Island in Newport Harbor and fired cannons on the vessel.

In 1769, the HMS *Liberty*, a sloop confiscated by the British from none other than John Hancock and repurposed as a Customs vessel, was boarded, scuttled, and burned by a mob of angry Rhode Islanders.

In 1772, on a dark night, a band of Rhode Islanders destroyed the HMS *Gaspee*, one of the most hated imperial ships, drawing what the Rhode Island abolitionist Frances Whipple McDougall called, in 1884, "The first blood in the Revolution."

The *Gaspee* and its captain, Lieutenant William Dudingston, were known for destroying Rhode Islanders' vessels, seizing their cargo, and flagging down ships to harass, humiliate, and interrogate the Colonials. As historian Steven Park describes in his new book, "The Burning of His Majesty's Schooner *Gaspee*: An Attack on Crown Rule Before the American Revolution," the *Gaspee* was an unwelcome, even hated, presence in Narragansett Bay. Rhode Island Deputy Gov. Darius Sessions complained to Gov. Joseph Wanton, in March 1772, that Lieutenant Dudingston had "no legal authority to justify his conduct, and his commission . . . [was] more of a fiction than anything else."

When British authorities assured Governor Wanton that Dudingston was there to protect the Rhode Island colony from pirates, the Governor replied that he didn't know whether Dudingston was protecting them from pirates or was the pirate himself.

On June 9, 1772, all this tension came to a head. On this day, Rhode Island Captain Benjamin Lindsey was en route to Providence from Newport in his ship the *Hannah*. He was ordered by the hated *Gaspee* to halt for inspection. Captain Lindsey refused, and he raced up Narragansett Bay—despite warning shots fired at the *Hannah*. The *Gaspee* gave chase to the *Hannah*, and Captain Lindsey, who knew the waters of Narragansett Bay far better than Dudingston did, steered his ship north toward Pawtuxet Cove in Warwick, right over the shallows off of Namquid Point—known today as *Gaspee* Point. The lighter *Hannah* was able to shoot over those shallows, but the heavier *Gaspee* ran aground and stuck firm in a sandbar in a falling tide. The British ship and her crew were stranded and would need to wait many hours before a rising tide could free them.

Wasting no time, Captain Lindsey sailed up to Providence, and with the help of the respected merchant and statesman John Brown, rallied a group of Rhode Island patriots at Sabin's Tavern, in what is now the East Side of Providence. Together, after suitable refreshment, the group resolved to end the *Gaspee*'s menace in Rhode Island waters.

That night, 80 or so men shoved off from the wharf under a moonless sky, with their faces blackened and their

oarlocks muffled, paddling eight longboats down Narragansett Bay toward the stranded *Gaspee*. The longboats silently surrounded the *Gaspee*, and the Rhode Islanders shouted for Lieutenant Dudingston to surrender his ship. As Daniel Harrington recounted in the *Providence Journal*, "Captain Abraham Whipple spoke first for the Rhode Islanders, summoning Dudingston: 'I am sheriff of Kent County, [expletive]. I have a warrant to apprehend you, [expletive]; so surrender, [expletive].' It was a classic Rhode Island greeting!"

Surprised and enraged, Dudingston refused and ordered his men to fire upon anyone who attempted to board the *Gaspee*. Gunshots struck out in the night, and musket balls hit Lieutenant Dudingston in his groin and his arm. The Rhode Islanders, outnumbering the British, swarmed onto the deck and commandeered the ship. Brown ordered one of his Rhode Islanders, a physician named John Mawney, to tend to Lieutenant Dudingston's wounds.

After properly plundering the lieutenant's quarters, the patriots removed the British crew to land and returned to torch the *Gaspee*. Ultimately, the flames reached the powder magazine, and the resulting blast echoed across the bay as the dreaded *Gaspee* blew to smithereens.

When word got back to the King, he was furious, and he offered huge royal rewards for the capture of the rebels who had done this deed, but, strangely enough, no Rhode Islander would step forward to finger the perpetrators. You have to admire, under that kind of pressure, that with 80 people who had gone down in those longboats, not one Rhode Islander would spill the beans.

Word spread throughout the Colonies of this incident and of the Crown's brand of justice. Samuel Adams wrote a letter in the *Providence Gazette* on December 26, 1772, that read, in part:

A court of inquisition, more horrid than that of Spain or Portugal, is established within this colony, to inquire into the circumstances of destroying the *Gaspee* schooner; and the persons who are the commissioners of this new-fangled court, are vested with most exorbitant and unconstitutional power. They are directed to summon witnesses, apprehend persons not only impeached, but even suspected! And . . . to deliver them to Admiral Montagu, who is ordered to have a ship in readiness to carry them to England, where they are to be tried.

The Reverend John Allen delivered at the Second Baptist Church in Boston a Thanksgiving sermon on the *Gaspee* Affair that was distributed in pamphlet form throughout the Colonies. His words helped rouse the spirit of independence of this fledgling Nation. He said:

Supposing . . . that the Rhode Islanders, for the sake of the blood-bought liberties of their forefathers, for the sake of the birthrights of their children, should show a spirit of resentment against a tyrannical arbitrary

power that attempts to destroy their lives, liberties and property, would it not be insufferably cruel (for this which the law of nature and nations teaches them to do) to be butchered, assassinated and slaughtered in their own streets by their own King?

Well, schoolchildren's history books tell a tale of Bostonians who dressed up in funny outfits and climbed onto a British boat and pushed bales of tea into the harbor, but not enough schoolchildren know of the bravery of the Rhode Islanders who, more than a year earlier, fired the first shots and drew the first blood in the quest for American independence. It is a fine thing, I am sure, to push tea bales off a boat. We blew the boat up, and we did it more than a year earlier.

Rhode Islanders are justifiably proud of our role in our rebellion. We have made a tradition of celebrating the *Gaspee* incident with the annual *Gaspee* Days celebration and parade through Warwick. An independent study group at Brown University is adapting the tale of the *Gaspee* into a virtual reality educational experience so you can put on the goggles and reenact the experience of the *Gaspee*, marrying Rhode Island history with cutting-edge technology to engage middle and high school students in this history.

Someday soon, children across the country may be able to join Captain Whipple and John Brown and step into a virtual longboat, coast down a virtual Narragansett Bay, and watch the sky over a virtual Rhode Island, alight with the fire of revolution.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REUNIFICATION OF JERUSALEM

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, this June marks the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem. I am honored to have supported S. Res. 176, which commemorates the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem.

This resolution reaffirms the Holy City of Jerusalem's central role for the Jewish people dating back many millennia. Since 1967, all people of all religious faiths are able to visit and worship at the holy sites of Jerusalem. I will always stand with Israel as it ensures that all individuals enjoy opportunities to visit and worship at Jerusalem's holy sites.

The United States has stood with Israel for the past 50 years and will continue to do so. The intervening 50

years have included momentous changes in Israel and throughout the region, including peace treaties with Egypt and Jordan that stand to this day. These events give me hope for a future in which Israel and all of its neighbors together benefit from a comprehensive, warm peace.

CHILD PROTECTION AND FAMILY SUPPORT ACT

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I am honored today to announce legislation that Senator PETERS and I have introduced that provides another option for children in the foster care system in Montana and across the country.

I worked with a host of Montana groups to develop the Child Protection and Family Support Act of 2017, including a handful of nonprofit organizations focused on foster youth, the Montana attorney general, Indian Tribes, and individual constituents. I am pleased to have their support on this legislation.

Montana is in the midst of a child welfare crisis. We have a record 3,400 children in foster care, and about a third of those children are there because of methamphetamine use by their parents.

Montana state law requires the Office of the Child and Family Ombudsman to investigate circumstances surrounding child fatalities when the child was involved with the Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services Child and Family Services Division within 12 months of the date of the child's death.

Last December, the Montana Department of Justice issued a report and the findings were devastating: It detailed 14 child deaths that met these parameters.

Of the 14 cases reviewed, 11 involved children 2 years old or younger. In nine of those cases, the children were 1 year old or younger. Eleven cases included allegations of drug use, four of which indicated methamphetamine use. Six cases indicated issues of domestic violence, and eight cases involved parents who received child protective services in Montana when they themselves were children. I have been told that at least seven children have met a similar fate in the first 5 months of 2017 alone. The death of one child is too many.

Under current Federal policy, a child must be removed from the home of a parent and, after removal, cannot be living with the parent, in order to be eligible for a title IV-E foster care maintenance payment. My bill would permit title IV-E foster care maintenance payment support, for up to 12 months, for a child in foster care who is placed with a parent in a licensed residential family-based treatment facility. This would allow the parent to get the help they need while keeping the family intact.

Secondly, the bill would reauthorize the Administration for Children and Families' Regional Partnership Grant, RPG, Program. These competitive grants reduce the risk of foster care due to parental substance abuse, an issue of utmost importance to Montana. Since their inception in 2006, two Montana grantees have utilized and benefited from RPGs: the Center for Children and Families in Billings, MT, and the Apsaalooke Nation Housing Authority in Crow Agency.

My bill reauthorizes and strengthens this grant program with modest improvements. For example, it encourages the use of RPGs to address the needs of children and families affected by methamphetamine, heroin, and opioid substance use disorders, help implement effective title IV-E prevention services, and focus on improved outcomes for families, including children and their parents. The bill further requires that, in addition to the State child welfare agency, every funded partnership must include the State agency that administers the Federal substance abuse prevention and treatment block grant and, if the partnership intends to serve children placed in out-of-home care, the court that handles child abuse and neglect proceedings in the region.

Among the long list of eligible grant applicants and partners, Native American Tribes, Tribal consortiums, and Tribal organizations are all eligible grantees, and I hope they will increasingly utilize RPGs, especially given the unique foster care challenges in Indian communities.

As a U.S. Senator, as a person of faith, as a father, and as an American, I believe in helping the most vulnerable in our society—in this case, innocent children.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

100TH BIRTHDAY OF THE 34TH AND 37TH BOMB SQUADRONS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I would like to recognize the 100th birthday of the Air Force's 34th and 37th Bomb Squadrons.

Two of the oldest active squadrons in the U.S. Air Force, the 34th and 37th Bomb Squadrons first served our Nation during "the war to end all wars." Too soon after the conclusion of their service in World War I, however, our country needed them once again. During World War II, when our allies in Europe and in the Pacific called for help, the brave airmen of these units answered the call. They served with distinction during the historic Doolittle Raid, a daring mission that tested the limits of the B-25 bombers that had been selected to strike a blow to the heart of the Japanese empire. While their bombers delivered payloads, their courage delivered hope to a world that longed for peace.

The 34th and 37th Bomb Squadrons went on to fly numerous interdiction and support missions during the Korean war, deployed during Operation Desert Storm, and fought in Kosovo and Serbia. When terrorists attacked our homeland in 2001, both squadrons took action in Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. In 2011, the 34th and 37th joined forces to launch the first ever B-1 combat mission launched from the continental United States, flying from Ellsworth Air Force base in South Dakota to hit enemy targets in Libya during Operation Odyssey Dawn. During their 100 years of service, the airmen of the 34th and 37th Bomb Squadrons have assisted allies around the globe and represented the very best of who we are as a nation. I have full faith they will continue their distinguished service in defense of our country, our allies, and our freedoms.

So many times throughout the history of our republic, we have called upon ordinary men and women to become extraordinary heroes. Today we honor the legacy of the heroes of the 34th and 37th Bomb Squadrons, and I thank you for joining me in wishing them the best as they celebrate a century of service.

TRIBUTE TO VICE ADMIRAL JAMES D. SYRING

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, today I wish to mark the retirement of VADM James D. Syring from the U.S. Navy following more than three decades of military service to this great Nation.

In his last post, he served as the Director of the United States Missile Defense Agency, MDA. As Director, Admiral Syring made enormous contributions to the successful development and fielding of the Ballistic Missile Defense System, BMDS, in order to protect our Nation, American troops deployed abroad, our allies, and our international partners.

Beginning as a midshipman at the U.S. Naval Academy, the Navy recognized his potential early on and designated him an engineering duty officer, where he served in various assignments.

Upon selection to flag rank in 2010, Admiral Syring served as the program executive officer for Integrated Warfare Systems, where he managed integrated weapons systems for ships, submarines, carriers, and aircraft within the Fleet and Joint Force.

His intellect, work ethic, and ability to deliver complex weapons systems resulted in his being nominated and confirmed as the ninth Director of MDA in November 2012, the first naval officer to assume the directorship of this multibillion-dollar Agency. He oversaw MDA's worldwide mission to develop and deliver to the warfighter a capa-

bility to defend the United States against ballistic missile attacks. He has done an outstanding job.

During his time at MDA, the Agency and the Department of Defense made significant progress in addressing current and emerging ballistic missile threats of all ranges. The progress made is even more remarkable considering the budget cuts sustained during that time. In response to the growing North Korean ICBM threat, Admiral Syring implemented a program to expand the capacity of homeland missile defenses. His leadership brought acquisition rigor to the critical Ground-based Midcourse Defense—GMD—Program and laid the foundation for the Agency to implement ground system modernization, a robust ground-based interceptor—GBI—Stockpile Reliability Program, as well as the Redesignated Kill Vehicle Program.

Under Admiral Syring's steady hand, the Agency successfully fielded a new data terminal at Fort Drum, NY, providing the warfighter the capability to improve communication with homeland defense interceptors.

He also oversaw a strategy to improve the overall sensor and discrimination capability of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. With the Long Range Discrimination Radar—LRDR—Program, MDA will deploy an improved persistent midcourse BMDS discrimination capability to enhance the Pacific architecture. The program today is within cost and is on schedule to deliver an initial capability to the warfighter in 2020. Those most familiar with major defense acquisition programs know that this is no small accomplishment.

Overall, Admiral Syring's advocacy for additional interceptor capacity, improved GBI reliability, a redesigned kill vehicle, and LRDR resulted in a fielded system that meets the threat today and is well-positioned to be expanded upon for future challenges.

Admiral Syring was also responsible for major BMDS asset deployments around the globe. He strengthened regional defenses by continuing deliveries of terminal high altitude area defense—THAAD—interceptors and Standard Missile-3—SM-3—Block IBs for use on Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense ships and at Aegis Ashore sites. He took steps to ensure that the United States remained committed to the planned European phased adaptive approach—EPAA—deployments.

He oversaw the delivery of the Aegis Ashore system in Romania in support of EPAA Phase 2, which was accepted for operations by the warfighter in May 2016. In addition, under his leadership, construction of the Aegis Ashore site in Poland commenced to improve European NATO defenses against medium- and intermediate-range ballistic missiles. He kept the Agency on track to deliver by the end of 2018 the

initial SM-3 Block IIA missiles developed in cooperation with Japan to support EPAA Phase 3.

Additionally, Admiral Syring supported successful negotiations between the United States and the Republic of Korea, ROK, on the deployment of a THAAD battery to the ROK, shoring up defenses against the growing threat from North Korean ballistic missiles.

In order to deal with future missile threats, Admiral Syring pursued an advanced technology program with the goal of reducing the cost of engaging increasing and complex ballistic missile threats.

Finally, Admiral Syring successfully initiated the development of an experimental space sensor layer for the BMDS, a new, low-cost program called Space-based Kill Assessment, SKA. The program will increase the performance of the BMDS by collecting data on missile intercepts, a critical capability of which the significance cannot be overstated.

Our Nation has long hoped and, indeed, expected that we will always be able to recruit and retain capable individuals with a strong sense of patriotism, who will spend their careers ensuring that our country is safe in peacetime and capable in time of war. The contributions that VADM James D. Syring made to the Missile Defense Agency, the U.S. Navy, and the national security of the United States of America over his career have again shown our Nation's hopes are not too great to be met. As he retires after more than three decades of military service, I wish him and his family well, and I hope he has a deep appreciation of his legacy to this Nation and of the gratitude of his fellow citizens.

TRIBUTE TO NANCY E. DICARLO

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, today I wish to pay tribute to the work and 37-year career of Ms. Nancy E. DiCarlo on the occasion of her retirement from the Department of Defense.

Since January 2007, Ms. DiCarlo has served as the Director for International Affairs for the U.S. Missile Defense Agency. In this capacity, Ms. DiCarlo has played an important role in the successful initial fielding of our integrated, layered, ballistic missile defense system, which currently protects our Nation, American troops deployed abroad, and our friends and allies from attack by ballistic missiles.

Ms. DiCarlo's career has been marked by increasing responsibility across a number of departments and programs important to the national security of the United States. Beginning her career in the Department of the U.S. Navy, Ms. DiCarlo contributed to the cost, schedule, and performance of the Navy's F/A-18 international programs, undersea surveillance programs, electronic hardware programs, and logistics programs.

Her performance caught the attention of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development & Acquisition, who selected Ms. DiCarlo to join the Navy acquisition team. In this role, she worked on a strategic implementation plan and performance measures across the Navy acquisition enterprise.

Ms. DiCarlo went on to join the U.S. Defense Security Cooperation Agency and lead both military and civilian staff in the management of Asian, European, NATO, and African security cooperation strategy, programs, and engagement. She was later selected for the Senior Executive Service and named as MDA's Director for International Affairs for MDA, where she diligently promoted U.S. national security goals and objectives.

Her service has assisted the sale of U.S. missile defense assets which has strengthened the cooperation of our international partners, thereby expanding the capabilities and effectiveness of U.S. missile defenses.

Additionally, Ms. DiCarlo's efforts have enhanced the U.S. partnership with the Government of Israel on missile defense programs. As the lead U.S. negotiator, she instituted codevelopment programs for the David's Sling Weapon System to defend Israel against long-range rockets and short-range ballistic missile threats and for the Upper Tier Interceptor Program as part of the Arrow Weapon System designed to defend Israel against longer-range ballistic missile threats. Ms. DiCarlo led negotiations with Israel on coproduction agreements for Iron Dome and David's Sling Weapon Systems.

The American people rely upon civilian and uniformed Federal employees to protect and advance their interests. Our country has been fortunate to have had Ms. Nancy DiCarlo's dedication and contribution to our Nation's defense for nearly four decades.

I hope my colleagues in the Senate will join me in recognizing Ms. Nancy DiCarlo for her work and thanking all of the men and women of the Missile Defense Agency for their service to our Nation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING DR. ALBERT H. OWENS, JR.

• Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, this Thursday, the Sydney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center at Johns Hopkins is hosting an event that includes a memorial cancer research symposium and a dinner in honor of the late Dr. Albert H. Owens, Jr., who died this past January at the age of 90. It is fitting to pay tribute to Al Owens, who served as president of the Johns Hopkins Hospital and was one of our Nation's pioneering oncologists.

Al Owens was born into a medical family. His father, Dr. Albert H. Owens, Sr., was a dentist; his mother, Grace Masters, was a head surgical nurse at Mount Sinai Hospital. He originally matriculated to Harvard University, but his college education was interrupted by his service as a medical officer in the Navy during the Korean war. He subsequently earned his bachelor's and medical degrees from the Johns Hopkins University and the school of medicine, respectively.

He joined the faculty in 1956. A year later, A. McGehee Harvey, who was head of the school of medicine's department of medicine, established a cancer research and treatment division within the department. He asked Al to head the new division. There was a slight problem: The Johns Hopkins Hospital did not have available space. So Al moved inpatient, clinical, and research oncology activities to Baltimore City Hospitals, now Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center. He opened Johns Hopkins' first cancer chemotherapy unit at Baltimore City Hospitals in 1961, making it one of the first university-based centers of its kind nationwide. In 1973, Al was named the first director of the Johns Hopkins Oncology Center, which had won Federal designation as one of the Nation's first comprehensive cancer centers. In 1977, he moved the center from Baltimore City Hospitals back to the main campus, where it was housed in a brand new facility, named the Oncology Center. Over the next decade, the Johns Hopkins Oncology Center—now named the Johns Hopkins Kimmel Cancer Center—became one of the most prestigious cancer centers in the country.

Al was named president of the Johns Hopkins Hospital in 1987, but he relinquished the presidency after only 18 months so that he could devote all of his time to developing a new oncology center for the hospital, but during his brief tenure as president, he decreed that the hospital would become smoke-free. We take smoke-free buildings for granted now; 30 years ago, it was a revolutionary move.

Thanks to Al's tireless devotion, the Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Building was completed in January 2000, followed shortly thereafter by the opening of the Bunting Family and Jacob and Hilda Blaustein Family Cancer Research Building. In 2006, the David H. Koch Cancer Research Building opened. These two research buildings are connected by the Albert H. Owens Auditorium, which was named in his honor.

Al was a beloved teacher and mentor, as well as a superb doctor, researcher, and administrator. His enthusiasm about cancer research was limitless. He frequently would visit young faculty members—unannounced—asking them to describe the most exciting research project they were working on that day. Al is survived by his wife, Sally W.

MacConnell; children Albert Henry Owens III, Elizabeth Ann Owens, David Tilden Owens, and Sarah Louise Owens; and five grandchildren. The Baltimore Sun ran an obituary at the time of his death; I ask that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There is an epitaph to Sir Christopher Wren, who is buried in St. Paul's Cathedral in London, which he designed. The epitaph reads, "Si monumentum requiris, circumspice." The English translation of the Latin is "if you seek his monument, look around." This is a fitting epitaph for Dr. Albert H. Owens, Jr., too, but it is not just the buildings dedicated to cancer research that you will see. Look around, and you will see people, probably including members of your family and your friends, who are alive today because of Al's unrelenting dedication to finding treatments and cures for cancer. They are his living monuments. I encourage my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to this wonderful and extraordinary man.

The material follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 26, 2017]

ALBERT H. OWENS JR., PIONEERING ONCOLOGIST AND FORMER HOPKINS HOSPITAL PRESIDENT, DIES

Dr. Albert H. Owens Jr., a pioneering oncologist who helped establish new ways to fight cancer and was a former president of Johns Hopkins Hospital, died of congestive heart failure Jan. 13 at Hopkins. The Churchville resident was 90.

Born on Staten Island, N.Y., he was the son of a dentist, Dr. Albert H. Owens Sr., and Grace Masters, a Mount Sinai Hospital head surgical nurse. He was a graduate of a high school in Port Richmond, N.Y.

His studies at Harvard University were interrupted by his Navy service in Korea, and he earned bachelor's and medical degrees from the Johns Hopkins University.

He became a Hopkins researcher and worked in liver metabolism. Hopkins colleagues said that in 1957, Dr. A. McGehee Harvey, who headed the Hopkins medical department, created a cancer research and treatment division.

Dr. Harvey asked Dr. Owens to head the new oncology division.

"At first, they gave him a card table, a secretary and a PH meter," said Dr. Donald S. Coffey, a colleague for many years who is a professor emeritus of urology, oncology and pathology. "Up to this time, there was no treatment for cancer other than surgery and radiation. Al went to work immediately and started drawing blood from his patients."

The hospital did not have room for the new treatment service, and Dr. Owens saw his patients and conducted research at the old Baltimore City Hospitals, now Hopkins Bayview Medical Center.

"He found a place in the backwater of the old buildings there and soon assembled a first-class team," said Dr. Coffey. "His great genius was his ability to bring great scientists and clinicians together. He would also say, 'We have to do everything right for this patient.'"

He recalled Dr. Owens as a quiet listener who would talk about patients as though they were his own children.

"Al Owens was one of the great figures in cancer. . . . He should receive a great deal of

the credit for what cancer care and research have become today," said Dr. William G. Nelson, Hopkins Kimmel Cancer Center director. "He was a wonderfully thoughtful person and was not prone to hyperbole. He liked people who worked on cancer seriously. And like great leaders, he distributed the credit."

A Hopkins statement described Dr. Owens as "a slightly bashful, bow tie-wearing researcher and clinician." In 1973, he became the first director of the Johns Hopkins Oncology Center. In 1977, he moved his work back to Hopkins' East Baltimore campus and a new oncology center. Much expanded, the facility is now named the Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center.

"Al was an exceptional leader who believed that the best way to foster science that would improve patient outcomes was to put basic scientists and clinicians into the same building so they would naturally bond as team members sharing projects, discoveries, frustrations and coffee on a daily basis," Hopkins professor Dr. Stuart A. Grossman said in a statement. "He radiated interest and enthusiasm when it came to cancer research and frequently dropped unannounced into the offices of young faculty members, asking them to describe the most exciting research project they were working on that day."

Dr. Owens was named Johns Hopkins Hospital president in 1987 and held the post for 18 months. He then resumed his work fighting cancer, but not before he instituted a smoke-free policy throughout the hospital. An auditorium at the medical campus is named in his honor.

"Dr. Owens was not only a superb oncologist and mentor, but a first-rate gentleman," Dr. David Ettinger, Hopkins professor of oncology, said in a statement.

Dr. Owens was a past president of the Maryland division of the American Cancer Society, the Association of American Cancer Institutes and the American Society of Clinical Oncology.

Dr. Owens resided at Medical Hall, a historic Churchville home, where he cultivated bee colonies.

Plans for a memorial service at Johns Hopkins Hospital are pending.

Survivors include his wife of 20 years, Sally W. MacConnell, a Johns Hopkins administrator; two sons, Albert Henry Owens III of Washington, N.J., and David Tilden Owens of Minneapolis; two daughters, Elizabeth Ann Owens of Baltimore and Sarah Louise Owens of England; and five grandchildren.●

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL H. MICHAEL EDWARDS

● Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, today I wish to recognize and commend MG H. Michael Edwards, who retired on March 31, 2017, after 43 years of exceptional leadership and service to our country, including 36 years in the Colorado Air National Guard. For almost a decade in the position of the Adjutant General for Colorado, General Edwards was responsible for the command administration of over 5,300 Army and Air National Guard members. He also served as the Executive Director of the Department of Military & Veterans Affairs and was a member of the Governor's cabinet. He had responsibility for the Colorado National Guard's pri-

mary missions of national defense and State emergency response. In addition, he was responsible for supporting the missions of the Civil Air Patrol's Colorado wing.

General Edwards received his commission in 1973, after graduating from the U.S. Air Force Academy, and earned his pilot wings in 1974 at Reese Air Force Base, TX.

He served as an F-4 pilot and AT-38 fighter lead-in instructor pilot at Osan Air Base, Korea, and Holloman Air Force Base, NM, respectively.

General Edwards joined the Colorado Air National Guard in August 1980. He has served in numerous assignments in flying and operations, as well as command positions at squadron, group, and wing levels—culminating as the Adjutant General for Colorado. During his tenure as Adjutant General, more than 6,000 Colorado National Guard citizen-soldiers and citizen-airmen have mobilized in support of overseas contingency operations.

He also oversaw the Colorado National Guard's record-setting response to some of the worst natural disasters impacting Colorado, including the High Park Fire and the Waldo Canyon Fire during 2012, followed by the Black Forest Fire and historic flooding along the Colorado Front Range in 2013.

Furthermore, General Edwards was instrumental in bringing a new National Guard cyber protection team to Colorado, bolstering the state's cyber defenses. He also diversified the Colorado National Guard through the appointment of its first female general officer.

Over a period of 10 years, General Edwards significantly grew the Colorado National Guard's enduring relationships with the Republic of Slovenia and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan under the National Guard State Partnership Program. These military-to-military exchanges have supported combatant command security cooperation objectives, promoted regional stability, and increased partner capacity and interoperability.

General Edwards has also overseen the missions of the Civil Air Patrol's Colorado wing, consisting of more than 1,600 volunteers. Under his leadership, the Civil Air Patrol took on a bigger role in State response, flying fire watch and conducting flood damage surveys. Colorado's Civil Air Patrol was first to fly support of the U.S. Army's on-base unmanned aerial systems operations.

General Edwards has flown over 4,600 mishap-free flight hours in a variety of aircraft to include the AT-38, A-7, C-21, F-4, F-16, T-37, and T-38. Of note, he has achieved the distinction of the Wing's Top Gun award on five separate occasions in his decorated flying career. Major Edwards has received numerous military decorations, including two Legion of Merit awards and three

Meritorious Service medal awards, along with many others from the State of Colorado.

General Edwards' operational experience, charismatic leadership, and unyielding patriotism have served him well in a lifetime of military service, both in the Colorado Air National Guard and abroad. Today we honor his distinguished service to our Nation as one of the most accomplished Adjutant Generals in Colorado history. We offer our heartfelt appreciation to his family for their countless sacrifices and selfless support to our country spanning over four decades.

On behalf of the Senate and a grateful nation, I congratulate MG H. Michael Edwards on a job well done and wish him the very best as he begins a hard-earned retirement in the great State of Colorado.●

18TH NORTHERN HONOR FLIGHT

● Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, today I wish to honor the veterans of the Northern Colorado Honor Flight and the organization's 18th trip to Washington, DC. More than 120 veterans from various wars and generations participated in this flight.

The Northern Colorado Honor Flight recognizes and celebrates the bravery, fortitude, and selflessness of our Nation's veterans. Twice a year, veterans are able to travel to Washington, DC, and visit the war memorials that stand in their honor, free of charge. We are eternally indebted to those who have served in our Armed Forces and have protected the United States. These veterans have preserved our rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Few words are sufficient to show the gratitude and respect we all have for the courageous men and women who have fought for our country. Of the 123 veterans who participated in the most recent honor flight, 11 served in WWII, 24 served in the Korean war, and 88 served in the Vietnam war.

Please join me in honoring Cecil Carlisle, Richard Crum, Edgar Darrow, Charles Davis, Eugene Doering, Muriel Elijah, Armand Hansen, Nathan Stiewig, William Thousand, Willard Williams, Richard Zisch, Richard Anema, John Baker, Edwin Boggle, Robert Brethauer, George Browning, Ralph Crockett, Gary Crouch, Marvin Elwood, John Fickes, Harold Hogness, LaVern Hueske, Harry Kembel, Neville Kempkes, Harold Krug, Louis Lambdin, Robert Lebsack, Arthur Meyer, LeRoy Odell, Loren Postlewait, Frank Shipman, Wayne Sodman, Irvin Troutdt, Wayne Wallis, Lois Wolfson, Jose Abeyta, Tony Abeyta, Timothy Ahern, Daniel Alires, Nelson Bachus, James Barnett, John Barslund, Stephen Bartels, Les Bates, Bernard Bay, David Beard, David Becker, Gary Becker, Mark Becker, Stephen Bernardo, Howard Bostrom, William Bradford, Darrell

Brasier, Robert Brevig, Timothy Camps, Thomas Chagolla, Eric Christensen, Marvin Clark, Norris Clark, Richard Conley, David Cowan, Wesley Craig, Lorraine Davison, Gary Dorsey, Christopher Erickson, Stanley Fisher, Jerome Folse, Patricia Folse, Douglas Frost, Aurthur Gallegos, Theodore Gilbert, Leroy Gonzales, Raymond Gonzales, Albert Guse, Lowell Hill, Richard Istas, Timothy Jachowski, Joseph Kolicko, Jr., Robert Krasznai, James Kuehl, Gary LaCrosse, Patrick Lennon, Gary Littlefield, Robert Loos, Malcom Macaulay, Robert Maciel, Ronald Martinez, Jonathan Mason, Douglas Mayeda, Joseph McKeon, Lee McCain, Donald McKinley, Michael McPherson, Lawrence Montoya, Tobias Morales, Marjorie Morningstar, Warren Morrow, John Niehoff, Everett Noble, Jr., Jeffrey Nuce, Danny Oppie, Robert Ortega, William Pierson, William Post, Jr., Anthony Quintana, Jimmy Rahm, Rudolph Ramirez, Constantino Ramos, Ronald Ray, Abel Razo, James Rose, Stephen Ryan, William Sheahan, Jimmie Shipp, William Springsteel, John Swens, Roland Trauernicht, Vernon Turner, Daniel Valdez, Dwight Van Beber, William Weaver, Warren Wienke, and Richard Wyatt.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WELD COUNTY COURTHOUSE

● Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, today I wish to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Weld County Courthouse in Greeley, CO. On July 4, 1917, the Weld County Courthouse opened for business after a mere 28 months of construction. Denver architect William N. Bowman designed the classical revival-style courthouse, and its original courtrooms remain intact. This anniversary recognizes the rich history in northern Colorado and is a reminder of Colorado's unique past.

Greeley, CO is named after Horace Greeley, one of the first journalists to document his experience in the Wild West. Horace came to Colorado during the Pikes Peak Gold Rush of 1859 and encouraged his fellow Americans to "Go West, young man, and grow up in this country." Horace's words helped put Greeley on the map and ultimately established the city as an important part of American history. Soon after Horace explored northern Colorado, the Colorado Legislature recognized Weld County as one of the first 17 counties in the Colorado territory.

The Weld County Courthouse was one of the first buildings constructed in Greeley. The first courthouse, built in 1861, served as a meeting place for court proceedings and business matters. During this period, the courthouse was only a one-room log cabin located near Platteville, CO. The courthouse moved locations four times before the final courthouse opened for business in 1917.

I would like to congratulate the citizens of Weld County on this milestone, and I look forward to the future accomplishments of the entire Weld County community.●

REMEMBERING JERRY PERENCHIO

● Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, it is with deep sadness that I come to the floor to pay tribute to my friend and great supporter, Jerry Perenchio. Along with my wife, Cindy, I offer my sincerest condolences to Margie and Jerry's three children, five grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren as they mourn the loss of a man whose brilliant talent and business success were only surpassed by his humility and generosity.

Jerry's incredible life and career epitomize the American dream. The grandson of Italian immigrants, Jerry spent time at military school before graduating from UCLA and joining the U.S. Air Force as a fighter pilot. Jerry pursued his goal of working in show business by taking a job in the mailroom at a talent agency. Before long, he was promoted to talent agent and later launched his own agency, representing Hollywood stars including Marlon Brando, Andy Williams, and Ronald Reagan. He would go on to partner with Norman Lear and Bud Yorkin and produce some of the most iconic television shows in history, including "All in the Family," "Good Times" and "The Jeffersons," and financed celebrated films such as "Driving Miss Daisy," which won the Oscar for best picture in 1989.

Jerry also played a major role in promoting some of history's most iconic sports matchups. In 1971, Jerry agreed to promote the heavyweight world championship "fight of the century" between Muhammed Ali and Joe Frazier at New York's Madison Square Garden. Jerry sold the broadcast rights to the fight, which was shown on closed-circuit TV. He guaranteed a \$5 million purse for the matchup, built a crowd of celebrities including Frank Sinatra and Burt Lancaster, and generated \$2 million in profits. He would go on to promote the legendary "Battle of the Sexes" tennis match between Billie Jean King and Bobby Riggs at the Houston Astrodome that attracted a crowd of nearly 30,000 people, as well as an additional 30 million viewers who watched the match on TV.

Jerry is perhaps best known for building Univision into the media powerhouse it is today. He bought the then-struggling network in 1992 and, in just 4 years, led Univision to an initial public offering. Under his leadership, Univision cultivated a loyal audience among Hispanic Americans who had been previously underrepresented in the mainstream media. Colleagues of Jerry at Univision have spoken of his deep respect and compassion for the

Hispanic community in the United States and his visionary foresight into the important role they play in culture and politics.

While Jerry had much personal success to celebrate, he carried himself with humility, generosity, and integrity. Despite working in show business, Jerry preferred a more reclusive life and encouraged his subordinates to work hard and avoid the press. "Stay out of the spotlight," Jerry would say. "It fades your suit." He gave to countless causes and charities, many anonymously, including the Ronald Reagan UCLA Medical Center and Walt Disney Concert Hall.

I was privileged to work closely with Jerry in 2008 when he served as national finance cochair of my Presidential campaign. I will always appreciate Jerry and Margie's generosity and support during that effort and value the strong friendship we forged in the years since.

Jerry Perenchio will be missed by his family and friends, but his remarkable impact on the entertainment industry and his immense patriotism and generosity will be long remembered by his country. I am honored to have known him and to call him my friend.

Thank you.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1666. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Sequestration Preview Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2018"; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select

Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1667. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Final Sequestration Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2017"; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Indian Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1668. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Increased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-SC-16-0088) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1669. A communication from the Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Organic Program (NOP); Organic Livestock and Poultry Practices" (Docket No. AMS-NOP-15-0012) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1670. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sweet Onions Grown in the Walla Walla Valley of Southeast Washington and Northeast Oregon; Decreased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-SC-16-0116) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1671. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's proposed fiscal year 2018 Budget and Performance Plan; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1672. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Asian Longhorned Beetle: Update List of Regulated Articles" (Docket No. APHIS-2015-0097) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 25, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1673. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Record-keeping" (RIN3038-AE36) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1674. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Isopropylazam; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9960-76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1675. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Flazasulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9961-54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1676. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fenazaquin; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9961-99) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1677. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting proposed legislation entitled "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1678. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of three (3) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1679. A joint communication from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, transmitting a request relative to issuing a travel restriction on senior officials' travel to Iraq and Kuwait for the period of June 1, 2017 through September 30, 2017; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1680. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense Federally Funded Research and Development Center during fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1681. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Frederick B. Hodges, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1682. A communication from the Deputy Director of the Office of Senate Security, transmitting a report relative to a report on the status of United States Strategic Command's request for forces to meet security requirements for land-based nuclear forces (OSS-2017-0532); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1683. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Michael T. Franken, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1684. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Ronald L. Bailey, United States Marine

Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1685. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Larry D. Wyche, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1686. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Jon M. Davis, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1687. A joint communication from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, transmitting a request relative to issuing a travel restriction on senior officials' travel to Afghanistan for the period of June 1, 2017 through September 30, 2017; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1688. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, with respect to Belarus; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1689. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility (New Haven County, CT, et al.)" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2017-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1690. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was originally declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1691. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility (Erie County, PA, et al.)" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2017-0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1692. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Home Loan Bank Membership for Non-Federally-Insured Credit Unions" (RIN2590-AA85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 25, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1693. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1694. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security,

Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision to an Entry on the Entity List" (RIN0694-AH36) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1695. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2018"; to the Committees on the Budget; and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1696. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference" (FRL No. 9961-26-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 25, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1697. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Washington; General Regulations for Air Pollution Sources, Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council" (FRL No. 9963-12-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 25, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1698. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Virginia; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference" (FRL No. 9957-86-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 25, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1699. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Pennsylvania; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference" (FRL No. 9959-23-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 25, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1700. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Maryland; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference" (FRL No. 9959-24-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 25, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1701. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Redesignation of the Muncie Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard" (FRL No. 9962-70-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 25, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1702. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval and Air Quality

Designation; GA; Redesignation of the Atlanta, Georgia 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment" (FRL No. 9962-27-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 25, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1703. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination to Defer Sanctions; Arizona Department of Environmental Quality" (FRL No. 9963-07-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1704. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Attainment and Approval of Base Year Emissions Inventories for the Imperial County, California Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area; Correction" (FRL No. 9962-82-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1705. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Plans (Negative Declarations) for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Connecticut, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont; Revisions to State Plan for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: New Hampshire" (FRL No. 9962-41-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1706. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Revisions to Allegheny County Health Department Rules" (FRL No. 9962-77-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1707. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Control of Nitrogen Oxide Emissions from Coal-Fired Electric Generating Units" (FRL No. 9962-73-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1708. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Redesignation of the Belding Area in Ionia County to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard" (FRL No. 9962-72-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1709. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "South Carolina: Air Emissions Reporting" (FRL No. 9962-30-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate

on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1710. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Redesignation of the Cleveland Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard" (FRL No. 9963-01-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1711. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice to utilize other than a full and open competition to retain specialized legal services for a proceeding at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1712. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Under Secretary, Department of the Treasury, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1713. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Department of the Treasury, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1714. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal State Unemployment Compensation Program; Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 Provision on Establishing Appropriate Occupations for Drug Testing of Unemployment Compensation Applicants" (RIN1205-AB63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1715. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Computation of Annual Liability Insurance (Including Self-Insurance), No-Fault Insurance, and Workers' Compensation Settlement Recovery Threshold"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1716. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Medicare-Medicaid Coordination Office Fiscal Year 2016 Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1717. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension of waiver authority for Belarus; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1718. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Medicare National Coverage Determinations for Fiscal Year 2016"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1719. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch,

Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Credit for Renewable Electricity Production and Refined Coal Production, and Publication of Inflation Adjustment Factor and Reference Prices for Calendar Year 2017" (Notice 2017-33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1720. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Credit for Carbon Dioxide Sequestration; 2017 Section 45Q Inflation Adjustment Factor" (Notice 2017-32) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1721. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2017-0092—2017-0099); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1722. A communication from the Deputy Director of the Office of Senate Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a report regarding the designation of a Foreign Terrorist Organization (OSS-2017-0529); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1723. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) annual report on Drug Shortages for Calendar Year 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1724. A communication from the General Counsel, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chairperson, National Endowment for the Humanities, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1725. A communication from the Board Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Congressional Justification of Budget Estimates Report for fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1726. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1727. A communication from the Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1728. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semi-Annual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017 and the Semi-Annual Report of the Treasury Inspec-

tor General for Tax Administration (TIGTA); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1729. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Defense Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1730. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's Congressional Budget Justification, Annual Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Report for fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1731. A communication from the Inspector General of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Congressional Budget Justification for fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1732. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Education's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1733. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1734. A communication from the Director of External Affairs, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Designation of Beneficiary" (5 CFR Part 1651) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1735. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Freedom of Information Act Regulations" (5 CFR Part 1631) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 25, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1736. A joint communication from the Chairman and the General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1737. A communication from the Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Annual Performance Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1738. A communication from the Chairman of the United States International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Annual Performance Report for fiscal year 2016 and Annual Performance Plan for fiscal year 2017-2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1739. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a

vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1740. A communication from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report from the Office of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1741. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Veterans Affairs' Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1742. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation's response; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1743. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1744. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1745. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-67, "Electric Company Infrastructure Improvement Financing Amendment Act of 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1746. A communication from the Chairman, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1747. A communication from the Chairman, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1748. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-54, "Defending Access to Women's Health Care Services Temporary Amendment Act of 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1749. A communication from the Board Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for

the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1750. A communication from the Vice Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board Annual Performance Report for FY 2016 and Annual Performance Plan for FY 2017 (Final) and FY 2018 (Proposed)"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1751. A communication from the Acting Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Corporation for National and Community Service's Response and Report on Final Action for the period from October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1752. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1753. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; 2016-2017 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for King Mackerel in Western Zone of the Gulf of Mexico" (RIN0648-XF414) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1754. A communication from the Counsel for Regulatory and Legislative Affairs, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "July 2017 Revision of Patent Cooperation Treaty Procedures" (RIN0651-AD14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1755. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy for the position of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1756. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment of 2015" (RIN2126-AB93) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1757. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pipeline Safety: Safety of Underground Natural Gas Storage Facili-

ties" (RIN2137-AF22) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1758. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (98); Amdt. No. 3743" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1759. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (48); Amdt. No. 3745" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1760. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (51); Amdt. No. 3746" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1761. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (1); Amdt. No. 3744" (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1762. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "MU-2B Series Airplane Training Requirements Update; Correction" ((RIN2120-AK63) (Docket No. FAA-2006-24981)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1763. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revocation of Class E Airspace and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Ruston, LA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9151)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1764. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of

Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace for the Haskell, TX" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9494)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1765. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Hailey, ID" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9355)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1766. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9303)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1767. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9569)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1768. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9570)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1769. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9434)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1770. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9394)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1771. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9433)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of

the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1772. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9439)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1773. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-7426)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1774. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0450)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1775. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9430)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1776. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0165)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1777. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-6651)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1778. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-6436)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1779. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, De-

partment of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2017 Recreational Accountability Measures and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Greater Amberjack" ((RIN0648-XF166)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1780. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2017 Recreational Fishing Seasons for Red Snapper in the Gulf of Mexico" ((RIN0648-XF369)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1781. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Commercial Trip Limit Reduction for Spanish Mackerel" ((RIN0648-XF179)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1782. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Resources of the South Atlantic; Commercial Trip Limit Reduction" ((RIN0648-XF290)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1783. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2017 and 2018 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish" ((RIN0648-XE904)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1784. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Amendment 26" ((RIN0648-BG03)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1785. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to the Reef Fish, Spiny Lobster, and Corals and Reef Associated Plants and Invertebrates Fishery Management Plans of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands" ((RIN0648-BG29)) received during

adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1786. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; 2017 Management Measures and a Temporary Rule" (RIN0648-BG59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1787. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Adjustment of Georges Bank and Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic Yellowtail Flounder Annual Catch Limits" (RIN0648-XF219) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1788. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan" (RIN0648-BG58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1789. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Fishing Restrictions for Tropical Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean" (RIN0648-BG67) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1790. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures for the 2017 Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries for Pacific Whiting" (RIN0648-BG47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1791. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Groundfish Fishery; Amendment 18" (RIN0648-BF26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1792. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Yellowtail Snapper Management Measures"

(RIN0648-BG06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1793. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 16; Technical Amendment" (RIN0648-BD78) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1794. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Several Groundfish Species in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XF064) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1795. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Shark Management Measures; Final Amendment 5b" (RIN0648-BD22) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1796. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Deep-Water Species Fishery Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF418) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1797. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2017 Sector Quota Transfer Adjustment" (RIN0648-XF247) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1798. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF418) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1799. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF310) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1800. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fish-

eries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XF248) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1801. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF325) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1802. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries" (RIN0648-XF346) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1803. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2017 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Golden Tilefish Longline Component" (RIN0648-XF382) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1804. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Possession and Trip Limit Implementation for the Common Pool Fishery" (RIN0648-XF377) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1805. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2017 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Vermillion Snapper" (RIN0648-XF424) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1806. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Blacktip Sharks, Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks, and Hammerhead Sharks in the Western Gulf of Mexico Sub-Region; Closure" (RIN0648-XF211) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1807. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Deep-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF368) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1808. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2017-2018 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments" (RIN0648-BG76) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1809. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Trawl Catcher Vessels in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF273) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1810. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Aggregated Large Coastal Shark and Hammerhead Shark Management Groups Retention Limit Adjustment" (RIN0648-XF347) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1811. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; 2017 Closure of the Northern Gulf of Main Scallop Management Area" (RIN0648-XF312) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1812. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF268) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1813. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XF334) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to

the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1814. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF244) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1815. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands" (RIN0648-XF229) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1816. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish Managed Under the Individual Fishing Quota Program" (RIN0648-XF270) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1817. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF224) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1818. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; 2017 Commercial Run-Around Gillnet Closure" (RIN0648-XF151) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1819. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF206) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1820. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF287) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1821. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2017 Recreational Accountability Measures and Clo-

sure for Atlantic Migratory Group Cobia" (RIN0648-XF106) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1822. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2017 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic" (RIN0648-XF218) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1823. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XF253) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1824. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands" (RIN0648-XF262) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1825. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Skate Complex; Adjustment to the Skate Wing and skate Bait Inseason Possession Limits" (RIN0648-XF146) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1826. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2017 Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pollock, Atka Mackerel, and Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amounts" (RIN0648-XF108) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1827. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Pot Catcher/Processors in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XF189) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1828. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species;

Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries; General Category Fishery” (RIN0648–XF284) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 26, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1829. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648–XF200) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1830. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2016 Tribal Fishery Allocations for Pacific Whiting; Reapportionment Between Tribal and Non-Tribal Sectors” (RIN0648–XF230) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1831. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Part 1 of the Commission’s Rules” (MD Docket No. 17-123) (FCC 17-53)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1832. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Business Data Services in an Internet Protocol Environment; Technology Transitions; Special Access for Price Cap Local Exchange Carriers; AT and T Corporation Petition for Rulemaking to Reform Regulation of Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier Rates for Interstate Special Access Services” (WC Docket No. 16-143; GN Docket. No. 13-5; WC Docket No. 05-25; and RM-10593) (FCC 17-43)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1833. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulated Navigation Area; East River, Brooklyn, NY” ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0434)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1834. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Annually recurring Events in Coast Guard Southeastern New England Captain of the Port Zone” ((RIN1625–AA08; RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2016-1022)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1835. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant

to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Buffalo Carnival; Buffalo Outer Harbor, Buffalo, NY” ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0408)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1836. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, St. Louis, MO” ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0312)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1837. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Lower Niagara River at Niagara Falls, New York” ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0492)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1838. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; United Illuminating Company Housatonic River Crossing Project; Housatonic River; Milford and Stratford, CT” ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2016-0825)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1839. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Tennessee River 323.0–325.0, Huntsville, AL” ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0336)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1840. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Tall Ships Charleston, Cooper River, Charleston, SC” ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0121)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1841. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, St. Louis, MO” ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0319)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1842. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Main Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, IL” ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0196)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to

the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1843. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Special Local Regulation, Temporary Anchorages and Safety Zones: Sail Boston 2017; Port of Boston, MA” ((RIN1625–AA08; RIN1625–AA01; and RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2016-0949)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1844. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Special Local Regulation; Breakers to Bridge Paddle Festival, Lake Superior, Keweenaw Waterway, MI” ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0170)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1845. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Special Local Regulation; Stuart, FL” ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2017-0167)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1846. A communication from the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the April 2017 Quarterly Report to Congress of the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1847. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting proposed legislation relative to cross-border electronic data for law enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 134. A bill to expand the prohibition on misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-91).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 1221. A bill to counter the influence of the Russian Federation in Europe and Eurasia, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*David Bernhardt, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

*Neil Chatterjee, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2021.

*Robert F. Powelson, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2020.

*Dan R. Brouillette, of Texas, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1291. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish rules for payment for graduate medical education (GME) costs for hospitals that establish a new medical residency training program after hosting resident rotators for short durations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1292. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to monitor and combat anti-Semitism globally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1293. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the research credit for domestic manufacturers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1294. A bill to expand opportunity for Native American children through additional options in education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CASSIDY, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1295. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide students with disabilities and their families with access to critical information needed to select the right college and succeed once enrolled; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself, Mr. HELLER, and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 1296. A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to prohibit the wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1297. A bill to make title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 permanent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S.J. Res. 44. A joint resolution condemning the deadly attack on May 26, 2017, in Portland, Oregon, expressing deepest condolences to the families and friends of the victims,

and supporting efforts to overcome hatred, bigotry, and violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 109

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 109, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 130

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 130, a bill to require enforcement against misbranded milk alternatives.

S. 198

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 198, a bill to require continued and enhanced annual reporting to Congress in the Annual Report on International Religious Freedom on anti-Semitic incidents in Europe, the safety and security of European Jewish communities, and the efforts of the United States to partner with European governments, the European Union, and civil society groups, to combat anti-Semitism, and for other purposes.

S. 243

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 243, a bill to provide for a permanent extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals.

S. 253

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 253, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 329

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 329, a bill to place restrictions on the use of solitary confinement for juveniles in Federal custody.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 431, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand the use of telehealth for individuals with stroke.

S. 445

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Wyoming

(Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 445, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 523

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 523, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a stewardship fee on the production and importation of opioid pain relievers, and for other purposes.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 681

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 697, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to lower the mileage threshold for deduction in determining adjusted gross income of certain expenses of members of reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) and the Senator from

North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

S. 782

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 782, a bill to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes.

S. 798

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 798, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the Yellow Ribbon G.I. Education Enhancement Program to apply to individuals pursuing programs of education while on active duty, to recipients of the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry scholarship, and to programs of education pursued on half-time basis or less, and for other purposes.

S. 801

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 801, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector.

S. 811

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 811, a bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 926, a bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 1014

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1014, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to eligible organizations to provide service dogs to veterans with severe post-traumatic stress disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 1028

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1028, a bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a

National Family Caregiving Strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 1093

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1093, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve pediatric medical device application procedures.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1094, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1094, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. PAUL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1094, *supra*.

S. 1132

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1132, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the removal of the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare program with respect to speech generating devices.

S. 1133

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1133, a bill to repeal changes made by health care reform laws to the Medicare exception to the prohibition on certain physician referrals for hospitals, and for other purposes.

S. 1141

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1141, a bill to ensure that the United States promotes the meaningful participation of women in mediation and negotiation processes seeking to prevent, mitigate, or resolve violent conflict.

S. 1151

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1151, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a non-refundable credit for working family caregivers.

S. 1238

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1238, a bill to amend the Inter-

nal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 1240

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1240, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act to establish an Office of Public Participation and Consumer Advocacy.

S. 1263

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1263, a bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit oil-, gas-, and methane hydrate-related seismic activities in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Straits of Florida planning areas of the outer Continental Shelf, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 12

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 12, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that those who served in the bays, harbors, and territorial seas of the Republic of Vietnam during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and ending on May 7, 1975, should be presumed to have served in the Republic of Vietnam for all purposes under the Agent Orange Act of 1991.

S. RES. 54

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 54, a resolution expressing the unwavering commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

S. RES. 174

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 174, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International and celebrating the Lions Clubs International for a long history of humanitarian service.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1297. A bill to make title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 permanent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the attacks in London last weekend exposed

in a matter of minutes just how vulnerable free societies truly are. All it takes is a van or a knife and an unsuspecting bystander to turn a fun night out on the town into a horrific nightmare.

Of course, we shouldn't need any reminders, but let me give one yet again: We are at war with Islamic extremists. We have been for years, and I am sorry to say that there is no end in sight. It is easy to forget this as we go about our daily lives, but our enemies have not, and they will not. They have never taken their eyes off the ultimate target, either—the United States.

Yes, we are at war with a vicious and unyielding foe, and just as our enemy can attack us with the simplest of everyday tools, the strongest shield we have in our defense is just as basic: It is the intelligence—information—of knowing who is talking to whom about what, where, when, and why.

After the 9/11 attacks, our national security agencies developed cutting-edge programs that allow us to figure out what the bad guys are up to and stop them before they can perpetrate such heinous attacks. Very often, the intelligence they have collected has made the difference between life and death for American citizens. But one of those programs is going to sunset later this year. I am talking about section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. This is a program that collects information about foreign persons on foreign soil and, as a result, saves American lives.

Unfortunately, this and other programs were distorted in the public debate by a traitor, a disgruntled ex-NSA contractor, Edward Snowden, who now sits in the warm embrace of Russian intelligence services. Ever since his very damaging leak of classified material many years back, many Americans have grown doubtful about these programs and about section 702 in particular, which is why it bears repeating just what section 702 does. It allows our national security agencies to collect internet or phone communications from a source within the United States, like an internet service provider, but only under a very specific set of conditions. It cannot target American citizens—not even lawful permanent residents. It can't even target foreigners communicating on U.S. soil. It can target only people discussing a specific list of topics preapproved by the FISA court, which is made up of Federal judges with life tenure. We are not talking about what they are picking up at the grocery store or when they are checking in on the kids. We are talking about things like weapons of mass destruction.

It is true that this program occasionally does collect information about American citizens. That will be true of any attempt to stop any kind of home-grown terrorism. But if you are con-

cerned about protecting Americans' privacy rights, then you should support extending 702. It puts in place a host of privacy protections to scrub raw intelligence of any unnecessary identifying information. To allow this program to expire on December 31 would hurt both our national security and our privacy rights.

That is why today I am introducing a bill that would reauthorize section 702 permanently, as is, with no changes. We can't tie the hands of our national security officials at the precise moment that our enemies are taking the gloves off around the world. Terrorists don't plan to sunset their threats to our way of life, so why should our important counterterrorism tools sunset?

I am glad to say that my legislation has the support of every Republican Senator on the Intelligence Committee, and I look forward to earning the support of my colleagues in the weeks ahead because we can't afford to let this program expire. It is not too much and it is not an exaggeration to say that American lives depend on section 702.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 219. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1094, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 219. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1094, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 81, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 82, line 24, and insert the following:

(a) REDUCTION OF ANNUITY FOR REMOVED EMPLOYEE.—(1) The Secretary shall order that the covered service of an employee of the Department removed from a position for performance or misconduct under section 713, 714, or 7461 of this title or any other provision of law shall not be taken into account for purposes of calculating an annuity with respect to such individual under chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, if—

(A) the Secretary determines that the individual—

(i) is convicted of a felony (and the conviction is final) that influenced the individual's performance while employed in the position;

(ii) committed an act of gross negligence; or

(iii) mismanaged funds of the Department; and

(B) before such order is made, the individual is afforded—

(i) notice of the proposed order; and

(ii) an opportunity to respond to the proposed order by not later than ten business days following receipt of such notice; and

(C) the Secretary issues the order—

(i) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual responds under subparagraph (B)(ii), not later than five business days after receiving the response of the individual; or

(ii) in the case of a proposed order to which an individual does not respond, not later than 15 business days after the Secretary provides notice to the individual under subparagraph (B)(i).

(2) Any individual with respect to whom an annuity is reduced under this subsection may appeal the reduction to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management pursuant to such regulations as the Director may prescribe for purposes of this subsection.

(b) REDUCTION OF ANNUITY FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEE.—(1) The Secretary may order that the covered service of an individual who the Secretary proposes to remove for performance or misconduct under section 713, 714, or 7461 of this title or any other provision of law but who leaves employment at the Department prior to the issuance of a final decision with respect to such action shall not be taken into account for purposes of calculating an annuity with respect to such individual under chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, if—

(A) the Secretary determines that the individual—

(i) is convicted of a felony (and the conviction is final) that influenced the individual's performance while employed in the position;

(ii) committed an act of gross negligence; or

(iii) mismanaged funds of the Department; and

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have 6 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 6, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on the posture of the Department of the Air Force in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2018 and the future years defense program.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 6, 2017, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing to consider the following nominations: Mr. Kevin Allen Hassett, to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers; and the Honorable Pamela Hughes Patenaude, to be Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate in order to hold a Business Meeting on Tuesday, June 6, 2017, beginning at 9:30 a.m. in Room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 6, 2017, at 10 a.m. in order to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Tuesday, June 6, 2017, at 3 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 6, 2017, at 2:30 p.m.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask consent that LCDR Michael Chesnut, U.S. Navy, a defense legislative fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the duration of his fellowship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Patrick Flanagan, an intern in Senator KENNEDY's office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR STAR PRINTING—S.
RES. 184

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that S. Res. 184 be star printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7,
2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 7; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 110, S. 722.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, if there is no further business to come

before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:25 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 7, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

RICHARD V. SPENCER, OF WYOMING, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, VICE RAYMOND EDWIN MABUS, JR.
CHARLES DOUGLAS STIMSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, VICE PAUL LUIS OOSTBURG SANZ.
OWEN WEST, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE MICHAEL D. LUMPKIN.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

JOSEPH OTTING, OF NEVADA, TO BE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE THOMAS J. CURRY, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ELIZABETH ERIN WALSH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE, VICE ARUN MADHAVAN KUMAR.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

STEVEN GILL BRADBURY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, VICE KATHRYN B. THOMSON, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

DAVID P. PEKOSKE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE PETER V. NEFFENGER.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ANNIE CAPUTO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2021, VICE WILLIAM CHARLES OSTENDORFF, TERM EXPIRED.

KRISTINE L. SVINICKI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2022. (RE-APPOINTMENT)

DAVID WRIGHT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2020, VICE JEFFERY MARTIN BARAN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ROBERT CHARROW, OF MARYLAND, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE WILLIAM B. SCHULTZ.

STEPHEN PARENTE, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE RICHARD G. FRANK.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

DAVID STEELE BOHIGIAN, OF MISSOURI, TO BE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION, VICE MIMI E. ALEMAYEHOU.
RAY WASHBURN, OF TEXAS, TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION, VICE ELIZABETH L. LITTLEFIELD.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

PETER LOUIS OPPENHEIM, OF MARYLAND, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR LEGISLATION AND CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE JULIUS LLOYD HORWICH.

CARLOS G. MUNIZ, OF FLORIDA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE JAMES COLE, JR.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BRIAN ALLEN BENCKZOWSKI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE LESLIE RAGON CALDWELL.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. SCOTT A. HOWELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JAMES C. VECHERY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS A. HORLANDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. BRUCE T. CRAWFORD

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. ANDREW L. LEWIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. MATTHEW J. KOHLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. KEVIN M. DONEGAN

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT F. HEDELUND

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO BE A CONSULAR OFFICER AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

NICHOLAS RAYMOND ABBATE, OF NEW YORK
BILQIS MAJIDAH AIDARA ADJEI, OF FLORIDA
NATHANIEL PALENKA AMBLER, OF VIRGINIA
LUKE JOSEPH ANDERSEN, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM SPENCER ANDERSON, OF WASHINGTON
JILLIAN CHRISTINE ANTHONY, OF VIRGINIA
MONICA LYNN ARRIOLA, OF CALIFORNIA
DAVID ALAN BAKER, OF VIRGINIA
KIMBERLY ANN BARONE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
GREGORY MARK BAUER, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN GLENN BENGTON, OF VIRGINIA
MADELINE REISING BENNETT, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL DANIEL BERENTSON, OF WASHINGTON
ARI BENJAMIN BERLIN, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN L. BOCANEGR, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL RYAN BOWERBANK, OF VIRGINIA
ERIC JAMES BRATT, OF CALIFORNIA
RALPH EVAN BROWN II, OF CALIFORNIA
SHALEEN JOHN BRUNSDALE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JEREMY RICHARD CAIRL, OF VIRGINIA
CLINTON CANADY IV, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CALVIN STEWART CARDILLO, OF VIRGINIA
ELIZABETH PATRICIA CARDONE, OF NEW YORK
RONALD E. CAREY, OF VIRGINIA
TRICIA LYNN CARLISLE, OF VIRGINIA
ANTHONY C. CARTELLI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANTHONY CARTER, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM DENNIS CASEY, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH G. CATALANO, OF VIRGINIA
BAHARAK SHAMS CHAISSON, OF VIRGINIA
GIRISH SUBHASH CHASKAR, OF VIRGINIA
PENNY PIN-CHIEH CHEN, OF VIRGINIA
SHERRIE MICHELLE CHUNG, OF VIRGINIA
COLETTE MARIA CLARK, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MALCOLM HOWARD CLARK, OF MARYLAND
HALEY MONET COTTRELL, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL NOAH CUNNINGHAM, OF VIRGINIA
JON ADAM CUSTIS, OF FLORIDA
JONATHAN A. CZIN, OF VIRGINIA
KATHRYN VICTORIA DANIEL, OF VIRGINIA
SCOTT RUSSELL DASH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SHAWN MICHAEL DAVIS, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW ALAN DEAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOHN L. DESALVIO, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL J. DISALVO, OF VIRGINIA
RYAN A. DOUGLAS, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW F. EBERT, OF VIRGINIA
RANDI E. ECKARD, OF VIRGINIA
LUCY PLICHTA EDGERTON, OF VIRGINIA
MELISSA ANNE FEDDERS, OF VIRGINIA
SHANNON J. FLECKENSTEIN, OF VIRGINIA
LAURIE JEAN GALLEGOS, OF VIRGINIA

ANTHONY JOSEPH GENTILE, OF VIRGINIA
ELIZABETH GESSON, OF CALIFORNIA
MARTHA CLAIRE GILLON, OF VIRGINIA
BENJAMIN DAVID GORDON, OF UTAH
MICHAEL ALBERT GREEN, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL STEPHEN HADLEY, OF TEXAS
MARK ZACHARY PETERSON HANDLOFF, OF NORTH CAROLINA
SEAN THOMAS HARDINGHAM, OF VIRGINIA
BENJAMIN LAFAYETTE HARRELL, OF VIRGINIA
NATHANIEL B. HEGSETH, OF MARYLAND
HAILEY ANNE HOFFMAN, OF VIRGINIA
SIMON M. HOLMES, OF VIRGINIA
PETER G. HUDDLE, OF VIRGINIA
SARABRYNN MICHELLE HUDGINS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARK VERNON HUNGERFORD, OF WASHINGTON
ALEXANDER MICHAEL HUNT, OF ARKANSAS
ANNA R. ISMAN, OF VIRGINIA
SCOTT MATTHEW JACKSON, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL DANIEL JACOBELLIS, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID NELSON JONES, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID A. KACZOR, OF VIRGINIA
SARA RUTH KAUFFMAN, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL KEALLY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ERIKA D. KIRKLAND, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID CHRISTIAN KISSLING, OF WASHINGTON
THOMAS B. KNESL, OF VIRGINIA
CAROLYN MARGARET KRAGIE, OF VIRGINIA
KENNETH R. KRAPER, OF VIRGINIA
JESSICA BENSON KUNTZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARK S. LANCASTER, OF VIRGINIA
ERIC VICTOR LARSON, OF FLORIDA
CARING CHAI LAW, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS ANDREW LEE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANDREW RICHARD LEWIS, OF VIRGINIA
IVERSON BRYANS LONG, OF NEW YORK
BRET DAVID LUGO, OF VIRGINIA
BRYAN THOMAS MANGAN, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT BYRON MANN, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW JEROME MAUNTEL-MEDICI, OF ILLINOIS
DAVID M. MCCLARY, OF VIRGINIA
MEGAN ALYSSA MCCULLOUGH, OF MARYLAND
MICHAEL STEPHEN MCLEAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ASHLIE KATHLEEN MENARD, OF NEW YORK
JUDD MILNE, OF VIRGINIA
JULIA LYNN MOGHE, OF VIRGINIA
CHELSEA L. MONTI, OF VIRGINIA
CHELSEA RAE MORGAN, OF VIRGINIA
KATHERINE SANDER MORRIS, OF WASHINGTON
TIMOTHY K. MOSS, OF VIRGINIA
ANGELEE MULLINS, OF MARYLAND
HEATHER CHRISTINE MURPHY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KRISTIN S. MUSSELMAN, OF VIRGINIA
MUHAMMAD AMMAR MIKDAMUL MUYEED, OF VIRGINIA
LAURIE JOHNSON MYNATT, OF FLORIDA
VINCENT STENNETT MYRICK, OF VIRGINIA
YUSHUWA WAAALID NETTLES, OF PENNSYLVANIA
PHUONG DUY NGUYEN, OF VIRGINIA
WALTER KILE NIGHTINGALE, OF TEXAS
TERESA LEE NOBLE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
TIMOTHY MICHAEL NORRIS, OF VIRGINIA
NATALIE ELIZABETH OLSON-CLOWES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANTHONY PALMER, OF VIRGINIA
MARK ANTHONY PATANELLA, OF VIRGINIA
PHAKISHA L. PETERSON, OF VIRGINIA
JESSICA ANH THU DUC PHAM, OF CALIFORNIA
ANAND PRASAD, OF VIRGINIA
POORNIMA RAI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LUKE ROBERT RAMSEY, OF VIRGINIA
VERONICA LYNN REDMOND, OF VIRGINIA
TRAVIS W. REZNIK, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID NATHAN ROBERTS, OF MICHIGAN
SHARON R. ROSE, OF VIRGINIA
NATALIE D. RUTKOWSKI, OF VIRGINIA
NICOLE SUNE SBITANI, OF VIRGINIA
DANA L. SCHMIDT, OF VIRGINIA
CAROLINE BROOKS SHAVER, OF VIRGINIA
AROSTINE MCDOWELL SHESTON, OF VIRGINIA
ELISABETH A. SIGLER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KATHRYN HORNER SIROLLY, OF ILLINOIS
TAYLOR STEWART SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
OLEG SKOLAN, OF VIRGINIA
NICHOLAS ARIC SOTTLER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SHANNON S. SPILLER, OF VIRGINIA

CANDACE VALERIE SPRADLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
AUDREY JANE STEVENS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHRISTINA BUCTON STOMM, OF VIRGINIA
KATHRYN NAOMI TAYLOR, OF VIRGINIA
LEE MCCLINTOCK THOMPSON, OF TEXAS
JENNIFER LYNN TORRES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ERIN CARNEY TRAMONTOZZI, OF TEXAS
GREG KEVIN TRAYLOR, OF FLORIDA
HENRY W. TRIMBLE, OF VIRGINIA
BRICE CAMERON TURNER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IAN P. TUTTLE, OF VIRGINIA
MUSTAFA AKBARALY VAHANVATY, OF CALIFORNIA
RACHEL KEY VAN JOHNSON, OF CALIFORNIA
STEVEN STERLING VERNON, OF VIRGINIA
MONICA THEODORA VON SCHLEGELL, OF CALIFORNIA
ELIZA PUI WAH WALSH, OF VIRGINIA
REES J. WALTHER, OF VIRGINIA
JOSHUA PAUL WELSH, OF FLORIDA
SONIA ANJULIE WETTSTEIN, OF NEW YORK
THOMAS HUSTON WHITE, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES B. WHITMORE, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAL KRZYŻSZTOF WIECZOREK, OF VIRGINIA
PATRICK CHARLES WILCOX, OF TEXAS
ERIC ARTHUR WILD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ELLEN DEAN WILSON, OF VIRGINIA
DANIELLE L. K. WINFIELD, OF VIRGINIA
JOSHUA HARRISON WISE, OF VIRGINIA
SETH ANDREW WYNGOWSKI, OF VIRGINIA
ELIZABETH MARIE WYSOCKI, OF MASSACHUSETTS

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR APPOINTMENT AS A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

GABRIELA R. ARIAS VILLELA, OF FLORIDA
NAVDEEP AUJLA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SUZANNE BALSAM, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL G. BARRERA, OF TEXAS
KATE WILKINSON BARTLETT, OF FLORIDA
YANIV M. BARZILAI, OF TENNESSEE
ALEXANDER B. BELLAH, OF VIRGINIA
BRANT B. BEYER, OF MONTANA
SHELLA A. BIALLAS, OF WASHINGTON
DANIEL A. BOEHMER, OF MASSACHUSETTS
ANNA M. BOULOS, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
EVELINA A. BOZEK, OF CALIFORNIA
EMILY R. BRANDT, OF TEXAS
DEVIN M. CAHILL, OF ILLINOIS
JOHN CERABINO-HESS, OF FLORIDA
SCOTT K. CLAYTON, OF OHIO
KEVIN M. COATS, OF FLORIDA
JAMES DAVIS II, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARIA A. DAVYDENKO, OF ALASKA
JOSHUA R. DELARA, OF NEW YORK
DANIEL J. DEVRIES, OF MICHIGAN
JEREMIAS N. DIRK, OF MICHIGAN
COCO A. DOWNEY, OF TEXAS
DANIEL A. DURAZO, OF CALIFORNIA
KATHRYN EDWARDS, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ROBERT GEORGE EHRLMANN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
NASHWA N. ELGADI, OF TEXAS
MATTHEW S. FERRY, OF MISSOURI
RAPHAEL A. GARCIA, OF FLORIDA
VICTOR M. GARCIA-RIVERA, OF FLORIDA
SARAH B. GARDINER, OF CONNECTICUT
ANTHONY PETER GIORGIANNI, OF VIRGINIA
ARON F. GOLD, OF PENNSYLVANIA
BRIAN H. GRANDJEAN, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW J. HAFNER, OF MISSOURI
BRETT E. HANSEN, OF VIRGINIA
GARRETT J. HARKINS, OF NEW YORK
KARI E. HATCHER, OF MICHIGAN
CALVIN L. HAYES, OF FLORIDA
CALANDRA J. HERSRUD, OF NEVADA
BRIAN J. HUSAR, OF FLORIDA
SHAYMA JANNAT, OF CONNECTICUT
LESLIE L. JOHNSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA
KATHERINE S. KIGUDDE, OF TEXAS
ERICA S. KING, OF TEXAS
ALEXANDRA J. KING PILE, OF MARYLAND
DARRIN J. KOWITZ, OF NEW MEXICO
JOSEPH N. LEAVITT, OF OREGON
EDITH HOPE LEE, OF WASHINGTON
DANIEL M. LISS, OF FLORIDA
TIMOTHY P. LOCKWOOD, OF ARIZONA

CHRISTIAN M. LOUBEAU, OF NEW YORK
MACIEJ J. LUCZYWO, OF NEW YORK
ADAM A. LUND, OF OREGON
MICHAEL JOHN MARBLE, OF VIRGINIA
RONALD LUKE MARTIN, OF CALIFORNIA
BRIA A. MATHEWS, OF MISSOURI
JILLIAN AMBER MCCOY, OF MARYLAND
JONATHAN D. MCMASTER, OF MARYLAND
TIFFANY MICHELLE MILLER, OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEREK M. MILLS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DORIAN MOLINA, OF MASSACHUSETTS
SALVADOR C. MOLINA, OF CALIFORNIA
DONNA R. MOLINARI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KENT M. MULLEN, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN J. O'CONNOR, OF CALIFORNIA
LAUREN FORBES O'DOHERTY, OF NORTH CAROLINA
KENDRA E. PACE, OF FLORIDA
THOMAS E. PAJUSI, OF NEW JERSEY
KABEER PARWANI, OF MASSACHUSETTS
STEPHANIE WEGMAN PETERSON, OF MINNESOTA
RICHARD T. PHILLIPS, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
MARISSA J. POLNEROW, OF NEW JERSEY
MARK J. REDMOND, OF CONNECTICUT
NATHANIEL DAVID REIN, OF OREGON
ROBERT B. REVERE, JR., OF FLORIDA
SARAH K. G. ROGERS, OF CALIFORNIA
WILLIAM L. ROMINE, OF FLORIDA
BENJAMIN R. ROODE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOSEPH A. ROZENSSTEIN, OF NEW YORK
VALERIE JEAN SANTOS, OF VIRGINIA
JILLIAN R. SCHMITT, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT ALLEN SCOTT, OF IOWA
CRAIG W. SIMONS, OF CALIFORNIA
AUDREY S. SLOVER, OF COLORADO
MARCO S. SOTELINO, OF MASSACHUSETTS
ABIGAIL M. SPENGLER, OF FLORIDA
HELAINA M. STEIN, OF NEW YORK
DANIEL S. STREITFELD, OF TEXAS
WILLIAM D. STURGEON, OF VIRGINIA
EMILY M. TEICKENSON, OF NEW YORK
AARON M. THOMPSON, OF VIRGINIA
JEFFERY ALAN TOMASEVICH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MATTHEW V. TOMPKINS, OF CALIFORNIA
VALERIE L. ULLRICH, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
MARTIN A. VAUGHAN, OF IDAHO
DANIEL R. WALKER, OF NEW YORK
ADAM M. WALLINGFORD, OF VIRGINIA
RYAN M. WAYE, OF GEORGIA
JONATHAN P. WEDD, OF CALIFORNIA
REBECCA R. WHITE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANTON L. WISHIK II, OF WASHINGTON
NOAH T. WOODIWISS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ANGELA J. WYSE, OF MICHIGAN
MATTHEW J. YI, OF CALIFORNIA
HAENIM YOO, OF CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ANDREW ANDERSON-SPRECHER, OF WYOMING
LAURA J. GELLER, OF OHIO
KARISHA L. KUYPERS, OF TENNESSEE
EVAN NICHOLAS MANGINO, OF NEW JERSEY
THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:
RAMEETH HUNDLE, OF ILLINOIS
JOY KADNAR, OF VIRGINIA
SPIRIDON NAKIS, OF VIRGINIA
LOREN STENDER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 6, 2017:

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

COURTNEY ELWOOD, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 6, 2017

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BERGMAN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 6, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JACK BERGMAN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

D-DAY TRIBUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the bravery and courage of so many men who sacrificed everything on D-day. At 5:52 in the morning on June 6, 1944, in a position about 4,000 yards from Omaha Beach, one of the oldest ships in the U.S. Navy, a World War I battleship, the USS *Arkansas*, opened fire on German positions at Omaha Beach in support of more than 30,000 American soldiers tasked with securing the beachhead. The countless heroes who stormed the beaches of Normandy on that fateful day 73 years ago will never be forgotten.

I had the honor of visiting this hallowed ground over Memorial Day, and while I was paying tribute to the brave soldiers who made the ultimate sacrifice at the Normandy American Cemetery and Memorial, an older Frenchman by the name of Mr. Vauclair approached me simply wanting to honor his liberators. He said that he just wanted to thank an American. He was 10 years old when D-day occurred, and

he will never forget how the United States of America came to his and so many others' aid in the liberation of Europe from the Nazi menace.

Mr. Vauclair's love for America and our GIs speaks volumes about the goodwill and exceptional character of our great Nation. It is a privilege to offer my sincere tribute to the brave men who laid down their lives in the defense of those French and American shared convictions of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

RECOGNIZING STAFF SERGEANT ROBERT DALE VAN FOSSEN

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of one of Arkansas' finest, Staff Sergeant Robert Dale Van Fossen of Greenbrier, Arkansas. On November 22, 1952, a Douglas C-124A Globemaster II took off from McChord Air Base in Tacoma, Washington, headed for Elmendorf Air Force Base near Anchorage. Staff Sergeant Robert Dale Van Fossen, along with 51 others, was onboard. And near Middleton Island, in the Gulf of Alaska, the plane disappeared.

Eight days after the plane's disappearance, part of the wreckage was located some 50 miles east of Anchorage. Unfortunately, a week into the search, the recovery team had to call off the effort due to weather conditions. The families of the victims were notified they would not have any remains to bury.

Finally, in March 2016, after 64 years and extensive recovery efforts, Staff Sergeant Van Fossen's remains were confirmed found and returned to his home in Heber Springs, Arkansas.

I would like to extend my deepest condolences to the family of Staff Sergeant Van Fossen and hope that they are now able to find peace that he is finally home and in his final resting place.

CONWAY BIKESHARE PROGRAM

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, last month we recognized National Bike Month and the many bicycling benefits that we have as citizens. I rise today to recognize the city of Conway, Arkansas, for its installation of their successful public bikesharing program and to emphasize its leading example of advocacy for an active lifestyle.

As a long-time biker, I am pleased to see the city work to provide an alternative and convenient source of transportation for residents of Conway to help relieve congestion and promote a healthier city.

As a former board member of the Bicycle Advocacy of Central Arkansas, I

am glad to see Conway's bikesharing program as one more step on the path towards fulfilling the mayor's vision of a vibrant, healthy, and bike friendly city.

RECOGNIZING RICHIE ARNOLD ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of a great Arkansan, a long-time Conway resident, and one of the pillars of the Conway Corporation, Mr. Richie Arnold. Mr. Arnold is retiring from his post as CEO after 39 years with the company. He hails from Harrison and is a University of Arkansas graduate with a degree in accounting. He joined Conway Corporation as a manager of data processing before becoming manager of finance and accounting and then ultimately the chief executive officer in 1998.

During his tenure at Conway Corporation, he always worked to keep the company ahead of the curve and was responsible for transitioning the utility to full computerization. Mr. Arnold was instrumental in assisting Conway Corporation in leading a path to diversifying services by adding new services for the citizens, such as digital cable, internet, telephone, security services, and water.

Mr. Arnold recently earned a national recognition after being listed in the "Regional 50" in Cablefax magazine. My congratulations and best wishes for Mr. Arnold's future endeavors.

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF MR. HERMAN HIGGS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. Herman Higgs, a World War II veteran who celebrated his 100th birthday last month. Born in Calhoun County, Arkansas, Herman was drafted into the Army and served the entire span of World War II, including as a POW in the last year. He was a platoon sergeant of a transportation convoy that was captured in December 1944 during the Battle of the Bulge.

In the spring of 1945, Patton's army arrived, and Herman was freed, along with other American GIs and the Jewish prisoners who had survived the atrocities of the Third Reich. He was granted an honorable discharge a few months later and returned to Calhoun County, where he served 29 years as a police officer and 24 years as a U.S. marshal.

The city of North Little Rock, Arkansas, dedicated May 13 as Herman Higgs Day. Herman's example is one that all Americans and Arkansans can admire, and I would like to extend my

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

congratulations to Herman for his life of service and this remarkable milestone of a centennial birthday.

HONORING DR. GAIL CARBERRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the accomplishments of Dr. Gail Carberry of Quinsigamond Community College in Worcester, Massachusetts, who will be retiring after a decade of tireless service to the QCC family and over 40 years of inspiring students across the Commonwealth.

From early on, Dr. Carberry recognized the impact one committed teacher can make in a young person's life. She understands at her core that community colleges present a transformative opportunity for students to be recognized for their talents and encouraged toward their goals.

Dr. Carberry is a passionate advocate for expanding access to the opportunities that community colleges can provide. Because of Dr. Carberry's conviction that every student can achieve, QCC implemented a high school dropout prevention program, and Dr. Carberry personally endowed over \$200,000 in scholarships for local community college students. She diversified the students, faculty, and staff populations to better reflect the community and implemented award-winning STEM programs to prepare students for the rapidly changing 21st century workplace.

In keeping with her desire to equip her students with the skills they need to compete in the modern workforce, Dr. Carberry successfully opened a 72,000-square-foot campus in downtown Worcester dedicated to the college's healthcare program, which not only addressed the needs of QCC students, but reinvigorated a large portion of downtown Worcester.

As a result of Dr. Carberry's leadership, QCC has become a leading institution of higher learning in Massachusetts. This year, QCC graduated almost double the number of students it did only 10 years ago. Dr. Carberry has exceeded fundraising goals and has increased enrollment by nearly 40 percent.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the city of Worcester, on behalf of the people of Massachusetts, and most importantly of all, on behalf of the students she has helped to achieve their dreams, I want to say thank you to Dr. Gail Carberry. We all owe her a heartfelt debt of gratitude and wish her great satisfaction in her endeavors to come.

TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, while our Nation faces many challenges, perhaps none is more pressing than that of growing our economy. The positive impact of strong, sustained economic growth has the potential not only to help families make ends meet, but it will also address the many other pressures we face. The time is now for Congress and this administration to act on meaningful tax reform.

The model is simple and straightforward. We need to simplify the ridiculously complex Internal Revenue Code, eliminate the loopholes that allow corporations and individuals to avoid paying their fair share, lower the rates for middle class families and small businesses, and broaden the tax base.

As a certified public accountant, an independent voice for the people of Bucks and Montgomery Counties, I intend to push vehemently to make tax reform a reality in this Congress. Moreover, this can and must be a bipartisan priority.

A 1.5 percent growth in GDP is simply unsustainable. If that trend continues, we will not be able to fund priorities such as bolstering our national security, taking care of our veterans, combating the addiction crisis, funding public education, preserving our environment, and a whole host of other priorities.

Economic growth has three essential aspects: tax reform, regulatory reform, and a balanced budget. The REINS Act and the upcoming vote on the CHOICE Act will start this process on the regulatory side, which will revive the ability of community banks to support local economies and advance infrastructure investment that puts Americans back to work by rebuilding roads, schools, bridges, as well as our IT infrastructure and the electrical grid.

The other critical component is tax reform, and we owe it to the American people to get this done. I call on my good colleagues from both sides to put politics aside and do what we were sent here to do, and that is to stand up for hardworking families and unleash the power of the American economy.

TYPE 1 DIABETES

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, over a million Americans, including 200,000 young Americans, are living with type 1 diabetes, an autoimmune disease in which a person's pancreas stops producing insulin. This disease is fatal without strict adherence to a regimented schedule of multiple daily insulin injections or continuous pump infusions, along with close monitoring of blood glucose levels.

My constituent Aislinn Keenan was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes when she was just 2 years old. She does not remember a day when she did not need to lance her finger multiple times a

day to check her blood sugar or receive insulin injections. Despite these challenges, Aislinn and her family serve as an inspiration to all those facing this disease. Through courage and perseverance, they refuse to let type 1 diabetes stand in their way. Aislinn just finished her sophomore year at Villanova University.

The Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation projects that 5 million Americans will have type 1 diabetes by 2050, including 600,000 young people, yet only one-third of the people with type 1 diabetes are achieving safe blood glucose levels. Accordingly, I am urging my colleagues to fully fund the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases.

Presently, there is no way to prevent type 1 diabetes and no cure for it once diagnosed. Only through robust funding and exhaustive research at the NIH can we continue to drive scientific progress to make the lives of those living with type 1 diabetes safer and healthier.

□ 1215

HONORING SPECIALIST KERRY M.G. DANYLUK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell you about the new Army Specialist Kerry M.G. Danyluk Memorial in Yoakum, Texas, which was unveiled last week on Memorial Day.

This new memorial, planned and funded by the Yoakum Rotary Club, honors Yoakum High School and Victoria College graduate Kerry Danyluk, who made the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation on April 15, 2014.

Assigned to the 10th Mountain Division based at Fort Drum, New York, 27-year-old Army Specialist Danyluk was serving his second tour of duty in Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. While conducting operations in the Logar province, enemy forces attacked Specialist Danyluk's unit with small arms fire, critically wounding him. Despite an evacuation to Landstuhl Regional Medical Center in Germany, Specialist Danyluk succumbed to his injuries.

Danyluk's awards include the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, the Army Commendation Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, the Army Good Conduct Medal, and more.

Thanks to the generous actions of the Yoakum Rotary Club, Specialist Danyluk's memory will live on.

A special thank-you is also due all involved in helping plan and implement the memorial. I am honored to represent communities like Yoakum and many others that are so grateful to those who serve our Nation.

COACH JAMES MCMINN NAMED ALL-SOUTH TEXAS
COACH OF THE YEAR

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of my constituents, James McMinn, who serves as the assistant athletic director and head girls basketball coach at Flour Bluff High School and was recently named the All-South Texas Coach of the Year.

Born and raised in Corpus Christi, Texas, Coach McMinn graduated from W. B. Ray High School in 1981 and continued his education at Del Mar College and Corpus Christi State University, now Texas A&M University Corpus Christi.

Coach McMinn started his career at my alma mater, Incarnate Word Academy in Corpus Christi, and he coached the Lady Angels to two separate State appearances.

He began working in Flour Bluff in the fall of 1993 and recently concluded his 27th year as head basketball coach. Over that 27-year career, he accumulated an impressive record. His teams have advanced to postseason play 19 of those 27 seasons. He has taken the Lady Hornets to the regional tournament five times and advanced to the State tournament final four in the 2016–2017 season.

Congratulations, Coach McMinn, on your outstanding coaching achievements. I hope you have continued success at Flour Bluff and all of your future endeavors.

TEXAS DELEGATES TO CONGRESS OF FUTURE
MEDICAL LEADERS AND CONGRESS OF FUTURE
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY LEADERS

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize four outstanding high school students from the 27th District of Texas who will be delegates to the Congress of the Future Medical Leaders and Congress of the Future Science and Technology Leaders later this month.

Britney Goodwin, a junior at Rockport-Fulton High School, excels in science and technology and was nominated for the Congress of Future Science and Technology Leaders for her academic achievement, leadership potential, and passion for science and technology.

Austin Thompson from Callallen High School, Nicole Morrison, a student at Incarnate Word Academy, and John Handleman from Corpus Christi will all be delegates at the Congress of Future Medical Leaders. These students were nominated by their teachers for their academic success and their desire to become future STEM leaders and medical professionals.

Our country needs more doctors. Our country needs more science, technology, and mathematics students to continue the technological revolution and continued innovation that our country needs.

Congratulations, Britney, Austin, Nicole, and John. America is proud of you all.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: We give You thanks, God of the Universe, for giving us another day.

As the various Members of this people's House return, we ask Your blessing upon each as they resume the difficult responsibilities that await them. Give each the wisdom and good judgment needed to give credit to the office they have been honored by their constituents to fill.

Bless the work of all who serve in their various capacities here in the United States Capitol.

Bless all those who visit the Capitol this very day, be they American citizens or visitors or guests of our Nation. May they be inspired by this monument to the noble idea of human freedom and its guarantee by the experiment that is the United States' democratic Republic.

God bless America, and may all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

(Mr. EMMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the great men and

women and their families that drive Minnesota's dairy industry. This month is National Dairy Month. In fact, considering the amount of milk and other dairy products we consume on a daily basis in the United States and beyond, one could argue that we already remember and recognize our dairy farmers every day.

In Minnesota, our dairy farmers produce nearly 10 billion pounds of milk each year. Our dairy farmers, along with their industry colleagues across the country, not only bring billions of dollars to our economy, they are vital to a strong and healthy population.

Our dairy farmers work extremely hard. Many, in addition to their dairy operation, have to maintain a job off the farm to make ends meet.

So, during National Dairy Month, when you drink a glass of milk, have a milk-filled bowl of cereal, eat a piece of cheese or that cup of yogurt, let's stop and remember the hardworking men and women of our dairy industry and their importance to our economy and their commitment to our health.

BIASED JOURNALISM IS UNACCEPTABLE

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, many years ago I received an undergraduate degree in journalism, was a reporter on a daily newspaper, and taught journalism for 1 year. In those years, there was a clear separation between the front page and the editorial page.

I don't believe I have ever read a more biased, partisan, opinionated paragraph in a "news" story than one that was on the front page of yesterday's Washington Post. Philip Rucker does not now deserve the title of journalist but, instead, should be referred to as a Democratic or leftwing hack.

He wrote that a traditional President would have reacted carefully "to the London attacks by instilling calm, being judicious . . . and appealing to the country's better angels." Instead, he accused President Trump of reacting "impulsively . . . stroking panic and fear, being indiscrete with details . . . and capitalizing on it to advocate for one of his more polarizing policies and to advance a personal feud."

Apparently, Mr. Rucker is so blinded by hatred for the President he cannot see straight and has written one of the most unfair, one-sided articles I have ever read in a "news" story in what used to be a newspaper.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF REUNIFICATION OF JERUSALEM

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, on the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem and on behalf of Hoosiers from Indiana's Sixth Congressional District, I rise today to send my prayers and best wishes to the Jewish state.

It is our hope that the special relationship between America and Israel continues to be strengthened and to grow. Israel is our most important friend in that region of the world and among America's strongest allies anywhere in the world. On this anniversary, let it be reaffirmed that Indiana and America stand with Israel.

The Holy City is a place of prayer for all people, and this day provides us with an opportunity to pray for the Jewish state. May it remain a beacon of light, representing democracy and freedom, and may peace and prosperity reign for its people.

The eternal capital of the State of Israel, Jerusalem, is also a seat of parliament; and from one representative body to another, we say "Shalom" and "God bless." Our prayers are with Israel today, tomorrow, and always.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

JUNE 5, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Pursuant to Section 603 of the Department of State Authorities Act, Fiscal Year 2017 (Pub. L. 114-323), I am pleased to appoint the following individual to the Western Hemisphere Drug Policy Commission:

Mr. Pete Gallego of Alpine, Texas

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

REAPPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S. TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 2004(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation:

Mr. DEUTCH, Florida

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1633

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

CONDEMNING VIOLENCE AGAINST PEACEFUL PROTESTERS OUTSIDE THE TURKISH AMBASSADOR'S RESIDENCE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 354) condemning the violence against peaceful protesters outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence on May 16, 2017, and calling for the perpetrators to be brought to justice and measures to be taken to prevent similar incidents in the future, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 354

Whereas, on May 16, 2017, President Donald J. Trump hosted President Recep Tayyip Erdogan of Turkey, a longstanding NATO ally, for an official meeting at the White House to discuss counterterrorism cooperation and bilateral issues;

Whereas, on the evening of May 16, 2017, over two dozen protesters gathered outside of the Turkish Ambassador's residence in Washington, DC, to demonstrate opposition to Turkish government policies;

Whereas after hours of peaceful protest, violence erupted when pro-Erdogan supporters and individuals from the Turkish Embassy grounds pushed past District of Columbia police officers to brutally attack the demonstrators;

Whereas those Turkish officials blatantly suppressed the First Amendment rights of United States citizens, and multiple armed Turkish security officials beat, kicked, and choked unarmed demonstrators;

Whereas multiple video recordings of the violence and reports by the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia and the Department of State confirm that the demonstrators did not instigate the violence;

Whereas at least 11 individuals were seriously injured in the ensuing brawl, with two individuals requiring immediate hospitalization;

Whereas separately, two armed Turkish security officers attached to a security detail were detained for physically assaulting Federal agents;

Whereas those two Turkish security officers were later released and subsequently allowed to leave the United States because they held Derived Head of State immunity;

Whereas the Department of State did not request that Turkey waive the immunity for these two security officers in order to fully investigate the assault prior to their being released from custody;

Whereas a joint criminal investigation into the incident is ongoing with the combined efforts of the Washington Metropolitan Police Department, the United States Secret Service, and the Department of State Diplomatic Security Service;

Whereas at no point was President Erdogan in danger;

Whereas immunity for diplomatic personnel and certain other foreign officials is a core principle, as is the right to protest peacefully and freely in the United States;

Whereas this is the third instance of violence perpetrated by members of Turkish President Erdogan's security detail in United States territory;

Whereas in 2011, a brawl erupted in the halls of the United Nations General Assembly between members of Turkish President Erdogan's security detail and United Nations security officers, resulting in one United Nations security officer being hospitalized due to serious injuries;

Whereas in 2016, members of Turkish President Erdogan's security detail engaged in unwarranted violence against journalists reporting on an event at the Brookings Institution;

Whereas Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said on May 21, 2017, that the violence outside the Turkish Embassy was "outrageous" and "simply unacceptable"; and

Whereas the right to assembly, peaceful protest, and freedom of speech are essential and protected rights in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the rights to peacefully assemble and freely express one's views are essential to the fabric of American democracy;

(2) the Turkish security forces acted in an unprofessional and brutal manner, reflecting poorly on President Erdogan and the Government of Turkey;

(3) any Turkish security officials who directed, oversaw, or participated in efforts by Turkish security forces to illegally suppress peaceful protests on May 16, 2017, should be charged and prosecuted under United States law;

(4) the United States Secret Service and the Diplomatic Security Service of the Department of State should review this incident and confirm with the Turkish National Police the standards expected by visiting security details to prevent future violent incidents;

(5) the Department of State should immediately request the waiver of immunity of any Turkish security detail official engaged in assault in the United States prior to release of that individual from custody;

(6) the Department of State should conduct a review of its own security procedures to determine how to mitigate the likelihood of such an event in the future;

(7) the United States respect for free speech requires officials of the United States to speak out against such incidents; and

(8) the United States should take steps to strengthen freedoms for the press and civil society in countries such as Turkey, and combat efforts by foreign leaders to suppress free and peaceful protest in their own countries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, and also the gentleman from New York, the ranking member of this committee, Mr. ENGEL, for working with us on this clear condemnation of the violence against peaceful protesters outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence in Washington, D.C., on May 16.

That day, President Erdogan of Turkey, a longstanding NATO ally, met at the White House to discuss counterterrorism cooperation and to discuss bilateral issues. This was an important meeting. But that evening, armed members of the Turkish President's security detail brutally attacked demonstrators who had gathered outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence on Sheridan Circle in Washington, D.C. They were there to protest various policies of the Turkish Government.

In an unprovoked attack, armed Turkish personnel broke through D.C. Metropolitan Police lines and attacked the protesters. They choked, beat, and kicked the demonstrators until D.C. Metropolitan Police officers, and State Department Diplomatic Security were able to stop the melee and restore order.

One woman was beaten unconscious. She testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee that she sustained brain damage as a result. A protester near her was beaten to the ground and repeatedly kicked in the face. His front teeth were smashed.

Mr. Speaker, what was the reason these and other American citizens were harshly beaten?

They chose to exercise their constitutional right to free speech and assembly. They chose to criticize actions of President Erdogan's government. The protesters got under the Turkish delegation's skin.

Let us be clear: at no time was President Erdogan in danger. This was not an act of protection. It was an act of suppression on our American soil.

The actions of the Turkish security detail were unprofessional and dan-

gerous. You had armed security personnel creating a melee. The actions were unjustified and, up to this point, have gone largely unchallenged.

H. Res. 354 puts Congress firmly on record in clear, unmistakable terms condemning the actions of the Turkish security guards last month. The resolution also demands that Turkey immediately lift diplomatic immunity for all those who assaulted U.S. citizens and law enforcement officers.

This resolution also calls for the U.S. State Department and the U.S. Secret Service to review their security procedures and for them to convey to Turkish officials in clear terms the expectations for the behavior of their security teams when they are operating in the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing aspects of last month's attack is that this assault by Turkish security officials was not an isolated incident. Rather, it was the third instance of violence they have engaged in while operating in the United States in recent years.

Passage of this resolution is an appropriate, strong response by this House to those brutal actions by Turkish forces.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. I thank the Democratic and Republican leaders who introduced this resolution condemning the violence of the security detail at the Turkish Embassy here in the Nation's Capital.

I am not surprised at the bipartisan nature of this resolution coming from the top of Congress about the right to protest peacefully in our country. This was an assault, after all, not only on the protesters, but on one of our most important American values: the right to assemble and use the First Amendment to protest.

Mr. Speaker, we must persist because I do not recall a demonstration like this. It was witnessed by the chief of police himself, Peter Newsham, and he, himself, is an eyewitness who declared that these protesters were all peaceful. There were also videos of the non-violent protesters being assaulted.

Now, the United States and the protesters deserve an appropriate response from the Turkish Government. Instead, we received a farfetched shifting of blame from Turkey. That makes it all the more important because the shifting of the blame will lead some to believe that we are responsible for what happened. Actually, we need to protest in the strongest terms because it turns out that this is part of a pattern.

A similar incident occurred about a half dozen years ago at the United Nations, same head of state, same thugs attacking peaceful protesters.

Last year—just this past year—there was an attack on journalists outside of The Brookings Institution.

So if we don't tell them it is time to stop when we have had the third attack, they will persist. That is for sure.

We know who these security details are. They couldn't have gotten into the country accompanying a head of state without telling us who they are. Moreover, two of them were arrested, so we have their names. I have written the Secretary of State, Mr. Tillerson, to ask him to bar the reentry of these security personnel; to hold them if they are still here; and to request information on whether they are entitled to immunity, and if they are, to have this immunity waived.

We will not let the Turkish thugs who took on our protesters unprovoked hide behind immunity. It can be waived if it is present. It should be waived. These security personnel should be charged and prosecuted under U.S. law. Imagine, we would have done precisely the same if some of our security had behaved in this fashion in Turkey.

There will be no justice to the citizens exercising their First Amendment rights who were stomped, kicked, and seriously injured until they and our country are vindicated with an appropriate response from the Turkish Government.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), my good friend.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 354, which forcefully condemns the shocking assault carried out here on American soil, here in our Nation's Capital, by trained paramilitary agents of the Turkish Presidential security force against a peaceful assembly of protesters who were exercising their First Amendment rights to freedom of speech.

Video footage offers evidence that President Erdogan sanctioned the attack, and then calmly sat back to watch as his bodyguards carried it out.

□ 1645

Each of us in this Chamber must ask the question: What sort of foreign leader invited for an official visit by the President of the United States would conduct himself in such a reprehensible manner and would show such contempt for America's commitment to human rights and civil liberties?

Make no mistake. This is the same man who has ordered mass incarcerations in his own country, who persecutes dissenters and jails democratically elected officials, and who locks up journalists on a whim. In fact, he is the number one jailer of journalists in the world.

The assault on innocent protesters in the streets of Washington, D.C., is entirely consistent with the impulses of

an autocratic Turkey. It has unmasked President Erdogan for the bully that he is and offers Americans a teachable moment on the character of official Turkey. It reflects a deeply imbedded reflex that, in the modern era, has brought the world, among other things, the unlawful invasion and occupation of Cyprus, the Armenian genocide, and the violent repression of the Kurdish people.

This incident demands more than just the prosecution of Erdogan's security personnel or the expulsion of the Turkish Ambassador or the strong condemnation of Erdogan himself, all of which should happen. It is time for a complete reevaluation of the U.S. relationship with Turkey. We cannot pretend that it is business as usual with a foreign leader that has attacked our Nation's most cherished democratic values on our very own soil.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this has been painful not only for the protesters, it is painful for our country because Turkey is an ally. We have our differences with Turkey, but we are dependent on Turkey for security matters. If this had never happened before, perhaps we could say that Turkey just doesn't understand how we operate in this country. The fact that it was the third incident makes it particularly bothersome.

Now, we are aware how sensitive this matter is. You cannot deal with a foreign adversary who happens to be an ally at the same time as if he were simply the enemy or our opponent. We have to understand the sensibilities of operating in the international sphere. But it is clear that Turkey doesn't understand that.

I was particularly concerned that Mr. Erdogan was in his car the entire time. He could have gotten out of his car and called attention to his security detail. He could have asked a staff member to do the very same thing. Instead, he stayed in his car, got out after the security detail from the D.C. police department had calmed things, stood there and had nothing to say. If we let this third incident go by with no response or accept—or even seem to accept—the Turkish response, that will be a signal to keep it up.

So I am so pleased that my good friend on the other side and I are in unison on this. I am particularly pleased that this was not a resolution introduced by me or by my good friend, that this resolution was introduced by top leaders on the Republican and the Democratic side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the Democratic whip of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Representative from the Dis-

trict of Columbia, Ms. NORTON, for yielding. I want to thank Mr. ROYCE for his continuing principled and focused leadership on issues that relate to foreign policy, that relate to human rights, and that relate to international law. I appreciate very much his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that I was able to join with the majority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, my friend, in sponsoring this resolution. It is an appropriate response to the terrible actions that were taken by security officers protecting Mr. Erdogan on his visit here.

I rise in support of this resolution, which I am proud to have introduced along with the majority leader, Ranking Member ENGEL, and Chairman ROYCE.

The assault on nonviolent demonstrators here in our Nation's Capital on May 16 by Turkish security personnel was an outrage. Our resolution makes it clear: the United States will not tolerate violence against peaceful protesters on our shores, and those responsible must face justice.

Turkey remains a critical NATO ally, but I am, nevertheless, extremely concerned, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that this is the third such incident in recent years, marking a pattern of violence by Turkish security personnel in the United States—unacceptable.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN—I won't quote him, but his response was very direct and very basic. He, too, said this was unacceptable behavior, and he even suggested that perhaps the Turkish Ambassador ought to leave. I do not suggest that, but I do suggest the conduct must change. It is unacceptable.

Our resolution calls on the State Department to take appropriate actions to ensure that the Turkish Government understands that we will not allow this to happen again. There must be consequences to this unprovoked attack on peaceful American citizens in their own country, and those responsible should be charged and prosecuted by the United States.

It should be clear to Turkey and to all nations that we will oppose any attempt to suppress dissent or the freedom of speech. That is why that is in the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States because our Founding Fathers and, frankly, those who follow Western values—and, yes, some Eastern values—believe that free speech is absolutely the sine qua non—an absolute essential—for democracy to succeed and to flourish.

I want to thank Mr. ROYCE again for his principled leadership. I want to thank Ms. NORTON, and I want to thank the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for their work on this resolution. I urge every Member of this House to join not only in passing it but sending this strong message not only to our Turkish allies but to all those

who would come to these shores and understand that our citizens may well have something to say. They may say it with signs, they may say it with their voices, and they may say it by standing someplace in proximity; one of the facets of America is that they have the right to do that, and those who visit our shores must honor that right.

Support this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the remaining time for the minority will be controlled by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

There was no objection.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this measure. I want to thank Mr. HOYER, the gentleman from Maryland.

Let me start by thanking the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ROYCE of California, for authoring this legislation and working to bring it to this floor.

By now we have seen the footage. We went to the film and saw the footage of Turkish thugs attacking peaceful protesters during President Erdogan's visit to Washington a few weeks ago. It is bad enough when we see governments anywhere crack down on basic rights like the freedom of assembly or expression. It is bad enough to see that sort of oppression in the streets of Ankara or Istanbul, but it is becoming more and more common as Turkey slips towards authoritarianism.

But to see that on the streets of Washington, D.C., is absolutely unacceptable—especially at the hands of foreign government officials who are guests in our country. We cannot allow these actions to remain unnoticed and to trample on our constitutional rights.

We know that President Erdogan was never in danger. He simply decided to treat Americans the way he treats his own people. His guards even had the nerve to attack law enforcement officials who were protecting him and his delegation.

This behavior cannot stand, and the resolution before us sends a clear, decisive message that Congress won't tolerate it. The State Department must do whatever it takes to make sure that this does not happen again, and those responsible for these heinous acts must be held accountable. Charges must be filed and pursued.

I am glad to support this measure that puts the House on record saying that we won't stand for this type of bully who attacks American citizens and American democracy.

Mr. Speaker, free speech, free assembly, and free expression are at the core of any democracy across the world. Turkey is certainly a partner and an ally, and it is deeply concerning to see

the steady erosion of democracy in that country.

But we cannot tolerate that sort of behavior here in our country. When you are in the United States, you play by our rules, and that means obeying our laws and respecting our values. Those responsible for violence against American citizens should face the consequences. Otherwise, what is to stop them from doing this once again?

Mr. Speaker, I support this measure, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The violent attacks, Mr. Speaker, by officers assigned to Turkish President Erdogan's security detail against peaceful protesters back on May 16 were designed to do one thing. They were designed to silence those protesters' criticism of the Turkish Government. That is why it is so important that we speak out.

We must speak loudly and clearly that we will protect our citizens and their fundamental rights to free speech and to assembly. Turkey is an important and longstanding NATO ally, but the Turkish Government can and should do better than this, and it can start by addressing the concerns of the House of Representatives and many Americans who were very angered by the video capturing this disgraceful attack on these citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 354, which condemns the violence, on American soil, against peaceful protesters outside the residence of the Turkish Ambassador to the United States and calls for the perpetrators to be brought to justice.

On May 16, 2017, the President hosted President Recep Tayyip Erdogan of Turkey for an official meeting at the White House to discuss counter-terrorism cooperation and bilateral issues.

That evening, over two dozen protestors peaceably assembled outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence in Washington, D.C., to voice their opposition to Turkish Government policies.

It was not long before unprovoked violence erupted, when pro-Erdogan supporters and individuals from the Turkish Embassy grounds pushed past District of Columbia police officers to brutally attack the peaceful demonstrators.

These Turkish officials violated the First Amendment rights of United States citizens, and multiple armed Turkish officials beat, kicked, and choked unarmed demonstrators.

Multiple video recordings show the violence with which these demonstrators were attacked.

The Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia and the Department of

State confirm that the demonstrators did not instigate the violence.

Two armed Turkish officers attached to a security detail were detained at the scene for physically assaulting Federal agents but were later released and allowed to leave the United States because they held diplomatic immunity.

Mr. Speaker, it is beyond dispute that the life of President Erdogan was never in any danger.

It must be noted that immunity for diplomatic personnel and certain other foreign officials is a core principal but so is the constitutionally protected right to protest peacefully and freely in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third instance of violence perpetrated by members of Turkish President Erdogan's security detail on United States soil.

In 2011, a brawl erupted in the halls of the United States Nations General Assembly between members of Turkish President Erdogan's security detail and United Nations security officers, resulting in one United Nations security officer being hospitalized due to serious injuries.

In 2016, members of Turkish President Erdogan's security detail engaged in unwarranted violence against journalist reporting on an event at the Brookings Institution.

On May 21, 2017, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson affirmed that violence outside the Turkish Embassy was "outrageous" and "simply unacceptable."

It is imperative that the right to assembly, peaceful protest, and freedom of speech are not abridged because they are the bedrock of democracy.

For this reason, the United States Secret Service and the Diplomatic Security Service of the Department of State should review this incident and confirm with the Turkish National Police the standards expected by visiting security details to prevent future violent incidents.

The Department of State should also conduct a review of its own security procedure to determine how to mitigate the likelihood of similar events in the future.

It is the duty of this House to stand for our ideals and take steps to strengthen freedoms for the press and civil society in countries such as Turkey, and oppose efforts by foreign leaders to suppress free and peaceful protest in their own countries.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H. Res. 354, I rise today in strong support passing this legislation to condemn the reprehensible attacks outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence on May 16.

I am a proud member of the Congressional Caucus on Turkey and Turkish Americans. New Jersey's Ninth District, and particularly my hometown of Paterson, has a large and thriving Turkish-American community and I cherish our close relationship. However, what happened last month was beyond the pale. The brutal attacks on peaceful protesters are an affront to our American values and core democratic freedoms of free speech and peaceful assembly.

One of the individuals attacked by President Erdogan's thugs was a constituent of mine from East Rutherford. As a college student, Ceren Borazan bravely joined her friends to

peacefully protest President Erdogan's policies in Washington D.C.

Since President Erdogan has taken office, Turkey has cracked down on freedom of expression, raided media outlets, and jailed judges, journalists, and civil servants in violation of democratic norms.

Outside the embassy Ceren was thrown to the ground and kicked by the Turkish security guards. During the attack a blood vessel in her eye burst and weeks later she is still reminded of the trauma by nightmares and fears of retribution. While freedom of speech and freedom to protest may be prohibited in Turkey, they are bedrock U.S. principles that must be safeguarded. Violence is never an appropriate response to free speech.

To ensure such an incident never happens again on our soil, those involved in carrying out this attack must be brought to justice. They must be denied diplomatic immunity and prosecuted to the fullest extent of U.S. law. Mr. Speaker, we must pass H. Res. 354 today to call attention to these attacks and to ensure justice is carried out for people like Ceren.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an editorial from The Star-Ledger titled "Trump won't denounce American thuggery. Will he punish Turkey?"

TRUMP WON'T DENOUNCE AMERICAN THUGGERY. WILL HE PUNISH TURKEY?

(By Star-Ledger Editorial Board)

Time to take stock of our rights of free speech and peaceful protest in this country, and what—if anything—President Trump has done to protect them.

He's been noticeably silent on the brutal beating of peaceful protesters in Washington, D.C. by the Turkish President's thuggish bodyguards, on public property, right in front of our own police, fully caught on video.

The violence was completely unprovoked, and happened shortly after Trump welcomed Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan to the Oval Office. Among others, a young woman from East Rutherford, Ceren Borazan, was put into a headlock and choked—popping a blood vessel in her eye—by a man who threatened to kill her.

This is common practice in Turkey—which is why Trump needs to make it clear that it isn't acceptable here.

But perhaps the real problem is that it is increasingly acceptable here. Not just verbal and physical attacks against peaceful protesters, but against journalists, whom Trump has called "the enemy of the people."

In the past month alone, reporters have been arrested, slapped, pinned against a wall and choked for trying to do their jobs; most recently by newly-elected Montana congressman Greg Gianforte, accused of body-slaming a journalist.

He's faced no real consequences. "Elections are about choices and Montanans made their choice," Speaker Paul Ryan said Friday. Trump, who had lavished praise on Gianforte—"a wonderful guy"—added: "Great win in Montana."

Perhaps this is why the former Breitbart News reporter Michelle Fields, who was grabbed roughly by Corey Lewandowski last year when she tried to ask Trump a question, said some Republicans "have put party over civility."

The casualty isn't just civility. Trump's hostility toward the press—like his attempt to use the FBI to muzzle journalists—has led Reporters Without Borders to lower America's ranking on press freedom, measured by

government restrictions and threats against the news media.

We're now ranked right below Burkina Faso, one of the world's poorest countries.

This failure to speak up for peaceful protesters and journalists began at Trump's rallies, where his supporters threatened and committed actual violence against them. Since then, the United Nations has warned that the basic principle of peaceful protest is under attack in the United States. At least 19 states have introduced measures that would criminalize such protests.

The very least the President can do is make some sort of distinction between what is tolerated here and in Turkey. Yes, it's a NATO ally, and we have a complex relationship. But this is about protecting the freedom of speech and assembly, and basic rules of law in our own country.

The New York Times has publicly identified the culprits, and New Jersey Rep. Bill Pascrell is among those leading the bipartisan charge to hold them accountable. If we can't get to the thugs in Turkey, then the Trump administration should hold the diplomats here to account.

Think about the message it sends if the Turkish government escapes this without so much as a slap on the wrist. A truly populist President, a defender of American freedoms, would stick up for the people—not the jack-booted thugs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 354, condemning the violence perpetrated against peaceful protesters outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence during Turkish President Erdogan's visit last month. This timely and critically important measure was introduced by my good friend, and Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman, ED ROYCE.

Mr. Speaker, as representatives of the American people, we take a solemn oath to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic." This sworn commitment spurs us to speak out now after the violent attack last month on peaceful protesters in Washington, D.C. who were peacefully exercising their First Amendments rights.

On that day a group of peaceful demonstrators—including a resident from my home state of New Jersey, Ceren Borazan—gathered outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence to protest the policies of Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Shortly after President Erdogan's arrival at the residence during his official visit to the United States, a contingent of his security guards, joined by some supporters, rushed across the street where the protesters were gathered. Before the demonstrators knew it, this group of thugs was upon them, throwing them to the ground and raining blows upon them.

By now we are all familiar with the shocking video images captured of men in dark suits, some with guns, and others in plainclothes mercilessly kicking protesters in their faces while they lie helplessly on the ground. Some demonstrators were outnumbered four to one by their assailants who punched and manhandled them until DC police intervened. When police stepped in, some attackers turned to assault our uniformed officers.

Among this group of protesters were Kurdish- and Armenian-Americans, members of minorities with a painful history of persecution and marginalization in their ancestral

homelands. These individuals came to the United States to seek the freedom and safety they were deprived in their lands of origin.

The United States and its Bill of Rights are a promise to these people that must not be broken. That members of the President's security detail and others felt they could attack these sacred rights with impunity should offend us all. That Erdogan would calmly watch the melee unfold—as video evidence shows—is as galling as it is unsurprising. Indeed, just a year ago his security detail was involved in an all-too-similar incident at a public event in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the steps recommended by this measure should be urgently implemented. Among other things, the United States should charge and prosecute all those involved in the attack. The State Department should request a waiver of immunity for any Turkish officials charged and detained in connection with the incident. Finally, the United States should redouble its efforts to promote democracy and human rights in Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, this was a brutal physical assault on a group of peaceful demonstrators in our nation's capital and a brazen insult to all Americans. I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join their voices and votes in strongly condemning this incident and calling for justice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 354, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1700

IRAQ AND SYRIA GENOCIDE EMERGENCY RELIEF AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 390) to provide for emergency relief to victims of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes in Iraq and Syria, to provide accountability for perpetrators of these crimes, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 390

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Iraq and Syria Genocide Emergency Relief and Accountability Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Religious and ethnic minorities in Iraq and Syria are persecuted groups, and the Secretary of State of State declared on March 17, 2016, that Daesh, also known as the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), was responsible for genocide, crimes against humanity, and other atrocity crimes against several of these groups, including Christians and Yezidis.

(2) According to the Department of State's annual reports on international religious freedom, the number of Christians living in Iraq has dropped from an estimated 800,000 to 1,400,000 in 2002 to fewer than 250,000 in 2015, and the number of Yezidis living in Iraq has dropped from 500,000 in 2013 to 350,000 to 400,000 in 2015.

(3) The annual reports on international religious freedom further suggest that Christian communities living in Syria, which had accounted for between eight and ten percent of Syria's total population in 2010, are now "considerably" smaller as a result of the civil war, and that the population of approximately 80,000 Yezidis in 2010 may now be larger because of refugees from Iraq.

(4) Local communities and entities have sought to mitigate the impact of violence directed against religious and ethnic minorities in Iraq and Syria, including the Chaldean Catholic Archdiocese of Erbil (Kurdistan Region of Iraq), which has used private funds to provide assistance to internally displaced Christians, Yezidis, and Muslims throughout the greater Erbil region, while growing needs and diminishing resources have made it increasingly difficult to continue these efforts.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATION.—The term "foreign terrorist organization" means an organization designated by the Secretary of State as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a)).

(3) HUMANITARIAN, STABILIZATION, AND RECOVERY NEEDS.—The term "humanitarian, stabilization, and recovery needs", with respect to an individual, includes water, sanitation, hygiene, food security and nutrition, shelter and housing, reconstruction, medical, education, and psychosocial needs.

(4) HYBRID COURT.—The term "hybrid court" means a court with a combination of domestic and international lawyers, judges, and personnel.

(5) INTERNATIONALIZED DOMESTIC COURT.—The term "internationalized domestic court" means a domestic court with the support of international advisers.

SEC. 4. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to ensure that assistance for humanitarian, stabilization, and recovery needs of individuals who are or were nationals and residents of Iraq or Syria, and of communities from those countries, is directed toward those individuals and communities with the greatest need, including those individuals from communities of religious and ethnic minorities,

and communities of religious and ethnic minorities, that have been identified as being at risk of persecution, forced migration, acts of genocide, crimes against humanity, or war crimes.

SEC. 5. ACTIONS TO PROMOTE ACCOUNTABILITY IN IRAQ AND SYRIA FOR ACTS OF GENOCIDE, CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY, AND WAR CRIMES.

(a) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development are authorized to provide assistance, including financial and technical assistance, as necessary and appropriate to support the efforts of entities, including nongovernmental organizations with expertise in international criminal investigations and law, to undertake the following activities to address crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity, or war crimes, and their constituent crimes, in Iraq since January 2014:

(1) The conduct of criminal investigations.

(2) The development of indigenous investigative and judicial skills, including by partnering, directly mentoring, and providing equipment and infrastructure where necessary, for the purpose of effectively adjudicating cases consistent with due process and respect for the rule of law.

(3) The collection and preservation of evidence and the chain of evidence, including for use in prosecutions in domestic courts, hybrid courts, and internationalized domestic courts, consistent with the activities described in subsection (b).

(b) ACTIONS BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.—The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall encourage governments of foreign countries—

(1) to include in appropriate security databases and security screening procedures of such countries information to identify individuals who are suspected to have committed crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity, or war crimes, and their constituent crimes, in Iraq or Syria, including individuals who are suspected to be members of foreign terrorist organizations operating in Iraq or Syria; and

(2) to prosecute such individuals for acts of genocide, crimes against humanity, or war crimes, as appropriate.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall consult with and consider credible information from entities described in such subsection.

SEC. 6. IDENTIFICATION OF AND ASSISTANCE TO ADDRESS HUMANITARIAN, STABILIZATION, AND RECOVERY NEEDS OF CERTAIN PERSONS IN IRAQ AND SYRIA.

(a) IDENTIFICATION.—The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and Director of National Intelligence, shall seek to identify the following:

(1) The threats of persecution and other early-warning indicators of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes against individuals—

(A) who are or were nationals and residents of Iraq or Syria, are members of religious or ethnic minority groups in such countries, and with respect to which the Secretary of State has determined ISIS has committed acts of genocide, crimes against humanity, or war crimes since January 2014; or

(B) who are members of other religious or ethnic minority groups in Iraq or Syria and are identified by the Secretary of State as persecuted groups.

(2) The religious and ethnic minority groups in Iraq or Syria identified pursuant to paragraph (1) that are at risk of forced migration, within or across the borders of Iraq, Syria, or a country of first asylum, and the primary reasons for such risk.

(3) The humanitarian, stabilization, and recovery needs of individuals described in paragraphs (1) and (2), including the assistance provided by the United States and by the United Nations, respectively, to address the humanitarian, stabilization, and recovery needs, and mitigate the risks of forced migration, of individuals described in paragraphs (1) and (2) and assistance provided through the Funding Facility for Immediate Stabilization and Funding Facility for Expanded Stabilization.

(4) To the extent practicable and appropriate, the entities, including faith-based entities, that are providing assistance to address the humanitarian, stabilization, and recovery needs of individuals described in paragraphs (1) and (2) and the extent to which the United States is providing assistance to or through such entities.

(b) ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall consult with, and consider credible information from, individuals described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection and entities described in paragraph (4) of such subsection.

(c) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development are authorized to provide assistance, including financial and technical assistance as necessary and appropriate, to support entities described in subsection (a)(4) that the Secretary and Administrator determine have access, and are capable of effectively managing and delivering such assistance, to the individuals described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection.

SEC. 7. REPORTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the following:

(1) A detailed description of the efforts taken, and efforts proposed to be taken, to implement the provisions of this Act.

(2) An assessment of the feasibility and advisability of prosecuting individuals for whom credible evidence exists of having committed acts of genocide, crimes against humanity, or war crimes in Iraq since January 2014 or Syria since March 2011 in domestic courts in Iraq, hybrid courts, and internationalized domestic courts, and of the measures needed to ensure effective criminal investigations of such individuals, and to effectively collect and preserve evidence, and preserve the chain of evidence, for prosecution.

(3) Recommendations for legislative remedies and administrative actions to facilitate implementation of this Act.

(b) FORM.—The report required under this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary.

SEC. 8. PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL FUNDING.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act. This Act shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr.

ESPAILLAT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by recognizing the efforts of our colleague, Mr. SMITH. Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations. We appreciate his strong leadership on this critical issue. And, as always, I also appreciate Ranking Member ENGEL for his support.

Mr. Speaker, more than 6 years ago, the world watched with dread as Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad ordered action against what were peaceful protestors coming down the main boulevard in Damascus. We watched on CNN and international television. As they were saying it was peaceful, we then saw the automatic weapons of the regime open up and mow them down. What has followed has been year after year of mass atrocities as Assad seeks to break the Syrian people.

Building on the vacuum created by Assad, ISIS burst onto the international stage in 2014 by declaring themselves and their supposed “caliphate”—and committing obscene, horrific acts in an effort to spread their nihilistic, death-filled ideology.

We also saw that they targeted anyone unlucky enough to cross their path across Syria and Iraq. Yet, oddly enough, the regime in Syria did not target ISIS. They were too busy carrying out their campaign against the people of Syria—protesters, the Free Syrian Army, and others—who were pushing back against the regime.

Here, alongside the nightmare that Assad created, came this new nightmare of ISIS. These two evils, as I call them, ISIS and Assad, exist side by side, perpetrating extreme violence on anyone who would oppose their grip on power.

ISIS is committing genocidal violence against Yazidis and Christians in Syria and Iraq, seeking to destroy their entire communities and to erase their shared histories. Assad is committing massive crimes against humanity, targeting men, women, and children from all sects, all religions, and all groups, as documented by Caesar, a military photographer who snuck out photos of what goes on in

Assad's prisons, documenting the torture and death of tens of thousands of citizens in Syria.

More than a year after the Obama administration, under intense congressional pressure, finally declared that ISIS' actions against the religious communities of Iraq and Syria constituted "genocide," there is still an urgent need for assistance to these vulnerable communities. These communities, which exist on the outskirts in Syria and on the borders, have been devastated by ISIS' efforts to wipe them out.

These ancient communities, whose roots go back centuries, include Christians, Yazidis, Assyrians, Syriacs, Turkomans, and many others. Their presence in Iraq and Syria is crucial to the social fabric of these nations.

While the U.S. has been generous in providing assistance to those targeted, their needs are still urgent and extreme. Whole communities have been displaced, enslaved, and slaughtered. Survivors need assistance in feeding and clothing their families and in beginning to address the extreme trauma caused by ISIS and Assad.

This bill offers additional immediate relief for these vulnerable communities and also directs the State Department to do more to support efforts to collect and preserve evidence of "genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes" so that, someday, justice might be served.

I urge Members to support this bill so that the possibility of justice and accountability for these atrocities can give hope to those suffering today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, April 24, 2017.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I write with respect to H.R. 390, the "Iraq and Syria Genocide Emergency Relief and Accountability Act." As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions within H.R. 390 that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I forego any further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 390 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 390 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be in-

cluded in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 390.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, April 24, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 390, the Iraq and Syria Genocide Emergency Relief and Accountability Act of 2017, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 390 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this measure.

I, again, want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL, who have worked in a bipartisan way to bring this important measure before us today. I would also like to thank Mr. SMITH and Ms. ESHOO for their work on this bill, the Iraq and Syria Emergency Genocide Act, and for their tireless efforts on behalf of religious minorities in the Middle East. It is often easy to look away in the face of these atrocities, Mr. Speaker, but these lawmakers have made sure that we stay focused on preventing genocide and promoting accountability in this part of the region.

On March 17, 2016, Secretary of State John Kerry said: "In my judgment, ISIS is responsible for genocide against groups and areas under its control, including Yazidis, Christians, and Shia Muslims . . . the United States will strongly support efforts to collect, document, preserve, and analyze the evidence of atrocities, and we will do all we can do to see that these perpetrators are held accountable."

The House had urged the Secretary to designate the crimes against minorities in Iraq and Syria as "genocide," and the measure before us today follows up on those efforts. It is tragic that a bill like this remains necessary. Unfortunately, ISIS continues to tar-

get religious minorities, including Christians, Yazidis, and Shia.

We have seen overwhelming evidence of forced migration, execution, rape, starvation, enslavement, amputation, and public lashings. In Raqqa, which ISIS has declared capital of the caliphate, children are forced to watch videos of mass executions in order to desensitize them to this level of violence.

ISIS remains an ongoing threat, and its campaign of violence and persecution is an ongoing tragedy for the people across the region. This bill would respond to that part of the challenge. It states that American assistance for humanitarian, stabilization, and recovery should go to those individuals and communities with the greatest need. That includes communities of religious and ethnic minorities.

The bill also will help ensure that those responsible for this violence and persecution are brought to justice. It pushes USAID to assist in the efforts to conduct criminal investigations and help develop skills on the ground to collect evidence and press these cases.

This legislation is supported by the Knights of Columbus, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, HIAS, Yazidi Human Rights Organization-International, and several other organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the author of this bill and also the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership on this bill. I want to thank Ranking Member ENGEL for his support and also Majority Leader MCCARTHY for making sure this bill came to the floor. Without that, we wouldn't be here, so I want to thank him especially for his support.

Mr. Speaker, I start off by saying that, since 2013, I have chaired nine congressional hearings focused in whole or in part on atrocities in Iraq and Syria. The distinguished chairman has had another dozen or so such hearings that have brought to light these atrocities.

In one of our hearings in December of 2015, Gregory Stanton, president of Genocide Watch, testified that "weak words are not enough," noting that 21 human rights organizations, genocide scholars, and religious leaders wrote to President Obama imploring him to recognize the ISIS genocide.

At that same hearing, Chaldean Bishop Francis Kalabat said that "since the fall of Mosul in early June 2014, Christians have endured targeted

persecution in the form of forced displacement, sexual violence, and other human rights violations.” He said, “ISIS has committed terrific atrocities against the Yazidis,” and then he bottom-lined it and said the Christians are “under threat of extinction.”

On May 9, 2016, the House passed JEFF FORTENBERRY’s genocide resolution 393–0. A few days later, Secretary of State John Kerry declared ISIS atrocities to be a genocide.

The existential threat to Christians and Yazidis and other minority faiths, however, continues to this day. Some of the fortunate ones have made it to the relative safety of Erbil but, astonishingly, have gotten no assistance from the United States Government.

Since 2014, as a matter of fact, the Chaldean Catholic Archdiocese of Erbil has provided almost all of the medical care, food, shelter, and education received by over 13,200 Christian families, almost one-third of the Christians remaining in Iraq, who escaped ISIS. The archdiocese also provides assistance to Yazidis and Muslims. The funding for all of this has been private, with money from Knights of Columbus, Aid to the Church in Need, and a few others.

Carl Anderson, Supreme Knight of the Knights of Columbus, which has donated more than \$12 million to the effort, testified in one of my hearings and said the Knights and other private sources have responded. “But non-governmental organizations can only do so much.”

“The rich tapestry,” as he pointed out, “of religious pluralism in the region must be preserved now or it will be lost forever,” noting that there has been an 80 percent decline of Christians in Iraq and 70 percent in Syria.

He said: “With its loss will come increased instability and threats to our own security and that of the world.

“We have a unique opportunity—and, some would say, unique responsibility—to protect the victims of genocide.”

Mr. Speaker, just before Christmas of last year, I traveled to Erbil with a staff delegation at the invitation of the Chaldean archbishop, Bashar Warda, to meet with survivors and to visit an internally displaced person camp of about 6,000 individuals. Both my staff and I were amazed and inspired by the genocide survivors’ resiliency and deep faith in the Lord, despite the cruelty that they had endured.

□ 1715

There was so much joy, love, and courage despite the loss of family and friends to ISIS. They had deep hope. The children sang Christmas carols—it was December 23 when we were there—with smiles and with reverence. The leaders, especially Archbishop Warda, trusted in God while working unceasingly and unselfishly for others.

Because the needs on the ground have always exceeded private support, the archdiocese has had to battle chronic funding crises over these last several years. Archbishop Warda told me recently that they had to temporarily suspend their distribution of medicines, and are on track to run out of money for food sometime this June.

H.R. 390 provides authority and direction to the secretary and the administrator of USAID to identify the humanitarian, stabilization, and recovery needs of these communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. This bill also authorizes and directs the secretary to fund entities, including faith-based ones, that are effectively providing assistance to meet those needs on the ground.

It addresses another urgent aspect of this crisis: evidence linking specific ISIS perpetrators to specific atrocity crimes that is being destroyed or lost. And we have seen this in the past in Rwanda, in Sierra Leone, and in the former Yugoslavia. You have got to collect the information that is actionable in order to prosecute these crimes against humanity. This legislation directs that, and that is why it has the support of all four former U.S. Ambassadors at Large for war crimes issues.

It also directs the Secretary of State to work with foreign governments to ensure that they are including identifying information about suspected perpetrators in their security databases and security screening and are prosecuting perpetrators of these horrific crimes.

President Trump and Vice President PENCE have strongly, publicly, and repeatedly committed the administration to providing relief to Christians, Yazidis, and other genocide survivors. This legislation tangibly supports this commitment and is a blueprint for action.

I especially want to thank tonight the coauthor of this legislation, ANNA ESHOO. Her tireless efforts on behalf of all Christians and other persecuted religious minorities has been really fantastic, and I want to thank her for that and for working so cooperatively together with me and my staff and the full committee staff.

I would also like to thank the great staff work of Nathaniel Hurd, Piero Tozzi in my office, Matt McMurray in ANNA ESHOO’s office, Doug Anderson and Joan Condon in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and Roger Mahan and Luke Murry in the majority leader’s office. And, as always, I want to thank Kelly Dixon, who ultimately helped us bring this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the statement of Mr. Carl A. Anderson

before the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

OPENING STATEMENT OF MR. CARL A. ANDERSON, SUPREME KNIGHT, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

(Before the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health Global Human Rights and International Organizations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, at a hearing titled The ISIS Genocide Declaration: What Next?, May 26, 2019)

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before this subcommittee and to discuss the next steps that need to be taken needed to protect the survivors of ongoing genocide in Iraq and Syria. Let me begin by saying that the House of Representatives, the State Department and the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom are all to be commended for the important step of declaring the situation confronting Christians and other religious minorities in the Middle East genocide.

The world’s greatest humanitarian crisis since World War II is unfolding now in the Middle East. In addition to millions of refugees, many of the region’s indigenous communities now face extinction. These communities may disappear in less than a decade. But their fate is not inevitable. The United States can avert this unfolding tragedy.

A UNIQUE HISTORICAL MOMENT

Around the world, people of good will, Muslim and non-Muslim alike, wish to differentiate themselves from the horrific and violent theology espoused by ISIS.

It is certainly true that such extremists make up a small percentage of Muslims overall. But among the world’s billion Muslims, the majority simply want to raise their families in peace and are scandalized by what ISIS is doing in the name of Islam.

Prominent Islamic leaders and scholars from around the world have recently taken an important step in the Marrakesh Declaration. Attempts such as this, which seek to align Islam with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be supported.

At the same time, it is clear that Christians, and other indigenous minorities, are experiencing genocide, at the hands of the Islamic State and related groups. Their plight is now at the top of the world’s agenda in a way that it never has been before.

These factors together create an unparalleled opportunity for the United States, and for all those opposed to ISIS’ radical vision—Muslims and non-Muslims alike—to advance an agenda of equality, justice, peace, and accountability in the region.

SIX PRINCIPLES FOR SOUND POLICY IN THE REGION

The United States can avert the extinction of indigenous religious and ethnic communities in Iraq and Syria with a policy that contains the following six principles:

(1) Increase aid and ensure that it actually reaches those most in need;

We are reliably informed that official government and U.N. aid does not reach the Christian genocide survivors in Iraq and Syria.

Repeatedly, we hear from Church leaders in the region that Christians—and other genocide survivors—are last in line for assistance from governments. Significantly, the Archdiocese of Erbil, where most Iraqi Christians now live, receives no money from any government whatsoever. If assistance from outside Church affiliated agencies ends in Erbil, Christians there will face a catastrophic humanitarian tragedy within 30

days. The situation is similar in Syria, according to Christian leaders there.

Those who face genocide are a tiny fraction of the population. They often must avoid official refugee camps because they are targeted for violence there by extremists. As a result, these minorities often do not get “official” aid. This will continue to be the reality unless specific action is taken to bring the aid to where these minorities are forced to reside by continuing violence.

The Knights of Columbus and others private sources have responded to this situation. Since 2014, we have raised more than \$10.5 million for relief, assisting Christians and other internally displaced persons and refugees in Iraq, Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon. We have partnered with dioceses and religious agencies working in the region to provide general relief, food, clothing, shelter, education, and medical care. In doing so we assist both Christians and non-Christians. We are also working with church entities to ensure that they are making use of all government or U.N. resources available.

But non-governmental organizations can only do so much. Government aid is essential to the long-term survival of these indigenous religious and ethnic minorities. It is urgent that Congress appropriate funding to save those who have escaped genocide. I urge you to consider special emergency appropriations, however modest, to improve the humanitarian conditions on the ground in Iraq.

This funding, whatever the vehicle, should come with mechanisms in place—reporting requirements and oversight—to ensure that American aid does not get diverted from its intended purpose.

(2) Support the long-term survival in the region of these ancient indigenous religious and ethnic communities;

In Iraq, the Christians population has declined by more than 80 percent, and in Syria by nearly 70 percent.

American policy should recognize the important differences in the situations of those fleeing violence and those targeted for genocide. And we should prioritize the latter.

Consider this analogy. After World War II, there were approximately 50 million refugees, and only a small fraction were Jews. Yet the world understood that Jews, who had survived genocide, faced a qualitatively different situation, and deserved heightened consideration.

The same is true today for the indigenous religious and ethnic minorities of the region. They have an indisputable right to live in their country—in whatever region of it they wish. Depending on the circumstances, this may mean where they are originally from, or where they find themselves now, but as survivors of an ongoing genocide, they deserve to be prioritized, not left behind by American policy decisions.

(3) Punish the perpetrators of genocide and crimes against humanity;

The United States should support action by the U.N. Security Council to refer key perpetrators of genocide for prosecution. Equally important, we should support the Iraqi Central Government and the Kurdish Regional Government's adjudication of the cases of thousands of ISIS fighters and supporters who currently remain in local detention centers.

As the population of captured ISIS fighters increases, local detention centers and jails risk becoming their own humanitarian issue. The need to improve this situation cannot be overstated.

Additionally, although substantial evidence of genocide exists, the United States

should cooperate in taking further action to develop additional documentation and preservation before physical evidence is lost. Appropriations intended to assist in the adjudication of ISIS fighters will be critical in the coming months.

(4) Assist victims of genocide in attaining refugee status.

A news report last week indicated that of the 499 Syrian refugees admitted to the U.S. in May, not one was listed as being Christian or as explicitly coming from any of the groups targeted for genocides. How long will this situation be allowed to continue?

The U.S. should appropriate funding and work with the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees to make provisions for locating and providing status to individuals—such as Yazidis and Christians—that have been targeted for genocide. Many of these genocide survivors fear going into official U.N. refugee camps, where they are targeted. Thus they are overlooked, and find it nearly impossible to acquire official refugee status or immigrate.

Congress should act now. Senator Tom Cotton has introduced the Religious Persecution Relief Act, S. 2708, to provide for overlooked minorities in the prioritization of refugees. We support this bill and urge its passage.

(5) Prepare now for foreseeable human rights challenges as ISIS-controlled territory is liberated by ensuring that Christians and other minorities have equal rights to decide their future;

We should prepare now for the consequences of the liberation of ISIS controlled areas, including Mosul and the Nineveh Region, as well as regions in Syria. We are likely to see another humanitarian crisis as civilians flee the fighting or return to their former communities when fighting ceases.

There has been much debate concerning plans for victims of genocide in Iraq. Some have argued for returning people safely to the Nineveh Region, others that they should be allowed to stay in Kurdistan, still others that they be allowed to immigrate. But these are not necessarily mutually exclusive, competing proposals. People should be allowed to decide their own future. And when they do, we should work to ensure they are treated with fairness, dignity and equality. This also means that it will be increasingly important to ensure that the property rights and claims of minority groups are respected.

(6) Promote the establishment of internationally agreed upon standards of human rights and religious freedom as conditions for humanitarian and military assistance.

The United States should advocate for full and equal rights for religious and ethnic minorities in the region in exchange for our military and humanitarian aid. A necessary first step to prevent genocide is to overcome the social and legal inequality that is its breeding ground.

Religious hatred, discrimination and second-class citizenship too often constitute a way of life in the region—and it is a way of life that is an antecedent to genocide. We cannot accept one standard for human rights in the region and another standard for the rest of the world.

The guarantees in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—and the First and Fourteenth amendments to our own constitution—regarding equality under the law and freedom of speech and religion must become a reality for all citizens of Iraq, Syria and elsewhere throughout the region.

CONCLUSION

The rich tapestry of religious pluralism in the region must be preserved now or it will

be lost forever. With its loss will come increased instability and threats to our own security and that of the world.

We have a unique opportunity—and some would say, unique responsibility—to protect the victims of genocide. The United States can provide such protection with a policy that includes the principles outlined above. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for your leadership and that of the members of this subcommittee.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

The only way for the people of Iraq and Syria to find peace and stability in the coming years is to move towards more inclusive governing, ensuring that minorities have a stake in the way their countries are run, and for those responsible for violence to face justice. It is as simple as that.

This legislation is a recognition that there are no military solutions in the Middle East; rather, the best way forward is to address the underlying causes that led to the creation of ISIS so we can prevent the next ISIS from rising up from the ashes in Iraq and Syria.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Just in speaking about the conditions of the Christian community, outside of Erbil, like Chairman SMITH, I had the opportunity last year to speak to Archbishop Warda and to many of those Christian families that have survived, and to see many of the children that are struggling there.

I did want to commend the Knights of Columbus, the archbishop, and Catholic Charities for their sustained effort, which goes not only to this Christian community, but also the neighboring Yazidi community. These communities have no other means of support.

I think that as we reflect upon this, beyond the genocidal actions of ISIS, we have also seen the depravity of the Assad regime, which has engaged in a massive effort to destroy anyone, regardless of sect or religion or ethnicity, if they suspect them of being unwilling to bow to Syria's murderous dictator. None are safe.

I say “suspect” because so many of those who were tortured to death to give up other names are simply caught up in a web of intelligence services who go out and try to find those who they believe may not be loyal. And they haul them in for torture. And under the knife, many of these people will give up names of other families, whoever they can remember, whoever they know who may or may not in any way be involved in politics, but then find themselves in those same torture chambers.

The result of this kind of a society year after year breeds a sense of absolute hopelessness, of blowback, of problems throughout Syria from which, I must say, I suspect this long climb back is going to be a very difficult one.

At the end of the day, though, it is still absolutely imperative that those responsible for those hideous crimes be held accountable. A key aspect of any lasting peace is going to be accountability, because a renewal of trust and the prospect of justice is going to be based on some measure on whether we are going to hold to account those who committed those kinds of crimes, those who led to this kind of horror. Whether it is Assad's regime or whether it is ISIS, there is so much devastation left in the wake.

I urge Members to support this resolution so that the possibility of peace can be sustained by the hope that justice will prevail. I again thank Mr. SMITH for authoring this measure. I also thank Ranking Member ENGEL for his passionate leadership on the crisis in Syria for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, since 2013, I have chaired nine Congressional hearings focused, in whole or in a large part, on atrocities in Iraq and Syria.

At one hearing in December of 2015, Professor Gregory Stanton, President of Genocide Watch testified that "weak words are not enough" noting that twenty one human rights organizations, genocide scholars, and religious leaders wrote to President Obama imploring him to recognize the ISIS genocide.

At the same hearing, Chaldean Bishop Francis Kalabat testified that "since the fall of Mosul in early June 2014, Christians have endured targeted persecution in the form of forced displacement, sexual violence, and other human rights violations." He said "ISIS has committed horrific atrocities against the Yazidis." The bishop said Christians are "under threat of extinction."

On May 9, 2016, the House passed Jeff Fortenberry's Genocide resolution 393 to 0. A few days later, Secretary of State John Kerry declared ISIS atrocities to be a genocide.

The existential threat to Christians and Yazidis and other minorities continues to this day. Some of the fortunate ones, however, have made it to relative safety in Erbil but astonishingly have not gotten assistance from the United States.

Since 2014, the Chaldean Catholic Archdiocese of Erbil has been providing almost all of the medical care, food, shelter and education received by 13,200 Christian families, almost one third of Christians remaining in Iraq, who escaped ISIS. The Archdiocese also provides assistance to Yazidis and Muslims. The funding has been private—Knights of Columbus, Aid to the Church in Need, and a few others.

Carl Anderson, Supreme Knight of the Knights of Columbus—which has donated more than \$12 million to the effort—testified that the Knights and other private sources have responded, "But non-governmental orga-

nizations can only do so much." He also made numerous recommendations including supporting the "Long term survival in the region of these ancient indigenous religions and ethnic communities. In Iraq, the Christian population has declined by more than 80 percent, and in Syria, it has declined by almost 70 percent . . . The rich tapestry of religious pluralism in the region must be preserved now or it will be lost forever." He said, "With its loss will come increased instability and threats to our own security and that of the world. We have a unique opportunity—and some would say, unique responsibility—to protect the victims of genocide."

Just before Christmas last year, I travelled to Erbil at the invitation of the Chaldean Catholic Archbishop of Erbil, Bashar Warda, to meet with survivors and visit an IDP camp.

Both my staff and I were amazed and inspired by the genocide survivors resiliency and deep faith in the Lord despite the cruelty they endured.

There was much joy, love, and courage despite the loss of family and friends to ISIS. They had hope. The children sang Christmas carols with smiles and reverence.

The leaders—especially Archbishop Warda—trust in God while working unceasingly for others.

Because the needs on-the-ground have always exceeded private support, however, the Archdiocese has had to battle chronic funding crises. Archbishop Warda told me they recently had to temporarily suspend their distribution of medicines and are on-track to run out of money for food sometime this June.

H.R. 390 provides authority and direction to the Secretary and Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development to identify the humanitarian, stabilization, and recovery needs of these communities. The bill also authorizes and directs the Secretary and Administrator to fund entities—including faith-based ones—that are effectively providing assistance to meet those needs on-the-ground.

H.R. 390 addresses another urgent aspect of this crisis: Evidence linking specific ISIS perpetrators to specific atrocity crimes is being destroyed or lost. It is vital that evidence that can be used in a range of court settings is collected and preserved. This will enable accountability and support our efforts to counter terrorist groups by demonstrating that the perpetrators are chronic rapists, child abusers, drug dealers and human traffickers.

This legislation authorizes and directs the Secretary and Administrator to fund entities that are conducting criminal investigations into perpetrators of atrocity crimes in Iraq.

The Commission for International Justice and Accountability is an example of a non-governmental organization that has been conducting such criminal investigations on-the-ground. CIJA has collected and preserved ISIS recruitment forms, foreign fighter passports, and ISIS instructions from ISIS facilities, laptops, hard drives, and memory sticks. It has taken hundreds of witness statements from victims, perpetrators, detained fighters, defectors, insiders, witnesses, and other witnesses. CIJA has developed pretrial briefs and perpetrator profiles that are of a world-class quality.

In 2016, CIJA received 409 requests for assistance on cases from law enforcement agen-

cies in many countries, including the Department of Homeland Security and FBI and works closely with both agencies. Yet, CIJA has received no financial support from the U.S. government.

H.R. 390 also directs the Secretary to work with foreign governments to ensure that they are including identifying information about suspected perpetrators in their security databases and security screening and are prosecuting perpetrators.

ISIS fighters in Iraq are being captured and detained in the battle for Mosul and beyond. Others are escaping the region and attempting to return to their home countries around the world. We should help ensure that in addition to being screened and prosecuted for terrorism, they are screened and prosecuted for atrocity crimes.

President Trump and Vice President Pence have strongly, publicly committed the Administration to providing relief to Christians, Yazidis, and other genocide survivors, and ensuring perpetrators are brought to justice. H.R. 390 supports this commitment and is a blueprint for implementation.

H.R. 390 has the bipartisan co-sponsorship of 46 members, support from a range of prominent Christian, Yazidi, religious freedom, and accountability organizations, and has been endorsed by all four former U.S. Ambassadors-at-Large for War Crimes Issues.

I especially want to acknowledge my co-author and good friend ANNA ESHOO. Her tireless efforts on behalf of Christians and other persecuted religious minorities, and the fantastic partnership with her and her staff on this bill, are a testament to the bi-partisanship of H.R. 390 and international religious freedom more broadly.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the great staff work of Nathaniel Hurd and Piero Toni in my office. Matt McMurray in ANNA ESHOO's office. Doug Anderson and Joan Condon in the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Roger Mahan and Luke Murry in the Majority Leader's Office. And Kelly Dixon who ultimately helped us get it to the floor.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and as a member of the Congressional Refugee Caucus, I rise in strong support of H.R. 390, the "Iraq and Syria Genocide Emergency Relief and Accountability Act of 2017."

This legislation makes clear that it is the policy of the United States to ensure that assistance for humanitarian, stabilization, and recovery needs is directed toward those individuals and communities with the greatest need, including those individuals from communities of religious and ethnic minorities, and communities of religious and ethnic minorities, that have been identified as being at risk of persecution, forced migration, acts of genocide, crimes against humanity, or war crimes.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a timely and important response to acts of genocide and other war crimes committed by ISIS in a its continuing effort to subjugate the Yazidi religious minority in Syria and Iraq.

ISIS has targeted and continues to target Muslims, Jews, Sikhs, Christians, Yazidis and its reprehensible actions are reminiscent of what we have seen in some of the darkest periods of human history.

For example, according to reports of human rights watchgroups, Shiite Muslims have been killed by ongoing waves of ISIS bombings of Shiite neighborhoods, and Shiite members of Iraq's security forces have been victims of mass ISIS executions.

ISIS is believed to be holding 3,500 people as slaves, and most of the enslaved are women and children from the Yazidi community.

ISIS claimed credit for the twin blasts that struck Christian Egyptian churches during Palm Sunday services, in which at least 47 Christians were murdered.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, in our own country we are witnessing an alarming increase in violence, bigotry, and acts of terror against members of many of our religious minorities:

1. Muslim college students have been shot and killed, execution-style, in their living room and outside of their mosques.

2. Jewish communities are struggling to deal with desecrated cemeteries and waves of bomb threats being called to their community centers and places of worship.

3. Two Sikh men were killed in New York City, a crime police declared to be a hate-shooting.

4. Nine African American parishioners were shot to death during Bible study at a Mother Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina.

H.R. 390 aims to promote accountability in Iraq and Syria for the atrocities committed against the religious minorities living in those countries.

It also provides emergency relief for victims of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes in Iraq and Syria.

Specifically, the bill authorizes the providing of financial and technical assistance to those in need, as well as working with nongovernmental organizations with expertise in international criminal investigations and law to investigate and address crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity, or war crimes, and their constituent crimes, occurring in Iraq since January 2014.

H.R. 390 also authorizes United States aid agencies to provide assistance to entities determined to be capable of effectively managing and delivering recovery, humanitarian, or stabilization assistance to Iraqi and Syrian religious or ethnic minorities that have been victimized by ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, the crimes ISIS has committed against Iraqi and Syrian religious and ethnic minorities are horrific.

The victims of this campaign of terror are innocent and in dire need of humanitarian and stabilization assistance.

As the global leader and champion of human rights and human dignity, the United States has an obligation to lead the international effort to defeat ISIS and ameliorate the suffering caused by its heinous acts.

H.R. 390 is a welcome and positive step in the right direction and I urge all Members to join me in voting for this important legislation.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 390, the Iraq and Syria Genocide Emergency Relief and Accountability Act of 2017.

In March of 2016, Congress declared in unequivocal terms that the persecution of Chris-

tians, Yazidis, and other ethnic and religious minorities in Iraq and Syria by ISIS constituted genocide.

This was a seminal moment in the U.S. Congress because it's only the third time in history that Congress has declared a genocide. Unfortunately, the conditions for the tens of thousands of survivors of these crimes against humanity grow worse each day.

Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing the systematic extermination of Christians and other religious and ethnic minorities at the hands of ISIS.

And despite the fact that Congress has appropriated over \$1 billion in humanitarian aid to help these communities in Fiscal Year 2017, the money has not reached survivors because the only organizations focused solely on aiding survivors are religious groups, which the State Department will not provide assistance to.

For example, the Archdiocese of Erbil is currently providing food, housing, and medical care to more than 70,000 Christians who escaped death at the hands of ISIS. Even though the Archdiocese of Erbil is providing assistance to survivors at the center of this crisis, the State Department will not distribute U.S. assistance through religious organizations. H.R. 390 would resolve this ongoing problem.

The bill directs the Secretary of State and USAID to provide assistance directly to entities, including faith-based entities that are effectively providing assistance to genocide survivors or other persecuted religious and ethnic communities on the ground in Iraq and Syria. Importantly, the aid can only be used for humanitarian relief on the ground, not to support the general operations of the church or faith-based entity.

H.R. 390 also includes important provisions that will help the international community document the crimes against humanity that have been committed by ISIS, hold the perpetrators accountable, and ensure we learn from the horrors we have witnessed over the last six years so that we can one day prevent the next large-scale genocide from occurring.

I want to thank the bill's sponsor and my partner in this ongoing effort to help the tens of thousands of survivors of genocide in Iraq and Syria, Congressman CHRIS SMITH. He has been a tireless advocate on behalf of these persecuted communities and I commend him for the work he has done to get this bill through the House.

Thirteen months after the House and Senate took the important step to label these crimes against humanity as genocide, my colleagues now have the opportunity to help bring an end to the suffering.

I urge my colleague to vote "YES" on H.R. 390.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 390, the Iraq and Syria Genocide Emergency Relief and Accountability Act.

For too long, the Middle East—the birth place of Christianity—has been the place where thousands of Christians have been led to their deaths. The Pew Research Center reports that Christians are the world's most persecuted faith community, with Middle Eastern Christians experiencing this most severely.

In 2012, President Obama declared what is happening to Christians in the Middle East as

"genocide", but not much has been done to respond to this crisis.

This bill will provide the dire supports and safeguards that Christians and other religious minorities desperately need. Specifically, it gives prioritized consideration to Christians and other religious minorities in the Middle East for admission into the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program, while keeping standard vetting procedures in place.

This is so important given that less than half of one percent of Syrians chosen for resettlement between 2011 and 2016 have been Christians.

H.R. 390 also supports entities that are conducting criminal investigations into the bad actors perpetrating violence against Christians and supports groups helping victims of genocide in the region.

Clearly, persecuted Christians in the Middle East desperately need our support. As a fellow Christian, I will keep working to bring attention to the failures of our current refugee program in helping these individuals, as well as promote efforts to provide resources and assistance to them in their time of need.

I applaud the passage of H.R. 390 and hope that the Senate will give it timely consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 390, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide emergency relief for victims of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes in Iraq and Syria, for accountability for perpetrators of these crimes, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING TERRORIST ATTACKS IN MANCHESTER, UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 355) condemning in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Manchester, United Kingdom, on May 22, 2017, expressing heartfelt condolences, and reaffirming unwavering support for the special relationship between our peoples and nations in the wake of these attacks, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 355

Whereas, on May 22, 2017, a terrorist triggered improvised explosive devices at the Manchester Arena following the conclusion of a concert by American recording artist Ariana Grande;

Whereas the blasts took the lives of at least 22 people, and seriously injured 59, many of whom were children;

Whereas British officials are continuing to investigate the bombing to determine whether it was perpetrated by a lone individual or by a terrorist network;

Whereas, on May 23, 2017, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) claimed responsibility for the attacks and threatened further attacks;

Whereas on June 3, 2017, three terrorists drove a van into pedestrians on London Bridge before committing multiple stabbing attacks against innocent bystanders in the Borough Market area of London;

Whereas British police quickly arrived at the scene and successfully ended the terrorist attack;

Whereas at least seven people were killed, and more than 48 wounded in the terrorist attack;

Whereas British police continue to investigate the incident to ensure that all involved in planning or supporting the attack are brought to justice;

Whereas the horrific attacks at the Manchester Arena and in London are the latest in a series of deadly assaults by ISIS in Europe in recent years;

Whereas British first responders reacted swiftly and heroically to both attacks, taking immediate measures to secure the areas and care for the wounded in ways that prevented further loss of life;

Whereas Prime Minister Theresa May stated on May 23, 2017, that “all acts of terrorism are cowardly attacks on innocent people but this attack stands out for its appalling, sickening cowardice, deliberately targeting innocent, defenseless children and young people” and paid tribute to “the spirit of Manchester and the spirit of Britain, a spirit that through years of conflict and terrorism has never been broken and will never be broken.”;

Whereas President Donald Trump condemned those who perpetrated the attacks and offered any and all assistance to the United Kingdom as it investigates these attacks and works to bring the terrorists to justice; and

Whereas the United Kingdom has been a steadfast ally to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the recent terrorist attacks in Manchester, United Kingdom, on May 22, 2017, and in London, United Kingdom, on June 3, 2017, and extends its deepest sympathies to all those affected by these tragedies;

(2) reaffirms the American commitment to the special relationship with the United Kingdom, and supports the efforts of the British Government to bring all those involved with these heinous attacks to justice;

(3) appreciates the significant efforts by the United Kingdom to combat terrorism;

(4) recognizes the persistent and growing threat posed by Islamist terrorist groups worldwide, and reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the multilateral, global fight against such violent extremists; and

(5) remains committed to the defense of universal democratic values.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Congressman GREGORY MEEKS, the ranking member of the Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats Subcommittee; and Congressman PAUL COOK, the vice chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I recognize them for their work on this timely and important resolution.

On May 22, as the world knows, in a cowardly act of terrorism, a suicide bomber attacked those exiting a concert at the Manchester Arena in England. These were principally teenagers and children who were attending that concert, in some cases, parents. What many had planned to be a night of joy, a festival, a chance for them to gather to celebrate turned with one horrifying blast into a nightmare of chaos and devastation, and 23 innocent people were killed, 166 were severely injured, and many of those victims were children.

This past week, in another cowardly attack, terrorists struck unsuspecting and unarmed pedestrians on London Bridge, and then those terrorists went on an attack against innocent bystanders in London's Borough Market area, slashing and killing, and thus far, at least 7 victims have died and 48 have been seriously wounded. We grieve their loss and send our prayers and condolences to their families.

We also commend the brave and selfless actions of British first responders who, in the wake of both attacks, moved to quickly secure the areas, aid the wounded, and prevent further loss of life.

Our deranged enemies, it is clear, are intent on striking us wherever and whenever possible, often choosing to prey upon the most vulnerable, the most innocent in our society, preying, in this case, on children and teenagers. We must be even more determined in our resolve to stop them and we must continue to build upon our own capabilities, strengthening our cooperation with our friends and allies like the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, the United Kingdom has been a staunch friend and ally, unparalleled in its support for the United States, including as a partner in our counterterrorism efforts. At this sad time, we stand solidly beside our friends and allies as they mourn, heal, and most assuredly rise again following

this tragedy. Passage of this resolution is just one way that we can demonstrate this support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in unanimously supporting this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for H. Res. 355. This resolution was submitted by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK). It is a strong message condemning in the strongest terms the most recent terrorist attacks in Manchester and London. We worked quickly in the committee to pass this resolution in a bipartisan way. I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL again for their bipartisan efforts.

□ 1730

I would like to lend my voice of condolence to the families and friends of those who were killed and injured. I pray that the Manchester and London communities remain resilient and continue their beautiful human display of kindness in the depths of such tragedy.

I read numerous human stories about neighbors, faith leaders, and local businessmen and -women coming together to aid their fellow citizens with open arms and compassionate hearts. The people of Manchester, London, and the U.K. in general show the rest of the world how to persevere in the face of terror.

Finally, let us remember that the attacks are directed at our open societies that we have built over many generations. Let us remember that our response will set the tone for not only the security of the present day but also the faith in such open societies and the unbreakable bonds of community for years to come.

We will continue to work in the Foreign Affairs Committee to bring about justice and encourage peace. The United States admires the Manchester and London response of stoicism, openheartedness, and solidarity.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), chairman of the British-American Parliamentary Group and co-chairman of the Congressional United Kingdom Caucus, and he also has strong family ties in Britain.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE for yielding me time, and I rise in strong support of this resolution condemning the terror attacks in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, the senseless acts of terror that took place in Manchester and London are stark reminders of the threat our allies and our Nation face

together. These horrific attacks require strong and coordinated response to not only bring the perpetrators and their enablers to justice but also to combat global terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, Congress stands ready to support our colleagues in Parliament with any assistance necessary. The special relationship that bonds our two nations and peoples is unlike any other relationship that we enjoy.

I am reminded of the events 73 years ago today when the United States stood with Great Britain to execute the largest amphibious landing ever assembled in order to liberate Europe. Our task in fighting terrorism is no less daunting.

I appreciate the efforts here today by the House to condemn these acts of terror and reaffirm our unwavering support for the special relationship that we enjoy with the United Kingdom.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, the British people are well known for their stiff upper lip, their resolve, and resilience. We have seen all these traits on display in the recent days in the proud European cities of Manchester and London as the dead are mourned, the injured are nursed to health, and the guilty are pursued.

Life must and will go on, and the United Kingdom will remain the beacon of freedom, tolerance, and justice. I am glad we took this time today to send this strong message of solidarity to the people of the U.K. Through the years, they have long stood by us, and we are proud of their friendship. We call them our friends. I support this measure and trust the House will do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), chairman of the Foreign Affairs' Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and for his work on this very important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, last month, as fans streamed out of a concert in Manchester, they were met by the worst kind of despicable treachery. A terrorist lay in wait with his time bomb to inflict maximum damage on people, killing as many as he could and creating fear among survivors. Twenty-two innocent people were slaughtered, including many children.

The attack claimed by ISIS thugs was, unfortunately, not the last to hit the United Kingdom. Over the weekend, terrorists attacked innocent civilians in London, killing 7 and wounding at least 48 others.

Free countries cannot and must not tolerate these attacks and must not ever accept these attacks as the norm. We must defeat the cancer of Islamic terrorism and the perverted thinking that inspires it.

I strongly support this resolution which condemns the attack in Manchester and expresses our support to the people of the United Kingdom. We will and must continue to stand together with the United Kingdom for many reasons, but the main reason being the bond of freedom that we have shared for so many years. We must stand together to combat and defeat those who seek to attack freedom and liberty and destroy our way of life. They must not win.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my sincere condolences to the victims of the attacks in the United Kingdom and their families. This evil cannot be allowed to continue without a bold response.

Mr. Speaker, justice demands that we track down these terrorists and hold them accountable for their evil deeds whenever and wherever they attack. Justice must be served because, Mr. Speaker, justice is what free people demand.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, following the killing in London this past weekend, British Prime Minister May compared the attacks in Manchester and those in the capital, and she said: "... while the recent attacks are not connected by common networks, they are connected in one important sense. They are bound together by the single evil ideology of Islamist extremism that preaches hatred, sows division, and promotes sectarianism."

"Defeating this ideology is one of the great challenges of our time. . . ."

Those were the Prime Minister's words.

We are committed to standing with our British friends and allies in this important fight. This resolution signals our resolve to deepen our collaboration with our friends and allies in the United Kingdom to counter terrorism and to counter radicalization.

Mr. Speaker, I, therefore, urge my colleagues to join me in unanimous support of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 355, which expresses the condolences of the United States to the twenty-two innocent victims who lost their lives and the fifty-nine individuals who were seriously injured in the barbaric attack perpetrated by a terrorist in Manchester, United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution's condemnation of this terrorist attack for the depraved, cowardly act that it is.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the families and loved ones of the victims.

Moreover, our heartfelt appreciation goes out to the first responders and others who selflessly came to the aid of those affected by this act.

Manchester will emerge from the attack more vibrant and united than ever before with the same resiliency that has enabled it to grow and evolve from the "birthplace of the Industrial Revolution" to the modern, progressive, and welcoming metropolis that it is today.

As Manchester recovers and responds, I hope that Mancunians and Britons as a whole will take comfort in the knowledge that the people of the United States stand in solidarity with them.

This attack is a reminder of the common danger that democratic, peace-loving nations of the world face from those who reject the norms of civilized society and abuse the liberties and freedoms afforded them by free societies.

This terrorist attack in Manchester was a horrific act on innocent civilians perpetrated by a depraved individual who had the support of those who misuse the peaceful religion of Islam for their own misguided purposes.

Those who claim responsibility for this crime against humanity should make no mistake; they will be held accountable for their actions.

Today, however, our thoughts and prayers are with the people of Manchester, a city that represents everything terrorists despise—that is, a place that welcomes people from all walks of life to live together in harmony.

That symbol is recognizable to Americans, because we are a society formed by diverse individuals intertwined to create a mosaic that is altogether lovely, strong, and unique.

Given our special relationship with the United Kingdom, the people of the United States of America offer our unwavering support to the people of Manchester and of the United Kingdom.

Today, I ask a moment of silence for the victims killed and injured in the terrorist attack in Manchester.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 355, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1829

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- H. Res. 354, by the yeas and nays; and
- H. Res. 355, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

CONDEMNING VIOLENCE AGAINST PEACEFUL PROTESTERS OUT- SIDE THE TURKISH AMBAS- SADOR'S RESIDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 354) condemning the violence against peaceful protesters outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence on May 16, 2017, and calling for the perpetrators to be brought to justice and measures to be taken to prevent similar incidents in the future, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 0, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

YEAS—397

Abraham	Brady (TX)	Cleaver
Adams	Brat	Coffman
Aguilar	Bridenstine	Cohen
Allen	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Amash	Brown (MD)	Collins (GA)
Amodel	Brownley (CA)	Collins (NY)
Arrington	Buck	Comer
Babin	Bucshon	Comstock
Bacon	Budd	Conaway
Banks (IN)	Burgess	Connolly
Barr	Bustos	Conyers
Barragán	Butterfield	Cook
Barton	Byrne	Cooper
Beatty	Calvert	Correa
Bera	Capuano	Costa
Bergman	Carbajal	Costello (PA)
Beyer	Cárdenas	Courtney
Biggs	Carson (IN)	Cramer
Bilirakis	Carter (GA)	Crawford
Bishop (GA)	Carter (TX)	Crist
Bishop (MI)	Cartwright	Crowley
Bishop (UT)	Castor (FL)	Cuellar
Black	Castro (TX)	Culberson
Blackburn	Chabot	Curbelo (FL)
Blum	Chaffetz	Davidson
Blunt Rochester	Cheney	Davis (CA)
Bonamici	Chu, Judy	Davis, Danny
Bost	Cicilline	Davis, Rodney
Boyle, Brendan	Clark (MA)	DeFazio
F.	Clarke (NY)	DeGette
Brady (PA)	Clay	Delaney

DeLauro	Katko	Peters
DelBene	Keating	Peterson
Demings	Kelly (IL)	Pingree
Denham	Kelly (MS)	Pittenger
Dent	Kelly (PA)	Pocan
DeSantis	Kennedy	Poe (TX)
DeSaulnier	Khanna	Poliquin
DesJarlais	Kildee	Polis
Deutch	Kilmer	Posey
Diaz-Balart	Kind	Price (NC)
Dingell	King (IA)	Quigley
Doggett	King (NY)	Raskin
Donovan	Kinziger	Reed
Doyle, Michael	Knight	Reichert
F.	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
Duffy	Kuster (NH)	Rice (SC)
Duncan (SC)	Kustoff (TN)	Richmond
Duncan (TN)	Labrador	Roby
Dunn	LaHood	Roe (TN)
Emmer	LaMalfa	Rogers (AL)
Eshoo	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)
Espallat	Lance	Rokita
Estes (KS)	Langevin	Rooney, Thomas
Espallat	Latta	J.
Evans	Lawrence	Ros-Lehtinen
Farenthold	Lawson (FL)	Rosen
Faso	Lee	Roskam
Ferguson	Levin	Rothfus
Fitzpatrick	Lewis (MN)	Rouzer
Fleischmann	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Flores	LoBiondo	Royce (CA)
Fortenberry	Loeb sack	Ruiz
Foster	Lofgren	Ruppersberger
Fox	Long	Russell
Frankel (FL)	Loudermilk	Rutherford
Franks (AZ)	Love	Ryan (OH)
Frelinghuysen	Lowenthal	Sánchez
Fudge	Lowe	Sanford
Gabbard	Lucas	Sarbanes
Gaetz	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
Gallagher	Lujan Grisham,	Schakowsky
Gallego	M.	Schiff
Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray	Schneider
Garrett	Lynch	Schrader
Gibbs	MacArthur	Schweikert
Gohmert	Maloney,	Scott (VA)
Gonzalez (TX)	Carolyn B.	Scott, Austin
Goodlatte	Maloney, Sean	Scott, David
Gosar	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Gottheimer	Marshall	Serrano
Gowdy	Massie	Sessions
Granger	Mast	Sewell (AL)
Graves (GA)	Matsui	Shea-Porter
Graves (LA)	McCarthy	Sherman
Graves (MO)	McCaul	Shimkus
Green, Al	McClintock	Shuster
Green, Gene	McCollum	Simpson
Griffith	McEchin	Sinema
Grijalva	McGovern	Sires
Grothman	McHenry	Slaughter
Guthrie	McKinley	Smith (MO)
Hanabusa	McMorris	Smith (NE)
Harper	Rodgers	Smith (NJ)
Harris	McNerney	Smith (TX)
Hartzel	McSally	Smith (WA)
Hastings	Meadows	Smucker
Heck	Meehan	Soto
Hensarling	Meng	Stefanik
Herrera Beutler	Messer	Stewart
Hice, Jody B.	Mitchell	Stivers
Higgins (LA)	Moolenaar	Suozi
Hill	Mooney (WV)	Swalwell (CA)
Himes	Moulton	Takano
Holding	Mullin	Taylor
Hollingsworth	Murphy (FL)	Tenney
Hoyer	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (CA)
Hudson	Nader	Thompson (MS)
Huffman	Neal	Thompson (PA)
Huizenga	Newhouse	Thornberry
Hultgren	Noem	Tiberi
Hunter	Nolan	Tipton
Hurd	Norcross	Titus
Issa	Nunes	Tonko
Jackson Lee	O'Halleran	Torres
Jayapal	O'Rourke	Trott
Jeffries	Olson	Tsongas
Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo	Turner
Jenkins (WV)	Palmer	Upton
Johnson (GA)	Panetta	Valadao
Johnson (LA)	Pascarell	Vargas
Johnson (OH)	Paulsen	Veasey
Johnson, E. B.	Payne	Vela
Jones	Pearce	Velázquez
Jordan	Pelosi	Visclosky
Joyce (OH)	Perlmutter	Wagner
Kaptur	Perry	Walberg

Walden	Weber (TX)	Womack
Walker	Welch	Woodall
Walorski	Wenstrup	Yarmuth
Walters, Mimi	Westerman	Yoder
Walz	Williams	Yoho
Wasserman	Wilson (FL)	Young (AK)
Schultz	Wilson (SC)	Young (IA)
Watson Coleman	Wittman	

NOT VOTING—33

Aderholt	Higgins (NY)	Pallone
Barletta	Johnson, Sam	Ratcliffe
Bass	Kihuen	Renacci
Blumenauer	Larsen (WA)	Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL)	Larson (CT)	Rooney, Francis
Buchanan	Lewis (GA)	Ross
Clyburn	Lieu, Ted	Rush
Cummings	Marino	Speier
Ellison	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Engel	Moore	Webster (FL)
Gutiérrez	Napolitano	Zeldin

□ 1855

Mr. RYAN of Ohio changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING TERRORIST AT- TACKS IN MANCHESTER, UNITED KINGDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 355) condemning in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Manchester, United Kingdom, on May 22, 2017, expressing heartfelt condolences, and reaffirming unwavering support for the special relationship between our peoples and nations in the wake of these attacks, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 0, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

YEAS—397

Abraham	Bishop (GA)	Budd
Adams	Bishop (MI)	Burgess
Aguilar	Bishop (UT)	Bustos
Allen	Black	Butterfield
Amash	Blackburn	Byrne
Amodel	Blum	Calvert
Arrington	Blunt Rochester	Capuano
Babin	Bonamici	Carbajal
Bacon	Bost	Cárdenas
Banks (IN)	Boyle, Brendan	Carson (IN)
Barr	F.	Carter (GA)
Barragán	Brady (PA)	Carter (TX)
Barton	Brady (TX)	Cartwright
Bass	Brat	Castor (FL)
Beatty	Bridenstine	Castro (TX)
Bera	Brooks (IN)	Chabot
Bergman	Brown (MD)	Chaffetz
Beyer	Brownley (CA)	Cheney
Biggs	Buck	Chu, Judy
Bilirakis	Bucshon	Cicilline

Clark (MA)	Harris	McMorris	Smith (NE)	Titus	Walz
Clarke (NY)	Hartzler	Rodgers	Smith (NJ)	Tonko	Wasserman
Clay	Hastings	McNerney	Smith (TX)	Torres	Schultz
Cleaver	Heck	McSally	Smith (WA)	Trott	Watson Coleman
Coffman	Herrera Beutler	Meadows	Smucker	Tsongas	Weber (TX)
Cohen	Hice, Jody B.	Meehan	Soto	Turner	Welch
Cole	Higgins (LA)	Meng	Stefanik	Upton	Wenstrup
Collins (GA)	Hill	Messer	Stewart	Valadao	Westerman
Collins (NY)	Himes	Mitchell	Stivers	Vargas	Williams
Comer	Holding	Moolenaar	Suoizzi	Veasey	Wilson (FL)
Comstock	Hollingsworth	Mooney (WV)	Swalwell (CA)	Vela	Wilson (SC)
Conaway	Hoyer	Moulton	Takano	Velázquez	Wittman
Connolly	Hudson	Mullin	Taylor	Visclosky	Womack
Conyers	Huffman	Murphy (FL)	Tenney	Wagner	Woodall
Cook	Huizenga	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (CA)	Walberg	Yarmuth
Cooper	Hultgren	Nadler	Thompson (MS)	Walden	Yoder
Correa	Hunter	Neal	Thompson (PA)	Walker	Yoho
Costa	Hurd	Newhouse	Tiberi	Walorski	Young (AK)
Costello (PA)	Issa	Noem	Tipton	Walters, Mimi	Young (IA)
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Nolan			
Cramer	Jayapal	Norcross			
Crawford	Jeffries	Nunes	Aderholt	Higgins (NY)	Ratcliffe
Crist	Jenkins (KS)	O'Halleran	Barletta	Johnson, Sam	Renacci
Crowley	Jenkins (WV)	O'Rourke	Blumenauer	Kihuen	Rohrabacher
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Olson	Brooks (AL)	Larsen (WA)	Rooney, Francis
Culberson	Johnson (LA)	Palazzo	Buchanan	Lewis (GA)	Ross
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Pallone	Clyburn	Lieu, Ted	Rush
Davidson	Johnson, E. B.	Palmer	Cummings	Marino	Speier
Davis (CA)	Jones	Panetta	Davis, Rodney	Meeks	Thornberry
Davis, Danny	Jordan	Pascarell	Ellison	Moore	Waters, Maxine
DeFazio	Joyce (OH)	Paulsen	Engel	Napolitano	Webster (FL)
DeGette	Kaptur	Payne	Gutiérrez	Poe (TX)	Zeldin
Delaney	Katko	Pearce			
DeLauro	Keating	Pelosi			
DelBene	Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter			
Demings	Kelly (MS)	Perry			
Denham	Kelly (PA)	Peters			
Dent	Kennedy	Peterson			
DeSantis	Khanna	Pingree			
DeSaulnier	Kildee	Pittenger			
DesJarlais	Kilmer	Pocan			
Deutch	Kind	Poliquin			
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Polis			
Dingell	King (NY)	Posey			
Doggett	Kinziger	Price (NC)			
Donovan	Knight	Quigley			
Doyle, Michael F.	Krishnamoorthi	Raskin			
Duffy	Kuster (NH)	Reed			
Duncan (SC)	Kustoff (TN)	Reichert			
Duncan (TN)	Labrador	Rice (NY)			
Dunn	LaHood	Rice (SC)			
Emmer	LaMalfa	Richmond			
Eshoo	Lamborn	Roby			
Espallat	Lance	Roe (TN)			
Estes (KS)	Langevin	Rogers (AL)			
Esty (CT)	Larson (CT)	Rogers (KY)			
Evans	Latta	Rokita			
Farenthold	Lawrence	Rooney, Thomas J.			
Faso	Lawson (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen			
Ferguson	Lee	Rosen			
Fitzpatrick	Levin	Roskam			
Fleischmann	Lewis (MN)	Rothfus			
Flores	Lipinski	Rouzer			
Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard			
Foster	Loeb	Royce (CA)			
Fox	Lofgren	Ruiz			
Frankel (FL)	Long	Ruppersberger			
Franks (AZ)	Loudermilk	Russell			
Frelinghuysen	Love	Rutherford			
Fudge	Lowenthal	Ryan (OH)			
Gabbard	Lowey	Sánchez			
Gaetz	Lucas	Sanford			
Gallagher	Luetkemeyer	Sarbanes			
Galleo	Lujan Grisham, M.	Scalise			
Garamendi	Lujan, Ben Ray	Schakowsky			
Garrett	MacArthur	Schiff			
Gibbs	Maloney	Schneider			
Gohmert	Maloney, Sean	Schrad			
Gonzalez (TX)	Marchant	Schweikert			
Goodlatte	Marshall	Scott (VA)			
Gosar	Massie	Scott, Austin			
Gotthelmer	Mast	Scott, David			
Gowdy	Matsui	Sensenbrenner			
Granger	McCarthy	Serrano			
Graves (GA)	McCaul	Sessions			
Graves (LA)	McClintock	Sewell (AL)			
Graves (MO)	McCollum	Shea-Porter			
Green, Al	McEachin	Sherman			
Green, Gene	McGovern	Shimkus			
Griffith	McHenry	Shuster			
Grijalva	McKinley	Simpson			
Grothman		Sinema			
Guthrie		Sires			
Hanabusa		Slaughter			
Harper		Smith (MO)			

NOT VOTING—33

□ 1902

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Condemning in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Manchester, United Kingdom, on May 22, 2017, and in London, United Kingdom, on June 3, 2017, expressing heartfelt condolences, and reaffirming unwavering support for the special relationship between our peoples and nations in the wake of these attacks."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 286 and No. 287 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H. Res. 354—Condemning the violence against peaceful protesters outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence on May 16, 2017, and calling for the perpetrators to be brought to justice and measures to be taken to prevent similar incidents in the future, as amended. I would have also voted "yea" on H. Res. 355—Condemning in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Manchester, United Kingdom, on May 22, 2017, expressing heartfelt condolences, and reaffirming unwavering support for the special relationship between our peoples and nations in the wake of these attacks, as amended.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote on H. Res. 354, a resolution "Condemning the violence against peaceful protesters outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence on May 16, 2017, and calling for the perpetrators to be brought to justice and measures to be taken to prevent similar incidents in the future" (Rollcall Vote No. 286), I would have voted "aye."

I would have also voted "aye" on H. Res. 355, a resolution "Condemning in the strong-

est terms the terrorist attacks in Manchester, United Kingdom, on May 22, 2017, expressing heartfelt condolences, and reaffirming unwavering support for the special relationship between our peoples and nations in the wake of these attacks" (Rollcall Vote No. 287).

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 60

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 60.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE DEBBIE'S DREAM FOUNDATION

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight the Debbie's Dream Foundation, an organization in south Florida that seeks to make the cure for stomach cancer a reality while also supporting patients, families, and caregivers who are impacted by this disease.

According to the NIH, Mr. Speaker, there are nearly 100,000 people living with stomach cancer in our great Nation, but despite these alarming numbers, Americans diagnosed with stomach cancer face a challenging battle, as it is difficult to find reliable information, good treatments, and valuable resources. Here is where Debbie's Dream Foundation steps in.

Debbie's Dream Foundation works with local communities, businesses, government agencies, and the scientific community to raise awareness about stomach cancer and promote research and cutting-edge treatment to improve the lives of those afflicted with this cancer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Debbie Zelman, the founder of this great organization, who is also undergoing treatment for this disease, for turning this tragedy into a positive change for others suffering from stomach cancer.

I also want to thank very much Debbie's wonderful parents and all of the advocates for their lifesaving efforts and unwavering commitment to defeat stomach cancer once and for all.

LEAVING PARIS AGREEMENT DAMAGING TO ENVIRONMENT

(Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, abandoning the commitments we made in the Paris climate accord is a

massive self-inflicted wound to our environment, our global influence, and our economy. The damage caused to our economy and environment by leaving the Paris Agreement is undeniable, but it was also completely foreseeable. That is why the first piece of legislation I wrote as a member of Congress called for our country to keep the pledges we made in this agreement, the promises we made to the world, and to ourselves.

Through his decision, the President is ceding American leadership in the green economy to China, and kneecapping the global effort to counter the effects of climate change. While the President has made his choice, the rest of us can make ours.

We must continue to resist global climate change by expanding our commitments to green technology and sustainable practices. If we do so, we will not only address the challenges of our time, but also embrace its opportunities.

RECOGNIZING ESTHER BEGAM

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Esther Begam, a Holocaust survivor who recently received her high school diploma from Wayzata High School at the age of 88.

In 1942, Nazis invaded Poland and forced 11-year-old Esther and her family into a labor camp. Esther tragically lost her mother and her brother in Auschwitz, as well as her older sister in another labor camp.

After the war, she married another survivor and moved to Minnesota to start a family. In 2010, she was invited to share her story with the Wayzata High School history class, where she was asked what her biggest regret was, and Esther said she wished she had received her high school diploma.

So after hearing her story, the school was able to arrange a graduation ceremony. Last month, Esther was presented with a diploma in front of her children, her grandchildren, and her great-grandchildren, receiving a standing ovation that was 71 years overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Esther Begam on her accomplishment after overcoming an incredibly difficult life challenge. She is truly an inspiration.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LONNY KAPLAN

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, New Jersey's 12th Congressional District lost a man of great strength and valor. We lost a husband, a father, an activist. For many others, we lost a great friend.

Lonny Kaplan and I met in the 1970s and long maintained a friendship of love and mutual respect. He is not only a statesman, but a hero. His commitment to political activism, especially towards pro-Israel causes, made him instrumental in strengthening the relationship between the United States and Israel.

Lonny was a respected leader in the Jewish community both here in the state and nationally, and will long be revered by those who had the honor to know him. The loss we feel as a congressional district and as a nation is deep, but I know that Lonny will never be forgotten by the countless lives that he touched.

ALZHEIMER'S AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, June is National Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month, and as a member of the bipartisan Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease, I am working to address this debilitating disease, its impact on everyday Americans, and its effect on our healthcare system for years to come.

Alzheimer's is the most common form of dementia, and it remains the sixth leading cause of death in the United States, afflicting 5 million Americans, a number which could rise to 16 million by the year 2050.

While there are drugs to mitigate the effects of Alzheimer's, these medications only help those in the early-to-moderate stages of the illness, which worsens over time. Right now there is no cure.

I am committed to funding groundbreaking Alzheimer's research and serving all Americans afflicted and their families suffering from the devastating effects of this disease. The time to act is now.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2213, ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Ms. CHENEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-162) on the resolution (H. Res. 374) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, FINANCIAL CHOICE ACT OF 2017

Ms. CHENEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 115-163) on the resolution (H. Res. 375) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to create hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THANK YOU, MR. JONES

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, there are people in a person's life that have a lasting influence, educators who help shape the person that you become. Ron Jones of Port Angeles, Washington, was one of those people for me and for hundreds of others.

For the last 42 years, Mr. Jones has been an outstanding music teacher who, for generations of students, was a difference maker in a way that would make Mr. Holland and his opus jealous. On multiple occasions he brought musicians to perform in Carnegie Hall and other places all around, and in doing so, he didn't just enhance a student's musical skills, he broadened the horizons of young people. I know he did that for me. He made you want to be better. He made you want to try harder. He made you want to perform well enough to get that genuine Ron Jones smile.

Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Jones prepares for his retirement, it is my honor to recognize him here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, to wish him well, and, on behalf of many grateful students, to simply say: Thank you, Mr. Jones.

□1915

HIT THE BEACHES, JUNE 6, 1944, D-DAY

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at dawn, in the hard cold rain of the choppy English Channel, thousands of men—boys, really—aboard landing craft assaulted the beaches in a place called Normandy, France. They were under brutal enemy gunfire and artillery shelling. That was the morning of June 6, 1944: D-Day.

Their buddies, the paratroopers, had earlier, before dawn, landed in France and met the same stiff resistance by the enemy. The Allies were determined to free Europe from the Nazis; and after the gunfire ceased and the smoke

cleared, the successful assault that day was costly.

At the top of the cliffs of Normandy, among the white crosses and glistening Stars of David, is the national cemetery of America's war dead. There are 9,387 Americans buried there. The average age is 24. They were the initial casualties of the invasion of Europe. More Americans would later die in the great World War II.

Today, we remember those who fought on June 6 and other Americans, like my 91-year-old dad, who went to liberate France and not to conquer it. These warriors are the charter members of the Greatest Generation.

And that is just the way it is.

OUR WORD IS OUR BOND

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, our word is our bond.

The United States, when it engages internationally with our allies and friends, and even our enemies, our word is our bond.

The meetings that the administration had recently in Saudi Arabia, I am sure there were some positive results, but there is no positive result to the disruption that is now occurring between Mideast countries and Qatar.

Qatar has some of our military assets that are enormously important. Rumor has it that the administration may be thinking of a regime change. Yes, we have had our concerns with Qatar. We have been concerned about human rights or concerned about various positions with Al Jazeera, but we have worked with them, and we have realized that the emir, over the years, has worked with us in an honest and decent way and treated their people in a manner of decency.

I hope this is straightened out. They can't be starved. We cannot continue to encourage or be part of any disruption in that region. We need them to collaborate against terrorism. We do not need one being fought by others.

I would ask that the administration straighten this out, working with those of us who are concerned about our friends in Qatar, and to recognize that there is no specializing and isolating and picking friends. We have to work with all of them in that region to fight against the terror in Iran.

I would offer, again, my acknowledgment of D-Day and thank those who sacrificed their lives. God bless them.

REMEMBERING D-DAY

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of the 73rd

anniversary of D-Day as well as to recognize the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Midway. These two conflicts were critical in changing the course of World War II.

Seventy-three years ago today, the eyes of the world watched as Allied forces, under the leadership of General Dwight Eisenhower, stormed the beaches of Normandy. For 4 years, Europe was enslaved in tyranny by the Nazis. To liberate the people of Europe, these brave men parachuted into pitch-black fields and vaulted towering cliffs, all while undertaking heavy enemy fire.

Two years prior to the D-Day landings and 6 months after the attack on Pearl Harbor, the U.S. emerged victorious in one of the most significant and decisive battles in naval history, known as the Battle of Midway. The U.S., under the command of Admiral Nimitz, was able to ambush and destroy four Japanese aircraft carriers. Thanks to the heroic bomber pilots and crews of the U.S. Navy, this battle changed the tide in the Pacific theater.

The United States and the world are eternally grateful for the heroism and sacrifices that our servicemen and -women displayed over 70 years ago today in an uncertain war.

RECOGNIZING LIONS CLUBS INTERNATIONAL ON IT'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International, the largest service club organization in the world. With more than 46,000 clubs and 1.4 million members, including 31 clubs and over 1,100 members in my home State of Rhode Island, Lions Club members are transforming lives through dedicated service to communities across the country and around the world.

Since 1917, Lions Club members have dedicated themselves to living up to founder Melvin Jones' inspiring words: "You can't get very far until you start doing something for somebody else."

In Rhode Island, Lions Club members have transformed the lives of visually impaired and blind Rhode Islanders by hosting Camp Mauchatea for children and working to expand access to high-quality, affordable vision care. The incredible support of Rhode Island Lions for the Ronald McDonald House has unquestionably saved lives, and their efforts to raise awareness of the need for foster parents, offer scholarships, and so much more have made a real difference.

So on behalf of the people of Rhode Island, it is my privilege to honor Lions Clubs International for their century of service.

D-DAY

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, on this day, June 6, 1944, 73 years ago, the largest amphibious assault in history landed on the beaches of Normandy, known as Operation Overlord, which we know more commonly as D-Day.

I rise today, 73 years later, to honor the thousands of Allied soldiers who lost their lives on the beaches of Omaha, Utah, Gold, Juno, and Sword, and those, as well, that lived to carry the battle, ultimately, to Berlin and win.

General Eisenhower told his soldiers that "the hopes and prayers of liberty-loving people everywhere march with you." Today we commemorate the operation which began the liberation of Europe from Nazi control and paved the way for the eventual Allied victory in Europe—and for all of us to remain vigilant to preserve that same precious and fragile freedom.

As was said in the movie "Saving Private Ryan," for all of us, "Earn this."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family emergency.

Mr. ROSS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of inclement weather.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of inclement weather.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. CUMMINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for May 24 through June 9.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and for the balance of the week.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 2, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 657. To amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain protections against prohibited personnel practices, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow,

Wednesday, June 7, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1487. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Michael T. Franken, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1488. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Ronald L. Bailey, U.S. Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1489. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing three officers to wear the insignia of the grade of major general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1490. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report presenting the specific amount of staff-years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense Federally Funded Research and Development Center during FY 2018, pursuant to Public Law 115-31, Div. C Sec. 8025(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1491. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Federal Home Loan Bank Membership for Non-Federally-Insured Credit Unions (RIN: 2590-AA85) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1492. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a Determination and Findings in support of a decision to utilize other than a full and open competition to retain specialized legal services for a proceeding at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 3304(a)(7); Public Law 111-350, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3748); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1493. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Administration's Annual Report on Drug Shortages for Calendar Year 2016, pursuant to Sec. 1002 of the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1494. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1495. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting two notifications of a federal vacancy and nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1496. A letter from the Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's Office of Inspector General Semi-annual Report to the Congress for the period ending March 31, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1497. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's Congressional Justification, Annual Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1498. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Aggregated Large Coastal Shark and Hammerhead Shark Management Groups Retention Limit Adjustment [Docket No.: 160620545-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-XF347) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1499. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Commercial Trip Limit Reduction for Spanish Mackerel [Docket No.: 101206604-1758-02] (RIN: 0648-XF179) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1500. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; 2017 Closure of the Northern Gulf of Maine Scallop Management Area [Docket No.: 151210999-6348-02] (RIN: 0648-XF312) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1501. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line or Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 150916863-6211-02] (RIN: 0648-XF204) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1502. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9570; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-185-AD; Amendment 39-18866; AD 2017-09-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

et No.: FAA-2016-9570; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-185-AD; Amendment 39-18866; AD 2017-09-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1503. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0165; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-02-AD; Amendment 39-18868; AD 2017-09-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1504. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9430; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-051-AD; Amendment 39-18874; AD 2017-09-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1505. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9303; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-093-AD; Amendment 39-18875; AD 2017-10-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1506. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9394; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-162-AD; Amendment 39-18872; AD 2017-09-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1507. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9434; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-136-AD; Amendment 39-18896; AD 2017-10-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1508. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9433; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-159-AD; Amendment 39-18901; AD 2017-11-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1509. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9439; Directorate Identifier

2016-NM-170-AD; Amendment 39-18870; AD 2017-09-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1510. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-7426; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-199-AD; Amendment 39-18900; AD 2017-11-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1511. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0450; Directorate Identifier 2017-CE-013-AD; Amendment 39-18883; AD 2017-10-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1512. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6436; Directorate Identifier 2015-SW-037-AD; Amendment 39-18869; AD 2017-09-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1513. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6651; Directorate Identifier 2016-SW-015-AD; Amendment 39-18867; AD 2017-09-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1514. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a legislative proposal that would (1) provide for the legitimate needs of law enforcement agencies in the United States to obtain electronic communications stored abroad that are relevant to U.S. criminal investigations; and (2) help resolve potential conflicting legal obligations that U.S. electronic communications service providers may face when required to disclose electronic data by foreign governments; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. CHENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 374. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-162). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUCK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 375. Resolution providing for con-

sideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to create hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-163). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2772. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for requirements relating to the reassignment of Department of Veterans Affairs senior executive employees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 2773. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to sell Pershing Hall; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 2774. A bill to establish a bug bounty pilot program within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Ms. FOXX, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 2775. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Ms. FOXX, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 2776. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. NORCROSS):

H.R. 2777. A bill to include information regarding VA home loans in the Informed Consumer Choice Disclosure required to be provided to a prospective FHA borrower who is a veteran, to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the provision of a certificate of eligibility for VA home loans during the pre-separation counseling for members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 2778. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a Smart Tech-

nology Traffic Signals Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 2779. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide through the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation (CMMI) for a Medicaid payment model demonstration project on Medicaid reimbursement for physicians' services in counties with a disproportionately high proportion of Medicaid enrollees; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself and Mr. BRAT):

H.R. 2780. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to create certain requirements for Federal agencies with a SBIR or STTR program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNN (for himself and Mr. PANNETTA):

H.R. 2781. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to certify the sufficient participation of small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans and small business concerns owned by veterans with service-connected disabilities in contracts under the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. BUCSHON):

H.R. 2782. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide students with disabilities and their families with access to critical information needed to select the right college and succeed once enrolled; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2783. A bill to amend titles 28 and 10, United States Code, to allow for certiorari review of certain cases denied relief or review by the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEGOS (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 2784. A bill to require the Attorney General to establish a "Good Neighbor" code of conduct for federally licensed firearms dealers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 2785. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay the reasonable costs of urgent care provided to certain veterans, to establish cost-sharing amounts for veterans receiving care at an emergency room of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 2786. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act with respect to the criteria and process to qualify as a qualifying conduit hydropower facility; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 2787. A bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a pilot program instituting a clinical observation program for

pre-med students preparing to attend medical school; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SOTO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 2788. A bill to expand access to health care services, including sexual, reproductive, and maternal health services, for immigrant women, men, and families by removing legal barriers to health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2789. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to reauthorize and improve the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. YODER, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 2790. A bill to phase out cosmetic animal testing and the sale of cosmetics tested on animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2791. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to treat infant formula as adulterated if its use-by date has passed; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2792. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain revisions to provisions limiting payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 2793. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide that the consumer transaction account deposits of an insured depository institution are not considered to be funds obtained by or through a deposit broker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.J. Res. 105. A joint resolution condemning the deadly attack on May 26, 2017, in Portland, Oregon, expressing deepest condolences to the families and friends of the victims, and supporting community efforts to overcome hatred, bigotry, and violence; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H. Res. 376. A resolution expressing support for designation of July 2, 2017, as the "National Day of Personal Reflection and Repentance"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

52. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 15, requesting Congress to adopt the National Park Service's recommendations as to the additional segments for inclusion in the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

53. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 10, rescinding all previous requests that the Congress of the United States call a convention of states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

54. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 17-019, urging the government of the United States of America to take action to preserve and enhance United States leadership in space, spur innovation, and ensure our continued national and economic security by increasing funding for space exploration and activities; which was referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

55. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 26, urging Congress and NASA to name the NASA IV & V Facility at Fairmont for West Virginia mathematician Katherine Coleman Johnson; which was referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. GABBARD introduced a bill (H.R. 2794) for the relief of Andres Magana Ortiz; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 2772.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 2773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 2774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 2775.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 2776.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 2777.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 2778.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 2779.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, United States Constitution.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 2780.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 2781.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 2782.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2783.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GALLEG0:

H.R. 2784.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

—Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 2785.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 2786.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2787.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 2788.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 2789.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 2790.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution—To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2791.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 2792.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2793.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes”)

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 2794.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 (Naturalization)

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (Foreign Commerce)

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 11–16 (Foreign Affairs)

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.J. Res. 105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 36: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 37: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 38: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 66: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 140: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 184: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 256: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 257: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 324: Mr. TONKO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 338: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 358: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 390: Mr. MESSER and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 398: Ms. TENNEY and Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 444: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 445: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 453: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 468: Mr. CRIST, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 480: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 490: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 525: Ms. DELAULO.

H.R. 564: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 632: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 635: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 664: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 671: Mr. VISLOSKEY.

H.R. 709: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 719: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 721: Mr. REED.

H.R. 723: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 747: Mr. COSTA, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 750: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BOST, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 754: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 757: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 781: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 785: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 788: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 801: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 807: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 816: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 820: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 826: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 830: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 849: Mr. DUNN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 850: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 873: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DENT, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. PALAZZO, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 878: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 911: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 916: Mr. ROSS, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 927: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 952: Ms. EVANS and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 959: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 960: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 997: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 1002: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1017: Mr. SIRES, Mr. YODER, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 1038: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 1057: Mr. BABIN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. HARPER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. BACON, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1058: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1090: Mr. TROTT and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1094: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1098: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1104: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 1116: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1141: Ms. BONAMICI.

- H.R. 1143: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1146: Ms. MOORE and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 1148: Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1156: Mr. VELA.
H.R. 1164: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 1171: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1187: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1200: Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 1212: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1225: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1231: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1235: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 1243: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1247: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1298: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1299: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1300: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 1307: Mr. McEACHIN.
H.R. 1310: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1316: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1317: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1334: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 1361: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1393: Mr. HECK, Mr. STEWART, Mr. HIMES, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1406: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1409: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. MAST, Mr. DENT, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1434: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 1439: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1441: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1454: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1456: Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 1457: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1478: Mr. McEACHIN and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1491: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1501: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1515: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1529: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 1539: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1542: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 1551: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 1556: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1563: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1599: Mr. FLORES and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1606: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 1615: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1626: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 1661: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 1676: Mr. TROTT and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1697: Mr. HOYER, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 1698: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 1730: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 1772: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 1776: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 1777: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 1785: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1815: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1820: Mr. DeFAZIO.
H.R. 1861: Mr. LANGEVIN and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1864: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1873: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 1876: Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 1877: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1881: Mr. BABIN and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1910: Mr. RATCLIFFE.
H.R. 1911: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. KIHUEN.
H.R. 1912: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1928: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BACON, Mr. DeFAZIO, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1953: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BACON, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1969: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1970: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 1988: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 1993: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2011: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 2023: Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 2044: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2056: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2059: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 2061: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 2077: Mr. DeFAZIO and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2091: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2101: Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 2106: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 2119: Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 2123: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2130: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HURD, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DUNN, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COLE, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DOGETT, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WALKER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. BARR, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2133: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. REED, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2148: Mr. ROSS and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 2149: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 2152: Mr. HUIZENGA and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 2173: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2215: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2224: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2228: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2230: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 2234: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2240: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2245: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2259: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2268: Mr. PETERS and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 2272: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2273: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 2276: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 2277: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2302: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2309: Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 2310: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2327: Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 2352: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2353: Mr. MESSER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. ESTES of Kansas.
H.R. 2358: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2359: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 2379: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2392: Ms. LEE and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2417: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. POCAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2422: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 2428: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2431: Mr. ARRINGTON and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 2435: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2440: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2451: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MENG, Mr. SABLON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. BEYER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. McEACHIN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. DeSAULNIER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr.

CLAY, Ms. LEE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 2455: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2456: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2465: Mr. TURNER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. JONES, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HECK, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2482: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. REED, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2484: Mrs. TORRES, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2491: Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2505: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 2514: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2519: Mr. SHIMKUS and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 2527: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2542: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 2544: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 2550: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2552: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 2556: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2578: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2585: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2589: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 2594: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 2601: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2618: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 2621: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COOK, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2622: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 2629: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 2633: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 2640: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SABLON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2645: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 2658: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 2660: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 2666: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 2669: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2675: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2678: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. WALZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LOEBSSACK, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 2679: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2683: Mr. POLIS and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2690: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 2706: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 2713: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2721: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 2723: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BUCK, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 2745: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2751: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 2752: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 2756: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.J. Res. 6: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. DUNN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.J. Res. 85: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. CULBERSON.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. KHANNA.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. TAKANO.

H. Con. Res. 51: Ms. TITUS.

H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. EVANS.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H. Res. 15: Mr. CRIST, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H. Res. 28: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H. Res. 30: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H. Res. 31: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H. Res. 85: Mr. LYNCH.

H. Res. 90: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H. Res. 161: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H. Res. 220: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H. Res. 252: Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 256: Mr. CLAY and Mr. KATKO.

H. Res. 274: Mr. KEATING, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. ESHOO.

H. Res. 279: Mr. ROYCE of California.

H. Res. 296: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H. Res. 317: Mr. CICILLINE.

H. Res. 321: Ms. LEE.

H. Res. 325: Mr. CICILLINE.

H. Res. 330: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, and Mr. GOSAR.

H. Res. 336: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. PEARCE.

H. Res. 344: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 349: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 351: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. McEACHIN, Mr. CRIST, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H. Res. 354: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. TROTT, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 355: Mr. BOST, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. MESSER.

H. Res. 361: Mr. COHEN.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative HENSARLING, or a designee, to H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act of 2017 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Ms. GRANGER.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ZHOUYI WANG

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Zhouyi Wang for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Zhouyi Wang is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Zhouyi Wang is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Zhouyi Wang for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING NEW CITIZENS

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and sincerity that I take this time to congratulate thirty individuals who will take their oaths of citizenship on Friday, June 9, 2017. This memorable occasion, presided over by Magistrate Judge John E. Martin, will be held at the United States Courthouse and Federal Building in Hammond, Indiana.

America is a country founded by immigrants. From its beginning, settlers have come from countries around the world to the United States in search of better lives for their families. Oath ceremonies are a shining example of what is so great about the United States of America—that people from all over the world can come together and unite as members of a free, democratic nation. These individuals realize that nowhere else in the world offers a better opportunity for success than here in America.

On June 9, 2017, the following people, representing many nations throughout the world, will take their oaths of citizenship in Hammond, Indiana: Fabian Alejandro Gonzalez Franco, Muralidhar Ganji, Qiang Xu, Gustavo Quijada Vega, Alan John McDonald, Marco Antonio Gonzalez Jimenez, Krysta Carmella Ma Abuyo Mapoy, Miao Cai, Blagica Bujaroska, Penina Kagwiria Imanene, Gaulo Amezcuca Luna, Marvin Antonio Sandoval, Do-

lores Eumelia Romero, Paula Phan Duong, Juan Diego Salgado, Hang Trung Dinh, Noe Joel Salazar, Ahmed Abed Kanaan, Vicar Serrano Valencia, Thales Felipe Neves Pontes, Mara Carolina Stibitz, Smruti Prabodhchandra Damania, Tatiana Carolina Zambrano Marin, Ishvarbhai Venabhai Patel, Pascual Lopez Rocha, Laura Ivonne Carmona Garcia, Liz Yessica Relinski, Yongtao Zhang, Maryrose Sachiko Moore, and Apollo Raj Velummylum.

Although each individual has sought to become a citizen of the United States for his or her own reasons, be it for education, occupation, or to offer their loved ones better lives, each is inspired by the fact that the United States of America is, as Abraham Lincoln described it, a country “. . . of the people, by the people, and for the people.” They realize that the United States is truly a free nation. By seeking American citizenship, they have made the decision that they want to live in a place where, as guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution, they can practice religion as they choose, speak their minds without fear of punishment, and assemble in peaceful protest should they choose to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating these individuals who will become citizens of the United States of America on June 9, 2017. They, too, are American citizens, and they, too, are guaranteed the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We, as a free and democratic nation, congratulate them and welcome them.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF
RALPH PONTILLO

HON. MIKE KELLY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize one of my constituents from Western Pennsylvania, Mr. Ralph Pontillo. Following nearly 30 years of service, Ralph recently retired as president of the Manufacturer & Business Association (MBA), a professional trade organization that represents more than 3,000 member companies in the tri-state region.

Ralph is a veteran of the United States Air Force and a native of Erie County, where he graduated from Strong Vincent High School and Gannon University, earning a baccalaureate degree in political science. Ralph joined the MBA in 1987 and served as manager of member services until he was named president on April 1, 1990. Ralph maintained his role as president for the following three decades, creating a legacy built on advocating for the business community.

Throughout his tenure, Ralph was instrumental in much of the MBA's success, includ-

ing the facility relocation to its present headquarters and the construction of the MBA's Conference Center. These two projects allowed the MBA to expand and offer additional programs and services, enabling the MBA to become one of the largest regional employer associations of its kind.

Ralph is credited with spearheading one of the MBA's most visible community outreach programs, the annual Roar on the Shore® charitable motorcycle rally. Roar on the Shore® is one of the fastest-growing charitable motorcycle rallies in the United States, attracting approximately 165,000 visitors to the Erie area annually, creating an economic boost of more than \$25 million. Over the past ten years, the rally has raised more than \$800,000 for local charities.

Ralph has actively participated in a number of local, state and national boards, voluntarily dedicating his time and effort in order to support various initiatives. Ralph is a member of the American Society of Association Executives and for more than 20 years has maintained the status of a Certified Association Executive, a professional designation that recognizes the highest level of achievement and excellence in the profession. Ralph's expertise has been an absolute asset to the various boards and organizations with which he has been involved.

Ralph is an admirable professional who has created a praiseworthy legacy built on advocacy and service. He took advantage of his role as President of the MBA, continuously striving for greatness in all that he did. Ralph has made lasting contributions and the Erie community will reap the benefits of his efforts long after his retirement. Ralph will be remembered as a catalyst for improvement and a longtime champion for the business community.

CANTERBURY COUGARS BASEBALL

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Canterbury School's men's baseball team for their second consecutive Class 3A State Championship. The Cougars clinched the Title following their tremendous 4–1 victory over Jacksonville University Christian at Hammond Stadium in their hometown of Fort Myers. This triumph came through their outstanding teamwork and ability to adapt during games. The Title caps off an excellent season where the team achieved an astounding record of 27 wins to just 5 losses.

I congratulate the Canterbury Cougars and Head Coach Frank Turco for an excellent season and this unforgettable win. I look forward

● This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

to seeing the accomplishments of these young men in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT
OF MR. DON MASCH AFTER
NEARLY 23 YEARS OF SERVICE
WITH ATK AND VISTA OUTDOOR,
INC.

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Mr. Don Masch after nearly 23 years of service with ATK and Vista Outdoor, Inc.

Don was born and raised in Waterbury, Connecticut and graduated from Sacred Heart High School in 1966. After high school, he attended the University of Connecticut and graduated in 1970 with a degree in Political Science.

As a Distinguished Military Graduate, he was commissioned a Second Lieutenant in the U.S. Army. Don served in a variety of command and staff positions in the United States and overseas, including assignments to Syria, Lebanon, Germany and Israel. He holds a Master of Arts in National Security Affairs from the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and is a graduate of the Defense Language Institute and Army Command and General Staff College. In the Pentagon, he served on the Army Staff and in the Secretary of the Army's Office of Legislative Liaison, retiring in 1993 as a Lieutenant Colonel.

Don Masch began his career in industry in February of 1993, initially with Short Brothers USA, joining ATK in 1994 as part of the corporation's government relations team. There he became a trusted lobbyist and advocate on a wide range of defense and aerospace policies and programs. He quickly earned a reputation as a reliable and effective spokesman in Washington, D.C., helping to establish ATK on Capitol Hill. His fact-based approach to issues and commitment to integrity made him indispensable to ATK and the people in Washington with whom he worked.

In addition to his role as head of Congressional Relations at ATK, Don served as the head of the Ethics Panel at the Association of Government Relations Professionals, President of the Washington, D.C. Chapter of the National Defense Industrial Association, and in other association positions. He also was a guest speaker at numerous seminars and panels, including NDIA and Georgetown Law School.

When ATK acquired Orbital Sciences in 2015, he played a key role in the transition of both the Orbital ATK and the newly formed Vista Outdoor Government Relations teams, becoming Vista's Vice President for Government and Industry Relations. As head of Vista's federal affairs, Don has proven to be an effective advocate on conservation, sportsmen's issues and 2nd Amendment rights. He is well respected for both his knowledge and his consummate professionalism, with a warm sense of humor and strong work ethic.

As Don and his wife Karen head off to future endeavors and more time with their sons

Don and Brian and five grandchildren, I congratulate him on his retirement and thank him for his diligent service to the country and to the defense and outdoor industries.

RECOGNIZING THE STATE CHAMPION
BOWLER ZACH BOBBETT

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishment of Zach Bobbett of the Union Springs/Port Byron Bowling Team, who was part of the Section IV team in the New York State Public High School Association on March 5, 2017. The Section IV team defeated the Section III team by 228 pins to secure the title.

Zach Bobbett scored the second highest score of the tournament with 1,341 pins over six games.

I am honored to recognize the hard work displayed by Zach Bobbett and the rest of the Section IV team, their families, the coaching staff, and teachers. This is a historic win for Central New York and I am confident that the positive experiences from the 2017 season will yield continued success in both athletics and academics.

TRINITY AVERITT

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Trinity Averitt for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Trinity Averitt is a student at Moore Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Trinity Averitt is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Trinity Averitt for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING FRED DOUGLAS
MASON, JR.

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend a great American who has devoted

more than five decades of his life to the continuing struggle of our nation's working families for greater opportunity, empowerment, and social justice.

On June 16, Fred Douglas Mason, Jr., who retired in April as President of the Maryland-District of Columbia AFL-CIO and its 384,000 members, will be honored at a dinner in his honor.

We would be remiss if we did not recognize the contributions and struggles of Fred Mason and all the other hard-working Americans who forge our steel, build our automobiles, care for our families in times of illness or injury, teach our children, and contribute their sweat and toil to enriching our lives in so many other ways.

Fred Mason's career, both on the assembly lines of Baltimore and as a union organizer and leader, exemplified the strong and resilient character of the Americans he served during the last 52 years.

Fred personally experienced the heartbreak that wreaked havoc on the economic and social order of our Greater Baltimore community—as Bethlehem Steel, General Motors, General Electric, Proctor and Gamble and other manufacturing corporations abandoned their Baltimore operations, leaving nearly 100,000 working families to reach deeply into their hearts, pull themselves together, and chart new courses for their lives.

Fred Mason also knew the empowering strength of education that provides needed skills and justifies a living wage, a health care plan and a secure retirement.

Throughout his career, he worked tirelessly to expand the job training and tuition assistance that has allowed so many of his brothers and sisters to build better lives.

From his earliest days as a student at Morgan State College (now University), Fred Mason also understood that an integrated America, both racially and socio-economically, is a stronger and more prosperous nation.

And although he will be laying down the gavel as President of the Maryland-DC AFL-CIO, I am confident that Fred Mason will carry on in the cause of universal civil and human rights.

I hold this conviction because, like Fred Mason, I, too, am a son of labor and a civil rights worker.

And like Fred Mason, we all must understand that the civil rights movement of our own time is not limited to issues of race or gender or freedom of conscience—as critically important as those struggles remain.

The civil rights movement of our time, Mr. Speaker, is also about whether parents can afford to feed and house their children—and provide those children with the education and health care that they need and deserve.

The choice is ours.

Will America once again become a nation of opportunity for everyone willing to work hard?

Or will hard-working Americans continue to be squeezed past the breaking point by policies, enacted from afar, that devalue our people, our economy and the nation that we love?

Mr. Speaker, this is the message that Fred Mason has lived and taught to others for more than five decades—and the same message that has become central to the national debates of our own time.

It was at Morgan State College that Fred first came to understand that organization matters and is critical to progress in our country in the area of Civil Rights.

At Bethlehem Steel and on the assembly lines of General Motors, Fred Mason came to realize that working people can become empowered if they organize.

Now, in retirement, Fred also knows that the struggle to organize America must continue.

He knows that political democracy in America is irrevocably linked to the expanded economic and social democracy that has carried so many closer to the American Dream.

And above all, Fred Mason has taught us that our struggle for the American Dream continues despite the attacks of recent years.

I have faith that dedicated, strong Americans like Fred Mason will always be there on the front lines.

And for all of these contributions, we should thank Fred Mason and his wonderful wife, Jennifer, and wish them well.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF DESCENT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT ORTHODOX CHURCH

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I congratulate Descent of the Holy Spirit Orthodox Church, located in Schererville, Indiana, as its congregation and church leaders join together to celebrate the church's 100th Anniversary. Reverend Father Holowaty and Subdeacon Daniel Coffman will be commemorating this momentous occasion with a Hierarchical Divine Liturgy and celebration on June 25, 2017, as well as additional memorial events throughout the church's anniversary year.

Descent of the Holy Spirit was founded 100 years ago when a small group of families were looking for a place to practice the Orthodox faith. In 1917, the original church was built in East Chicago, Indiana, and it was in this location that parishioners worshipped as a community for the next eighty years. In 1997, the current church, located in Schererville, was constructed. It is here that the congregation continues to gather together in celebration, praise, and faith. Descent of the Holy Spirit is part of the American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese of the United States of America, led by His Grace, Right Reverend Bishop Gregory Tatsis, under the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, Patriarch Bartholomew.

Descent of the Holy Spirit Orthodox Church continues to touch the lives of its parishioners and countless individuals through its compassionate service. The congregation is a close-knit, family-centered community where all people are welcome.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my distinguished colleagues to join me in honoring and congratulating Descent of the Holy Spirit Orthodox Church in Schererville, Indiana, on the occasion of its 100th Anniversary. For their commitment to service and to their faith, the

church leaders and parishioners are worthy of the highest praise.

CONGRATULATIONS TO 3M IN SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate 3M on 50 years of innovation in Springfield, Missouri.

3M is a company filled with employees that have spent over 100 years in the United States inventing and working each day to make the lives of others easier. Southwest Missouri is fortunate enough to have a 3M plant in Springfield, Missouri.

The 3M plant in Springfield is a vital part of the community. This plant employs many people that go to work each day and impact the lives of those not just in the local community, but all around the world.

I am honored to recognize 3M in Springfield and its dedication to not only southwest Missouri, but the many communities throughout the world. On behalf of Missouri's 7th Congressional District, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in wishing 3M in Springfield and all of its employees the best.

HONORING BILLIE PAUL BAILEY

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a very special man, Mr. Billie Paul Bailey, of Bath County, Kentucky.

Mr. Bailey has always loved his country. He was honored to serve when drafted into the United States Army in 1952, during the Korean War. Following training at Camp Breckenridge, Mr. Bailey was deployed to Stuttgart, Germany where he served in the 29th Transportation Company. He was honorably discharged in 1954 and remained in the Reserves until 1960.

Mr. Bailey returned to Bath County following his service. He and his wife Emma Lea married in 1954. They have three children. Mr. Bailey operated a dairy and crop farm for 52 years. He has been described as a dedicated follower of Christ and a pillar in the community.

Mr. Bailey and his fellow men and women of the United States military answered the call to serve our great nation. America is forever grateful and appreciative of the service of Mr. Bailey and all our patriots. I am honored to recognize Mr. Billie Paul Bailey before the United States House of Representatives.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JULIA WHITLA CLINGER

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Julia Whitla Clinger, who passed away on November 22, 2016, at the age of 85. Judy, as she was known to her friends, was the wife of William F. Clinger, a distinguished former member of this body whom I was privileged to work for during his tenure as the Chairman of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee in the mid-1990s.

Judy was born on February 3, 1931, in Sharon, Pennsylvania. Her early life was marked by tragedy—her father, a prominent lawyer in Sharon, died of pneumonia when she was just two years old. Judy graduated from Connecticut College with highest honors, Phi Beta Kappa, with a degree in English. In 1951, she married Bill, and spent the better part of the next 25 years in Warren, Pennsylvania, where they raised their four children and were active members of the community.

After Bill's election to Congress in 1978, Judy moved with him to Washington. Here, she was involved in a number of charitable and civic organizations, including the International Club of Washington and the Congressional Wives Task Force, where she served as Treasurer. Bill would be the first to tell you that Judy was his greatest political asset, actively participating in his nine successful congressional campaigns and playing an important behind-the-scenes role as he rose through the ranks on Capitol Hill to become a committee chairman.

Judy will be remembered by those who knew her for what one described as her "feisty elegance"—a combination of social grace and high-spiritedness that made it a pleasure to spend time with her. Judy's life will be celebrated over the upcoming Fourth of July holiday at a memorial service in the lakeside community of Chautauqua in upstate New York, where she and Bill first met and where they returned every summer.

Judy is survived by Bill, whom I had an opportunity to visit with recently, her children (Eleanor, Will, Jim, and Julia), and by seven grandchildren, to whom she was devoted.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating the life of Judy Clinger, and extending our sincerest condolences to our former colleague, Bill Clinger, on the loss of his wife of 65 years.

YANIRA ALVARADO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Yanira Alvarado for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Yanira Alvarado is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because her

determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Yanira Alvarado is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Yanira Alvarado for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

COMMEMORATING THE 28TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MASSACRE ON TIANANMEN SQUARE

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 28th anniversary of the massacre at Tiananmen Square.

This historic stand against oppression saw several hundred civilians shot dead by the Chinese army during a bloody operation to crush a democratic protest in Beijing's Tiananmen Square.

The Chinese army took the Square with violence against its own people; most of whom were students refusing to move until their demands for democratic reform were met.

Tanks rolled through the capital's streets randomly firing on unarmed civilians.

Millions of people had joined this protest—people from all walks of life who were angered by widespread corruption and calling for democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize former President George H.W. Bush and former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher who both publicly condemned this atrocious act of violence and stood in solidarity with the men and women who peacefully assembled to demand democracy.

The courage and commitment to democratic governance displayed by the demonstrators in Tiananmen Square 28 years ago will never be forgotten by Americans and freedom loving people everywhere.

HONORING LISA M. MAATZ FOR HER OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS WITH THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join colleagues, family, and friends in paying tribute to Lisa M. Maatz for her outstanding leadership and invaluable contributions as Vice President of Government Relations and Advocacy at the American Association of Uni-

versity Women (AAUW). Though she has decided to move forward to other opportunities, she has left an indelible mark on this organization and all of those who have been fortunate enough to have worked with her.

For fifteen years, Lisa has served in multiple leadership capacities at AAUW and remained a tireless advocate for women and girls. As the organization's top policy adviser she has faithfully worked to advance and protect the interests of women and families across the nation. During her tenure she dedicated much of her work to advocating for the economic and retirement security of women and families. Among her many accomplishments, she is most notably remembered for her instrumental role in the successful passage of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009.

Lisa's strengths for developing and directing public policy and grassroots advocacy have resulted in her the successful leadership of several coalitions working to advance opportunities for women and girls, including the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education (NCWGE) and the Equal Pay Coalition. In addition to leading the Public Policy and Government Relations department, Lisa spent eighteen months serving concurrently as the interim director of the AAUW Legal Advocacy Fund. A highly sought-after speaker, having made numerous presentations on the national stage, and a principal spokesperson for women's issues in Washington and across the nation, Lisa is a trailblazer by any definition. Her creative and strategic approaches to legislation and advocacy at all levels coupled with her equally talented ability to implement and mobilize grassroots strategies have earned her the respect and admiration of co-workers, peers, and legislators alike.

Lisa's reputation in public service precedes her. Her grassroots advocacy career began when she was Executive Director of Turning Point, a battered women's program recognized for excellence by the Ohio Supreme Court. Since then, she has worked on behalf of such organizations as the NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund and the Older Women's League, and served as a legislative aide to U.S. Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY. She was recently featured in the book "Secrets of Powerful Women", is a contributor to "Love Her, Love her Not: The Hillary Paradox" and recently served on the boards for the Women's Information Network (Win) as well as on the Public Leadership Education Network (PLEN) where she mentored the next generation of young women activists.

Lisa's work has been recognized by countless distinctions including the 2013 National Committee on Pay Equity's Winn Newman Advocacy Award, the 2012 National Association of Partnerships in Equity's first-ever Public Policy Advocate for Equity Award, and the U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce's 10th anniversary Trailblazer Award. Her achievements reflect her extraordinary career in advancing gender equity and her unwavering commitment to social justice.

I would be remiss if I did not take a moment to extend a personal note of thanks to Lisa for the work that she has done with me and my staff. Lisa has been a sister-in-arms on my work with the Paycheck Fairness Act, not only making "Equal Pay for Equal Work" a priority

for the AAUW, but also bringing it to the forefront of state and national public policy debates. She has been an extraordinary resource and I cannot thank her enough for the vision and counsel she has provided over the years.

Lisa M. Maatz has dedicated her life to supporting women and girls through advocacy, education, and philanthropy. Her service and leadership in this capacity is nothing less than exceptional. As she continues her legacy, I am honored to stand today and thank her for the incredible work she has done in the service of all women and girls and wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

DR. GEORGE WINDSOR

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. George E. Windsor, a family physician in Windsor, Missouri. George has been a physician for 47 years and has decided to retire from his practice at the age of 74. I hope all of you can join me in congratulating him on his retirement and wishing him continued health and happiness in this new phase of life.

I am honored to share my gratitude and respect for Dr. George E. Windsor. His dedication and care for the people of his community are an inspiration to us all.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES JACOBS

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. James Jacobs, who is retiring at the end of June from a 50-year career at Macomb Community College (MCC). Since 2008, Dr. Jacobs has served as President of MCC.

On its face, the pairing of Dr. Jacobs and Macomb Community College was improbable. A native of Brooklyn, New York with a Ph.D. in Politics from Princeton University, the notion that Dr. Jacobs would accept a faculty position at a Midwestern community college seemed, to his university peers at least, to be highly unlikely. As Dr. Jacobs told the Detroit Free Press in January of 2016, "They said, 'Do you need help finding a job? We can help you find something.'"

What those colleagues did not understand was that Jim Jacobs' passion for activism and his belief that, as a profile written about him for Advancing Macomb put it, "... as a college professor he could be a positive change agent for the country," was deeply held. At the request of a friend, Dr. Jacobs accepted an invitation to speak to students at MCC. As he explained in the same profile, "Two things immediately impressed me. First, the students were real people and included Vietnam veterans, auto workers and homemakers, who

were in college asking good questions based on their life experiences. They brought a refreshing perspective that was dramatically different to my experience at Princeton." So, when he was offered a part-time position at MCC as a professor of economics, Dr. Jacobs brought his commitment to helping working class people build their futures to Macomb County.

Dr. Jacobs has been an enthusiastic advocate for the importance of helping people to deal with the challenges of a changing economy through new skills training. During his tenure as President, MCC has enhanced its reputation as a pre-eminent institution for workers displaced by economic change to gain the skills needed to achieve career success. As a testament to the high regard in which MCC is held, former President Barack Obama visited the college three times to highlight the importance of workforce development and worker retraining.

Dr. Jacobs is also widely known for his annual "Macomb County Economic Forecast," which he delivers to a coalition of the county's local chambers of commerce. In his report, Dr. Jacobs delves deeply into the state of the county's economy—including employment, wages, home values, demographic changes, and more—which he places in context with state and national economic trends, and projects future economic change based on his analysis of the data. This report is highly valued not only by chamber of commerce members, but by county, state and federal policy makers.

My office and I have turned to Dr. Jacobs on innumerable occasions to better understand an education or economic issue, to fully immerse ourselves in local demographic developments, and to collaborate on local economic development issues. He was instrumental as chair of the local committee that oversaw the return of federal property to the City of Warren for economic development during a Base Closure and Realignment Commission (BRAC) process. He was proactive in talking about the economic opportunities that exist in the defense sector for Macomb County and Southeast Michigan, and in ensuring a vital role for MCC in training and re-training efforts in this sector. In recent years, he has spoken out eloquently about the role of new immigrants in the County and at the College. Each of these examples highlights how Dr. Jacobs combines a unique ability to look to the future, with an appreciation of the past and always a grounding in the realities of working families. We have benefitted tremendously from his expertise, but more importantly from his passion and commitment for all of these issues.

While he is retiring from Macomb Community College, he will continue the important work to which he has been committed for five decades. He will join the Ralph C. Wilson Jr. Foundation, which focuses its philanthropic efforts in Southeast Michigan and in Western New York, advising it on how it can best support programs which will help working class families receive skills training and education to better secure their futures.

The President of the Center for Automotive Research, Jay Baron, told the Detroit Free Press, "Jim can talk to presidents and he can

talk to the guy in the tool and die shop." Jim Jacobs has always known that presidents are important, but his life's work has been to help that person in the tool and die shop achieve economic security for his or her family in an ever-changing economy. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in thanking Dr. James Jacobs for his immeasurable contributions to Macomb Community College and to the people of Macomb County, and in wishing him the very best as he retires from the important institution which he served for 50 years.

HONORING CLAUDE CARTER

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a very special person, Mr. Claude Carter, of Bath County, Kentucky. Mr. Carter, a veteran of World War II, is a member of the Greatest Generation.

Mr. Carter enlisted in the United States Navy at the age of 18. After completing basic training at the Great Lakes Naval Base in Illinois, he was then placed on a troop transport train to San Francisco. There, he received hatchman and winchman training. The sailors were trained to load and unload tons of supplies from the merchant ships as quickly as possible. Mr. Carter and 3,000 others then boarded the U.S.S. *Pondera* for Honolulu. There they were transferred to a naval supply depot where they were in charge of transporting supplies to ships outside the harbor. Mr. Carter and others were struck by the destruction left following the attack on Pearl Harbor, and were always mindful of the sacrifices made there on December 7th, 1941. During his time in Hawaii, the names of all those in his company were listed on the wall, and every other man was chosen to transfer to Iwo Jima or Okinawa. Mr. Carter was not chosen and stayed on the island to finish his service. He reached the rank of 3rd Class Boatswain's Mate Coxswain and was discharged in June of 1946.

Mr. Carter returned home where he attended Tennessee Tech, worked at the family hardware store, and built electricity and telephone line systems. He and his wife Lena have lived in Owingsville for 22 years where they enjoy retirement.

Mr. Carter and so many other men and women accepted the call of their country and volunteered to serve. Their sacrifice protected freedom and preserved it for future generations. Mr. Carter is truly an American patriot. I am honored to recognize Mr. Claude Carter before the United States House of Representatives.

TAYLOR BELLMER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Taylor Bellmer

for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Taylor Bellmer is a student at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Taylor Bellmer is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Taylor Bellmer for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MELVIN R. BROWN III FOR EARNING EAGLE SCOUT ACHIEVEMENT

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Melvin R. Brown, of Joplin, Missouri, on his recent achievement of the Boy Scouts of America's top rank of Eagle Scout.

The rank of Eagle Scout is the highest rank attainable in the Boy Scouts of America. It is the culmination of many years of hard work and dedication, requiring countless hours of service, training and learning.

Becoming an Eagle Scout requires a significant amount of determination and self-discipline, traits which will no doubt serve to make Mr. Brown a better employee, family member and American throughout his life. To achieve this rank, he demonstrated active teamwork in his troop, underwent numerous wilderness training tests, dedicated time to his community and has adhered to the Boy Scouts of America oath's reverence for character, citizenship and personal wellness.

Mr. Speaker, by attaining the rank of Eagle Scout, Mr. Brown has set himself on the path to achieve future success, and I'm proud to count him among my constituents. His dedication in completing the required benchmarks and community service requirements to reach the Eagle Scout rank is indicative of his ability to accomplish whatever goals he sets his mind to. I wish Mr. Brown luck with all his future endeavors, and urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on this momentous achievement.

COMMEMORATING THE FRIENDSHIP CENTERS OF EMMET COUNTY'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to recognize the Friendship Centers of Emmet

County as they celebrate 50 years of meaningful work in Michigan's First Congressional District. Families throughout Michigan understand how important it is to have quality and compassionate care for seniors, and we are grateful for the Friendship Centers of Emmet County's half-century of community service.

The Friendship Centers of Emmet County date back to 1960 when a small group of friends in the basement of a Petoskey church decided to gather for social activities on a regular basis. Eight years later, the group of friends, which had grown significantly and formed a "Steering Committee for a Drop-in Center," successfully petitioned the city for the use of space in the old Petoskey City Hall building. In 1988, the Friendship Center of Petoskey was officially reincorporated as the Friendship Centers of Emmet County (FCEC) with three satellite locations in Alanson, Harbor Springs and Pellston, aimed at serving the educational, social, and physical needs of senior citizens. The Friendship Center of Petoskey remained at the old city hall for the next thirty years until it moved to its current location on Anderson Road in December of 1999.

In addition to offering a fun and social space for senior citizens to gather, the Friendship Centers of Emmet County have consistently proven to be leaders in the community through targeted initiatives that enhance the wellbeing of elderly citizens. Programs like "Sit and Be Fit" and Tai Chi classes help members stay healthy, engage seniors in activities that enhance their standard of living, and prepare them for an active lifestyle in their later years. The FCEC also hosts several special guest speakers who provide lectures to seniors on topics ranging from health and volunteerism to the arts and environmental issues. This program is one of several that exemplify the FCEC's tremendous efforts to foster continued academic growth within the community, and promote lifelong scholarship in a robust social setting.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Friendship Centers of Emmet County for 50 years of service in the Emmet County communities. Northern Michigan residents can take great pride in knowing that Emmet County is a better place thanks to the work and dedication of the Friendship Centers. On behalf of my constituents across Michigan's First District, I thank the Friendship Centers of Emmet County for their work and look forward to their continued success.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. RANDY
REID

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Randy Reid, Superintendent of Schools at Keller Independent School District (ISD). Dr. Reid is retiring after thirty-four years of public service in Texas.

Dr. Reid received a bachelor's degree from Baylor University and a master's degree and Doctorate in Education Administration from

Texas A&M University at Commerce. After completing his own education, Dr. Reid began his career in public service as a teacher in Richardson ISD. Over the next 24 years, he advanced from teacher to coach to Assistant Superintendent of Richardson ISD. Before assuming the helm of Keller ISD in 2012, Dr. Reid served as the Superintendent of Celina ISD and Tyler ISD.

While serving as superintendent, Dr. Reid oversaw the passage of a \$169.5 million bond package which funded four new campuses in the District. This expansion included Keller's first campus solely devoted to Career and Technological Education coursework, the cutting-edge Keller Center for Advanced Learning.

While serving as a catalyst for academic success in his own district, Dr. Reid has also advocated for the advancement of quality education throughout the state of Texas. Dr. Reid currently serves as President of the Texas Fast Growth School Coalition, a group of more than fifty of the fastest-growing Texas school districts. In addition, he is active member of the University Interscholastic League (UIL) Waiver Review Board, the Texas Association of School Administrators, and the Future Ready Superintendents Leadership Institute.

For the past five years, Dr. Reid has been a dedicated community leader in the greater Keller area. I salute Dr. Reid for his exemplary career and extend my best wishes upon his retirement. It is an honor to represent the students, families, teachers and staff of Keller ISD in the U.S. House of Representatives.

CONGRATULATING THE BOYS AND
GIRLS CLUB OF CAMARILLO ON
THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the Boys and Girls Club of Camarillo on the occasion of their 50th anniversary as a remarkable afterschool institution servicing the youth and families of the City of Camarillo.

Since 1967, the Boys and Girls Club of Camarillo has had a profound impact on the community with an exemplary goal of educating our youth to become socially responsible citizens. The Boys and Girls Club of Camarillo has become an extraordinary asset to our community as a whole.

Holding true to its mission, the Boys and Girls Club of Camarillo cares for each and every student that comes through their doors regardless of race, gender, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status. They develop each student's full potential to become productive, responsible, and caring individuals. For over five decades, the Boys and Girls Club of Camarillo has accomplished this goal through dedicated staff and volunteers to whom we owe an insurmountable debt of gratitude.

Since its founding, the Boys and Girls Club of Camarillo has aimed to keep our young kids off the streets through supervised, quality afterschool programs and services. Today, the

Boys and Girls Club of Camarillo serves approximately 400 kids every day and over 4,000 kids each year. These kids have the opportunity to participate in sports programs in its gymnasium, arts programs in its performance theatre, and academic programs in and outside its technology lab, giving kids a truly holistic development experience that will empower them and instill confidence.

Furthermore, the Boys and Girls Club of Camarillo has a youth employment program that connects its teens with job opportunities in the community. In doing so, they act as a collaborative relationship builder, mentoring teens and facilitating a connection with potential employers where they can utilize the skills and knowledge they have obtained through the organization.

Every child deserves a great future, and the Boys and Girls Club of Camarillo has succeeded in creating a positive, fun, and safe environment for our community's youth to reach their fullest potential. For these reasons, it is my sincere pleasure to honor the Boys and Girls Club for its exceptional 50 years of service to our community's youth and developing our future leaders.

HONORING THE CAREER OF
MATTHEW A. ROZELL

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable man who has shown a strong dedication to educating the students of New York's 21st District.

Growing up in the historic foothills of the Adirondack Mountains, Matthew Rozell's surroundings inspired in him a deep interest in the past. This fascination led him to SUNY Geneseo, where he received a Bachelor of Arts in History, and a Master's in Education. After graduating, Mr. Rozell returned to his high school alma mater in Hudson Falls, NY, where he has spent the entirety of his career going above and beyond as an educator.

As the founder of the World War II Living History Project, Mr. Rozell has established an excellent tool for educating students. He has helped to connect WWII veterans and survivors throughout the country and worked to make their stories known. Specifically, the work that the project has done on uncovering personal accounts and photographs from the Holocaust has drawn attention and recognition from organizations around the country.

In addition to being featured as an ABC World News "Person of the Week," Mr. Rozell has received multiple awards, including the History Teacher of the Year Award from the Organization of American Historians, and the Founders' Medal for History Education from the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Rozell also received the New York State Education Department's Louis E. Yavner Teaching Award for Distinguished Contributions to Teaching the Holocaust.

I would like to thank Mr. Rozell for his enduring commitment to academia and research. Through his work, he has served as an exemplary educator and as a role model for his students and his peers.

IN RECOGNITION OF STUART VOGT

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate Mr. Stuart Vogt of Vienna, Virginia. Born in 1920, Mr. Vogt lived through some of the most uncertain times in American history during which he not only endured, but flourished. And throughout his illustrious career he has always put his country and community first.

Mr. Vogt graduated from Lehigh University in 1942 with a B.S. in Electrical Engineering. With the war effort furiously ramping up, there was a demand for young, aspiring engineers. He was recruited by Westinghouse in Lima, Ohio, near Army Air Force headquarters at Wright-Patterson AFB, to join Westinghouse's brand new Aviation Engineering Department. While there he designed dynamos and generators for World War II P40 fighters and B17 & B24 bombers. After the war, Mr. Vogt moved to Virginia to work with Naval Air Systems Command on aircraft electric motors. However, after only a few years there he was given a unique opportunity to work on NASA's Launch Operations' Saturn rockets. During his time at NASA, he worked in conjunction with Werner Von Braun and other scientists in Huntsville and Cape Canaveral. Before retiring thirty years ago, Mr. Vogt returned to Naval Air Systems Command where he installed aircraft carrier computer upgrades to accommodate new carrier-based F14 Tomcat fighters, S-3 Viking submarine trackers and E-2C Hawkeye early warning radar aircraft.

In retirement Mr. Vogt shifted from serving his country to serving his community. He was the Chairman of his local chapter of the National Active and Retired Federal Employees, and today he remains a very active member of Our Lady of Good Counsel Catholic Church in Vienna. Mr. Vogt has a selfless desire to serve and to give back to his community, and this attitude inspires the same in all who meet him. He is a leader and I know he passes on the same selfless qualities to all he meets.

Beyond his duties within his community and long career in the defense and aerospace industries, Mr. Vogt was a loving husband to his wife Marie who passed away 14 years ago and is a loving father to son Stuart Vogt and grandfather to Lynne and Andy. At this moment, Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in extending our sincerest thanks to Mr. Vogt for all the work he has done in his community and for our country.

TEA BENZENBERG

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Tea Benzenberg for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Tea Benzenberg is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because

her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Tea Benzenberg is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Tea Benzenberg for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING PROFESSOR ROLAND ALUM, JR.**HON. THOMAS MacARTHUR**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the academic scholarship and contributions of Professor Roland Alum, Jr., of New Jersey, specifically his recent article, regarding the 115th anniversary of the inauguration of the Cuban Republic in 1902. Include in the RECORD this article which was published on Saturday, May 20, 2017 in the Jersey Journal. Professor Roland Alum, Jr., has managed a successful career of university teaching, administration, and scholarship, while still remaining committed to civic engagement.

In his article, Professor Alum reviews a book by another New Jerseyan, Professor Margarita Garcia, which honors the legacy of Tomás Estrada, who served as the first elected president of the Cuban Republic. Prior to his installation as president, Estrada spent 25 years in exile, mostly in the United States, where he grew to admire our democracy and civilian-dominated system of government. Professor Alum explains his view that these facts contribute to the reasons why the Castro brothers' dictatorship in Cuba demonizes Estrada's memory and further ignores the historical significance of May 20th. Professor Alum contrasts Estrada's good will and actual governmental history with the Castros' mega militaristic, oppressive totalitarianism, since 1959. He concludes his article with an emphasis on the significance of the date of May 20th, particularly to the pro-democracy Cuban-Americans, who constitute a valuable community in New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, the people of New Jersey are tremendously honored to have Professor Roland Alum, Jr., as a dedicated member of their community. It is because of his recent academic contribution, that I rise to recognize his scholarship and request that this article, as prepared by Professor Alum, be printed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before the United States House of Representatives.

WHY MAY 20 IS SO IMPORTANT TO CUBAN AMERICANS

(By Roland Alum, Jr.)

On May 20, 1902, the independent Republic of Cuba was inaugurated with the swearing in of its first elected president, Tomás Estrada (aka Estrada Palma—with his ma-

ternal patronymic added as per Hispanic cultural tradition). Cuban patriots had been waging the War of Independence vs. colonial Spain since 1895, a conflict that blended into the brief Spanish-Cuban-American War in 1898, in turn giving way to the first U.S. Intervention (1898–1902), which called for elections in 1901. Estrada won the presidency after 25 years in exile, mostly in the U.S.

After rising in arms against the Spanish Empire in 1868, Estrada (1835–1908) was taken prisoner; upon his release, he moved to Honduras, where he was hired to reorganize the postal, educational and health-care services. When the Honduran military ousted the democratic government for which he worked, Estrada settled with his family in Central Valley, New York, 50 miles north of Manhattan (an hour's drive from Hudson County), directing a pioneering private school there.

In 1895, Estrada became the head of the Cuban Revolutionary Party that had been founded in New York for the independence of Cuba and Puerto Rico. Leading an extraordinary lobby pro Cuba's independence, he often passed through today's Jersey City's Liberty State Park on his train trips to/from Washington. Hudson County is nowadays home to the second most important Cuban-American community, and May 20 is routinely remembered with celebrations, including a Bergenline Avenue parade and "pilgrimages" to Central Valley. The Castro family's Communist-styled tyranny and its pro-democratic exiled opponents share in the commemoration of most Cuban patriotic holidays, except for this one, given that the "socialist" dictatorship demonizes Estrada as "a U.S. puppet."

Professor Margarita Garcia, a Hudson County ex-resident, straightens the record of Estrada's legacy in her recent "Before 'Cuba Libre': The Making of Cuba's First President, Tomás Estrada Palma" (Outskirts Press, 2016). One gathers from her book that among Estrada's presidential accomplishments (1902–1906) was the limiting the number of U.S. naval bases from the seven requested of the nascent republic, to one: Guantanamo. Above all, Estrada sought to establish a civilian-dominated, honest governmental system, drastically distinct to what had already become by then a nefarious Latin-American militaristic model, of which he had been a victim in Honduras.

Unfortunately, throughout Cuba's republican trajectory, the military often interfered in politics, culminating in the Castros' six-decade reign, as the island-country is tormented by an egotistic elite of "revolutionary generals" parroting passé, hate-mongering Marxist-Leninist slogans while the average Cuban suffers boundless deprivations.

Since 1959, the Castro family—an unelected, de facto Caribbean nepotistic dynasty—has persistently accused Estrada of turning Cuba into a "Yankee vassal state." Paradoxically, it was the Castro brothers who made Cuba subservient to the far-away, failed Soviet Bloc, thus transfiguring a progressive trending nation into a backwards one from which its people desperately aspire to flee. Ironically, that ruling entrenched gerontocratic oligarchy now seeks the "stinking Yankee dollars" to subsidize the government's business monopolies managed by a vast network of corrupt Castro kinspeople and accomplices.

What Cuba needs above all is a regime change that would bestow power to the people and establish a democratically elected, civilian dominated open society that will respect individual freedoms and human/civil

rights, as was envisioned by the republic's founding fathers, such as Presidente Tomás Estrada.

HONORING WALTER MCGLOTHIN

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a very special man, Mr. Walter McGlothlin, of Bath County, Kentucky.

Mr. McGlothlin was born on the 4th of July. He was drafted into the United States Army on November 15, 1951. He received training on anti-aircraft artillery and was sent to Japan, where he spent 16 months on a 120mm artillery gun. He returned home on October 29, 1953. Mr. McGlothlin was in active reserve for 6 years and was honorably discharged on November 15th, 1959.

Mr. McGlothlin and his wife Joyce have been married for 53 years. They have four children, eight grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren.

Mr. McGlothlin and his fellow men and women of the United States military answered the call to serve our great nation. America is forever grateful and appreciative of the service of Mr. McGlothlin and all our patriots. I am honored to recognize Mr. Walter McGlothlin before the United States House of Representatives.

TREVIN MONTANO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Trevin Montano for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Trevin Montano is a student at Standley Lake High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Trevin Montano is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Trevin Montano for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

CONGRATULATIONS TO HALEY FARRIS

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and honor a young student from my

district who has achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in her community. Haley Farris of Oldfield has just been named one of the distinguished finalists in Missouri by The 2017 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on the most impressive student volunteers in each state and the District of Columbia.

Ms. Farris is being recognized for creating "4Confidence," a program designed to help middle school students learn to love themselves through biweekly meetings covering topics from bullying to eating disorders. Ms. Farris started the group after realizing she wasn't the only one struggling with low self-esteem, organized pageants to raise money for group activities and increase the confidence of the young contestants she recruited from the community.

It's vital that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contribution this young citizen has made. Young volunteers like Ms. Farris are inspiring examples to all of us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

The program that brought this young role model to our attention—The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards—was created by Prudential Financial in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued, and to inspire other young people to follow their example. Over the past 22 years, the program has become the nation's largest youth recognition effort based solely on community service, and has honored more than 115,000 young volunteers at the local, state and national level.

Ms. Farris should be extremely proud to have been singled out from the thousands of dedicated volunteers who participated in this year's program. I wish Ms. Farris luck with all her future endeavors, and urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating her on this momentous achievement.

IN RECOGNITION OF CLARENCE E. GOODLEIN'S SERVICE TO THE CITY OF WIXOM

HON. DAVID A. TROTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in recognition of the lifetime of dedication and service of Clarence E. Goodlein of Wixom, Michigan.

Serving his community well for 37 years, as Police Chief for five years and Police Chief and Director of Public Safety for ten, Mr. Goodlein dedicated his life to ensuring the City of Wixom continued to be a safe and desirable neighborhood for those of all ages.

Mr. Goodlein built his career on a foundation of protecting others and his unwavering dedication to this principle and his community earned him the appointment of Wixom City Manager in 2015. Here he brought a unique combination of vibrant leadership and years of proven experience to inspire new direction to the city's government.

As a proud graduate of Madonna University, the University of Detroit–Mercy, Oakland University, and the FBI National Academy and Executive Leadership Programs, his wealth of knowledge built a sound future of success for our entire community.

His outstanding leadership has not gone unnoticed. It helped model the Lower Peninsula Law Enforcement Risk Control Advisory Committee, which aids local law enforcement agencies throughout the State of Michigan.

While his retirement from City Manager will leave a great void in City Hall, I have no doubt that Mr. Goodlein will continue to be a vibrant part of our community, continuing to serve each and every one of his neighbors for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my most sincere gratitude to Mr. Goodlein for his decades of service to our community, the City of Wixom, and the great State of Michigan, and wish him well in his retirement.

HONORING MR. CLIFTON HARTMAN

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life of Mr. Clifton "Clif" R. Hartman and his long dedication to our Cheshire community. Clif passed away on May 27, 2017 at the age of 97, but his memory and contributions will live on in Cheshire for years to come.

Clif was born in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania on May 21, 1920. He graduated from high school in Dunellen, New Jersey, and then studied organic chemistry and chemical engineering at Lehigh University, Rutgers University, and Columbia University. Clif met the love of his life, Mary Shuey, and the couple married on June 1, 1942. Just a few weeks later, Clif joined the U.S. Army Air Force to lend his expertise as an ammunitions specialist during the Second World War. He served with a bomb disposal unit across the European and northern African theaters of war, and earned a Bronze Star in recognition of his service and dedication to the country. At the end of the war, Clif started his long career with the Calco Chemical Company, and he retired in 1985.

In their retirement, Clif and Mary were active and adventurous, traveling extensively with their family. Clif was an active member of our community and enthusiastically shared his knowledge as a longtime member of the Cheshire Army Air Force Round Table and the First Congregational Church. He was also a master chess player and shared his passion for the game with hundreds of elementary school children in after-school programs.

Mr. Speaker, Clif Hartman was a model member of our community whose dedication and willingness to help others serve as a model for those who knew him, and it is fitting and proper that we honor his legacy here today. My condolences go out to his family, including his children Keith and Dale, and his grandchildren Caitlin, Beth, Megan, Erik, Elise, Rebecca, Ryan, and Jeffrey. Clif had an immeasurable impact on Cheshire, Connecticut

and the United States of America, and those who knew him will cherish his memory.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF ALEXANDRA "SANDY"
BRESLIN

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with the heaviest of hearts that I rise today to join the many family, friends, colleagues, and community leaders who have gathered to pay tribute to one of our community's most ardent and passionate advocates, Alexandra "Sandy" Breslin, who lost her battle with cancer just days ago. Sandy was an extraordinary woman, whose compassion, dedication, and commitment to public service touched the lives of many and helped to shape the very character of our great state.

Sandy was many things to many people—advocate, activist, mentor, and most importantly, friend. I first met Sandy as a newly elected Member of Congress when she sought me out to talk about the need to preserve and protect the Long Island Sound and the invaluable habitats along its shores. Few have had a larger impact on the preservation and protection of the Long Island Sound than Sandy. She worked with me and others to secure millions of dollars in federal funding to support conservation efforts up and down the Sound's coast and was instrumental in the passage of the Long Island Sound Stewardship Act. She also served as the Connecticut Co-Chair of the Citizens Advisory Committee of the national estuary program for Long Island Sound where she fought for horseshoe crab sanctuaries that protected this ancient creature and helped establish standards for harvesting menhaden that set the stage for the return of whales to the Sound.

Sandy's passionate activism helped to make real many land conservation projects including such local environmental jewels as Kelda, the former Griswold Airport, Long Beach West, The Preserve, and Suffield and Barn Island Wildlife Management Areas; and to expand the Stewart B. McKinney the Silvio O. Conte National Wildlife Refuges. Her outstanding contributions have been recognized with three national awards including a U.S. Department of the Interior Environmental Achievement Award; a Teaming with Wildlife Member Achievement Award for establishing a Connecticut Conservation License Plate; and a Coastal America Award for conservation teamwork at Long Beach West.

In addition to her environmental work, Sandy was also a dedicated advocate for the Town of Bethany, Connecticut. She served as a member of the Inland Wetlands Commission for more than two decades, she worked to renew State funding that resulted in creation of a municipal open space and watershed matching grants program that helped protect Clover Nook Farm, Veteran's Memorial Park and Monument Stables and for more than a decade she served as Bethany's representative on the Regional Policy Board of the South

Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority, and on its Land Use Committee.

Sandy was also a dedicated member of Connecticut's Democratic Party. She served as the Democratic Town Chair of Bethany for many years and it was under her leadership that the first Democrat in nearly a century was elected First Selectman. In neighboring Woodbridge, she was a driving force behind the election of the first woman to serve as First Selectman in the town's history. Her contributions to local and state politics earned her the respect and admiration of many across the state.

Sandy was a great friend to me and several members of my staff. There was not a time when we could not call her for advice, information, and council. There was not an environmental event in the state that she did not attend—and she likely had a hand in its organization as well. Even under the most frustrating of circumstances, she was there with a smile, ready to roll up her sleeves and get to work. Sandy was the best—an embodiment of everything we strive to be as advocates for others. Like so many others, I consider myself fortunate to have called her my friend.

Sandy leaves behind her mother, Ruth, as well as scores of family, friends, and colleagues whose lives were touched by her good work. I am proud to stand today and take this opportunity to pay tribute to her lifetime of public service, to thank her for her invaluable contributions, and to honor her lasting memory. Alexandra "Sandy" Breslin has left an indelible mark on the State of Connecticut, the Town of Bethany, and in the hearts of all of those fortunate enough to have known and worked with her. Though her presence will be deeply missed, hers is a legacy that will continue to inspire generations of activists and advocates to come.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO
THE VICTIMS OF THE TER-
RORIST ATTACK IN LONDON AND
SOLIDARITY WITH THE PEOPLE
OF ENGLAND

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the lives of the innocent victims of the horrific attack that took place in London this past weekend.

Seven lives were cut short and dozens more people were injured by the outrageous and heinous acts of terror that shocked the people of London and the world.

At this terrible time, our hearts and prayers are with the victims and their loved ones.

Our gratitude and appreciation goes to the first responders, the intelligence community and all those who selflessly risked their lives and worked together to prevent the terror from spreading farther.

We stand in unyielding solidarity with the people of England, which like the United States, stands against the dark forces that put our way of life at risk.

England will emerge from this and other recent attacks as a stronger nation that remains

committed to the values and principles that have made the city a key player in commerce, human rights and democracy.

London has been a world leader in the march of human progress in the arts, culture, science, democratic theory and governance, and in embracing the challenges and opportunities of the modern world.

Those who think that they can terrorize the people of England or the values that the western world cherishes underestimate a nation that has a long history of prevailing against far more sinister and lethal adversaries.

And they will again, but they will not confront these adversaries alone.

They will be joined by the United States and the other countries of the civilized world.

As London recovers and responds, I hope its people and the loved ones of the victims can find comfort in the knowledge that the people in the United States stand in solidarity with them.

The attacks in England are a reminder of the common threat the free, democratic, and peace loving nations of the world face from those who violently reject the values and norms of our civilized society.

The attacks highlight the extent to which enemies of our shared values are willing to go to threaten the liberties and freedoms enjoyed by those of us living in free societies.

Those responsible for the attacks should make no mistake; they will be held accountable for their horrific actions against humanity.

And as has been done many times throughout the long and special relationship between the United States and England, we will face and overcome threats to our way of life together.

We will not bow and will never break; we will not falter or fail.

We will respond. We will endure. We will overcome.

The horrible and heinous acts of terrorists are their responsibility and theirs alone, and for which they can be assured that they alone will be held accountable.

But that will come another day; today I ask a moment of silence for the victims killed and injured in the terrorist attacks in London.

ZACHARY SALAS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Zachary Salas for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Zachary Salas is a student at Bear Creek K-8 School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Zachary Salas is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Zachary Salas for winning the Arvada Wheat

Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING CALIFORNIA HUMAN
DEVELOPMENT

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor California Human Development, as they celebrate their 50th Anniversary this year. This important community organization has played a vital role in fighting poverty across northern California and will continue to help struggling Californians for years to come.

California Human Development (CHD) is a non-profit, human services provider waging the War on Poverty. Founded in 1967, and inspired by labor icon Cesar Chavez, the original focus of CHD was to assist migrant and seasonal farmworkers by providing training and workforce development services. Over the past five decades, CHD has expanded its role and now serves not only farmworkers, but also people from many different backgrounds. Their patrons include seniors, addiction recovery patients, immigrants seeking to be part of the American Dream, adults living with disabilities, and many more.

CHD has seen incredible success during their past fifty years. Today they serve community members across thirty-one northern California counties. CHD operates twelve community-based farmworker services offices and four Anthony Soto Training Centers, providing jobs and training to their patrons and empowering them to achieve self-sufficiency. Additionally, CHD provides jobs programs, affordable housing options, immigration and citizenship application services, disability services and addiction recovery programs. All told, CHD serves over 25,000 people across northern California.

Mr. Speaker, California Human Development creates opportunities for people from all walks of life and this year celebrates fifty years and over 500,000 lives changed. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor them here today.

IN HONOR OF GREGG ALLMAN

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding artist and homegrown legend, the late great Gregg Allman. Sadly, on Saturday, May 27, 2017, Gregg passed away peacefully at his home in Savannah, Georgia. A private funeral was held in his hometown of Macon, Georgia on Saturday, June 3, 2017 and he was laid to rest at Macon's Rose Hill Cemetery beside his brother and bandmate, Duane Allman, and bandmate, Berry Oakley.

Born in the "Music City" of Nashville, Tennessee, Gregg Allman's connection to music runs deep. Appropriately, it was a concert in Nashville with Jackie Wilson, Otis Redding, B.B. King, and Patti LaBelle that jumpstarted Gregg's passion for music. Though he is best known as a keyboardist and singer, he also performed on acoustic guitar, which he learned to play from a neighbor. He worked as a paperboy to buy his first Silverstone guitar, which he and his brother often fought to play. Ultimately, it was Duane who became the paramount guitar player of the family.

Gregg and Duane Allman formed a series of bands in cities ranging from Los Angeles to Jacksonville to Muscle Shoals, Alabama. Eventually, in Daytona Beach, they formed what is considered their first "real" band, the Escorts, which later evolved into the Allman Joys. Then in 1969, the Allman Brothers Band officially formed and moved to Macon, Georgia, captivating a generation of music lovers with their distinctive sound. Songs such as "Whipping Post," "Ramblin' Man," and "Midnight Rider" helped define what is known as Southern rock and set the stage for other musicians such as Lynyrd Skynyrd and the Marshall Tucker Band.

In October 1971, Gregg's brother Duane was killed in a motorcycle accident in Macon. One year later, the band's bassist, Berry Oakley also died in a motorcycle accident just a few blocks from where Duane lost his life. Music was the best release the band members found, so they continued performing and recording over the next four decades. Throughout the years, the band dismantled and reformed several times, allowing Gregg to produce a few solo albums and even one with his former wife, Cher. Eventually, the Allman Brothers Band regrouped for the final time in 1989 and continued performing until 2014.

As a member of the Allman Brothers Band, Gregg Allman was inducted into the Rock & Roll Hall of Fame in 1995. He was also inducted into the Georgia Music Hall of Fame in 2006 and received the Lifetime Achievement Award at the 2012 Grammy Awards. Those who knew Gregg personally spoke fondly of him, describing him as a jokester and a man with a kind heart.

Gregg Allman is survived by his wife, Sharon, five children, and three grandchildren. Not surprisingly, several of his children have played music professionally.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the more than 730,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in recognizing Gregg Allman for his remarkable accomplishments as a pioneering and world-renowned musician. His timeless talent and everlasting legacy live on in the hearts of those who loved him and will continue to be remembered by generations to come.

BATTLE OF MIDWAY

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, after his victory over Pearl Harbor, when asked why he

wasn't celebrating, Japanese Admiral Yamamoto replied, "I fear all we have done is to awaken a sleeping giant and fill him with a terrible resolve." Admiral Yamamoto was right, and he felt the terrible resolve of this giant on June 4, 1942 at the Battle of Midway. Midway was an important battle in the Pacific theater: it was the turning point that put the United States in an offensive position to take on the Empire of Japan. Those of the Greatest Generation proved that when the peace of this nation is threatened, our people will stand up and fight, bringing the thunder of God upon our enemies.

Japan's goal at Midway Island was to destroy and ambush the remainder of our fleet in hopes of invading Hawaii. In the early morning on June 4th, Japan launched its attack on Midway by bombing the island. This strategy proved to be ineffective. In response, the three U.S. carriers—*Enterprise*, *Hornet* and *Yorktown*—launched fighters and bombers against the Japanese fleet and sank all four Japanese carriers *Akagi*, *Kaga*, *Soryu* and *Hiryu*. These four Japanese aircraft carriers were the same carriers that attacked Pearl Harbor six months earlier. Over the next two days, the Imperial Japanese Navy suffered the loss of four aircraft carriers and hundreds of pilots—pilots that had bombed Pearl Harbor. Japan's defeat at Midway began America's drive on toward Tokyo. On that day, over 300 American sailors gave their lives for our country. It was Japan's first defeat of WWII.

The victory at Midway was in part due to American intelligence, US codebreakers. These codebreakers were able to decipher the Japanese radio code called JN-25b, which enabled Pacific Fleet Commander and Texan, Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, to learn of their exact plans of attack. Admiral Nimitz gained valuable intel leading up to the battle, including the logistics and timing of the attack. As a result of the Navy codebreakers Admiral Nimitz was able to reconstruct the Japanese plan of attack in detail.

Like Admiral Nimitz, there were other great Texans who helped contribute to the victory at Midway. Baytown resident Ronnie Anderson told me the story of his dad, James Wyatt Anderson who served during this time. SF3/C James Anderson was a twelve year Naval veteran of both World War II and the Korean War. He served in the United States Navy on the survey ship, the USS *Bowditch*. He surveyed many invasion sites, including the Marshall Islands, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa. Midway Island was the only overseas assignment where SF3/C James Anderson was able to bring his family. Ronnie said, living on Midway Island, was like living in a kids paradise, especially for a 10 year old boy. Much of Ronnie's time was spent playing war games in the bunkers with the left over mortars and with anti-aircraft shells. Ronnie has several artifacts from the Battle of Midway including a 40mm brass shell and a mortar tube which are great mementos of childhood treasure hunts. Throughout the years, Ronnie passed down eventful island stories to his children and grandchildren. Now Ronnie's 15 year old grandson, Asher Isaacks, has become fascinated with the Battle of Midway and hopes to one day take his grandfather back to the island. Unfortunately, Midway has been closed

to tourism by the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife due to budget constraints. It is now a bird sanctuary because of its ecosystem with little to no predators. The island is home to birds, such as the Short-tailed Albatross "Gooney Birds", Masked Booby, and Great Frigatebird. The history of the island is as great as the birds that live there. Midway was claimed for the United States by Captain N.C. Brookes in 1859 and formally annexed in 1867. Originally, the island was meant to be a coal depot; however, this never came to be. In 1903, President Theodore Roosevelt placed the island under the control of the Navy. The island became a link in the Hawaii-Guam segment of the first transpacific submarine cable. The name "Midway" comes from the island being half the distance from the U.S. and Japan.

As we observe the 75th Anniversary of the Battle of Midway, it is vital we remember heroes like Admiral Chester Nimitz and James Anderson and give Americans, like Ronnie Anderson, the opportunity to return to Midway Island. On Monday, June 5th at 1:30pm, the United States Navy Memorial in Washington D.C. held the 75th Anniversary of the Battle of Midway Commemoration Ceremony. They created the Naval "Sea of White", wreath laying ceremony, and played the live stream from the USS Midway Commemoration Ceremony. The importance of this epic battle is a part history made by the "Greatest Generation".

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING JOHN BRADLEY

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a very special person, Mr. John Bradley, of Bath County, Kentucky.

Mr. Bradley volunteered to serve in the United States Army and began basic training August 4, 1948. He trained in Food Service School. He served at Fort Knox and Yokohama, Japan before being sent to Pusan, South Korea in 1950. His unit later moved northward to Seoul, where he oversaw the field kitchen, feeding 500 soldiers. Gunfire was constant, both day and night.

Mr. Bradley's time of service was extended for 9 months. While he was serving, his mother died and his daughter was born. He was discharged on May 10, 1952 and returned home to meet his 2-year-old daughter for the first time.

During his time in Korea, Mr. Bradley was awarded the Korean War Occupation Medal, five Bronze Stars, a Merit Unit Citation, a Good Conduct Medal, and the Korean Service Medal. Upon returning home, Mr. Bradley farmed and provided for his family. He is an active member of his community. Mr. Bradley and his wife Edith have been married over 68 years.

Mr. Bradley and so many other men and women volunteered to serve our great nation in the United States military. His sacrifice is appreciated by a grateful nation. Mr. Bradley is truly an American patriot. I am honored to

recognize Mr. John Bradley before the United States House of Representatives.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JOSHELLE HARGUS

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and honor a young student from my district who has achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in her community. Joshelle Hargus of Aurora has just been named one of the distinguished finalists in Missouri by The 2017 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on the most impressive student volunteers in each state and the District of Columbia.

Ms. Hargus is being recognized for being the creator of "Joshelle's Funky Flip Flops," making more than 500 pairs of handmade flip flops since 2008 and using her earnings from her sales to buy shoes and clothes for 100 kids in need. Inspired to help by a kindergarten classmate's only pair of torn-up shoes, Ms. Hargus has gone on to sell her flip flops at craft shows and spread the word about her cause through events and media appearances.

It's vital that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contribution this young citizen has made. Young volunteers like Ms. Hargus are inspiring examples to all of us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

The program that brought this young role model to our attention—The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards—was created by Prudential Financial in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued, and to inspire other young people to follow their example. Over the past 22 years, the program has become the nation's largest youth recognition effort based solely on community service, and has honored more than 115,000 young volunteers at the local, state and national level.

Ms. Hargus should be extremely proud to have been singled out from the thousands of dedicated volunteers who participated in this year's program. I wish Ms. Hargus luck with all her future endeavors, and urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating her on this momentous achievement.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH COMMENCEMENT OF SPRINGFIELD TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, on June 1st, I had the honor to address Springfield Technical

Community College (STCC) class of 2017 as their commencement speaker. In my speech below, I explained to the students, faculty, and families assembled that a quality education and working together toward a common purpose, you can accomplish great outcomes even in challenging moments. I want to thank President John B. Cook for his gracious introduction and commend him on his outstanding leadership as STCC celebrates their 50th anniversary. I also want to particularly recognize the over 1000 students of the graduation class of 2017 on completing this important step in their education. I wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

"Good evening President Cook, parents, friends and guests. And of course Springfield Technical Community College class of 2017. Or as you are affectionately known in our community in the highest regard—STCC. We define community as a place where no one is to be abandoned and no one is to be left behind.

I am honored to have been chosen to deliver the commencement address for STCC's 50th commencement—or as your neighbors on Federal Street, Merriam-Webster, would say, your 'quingagenarian.'

The story of STCC begins with the decision of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara to close the Springfield Armory. In history, it was known as the arsenal at Springfield. Established by General George Washington and administered by his trusted aide General Henry Knox. The college is located on at least three historic sites—the Knox Trail, Ben Franklin's mail route, and the site of Daniel Shays Rebellion which helped bring about the establishment of the United States Constitution, of which the convening is 230 years old as of last Thursday.

However, when Secretary McNamara announced his decision to close the Armory, he waived off the emotion and sentiments of the day and stood firm in his determination. Consternation, and some even predicted, calamity, would be the result of the Secretary's decision.

A sense of despair settled in with the loss of hundreds of manufacturing jobs. A polarizing debate began over whether or not to use the site in an attempt to secure a different commercial purpose or to use the site for education. Today, coincidentally, both missions have been accomplished. A reminder, once again, that in every crisis there is opportunity.

The dream began with the vision of Edmund Garvey, who had been the principal of Springfield Trade High School. A decision was reached to build an addition to Trade High School, which would be called Springfield Technical Institute. Edmund Garvey's concept would be championed by other notables in our community including then-Springfield Mayor Charles V. Ryan (who actually handed me my high school diploma), Joseph Deliso, a prominent titan of industry, and Representative Anthony M. Scibelli, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Refusing to be turned back by the usual voices and forces of pessimism and doubt, with alacrity and unyielding determination, they created the only technical community college in Massachusetts. Recall that it was also another native son of Springfield, Governor Foster Furcolo (whose father's doctor's offices still

stand on south Main Street) to create the community college system in Massachusetts.

This evening, we acknowledge their conceptualization. How simple but how important—provide education to students in the community so that they might see beyond themselves and give back to humanity.

They predicted the best way to accomplish that goal was to provide a quality education that can translate into opportunity and the dignity that comes with a good job. And not just any job—one that supports our security, our healthcare, our infrastructure, and our social needs.

Although their focus was to create a technical community college, they did something else along the way: they knew how to get a big idea accomplished.

Opportunity is still the theme that is much woven into the fabric of this college's culture. The grounds the community college stands on today has been part of our community for more than two centuries, where it once housed soldiers, guardsman and industrial might. Today it is home to optimism and determination.

There were strong disagreements at the time among community members as to what to do with this historic site. Persistence, patience and positivity was the foundation of STCC's birth.

In hindsight, the founder's unwavering courage was both warranted and wise. Compromises were reached and with the help of Congressman Edward P. Boland, my predecessor, the decision was made to establish next to the Community College a national historic site, "The Springfield Armory" which today is visited by tens of thousands of people. It is the home to the famous gun rack immortalized in Longfellow's poem.

This 50th anniversary is a great example of how we work with our colleagues, community leaders and peers to accomplish extraordinary outcomes that help to lift the clouds of despair. Much of this was accomplished in the crucible of public life. And remember, as these founders understood, democracy is supposed to be noisy. But then we move to the next plane of achievement. Just as Holmes said, it is conflict that is the core of life, but it is cooperation that brought about this outcome.

As the Democratic leader of the Ways and Means Committee, I work closely on policies that directly impact our economy and America's middle class: trade, health care, taxes and Social Security. One of our tasks is to take on the issues that will have far reaching consequences on the United States economy, revising the tax code and our nation's trade policies to provide greater opportunity for those of you assembled here this evening. I can assure you that the degree you receive tonight is more critical than ever. While we speak of income inequality, and greater concentration of wealth in America, we also should be reminded that the unemployment rate among college graduates in America today is under 4%.

Our economy has undergone major transformations. It has created companies that are highly competitive in the global marketplace. Unfortunately, our workforce has not always adapted and too many workers have been left behind. Globalization, skill-set, decline of pri-

vate sector unionism and technological advances have been contributing factors in this. It has created what we know today as a "skills gap." Companies have well-paying jobs to fill, but eager workers simply don't have what's needed to qualify for the 650,000 technology jobs available even as we convene this evening. Your accomplishment tonight will be critical to closing the skills-gap and provide incentive to employers for people who want work. And people want to go to work!

The education you received at STCC has emphasized the marriage of training and education. It has set you on a course for good jobs that are desperately needed and are an important part of economic policy debates. While state and local leaders hammer out policies that have direct ties to jobs, there needs to be a parallel discussion with community colleges and employers so we can make these policies a reality. Whatever the education challenges we face—economics and socialization—community colleges will be a profound part of the answer. We can pass all the infrastructure and health packages in the world, but if there aren't workers to carry out those policies, we would have accomplished little. Right here in New England, a recent New England Council/Deloitte Study estimates that over the next decade 20,000 precision manufacturing jobs could go unanswered.

There needs to be a serious discussion—not excitable language—between employers, community leaders and our workforce. Community colleges can provide the bridge between an eager, willing, gifted workforce and employers desperate for skilled employees. A commitment from them to invest in technical and community colleges and apprenticeship programs is an important first step. Institutions like STCC can design curriculum and internship programs to ensure students can receive the skills and education they need that employers are seeking.

But in order to provide these classes, internships and apprenticeships, the private sector and Congress need to work together to provide incentives similar to the Community College Partnership Tax Credit, which would provide employers with a tax credit for hiring community college graduates. This would encourage business engagement in the community and provide students with opportunities to find good paying jobs upon graduation.

Experience always informs our judgement. It will help shape your understanding and ultimately encourage others to enter the world you plan to thrive in. On a personal note, let me tell you bluntly, the world responds more to aspiration than it does to grievance. Be proud of your accomplishments and your work. I tell you this: your talent, skill, and achievements are as important if not more to federal, state and local policy discussions.

Let me acknowledge the faculty this evening. You lend experience and teaching talents to help students reach their potential. And as I have always noted, when you reach your potential, your potential expands.

Today's economy is certainly complex. The conversation between our workforce and employers requires serious commitment to our community college system. As you move forward into the next step of career choices or additional education, accept the challenge you

so proudly have earned to see your ambition as central to the new economy. Stay engaged. We need your voice and your talent.

Have a dream, but have a plan. The STCC founding and experience was born in doubt. But on this 50th anniversary, STCC has risen to become an extraordinary achievement because the founders had a dream and they had a plan. I mentioned earlier the site on which STCC sits has been home to events that have shaped world history. General Washington shaped history; General Knox shaped history; Ben Franklin shaped history; Daniel Shays shaped history; the Springfield Rifle shaped history; John Garand's invention shaped history. STCC has shaped history and tonight your pledge should be to shape history, too.

Thank you President Cook, the Board of Trustees, the faculty, and the students at STCC. And of course, your families who helped make this evening possible. You say it best—STCC works. Congratulations from the United States of America."

IN RECOGNITION OF LAUREN LORIA

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge one of my constituents from Chantilly, Virginia, Young Marine Master Gunner Sergeant, Lauren Loria, for her exemplary service to our community and our armed forces. This past weekend, Young Marine Loria had the unique opportunity to dedicate a bench at Ellanor C. Lawrence Park to Medal of Honor Recipient Colonel Wesley Fox.

Lauren Loria joined the Young Marines in 2009; the day she turned 8 years old. During her time as a Young Marine, she has consistently met her goals and objectives. She has documented 1,284 volunteer community service hours, participating in programs such as Homes for the Troops, Young Eagles Rally, Honor Flight Color Guards, STEM functions, Wreaths Across America, and Sobriety Checkpoints with MADD. She has also received 259 hours of Drug Demand Reduction/Prevention instruction, which includes peer education training and counseling, and she has attended all three Leadership Schools offered by the Young Marines, including the National Leadership Academy. Lastly, she has received seven Gold Lamp awards, an annual academic achievement for obtaining a 3.5 GPA or higher.

Now 16 years old, Young Marine Loria will be moving on to Freedom High School to complete her high school education, and I wish her the best of luck in all of her future endeavors. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in extending our sincerest recognition and gratitude to Young Marine Loria for all she has done for our community and our nation.

VICTORIA CORRAL-HERNANDEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Victoria Corral-Hernandez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Victoria Corral-Hernandez is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Victoria Corral-Hernandez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Victoria Corral-Hernandez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION**HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 25, 2017, my vote was not recorded due to a technical error. I intended to vote YES on H.R. 1761 the Protecting Against Child Exploitation Act.

RECOGNIZING MR. ANDREW LOEB SHOENIG UPON HIS DEPARTURE FROM WASHINGTON

HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my great appreciation for a tremendous service that has been rendered to the Congress by Andrew Loeb Shoenig in his capacity as International Programs Director of the Congressional Study Groups.

As you are aware, the Congressional Study Groups are the premier international projects administered by the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress, and they are the most active and substantive bipartisan exchange involving the U.S. Congress and legislative branches of another country.

Mr. Shoenig has been an integral part of the Study Group's outstanding success for almost six years. He worked tirelessly to enable Members to have a productive and fruitful dialogue with colleagues in the legislatures of Germany, Japan, Turkey, and the E.U. His effective leadership has resulted in the creation of a network of colleagues who have an avenue of discourse, so that the many important

international issues that affect our constituencies can be addressed in a constructive and positive manner.

In addition to expressing the appreciation of my colleagues in Congress, I wish to add that on a personal note, it has been a great pleasure working with Andy over the past six years during my chairmanship of the Congressional Study Group on Germany. He is an exceptional professional who has delivered to Members an incredibly valuable and effective service. He is leaving Washington to earn his Master's Degree in Public Administration at the University of North Carolina, and we wish him much success as he pursues this new opportunity.

HONORING CLEOPATHIA MOORE-BELL**HON. JEFF DENHAM**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor West Modesto/King Kennedy Neighborhood Collaborative Executive Director Cleopatia Moore-Bell, who has announced her retirement after numerous years of dedicated service.

In addition to being a founding member of the Christ Unity Baptist Church in 1991, Ms. Moore-Bell took the initiative to create the Stanislaus Multicultural Community Health Coalition/West Modesto King Kennedy Neighborhood Collaborative. She pioneered this movement because she felt the need to captivate and motivate community residents to become more involved with refining the community's health. Thanks to her dedication to her community, this movement was able to serve as a blueprint for the Stanislaus County Public Health's involvement with Partnership for the Public's Health (PPH). From the partnership with PPH, Mobilizing for Action through Planning and Partnerships (MAPP) was born. Through this, Ms. Moore-Bell was once again able to become an active participant engaging in all aspects of health care, community, and government, unifying them to plan a strategy on how to tackle critical health and safety affairs in communities.

Ms. Moore-Bell continues to be committed to her community by advocating for the improvement of health for children and families. Specifically, she focuses on assisting low-income and multicultural populations. She currently serves on the Chief Executive Office (CEO) Stewardship Council for "Focus on Prevention," which is a project designed to draw a spotlight on homelessness, strengthening families, increasing education attainment, and improving health.

It is evident that Cleopatia has a passion to go above and beyond in her field. Her work exemplifies a spirit that is full of joy, optimism, and progress and inspires all who worked with her to create a better community.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and commending Cleopatia Moore-Bell for her many years of service, devotion, and outstanding contributions to public health in her community. We wish her continued success in her retirement.

HONORING REV. PATRICK OLIVER LINDSEY FOR 25 YEARS OF SERVICE AS LEAD PASTOR OF GREATER BIBLEWAY MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues, Representatives DEBBIE DINGELL and BRENDA LAWRENCE, to recognize the outstanding service that Rev. Patrick Oliver Lindsey has provided to the Greater Bibleway Missionary Baptist Church in Detroit, Michigan, over the past 25 years.

For years, this church has been a pillar in the Detroit community, providing more than just spiritual guidance. At the helm has been stalwart lead Pastor Lindsey, who has served tirelessly to ensure the needs of his congregation are met. In June 1992, when Pastor Lindsey assumed the pastorate, he was charged with cultivating the congregation's spiritual growth and development, while overseeing the implementation of the ministry's strategic plan and directing the administration of the church's ecclesiastical and business affairs. Pastor Lindsey successfully spearheaded Phase 1 of the church's building project—a complete renovation of the existing facilities, and he founded the Rev. CJ Henderson Scholarship, which provides students with financial support in their pursuit of higher education.

Pastor Lindsey has been a tireless servant, not only to his church, but to the entire Detroit Metropolitan Community. Pastor Lindsey volunteers his time to serve in a multitude of leadership roles in community organizations such as: Vice Moderator of the Pleasant Grove Baptist District Association, Board Chair of Community-in-Schools of Metropolitan Detroit, and is a board member of the Urban League of Detroit and Southeast Michigan. He is also a member of the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc., and the University of Michigan Alumni Association.

Pastor Lindsey was born to Deacon John (deceased) and Ida Lindsey, and raised on the eastside of Detroit. He was educated in Detroit and Highland Park Public School systems and matriculated to the University of Michigan where he graduated in 1981 with a Bachelor's degree in Political Science. He is married to another spiritual servant, his wife Kathy, and they have two wonderful children: Kendall (a junior at University of Michigan) and Kaylyn (a sophomore at Wayne State University).

Pastor Lindsey currently serves as Vice President of Government and Community Affairs at Wayne State University. In this position, he oversees the federal and state affairs offices, which support the University's goals and strategic plan by working with key stakeholders to ensure adequate funding for the institution's more than 27,000 students enrolled in its 13 schools and colleges.

As you can see, Pastor Lindsey's reach has no bounds. His is truly, first of all, a servant of all. On Saturday, June 10, 2017, he will be honored by the Greater Bibleway Missionary Baptist Church. Today, we urge our colleagues to join us in honoring Pastor Lindsey's

selfless leadership in the church and in his community over the past 25 years.

RECOGNIZING CARMELLA
SABAUGH

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my gratitude to Carmella Sabaugh, who retired from her position as Macomb County Clerk at the beginning of this year. This week she is being honored for her 40 years of distinguished public service.

Carmella Sabaugh began her public career in 1975, when as a young mother of 5 children she was elected to the Warren City Council. She was elected as Warren City Clerk in 1979, a position she held for 11 years, and in 1992, she was elected as Macomb County Clerk. She was subsequently re-elected as County Clerk five times, and chose not to run again in 2016.

As Macomb County Clerk, Carmella was singularly focused on providing model customer service, and worked with her office's team of committed public employees to introduce innovations which made citizens' interactions with the Clerk's office as simple as possible. During Carmella's 24 years as Clerk, her office received 65 Achievement Awards from the National Association of Counties (NACo). These awards highlight innovative programs instituted at the local level, and the programs are shared with clerks around the country as models they can look to as they seek to improve their own operations.

Among her many accomplishments, Carmella and her team made it easier for people to register and exercise their right to vote, created programs to help prevent real estate and other fraud, brought innovations to the operation of the jury room at the Macomb County Circuit Court, and created county photo ID cards for veterans and a program to help veteran's survivors access benefits. And over the years, as new technology and other ways to improve the operation of the Clerk's office became available, Carmella made sure that her office never stopped innovating. Two examples related to awards the Clerk's office received from NACo help to illustrate Carmella's commitment to using new advances to modernize her office, even if that advance replaced something which just a few years earlier had been recognized as a best practice. In 2010, the County Clerk's office received an award for providing jurors waiting to be called for duty to receive pagers so that they could be notified that they were due in court. In 2016, the office received an award for using text messages to do the same thing. And in 2005, the Macomb County Clerk's office was recognized for providing free bus rides to jurors, while in 2016, they received an award for providing jurors with Uber rides to the court.

Those who know Carmella Sabaugh well, as I do, know that her excellence in public service is matched by the quality of her friendship. In the many years I have known her, I have deeply appreciated her warmth, kindness, and generosity of spirit.

Mr. Speaker, Carmella Sabaugh provided the people of Macomb County with truly outstanding service for 40 years. I encourage my colleagues to join me in expressing deep appreciation for all she has done, and in wishing her well in retirement.

HONORING JERRY THATCHER

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of a very special Kentuckian, Mr. Jerry Thatcher.

Mr. Thatcher spent 34 years as an educator in Bath County, Kentucky. He taught at Bethel Elementary and Bath County Middle School. He served as assistant principal at Owingsville Elementary School and as principal at Crossroads Elementary School. Mr. Thatcher also coached soccer, basketball, and tennis and sponsored the Beta Club and many science fairs. He was passionate about education and was a lasting influence on countless lives.

Following his retirement in 2016, Mr. Thatcher became involved in the Kentucky Patriot Guard Riders. While returning from his third mission, he tragically lost his life in an accident. He is survived by his wife Melanie, two sons, and two grandchildren. In memory of his exemplary life, a stretch of US 60 between two of the schools he served is being named the "Jerry Thatcher Memorial Highway."

Mr. Thatcher was a passionate educator, dedicated family man, follower of Christ, and patriotic American. I am honored to recognize the life of Mr. Jerry Thatcher before the United States House of Representatives.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MEREDITH
SHARP

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and honor a young student from my district who has achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in her community. Meredith Sharp of Springfield has just been named one of the top honorees in Missouri by The 2017 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on the most impressive student volunteers in each state and the District of Columbia.

Ms. Sharp is being recognized for raising over \$13,000 to provide new athletic shoes for all 311 students at a local elementary school in a low-income area of Springfield. She created a nonprofit organization called "Just for Kicks," then began seeking donations in person and by mail from relatives, neighbors and business leaders. While she had hoped to collect enough money to buy shoes for one class of kids, she had collected enough for an entire school in just a matter of months.

It's vital that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contribution this young citizen

has made. Young volunteers like Ms. Sharp are inspiring examples to all of us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

The program that brought this young role model to our attention—The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards—was created by Prudential Financial in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued, and to inspire other young people to follow their example. Over the past 22 years, the program has become the nation's largest youth recognition effort based solely on community service, and has honored more than 115,000 young volunteers at the local, state and national level.

Ms. Sharp should be extremely proud to have been singled out from the thousands of dedicated volunteers who participated in this year's program. I wish Ms. Sharp luck with all her future endeavors, and urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating her on this momentous achievement.

VICTORIA MCCOLLUM

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Victoria McCollum for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Victoria McCollum is a student at Arvada West High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Victoria McCollum is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Victoria McCollum for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

LT. COL. AND STAFF

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize United States Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Molly Nelson and her entire Veterans Affairs staff. Lt. Col. Nelson is a Doctor in the Missouri VA Clinic and has dedicated her life to healing and helping veterans who have risked their lives for our country.

Lt. Col. Nelson and her staff continuously go the extra mile for our veterans to make sure they get immediate and effective care. I am honored to share my gratitude and respect for

this Missouri Clinic and their dedication and compassion are an inspiration to us all.

HONORING THEA MEI LEE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR THE AFL-CIO ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues, PETER A. DeFAZIO, DEBBIE DINGELL, KEITH ELLISON, MARCY KAPTUR, BARBARA LEE, SANDER M. LEVIN, JAMES P. MCGOVERN, BILL PASCRELL Jr., MARK POCAN, and ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT. It is our honor to join the many family, friends, and colleagues in extending our deepest thanks and appreciation to Thea Mei Lee, as she marks her retirement as Deputy Chief of Staff at the AFL-CIO.

Over the past twenty years, Thea has made an indelible impact on the AFL-CIO, fighting for trade and economic policies for working families that would promote shared prosperity and sustainable growth. Thea began working for the AFL-CIO in March 1997 as the Assistant Director for the Trade Task Force, and was subsequently promoted to the positions of Director of Public Policy, Chief International Economist and Deputy Chief of Staff.

Thea led the fight against harmful trade agreements and policies negotiated in a manner damaging to working people's interests, including the North American Free Trade Agreement, the Central American Free Trade Agreement, Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China, the World Trade Organization; the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement, the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, the U.S.-China BIT, and many others.

Her work was instrumental to the defeat of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas, and the Multilateral Investment Agreement—harmful trade agreements that would have advanced profits over people and the planet.

She has testified on behalf of America's working people before both the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate. And, she has contributed valued work to the conversation around fair trade, including co-authoring A Field Guide to the Global Economy.

She has often made the case for a fair and inclusive economy—eloquently and passionately on the PBS News Hour, CNN, Good Morning America, and NPR's All Things Considered among others. In 2013, she was named a "Top Lobbyist" by The Hill.

Thea has fought to ensure that all workers around the globe are treated with dignity and afforded fundamental labor rights as recognized by the International Labor Organization. And, she has mobilized workers, helping turn out thousands of working people to protest unjust WTO policies at "The Battle in Seattle."

The AFL-CIO sets a national standard in the fight for working Americans, in large part because of Thea's work. She has left her mark on this outstanding organization and a legacy that will continue to inspire others to

ensure that fair trade benefits working Americans. Her career should encourage all elected officials to continue to focus on building a better, stronger, more inclusive economy for all the people of the United States.

We are honored to stand today to extend our heartfelt thanks and congratulations to Thea Lee for her outstanding leadership and good work, as well as our very best wishes for many more years of health and happiness as she enjoys her retirement.

COMMEMORATING THE 73RD ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY AND REMEMBERING THE MEMBERS OF THE GREATEST GENERATION WHO SAVED FREEDOM IN THE WORLD

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today, June 6, marks the 73rd anniversary of D-Day, the Allied Forces' audacious amphibious landing at Normandy, France, on June 6, 1944.

This joint undertaking to liberate the continent of Europe from the clutches of an evil and aggressor enemy was the first and most emphatic demonstration of the invincible strength of democratic nations when acting collectively.

For nearly seventy years, from April 4, 1949 to January 20, 2017, peace in Europe has been secured and no adversary, not the old Soviet Union or the contemporary Russian Federation, has dared to risk war by attacking a European ally of the United States because every American president has made clear that the United States is committed to Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty which holds that an attack on any NATO member is regarded as an attack on all of them.

Mr. Speaker, "Operation Overlord," as D-Day was formally known, was the largest single amphibious assault in the history of warfare.

The success of D-Day, which was far from certain at the outset, led to the liberation of Western Europe, signaled the death knell of the German Wehrmacht, and paved the way to unconditional victory by the Allied Forces over the evils of Nazism, fascism, and Japanese imperialism.

It is no exaggeration to say that D-Day changed the course of human history.

The aim of the meticulously planned D-Day operation was to open a second front in the European war theater from which the Allied Forces could attack the German army and push east to capture Berlin.

With the Russian Army advancing from the east, coupled with the southern front opened by the Allied invasion of Italy from North Africa in 1942, the opening of a western front would set in motion the pincer movement that would catch the German Army in a trap from which there would be no escape.

The formidable German Army expected that the Allied Forces would try to launch an invasion from the western beaches of France.

They just did not know when or where.

So in anticipation of an Allied invasion, the Nazis constructed the infamous Atlantic Wall, an extensive system of coastal fortifications built along the western coast of Europe and Scandinavia.

Under the direction of Field Marshal Rommel, the Atlantic Wall was reinforced by the addition of concrete pillboxes built along the beaches to house machine guns, antitank guns and light artillery.

Mines and antitank obstacles were planted on the beaches themselves and underwater obstacles and mines were placed in waters just off shore.

By the time of the D-Day landing, the Nazis had laid almost six million mines in northern France.

And awaiting Allied soldiers who made their way onto and away from the beaches were gun emplacements and minefields extended inland.

"War is hell," said General William Tecumseh Sherman during the Civil War.

And that is an apt description of what awaited the brave Allied warriors who set sail from England to the beaches of Normandy in the early morning of June 6, 1944, at the beginning of what has rightly been called "The Longest Day."

But they were buoyed in their resolve by the millions of prayers from Americans and others back home, of all races, religions, and creeds, invoking the Lord's blessing, mercy, and grace.

With the outcome in doubt, President Franklin Roosevelt asked the nation to join him in this solemn prayer:

Almighty God: Our sons, pride of our nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our Republic, our religion, and our civilization, and to set free a suffering humanity.

Lead them straight and true; give strength to their arms, stoutness to their hearts, steadfastness in their faith.

They will need Thy blessings.

For these men are lately drawn from the ways of peace.

They fight not for the lust of conquest.

They fight to end conquest.

They fight to liberate.

They fight to let justice arise, and tolerance and goodwill among all Thy people.

They yearn but for the end of battle, for their return to the haven of home.

The prayers were needed because the cost of D-Day was high; U.S. casualties on D-Day totaled more than 2,499 dead, 3,184 wounded, 1,928 missing, and 26 captured.

Our British and Canadian allies suffered terrible losses on D-Day as well: approximately 2,700 for the British and 946 for the Canadians. German casualties are estimated at 4,000 to 9,000.

In total, the number of combatants killed, wounded or missing in the Battle of Normandy for both sides exceeded 425,000, not including the estimated 15,000 to 20,000 French civilians killed.

But the operation was a success.

More than 156,000 troops or paratroopers came ashore on D-Day, 73,000 from the U.S., 83,000 from Great Britain and Canada.

By the end of June 11, D-Day plus 5, 326,547 troops, 54,186 vehicles and 104,428 tons of supplies had come ashore.

And with them the seeds for the victory in Europe that would come less than a year

later, on May 8, 1945, with the fall of Berlin and the unconditional surrender of the Nazis.

On the eve of the Normandy invasion, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces, addressed the soldiers, sailors, and airmen of the Allied Expeditionary Forces and said to them that they were about to embark upon a "Great Crusade," and that the "eyes of the world" were upon them.

He told them that their task would not be easy because the "enemy is well trained, well equipped and battle-hardened. He will fight savagely."

But, General Eisenhower said, "this is the year 1944. The tide has turned. The free men of the world are marching together to victory."

And march to victory they did, fully justifying General Eisenhower's "confidence in their courage, devotion to duty, and skill in battle."

Because of the heroism of these men who willingly risked their lives to be the tip of the spear of liberty, the war was won and a world was saved for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, D-Day was, and remains, a day like no other in the history of man's sojourn on earth.

We remember Gettysburg.

There, President Lincoln paid tribute to those "who gave their lives so that the nation might live."

It is equally fitting and proper that we never forget D-Day and that we continue to honor those who risked all and gave all so that the world could remain free.

IN RECOGNITION OF FLUTONIC HARMONICS FLUTE STUDIO

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a local flute studio and flute choir in my district, Flutonic Harmonics, for their hard work, dedication to the arts, and immense achievements for which they have attained national recognition over the past year. Local choirs and organizations, like Flutonic Harmonics, are vital to engaging our youth and expanding their educational experience beyond the classroom.

Flutonic Harmonics is led by my constituent, Michelle Rubis, of Purcellville, Virginia, and under her leadership they have experienced tremendous success. Last year, the flute choir performed before the entire Purcellville Town Council and subsequently at the Universal STARS Performance Program. This annual event takes place at Universal Studios in Orlando, Florida, and gives some of the nation's most prestigious marching bands, concert bands, dance teams, choirs, or other performing groups the opportunity to showcase their talents on a national stage in front of thousands of Universal Studios visitors. Additionally, this program allows for these young musicians to interact with other talented artists around the country.

This coming June, Flutonic Harmonics will be recording their recital and sending it to several famous venues in New York, Boston, and

even Italy for consideration. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring Flutonic Harmonics and Michelle Rubis for their participation in Universal STARS Performance Program and for their exemplary dedication, impressive talent, and noteworthy accomplishments. I wish them all the best in their future endeavors and look forward to seeing all they will accomplish in the years to come.

HONORING MALCOLM STOKELY

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a very special individual, Mr. Malcolm Stokely, of Clark County, Kentucky. Mr. Stokely, a part of the Greatest Generation, answered his nation's call to service during World War II.

Mr. Stokely enlisted in the United States Army on March 28, 1945. After training in Texas, he was sent to Missouri to board a massive train that transported thousands of troops across the Rocky Mountains to Portland, Oregon. The troops then boarded a ship, which, unknown to them, was part of a top-secret invasion party of hundreds of ships and thousands of troops headed for Japan. While en route, the United States dropped the first atomic bomb on Japan, which was ineffective in stopping the war. After the second bomb was dropped and Japan surrendered, the troops were told they had actually been headed for Japan and thousands of them likely would have died in battle. After the surrender, the ships turned around. Mr. Stokely's ship landed in Hawaii where he served out the remainder of his tour in the signal corps. He was discharged on December 9, 1946.

Mr. Stokely returned home to lead an active and productive life. At the age of 93, he is a regular on the golf course and leads an aerobics class. He is very active in his church, Ephesus Baptist, where he serves as a deacon and choir leader.

The bravery of Mr. Stokely and his fellow men and women of the United States military is heroic. Because they were willing to serve our great nation, our freedoms have been preserved for our generation and for future generations. He is truly an outstanding American patriot. It is my honor to recognize him before the United States House of Representatives.

CONGRATULATIONS TO GRANBY FIRST CHURCH OF GOD

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Granby First Church of God on 100 years of service and dedication to the Granby community.

Granby First Church of God, which was first known as the "old rock church," opened its doors in 1917. Since then, the church has wel-

comed thousands of people from all different walks of life. When Joplin was hit by a devastating tornado in May of 2011, Granby First Church of God didn't hesitate to open its doors for people outside their community. As people came in to volunteer and help with clean-up, they were allowed to use the Family Life Center as a place to stay.

Granby First Church of God is vital to the Granby, Missouri community.

I am honored to recognize Granby First Church of God and its dedication to not only southwest Missouri, but the many communities throughout the area. On behalf of Missouri's 7th Congressional District, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Granby First Church of God on 100 years of service.

TIARA SISNEROS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Tiara Sisneros for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Tiara Sisneros is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Tiara Sisneros is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Tiara Sisneros for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING MR. VERNE ALLISON AND THE DELLS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring the R&B music group, the Dells. Mr. Verne Allison, the last surviving member of the Dells, was visiting Washington, D.C. over the last few days so I wanted to take this opportunity to recognize the group and their outstanding music.

Originally from Chicago, Illinois, the Dells formed out of a group of young men still in high school: Marvin Junior, Verne Allison, Johnny Funches, Chuck Barksdale and Mickey and Lucius McGill. They originally called themselves the El-Rays, but changed their name to The Dells once they signed with Vee Jay Records in 1955. It was at this record company where they released their hit recording, "Oh What a Night," which, at one point,

finished right behind Elvis' "Don't Be Cruel" on the music charts. By the early 1960s, with their reach growing, the Dells were able to tour with big artists like Dinah Washington and Ray Charles, opening for them and exposing themselves to much bigger audiences.

A soundtrack to the 1960s would not be complete without soulful melodies from groups like the Dells. At a time of constant political and social upheaval, a Washingtonian could turn on the radio and be serenaded with songs like the Dells' "Give Your Baby a Standing Ovation" and "Stay in My Corner," a 1965 top 30 R&B hit. Decades passed and the Dells' music largely adapted. Members of the band remained largely stable. Their final work was the "The Heart is a House for Love," part of a soundtrack for a movie in 1991. The Dells were inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame in 2004. Today, Verne Allison, one of the original members of the Dells, is the band's only surviving member.

While Mr. Allison was in my district, he worked closely with DC Legendary Musicians. This organization works to protect the legacy of D.C. area musicians, past and present, and promote the music of artists from Washington around the globe. Although Mr. Allison and the Dells are from Chicago, DC Legendary Musicians recognizes the impact that music from artists like the Dells—who have performed locally at the Howard Theater, Constitution Hall and the Kennedy Center—have had on D.C. and its own music scene and history. Their work is crucial to ensuring this essential part of D.C. culture stays intact. I thank DC Legendary Musicians for their contributions to the District.

I ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring Mr. Verne Allison and the Dells. We celebrate their harmonious and soulful music that is part of the rich American tapestry that is Rhythm and Blues. I am very pleased we can still listen to it today.

HONORING THE VICTIMS AND HISTORY OF THE MS "ST. LOUIS"

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 78th anniversary of the day that 937 mostly Jewish refugees aboard the MS *St. Louis* were denied entry to the United States.

In the summer of 1939, fleeing unspeakable horrors under Hitler's regime, men, women, and children set sail in search of refuge. After being denied entry to the United States, Canada, and Cuba, many refugees were eventually accepted into several European countries. Over a quarter, however, were not so lucky and lost their lives in concentration camps.

The Brooklyn Synagogue Coalition for Refugees is one of many Jewish communities across the country that will gather to hold a candlelight vigil to honor the victims and history of this anniversary.

At a time when acts of fear and intolerance have dictated policies to yet again shut America's doors to those fleeing harm, we must re-

main committed to ensuring that America is and will continue to be a place of hope and second chances.

I'd like to thank the Brooklyn Synagogue Coalition for Refugees for their hard work and dedication to the Jewish community. As we reflect on this tragic occasion, let us recommit to ensuring that no one who is in desperate need is turned away from our country's shores.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. CHRISTOPHER J. QUINN

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Christopher J. Quinn on his selection as President-Elect of the American Optometric Association (AOA). Dr. Quinn will be installed as the AOA's 96th President during the 120th Congress of the House of Delegates this year.

Dr. Quinn's long-standing involvement with the AOA exemplifies his dedication to the association and the greater medical community. He has served on the Board of Trustees since 2008 and is a liaison trustee to the Accreditation Council on Optometric Education and the American Academy of Optometry. Throughout his career, Dr. Quinn has also been a member of the AOA Federal Relations Committee, the AOA State Government Relations Committee, and has also served as an AOA representative to the American Medical Association's Resource Based Relative Value Upstate Committee—Health Care Professionals Advisory Committee.

In addition to his experience with the AOA, Dr. Quinn is past president of the New Jersey Society of Optometric Physicians, a Fellow of the American Academy of Optometry and is an adjunct professor at the Pennsylvania College of Optometry, State University of New York, New England College of Optometry, University of California at Berkeley and The Ohio State University. He is also the owner and president of Omni Eye Services in New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in congratulating Dr. Quinn as President-Elect of the American Optometric Association and thanking him for his commitment to his patients and the field of optometry.

NATIONAL REPUBLIC DAY OF AZERBAIJAN

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Republic Day of Azerbaijan commemorating Azerbaijan's 99th year of independence and democracy. In 1918, Azerbaijan became the first democratic and secular Muslim country in the world. However, in 1920, the country was absorbed into the

Soviet Union. After seven decades, Azerbaijan prevailed over the forces of communism to restore the country's independence in 1991, following the collapse of the Soviet Union. Azerbaijan's National Republic Day highlights the nation's significant contributions to global stability, and religious tolerance.

As an unwavering U.S. ally, Azerbaijan has provided vital resources for U.S. and NATO forces and fought side-by-side with U.S. troops in Afghanistan. The United States is grateful for Azerbaijan's security contributions in Afghanistan, Kosovo and Iraq as well as the country's commitment to global nonproliferation efforts.

As a tolerant and secular Muslim-majority nation, Azerbaijan is dedicated to religious pluralism and ensuring the right of religious freedom. Azerbaijan is home to a thriving Jewish community and since the early 1990s, bilateral relations between Azerbaijan and Israel have grown in the fields of intelligence sharing, security coordination and economic development.

I commend Azerbaijan for their participation in the international community as a member of the United Nations (UN), North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

Azerbaijan is a strong partner of the United States in a strategically important and complex region of the world. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Azerbaijani people on their National Republic Day.

RECOGNIZING "MARY A. WHALEN"

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the launch of the NYC Ferry South Brooklyn route, I rise to recognize the 79th birthday of the tanker *Mary A. Whalen* (The *Mary*).

The *Mary* was launched in May of 1938, and now serves as a vital community landmark and asset in Red Hook, Brooklyn. As home to PortSide NewYork, a nonprofit organization, the tanker is a vessel for arts, education and vocational programs as well as public access to the waterfront.

By recognizing the importance of a life of continued learning, PortSide NewYork developed Red Hook WaterStories. As a digital museum, WaterStories is a resource for both locals and visitors to learn about the history and present of the Red Hook Waterfront.

PortSide NewYork received a 2013 Champions of Change White House Award for their Superstorm Sandy preparations that protected the *Mary* followed by creating a pop-up aid station to ensure recovery efforts for the community after the storm.

The *Mary* is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and is the only oil tanker cultural center in the world. On June 1, 2017, the NYC Ferry will make its maiden journey to Red Hook, pulling up right beside the *Mary*.

I applaud PortSide NewYork for their dedication to serving the communities ashore and afloat, the Red Hook community and the maritime community of this port. On this joyful day,

I wish them many more years of continued learning and success.

MARK GALLAGHER'S ENDURING
LEGACY

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Gallagher family will lay to rest a beloved husband, father, brother, grandfather and great grandfather—Mark Gallagher.

I worked with Mark for many years in his capacity as the key U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops lobbyist for the poor and unborn. Mark was a quiet but extraordinarily powerful force. While the full reach of his impactful life can only be known to God, those of us who were blessed to know him witnessed the many ways his persevering work made a positive difference for the lives of the weakest and most vulnerable.

First hired by the National Committee for a Human Life Amendment in 1974, Mark formally took up the cause just one year after *Roe v. Wade* stripped the unborn child of all legal protection. He eventually represented the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops as their lead lobbyist until his retirement in 2007. Over the course of those three decades, Mark played an integral role in every pro-life effort in Congress.

He educated an entire generation of lawmakers on the arguments for protecting the unborn, at a time when few others could be found on Capitol Hill with this expertise.

Mark's skillfulness and serene demeanor was critical to the enactment of and defense of the Hyde amendment—the landmark amendment preventing federal funding of abortion that has saved the lives of at least two million people. Two million people who have been aborted instead survived because

public funds were unavailable to effectuate their violent demise.

Mark was as concerned about the plight of women facing an unplanned pregnancy as he was about their unborn children. A former worker for U.S. anti-poverty programs like Catholic Charities, he was happy to take part in efforts to pass the Family and Medical Leave Act and the Refundable Child Tax Credit.

A brilliant strategist for the causes he served, Mark was always selfless and self-effacing. Thanks to Mark's mastery of intricate details of the rules of Congress, all the legislative recommendations of the Meese Report, i.e. the Attorney General's commission to combat pornography, were enacted into law.

Beyond living out a Christ-like care for the vulnerable in the political realm, Mark also labored for souls, becoming a permanent deacon in the Catholic Church in 1996.

Someday soon, America will protect the weakest and most vulnerable. And into eternity Mark Gallagher played a critical part in this all-important human rights struggle. We are grateful for the gift of his life and pray for his family in their time of grief.

INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION
COMMEMORATING THE
BRAVERY OF RICK BEST,
TALIESIN MYRDDIN NAMKAI-MECHE,
AND MICAH DAVID-COLE
FLETCHER

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I, with Representatives SUZANNE BONAMICI, PETER DEFAZIO, KURT SCHRADER, and GREG WALDEN and the support of Sens. WYDEN and MERKLEY, am introducing a resolution commemorating the bravery of Rick Best, Taliesin Myrddin Namkai-Meche, and Micah David-

Cole Fletcher. These courageous heroes stood up against hate and injustice. Rick, Taliesin, and Micah make us proud to be Oregonians. This resolution is to honor these heroes, help our community heal, and allow for introspection and broader discussion. As we begin the process of healing, we must all continue to protect one another, help one another, and work for peace and justice. I urge the House to pass this resolution.

CONGRATULATING THE BROOKLYN
CHINESE-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2017

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to congratulate the Brooklyn Chinese-American Association (BCA) on its 29th Anniversary Celebration. BCA offers life-changing services to numerous communities that have become collectively known as "Brooklyn Chinatown".

Since its establishment in 1988, BCA has helped to meet the needs of Brooklyn's rapidly growing Asian-American community. Their daycare programs nurture children and their senior centers give the elderly a chance to meet, socialize and stay active.

Through adult educational programs, BCA helps immigrants adjust to their new communities. Further, by providing naturalization assistance, BCA aids applicants in the process of becoming an American citizen.

BCA is committed to preserving and revitalizing local neighborhoods, supporting clean-up campaigns and fighting for crime prevention and victim's rights.

Thanks to the hard work of the staff and community at BCA, Brooklyn's communities are a better place to live, work and celebrate a diverse cultural heritage.

SENATE—Wednesday, June 7, 2017

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Father of love, whose presence and power is revealed to the hearts that long for Your guidance, we thank You for the gift of this day. May we use this borrowed time for Your glory.

As our lawmakers strive to honor You, may they work with commendable zeal, knowing that life's evening is coming when their labor will be done. Lord, give them the wisdom to keep Your words in their hearts, providing them with a lamp for their feet and a light for their paths.

Continue to be our strength and shield. May we think of You consistently and trust You constantly.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PAUL thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 1628

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1628) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

SANCTIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Senators today will have an opportunity to advance important bipartisan Iran sanctions legislation. As we consider this bill, we anticipate that amendments addressing Russia sanctions are likely to be offered. I am encouraged that the chairmen of the Foreign Relations and Banking Committees, Senator CORKER and Senator CRAPO, have already been in discussions with their respective ranking members to work toward a bipartisan agreement. I support that effort, and I will have more to say about the underlying legislation tomorrow.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Mr. President, on one other matter, later today President Trump will visit Cincinnati to discuss the importance of our Nation's inland waterways. Kentucky is home to over 1,900 miles of navigable inland waterways, which, in addition to adding majestic beauty to my State, are also vital to thousands of jobs in the Commonwealth.

In recent years, over 95 million tons of cargo and agricultural products have been transported across these water trade routes. Our many levees, docks, and dams represent crucial infrastructure that play an important role in our regional and national economy.

I am proud of the work Congress has done in the past to protect our Nation's waterways, like passing the Water Resources Development Act by a bipartisan majority last year in order to support infrastructure, enhance commerce, and maintain American ecosystems.

As President Trump continues to release his plans for our Nation's infrastructure, I look forward to working with the administration and colleagues in the Senate to protect and improve the many roads, bridges, airports, and waterways that serve people and jobs all across our country.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 722 occur at 1:45 p.m. today, and if cloture is invoked, time postcloture count as if invoked at 10:30 a.m.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

SANCTIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first on Iran and Russia: This week we will be considering bipartisan legislation to impose sanctions on Iran for its ballistic missile testing, for its human rights abuses, and for its overt support of terrorism. I support this and look forward to a vote on the measure. It is important we do it.

I also understand that the majority leader will consent to an amendment vote alongside that bill on bipartisan Russia sanctions legislation. There is a broad bipartisan consensus for moving forward on tough sanctions against Russia. Russia defied the sovereignty of the Ukraine with the annexation of Crimea. It has been accused of human rights abuses including propping up the brutal Assad regime in Syria, and of course the intelligence community has confirmed that Russia interfered with our democracy.

I appreciate that the majority leader has committed to having a vote on

Russia sanctions, and I thank so many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for pushing this issue. It is the right thing to do, and I appreciate them doing it.

I strongly believe that Russia's sanctions legislation needs to do three important things. First, we must codify existing sanctions on Russia; second, we need to give Congress a chance to review any decision by this administration before sanctions are lifted; and, third, we need to impose tough, new sanctions on Russia for its attack on our democracy.

Two pieces of legislation, one posted by the two lead sponsors, Senators MCCAIN and CARDIN, the other by Senators GRAHAM and CARDIN—both bipartisan and both, I believe, with at least 10 cosponsors from each side of the aisle—do these things. What we have suggested to the leader is that we put those two bills together and combine them, tweak them a little bit, and move forward. We await the answer from the majority leader on our proposal.

It is certainly our responsibility and the responsibility of this Congress to vote on the tough Russia sanctions bill as a response to Russia's persistent violations of international norms and agreements.

If we do nothing on Russia or if we have a weak bill, we will not accomplish that goal, and Mr. Putin will continue to do everything he is doing. We know sanctions have bite with Russia. If the Russians see that this Congress, in a bipartisan way, is resolute and strong, it will make a difference, and I hope we move forward.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, there are many subjects in this very quickly changing world in which we live. The next subject is infrastructure.

Today, President Trump will continue his infrastructure week in talking about inland waterways. I would like to repeat that Democrats welcome a discussion about these issues. Democrats have argued in favor of a large infrastructure package to address our crumbling roads and bridges, our levees, our dams, our ports, and our locks for a long time. While we disagreed with President Trump on a great many things during the campaign, I think many of my colleagues thought that when Mr. Trump was elected, we could find some common ground on the topic of infrastructure.

Needless to say, so far, the President's actions on infrastructure have been a disappointment. In 6 months, the President has not given any real details about his infrastructure plan. The most he has done is endorse an off-the-shelf plan to privatize air traffic control. In fact, he actually cut infrastructure spending in his budget by

over \$200 billion. Now, during what they have termed "infrastructure week," the White House has only proposed to privatize much of our infrastructure.

Today, I expect more of the same—bold promises, few details. What details we do hear will likely be about how large financiers should decide where and how to build American infrastructure. That has never happened before. The approach will not address the very broad infrastructure needs we have. Financiers will not pay to finance infrastructure projects from which they cannot make a buck. It is their right to seek a profit—that is what businesses do and are supposed to do—but there is no such thing as a free lunch. They are going to need to get recompense when they lay out money. That kind of approach will not fix our water sewer systems. It will not expand rural broadband. It will not fix our energy grid. It will do one thing—lead to Trump tolls from one end of America to the other.

After the election, we stood ready to work with the President on a real bill, provided it would not be just tax breaks for private financiers or roll back labor and environmental protections. We even wrote a detailed blueprint on how to spend \$1 trillion. That was the President's number. It would create 13 to 15 million jobs. It would rebuild our infrastructure—large parts of it—from one end of America to the other. It would not leave out rural areas that will never benefit from any kind of private financing, as Senators BARRASSO and MORAN have made clear.

We sent it to the White House and never heard a peep. I have talked to the President several times on the phone and said that I want to work with him on infrastructure—no response. Now we have their plan without any consultation from Democrats. Even with talk that they should do this on reconciliation, there has been no Democratic support or votes or input. Just as their doing things by reconciliation is tying the Republican Party in knots on healthcare, it does not bode too well for them on tax reform. It will mess up infrastructure as well.

So I hope the President drops his go-at-it-alone infrastructure push and instead decides to sit down and talk to Democrats about the issue. We agree wholeheartedly on the problem and its magnitude. Let's sit down and start talking about what solutions actually make sense. Let's not have a few financiers who whisper into the President's ear determine our infrastructure policy—because it will be a flop.

TRUMPCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, on another matter: healthcare.

Yesterday, the insurer Anthem pulled out of exchanges in Ohio, citing

the administration's decision to hold cost-sharing reduction payments hostage as the reason for its exit. Anthem joins a growing list of health insurers that have chosen to leave the 2018 marketplace or considered raising their rates as a result of the uncertainty the President and Republicans are causing—deliberately, in my judgment—in our healthcare system.

The President and Republicans blame ObamaCare for insurers leaving the marketplace. It is simply not true. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said it is the "substantial uncertainty about enforcement of the individual mandate and about future payments of the cost-sharing subsidies" that have led insurers to withdraw from the current marketplace. AHIP, which is hardly a Democratic group—it is the largest trade group of insurers and is completely nonpartisan—said the uncertainty about cost-sharing payments was "the single most destabilizing factor in the individual market."

The Affordable Care Act is not falling under its own weight. It is being sabotaged deliberately by President Trump and Republicans who have been whipping up all of this uncertainty to gain political advantage, to say: "I told you so." They are hurting millions of people. That is really wrong.

After downplaying weeks of expectations in moving forward, yesterday our Republican colleagues said they expect to have a repeal bill passed by June 30. That is 23 days from today. From all reports, the efforts by Republican Senators to craft a different TrumpCare will be based on many of the provisions in the House bill—a bill that would remove the guarantee of coverage for preexisting conditions, raise rates on some older Americans by as much as 800 percent, and decimate Medicaid, which so helps rural folks, folks with a family member in a nursing home, and those suffering from opioid abuse. It would also leave 23 million more Americans without health insurance.

I remind all of my colleagues on the other side that drafting a Senate Republican healthcare bill that is based on a House bill is putting lipstick on a pig. TrumpCare is fundamentally flawed, has been rejected overwhelmingly by the American people of all political stripes, and will devastate our healthcare system in order to finance massive tax breaks for the wealthiest of Americans. There is no amount of window dressing that can fix up a flawed concept.

I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that even if the proposal is 10 or 20 percent better than the House bill, it ain't close to being good enough for the American people. Republicans ought to drop the repeal. Choose to work with Democrats to actually improve our healthcare system, not to sabotage it.

BORDER WALL

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, Mr. President, a word on the President's latest idea for a border wall with Mexico. After the idea of a border wall was roundly rejected in the last omnibus by Members of both parties and after no Republican from a border State area would support the border wall, the President just cannot seem to let it go. Yesterday, it was reported that he actually pitched the idea of a 40- or 50-foot-tall border wall with solar panels. Never mind that he still has not come up with a plan on how to build the wall, where to build it—on our side or the Rio Grande side—or how to get the land on the border from the private citizens who own it. Never mind that a border wall would be incredibly expensive and ineffective in actually preventing illegal border crossings. Never mind that Mexico still wouldn't be paying for the border wall or its solar panels.

The President is still pushing this medieval proposal—now with an absurd twist. Just like painting stripes on a pony doesn't make a zebra, solar panels on a wall no one wants doesn't make it any more attractive. If the President thinks his new idea will catch on in Congress, well, I have a 50-foot-tall wall made of solar panels I will sell to you.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

COUNTERING IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIVITIES ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 722, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 110, S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I understand that we had originally scheduled for, in about 1 minute, a vote on cloture on the new Iran sanctions bill. I understand that the cloture vote has been delayed until early this afternoon.

This comes on the heels of an announcement of very sad news from Iran. I would certainly be among the first to note that some of the people in Iran, the Revolutionary Guard and some of their leadership, support terrorism. They wish ill for us and for our country.

That same country had elections about 2 weeks ago, and the results of those elections were surprising, even for me, but encouraging. The results of the election found that President Rouhani, one of the leaders of reform and one of the modern elements within that country, was reelected by a resounding majority—close to 60 percent of the vote. Although the Supreme Leader thought it would be a one-on-one race for the Presidency, in spite of that, Rouhani was reelected, and we congratulate him. There were a number of municipal elections across the country, most prominently in Tehran where the hard-line mayor of Tehran has been ousted, and moderate forces seem to have made real, encouraging progress from my perspective and I think the perspective of most Americans.

One of the things the Iranians do, which is troubling to me and I think to others in this country, is continue to test ballistic missiles in what we believe is in violation of the United Nations' decision. Iranians are not violating the agreement that was entered into among five nations, including the United States and Iran, roughly 2 years ago in Iran's nuclear joint agreement. They are not violating that, but they are violating other U.N. sanctions.

So this revised sanctions bill, which was scheduled to be debated today and maybe voted on later this week—at least the start of the debate on whether they are going to proceed to the bill—has been delayed until this afternoon. I urge us to consider delaying further action on this Iran sanctions measure today or this week.

The term "adding insult to injury" comes to mind. I try to use the Golden Rule to figure out what I should do and how I should behave as a human being, and I think maybe we ought to consider the Golden Rule in this case as well. Iran is not necessarily our close friend. They are not our close ally. I think the potential is there for having a much better relationship as a young generation of Iranians grows up and eventually assumes the leadership of their country.

It is a country of 80 million people, over half of them under the age of 25. They had a revolution in 1979 and cap-

tured our Embassy. They held our people for a year or more until after the 1980 Presidential election. Our relations with Iran have been difficult since that time but more encouraging of late—again, a young country of 80 million people, more than half under the age of 25.

The younger generation there wants to have a good relationship with the rest of the world, a better relationship with the rest of the world, and certainly a better relationship with us. I have talked with a number of American leaders, including senior American leaders, who have been to Iran in recent years and were surprised by the warm welcome they received.

It reminds me very much of the warm welcome I received leading a congressional delegation to Vietnam in August of 1991 to find out what happened to thousands of MIAs. We were expecting to be met by suspicion and hostility, and we were warmly embraced at that time. Six of us—Democratic and Republican Congressmen—were there to present to the leadership of Vietnam on behalf of the George Herbert Walker Bush administration a roadmap to normalize relations if they would do a number of things to enable us to find out what happened to thousands of our MIAs. We presented that proposal. John Kerry and JOHN MCCAIN worked very hard on the Senate side and at the same time in Southeast Asia as well. We ended up with normalized relations within a few years of our visit. One of the members of my delegation, Pete Peterson, became our first U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam.

I mention that today because of the hostility we felt toward Vietnam for many years during the war and after the war and the suspicion that they were holding thousands of our MIAs as POWs, which turned out not to be true. But our efforts, along with those of Senator MCCAIN, Senator Kerry, and others, ended up providing information about the missing and the closure we hoped for hundreds of families of Americans who had lost their loved ones in Vietnam and never recovered their remains—although some of their remains were recovered and returned to the families.

I mention it today because a year ago in Vietnam, with President Obama and Secretary Kerry, and at a time when the Vietnamese were announcing they were going to buy billions of dollars' worth of our Boeing aircraft—we are their top trading partner, and they were going to be an integral part of the Trans-Pacific Partnership that we negotiated, along with other nations. Sadly, that has gone away. I think one of the biggest mistakes of this Congress and the last was to let the trans-Pacific trade partnership die. But Vietnam was a key member of that.

It is kind of ironic to me that a nation with whom we fought in a war,

where the names of 55,000 who died are at the Vietnam Memorial—not even 2 miles from where I am standing right now—yet, since the 1970s we have let bygones be bygones and have a much better relationship with Vietnam. They are still Communist, and they are still a one-party system, but they have high regard toward Americans.

Rather remarkably, we learned last April when we were there that they had two surveys done of the Vietnamese people this last year. One survey found that 85 percent of the people surveyed had favorable opinions of the United States, more than any other nation in the world. In the second survey, we learned that about 95 percent of the Vietnamese people had favorable opinions of the United States, more than any other nation on Earth.

Again, we are their top trading partner these days, and they are buying a lot of the products we manufacture and sell. If that relationship can change, I think there is reason to hope our relationship with Iran can change.

We have our pages here. If it were left to the generation the age of our pages or maybe their parents, it would be a brandnew day in Iran. But change is happening there.

The question is, on the heels of this attack by ISIS, with whom we have bitter differences and a hotly contested armed conflict—for us to somehow, on the heels of two attacks by ISIS in Iran, one on the Parliament and the other apparently on the mausoleum for the former Ayatollah, where a dozen or more people have been killed, 40-something wounded—does it make sense for us to take up the Iran sanctions bill today? I don't think so.

My reading of the Golden Rule, treating other people the way we want to be treated, would suggest this might not be the right day to do this—next week, maybe; today, no. I call on our leadership to hit the pause button. There is not a need to rush on this.

The Iran sanctions bill, which is coming to us today, is a much more thoughtful approach than was originally contemplated by the Foreign Relations Committee. They have done a very nice job of improving what I thought was a badly flawed earlier effort. But this might be a good day to hit the pause button. Instead of rubbing salt into a wound, let's wait a few days and consider what to do. If we were in their shoes, I think we would appreciate that gesture. If we were in their shoes, I think the idea of their taking this kind of action or step against us on a day that we have been attacked by ISIS would not be well received. It would be badly received. So I think we ought to treat them the same way.

I think that is pretty much it. I appreciate the chance to come to the floor and say a few words. I call on leadership to delay this vote on cloture

and to delay the vote on the underlying bill until next week. When we do the underlying bill on Iran sanctions, let's couple it with something that includes some of the very thoughtful work going on with respect to Russia, which really is creating mischief in this country—not just with elections but otherwise as well—and maybe do a package that includes both together. That might make a lot more sense, and the timing would be a lot better.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I am strongly supportive of adding sanctions against Russia to the bill that is scheduled to come up this afternoon. As I think we all know, Russia actively worked to influence our 2016 Presidential election and continues to try to destabilize democracies around the world, including our own, and that is unacceptable.

At the same time, I have serious concerns about the sanctions on Iran contained in this bill. As we have heard from former Obama administration officials, including Secretary Kerry and Ambassador Sherman, these measures could undermine the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the very important nuclear agreement signed in 2015 between the United States, our P5+1 partners, and Iran. But above and beyond that, let us be aware and cognizant that earlier today, the people of Iran suffered a horrific terror attack in their capital, Tehran, in which 12 people were killed and many more were injured. The Islamic State has claimed credit for this attack.

At a time when tensions are extremely high in that part of the world, our goal must be to find ways to bring people together to reduce tensions rather than to exacerbate this very painful and dangerous situation. Let us also remember that the leaders of Iran immediately expressed condolences for the September 11 attacks against the United States and that hundreds of Iranians held a candlelight vigil.

It seems to me to be the right thing to do—on a day when Iran has been attacked by ISIS, by terrorism, now is not the time to go forward with legislation calling for sanctions against Iran. I would respectfully request that we delay our vote on this bill until next week. Let us tell the people of Iran that while we have serious disagreements with them on a number of issues, that today, when they are mourning, when they are dealing with the shock of a terrorist attack, today

is not the day to go forward with this piece of legislation.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor very briefly to make what, I hope, is a reasonable recommendation to my colleagues on both sides.

We are due to vote later today on moving forward on a piece of legislation that I support. Last week, we voted out of the Foreign Relations Committee a new sanctions bill against the Iranian regime for its continued movement toward a ballistic missile program that, ultimately, could threaten the security of the Middle East and could threaten the security of our sacred ally in the region, Israel. It also speaks to Iran's continued problematic human rights record and its support for terrorism in the region.

We should move forward on this piece of legislation, but I would recommend that we not do so today. There is reason to have this debate, but given the terrorist attack that occurred in Iran, given the fact that today we know that there are 12 dead and 40 wounded in 2 very coordinated attacks, my worry is that, literally, at the moment of grieving in Iran, this resolution would look as directed not at the regime, as it is, but at the Iranian people. It would seem intemperate and, ultimately, do more damage than good.

This is an important resolution to debate. We can find the time to get this done, but given the unfortunate timing—obviously, not intentional in our moving this forward this week—given the attacks that just occurred and for which ISIS has claimed responsibility, I would hope that we could find a way to move this to another time. I think it is really important because, ultimately, it is in the United States' national security interest for the Iranian people to get their way, who are, broadly speaking, Western-oriented and who, broadly speaking, want a democratic, internationalist future.

In everything we do, we need to make it clear that we have deep disagreements with the Iranian regime—its rhetoric toward Israel, its inflaming of tensions, its funding of proxy wars in the region—and that our beef is not with the people of Iran. From time to time, that is a difficult distinction to make, but it is a very important distinction to make. By choosing to postpone this debate and this vote to another time, I think we will send an important message to the Iranian people

that we want to give them the time to grieve and that we want to give them the time to understand the scope of this attack.

I do not think it comes at much of a cost or loss to us. It is important to remember that when we were attacked on September 11, there were vigils held throughout Iran. The regime itself was not sponsoring those, but the Iranian people did stand up and, in substantial numbers, displayed a common cause with the people of this country—again, another sign that this disagreement is not with the people of Iran but with the regime.

Despite my having some reservations about this piece of legislation—I do not endorse it wholeheartedly, but I am a supporter of it and will vote for it when it comes to the floor of the Senate—I would hope that the leadership on both sides of the aisle might find a path so as to give the people of Iran some grieving space, to make sure that we are not sending the wrong message with this vote this afternoon, and to find some time later this summer to take up a very, very important issue.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise today in strong support of the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017, but first I would like to offer my strongest condemnation of the terrorist attack allegedly carried out by ISIS this morning in Tehran, which claimed the lives of 12 people. Attacks on civilians in any corner of the world must be strongly condemned by the United States, and I offer my condolences to the people of Iran and the families who lost loved ones in this latest act of terror.

If anything, these events remind us that the entire Middle East is increasingly under siege, and the United States and the entire international community must unite to confront terrorism and extremism in all of its forms. That means holding governments that continue to foment, fund, and encourage terrorism accountable.

While the people of Iran suffered a heinous attack today, the unfortunate reality is that the violence, volatility, and profound human suffering that imperils the Middle East are all too often linked back to the Government of Iran. Across the region, this regime continues to pursue policies that threaten the national security interests of the United States. It continues to support terrorism and exert influence through

the growing power of proxy actors throughout the Levant and Yemen. Even as it continues to supply terrorists across the region with money, weapons, and resources, the people of Iran continue to suffer under an oppressive regime with absolutely no respect for basic human rights.

We all know the United States faces a multitude of threats at home and abroad, from Russia's cyber attack on our elections, to North Korea's continued belligerence, to new questions about America's leadership in the world. But even as Congress rightly remains focused on these challenges, we must not lose sight of Iran's ongoing, ever-growing efforts to exert more control, more power, and more influence throughout the Middle East. Whether we are talking about an adversary like Russia or Iran or an international challenge like climate change or the refugee crisis, we cannot let issues of such importance to our future be obscured by partisan politics, derailed by divisive tweets, or lost amid the revelations of our relentless 24-hour news cycle.

I have always believed politics must stop at the water's edge, and I know many of my colleagues share that principle. That is why there is such broad bipartisan support for the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act. I am pleased to have worked with Senators CORKER, CARDIN, and a number of other colleagues on legislation that has earned the support of nearly 60 cosponsors. We crafted this legislation by listening to an array of different voices with experience addressing Iran's destabilizing influence.

But let me be clear. This bill is not—is not—about Iran's nuclear program. This bill is not about the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. With the regime's tentacles reaching across the region—from its support of a Shia proxy network in Iraq, to its growing influence in Afghanistan, to its continued sponsorship of terrorist groups like Hezbollah and Hamas—we need a strategic approach, one that energizes our partners in the region and recognizes their capacity to counter Iran's behavior. That is exactly what the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act does.

Our legislation calls on the President of the United States to develop a regional strategy to counter Iran's asymmetric and conventional threats across the Middle East. We know that Iran, for example, continues to develop sophisticated ballistic missile technologies. They aren't exactly hiding it. Just a few weeks ago, a semi-official news service for the Iranian Revolutionary Guard announced it had built a third underground facility dedicated to ballistic missiles. Iran continues to test launch missiles, some of which may be capable of reaching Europe or Israel—both critical allies of the

United States. In fact, some of the missiles launched earlier this year had the words "Israel must be wiped off the Earth" etched on their sides. That is why S. 722 requires the President to impose sanctions on any person who knowingly engages and materially contributes in support of Iran's ballistic missiles program.

Some argue that imposing new sanctions on Iran violates the spirit of the JCPOA, but I would argue that actively building underground ballistic missile facilities does little to promote good will or the spirit of the JCPOA in the region.

Beyond its missile program, Iran remains actively engaged in importing and exporting small and conventional arms to terrorist proxies around the world and bad actors like North Korea. In January of this year, the outgoing United Nations Secretary General, Ban Ki-moon, expressed concern that Iran might have violated an arms embargo by supplying weapons and missiles to Hezbollah. Yet, not all of Iran's violations make high-profile news. We know Iran has ramped up its supply of weapons to the Houthi rebels in Yemen and other proxies throughout the region. That is why this legislation imposes sanctions on any individual who knowingly engages in activity that materially contributes to the supply, sale, or transfer of arms as defined and established by U.N. standards.

Finally, when it comes to human rights, some try to paint a pretty picture of reform in Iran, but a closer look reveals chilling and deplorable human rights abuses. According to Human Rights Watch, by October of last year, Iran had executed more than 250 people—that is 1 person sent to death every day—and many were executed for nonviolent drug offenses. That is why our legislation expands the scope of violations eligible for sanctions, including those behind the extrajudicial killings of journalists and activists who seek to expose the oppression of the Iranian people.

Finally, this bill calls for a comprehensive report on Americans who suffer at the hands of the Iranian regime, including those who have been unjustly detained and those who have remained missing in Iran for more than a decade.

In short, this bill is a carefully crafted response to Iran's ongoing aggression in the Middle East.

Let me turn to a provision that continues to be misrepresented, and that involves the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps. The IRGC is officially responsible for Iran's internal security, with a ground force of about 100,000, but like many other quasi-military-political entities in undemocratic countries throughout the world, the IRGC holds enormous influence in Iran's economy and public affairs. On paper, the IRGC Quds Force is the lead supporter of Iran's terrorist networks

around the world, and the United States has designated it as such, but the reality is, the IRGC exercises tremendous economic and political power throughout Iran. It pulls the regime's levers to fund and support terrorists in the Middle East and beyond. That is why our bill specifically calls for terrorism-related sanctions on the IRGC, but it does not—let me repeat—it does not, as some have claimed, label the IRGC a foreign terrorist organization. We heard the concerns of our military and intelligence community. Let me repeat. This bill does not label the IRGC as a foreign terrorist organization. What it does do is require the President to acknowledge the role the IRGC plays in supporting terrorism globally.

I know some of my colleagues have expressed concerns as well about whether this bill gives a green light to the administration's decidedly confrontational approach to Iran, but that is precisely why Congress must step up and define our strategy in the Middle East. We need to look at the big picture here. As the United States and our partners work to build democratic governance structures—promote tolerance across the region and protect civilians and refugees living under siege—Iran remains aligned with Russia and Syria, actively working to undermine U.S. security interests. Indeed, Putin, Assad, and the Ayatollah continue to take advantage of the strife that imperils the region. Meanwhile, the world continues to struggle with extremism, with mass migration, and with the largest humanitarian crisis since World War II.

With this administration unable to articulate a clear vision for American leadership in the world, the time is ripe for Congress to assert its influence in our foreign policy, to provide guidance and expertise, and to develop a framework for securing our interests in the Middle East.

Now is not the time for Congress to turn a blind eye to Iran's hostile behavior. Now is the time for all of us to demand nothing less than vigorous oversight, constant vigilance, and strict enforcement of our entire arsenal of diplomatic tools, including sanctions on Iran. That is our effort—outside of the nuclear proposal—to make it very clear that you cannot get a green light to do all of these things just because you signed on to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. I think it is important for us to send this message, and when the appropriate time comes for this vote, I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, for a number of years, we have been debating healthcare in this country. Clearly, our healthcare system had problems 8 years ago when they started to do healthcare reform. I saw that as a doctor practicing in Casper, WY.

Well, then Washington Democrats tried their solution. It is a solution that passed, and it is known as ObamaCare. Republicans said that it wouldn't work and have been proven right. ObamaCare is too costly. It is collapsing. It is interesting because yesterday, as we were having our policy lunch meetings—Republicans and Democrats—word came out that another one of the ObamaCare exchange companies, Anthem, this time in Ohio, was pulling out, leaving about 18 counties, if not more in Ohio, without anybody to sell insurance on the ObamaCare exchange.

ObamaCare actually hasn't solved the problems of America's healthcare system. In many ways, it has made matters worse. That is why the law has never really had the support of the American people and continues to be unpopular today. It is why more than 19 million people actually chose not to sign up for ObamaCare coverage at all, even in spite of financial incentives to do so and a fine or a tax if you didn't sign up. So they either paid the fine or they got an exemption.

The Democrats, when they come to the floor to talk about healthcare, refuse to talk about those 19 million people who have just said: We want nothing to do with ObamaCare. We are not going to sign up. Give us an exemption. Let us out.

They want to talk about people whom they actually have covered by pushing them into a broken Medicaid system, and that is about what has happened here. This expansion through the healthcare law and expanding Medicaid put many people into a broken healthcare system called Medicaid. It wasn't working well before ObamaCare, and it has gotten worse. The numbers out there, in terms of physicians taking care of patients, are about one-third—one out of three doctors will not take new Medicaid patients, so it is not a system that is working. It is not a solution, but Democrats put more people into that.

For people who didn't end up in Medicaid and who paid their premiums, those premiums have gone up significantly. They have doubled in most States, I think, across the board—up about 107 percent over the last 4 years. Thus, the statistics that have come out from the Department of Health and Human Services recently are the sta-

tistics the Obama administration, as it left office, didn't want the American people to see—that rates have doubled across the country and, in some States, much, much higher than that.

In my home State of Wyoming, they were up actually higher than the national average has been. People are paying more and more. There were two companies, at one point, that were selling insurance on the ObamaCare exchange, both losing money. One lost so much that they are no longer in business. The other is still losing money and still selling on the exchange, but you wonder how long they will stay. Or will they do the sort of thing that Anthem had to do in Ohio and the sorts of things we have seen in the Presiding Officer's home State of Iowa and we have seen in Nebraska and we have seen across the board? Some Democrats say: This is a one-term correction; give it time. But it doesn't seem that it is going to be working that way.

There was an article in the paper here, in Washington's Roll Call, and the headline was—this was last week—“Insurers Seek Increases for Obamacare Premiums in Early Filings.” This is for next year. The article talks about how the insurance companies are starting to say how much they are going to need to charge people next year, which is much higher than it is this year. They are talking about an average increase of about 30 percent.

The average premium in the ObamaCare market in Wyoming right now is already more than \$7,000 a year for a family. So how much more can people take? That is why I continue to come to the floor and talk about what is the problem with the healthcare law—healthcare and the system. People under ObamaCare have seen their deductibles go up, their copays go up, and the choices that they have go down. This is the real problem when we talk about ObamaCare.

Then, of course, the other thing is taxes. There are at least 15 new or higher taxes under ObamaCare. So people aren't just paying higher premiums; they are paying higher taxes, which were supposed to help with the premiums, but it doesn't seem to be doing so for people all across the country.

The Congressional Budget Office has looked at this, and it said that Americans are going to pay more than \$28 billion over the next 10 years on just one tax on prescription drugs. Well, if we are trying to lower the cost of drugs and trying to lower the cost of care, putting a tax like this, as ObamaCare did on prescription drugs, just adds to the problem.

It has raised taxes all across the board. I don't want to go through each and every one of the taxes, but suffice it to say that when President Obama said he would put this program into place and it wouldn't cost a single

dime, he forgot the trillion dollars in new taxes that he added onto the backs of hard-working Americans. So we have had higher taxes, we have had higher premiums, we have had higher out-of-pocket costs from people—this huge tax burden.

What has happened is that we need to do a reform. The House has passed reform, and now in the Senate we are working on passing our own healthcare reform bill. We have been meeting three times a week up to over 5 hours a week for the last month and a half, going through piece by piece of all the different components of the healthcare law, trying to address the issues that are facing the American people, trying to lower the taxes that top the list of what we hear about at home in terms of trying to help people because they are paying more taxes, trying to work to deal with premiums.

I am really encouraged by the debate we have been having. I think we have been taking good steps in trying to address the issues the American public is seeing in terms of higher premiums and fewer choices.

I would like to work with the Democrats to solve these problems in a bipartisan way, to talk about how people can actually get healthcare in this country. But what have the Democrats done in response? Well, it is interesting because they want to go to a single-payer healthcare system. Some may deny it, but a majority of the Democrats in the House have cosponsored legislation to go to a single-payer healthcare plan. It is modeled, in some ways, after what you are seeing in California.

The California State Senate last week passed a bill, which seems to be the drift and the direction and maybe even the tip of the sphere of the Democratic Party efforts. It said: We want single-payer healthcare in California.

I served in the Wyoming State Senate, and I know the Presiding Officer served in the State legislative body in her home State of Iowa. We do a fiscal note. We say: What is this going to cost? Is it a good idea? Can we afford it? What are the costs going to be? And the cost for what they proposed in California is \$400 billion. Can they afford it? What is the total budget of the State of California? What is their general fund for the year? It is only \$190 billion. So what they are proposing for healthcare alone is over twice what the entire general fund for the entire State of California is. Yet, it passed. It was a party-line vote in the State of California in the State senate, but that is now the position that they are working to do.

So it is hard to get cooperation from somebody to work on dealing with a healthcare plan when their plan is to go with more government, more spending, pledging money they don't have. When I looked at it in California, I

said: If they want to do this, they will have to, No. 1, cut spending on other things. When you think about where general funding goes, it is for teachers, law enforcement, public safety, and firefighters. But they would also have to raise taxes significantly to get the money for what they want to promise everybody in this single-payer healthcare plan.

I am interested in working in a bipartisan way with people, but it is hard to get cooperation from people when their solution is more government, higher taxes, and less freedom. We need a solution, and that is what we are working on. I am very happy to say that it has been discussed at length in our conference. We had another good meeting about it yesterday, along with the Vice President, focusing on eliminating taxes, getting rid of the mandate that says that people must buy a government-approved product, giving people additional choices, and giving the States flexibility to make a number of these decisions.

I am from a State where agriculture plays a significant role, as is the Presiding Officer. I will be at our Wyoming stock growers' meeting on Friday when I am back home in the State. I was there a couple of years ago after ObamaCare passed, talking to people who had insurance that worked for them and worked for their families, but they lost it, not because they couldn't afford to pay for what they had but because what President Obama and the Democrats forced through in Congress said it wasn't good enough for them.

Under the mandate, as to what my friends and neighbors and folks around Wyoming have been saying was good enough for them and they could afford, President Obama said it wasn't good enough for them. Who is the better judge of what is good for a family in Iowa or Wyoming—President Obama and the Democrats or the family there in Iowa or Wyoming who is making the decision about what works best for them and their families? I am sure I am going to hear more about it at the stock growers' meeting on Friday, when I hear from families who say: What we had worked, but lost it because it wasn't allowed to be sold anymore. The President said it wasn't good enough for me. One woman said to me: Tell the President that I can make the decisions for myself. I don't need his help—referring to President Obama.

So we will continue to work toward the goal of making sure that we have people who can get the insurance and care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs. That is what we needed with healthcare reform. That is what we didn't get with ObamaCare. We got higher costs and fewer choices. Across the board right now, it looks like in 7 out of 10 counties in this country, people are down to one or two choices—hardly a market. In many

places it is a monopoly now. After the news that came out yesterday from Anthem in Ohio and some of the news that we see from Iowa and neighboring Nebraska, we are going to find that many places will find themselves with no options available. Even with the subsidies that the Democrats had promised to help deal with the high premiums they have caused, there may be nobody to sell the insurance even when the subsidies are available.

So I come to the floor, as I do just about every week, to talk about the situation with the Obama healthcare law, the challenges the American people face, and our commitment to help provide relief and rescue the American people from what has happened to them under President Obama's healthcare law.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, the most important words in our Constitution are the first three—"We the People"—written in a beautiful script and written in a font size so that one can see it from across the room. They set out the mission statement for our Constitution, for our vision of government—not government of, by, and for the privileged and the powerful but government of, by, and for the people, as President Lincoln so eloquently summarized.

It is our responsibility as elected officials to look out for decisions that serve this mission of government of, by, and for the people, to fight in times of trouble for policies that provide a ladder of opportunity and a foundation for families to thrive. But at this very moment, a secret group of 13 Senators is devising a healthcare plan with the intention of bringing it to this floor with no public debate, no committee meeting, and no public notice. They want to just bring it to the floor, have a few hours of debate, and put it forward, even though it will affect millions of Americans. It probably will hurt millions of Americans, but the secret 13 want to craft this policy. And why in secret? Because they are plotting a plan that will hurt so many people, they don't want the public involved in the process. They don't want to hear from the citizens from rural America or urban America who are so concerned about the TrumpCare bill—the bill that will immediately destroy healthcare for 14 million Americans; the bill that will immediately undermine the solvency and success of our

rural healthcare clinics and our rural hospitals; the bill that breaks every promise the President put forward on healthcare.

It breaks the promise that every person will be covered, breaks the promise that people with preexisting connections will get the same price as everyone else, breaks the promise that the policies will be even better, higher quality. Instead, it guts the essential benefits. It breaks the promise that the insurance will be at a lower cost. In fact, for someone roughly 64 years of age earning about \$26,500, their healthcare bill would go from \$140 a month to \$1,200 a month—a sum that is clearly impossible to pay on an annual income of \$26,500. That is why it is being done in secret—because it involves broken promise after broken promise, destroying healthcare in every town and hamlet across America.

That is quite a contrast to the way ObamaCare was forged. ObamaCare had a yearlong debate. It proceeded to be in committee markup—that means with amendments being offered—in the HELP Committee for about 5 weeks, with television cameras rolling and 150 Republican amendments accepted during that process. Then the Finance Committee had its turn, and it had a very long markup, and it had dozens and dozens, if not 100 or more, Republican amendments adopted. The debate was all over the country. It was in the newspapers. It was in every forum. It was right there, square center, nothing hidden. But this is quite different. The majority leader today has started the rule XIV process, specifically intending to bypass those Senate committees and bring the TrumpCare bill to the Senate floor, completely bypassing government of, by, and for the people.

This is unacceptable. I think my colleagues know it is unacceptable, but they are hoping to do it so quickly and so fast that they will have a minimum of criticism across the country. There should be a maximum amount of criticism on the floor of the Senate. Every Senator who believes that this democracy—this democratic Republic—is one in which we do the people's work should see the light of day. The debate should see the light of day in the forging of the bill, as well as the final debate here on the floor.

We know another reason this bill—this replacement or addition or modification of the House bill—is being crafted in secret. That is because the very premise of it is to give a massive tax break to the wealthiest Americans, another promise broken in which Trump said that this would not be done. But there it is, TrumpCare out of the House, \$600 billion given away to the richest Americans while devastating healthcare for working Americans.

Has no one noticed that we have an incredible gap in income in this coun-

try, with massive numbers of people earning very little and a few at the top earning massive amounts? Has no one noticed that we have a huge wealth gap in this Nation, with those at the bottom having few, if any, savings and those at the top having billions upon billions? If we have noticed, then we should care that that is not a foundation for families to thrive. Indeed, it is something that is only made much worse in a bill that takes away the foundation of healthcare—essentially, the quality of life for families across America—and, in turn, takes the savings and gives it to the wealthiest families.

There is a reason to hide this bill. There are a lot of reasons to hide this bill. But it is undemocratic to have this secret group developing this bill with an intention to bring it to the floor without a committee hearing, without public exposure.

Folks back home are very worried, and I would like to share a few of their stories.

Lynda of Talent, OR, who survived her battle with stomach cancer, thanks to the Affordable Care Act's Medicaid expansion—Lynda's friend wrote to share her story. Lynda was a self-employed plumber, working hard to get her business off the ground, but she was diagnosed with stage IV stomach cancer. Lynda couldn't afford insurance, and she and her husband couldn't afford to pay for treatment out of pocket because they were already paying off enormous debt from care her husband had received.

So what did Lynda do? She ignored the symptoms. She tried to go about her life as best as she could. As her friend wrote, "She would have died rather than take on more debt that she was not sure she could pay." But that changed with the Affordable Care Act the day Lynda found out she would receive coverage under the Oregon Health Plan—Oregon's Medicaid expansion.

Now there is good news to share. Lynda received treatment. She has been cancer-free for almost a year, and her friend describes this as "nothing short of a miracle." ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, delivered a miracle to an individual who was planning just to die rather than get treatment and then could get treatment, thanks to Medicaid expansion, and is now in remission.

TrumpCare is being reworked in secret by 13 of my colleagues out of public sight. It wants to strip away that expansion of Medicaid, wants to rip away the chance for people like Lynda to receive lifesaving care.

Yvonne from Elmira, OR, sent a note to us about the high-risk pools that Republicans want to institute under TrumpCare. She says:

Before the ACA existed, I was in our state's high risk pool because no company would in-

sure me because I had Asthma and had an ovary removed because of cysts.

The \$1500 deductible and \$550 per month was hard to pay and then it only covered 70%.

When I was severely injured in an accident and required reconstructive surgery I ended up bankrupt.

But then, 2 years ago, she qualified for the Oregon Health Plan. Now Yvonne has her medical needs covered at an affordable price and can't be denied coverage or charged a higher premium because of her preexisting conditions. Yvonne, like so many others, would suffer under the Republican plan to strip away the protection for preexisting conditions. She has had an accident, she has had an ovary removed, she has had asthma. It would be extraordinarily difficult for her to get insurance without the protection of everyone being in the same healthcare pool together. If she could get insurance—which is not at all clear—it would be at sky-high, unaffordable prices.

Bernard from Portland wrote to us. He said that an important thing that often gets lost in this whole debate over the future of the Affordable Care Act is the support it gives for Americans to innovate.

In 2011, Bernard in Portland chose to leave his job and pursue his passion of becoming a freelance artist. Here is what he said, in his words:

With my departure, I left behind the security of medical coverage. For two years, I was not covered by medical insurance, and fortunately nothing happened, but that is a gamble nobody should have to take. And it's a gamble that I could take being under 40 years old, and in relatively good health.

A person should not have to stay in a job they may not even like, and could be better filled by someone else, just for fear of not having medical coverage.

He is right. One of the powerful things that has occurred under ObamaCare is that individuals worked for firms and wanted to become entrepreneurs but were afraid to do so because of the loss of healthcare coverage, but now, either through the expansion of Medicaid or through the exchanges, they can acquire insurance without being part of a large company. That has unleashed entrepreneurship across the country. People are pursuing their dreams and contributing to the economy in all kinds of ways because they can now access healthcare without being part of a company that provides healthcare.

Eventually, Bernard was able to afford a basic coverage plan. But it didn't provide much, and it cost a significant portion of his income, but it all changed with the ACA.

An October 2016 survey of American small businesses and a January 2017 followup survey found that one-third of 5,400 small business owners interviewed had the confidence to start their own businesses because they had access to

healthcare through the ACA. According to the Department of Labor, between 2013 when the ACA went into effect and the end of 2015, the number of self-employed Americans increased by 3.5 percent.

These are just different ways of noting what we hear about all the time—people launching their entrepreneurial efforts, launching their companies because of the confidence they have that they can get healthcare. That is the powerful unleashing of creativity. It is an economic engine. It is a small business driver.

Lisa from Phoenix also wrote to share her powerful story. Lisa's daughter suffers from cerebral palsy and epilepsy, so Lisa has stayed home and cared for her for the last 15 years while her husband worked. Now, thanks to ACA's Medicaid expansion, her family has been able to hire in-home help and it has been transformative.

Lisa's daughter has become more connected to the community, gained new skills and independence, is contributing to household chores, and has shown a great deal more vitality and engagement since the family was able to get some assistance. It has gotten to the point where Lisa can start thinking about her own needs a bit more. In fact, for the first time in quite a while, she is considering taking on a job outside her home to help provide more income.

The ACA isn't just saving lives in emergency health situations or by addressing diseases. It is improving the quality of life for millions of American families like Lisa's.

I will share one more constituent story today. It is hard to pick just one more because there are so many stories coming in each and every day. As we continue to talk about the assault on the health and peace of mind of millions of Americans, I will be coming back to the floor to share those stories coming in from other Oregonians. But this last story comes from Warren in Tigard, OR.

Warren and his wife Joyce have been happily married for over 60 years, but in the last few years, Joyce has been suffering from Alzheimer's. Joyce's disease has progressed very far. Among other things, she has lost her mobility, much of her cognition, and she is wheelchair bound. Her condition has progressed so far that Warren and the home caregivers who were helping him care for his wife just couldn't meet the need requirements any longer, so they admitted Joyce to a nearby adult care facility, where she is now secure, stable, and comfortable. But, as we know, the kind of care Joyce is receiving is expensive. Warren writes:

This care costs \$4,000 per month. Our long-term care insurance is currently covering most of this cost, but only about 4 months' worth of insurance coverage remains. So we will have to obtain Medicaid coverage for her continued care.

But proposed changes to the Affordable Care Act could jeopardize this coverage. I have not anticipated this disastrous change, but fear it would be a tragedy for both of us.

Yes, it would be a tragedy for Warren and for Joyce to have TrumpCare pass and dismantle Medicaid and dismantle the exchanges. It would be a tragedy for so many others in similar situations across the country.

Many people don't realize that Medicaid helps pay for nursing home care for more than half of the nursing home residents—residents like Joyce. But here is TrumpCare, planning to cut \$880 billion in direct Medicaid spending. It is basically: Well, too bad Warren and too bad Joyce. We want to save some money so we can give big tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans.

I must say, there is not a lot of caring in that perspective. It embodies a principle, but is it really the principle we want in the United States of America—the principle that the goal of the majority party is to take away from those who have little to give more to those who have most? Is that really the principle my Republican colleagues want to embrace on the floor of the Senate?

Is that really the principle the secret 13 with their secret meetings out of public sight to develop a new version of TrumpCare want to embrace? I would suggest that is simply wrong. It is wrong from the point of view of providing an opportunity for all Americans to thrive. It is wrong from a moral point of view to pull healthcare—and the peace of mind that comes with healthcare—out of the hands of struggling Americans and working Americans across our country.

Finally, I want to address one more issue. We heard earlier today that Anthem is pulling out of Ohio. Why are they pulling out? Because of President Trump. Why is that connected? Because he refuses to confirm that his administration will make the cost-sharing reduction payments that have been part of the Affordable Care Act. Those payments reduce the premiums. Those payments proceed also to reduce the level of deductibles so you get more care sooner. So insurance companies don't know whether to raise their insurance policy a little or a tremendous amount, and that instability means they simply can't price their policies.

In addition, my Republican colleagues have assaulted the risk quarters, or reinsurance programs, that make it possible for an insurance company to go into a new market and know that if they get a disproportionate share of sick patients, they will get compensated for that risk and that result. So that reinsurance is essential for more companies to be in a particular market.

Moreover, the administration proceeded to not spend the money on advertising in the last stage of signups

and reduced the number of people who were in the markets. So that is another assault on the stability of health insurance in America. This is a deliberate, straight-out effort to undermine healthcare in America to the disadvantage of millions of Americans. It is being done by the President without any action even happening on TrumpCare here in the Senate. It is wrong. It is hurting a lot of people, and the President should stop.

With that, I conclude my comments. Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask permission to speak under leadership time for a brief moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. President.

With respect to the pending vote on the Iran sanctions bill, I want to be very clear. Democrats will vote to advance this bill to the floor because most of us support the bill but also because we expect an amendment process that will follow for a vote on a strong package of Russia sanctions. I have talked to the Republican leader about this. He is amenable to that.

Our Republican colleagues should realize it will be very difficult to gather Democratic support for final passage of this bill until we deal with Russia sanctions. We feel strongly that we need a tough, effective package of Russia sanctions to move alongside the Iran sanctions. We are currently negotiating to that end. I have faith that the majority leader and I, along with Chairman CORKER, Chairman CRAPO, Ranking Member CARDIN, and Ranking Member BROWN, will be able to agree on a way forward that allows for a final vote on Iran sanctions alongside a strong and effective package of Russia sanctions.

With that, I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 110, S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

Todd Young, Joni Ernst, Bill Cassidy, Ron Johnson, Tom Cotton, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, Mitch McConnell, Richard Burr, Luther Strange, James M. Inhofe, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, John Cornyn, Bob Corker, John Barrasso.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 91, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 140 Leg.]

YEAS—91

Alexander	Gardner	Nelson
Baldwin	Graham	Perdue
Barrasso	Grassley	Peters
Bennet	Harris	Portman
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Blunt	Hatch	Risch
Booker	Heinrich	Roberts
Boozman	Heitkamp	Rounds
Brown	Heller	Rubio
Burr	Hirono	Sasse
Cantwell	Hoeven	Schatz
Capito	Inhofe	Schumer
Cardin	Isakson	Scott
Casey	Johnson	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kaine	Shelby
Cochran	Kennedy	Stabenow
Collins	King	Strange
Coons	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Corker	Lankford	Tester
Cornyn	Leahy	Thune
Cortez Masto	Lee	Tillis
Cotton	Manchin	Toomey
Crapo	Markley	Van Hollen
Daines	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskey	Warren
Duckworth	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Menendez	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Wyden
Fischer	Murkowski	Young
Flake	Murphy	
Franken	Murray	

NAYS—8

Carper	Gillibrand	Sanders
Durbin	Merkley	Udall
Feinstein	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 91, the nays are 8.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, on rollcall vote No. 140, I voted yea. It was my intention to vote nay. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues to speak about the need to ensure that the policies that we make in this Chamber work for and support rural America.

Senators STABENOW, HEITKAMP, and I are all from the Midwest—the heartland. We represent the people who are truly in the middle of this country—the middle of the country economically, politically—and who are often middle-income people who need representatives who are focused on what matters to them.

Each year I visit all 87 counties in my State, and I hear a lot. I hear about dads who can't be sure their sons or daughters will have the support they need to take over the family farm when the time comes, small business owners who can't get a broadband connection, moms who can't figure out how to pay for their kids' prescriptions when the costs go up, and manufacturers who can't find workers to fill jobs.

Rural America has been left behind. The poverty rate in their areas for kids is higher than it is in urban areas. Businesses may not invest when they can't get reliable internet access or they can't get the right people to support their operation. Housing is hard to come by.

We should be focused on supporting our farmers and ensuring that people can raise a family in a small town and have the healthcare they need. We should be making sure that high-quality education is attainable and that job training options are available and affordable. We should be able to provide every person in this country with a clear path to a good job.

Unfortunately, from the administration we have seen a disconnect between rhetoric and policy. We have seen a budget that hits the heartland with 21 percent cuts in the Department of Agriculture—cuts to grant programs that support rural homeownership, provide clean drinking water and wastewater systems, and promote access to critical services such as rural hospitals. It eliminates rural business programs that help create hundreds of thousands of jobs. If enacted, these cuts would have a damaging impact on rural communities throughout the country.

Rural communities help our country get ahead. They are the backbone of our country. We need to work to find common ground on these issues, and we need a budget that helps and not hurts the heartland.

I see my colleague from Michigan, Senator STABENOW, is here as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to first thank my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR. She is a very important part of our Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee. She provides tremendous leadership. We both come from great "M" States. So it is always great to have an opportunity to be part of sharing remarks on such an important topic. I am also pleased to state that Senator HEITKAMP will be joining us today, as well, from another very important rural State.

Michigan small towns and rural communities embody much of our State's way of life and drive our economy forward. I grew up in one of those small towns, in Clare, in Northern Michigan. I believe that towns like mine should be celebrated and strengthened. We want young people to go to college and feel that there is a future to come home to, either back to the farm or the small business or participating in the community or maybe working at the local hospital, but being part of continuing this important way of life.

People in our communities deserve every opportunity to be able to raise their families with well-paying jobs and a high quality of life, like everyone in every part of Michigan and all across the country wants to have, but many rural areas and many small towns face unique challenges in developing and maintaining infrastructure.

Broadband. We now need to make sure that the farm at the end of the road is connected with high-speed internet. At one point in our country's history, it was the telephone. It was electric poles and being able to connect the farm at the end of the road to the rest of the community. Now it is high-speed broadband, and it is critically important that that happen.

Providing high-quality health services and education. My mother was a nurse—the director of nursing—at the small hospital in Clare for many, many years. So I know how important not only healthcare was and making sure there were doctors in our town but also making sure there were jobs, because one of the top employers in our community was the hospital. That remains true today.

When the Trump administration released its budget proposal at the end of the month, frankly, I was shocked to see the kinds of disinvestments and sharp cuts that would hurt small towns like Clare and rural communities all across Michigan and all across the country. No matter which part you look at, President Trump's budget is bad for rural Michigan, and it is bad for rural America.

First, the budget calls for a 21-percent cut to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is our second largest industry. One out of four jobs in Michigan is connected to agriculture and the

food economy. In the President's budget, it was decided that the third largest cut to any Federal agency would be in the Department of Agriculture. This will dramatically reduce and eliminate very key rural development services.

The budget would zero out funding for water and sewer infrastructure projects, which is amazing to me. I can drive from one end of Michigan to the other and see communities in which rural development has made all the difference in supporting the ability to have clean water and water and sewer systems, as well as other important infrastructure. This program has improved nearly 6,000 rural water systems, including many in Michigan. There is an extremely high demand for upgrading water and sewer systems across the country. Right now, the USDA has a backlog of nearly 1,000 applications from small towns that need to improve their water systems.

President Trump's answer, as part of his infrastructure package, is to say that this will come from not supporting rural communities ourselves but leaving it up to Wall Street investors or, maybe, foreign countries to invest in our water systems, like Saudi Arabia or China. The fact is that Wall Street investors are not investing in rural communities. I would argue that that is not a good strategy anyway. We know that, when you depend on that kind of a strategy—foreign country investor or Wall Street investor efforts—those investments are not being done in small towns like the one in which I grew up. Towns with populations of a few hundred people cannot afford the high interest rates—or the toll roads, by the way—that come with a lot of the projects in this kind of approach.

The budget also undermines rural jobs and businesses in communities in which unemployment is already too high. The USDA's small business loans are eliminated under the President's budget. Again, I can go from community to community around Michigan and see wonderful small businesses operating with the support of rural development loans. These are programs that have saved almost 800,000 jobs and have helped finance more than 107,000 businesses in the last 8 years alone.

This proposal that the White House put out also jeopardizes what I talked about earlier, which is rural broadband, or high-speed internet, for communities in order to access education, rural healthcare, and telemedicine, as well as addressing issues like resources to curb the opioid epidemic. Last year, the FCC found that 39 percent of rural Americans—that is, roughly, 23 million people—lack access to high-speed internet service. This is astounding to me when we look at this as a challenge that we have in 2017.

President Trump's budget also targets the farm bill directly for \$231 billion in cuts. We work together on a

strategy for a 5-year economic development plan. We do it on a bipartisan basis. It will be time to bring that up again next year. That 5-year process gives certainty to our farmers and communities and those interested and committed to conservation and bio-energy and all of the other provisions in the farm bill. To see—outside of this 5-year period and our bipartisan process—the Trump administration come in and target these funds for a cut of \$231 billion, again, is shocking to me. If that were to pass, it would be impossible for us to write the next farm bill next year.

Cutting crop insurance by \$29 billion would take away critical support for farmers right at a time of low commodity prices. We moved from subsidies to risk management in crop insurance in the last bill, saving taxpayer dollars. We made a commitment to farmers purchasing insurance, where they are writing a check for the insurance bill instead of getting a subsidy during good times, but you have the insurance if there is a weather event, if commodity prices are low, if there is another challenge like we are seeing today for our farmers.

Our farmers also need export opportunities in order to sell their products, which are in high demand around the world. We have to be able to sell agricultural products. The budget eliminates important market-access programs to help our farmers sell. Simply put, cuts to these programs mean lower economic growth, less development, less opportunity, and a lower quality of life in small towns in Michigan and all across rural America.

Our small towns and rural communities deserve better, and we are standing here today as advocates and voices for them. We know, as farm prices are down nearly 50 percent from their highs just a few years ago and producers are struggling to make ends meet, that these are challenging times, and we need to understand that. We need to write a farm bill and focus on those areas to support our farmers and growers. We know there are those like our dairy farmers, in particular, who are in challenging times, and we need to make sure we are addressing their concerns as well.

Rural America is the economic backbone of the country. Somebody has to grow something, and somebody has to make something. Otherwise, you do not have an economy. That is what happens in rural Michigan and rural America. Yet we also know that too many communities are still struggling to recover from the great recession.

From my perspective, I join with the 500 groups from every part of agriculture, the food economy, nutrition, and conservation groups—everyone involved in the food economy—in saying that we cannot afford additional cuts to agriculture, rural communities, and

other parts of the farm bill that support our ongoing economy.

It is critically important that we stand with those in every small town in Michigan and across our country in saying that we understand and are partners with you in making sure that, when you work hard, you have the quality of life for yourself and your family that you deserve, and we are going to do our part to make sure that support is there.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, while I join Senator STABENOW in her remarks, I want to thank her for her tremendous leadership on the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee and for working across the aisle with Chairman ROBERTS. The two of them, I have no doubt, will be able to come to an agreement and keep working on getting an even stronger farm bill. It took some Herculean efforts to get the last farm bill done, and it would not have happened without her. I appreciate what she said about the importance of the farm bill and the USDA.

I would also add another important pillar of strong rural economics, and that is job training.

Starting with high school, I think we all have to come to grips with the fact that not every kid wants to get a 4-year degree. In fact, we have so many openings across this country—millions of job openings—whether it be on a plant floor, whether it be as a plumber or as a welder, that can be obtained with a 1-year or a 2-year degree. My own sister did not graduate from high school. She went on, years later, and got her GED, and then she went on to get a 2-year degree. After that, she got 2 more years of training and became an accountant. There is not just one path in America.

Part of this is investing in STEM—science, technology, engineering, and mathematics—and doing it early so that kids get a jump start on the jobs of tomorrow. By the way, this is not just your Ph.D.s and Silicon Valley jobs. This also includes blue-collar jobs. I call it blue STEM. There is a shortage, as I said, of welders and auto mechanics, and those can be good-paying jobs. We need to talk about them with dignity, and we have to realize that this is where the openings are.

The other piece of this, in addition to training kids in high school, is to make sure we have apprenticeship programs available. This year, a report came out in my State that 68 percent of Minnesota manufacturers found it was difficult for them to find workers with the right skills and experience. That is up from 40 percent in 2010.

I see that Senator HEITKAMP is here. As they are starting to add some more jobs in the oil patch in North Dakota,

it is going to become even harder to find Minnesotans to fill some of our jobs because some of them like to go over to North Dakota.

Senator COLLINS and I have introduced a bill called the American Apprenticeship Act, which would expand tuition assistance for pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship programs. The President has talked about workforce development as being a priority. Yet we have seen a cut of 15 percent in Department of Education grants for career and technical education, as well as a 36-percent cut to Labor Department funding for training and employment services.

As I noted before, there is this disconnect between the rhetoric we hear and what we are reading in the black and white of this budget. I know there are people on both sides of the aisle here, including the Senator from North Dakota, who want to work on bridging that difference and getting a good budget done that really helps rural America.

I see Senator HEITKAMP is here, and I thank her for coming. Senator HEITKAMP serves on the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee. She was an integral part of the last farm bill and will be an integral part of this as well as in really understanding the economics within a rural State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I thank my good friend the Senator from Minnesota. She just exists to the east of me. We share a common border, but we also share a common belief that Washington is not devoid of ideas. Somehow, it has just lost the capacity to bring those ideas to fruition. As my great friend the Senator from Minnesota can attest, there are hundreds—and probably thousands—of great ideas for small business, for workers, for improving the economic conditions of people in this country that are here, ready for debate, and ready for passage.

What is not a formula for success for America is the budget. The President's budget would devastate rural communities. I am not given to hyperbole, and I am not given to exaggeration, but the absolute, bare fact is that this budget will decimate economic opportunity not only for American agriculture but for economic opportunity and security for rural communities.

When we think about North Dakota, it is hard to imagine a State that most of the people in this country would imagine more equated with rural America. I tease AMY many times when I tell her: Oh, it is coming up from the Cities, because our big opportunity to travel and to see the sites of the big city really is Minneapolis and St. Paul. But a lot of Minnesota—a lot of western Minnesota in particular, the area that I know about—is engaged in agriculture, and we share a common border, but we share a common purpose.

I wanted to start off by saying that in North Dakota, we understand the value of rural communities. We understand the value of investing in agriculture and infrastructure and how important those things are to boosting our local economy. We see the direct impacts of it on our families, businesses, and towns.

Most of us—me included—come from towns of fewer than 100 people. In fact, I am proud to say that growing up, there were nine people in my family, and my family was one-tenth of the population of the small town I lived in. We are proud of that. We are proud of our rural roots, and we are proud that from those life experiences growing up, we learned a lot about compromise, we learned a lot about work ethic, and we learned a lot about the importance of community and working together.

We also learned a lot about the importance of investment. Without critical investment, our rural communities are at risk, and I think that could have dramatic and drastic ramifications for our State, our counties, our families, and our neighbors. Instead of lifting up rural communities, the Presidential budget pushes us down.

Rural communities and the jobs there—including agriculture—are vital to many of the families I know but really families across the country. There are over 30,000 farmers and ranchers in North Dakota who lead the country in producing spring wheat, durum, sunflowers, canola, dry edible beans, flax, honey, and many more specialty crops and grain crops. These farmers feed North Dakota, our country, and the world.

In 2015, agriculture contributed more than \$9.1 billion to my State's economy. That may not seem like a lot when we are talking about California, but that is a huge amount when we are talking about North Dakota.

About one-third of North Dakota's jobs are directly tied to agriculture. There are implement dealers, veterinarians, agriculture retailers, and many more who are closely associated with agribusiness. There are countless other jobs that support these rural communities, such as teachers, firefighters, police officers, and more.

Since the election, there has been a great deal of talk in Washington about rural America. I think rural America reared up its head in this past election and said "We are not to be forgotten" and they believed they had secured an advocate in Washington in this current administration, only to be basically told otherwise by a Presidential budget.

So what does the budget mean, and why should we pay attention to it? I think the first thing we need to know about a budget is that it is about priorities. It is really a values document. Unfortunately, the President's budget shows that the administration doesn't

value North Dakota or really, in fact, rural America. In fact, it targets both.

Today I want to talk a little bit more specifically about how devastating this budget would be for rural communities across my State and across the country.

This budget would slash USDA's budget by over 21 percent, cutting \$231 billion from funding from the farm bill over the next decade. It would specifically cut \$29 billion—\$29 billion—from crop insurance over the next decade. This is crop insurance our farmers rely on, especially at a time of challenging weather and low commodity prices. Crop insurance helps prevent family farms from going under when disaster strikes. Without an affordable crop insurance program, a drought or a flood could wipe out the wealth of an entire family and basically bankrupt a family farm.

When ranchers and farmers do well, North Dakota does well, and so will all the rest of the country. To challenge these farmers with a crop insurance program that will be nonexistent is to take away the opportunity for food security in this country—food security that is so closely linked and important to national security.

By drastically reducing field staff, the President's budget also prevents USDA from achieving its mission to support rural communities. The budget calls for reducing staffing levels at USDA by 5,200 employees. Nearly 2,500 of those employees are with the Farm Service Agency, Rural Development, and Natural Resources. What does that mean? The Farm Service Agency's caseloads have increased in North Dakota, and the current hiring ban has hampered efforts to administer the farm programs—those efforts which are critical to farmers as they make their business decisions.

I can't tell my colleagues the number of times farmers across my State have come up to me and said how grateful they are that the Farm Service Agency is available in their county and available to them to provide advice and much needed documentation on their decisionmaking on how they are going to implement the farm program.

In fact, I tease those farmers a little bit, because they always say: You know, that Farm Service gal—usually a woman who has been with the Agency over decades and knows that farm as well as that farmer, and when that farmer walks through the door to get that advice and to get that number, they know that not only do they have a friend sitting across the table from them—probably a neighbor—they also have an advocate sitting across the table. We don't want to lose that connection to this vital service, the Farm Service Agency, by making this about picking up the phone and pressing buttons and talking to someone who would barely even understand or even know

North Dakota or the county the farmer is in. So at a time when farmers and ranchers are already experiencing low commodity prices, these cuts to the Farm Service Agency would limit the ability of that Agency to provide timely, accurate, and useful services to our family farmers and our ranchers.

The budget would create huge challenges for rural healthcare. On top of the \$800-plus billion taken out of the Medicaid Program by the Republican healthcare bill, this budget would also cut \$610 billion from Medicaid by reducing it to a block grant program.

Medicaid is a lifesaving, cost-effective program that enables more than 90,000 seniors, individuals and children with disabilities, and low-income families to get affordable, quality care.

I want my colleagues to think about the enormous challenge of delivering healthcare in a sparsely populated area. One of the challenges my rural healthcare providers have not had in the last many years since the implementation of the Affordable Care Act is uncompensated care. But when we go back to uncompensated care, on top of operating on razor-thin margins, we are now going to say that not only are you operating on razor-thin margins, but you are not going to have your bills paid, making it impossible for you to meet payroll and impossible for you to continue to provide these resources.

So we have real challenges in rural healthcare as a result of this budget and the Republican proposal.

The President's budget also cuts nearly \$400 million in Federal funds for substance abuse prevention and behavioral health workforce training programs at the same time that every part of this country—particularly rural parts of our country—is facing opioid abuse. In North Dakota alone, fatalities from opioid abuse have grown 125 percent.

I met just yesterday with the North Dakota Medical Association, which told me that every day this week in Fargo, ND, there has been a death as a result of overdoses. It is hard to imagine that is happening in our rural communities in places like North Dakota, but it is.

I talked to a healthcare provider in Dickinson, ND, who told me that while his average percentage of Medicaid recipients in his hospital is about 15 to 20 percent, as it relates to opioids and behavior and mental health, it is well over 60, bordering on 70 percent. So the population, without Medicaid dollars, would not be able to get important rehabilitation and treatment services.

Last week, I also visited one of our rural airports that are dependent on the Essential Air Service. That is absolutely critical to maintaining air service in Jamestown, in Devil's Lake, and now in Dickinson, which has gone back to Essential Air Service after years of not needing that support because of the growth in the Bakken oilfield.

Last week, while talking to the folks in Dickinson, they told me there are 475 jobs which are dependent on the airport, which helped generate \$76.6 million for the area in 2015. The Dickinson Airport would receive about \$4.2 million in assistance from the Essential Air Service each year, but when we look at how that investment pays off in terms of dividends, it seems like a small price to pay.

It would eliminate funding to protect water programs and infrastructure in rural areas which have improved water and wastewater systems for more than 40 North Dakota towns, Tribal reservations, and water districts since 2010.

This budget would also eliminate the Community Development Block Grant Program, which helped the State of North Dakota improve housing conditions for low- and moderate-income families with \$4.9 million in investments in 2016.

It would eliminate the Economic Development Administration, which has provided over \$34 million in investments since 2009 to local economic development organizations in North Dakota, particularly those in rural towns.

The list goes on and on and on. We haven't talked about the reduction in services for export markets. We haven't talked about research reductions at USDA and what that would mean. We haven't talked about eliminating trade assistance. All of these things have huge consequences for large pieces of the United States of America.

What I would say to the administration is that rural America expects better. Rural America thought they were going to get better than this. Rural America has enough challenges. We have volatile commodity prices, healthcare shortages, declining populations, and I will tell my colleagues that today in North Dakota, there is a potential disaster from drought. The President's budget would not only not help rural America thrive, it would only make matters worse.

Rather than taking an ax to proven, successful programs that strengthen our rural communities, we need strong investments in rural communities, jobs, and families, that help support North Dakota's future.

With this budget, the administration's priorities are clear for everyone to see. It is now Congress's job to set spending priorities and fund programs in rural America to a level so that we know rural America can not only survive but can thrive.

North Dakota needs and deserves a strong voice at the table. I will make sure that we tell the story of all of these programs, that we tell the story of how critically important these programs are to maintaining our opportunity to produce food in our country but also to raise our children in rural settings. It is beyond belief to me that

we are in this situation given the level of support that rural America provided to this administration and to this President during the last election.

We know we can do better, and we will do better. We know we can't waste money. We know we have to deploy these valuable resources in ways that actually produce results. I can show my colleagues result after result after result and the importance of providing these services so that rural communities can thrive.

I will close with this: A little-known fact is that so many of our rural communities today are the most impoverished places in America. When people think of poverty, they think of inner city poverty, they think of other pieces of America they have seen, but we know that the rates of poverty, the rates of challenges in terms of healthcare, education—those challenges are much greater in rural America. The last thing we need to do is saddle rural America with a 500-pound rock, put it on their backs, and still expect them to thrive. This budget is a 500-pound rock on the backs of our farmers who work every day to put food on their table, but more importantly, work every day to feed America.

With that, I yield the floor and turn it back to my friend from the State of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I again thank Senator HEITKAMP for her understanding not just of farm policy but also the importance of keeping towns strong, manufacturing strong, and transportation strong.

I will note that the infrastructure portions of this budget are very concerning. The point has been made by others that right now, under the proposed budget, at a time when our deteriorating infrastructure is costing our economy a lot of money—not just congestion, not just potholes, but in delaying getting goods to market—unfortunately, this budget proposal would cut funding for vital transportation programs.

It will eliminate funding for the TIGER Grant Program. Currently, the program provides \$500 million per year to help fund local transportation priorities. It eliminates funding for Essential Air Service, which helps support commercial air service to rural airports. It eliminates the Federal Transit Administration's Capital Investment Grant Program, which funds light rail, heavy rail, commuter rail, street car, and bus rapid transit projects. We can't wait any longer to make critical investments in our infrastructure.

Probably right up there with any of these infrastructure needs in rural America is broadband. Internet access is a great equalizing force for creating jobs and leveling the playing field.

There is a big digital gap when it comes to rural America. I know the percentages; close to 40 percent of Americans in rural areas do not have access to high-speed broadband. It used to be that slow speed would be OK if someone were trying to email their kid in school maybe 10, 15 years ago, but this is not true anymore. Now, if you want to do your work, if you want to go to the hospital—whatever you want to do in rural America, you are going to have to have high-speed internet.

I think about the doctor in Brainerd, MN, who for so long could look at x rays in the hospital but couldn't look at them in his home. If he had some emergency and wanted to talk to someone when he got home that evening, he had to go to the McDonald's parking lot to be able to do that.

There was a student at one of our reservations who got Wi-Fi in his house, looked out the window, and all of a sudden all these kids were doing their homework in his front yard. That is just not right. Rural Americans deserve equal footing so they can launch new businesses, export their goods, or just Skype with their loved ones.

This is about the farm bill, yes, but it is also about this budget and making sure this budget works for all Americans and leaves no one behind.

Sadly, these cuts are specifically targeted at rural America. That is why we are going to fight to make sure, hopefully on a bipartisan basis with colleagues on the Republican side, we produce a budget that is fair to everyone.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

(The remarks of Mr. FLAKE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1305 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from New York.

(The remarks of Mrs. GILLIBRAND and Mr. CASSIDY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1313 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to bring two baskets of hemp products onto the floor of this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL HEMP HISTORY WEEK

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this is National Hemp History Week, a chance to recognize a product that has deep roots going way back in America but faces some of the most anti-farmer, anti-job, unjustifiable policies that are on the American legal books today. Because of its relation to marijuana,

hemp can't legally be grown in American fields.

Now, hemp is harmless. Hemp grown for industrial use simply does not have marijuana psychoactive properties. You are going to get as high off hemp as you will off a bag of vegetables. But, still, farmers in Oregon and across the country can't legally grow it. So if America is serious about banning harmless products like hemp, just because they are related to drugs, then I have bad news for fans of poppy seed muffins.

This is the third year I have come to the floor during this time—National Hemp History Week—to talk about the importance of industrial hemp, its huge economic potential for hard-working farmers, and the indefensible ban that keeps so many American farmers from growing it. As was the case before, I am joined by Malcolm McGeary from Southern Oregon, where a lot of farmers have an interest in this, to showcase a variety of hemp products in these baskets on the floor because, despite the ban on growing hemp, you can legally import it for use in products sold in stores across the country.

What really changed my mind on this was when my wife was pregnant—we are older parents—with our third child, and we went into a Costco store. We went into a Costco store on a weekend at home in Oregon, and there were these big bags of hemp hearts, and it said: healthy, good for the blood pressure, fiber—everything that one would expect in Pennsylvania or Oregon. I know the Presiding Officer is one of the most physically fit members of the body. I see him in the gym all the time so he obviously cares a lot about nutrition. So Nancy and I were walking through Costco, and it said this giant bag of hemp hearts could be purchased there. You say to yourself: Let me see if I get this straight. The hemp comes from Canada, so the farmers must just be laughing all the way to the bank because they are making money. I get what we do is we put it in bags, and it is sold in Costco. That led me to the really intellectual concept of saying that if you can sell it at a Costco in Oregon, why can't our farmers grow it? It is not much more complicated than that.

When you are shopping for hemp products, it is not just potato sacks and rough fabric by the yard. There is clothing, lotions and food, hemp milk, nutritional supplements—all these products Mr. McGeary has—used to make soaps, cleaners, and even deck stain. I understand Mr. McGeary may even be wearing a hemp tie. None of these products can be called 100 percent American because every bit of the hemp in these baskets had to be grown someplace else, which is essentially what I described as the Wydens toured Costco at home.

When it was imported, it wasn't an American farmer earning money off that sale. Despite the consumer demand for hemp products and the ingenuity of so many producers who find uses for it, American farmers are cut out of the hemp equation.

The ban on hemp is not anti-drug policy. I think that is what has been confusing with respect to this issue. The ban on hemp is not going to advance the cause of being against drugs. It is not anti-drug policy. It is anti-farmer policy, and it is anti-American jobs policy.

As I indicated, if you can buy it in a local supermarket, the American farmer ought to be able to grow it. Yet year after year, despite a lot of work from Members on both sides of the aisle in this body and in the House, hemp remains on the controlled substance list.

Hemp is not a drug. It is a big opportunity for our farmers. So it is long past time to end these statutory relics of history that cut American farmers out of a valuable market.

Despite the fact that hemp continues to be stigmatized by Federal laws, there is some good news and progress. The 2014 farm bill began to chip away at the Federal ban. It OK'd hemp research projects led by universities and agriculture departments in States like Oregon and Kentucky that take a smarter approach to hemp. These projects are showing significant success. Farmers are ready to grow hemp, and States' agriculture departments are ready to regulate.

The first steps, in my view, don't go far enough, and even some of these early projects remain tied up in red-tape due to the Federal ban.

In my view, the only real solution is a legislative solution. So here we have a bipartisan coalition, the kind of coalition you see in the U.S. Senate when people really look into the facts and Members decide to make common cause. We have the good fortune of having the majority leader, Senator McCONNELL of Kentucky, as one of our principal sponsors; Senator PAUL, his colleague; Senator MERKLEY; and I re-introducing the Hemp Farming Act. We pursued this for a number of years. I introduced it every Congress since 2011.

Last year, our bipartisan bill had more than a dozen Senate cosponsors. This year, the goal is to again find common ground to remove hemp from the schedule I controlled substance list, give the go-ahead to farmers across the country who are ready to grow industrial hemp, and, once again, make it a true American crop.

I hope my colleagues will join in the effort to celebrate National Hemp History Week. I hope they will use it to learn more about a very versatile crop, a safe crop, and one with really extraordinary potential to boost jobs in the economy, in our agricultural sector, and our domestic employment base.

This is commonsense legislation. Again, we have the good fortune to be led by the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. McCONNELL. We will be introducing this commonsense legislation very shortly.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017. For too long, a myopic focus on the Iran deal blinded the United States to Iran's persistent campaign to destabilize the Middle East and undermine America's national security interests. Iran has been given a free pass to detain U.S. sailors in clear violation of international law, conduct ballistic missile tests in violation of the United Nations resolutions, support terrorist groups across the region, and prop up the murderous Assad regime in Syria.

It is long past time for the United States and the international community to hold Iran accountable, not just for its commitments under the nuclear deal but for its destabilizing behavior across the Middle East. This legislation begins to do just that by imposing new sanctions on Iran's ballistic missile program, applying terrorism sanctions to the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, imposing sanctions on Iranians engaged in human rights abuses, and tightening enforcement on arms embargoes on the Iranian regime.

I thank the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senators CORKER and CARDIN, for ringing this bell to the floor. They recognize that the United States must not stand idly by when hostile regimes undermine and attack our interests and that of our allies. They recognize that regimes that aid and abet crimes against humanity must be held accountable. They recognize that weakness in the face of aggression is provocative.

These are the reasons we must pass this legislation, but these are also the very same reasons this legislation must be amended to strengthen and expand sanctions against Vladimir Putin's Russia.

In just the last 3 years under Vladimir Putin, Russia has invaded Ukraine, annexed Crimea, threatened NATO allies, and intervened militarily in Syria, leaving a trail of death, destruction, and broken promises in its wake.

Last year, Russia attacked the foundations of American democracy with a cyber and information campaign to

interfere in America's 2016 election. It has been 8 months now since the U.S. intelligence community publicly concluded that the Russian Government had attempted to interfere in our last Presidential election.

On October 7, 2016, the Department of Homeland Security and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence stated that the "U.S. intelligence community is confident that the Russian government directed the recent compromises of e-mails from U.S. persons and institutions, including from U.S. political organizations." The statement concluded that "only Russia's senior-most officials could have authorized these activities."

On January 6, 2017, the U.S. intelligence community went even further, concluding:

Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the United States presidential election. Russia's goals were to undermine public faith in the United States democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency.

The intelligence community "did not make an assessment of the impact that Russian activities had on the outcome of the 2016 election," but they did warn that "Moscow will apply lessons learned from its Putin-ordered campaign aimed at the U.S. Presidential election to future influence efforts worldwide, including against U.S. allies and their election processes."

Since January, months of congressional hearings, testimony, and investigative work have reinforced these conclusions: that Russia deliberately interfered in our recent election with cyber attacks and a disinformation campaign designed to weaken America and undermine faith in our democracy and our values.

Vladimir Putin's brazen attack on our democracy is a flagrant demonstration of his disdain and disrespect for our Nation. This should not just outrage every American, it should compel us to action. But in the last 8 months, what price has Russia paid for attacking American democracy? Hardly any at all: modest sanctions against a few Russian individuals and entities, some Russian diplomats and spies sent home to Russia, two spy compounds have closed, at least for now—and all of this reversible and at the discretion of the President.

What has Russia's reaction been to America's tepid response and reaction to its aggressive behavior? More of the same. More aggression, more meddling. Russia attempted to overthrow the democratically elected Government of Montenegro and murder its Prime Minister. Russia attempted to interfere in France's election. We have already seen attempts to influence German public opinion ahead of the elections in September, and there is every expectation that Russia will do the same thing

in the Czech Republic, Italy, and elsewhere in future elections.

Sooner or later, my friends, there will be another American election that captures Russian attention and interest. The victim may be a Republican or a Democrat. To Putin, it won't matter because his targets are not Republicans or Democrats but Americans and all that we stand for as a people. He seeks to sow dissent amongst us and divide us from one another, to erode our resolve to resist his dark and dangerous view of the world, and to undermine our confidence in ourselves and our belief in our own values.

We must take our own side in this fight—not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans. It is time to respond to Russia's attack on American democracy with strength and resolve, with common purpose, and with action. Together with Senator GRAHAM and a number of other Senators, I am prepared to offer an amendment to this legislation that will begin to do just that. It incorporates some of the best ideas from different pieces of legislation already introduced in the Senate, ideas that have broad bipartisan support.

The amendment we are talking about would impose mandatory sanctions on transactions with the Russian defense or intelligence sectors, including the FSB and the GRU, the Russian military intelligence agency that was primarily responsible for Russia's attack on our election.

The amendment would impose mandatory visa bans and asset freezes on any individual who undermines the cyber security of public or private infrastructure and democratic institutions. It would impose mandatory sanctions on those who assist or support such activities.

The amendment would codify existing sanctions on Russia by placing into law five Executive orders signed by President Obama in response to both Russian interference in the 2016 election and its illegal actions in Ukraine, and it would take new steps to tighten those sanctions. For example, Russia's ability to issue new sovereign debt essentially allows Russia to borrow money from global capital markets to offset pressure from existing U.S. and European sanctions. So this amendment would impose mandatory sanctions on U.S. and third-party investment in sales of Russian sovereign debt as well as in the privatization of Russian state-owned assets.

The amendment would target the Russian energy sector, which is controlled by Vladimir Putin's cronies, with sanctions on investments in Russian petroleum and natural gas development as well as Russian energy pipelines.

We also need to put additional pressure on the ability of Putin and his cronies to move money they have

looted from the Russian state. So this amendment would mandate that the Secretary of the Treasury establish a high-level task force within the Department's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network that would focus on tracing, mapping, and prosecuting illicit financial flows linked to Russia if such flows interact with the U.S. financial system. The task force would also work with liaison officers in key U.S. Embassies, especially in Europe, to work with local authorities to uncover and prosecute the networks responsible for the illicit Russian financial flows.

Finally, recognizing that Russia seeks to undermine not just American democracy but Western democracy altogether, this amendment would provide support to the State Department, the Global Engagement Center, and USAID to help build the resilience of democratic institutions in Europe against Russian aggression exerted through corruption, propaganda, and other forms of political interference.

We need a strong Russia sanctions amendment. We need it now. We need it on this piece of legislation. We need this amendment because we have no time to waste. The United States of America needs to send a strong message to Vladimir Putin and any other aggressor that we will not tolerate attacks on our democracy. There is no greater threat to our freedoms than attacks on our ability to choose our own leaders free from foreign interference. So we must act accordingly, and we must act now.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, this body has a dual obligation—to ensure that there are sanctions against Iran for its destabilizing activity around the region and, indeed, the world but also sanctions against Russia for its interference with our election—one of the core democratic institutions of our Nation—as well as other acts that are hostile to the world order and to world peace.

I support S. 722, the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act, but I strongly believe it should have Russian sanctions included as well.

As the Senate proceeds to this urgently needed measure, Iran's own Parliament has suffered an ISIS-claimed terrorist attack in Tehran. I condemn that act of terror—one of many the world has suffered because of ISIS. We are at war with ISIS as we are with terrorists—extremism—around the world.

It intentionally targets civilians. It uses violence to spread terror and destabilize the Middle East. ISIS has been a world terror organization.

The fact that Iran's leaders themselves direct and glorify terrorism against Israel and the United States does not diminish the horror of what has occurred. People of all faiths from an increasingly diverse number of nations have become victims of this terror spread by ISIS and Iran. What occurred today is, sadly, more evidence that Iran's unconditional support for Bashar al-Assad is directly counter to the interests of the Iranian people and our ongoing efforts to defeat ISIS.

We must hold Iran accountable. We must hold it accountable for its many malign activities through increasing and enforcing strong, targeted sanctions. I thank my colleagues, including Senator MCCAIN, who just spoke so forcefully on the floor, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator CORKER, Senator CARDIN, as well as other colleagues who have worked on this cause. We must hold Iran accountable for the threat its acts of terrorism pose to our national security. We must hold it accountable to the threat its missile program holds to our allies, including Israel—our major strategic partner in that region. We must hold Iran accountable for the gross violations of human rights and war crimes that it and Russia together are perpetrating in Syria.

In the last few months, Iran has tested and fired ballistic missiles, tested a new Russian-made air defense system against missiles, and harassed U.S. ships. It continues to arm and enable the Hamas terrorist organization, the despotic Assad regime, and the supply of weapons to Hezbollah. It has enabled Hezbollah to amass 150,000 rockets and missiles—all aimed at civilians in Israel.

Last month, the State Department released a report on Iran's human rights violations. It continues to show a troubling trend of abuse and notes that Iran has more than 800 political prisoners and that it executed at least 469 people just last year.

We know that sanctions must be targeted and continually strengthened to deter Iran. This legislation will impose sanctions on Iran for its support of terrorism, human rights violations, and ballistic missile development. That includes sanctioning any person who knowingly violates arms embargoes or materially contributes to Iran's ballistic missile program. It also includes terrorism-related sanctions on members of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps and its affiliates—going beyond members of the Quds Force, who are already sanctioned.

In no way does this sanctions program contradict or undermine the nuclear agreement with Iran. That agreement provided us and our allies the time and space to now push Iran to end

its malign activities without the imminent threat of a nuclear weapon.

Congress must do everything it can to authorize new measures against Iran and ensure that this new administration effectively enforces them. We must also seize this opportunity to hold Russia accountable as well for its egregious, aggressive behavior and ongoing violations of international law.

Russia's cooperation with Iran, including providing Iran with an S-300 air missile defense system that it recently tested, strengthens Iran as it fuels and finances a network of terrorism. Under Putin's direction, Russia both enabled and tried to cover up crimes in Syria. It invaded Ukraine. It illegally annexed Crimea. It attacked and interfered with our democracy.

Enough is enough. That is why I urge this body to adopt Russian sanctions as part of S. 722. Sadly and dangerously, our President has proven time and again to be unwilling to hold Vladimir Putin accountable. Congress must ensure that he does so. It must ensure that Russia receives a clear, unequivocal signal through this measure, Senator CARDIN's Counteracting Russian Hostilities Act, and Senator GRAHAM's Russia Sanctions Review Act, as an amendment to be adopted by this body to the Iran legislation, which I helped author. These measures are critical to sending a message that we will hold Russia accountable for its lawbreaking, its support of terrorism, its interference in our elections, its annexation of Crimea, its invasion of Ukraine, and its violation of the INF Treaty. I can accept nothing short of including these Russia bills to move forward to a final vote. I will support S. 722, but I believe there is a track and a path for this body to do both, and we must do it.

The imposition of mandatory sanctions codifying former President Obama's Executive orders regarding Ukraine and malicious cyber activity, as well as targeting individuals and entities contributing to Russia's oil and gas industries, should be part of this final passage. We cannot afford to wait any longer to take action.

I am disappointed that the President has seemed disinterested or at least unwilling to join in these sanctions against Russia. Unfortunately, the testimony that former Director Jim Comey will deliver tomorrow provides evidence as to possible motive and intent in his discussions with Comey that reflect on his apparent willingness to tolerate this aggressive conduct by Russia without holding it accountable.

This testimony from Director Comey is an explosive corroboration of the facts that have been reported—that the President asked for loyalty, threatening Jim Comey's job, and tried to influence the FBI's ongoing criminal investigation on multiple occasions. This conduct shows unequivocally the disdain the President has for the rule of

law and clearly demonstrates that he believes he and his friends and family are above the law. I am saddened and I am chilled that this harrowing account will be given to the Senate Intelligence Committee rather than, in fact, in a fictional spy novel.

Director Comey deserves credit for his willingness to come before the committee, for his apparent candor and truthfulness, and for his resistance to those demands for a pledge of loyalty and an end to the Flynn investigation, even when it meant his firing.

His testimony should serve as evidence in the investigation led by Robert Mueller but also as evidence that Mr. Mueller must have unimpeded space, resources, and independence to conduct his investigation. I will take action as a member of the Judiciary Committee to seek oversight simply to ensure that those resources are independent and are safeguarded. With this documented proof, clearly the White House has sought to derail our law enforcement officials in their enforcing of the law. We must ensure an end to such conduct, and we must send Russia a signal that, in fact, it will be held accountable; that the investigation into its meddling in our election will be pursued vigorously and aggressively; that anyone in this country who colluded with or aided and abetted that meddling will be held accountable; and that there will be no obstruction of justice. This goal should unite us across the aisle on a bipartisan basis.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I voted no today on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 722, the Iran sanctions bill.

I did so not because I oppose the underlying bill and the need to further sanction Iran's belligerent missile and terrorist activity; in fact, I support that legislation. I voted no to give a moment's pause after the terrible ISIS attack in Tehran that just occurred.

Earlier today, a pair of deadly attacks occurred over several hours in Tehran, including in the nation's parliament building, indiscriminately killing at least 12 people and wounding dozens more. The heavily armed assailants targeted guards, cleaners, and administrative employees of the parliament. ISIS later claimed responsibility for this barbaric attack.

I certainly have my differences with the Iranian regime, its continued sponsorship of Hezbollah and Hamas, its threats to Israel, its proxy wars in Yemen and Syria, and its human rights abuses, but we must remember that the Iranian regime isn't the same as the Iranian people, many of whom expressed sympathy with the American people after we suffered the horrific attack on September 11.

In fact, the Iranian Government issued a surprisingly strong statement

of condemnation of the terrorists responsible after the September 11 attack.

There was even some hope after those statements that our two nations might work together on other shared interests, although unfortunately, other than the historic nuclear agreement, that has not come to pass.

Nevertheless, I think it is important that we pause and reaffirm the statement made today by our State Department that condemns the attack in Iran and expresses condolences for the families and victims.

I also think it is critical that we finally take some action here in the Congress to address Russia's attack on our election, which occurred more than 7 months ago.

We have overwhelming evidence of this historic attack—an attack that I liken to a cyber act of war.

The majority party here in Congress has done nothing to respond to Russia's aggression or to help protect America against any future such attack on our democracy.

President Trump still refuses to acknowledge the Russian attack—seemingly more interested in befriending the Russians and complaining about former Federal Bureau of Investigation Director Comey than convincingly telling Russia to never interfere in our election again or face the consequences.

This lack of resolve is truly an abdication of our national security responsibilities in Congress.

As one Polish security expert recently warned me, if the United States does not respond to the Russia attack on its own democracy, then Putin will feel emboldened and free to conduct further such attacks against other Western democracies.

Sadly, that has already proven true—just look at Russia's meddling in the recent French, German, and Dutch elections.

As we act to address Iran's troubling missile and destabilizing activity in the Middle East, including its continued threat against Israel, we must also act against Russia, which conducted a cyber act of war against our Nation.

We must ensure that existing sanctions placed on Russia for its destabilizing actions in Ukraine and Europe and its attack on our election are not lifted until such Russian actions are reversed or addressed.

I voted no on cloture today—out of respect for the Iranian people who suffered the horrific attack today and because I think it is long overdue for the Congress to finally respond to Russia's attack on our Nation—and stand prepared to support the final Iran sanctions bill after addressing these matters.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, Donald Trump has decided to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement on climate change. This is a decision that may prove to be one of the worst foreign policy blunders in our Nation's history.

There is no denying the mounting threat of climate change. We observe rising seas, warming global temperatures, and melting glaciers and ice sheets. Yet the President cast aside a historic global agreement forged through American leadership.

Americans now ask what to do next. For individual citizens, my answer is simple: Take action. Join an environmental group. Support science and scientists. Organize in your community.

Many Americans have been publicly pledging to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement through movements like the "I am still in" pledge. Every action, big and small, counts.

American corporations must also act. Unfortunately, they have been AWOL in the politics of climate change. This has been so frustrating because so many of them have great climate principles. They just abandon them when they come to Washington. That is why, for my 169th "Time to Wake Up" speech, I have a message for corporate America:

First, know that you are hugely influential in Congress. You command extraordinary attention in our political system. This gives you a unique power against the Breitbart fake-news spigot, the shameless fossil fuel industry, and the Koch brothers' climate denial operation, which were all behind the President's fateful decision.

President Trump's brain-dead withdrawal from the Paris accord may prove to be for the best if it creates heightened political interest in climate action from American business leaders. At the moment, corporate political interests in climate action, setting the fossil fuel industry aside entirely, still averages out below zero.

As a Senator, I see corporate America's lobbying efforts in Congress firsthand. Here are some highlights:

Silicon Valley lobbies through an organization called TechNet. TechNet represents Goliaths, like Microsoft, Apple, Google, and Facebook, all of which have great climate policies. TechNet also represents clean energy companies, like Sunrun, Bloom Energy, and SolarCity.

TechNet came again this year to lobby Congress on its six priorities. Here is a page from the actual lobbying materials that TechNet brought to our

meeting. The group's Federal policies are these: tax reform, high-skilled immigration reform, education and workforce development, entrepreneurship and job creation, smart infrastructure, and digital trade. Climate change did not make it onto TechNet's priorities list. Even clean energy failed to make it onto the list of the organization that includes Bloom Energy, SolarCity, and Sunrun.

This is not a matter of these giants being cowed by the Trump administration. TechNet came last year when Obama was President, and climate change was not on their agenda then, either. Indeed, the week TechNet came last year, I also had a visit from the timber and lumber industry. Despite what climate change is doing to America's forests, climate change was not on the lumber and timber industry agenda.

That very same week, the property casualty insurance industry came to meet me. These insurance companies write the big checks when climate change sends Mother Nature haywire. Climate change was not mentioned by this industry, either. That was quite a week.

Big business lobbying on climate change is actually worse than zero because the big business trade associations and lobbying groups are often run by the fossil fuel industry. Green energy manufacturers, represented in Washington, DC, by the National Association of Manufacturers, will find their own association lined up against them on climate change. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce is one of climate action's most implacable enemies, despite the good climate policies of so many companies on its board.

These lobby groups are the most persistent voices of America's business community here in Congress. They are the ones who are most active, and they are constant enemies on clean energy and climate action—despite the companies they represent—because, in truth, they answer to the fossil fuel industry, not the business community, when it comes to climate change.

Here is how this can play out. Coca-Cola and PepsiCo are the two biggest beverage companies in America. Both have excellent climate policies. Pepsi even supports Ceres, a fledgling business lobbying group for climate action, but their trade association, the American Beverage Association, takes no lobbying interest in climate change. It knows how to lobby. We can see the lobbying expenditures run up in 2009 and 2010, when they were concerned about Congress's taxing sweetened drinks or corn syrup. It just takes no interest in climate issues.

Worse, Coke and Pepsi run money through the American Beverage Association to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Add their lobbying all up, and Coke and Pepsi do virtually nothing

themselves. A few ounces of credit go to Pepsi for supporting Ceres. Their American Beverage Association trade group doesn't lift a finger to help, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is a brute force adversary.

The result is that the net lobbying presence of Coke and Pepsi in Congress on climate change is exactly opposed to the two companies' stated policies on climate change. They say one thing; their lobbying effort does the opposite.

On the other side of the fossil fuel divide, the heavy political hand of the fossil fuel industry is felt constantly around here, and that heavy hand is mercilessly opposed to any climate action and enforces its will with a parade of political weaponry akin to those old Soviet May Day parades of tanks, rockets, and artillery. Cross them, and they come after you hard. Ask former Congressman Bob Inglis. He urged his fellow Republicans to heed the climate science and was hammered for it.

Also, no one should buy the phony assertions by Big Oil CEOs that they recognize that climate change is real and support putting a price on carbon. They say that. ExxonMobil's CEO said that to his shareholders again just last week.

In the Senate, I am the Senate author of a carbon price bill. I know who is lobbying where on carbon prices, and I can tell you their statement is just not true. Every single element of that Soviet May Day parade of fossil fuel political weaponry is dead set against any such thing. What do we conclude from that? Either Big Oil's CEOs don't know what their own lobbying apparatus is doing, or they are just not telling the truth. You guess which.

The strategy of the fossil fuel industry has been to control the Republican Party. You can jam things up by jamming up one party, and you can make it look like it is a partisan issue when it is just old-fashioned, self-interested lobbying. In order to accomplish that purpose, the worst of the political threats and blandishments of the fossil fuel industry are directed against Republicans.

As long as legitimate corporate leaders in America sit idly by while fossil fuel terrorizes and corrupts the Republican Party, there will not be much progress. "But, oh," some will say, "there aren't Republicans who will respond. This is too partisan an issue. It will be a wasted effort." Not so. I came to the Senate in 2007, and for years there was bipartisan action on climate change—2007, 2008, 2009.

It only stopped when the fossil fuel industry secured from five Republican-appointed Justices on the Supreme Court the disgraceful Citizens United decision of 2010. In 2007, lots of bipartisan activity; 2008, lots of bipartisan activity; 2009, lots of bipartisan activity; 2010, Citizens United—dead stop. That Citizens United decision is what

started the fossil fuel Soviet May Day parade of unprecedented political artillery. No special interest had that kind of political artillery before Citizens United opened it up, and much of the post-Citizens United effort has been using dark money to hide the fossil fuel industry's hand.

Since Citizens United, there has been no bipartisan climate action, but that doesn't mean there aren't still Republicans willing to work with us. I know this firsthand. There are Republicans willing to work with us. They just need to know somebody will give them safe passage through the political kill zone that Citizens United has let the fossil fuel industry create. Well, with the Trump administration now all the way over in the "fossil fuel, Breitbart, Koch brothers climate denial corner," it now rests on the shoulders of the legitimate business community to come off the sidelines. They can't count on this administration. They now have to come off the sidelines themselves and do so in strength commensurate with the seriousness of the problem.

If, as a country, we pitch ourselves and the world into the present worst-case climate change scenarios, billions of people will suffer, and suffering people want answers and justice. It will become hard to defend to them our American system of democratic government against charges of corruption and our system of market capitalism against charges of indifference. Government has been corrupted by fossil fuel interests, and too many companies are indifferent. You can't make a case without the facts to back it up, and American companies, more than anyone else, benefit from a world order where liberal democracies prevail. So the stakes for the American business community are very real.

The political mischief of the fossil fuel industry and its front groups will leave a lasting stain on the democracy we all treasure. It is time, in the wake of the President's decision on Paris—isolating America with Syria as our companion in isolation—it is time that the decent and honorable business community played a meaningful role in setting this right. To them, I say: Trump has betrayed you so now is the time to align your industry's political engagement with your industry's position on climate. That is not asking much. We are only asking that American corporations align their political engagement on climate change with their actual position on climate change. If you take climate change seriously, great. Take it seriously when you come to Congress. The United States of America, where 1 day after D-day—a day when Americans stormed ashore to free the continent of Europe, fought their way through to knock down Nazi tyranny, and then rebuilt Europe under the Marshall Plan and came home—that country ought not to be a pariah nation with Syria.

We needn't be a banana republic for fossil fuel. We can lead the world into a brighter, cleaner, safer energy future, but it will take an effort. So, corporate America, let's make the effort.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, it is nice to see the Presiding Officer in the Chair. Because he is a student of history, I know it will come as no surprise to my colleague from Colorado that this week marks the 70th anniversary of the Marshall Plan.

In 1947, Europe was in ruins. After years of war, factories from Manchester to Munich had been bombed out. Railroads laid disfigured from artillery. Farms stood defaced by the tracks of a thousand tanks. Across the continent, Europe's once humming economies stood silent. Over 60 million people had died, including 6 million Jews who were killed in the Holocaust.

Here in the United States, we mourned the loss of over 400,000 of our soldiers. We had spent, in today's dollars, nearly \$4 trillion to secure that victory in World War II. But to secure the peace, our leaders understood that even more was required of us. Truman's Secretary of State, George Marshall, told the Nation that without a return to "normal economic health in the world," there could be "no assured peace." In other words, if famine and poverty remained unchecked across Europe, unanswered, fascism and communism would soon follow, threatening U.S. interests and global stability at the same time.

So after years of sacrifice—sacrifice that this generation of Americans, thank goodness, has never had to endure—the easy course would have been to withdraw behind the Atlantic and the Pacific, turn our back on the world, and embrace isolation.

Instead, we proposed the Marshall Plan, a bold investment to revive Europe's economies, modernize industry, and expand trade, not only for allies like France and Britain but also for our enemies, Germany and Italy. It was extraordinary that political leaders here once made those decisions. I struggle to think of a time in human history when the victor helped to revive the vanquished with no strings attached, no colonial objective.

As the Marshall Plan made its way through Congress, leaders in Washington made the case to the American people, even standing firm against some who wanted to require European

countries to buy only American products with the aid that we gave them. Still in the years to come, American farmers and manufacturers would fill millions of crates of wheat and wood, of sugar and steel to rebuild Europe from the ravages of war.

President Truman understood that, in time, strong European economies would become strong trading partners, strong military allies, and a bulwark of freedom against Soviet expansion. History proved him right, to say the least.

After the Marshall Plan, Western Europe surged back to life as Eastern Europe stagnated behind the Iron Curtain. In the West, production rose and hunger fell. Foes became friends. Bonds across the Atlantic solidified. Investments through the Marshall Plan helped lay the foundation for NATO, the common market, and the European Union.

Few actions in our foreign policy have been as consequential for America's long-term interests, for our national interests, and all at a cost of \$150 billion in today's dollars—25 times less than the total cost of World War II and about 25 times less than what we paid in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

As President Truman invested in Europe's recovery, he also helped fashion a new world order from the rubble of war. American leadership forged global institutions to enshrine our interests and values around the world for generations, giving rise to the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations, and the entire international system that we have today.

Seventy years ago, President Truman had the vision to think longer term. He had the wisdom to see that what was good for others was often good for us as well. And he had the courage to ask our citizens to lead, to sacrifice, and to believe that even after the second war in a generation, it was still within their power to shape a lasting peace.

Those actions, those qualities are why Truman's Presidency marks one of the finest periods in American foreign policy in the history of our foreign policy. The comparison with what we are seeing today just couldn't be starker.

Under the banner of putting America first, President Trump has undermined our interests at nearly every turn. At a time when China proposes to spend over a trillion dollars to expand its global influence with new railroads from Hungary to Kenya, new bridges and tunnels linking Southeast Asia together, and new electrical plants to power Pakistan, President Trump proposes to slash our foreign assistance advancing U.S. interests around the world. At a time when NATO faces challenges to its east and south, President Trump publicly rebukes the alliance and refuses to reinforce its bedrock principle of collective security.

As the recent terrorist attack unfolded in London, President Trump took to Twitter to promote his political agenda and sow fear in the wake of that attack. In the face of challenges like extremism and instability that demand 40-year strategies like the ones President Truman had in mind, President Trump is conducting his foreign policy 140 characters at a time.

Now, as the world unites to confront the perils of climate change, our President has withdrawn from the landmark Paris Agreement, which we helped forge, in a shameful abdication of America's global leadership. In doing so, the President ignored the voices of millions of Americans and thousands of businesses, urging him—against the arguments that he made—to stay in the agreement for climate reasons, for economic reasons, and for national security reasons as well. By withdrawing from it, the President has turned his back on millions of people across the globe, as well, mostly the poor, who are already on the edge of crisis, who may face drought, displacement, and famine from a warming planet.

America has a strong interest in avoiding that future. Anybody who has seen what has happened since the Arab Spring understands what resulted from a doubling of the price of wheat in Egypt. A wise leader could see that. A President Truman would see that.

Like the Marshall Plan, the Paris Agreement recognized that in the modern world there is no "over there" anymore. Today, over there is here, and here is over there, and our President fundamentally doesn't understand it.

He claimed that withdrawing from the Paris Agreement would "put America first." In fact, this move threatens to put America last—last in innovation, last in clean energy, last in science, last in our moral responsibility to hand the next generation a safe and stable planet. That is why States and cities all across the country are making their own commitments to honor the Paris Agreement.

Now it is just us, Nicaragua, and Syria on the other side. That is why towns, cities, and States all across the country are scrambling to fill the void of leadership left by the administration to show the rest of the world that we are serious too.

In my home State of Colorado, we know that we can protect our economy and our climate, that we can grow our economy and protect our climate. We see those as linked together. You can't do one without the other. We developed the first State limits on methane pollution. We passed the first voter-led renewable standard in the entire Nation. We established our own limits on carbon pollution. And in the process, we have created 13,000 renewable energy jobs, with wind jobs alone expected to triple by 2020. On average, those jobs

pay a salary of \$50,000. We are manufacturing again in our State with the supply chains that come along with it.

What comes with those commonsense regulations? One of the strongest economies in America, the lowest unemployment rate in America, and we see this all across the country. New energy jobs are growing 12 times faster than the overall economy. The President doesn't see any of that.

In a matter of months, from foreign assistance, to global alliances, to terrorism and climate change, the administration has imperiled America's stature with a shortsighted and willfully ignorant agenda that is profoundly out of step with the realities of the world and the interests of the people of the United States.

In a recent op-ed, senior officials from the administration painted the world as no more than an "arena" where nations "compete for advantage." They were trying to explain the President's behavior while he was in Europe. That attitude marks a huge departure from generations of American foreign policy. This is not about the Obama administration; this is about a set of traditional American values and approaches to the world that we have had almost since the Nation's founding, and the space the President is creating out there in the world by abandoning those treasured American values gives space to those who seek every single day to undermine the liberal world order that has allowed our country and allies across the globe to succeed.

The President should understand that generations of leaders in the United States have put America first. They have always put America first—not in slogans or stump speeches but in the alliances and institutions we built, the values we champion, the alliances we forged that have given our world 70 years of peace and prosperity. That is a legacy upon which we must build—one that has put America first and has kept America first today and, if we act wisely, I think for decades to come.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Kansas.

(The remarks of Mr. MORAN are printed in today's RECORD during consideration of S. Res. 174.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE REFORM

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the destructive path that the majority is headed down with their attempts to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The Republican bill, and, frankly, the House Republican bill that the Senate is now considering in addition to other ideas is, in my judgment, not really a healthcare bill but a tax cut bill. It is a tax cut bill for the super-rich—not only the rich but, literally, the wealthiest few Americans—while increasing costs for middle-class families. It gives States the option to allow insurance companies to discriminate again like they did before the ACA was passed. It would also allow those same policies to devastate our hospitals, particularly those in rural communities. I live in a State where 48 out of 67 counties are, in fact, rural counties.

The Republican bill would rip away healthcare, according to the Congressional Budget Office, from 23 million Americans. Here is what that means in Pennsylvania, based upon the Congressional Budget Office numbers: Up to 770,000 Pennsylvanians could lose health insurance by 2026 if the bill were to pass, 48,000 Pennsylvania seniors on Medicare could lose access to services covered by Medicaid, and 52,600 Pennsylvanians with disabilities could lose Medicaid coverage. I live in a State where, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, over 722,000 Pennsylvanians with disabilities rely on Medical Assistance for their medical care. Medical Assistance is the State version of Medicaid. We know that if you are a child, if you are a senior, or if you have a disability, many Americans in those categories, of course, rely upon Medicaid.

We also know, based upon the CBO numbers, that 180,000 Pennsylvanians could lose access to mental health and substance abuse care now provided by Medicaid. We have heard a lot of talk, and there has been a lot of work, actually, in this body, as well as in the other body, in the last year on the opioid problem. We have Democrats and Republicans focusing on a major national problem, an urgent public health problem. We have made some progress—not enough but some good progress—on opioid legislation. All of that would be badly undermined if we made the changes to Medicaid that some want to make here because of the significant impact that cuts to Medicaid would have on the challenge of reducing the opioid crisis.

So even the possibility that this bill might become law is, in a sense, destabilizing to the healthcare marketplace, which has been better each year we move forward from the passage of the ACA in 2010.

Just last week, the Pennsylvania Insurance Department announced average proposed rate increases for health insurance premiums for 2018. Here is what the Pennsylvania Insurance Department told us. If we maintain current law, premiums will go up 8.8 percent in Pennsylvania. If the Republicans get rid of the cost-sharing subsidies, which many seem either to want to get rid of or to want to ignore, thereby creating uncertainty—if those cost-sharing subsidies are thrown out the window—premiums will go up 2.5 times as much, by over 20 percent. So far, it is 8.8 percent under current law or 20 percent just based upon the cost-sharing subsidies being taken away.

Also, if the individual mandate is repealed, premiums will go up almost three times as much, by 23 percent. If we get rid of both the cost-sharing subsidies and the individual mandate, premiums in our State will go up by over 36 percent.

So we have a basic choice to make, at least as it relates to Pennsylvania. Under current law, it is 8.8 percent, and we should try to bring that down. I think there are ways we could work together in a bipartisan fashion to bring that down. But if we go in the direction that many want to go—especially on the Republican side—to undermine or to do nothing about cost-sharing and get to rid of the individual mandate, premiums go up 36 percent. So folks can make their choice to go up about 9 percent or to go up 36 percent. It is a real simple choice with basically two options.

The bill that was passed in the House would destroy the lives of many vulnerable Pennsylvanians. What should we do about it? Well, the first thing we should do with the bill is to throw it in the trash heap. That is where it belongs, and I hope that is where Senate Republicans are headed and that they are going to start over on a new bill, because the bill that was passed in the House is very bad for the country.

Among the 3 million Pennsylvanians with preexisting conditions are two remarkable young women whose mother first contacted me in 2009. Stacie Ritter, from Manheim, PA, is the mom of four children, including her twin daughters, Hannah and Madeline, who are depicted here in this picture when they were much younger. Hannah and Madeline were diagnosed with a rare and dangerous type of leukemia when they were just 4 years old. You can see their picture there at that time.

Stacy and her husband Benjamin went bankrupt trying to pay their daughters' medical bills. She wrote to me at the time, saying that without healthcare reform, "my girls will be unable to afford care, that is if they are eligible, for care that is critically necessary to maintain this chronic condition."

Fortunately, things have changed in the last 8 or so years. Fortunately,

Hannah and Madeline are healthy young women now. They are freshman at Arcadia University and are doing well. They rely on the Affordable Care Act's protections to ensure that they have access to affordable coverage, whether they are on their parents' plan or purchasing a plan in the individual market. As you can see on my left, this is a picture of Hannah and Madeline today as college freshmen.

Without the Affordable Care Act, Hannah and Madeline could be denied health insurance. As their mom said, they could be "punished and rejected because they had the misfortune of developing cancer as a child."

The Republican bill passed in the House would put them at risk of being denied health insurance or being charged more because they are cancer survivors.

I don't know why anyone would support a bill that would do that.

Just a number of months ago I received a letter from Pam Simpson from Chester County, PA. Pam and her son Rowan have their story to tell. Rowan is 5 years old, and a number of years ago he was diagnosed with autism. I have talked about Rowan before on this floor and in other places and what Medicaid means for Rowan and his family. Medicaid provides important services for Rowan and others with disabilities, enabling Rowan to go to preschool and allowing his mother to work. Here is what his mom said to me. I won't read the whole letter, but I will just highlight the first page.

The first page is Rowan's life before he was diagnosed with autism—all of the challenges that he and his family had—and Rowan's life after the diagnosis of autism, but, then, ultimately, when he received Medicaid, or Medical Assistance, as we call it in Pennsylvania. Here is what his mom told me in the letter after he received word that he was going to be enrolled in Medical Assistance:

Late January 2016, I applied for Medicaid. That is Medical Assistance.

After Rowan was awarded Medical Assistance, we were able to obtain wrap-around services. These services included a Behavioral Specialist Consultant and a Therapeutic Staff Support worker.

She goes on later in that paragraph to say that these wrap-around services "have been a Godsend."

Then she goes on later and says:

I am thrilled by Rowan's daily progress. I cannot say enough good things about this program.

Then she says:

Without Medical Assistance, I am confident that I could not work full time to support our family. Our family would be bankrupt or my son would go without the therapies he sincerely needs.

Here is the last line of her letter:

We are desperately in need of Rowan's Medical Assistance and would be devastated if we lost these benefits.

She is referencing "Medical Assistance" for Medicaid, the same program at the State level.

So we have two families now that are totally reliant on these programs, either the ACA more broadly or, in particular, the Medicaid Program. Both families have referenced bankruptcy because of healthcare challenges in the life of that family—one who would be on the brink of bankruptcy, Rowan's family, and the other, who actually went through bankruptcy because of those healthcare challenges. No family in the United States of America should have to worry about going bankrupt because of a healthcare problem. We are well on our way to solving these problems, and no one should pull the rug out from under those families. But, unfortunately, when it comes to this legislation, that is exactly what could happen to many of them.

I will give a third example: Alex. Recently I met Alex, who is from South-eastern Pennsylvania. He is 9 years old, and he has Down syndrome. Here is what Alex, a 9-year-old, wrote:

Although I have a medical diagnosis of Down Syndrome, I am an excellent student. I get 100 percent on my spelling tests and I get picked as the Math King quite often. . . . My parents, my teachers, and everyone around me thought from the beginning there was nothing that I could not do. . . . I am able to get a good education because of the supports that I get from Special Education. That's why I am very concerned about the possible cuts in Medicaid funding in schools. . . . Medicaid funding in schools is a very, very important part of what makes it possible for us to receive successful education in school and become contributing members of our society.

That is a 9-year-old in Pennsylvania reminding us about this important program. Alex has tremendous potential that would be in jeopardy by the proposed cuts to Medicaid.

Here is another example: Peg Fagan of Pennsylvania. The Republican bill includes an age tax that will allow insurers to charge older Americans up to five times more than younger Americans. Peg is from Bucks County, in Southeastern Pennsylvania. She is a three-time cancer survivor who could not afford health insurance prior to the Affordable Care Act. She is approaching Medicare eligibility but still has a few years to go before she is old enough to enroll.

Peg was able to find affordable health insurance thanks to the ACA, but under the Republican bill, she could once again be discriminated against for being an older adult, and another possible object of discrimination would be that she is a cancer survivor.

That was the old law. That is where we were before, where insurance companies were allowed under the law to discriminate in that fashion. They could discriminate against you because you were a woman. They could discriminate against you because you had

a preexisting condition. They could discriminate against you because you were a cancer survivor or because of your age, or so many other circumstances. I thought we were beyond that. I thought we had finally cured that problem, but some want to go back in time.

So the CBO tells us that the Republican bill would rip away healthcare from 23 million Americans. I just went through some Pennsylvania stories. We have a lot more, and my colleagues will be hearing them. But for Hannah and Madeline and Rowan and Alex and Peg, we should ask ourselves a couple of basic questions. Healthcare for those Pennsylvanians should not be made worse, and they should not be made worse off, in order to give the top one-tenth of 1 percent a \$200,000 giveaway. That is what the first version of the House healthcare bill would do. It would give the top one-tenth of 1 percent an average tax cut of \$197,000. I exaggerated; I said \$200,000. Let's be exact. It is \$197,000 each. Why would we take away healthcare or even risk or create uncertainty about healthcare for Hannah, Madeline, Rowan, Alex, and Peg because some people around here want to give tax cuts to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars to very wealthy people? That is not what I call a healthcare bill.

The Senate has an obligation, in my judgment—both parties—to stop this bill from being enacted into law. We cannot allow this legislation to pass or anything like it to become law. So I ask each Member of the Senate to consider these Pennsylvanians and plenty in your home States and the countless more like them who are anxiously hoping and praying this Congress will not vote to take away their healthcare.

DRUG AND VETERANS TREATMENT COURTS

Mr. President, I rise to express my support for the drug and other treatment courts, including veterans treatment courts, in Pennsylvania and the more than 3,000 across the Nation.

Just last month during National Drug Court Month, drug courts across the country held graduation ceremonies to recognize individuals who completed this rigorous treatment program. These courts, which serve about 150,000 people a year, hold offenders with substance use and mental health disorders accountable for their actions through strict supervision while also connecting them to the treatment they need. More than 1.25 million people have successfully graduated from drug and treatment court programs and are now on a path to recovery.

Research has demonstrated that drug and other treatment courts not only reduce crime but also reduce spending by slowing the cycle of recidivism. Drug and other treatment courts are also an important resource to law enforcement and community stakeholders working to combat the opioid

epidemic. Opioid addiction is a growing public health crisis in Pennsylvania and throughout the Nation, and it demands real action. As public officials, we have an obligation to ensure that the resources and policies are in place to fight this scourge so that more families won't have to endure the heartache of losing a loved one to addiction.

Veterans treatment courts are innovative and collaborative programs to address some of the unique challenges that face our veteran communities. There are approximately 22 million veterans in the United States, and Pennsylvania is home to nearly 1 million. The majority of veterans return to our communities as leaders and lead exemplary lives; however, not every veteran's path is straightforward. That is why we need to make sure the right programs and support services are in place.

According to the Department of Justice, in 2011 and 2012, approximately 8 percent of the total incarcerated population in the United States were, in fact, veterans. These veterans found themselves serving time in correctional facilities because they had not received the treatment they needed. While this represents a very small percentage of veterans, it is important that we support programs like veterans treatment courts for veterans who face significant obstacles returning to civilian life, including mental health concerns, post-traumatic stress disorder, and substance abuse issues. These treatment courts can have a lifelong impact on a veteran by helping them get out of the criminal justice system and get the necessary treatment they have earned. It is our obligation to work every day to ensure veterans are receiving the care and support they deserve.

There are many stories from across Pennsylvania and our country that exemplify why these veterans treatment courts are critical. Just to give one, shortly after Michael Colletti from Montgomery County received an honorable discharge from the U.S. Coast Guard, he found himself in the grips of a serious addiction to opioids. To support his growing habit, Michael began stealing from his employer, resulting in his arrest and jail time. His crimes were caused by his opioid use disorder, and Michael found himself in the Montgomery County Veterans Treatment Court.

Finally, getting the accountability he needed and connecting with the benefits he earned as a veteran, Michael began the process of leaving behind his life of addiction and crime to start a new path. Today, Michael Colletti is a partner in a successful small business and a mentor to others in his community struggling with their own substance use.

He says of the veterans treatment court:

I wouldn't be here without the support network from the court. I wouldn't have my girlfriend, I wouldn't have my beautiful place, I wouldn't have my career, and most importantly, I wouldn't have the sound clarity of mind to be myself again. Now I am committed to paying it forward.

I and I know many others are proud to support a recent letter led by our colleagues, Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator WICKER, highlighting the importance of funding the Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program and veterans treatment courts. As we go through the appropriations process, I urge my colleagues to consider the proven track record of these courts in improving outcome for graduates, and I hope Congress will offer strong support for these important programs that have been helping the justice system better serve individuals, veterans, their families, friends, and communities.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for June 2017. The report compares current-law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts the Senate agreed to in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2017, S. Con. Res. 3. This information is necessary for the Senate Budget Committee to determine whether budget points of order lie against pending legislation. The Republican staff of the Senate Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, prepared this report pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, CBA.

My last filing can be found in the RECORD on April 27, 2017. The information contained in this report captures legislative activity since that filing through June 5, 2017.

Republican Budget Committee staff prepared Tables 1–3 of this report.

Table 1 gives the amount by which each Senate authorizing committee exceeds or is below its allocation for budget authority and outlays under the most recently adopted budget resolution. This information is used for enforcing committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the CBA. For this reporting period, 13 of the 16 authorizing committees are in compliance with their allocations. Legislative activity involving the appropriations

process, continuing resolution and omnibus, during the last reporting period includes provisions, such as changes to health benefits for miners and Medicaid funding, charged to the Committee on Finance that caused it to breach its allocation. The other two committees in breach, as previously reported, are the Committee on Veterans Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. In total, authorizing committees are estimated to increase outlays by \$292 million more than they were allocated over the fiscal year 2017–2026 period. Of that \$292 million in violations, \$91 million stems from the Finance Committee's violations during this reporting period.

Table 2 gives the amount by which the Senate Committee on Appropriations exceeds or is below the statutory spending limits for fiscal year 2017. This information is used to determine points of order related to the spending caps found in sections 312 and 314 of the CBA. H.R. 244, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017, P.L. 115–31, provided full-year appropriations for the current fiscal year. These appropriations, \$551.1 billion for defense and \$518.5 billion for nondefense, were consistent with the statutory limits imposed by the Budget Control Act of 2011.

Table 3 tracks compliance with the fiscal year 2017 limit for overall changes in mandatory programs, CHIMPS, in appropriations bills, established in the fiscal year 2016 budget resolution. CHIMPS in the Consolidated Appropriations Act were consistent with this year's limit of \$19.1 billion. This information is used for determining points of order under section 3103 of that resolution.

In addition to the tables provided by Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting CBO tables, which I will use to enforce budget totals approved by the Congress.

CBO provided a spending and revenue report for fiscal year 2017, which helps enforce aggregate spending levels in budget resolutions under CBA section 311. CBO's estimates show that current-law levels of spending for fiscal year 2017 are below the amounts assumed in the budget resolution by \$303 million in budget authority and \$6.4 billion in outlays. CBO also estimates that revenues are \$1 million above assumed levels for fiscal year 2017, but \$21 million below assumed levels for the fiscal year 2017–2026 period. Social Security levels are consistent with the budget resolution's fiscal year 2017 figures.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate pay-as-you-go, PAYGO, rule. The Senate's PAYGO scorecard currently shows increased deficits of \$226 million over the fiscal year 2016–2021 and \$227 million over fiscal year 2016–2026 periods. For both periods, outlays have increased by

\$201 million, while revenues decreased by \$25 million over the 6-year period and \$26 million over the 11-year period. Missing from these levels are the budgetary effects of divisions M-O of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 and the miners' health provisions of H.J. Res. 99, the short-term continuing resolution, P.L. 115-30, which are required to be excluded based on language in the acts. The consolidated appropriations bill, however, is recorded as reducing revenues by \$24 million and

\$25 million over the fiscal year 2016–2021 and fiscal year 2016–2026 periods, respectively. That revenue loss is found in the appropriations section of the bill, not covered by the exclusion, which includes provisions related to visa-program extensions and insurance coverage of mammography. The Senate's PAYGO rule is enforced by section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21, the fiscal year 2008 budget resolution.

Finally, included in this submission is a table tracking the Senate's budget

enforcement activity on the floor. No budget points of order have been raised since my last filing.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (–) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	2017	2017–2021	2017–2026
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Armed Services			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation			
Budget Authority	1	1	1
Outlays	1	1	1
Energy and Natural Resources			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Environment and Public Works			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Finance			
Budget Authority	–239	468	–204
Outlays	38	763	91
Foreign Relations			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Judiciary			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Rules and Administration			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Intelligence			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	200	200
Indian Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Small Business			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Total			
Budget Authority	–238	469	–203
Outlays	39	964	292

TABLE 2.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS ¹

[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2017	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Statutory Discretionary Limits	551,068	518,531
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	20,877
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	5,200	51,355
Defense	515,977	138
Energy and Water Development	19,956	17,815
Financial Services and General Government	33	21,482
Homeland Security	1,876	40,532
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	32,280
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	161,025
Legislative Branch	0	4,440
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	7,726	74,650
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	36,586
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	300	57,351
Current Level Total	551,068	518,531
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (–) Statutory Limits	0	0

¹ This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.

² Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)

	2017
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2017	19,100
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	741
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	8,452
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	826
Homeland Security	187
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	28
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	8,009
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	857
Current Level Total	19,100
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	0

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2017.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2017 budget and is current through June 5, 2017. This report is sub-

mitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of S. Con. Res. 3, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2017.

Since our last letter dated April 27, 2017, the Congress has cleared and the President

has signed the following legislation that has significant effects on budget authority, outlays, and revenues in fiscal year 2017: A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes (Public Law 115–30); and Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 (Public Law 115–31).

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, AS OF JUNE 5, 2017

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (–) Resolution
ON-BUDGET			
Budget Authority	3,329.3	3,329.0	– 0.3
Outlays	3,268.2	3,261.8	– 6.4
Revenues	2,682.1	2,682.1	0.0
OFF-BUDGET			
Social Security Outlays ^a	805.4	805.4	0.0
Social Security Revenues	826.0	826.0	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

^a Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, AS OF JUNE 5, 2017

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted ^{a,b}			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,682,088
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,054,297	1,960,884	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	132,558	614,655	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	– 834,250	– 834,301	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,352,605	1,741,238	2,682,088
Enacted Legislation:			
National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–10)	1	1	0
A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes (P.L. 115–30)	2	2	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–31)	1,967,450	1,518,744	1
Total, Enacted Legislation	1,967,453	1,518,747	1
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	8,928	1,795	0
Total Current Level ^c	3,328,986	3,261,780	2,682,089
Total Senate Resolution ^d	3,329,289	3,268,171	2,682,088
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	1
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	303	6,391	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2017–2026:			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	32,351,639
Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	32,351,660
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	21

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^a Includes the budgetary effects of enacted legislation cleared by the Congress during the 114th session, prior to the adoption of S. Con. Res. 3, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2017.

^b Sections 193–195 of Division A of P.L. 114–254 provided funding, available until expended, for innovation projects and state responses to opioid abuse. CEO estimates that, for fiscal year 2017:

The \$20 million in discretionary budget authority provided by section 193 would result in an additional \$5 million in outlays for FDA innovation projects;

The \$352 million in discretionary budget authority provided by section 194 would result in an additional \$91 million in outlays for NIH innovation projects;

The \$500 million in discretionary budget authority provided by section 195 would result in an additional \$160 million in outlays for state response to opioid abuse.

Consistent with sections 1001–1004 of P.L. 114–255, for the purposes of estimating the discretionary budget authority and outlays for these provisions under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act of 1974 and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Act of 1985, those amounts are estimated to provide no budget authority or outlays.

^c For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

^d Periodically, the Senate Committee on the Budget revises the budgetary levels in S. Con. Res. 3, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution. The total for the Initial Senate Resolution shown below excludes \$81,872 million in budget authority and \$40,032 million in outlays assumed in S. Con. Res. 3 for non regular discretionary spending, including spending that qualifies for adjustments to discretionary spending limits pursuant to section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. The total for the Revised Senate Resolution shown below includes amounts for non regular discretionary spending.

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Initial Senate Resolution	3,226,128	3,224,630	2,682,088
Revisions:			
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	103,161	43,541	0
Revised Senate Resolution	3,329,289	3,268,171	2,682,088

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS, AS OF JUNE 5, 2017
[In millions of dollars]

	2017–2021	2017–2026
Beginning Balance ^a	0	0
Enacted Legislation: ^{b,c,d}		
Tested Ability to Leverage Exceptional National Talent Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–1)	*	*
Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior known as the Stream Protection Rule (P.L. 115–5)	*	*
National Aeronautics and Space Administration Transition Authorization Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–10)	1	1
Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues (P.L. 115–14)	*	*
Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to “Clarification of Employer’s Continuing Obligation to Make and Maintain an Accurate Record of Each Recordable Injury and Illness” (P.L. 115–21)	1	1
Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by qualified State political subdivisions for non-governmental employees (P.L. 115–24) ..	*	*
An act to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to modify the termination date for the Veterans Choice Program, and for other purposes (P.L. 115–26)	200	200
Pursuing further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes (P.L. 115–30) ^e	*	*
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–31) ^f	24	25
U.S. Wants to Compete for a World Expo Act (P.L. 115–32)	*	*
Modernizing Government Travel Act (P.L. 115–34)	*	*
Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by States for non-governmental employees (P.L. 115–35)	*	*
Follow the Rules Act (H.R. 657)	*	*
Public Safety Officers’ Benefits Improvement Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–36)	*	*
A bill to amend section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for stays during a period that the Merit Systems Protection Board lacks a quorum (S. 1083)	*	*
Current Balance	226	227
Memorandum:		
	2017–2021	2017–2026
Changes to Revenues	–25	–26
Changes to Outlays	201	201

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
Notes: P.L. = Public Law; * = between –\$500,000 and \$500,000.
^a Pursuant to the statement printed in the Congressional Record on January 17, 2017, the Senate Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard was reset to zero.
^b The amounts shown represent the estimated effect of the public laws on the deficit.
^c Excludes off-budget amounts.
^d Excludes amounts designated as emergency requirements.
^e CBO estimates that this joint resolution will increase the deficit by \$2 million over the 2017–2021 period. Pursuant to section 202(c) of P.L. 115–30, the budgetary effects of this joint resolution are excluded from the Senate’s PAYGO scorecard.
^f Division M of P.L. 115–31 contains the Health Benefits for Miners Act of 2017 and the Puerto Rico Section 1108(g) Amendment of 2017. Division N contains the HIRE Vets Act. CBO estimates that the provisions in Divisions M and N will increase the deficit by \$757 million over the 2017–2021 period, and by \$84 million over the 2017–2026 period. Pursuant to section 301(b) of Division M, the budgetary effects of Division M and succeeding divisions are excluded from the Senate’s PAYGO scorecard.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee’s intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No.

16-84, concerning the Department of the Army’s proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$662 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

J.W. RIXEY,
Vice Admiral, USN, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-84

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment \$482 million.
Other \$180 million.
Total \$662 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:
Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
Twenty-six (26) each AN/TPQ-53(V) Radar Systems to include Solid State Phased Array Radar with KN-4083 Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) enhanced Land/Sea Inertial Navigation System (INS) and automatic leveling system.
Eight hundred and forty (840), M931 Full Range Training Round, 120mm Projectile with M781 fuzes (for live fire exercise).
Two thousand, two hundred and forty (2,240), M107, 155MM Projectiles with M557 fuzes (for live fire exercise).
Non-MDE includes: Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio Systems (SINCGARS)

and accessories; Defense Advanced Global Positioning System (GPS) Receiver (DAGR) equipment and accessories; Miltope laptops and accessories; Medium Tactical Vehicles FMTV M1092 5-ton trucks/chassis with support and accessories; software support; support equipment; classroom simulators; government furnished equipment; technical manuals and publications; essential spares and repair parts; consumables; live fire exercise and ammunition; tools and test equipment; training; transportation; U.S. Government technical support and logistic support; contractor technical support; repair and return support; quality assurance teams; in-country Field Service Representative (FSR) and other associated equipment and services.

(iv) Military Department: Army (ZAI).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Annex Attached.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 5, 2017.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia—AN/TPO-53(V) Radar Systems and Related Support

The Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has requested a possible sale of twenty-six (26) AN/TPQ-53(V) Radar Systems to include Solid State Phased Array Radar with KN-4083 Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) enhanced Land/Sea Inertial Navigation System (INS) and automatic leveling system; Eight hundred and forty (840), M931, 120mm Projectiles with M781 fuzes (for

live fire exercise); Two thousand, two hundred and forty (2,240), M107, 155MM Projectiles with M557 fuzes (for live fire exercise); Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio Systems (SINCGARS) and accessories; Defense Advanced Global Positioning System (GPS) Receiver (DAGR) equipment and accessories; Miltope laptops and accessories; Medium Tactical Vehicles FMTV M1092 5-ton trucks/chassis with support and accessories; software support; support equipment; classroom simulators; government furnished equipment; technical manuals and publications; essential spares and repair parts; consumables; live fire exercise and ammunition; tools and test equipment; training; transportation; U.S. Government technical support and logistic support; contractor technical support; repair and return support; quality assurance teams; in-country Field Service Representative (FSR) and other associated equipment and services. The total estimated program cost is \$662 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of an important partner which has been and continues to be a leading contributor of political stability and economic growth in the Middle East.

Saudi Arabia intends to use these radars to support its border security requirements and modernize its armed forces with a more current capability to locate and counter the source of incoming ballistic artillery, rockets, and mortars. This will contribute to Saudi Arabia's goal to update its military capability while further enhancing greater interoperability among Saudi Arabia, the United States and other allies. Saudi Arabia will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The Lockheed Martin Corporation, Liverpool, New York, is the principal contractor for the AN/TPQ-53(V) Radars. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require U.S. Government or contractor representatives to travel to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for a period of four (4) months for in-processing/fielding, system checkout and new equipment training, as well as providing the support of two in-country FSRs for two years.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of the proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 16-84

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AN/TPQ-53(V) radar system is a highly mobile radar that automatically detects, classifies, tracks, and locates the point of origin of projectiles fired from mortar, artillery and rocket systems with sufficient accuracy for first round fire for effect. It mitigates close combat radar coverage gaps and replaces the AN/TPQ-36 and AN/TPQ-37 Firefinder Radars; fully supporting Brigade Combat Teams (BCT), Division Artilleries (DIVARTYs), and Field Artillery (FA) Brigades. Designed to be transported by ship, trucks, train, or aircraft, it is capable of deploying as part of the counter-rocket, artillery, and mortar system of systems to provide a sense and warn capability for fixed

and semi-fixed sites. The AN/TPQ-53(V) provides a net ready system with increased range and accuracy throughout a 90 degree search sector (stare mode) as well as 360-degree coverage (rotating).

a. The Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) hardware design of the AN/TPQ-53(V) is UNCLASSIFIED. Foreign source systems of similar design and capability are available in advanced industrial nations such as Sweden and Israel.

b. The AN/TPQ-53(V) software gives it an enhanced capability in terms of target detection and classification in an Electronic Countermeasure (ECM) environment. Release of detailed knowledge of the software code or test data could aid an adversary trying to identify ways of countering the detection capabilities of the AN/TPQ-53(V) or improve the performance of their own radar systems. Although the detection, classification technology, and concept used in the AN/TPQ-53(V) has been utilized for more than a decade, the ability to incorporate such technology on a solid state air cooled radar would be a major technological improvement. The software is UNCLASSIFIED. The system is classified SECRET when employed in a theater of operations.

c. The Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio System (SINCGARS) is a tactical radio providing secure jam-resistant voice and data communications of command, control, targeting, and technical information for the AN/TPQ-53(V) radar system. The spread-spectrum frequency hopping Electronic Counter-Counter Measures (ECCM) technology resident in the radio is sensitive but UNCLASSIFIED. While sensitive, the frequency-hopping algorithms used to generate the ECCM waveform are unique to the country of ownership and cannot be manipulated by potential adversaries for use or interference with other countries possessing SINCGARS technology. Should a potential adversary come into possession of one of these radios, they would have the potential to intercept operational command, control, and targeting information. This potential problem is mitigated by the fact that the customer can secure information passed over the radio network using a commercial grade security capability equivalent to an AES 256-bit encryption system whose keys are controlled by the customer country.

d. The Defense Advanced Global Positioning System (GPS) Receiver (DAGR) is a handheld GPS location device with map background displaying the user's location. Unlike commercial grade GPS receivers capable of receiving Standard Positioning Signals (SPS) from GPS satellites, the DAGR is capable of receiving Precise Positioning Signals (PPS). PPS satellite signals provide significantly more accurate location data than do SPS signals. This capability within DAGR is possible due to the Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM). The SAASM is an encrypted device permitting both receipt of PPS signals and the benefit of preventing potential adversaries from spoofing the system to display incorrect location information. The SAASM capability within the DAGR is sensitive but UNCLASSIFIED. The SAASM capabilities are sensitive due to the system's ability to access restricted PPS GPS satellite signals and to prevent spoofing. While sensitive, the ability of potential adversaries to exploit the system are limited. The SAASM chip goes through a special process of loading encryption signals and unique access codes keyed to the customer country. These processes are strictly controlled by the US Air

Force. If the DAGR is compromised, the US Air Force can cut off the device access to PPS signals and the anti-spoofing capability.

e. The same SAASM capabilities resident in the DAGR are also resident in the AN/TPQ-53(V) KN-4083 Inertial Navigation System (INS). The KN-4083 is a SAASM enhanced INS capability with a 3-axis Monolithic Ring Laser Gyro allowing extremely accurate location as well as 3-axis accelerometer to provide angular information regarding the radar position (i.e. pitch, roll, and azimuth data). While inertial navigation and accelerometer capabilities are well-known, the SAASM capability within the system makes it sensitive but UNCLASSIFIED. As with the DAGR, the US Air Force can cut off access to PPS signals and anti-spoofing capabilities, minimizing impacts should a potential adversary obtain the system.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific radar hardware and software elements, the information could be used to identify ways of countering the detection capabilities of the AN/TPQ-53(V) Radar System or improve the performance of their radar systems. Testing and identification of methods to defeat the AN/TPQ-53(V) ECCM capabilities would lead to improvements in the overall effectiveness of an adversary's system and improve their survivability.

3. A determination has been made that Saudi Arabia can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS ACCOUNTABILITY AND WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate adopted the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act. This legislation facilitates the process of terminating nonperforming VA employees by eliminating certain due process protections that are currently part of the system. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs says he needs this authority to reform the system. The Senate, by voice vote, honored the request. However, in Alaska, we have a different problem which is not addressed in the legislation, and that problem is filling vacant positions within the VA. The major challenge facing VA leaders in Alaska is recruitment and retention.

The Wasilla community based outpatient clinic, CBOC, serves veterans in the fastest growing community in the State. The last permanent physician at this CBOC resigned in May 2014, citing "excessive workload." A number of temporary physicians have rotated through since, and some have considered VA employment, but ultimately said no. The fact remains that, for the past 3 years, the VA has not been able

to recruit a single physician to permanently staff this CBOC, a facility that, given demand, requires a permanent staff of two—or possibly three—physicians. Wasilla is hardly the most remote place in the State. Actually, it is one of the least remote. Moreover, it is one of the most desirable places in Alaska to live. For example, Mat-Su Regional Hospital, the community hospital down the road, has no problem retaining medical professionals. Staffed with 160 physicians in 28 specialties, including primary care, it was recently highlighted by Becker's Hospital Review as one of the 150 best places to work in healthcare for 2017. By comparison, the VA has been unable to recruit a single physician to permanently tend to the needs of our veterans in the Mat-Su Valley.

That suggests to me that the VA has a second problem. The VA is simply not regarded as an employer of choice among potential recruits. Removing due process protections for VA employees may well exacerbate that problem. Over the past 14 years, I have spent time with a great many VA employees, and the fear that a supervisor may now have greater latitude to target an individual on a trumped up charge because they are seen to be rocking the boat or because they just don't like them is a real one. We have very good management in the Alaska VA healthcare system now, but the faces of managers change with some frequency and with those changes can come wide swings in management philosophies.

At a recent hearing of the MILCON-VA subcommittee, my friend from Florida, Senator RUBIO, asked Dr. Shulkin, "In your time at the Veterans Administration, have you ever seen or do you have any evidence of any instance in which supervisors targeted individuals for dismissal because they just don't like them and were going to make something up in order to get rid of them?" While the official transcript is not yet available, we do have the CQ transcript. That transcript indicates that Dr. Shulkin did not directly answer the question. He responded that the VA has seen cases of documented whistleblower retaliation.

But not every employee who faces inequity in the workplace becomes a whistleblower. Some just go out and find a new job which offers better working conditions and in some cases better money than the VA pays.

To his credit, Dr. Shulkin went on to say, "But, I want people to understand, I am not seeking this and I do not support your legislation so that we can willy-nilly fire employees, or allow supervisors to abuse our employees. This allows due process. I believe it's very important that our employees have due process, the right to pre-decisional appeals, and the right to be represented by the union or their attorneys."

I hope that he is right about how this will work out on the ground, but the

VA is a highly decentralized system with a great many seemingly autonomous decisionmakers. In asking for this new authority, Dr. Shulkin must accept the responsibility for ensuring that it is not abused and must also accept accountability in the event that it is, but the larger question is whether all of the energy we have put into legislating VA accountability does anything to make the VA a more attractive employer to in-demand healthcare professionals. I would like to see the VA devote as much energy and creativity to addressing this challenge as it has to the issue before us yesterday.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

GRANITE MOUNTAIN/SPECULATOR MINE FIRE

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I wish to remember metal mining's greatest disaster, the Granite Mountain/Speculator Mine Fire that took place 100 years ago in Butte, MT, that claimed the lives of 168 men.

On the night of June 8, 1917, approximately 410 men were in the mine, working to meet the demand for copper that was created by our Armed Forces on the frontlines during World War I. An electric cable had been lowered into the mine earlier in the day and had gotten away from the workers, falling into a tangled coil. Later that evening, as crews examined the damaged cable, a lamp accidentally ignited the cable and sparked a fire that would fill the mine with smoke and poisonous gas.

Unable to lower cages due to fire damage, in an act of pure bravery, over 100 rescue workers immediately jumped into harm's way to try to rescue their trapped brothers. Miraculously, none of the rescue workers were killed, but sadly, after the conclusion of rescue efforts, a total of 168 miners were lost. The community of Butte grieved together, as did the entire Montana family.

Today I want to honor those who perished that tragic day and honor those whose families who would never be the same after it. Would you please join me in a brief moment of silence to remember those miners and their families?

This proclamation is meant to recognize the strength of those Montanans who sacrificed their lives in support of our Nation's military work in World War I, as well as those who jumped to help a fallen brother without question. The tragedy that befell our mining community highlights the strength found in the hearts of not only Montanans, but all Americans, and the moments that make heroes out of ordinary men and bring communities together.

So that future generations will not forget the men who perished that day, a memorial was built in honor of those

who died in the Granite Mountain/Speculator Mine Fire. If you are ever in our beautiful State, I hope you will take time to visit.

One hundred years after this tragedy, we are also reminded of how far we have come in hard rock mining. Jobs that were once seen as high risk are now very desirable, not just due to high wages, but more importantly because of advances in safety. In fact, according to the Department of Labor, fiscal year 2016 was the safest year in mining history. The continued progress toward safer mining has been a shared effort across State and Federal agencies, as well as the mining community itself. New technology, better practices, special initiatives, and improved training have led to a culture in mining communities and industry that prioritizes safety. The Granite Mountain/Speculator Mine Fire reminds us so that we must continue to push for even safer mining.

Lastly, I want to take a moment to thank those hard rock miners who are spread across our beautiful country and who continue to serve the American people. Thank you for all that you do. We must continue to prioritize safety that we never again have a tragedy like that of the Granite Mountain/Speculator Mine Fire.●

TRIBUTE TO HELEN AND BOBBY FELDMAN

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Helen and Bobby Feldman for their strong leadership in the Jewish community. Bobby and Helen have been involved in a number of causes that celebrate their Jewish heritage as well as make a difference by putting the needs and well-being of others before themselves.

Bobby and Helen have worked with many organizations, including Stand With Us, an organization dedicated to educating individuals all over the world about Israel and ways to combat anti-Semitism, and HonestReporting, a media watchdog organization dedicated to providing facts, figures, and statistics to journalists across the world to ensure Israel's story is told fairly by the media.

Bobby Feldman's interest in Jewish culture and causes stemmed from his early interest in environmental issues. He worked with the Jewish National Fund in Las Vegas where he now serves as the president of the southern Nevada chapter. Their organization is working to revitalize areas in Israel by planting trees, creating parks, and working to build a better country for years to come.

Helen Feldman has a list of accomplishments herself. She helped organize the Women's Alliance of the Jewish National Fund. This organization encourages future generations of Las

Vegas women to celebrate our solidarity with Israel. She also volunteered her time at local nursing homes; there she shows off her amazing singing talents and brightens the day of so many Nevada seniors.

On Sunday, April 30, the Jewish National Fund is hosting their annual Love of Israel brunch where both Helen and Bobby will be recognized for their involvement in the community. These two individuals should be proud of all that they have done together.

Earlier this week, Israel celebrated their Holocaust Remembrance Day, honoring and remembering the 6 million Jewish people who were the victims of Nazi hatred. It serves us all as a reminder for the need to turn away prejudice and racism and embrace others. That is why I am both humbled and honored to acknowledge Helen and Bobby for their work here in the great State of Nevada. I also want to congratulate them on 29 years of marriage, and I look forward to seeing more from them as they continue to make us all very proud.●

TRIBUTE TO BETTY FOX

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Betty Fox and not only wish her a happy birthday, but also reflect on her years of service. Betty Fox served her country in the Armed Forces and remains an active leader in the community. On April 22, Betty Fox turned 98 years old, and to this day, she makes us proud to call her a fellow Nevadan and American.

Betty Fox joined the Marine Corps in April 1943 shortly after the beginning of World War II. She was stationed at the Marine Corps Air Station, MCAS, located in Cherry Point, NC. She was then sent to the MCAS in El Toro, CA, there she received the Honorable Service Lapel Button marking her outstanding service to her country. Betty Fox was promoted to private first class on August 20, 1943, then to corporal on January 24, 1944. She was discharged on February 5, 1944, but her promotions and designations reflect on her service and our country will never be able to fully repay her for the sacrifices she made in the defense of freedom.

In 1956, she moved to Las Vegas, NV, and has been a Nevadan ever since. Despite no longer being Active military personnel, Betty Fox remains involved in the local community. She epitomizes an age-old saying: "You are only as old as you feel."

Betty Fox volunteered at the Las Vegas convention center for the past 18 years. She is an active, lifetime member of the Marine Corps League, Local Detachment 186, and has marched in several Veteran's Day parades in order to honor those who, like her, sacrificed to defend America and its values.

Betty is also a lifetime member of Women Marine Association, WMA, and

was an active member until the local chapter disbanded. After years of serving her country and community, she volunteered her time at the local senior living center, brightening the day of many of Nevada's senior citizens.

I am both humbled and honored to acknowledge Betty Fox for her service to our country and community. Her sacrifices and continued commitment to helping those who served makes me proud to call her a fellow Nevadan. As Nevada's senior Senator, I want to honor her success, her life of giving back, and wish her the happiest 98th birthday. Rest assured, we all look forward to her continued efforts that are sure to inspire us all.●

RECOGNIZING THE WOMEN'S MINING COALITION

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Women's Mining Coalition, a Nevada-born group that has devoted 25 years of service advocating for a strong U.S. mining industry. I am proud to honor the significant contributions the Women's Mining Coalition has made to the mining industry in the State of Nevada and throughout our Nation. I am extremely proud of their successes and am grateful for how it has benefited the Silver State.

In 1993, three Nevada geologists—Kathy Benedetto, Ruth Carraher, and Debbie Struhsacker—started the Women's Mining Coalition in response to the congressional debate to enact major changes to the U.S. mining law that would threaten the future of Nevada's mining industry and hard rock mining throughout the country. At that time, they never dreamed that their concept would involve more than taking a couple of trips to Washington, to talk to lawmakers about mineral exploration, the importance of mining, and that mining is a good career for women, but this Battle-Born Nevada concept has become a nationwide, quarter-century commitment to talk to Members of Congress about how modern mining provides the building blocks of our society while caring for the environment and providing family-wage jobs to miners and the many companies throughout the country that provide equipment, goods, and services to the mineral exploration and mining sectors.

Each year, WMC's Nevada members travel to the group's annual Washington, DC fly-in. These Nevada women represent the diverse domestic mining industry and discuss legislative issues and proposed rules affecting mining. During these meetings, WMC members put a face to mining that lawmakers don't expect: women involved in all facets of mining, from equipment operators and manufacturers, engineers, executives, miners, metallurgists, geologists, and environmental scientists.

Last September at a banquet in Las Vegas, the group received the prestigious Prazen Living Legends of Mining Award from the National Mining Hall of Fame for their many years of service and commitment to the mining industry. Not resting on their laurels, the Women's Mining Coalition is in Washington, DC, this week to continue their work to let Congress know that a strong mining industry is essential to the future of Nevada and our Nation. Our national defense, our infrastructure, our electricity, our technology, our agriculture, our transportation, and communication capabilities all rely on the products of mining. The Women's Mining Coalition will continue to make this message heard with energy, talent, and enthusiasm.

As the senior Senator from the Silver State, I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in congratulating the Women's Mining Coalition on its 25 years of thoughtful advocacy on behalf of mining in Nevada and across the country. This group has advanced Nevada's mining industry, and I am honored to recognize this important contribution. I wish the Women's Mining Coalition well in its future endeavors in creating greater opportunities for mining in our great State.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1628. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017.

H.R. 2192. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to eliminate the non-application of certain State waiver provisions to Members of Congress and congressional staff.

At 10:27 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 390. An act to provide emergency relief for victims of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes in Iraq and Syria, for accountability for perpetrators of these crimes, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 2004(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation: Mr. DEUTCH of Florida.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 603 of the Department of State Authorities Act, Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-323), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Minority Leader appoints the following individual to the Western Hemisphere Drug Policy Commission: Mr. Pete Gallego of Alpine, Texas.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 390. An act to provide for emergency relief for victims of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes in Iraq and Syria, for accountability for perpetrators of these crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2192. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to eliminate the non-application of certain State waiver provisions to Members of Congress and congressional staff; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 1628. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 286. A bill to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-92).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*William Francis Hagerty IV, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

Nominee: William F. Hagerty.

Post: Ambassador to Japan.

Nominated: 03/27/2017.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I

have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, date, amount, and donee:

1. Self: William F. Hagerty 9/1/16, 2,700.00, Trump Victory; 9/1/16, 2,700.00, Trump of President; 6/29/16, 5,400.00, John McCain; 5/25/16, 5,000.00, RNC/Convention; 5/22/16, 1,000.00, David Kustoff; 2/29/16, 2,700.00, Marco Rubio; 1/8/16, 33,400.00, RNC; 1/8/16, 1,600.00, RNC; 9/1/15, 5,000.00, TennPAC; 6/30/15, 2,700.00, Jeb Bush; 6/5/15, 3,000.00, TNGOP; 5/27/15, 2,500.00, Healthcare Freedom Fund; 4/21/15, 33,400.00, RNC; 11/3/14, 2,600.00, Lamar Alexander; 10/21/14, 1,000.00, David Perdue; 4/17/14, 1,000.00, John Ratcliffe; 2/17/14, 2,000.00, Keith Crisco; 2/3/14, 3,000.00, TNGOP; 12/30/13, 1,000.00, Jim Tracy; 12/18/13, 1,000.00, John Ratcliffe; 12/10/13, 1,000.00, Marsha Blackburn; 9/3/13, 2,600.00, Diane Black; 8/14/13, 2,600.00, Lamar Alexander; 2/11/13, 3,000.00, TNGOP; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, Republican Party of Idaho; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, Republican State Comm of Mass; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, Oklahoma Leadership Council; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, VT Rep Fed. Elections Cmte; 6/22/12, 2,000.00, TNGOP; 6/21/12, 2,500.00, TennPAC; 6/21/12, 2,500.00, Alexander for Senate; 5/17/12, 50,000.00, Romney Victory; 5/17/12, 30,800.00, RNC; 5/17/12, 2,500.00, Mitt Romney; 5/9/12, 350.00, TNGOP.

2. Spouse: Christine L Hagerty: 9/1/16, 2,700.00, Trump Victory; 9/1/16, 2,700.00, Trump for President; 6/28/16, 5,400.00, John McCain Primary/Gen; 2/29/16, 2,700.00, Marco Rubio; 1/8/16, 1,600.00, RNC; 1/8/16, 33,400.00, RNC; 6/30/15, 2,700.00, Jeb Bush; 11/3/14, 2,600.00, Lamar Alexander; 8/14/13, 2,600.00, Lamar Alexander; 9/3/13, 2,400.00, Diane Black; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, Republican Party of Mass; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, Oklahoma Leadership Council; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, Vermont Repub Federal Elections Cmte; 7/31/12, 4,175.00, Republican Party of Idaho; 6/13/12, 2,500.00, Mitt Romney; 6/13/12, 30,800.00, RNC; 6/13/12, 50,000.00, Romney Victory.

3. Children and Spouses: William F. Hagerty—none; Stephen L. Hagerty—none; Tara E. Hagerty—none; Christine B. Hagerty—none.

4. Parents: William Hagerty, III—Deceased; Ruth Hagerty, \$1000.00, 3/1/07 Mitt Romney; William Locke-Paddon—Deceased; Terry Locke-Paddon—none.

5. Grandparents: William F. Hagerty, Jr.—Deceased; Lillian Dwiggins Hagerty—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Michael Hagerty—none; Robin Hagerty—none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Elizabeth Hagerty—none.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1298. A bill to modify the criteria used by the Corps of Engineers to dredge small ports; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1299. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the occurrence of diabetes in Medicare beneficiaries by extending coverage under Medicare for medical nutrition therapy services to such beneficiaries with pre-diabetes or with risk factors for developing type 2 diabetes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1300. A bill to prohibit the indefinite detention of persons by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1301. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1302. A bill to provide for the conversion of temporary judgeships to permanent judgeships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1303. A bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1304. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exclude customary prompt pay discounts from manufacturers to wholesalers from the average sales price for drugs and biologicals under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1305. A bill to provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection with adequate flexibility in its employment authorities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 1306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish refundable tax credits for expenses relating to ensuring safety and accessibility in historic structures; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1307. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand eligibility to receive refundable tax credits for coverage under a qualified health plan; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1308. A bill to increase authorized funding for the Soo Locks; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1309. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit American Indian tribal councils to enter into agreements with the Commissioner of Social Security to obtain social security coverage for services performed by tribal council members; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1310. A bill to amend the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 to specify which depository institutions are subject to the maintenance of records and disclosure requirements of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BURR, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1311. A bill to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1312. A bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1313. A bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1314. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to bolster fairness and transparency in consideration of interstate natural gas pipelines, to provide for greater public input opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. NELSON):

S. Res. 185. A resolution recognizing and expressing support for the goals and ideals of National Water Safety Month; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. Res. 186. A resolution recognizing the Aviation Cadet Museum in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, as the national aviation cadet museum of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 187. A resolution congratulating and honoring Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory on 50 years of groundbreaking discoveries; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 170

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to provide for non-preemption of measures by State and local governments to divest from entities that engage in commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activities targeting Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr.

KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency may not regulate vehicles used solely for competition, and for other purposes.

S. 301

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 301, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit governmental discrimination against providers of health services that are not involved in abortion.

S. 319

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 319, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish within the Department of Veterans Affairs a center of excellence in the prevention, diagnosis, mitigation, treatment, and rehabilitation of health conditions relating to exposure to burn pits.

S. 341

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 341, a bill to provide for congressional oversight of actions to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

S. 379

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 379, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 447

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 447, a bill to require reporting on acts of certain foreign countries on Holocaust era assets and related issues.

S. 486

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 486, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the non-application of Medicare competitive acquisition rates to complex rehabilitative wheelchairs and accessories.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

S. 749

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 749, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require the disclosure of the annual percentage rates applicable to Federal student loans.

S. 751

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 751, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 806

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 806, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act to ensure College for All.

S. 829

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 829, a bill to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 926, a bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to prohibit, as an unfair or deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes.

S. 1018

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1018, a bill to provide humanitarian assistance for the Venezuelan people, to defend democratic governance and combat widespread public corruption in Venezuela, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii

(Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, *supra*.

S. 1055

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1055, a bill to restrict the exportation of certain defense articles to the Philippine National Police, to work with the Philippines to support civil society and a public health approach to substance abuse, to report on Chinese and other sources of narcotics to the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

S. 1068

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1068, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for increased investment in clean energy.

S. 1099

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1099, a bill to provide for the identification and prevention of improper payments and the identification of strategic sourcing opportunities by reviewing and analyzing the use of Federal agency charge cards.

S. 1129

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1129, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

S. 1146

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1146, a bill to enhance the ability of the Office of the National Ombudsman to assist small businesses in meeting regulatory requirements and develop outreach initiatives to promote awareness of the services the Office of the National Ombudsman provides, and for other purposes.

S. 1154

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1154, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the housing treatment of members of the Armed Forces and their spouses and dependents undergoing a permanent change of station in the United States, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 42

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 42, a joint resolution relating to the disapproval of the proposed export to the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of certain defense articles.

S.J. RES. 44

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California

(Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 44, a joint resolution condemning the deadly attack on May 26, 2017, in Portland, Oregon, expressing deepest condolences to the families and friends of the victims, and supporting efforts to overcome hatred, bigotry, and violence.

S. RES. 136

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 136, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the 102nd anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

S. RES. 174

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 174, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International and celebrating the Lions Clubs International for a long history of humanitarian service.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1305. A bill to provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection with adequate flexibility in its employment authorities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Customs and Border Protection Hiring and Retention Act, or CBP HiRe Act.

In recent years, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or CBP, has had a lot of trouble recruiting, hiring, and retaining personnel to adequately staff the border and our ports of entry. Today, CBP is nearly 1,000 officers below the mandated staffing levels. The Border Patrol, whose duty it is to secure 6,000 miles of borderlands, suffers from a shortage of more than 1,800 agents. These shortages persist, despite ample backing and funding from Congress and the threat they pose to both national security and trade-reliant communities and economies, particularly in my State of Arizona. This has been frustrating for border communities across the country, but it is especially problematic for Arizona, a State that depends on both border security and a lot of cross-border trade.

For example, the Nogales port of entry in Southern Arizona is one of the busiest ports in the United States. It processes approximately \$2.5 billion worth of produce each year. Arizona alone does about \$15 billion in trade with Mexico alone, every year. Mexican shoppers spend about \$8 million in stores in Arizona every day.

However, the port currently is suffering from a 23-percent shortage of

CBP officers. Our ports cannot effectively and efficiently facilitate the flow of commerce across the border without adequate staffing.

One of the biggest challenges in both retaining and hiring new officers and agents for frontline positions has been the remoteness of CBP installations. CBP officers and border agents are often stationed in geographically remote and isolated locations. This likely contributes to the fact that, of those leaving the agency, nearly 30 percent of Border Patrol agents and over 10 percent of CBP officers are lost to other agencies.

Massive staffing shortages aside, CBP is barely able to hire fast enough to fill the jobs left by departing agents and officers. So we have great needs that are not being filled, but we also have attrition we simply can't replace. In fact, CBP hires only 1 out of every 64 applicants for officer positions, and 1 out of every 113 applicants for Border Patrol agent positions. This means that less than 2 percent of applicants manage to get through CBP's hiring process. The situation at CBP today is simply unsustainable.

Congress can't sit idly by as slow hiring rates and accelerating attrition threaten the security of our borders and the underpinnings of our economy. To that end, I am pleased to introduce my CBP HiRe Act with Senator HEITKAMP from North Dakota. This legislation would streamline the hiring process and allow the CBP to finally bring more agents and officers into frontline positions.

Importantly, this bill gives CBP new tools to recruit and retain personnel in remote and hard-to-fill locations. This includes special salary rates and recruitment, relocation, and retention incentives.

In addition, the bill will eliminate bureaucratic redtape by giving CBP the authority to use direct-hire authority and to expedite the hiring of qualified applicants. Right now, the situation is that they have to deal with other Federal agencies and get virtually every incentive and program they want to approve and need to approve to hire more officers. They have to run it up the flagpole so many times with Federal agencies that it simply takes too long.

Lastly, the bill prevents CBP from disclosing an applicant's polygraph results with another Federal agency or non-Federal employer. Challenges relating to the administering of the polygraph have resulted in approximately 65 percent of the individuals failing the test.

Think about that. People who are in another law enforcement position, even those who have taken a polygraph before just a year or two prior—many of them fear that a false positive on a polygraph exam might impact their ability to move to another Federal

agency if that is disclosed. If you have a polygraph, which can't be used in courts of law because it is not perfect or nowhere near perfect, then Federal agencies shouldn't be able to forward that to other Federal agencies. It acts as a big disincentive for people to apply for these positions because a false positive on a polygraph exam might imperil their chances to work for another Federal agency or to work in law enforcement later in their career. This also creates a disincentive, as I mentioned, for individuals to want to be hired by CBP.

In Arizona, safety and prosperity are inextricably linked to CBP's ability to secure the border and facilitate trade. The CBP HiRe Act will give CBP the tools and flexibility necessary to accomplish these missions.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan solution, and I look forward to seeing it move through the Senate without delay.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 1306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish refundable tax credits for expenses relating to ensuring safety and accessibility in historic structures; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, founded more than two centuries ago, Vermont boasts a trove of historically preserved buildings, structures, and towns. These are part of our heritage, and our State's character. Making a priority of managing and preserving our cultural heritage makes Vermont a National leader in this field.

Of course, many of these historic structures do not meet modern fire prevention codes and lack basic features such as sprinklers, which can drastically reduce the potential for irreparable damage from a fire. Today I am reintroducing the Historic Downtown Preservation and Access Act, a bill that would create a refundable tax credit for the installation of fire suppression systems and elevators in older, multi-use buildings in historic downtowns. Every year, fires destroy numerous historic buildings that often serve as the center of towns and villages across the nation. In 2011, the Brooks House in Brattleboro, Vermont, burned down after almost 150 years in use as a hotel and later, as a multi-use building for residential housing and commercial space. After six years of rebuilding and restoring, those who were displaced by this fire are finally getting back on their feet.

The Historic Downtown Preservation and Access Act will establish a 50 percent refundable tax credit of up to \$50,000 that incentivizes the installation of sprinkler systems in order to help prevent and minimize damage caused by fire, including potential loss of life, extensive property damage, and, in some instances, federal funding that

is reinvested during the restoration process. This bill also includes a provision to encourage the installation of elevators in our historic buildings, making them accessible to all. This would ensure that upper floors for commercial or residential use are accessible to everyone, including tenants and their guests. Finally, this bill is updated to establish a tax credit for the costs incurred when removing hazardous substances from historic buildings, like lead paint, asbestos, and radon.

We should encourage the maintenance of the history and character of historic buildings and downtowns, while also ensuring that they remain safe and accessible to all. This bill is a responsible step forward in those efforts. As we look ahead to comprehensive tax reform, I hope that Congress will consider commonsense legislation like this that will help preserve our towns' unique histories and legacy features for decades to come, while promoting the safety of all Americans.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1307. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand eligibility to receive refundable tax credits for coverage under a qualified health plan; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Affordable Health Insurance for the Middle Class Act, a common sense fix to improve affordability of health insurance on the individual market. I am pleased that Senators HASSAN, WARREN, HARRIS, BALDWIN, and LEAHY have joined this bill as original cosponsors, and I appreciate their support.

Since its implementation, the Affordable Care Act has helped to expand health care and control out-of-pocket costs for millions of Americans. Over 20 million people who were previously uninsured now have coverage, there are no yearly or lifetime limits on coverage, and no one can be denied coverage or charged more based on their gender or because of a pre-existing health condition. The Affordable Care Act also expanded the individual marketplace, through which 18 million people currently get their coverage. Individuals who make between 100 and 400 percent of the federal poverty level, and who do not have affordable employer coverage available to them, can receive a tax credit subsidy to help pay for insurance on the individual market. This credit limits the cost of insurance at 9.69 percent of an individual's income.

However, someone who makes just one dollar above the income threshold immediately loses all federal assistance. This 'cliff' unfairly impacts middle-income Americans who are by no

means wealthy, but who make just barely too much to qualify for the tax credit. I am particularly concerned about my constituents between the ages of 50 to 64, who are facing higher premiums as they age and who need access to health services but are not yet eligible for Medicare.

To address this issue, the Affordable Health Insurance for the Middle Class Act would eliminate the current cliff, and instead gradually phase out federal assistance based on income. Nobody would pay more than 9.69 percent of their income for insurance, and once someone's premium fell below this threshold, they would no longer receive federal assistance.

For example, in my hometown of San Francisco, a 60-year-old making \$50,000 currently pays \$946 per month for the second-lowest cost Silver plan and does not receive federal assistance. Under this bill, their premium would be capped at \$404, or 9.69 percent of their income, and the tax credit subsidy would cover the rest. This bill would create a fairer and more predictable system, ensuring that consumers on the individual market know just how much their insurance will cost and will have affordable options available. The Affordable Care Act has reduced costs and expanded benefits for many Americans, and it is critical that we build on this progress to further improve the law—not destroy it.

The bill is supported by a number of organizations, including the American Association of Neurological Surgeons, AANS, Child Welfare League of America, Congress of Neurological Surgeons, CNS, Families USA, Lung Cancer Alliance, and National Farmers Union.

This legislation is a simple fix that provides relief for middle-income Americans and strengthens affordability protections for coverage through the individual market. I urge all of my colleagues to cosponsor the Affordable Health Insurance for the Middle Class Act. Thank you Mr. President and I yield the floor.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1308. A bill to increase authorized funding for the Soo Locks; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise to speak about legislation I am introducing with my colleague from Michigan Senator STABENOW to authorize funding for a new Soo Lock.

Since 1855, locks at the St. Mary's River have allowed ships to pass between Lake Superior and Lake Huron. In modern times, this waterway has allowed large freighters to move coal, iron ore, and agricultural products throughout the Great Lakes. The Soo Locks are the most important link in a critical supply chain that connects iron ore mines in Minnesota and Michigan's Upper Peninsula with steel mills

and manufacturing facilities all across the country.

During World War II, Congress authorized funding for a new lock because it was clear the country's ability to move iron ore to steel plants in Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania was absolutely critical for the war effort. It took less than 2 years to complete that project after Congress authorized the funding in 1942.

President Roosevelt signed an Executive order establishing the military district of Sault Saint Marie, and the Army stationed 10,000 troops there to defend the Soo Locks by land, air, and sea—so great was the fear that a German attack would instantly cripple Allied efforts to produce steel and weapons.

Today, there is only one Soo Lock—the Poe Lock—that is large enough to accommodate modern freighters, especially the 1,000-foot-long vessels that move millions of tons of iron ore each and every year. Over 80 percent of the commodities that flow through the Soo Locks must pass through the Poe Lock, and each one of those 1,000-foot freighters carries the equivalent of 3,000 truckloads of commodities. It is not possible to move that amount of iron ore in these 1,000-foot freighters by rail or by road, and on top of that, the steel mills are only equipped to handle the iron ore supply by water.

A study conducted by the Department of Homeland Security in 2015 confirmed that it is the Achilles' heel of our economy. Key findings from the Department say: "A disruption of the Poe Lock likely will cause an almost complete shutdown of Great Lake steel production."

The report goes on to say: "A shutdown of Great Lakes steel production likely will cause almost all North American appliances, automobiles, construction equipment, farm equipment, mining equipment, and railroad production to cease within weeks."

Within weeks. The Homeland Security report estimates that 11 million Americans would lose their jobs if this were to happen.

Consider the fact that the jobs of millions of American workers depend on the ability of large ships to pass, as depicted, from here to here on the St. Mary's Falls Canal. Currently, there is only one lock that can accommodate this task. If this lock shuts down, steel plants in Ohio and Indiana and Kentucky shut down. Auto plants in Texas, Tennessee, California, and Michigan shut down. The American economy shuts down. The losses would be felt throughout the United States, wherever steel is used in the manufacturing process.

We are taking an unacceptable risk if we do not act swiftly to ensure that there is a backup in the case of a lock failure. That is why I am joining Senator STABENOW and members of the

Michigan congressional delegation from both parties to introduce a bill that would authorize the funding for constructing another larger Poe-sized lock. The current authorization for the project is far below projected cost estimates. Our bill, which was introduced today, if enacted, will allow the Army Corps to move directly into the design and construction phase. We do not have a moment to lose.

Just last week, I traveled to the Soo Locks for a tour with members of the Michigan congressional delegation, and we saw firsthand how the dedicated men and women of the Army Corps are working to keep the locks functioning. They go to work each and every day with a full understanding of how the safety and security of the Nation rests with their ability to maintain this critical infrastructure. It is a credit to the skill of the Army Corps of Engineers that freighters have been able to pass through the St. Mary's on their journeys around the Great Lakes almost without interruption. But they are working with equipment that has been maintained well beyond its life cycle and in some cases beyond two life cycles. When I was there last week, I saw 100-year-old water pumps still in use.

We cannot continue to rely on the infrastructure investments made by our grandparents and great-grandparents. It is time to invest in our country and the well-being of our economy for future generations and pass the Soo Locks Modernization Act.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BURR, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1311. A bill to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1311

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Abolish Human Trafficking Act of 2017".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Preserving Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund.
- Sec. 3. Mandatory restitution for victims of commercial sexual exploitation.
- Sec. 4. Victim-witness assistance in sexual exploitation cases.
- Sec. 5. Victim protection training for the Department of Homeland Security.

- Sec. 6. Implementing a victim-centered approach to human trafficking.
- Sec. 7. Direct services for child victims of human trafficking.
- Sec. 8. Holistic training for Federal law enforcement officers and prosecutors.
- Sec. 9. Best practices in delivering justice for victims of trafficking.
- Sec. 10. Training for health professionals.
- Sec. 11. Improving the national strategy to combat human trafficking.
- Sec. 12. Specialized human trafficking training and technical assistance for service providers.
- Sec. 13. Enhanced penalties for human trafficking, child exploitation, and repeat offenders.
- Sec. 14. Targeting organized human trafficking perpetrators.
- Sec. 15. Investigating complex human trafficking networks.
- Sec. 16. Combating sex tourism.
- Sec. 17. Human Trafficking Justice Coordinators.
- Sec. 18. Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Human Trafficking.
- Sec. 19. Additional reporting on crime.
- Sec. 20. Making the Presidential Survivor Council permanent.
- Sec. 21. Strengthening the National Human Trafficking Hotline.
- Sec. 22. Ending government partnerships with the commercial sex industry.
- Sec. 23. Study of human trafficking victim privilege.
- Sec. 24. Understanding the effects of severe forms of trafficking in persons.
- Sec. 25. Combating trafficking in persons.
- Sec. 26. Grant accountability.

SEC. 2. PRESERVING DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS' FUND.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund established under section 3014 of title 18, United States Code—

(1) is intended to supplement, and not supplant, any other funding for domestic trafficking victims; and

(2) has achieved the objective described in paragraph (1) since the establishment of the Fund.

(b) ENSURING FULL FUNDING.—Section 3014 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "September 30, 2019" and inserting "September 30, 2023";

(2) in subsection (f), by inserting "including the mandatory imposition of civil remedies for satisfaction of an unpaid fine as authorized under section 3613, where appropriate" after "criminal cases"; and

(3) in subsection (h)(3), by inserting "and child victims of a severe form of trafficking (as defined in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102))" after "child pornography victims".

SEC. 3. MANDATORY RESTITUTION FOR VICTIMS OF COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 117 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 2429. Mandatory restitution

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3663 or 3663A, and in addition to any other civil or criminal penalty authorized by law, the court shall order restitution for any offense under this chapter.

"(b) SCOPE AND NATURE OF ORDER.—

"(1) DIRECTIONS.—An order of restitution under this section shall direct the defendant

to pay the victim (through the appropriate court mechanism) the full amount of the victim's losses, as determined by the court under paragraph (3).

“(2) **ENFORCEMENT.**—An order of restitution under this section shall be issued and enforced in accordance with section 3664 in the same manner as an order under section 3663A.

“(3) **FULL AMOUNT OF THE VICTIM'S LOSSES DEFINED.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘full amount of the victim's losses’—

“(A) has the meaning given the term in section 2259(b)(3); and

“(B) includes the gross income or value to the defendant of the victim's services, if the services constitute commercial sex acts as defined under section 1591.

“(4) **FORFEITURE OF PROPERTY.**—The forfeiture of property under this subsection shall be governed by the provisions of section 413 (other than subsection (d) of such section 413) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 853).

“(c) **VICTIM DEFINED.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In this section, the term ‘victim’ means the individual harmed as a result of the commission of a crime under this chapter.

“(2) **ASSUMPTION OF CRIME VICTIM'S RIGHTS.**—In the case of a victim who is under 18 years of age, incompetent, incapacitated, or deceased, the legal guardian of the victim, a representative of the victim's estate, or any other person appointed as suitable by the court may assume the crime victim's rights under this section

“(d) **PROHIBITION.**—A defendant charged with an offense under this chapter may not be named as a representative or guardian of a victim of the offense.”.

(b) **TABLE OF SECTIONS.**—The table of sections for chapter 117 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2428 the following:

“2429. Mandatory restitution.”.

SEC. 4. VICTIM-WITNESS ASSISTANCE IN SEXUAL EXPLOITATION CASES.

(a) **AVAILABILITY OF DOJ APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 524(c)(1)(B) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, chapter 110 of title 18” after “chapter 77 of title 18”.

(b) **AMENDMENT TO TITLE 31.**—Section 9705(a)(2)(B)(v) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, chapter 109A of title 18 (relating to sexual abuse), chapter 110 of title 18 (relating to child sexual exploitation), or chapter 117 of title 18 (relating to transportation for illegal sexual activity and related crimes)” after “(relating to human trafficking)”.

SEC. 5. VICTIM PROTECTION TRAINING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title IX of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (6 U.S.C. 641 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 906. VICTIM PROTECTION TRAINING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

“(a) **DIRECTIVE TO DHS LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS AND TASK FORCES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue a directive to—

“(A) all Federal law enforcement officers and relevant personnel employed by the Department who may be involved in the investigation of human trafficking offenses; and

“(B) members of all task forces led by the Department that participate in the investigation of human trafficking offenses.

“(2) **REQUIRED INSTRUCTIONS.**—The directive required to be issued under paragraph (1) shall include instructions on—

“(A) the investigation of individuals who patronize or solicit human trafficking victims as being engaged in severe trafficking in persons and how such individuals should be investigated for their roles in severe trafficking in persons; and

“(B) how victims of sex or labor trafficking often engage in criminal acts as a direct result of severe trafficking in persons and such individuals are victims of a crime and affirmative measures should be taken to avoid arresting, charging, or prosecuting such individuals for any offense that is the direct result of their victimization.

“(b) **VICTIM SCREENING PROTOCOL.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue a screening protocol for use during all anti-trafficking law enforcement operations in which the Department is involved.

“(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The protocol required to be issued under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) require the individual screening of all adults and children who are suspected of engaging in commercial sex acts, child labor that is a violation of law, or work in violation of labor standards to determine whether each individual screened is a victim of human trafficking;

“(B) require affirmative measures to avoid arresting, charging, or prosecuting human trafficking victims for any offense that is the direct result of their victimization;

“(C) be developed in consultation with relevant interagency partners and nongovernmental organizations that specialize in the prevention of human trafficking or in the identification and support of victims of human trafficking and survivors of human trafficking; and

“(D) include—

“(i) procedures and practices to ensure that the screening process minimizes trauma or revictimization of the person being screened; and

“(ii) guidelines on assisting victims of human trafficking in identifying and receiving restorative services.

“(c) **MANDATORY TRAINING.**—The training described in sections 902 and 904 shall include training necessary to implement—

“(1) the directive required under subsection (a); and

“(2) the protocol required under subsection (b).”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-22; 129 Stat. 227) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 905 the following:

“Sec. 906. Victim protection training for the Department of Homeland Security.”.

SEC. 6. IMPLEMENTING A VICTIM-CENTERED APPROACH TO HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b)(2) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(ii); by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **PRIORITY.**—In selecting recipients of grants under this paragraph that are only available for law enforcement operations or task forces, the Attorney General may give priority to any applicant that files an attes-

tation with the Attorney General stating that—

“(i) the grant funds—

“(I) will be used to assist in the prevention of severe forms of trafficking in persons in accordance with Federal law;

“(II) will be used to strengthen efforts to investigate and prosecute those who knowingly benefit financially from participation in a venture that has engaged in any act of human trafficking;

“(III) will be used to take affirmative measures to avoid arresting, charging, or prosecuting victims of human trafficking for any offense that is the direct result of their victimization; and

“(IV) will not be used to require a victim of human trafficking to collaborate with law enforcement officers as a condition of access to any shelter or restorative services; and

“(ii) the applicant will provide dedicated resources for anti-human trafficking law enforcement for a period that is longer than the duration of the grant received under this paragraph.”.

SEC. 7. DIRECT SERVICES FOR CHILD VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)) is amended—

(1) in the heading by inserting “CHILD VICTIMS OF A SEVERE FORM OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS AND” before “VICTIMS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY”; and

(2) by inserting “victims of a severe form of trafficking (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(A)) who were under the age of 18 at the time of the offense and” before “victims of child pornography”.

SEC. 8. HOLISTIC TRAINING FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND PROSECUTORS.

All training required under the Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2015 (42 U.S.C. 14044g) and section 105(c)(4) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(c)(4)) shall—

(1) emphasize that an individual who knowingly solicits or patronizes a commercial sex act from a person who was a minor (consistent with section 1591(c) of title 18, United States Code) or was subject to force, fraud, or coercion is guilty of an offense under chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, and is a party to a human trafficking offense;

(2) develop specific curriculum for—

(A) under appropriate circumstances, arresting and prosecuting buyers of commercial sex, child labor that is a violation of law, or forced labor as a form of primary prevention; and

(B) investigating and prosecuting individuals who knowingly benefit financially from participation in a venture that has engaged in any act of human trafficking; and

(3) specify that any comprehensive approach to eliminating human trafficking shall include a demand reduction component.

SEC. 9. BEST PRACTICES IN DELIVERING JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall issue guidance to all offices and components of the Department of Justice—

(1) emphasizing that an individual who knowingly solicits or patronizes a commercial sex act from a person who was a minor (consistent with section 1591(c) of title 18, United States Code) or was subject to force, fraud, or coercion is guilty of an offense under chapter 77 of title 18, United States

Code, and is a party to a severe form of trafficking in persons, as that term is defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9));

(2) recommending and implementing best practices for the collection of special assessments under section 3014 of title 18, United States Code, as added by section 101 of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-22; 129 Stat. 228), including a directive that civil liens are an authorized collection method and remedy under section 3613 of title 18, United States Code; and

(3) clarifying that commercial sexual exploitation is a form of gender-based violence.

SEC. 10. TRAINING FOR HEALTH PROFESSIONALS.

Section 107 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) TRAINING FOR HEALTH PROFESSIONALS.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘pilot program’ means the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training pilot program established under paragraph (2); and

“(B) the term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

“(2) PILOT PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may continue a pilot program, which shall be known as the ‘Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training pilot program’ or the ‘SOAR to Health and Wellness Training pilot program’.

“(B) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—Under the pilot program, the Secretary may award grants to appropriate entities to train health care providers—

“(i) to identify potential human trafficking victims;

“(ii) to work with law enforcement agencies to report human trafficking and facilitate communication with human trafficking victims, in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, local, and tribal laws, including legal confidentiality requirements for patients and health care providers;

“(iii) to refer such victims to appropriate social or victims service agencies or organizations;

“(iv) to provide such victims with appropriate patient-centered, evidence-based care; and

“(v) to foster the practice of interprofessional collaboration, including practices used by organizations other than health care organizations.

“(C) FUNCTIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The functions of the pilot program shall include, as appropriate, the functions of the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training program that was operating on the day before the date of the enactment of this subsection and any of the authorized initiatives described in clause (ii).

“(ii) AUTHORIZED INITIATIVES.—The authorized initiatives of the pilot program shall include—

“(I) engaging stakeholders, including victims of human trafficking and Federal, State, local, or tribal partners;

“(II) making grants available to support training in health care sites that represent diversity in—

“(aa) geography;

“(bb) the demographics of the population served;

“(cc) the predominate types of human trafficking cases; and

“(dd) health care provider profiles; and

“(III) providing technical assistance to assist grantees in—

“(aa) achieving the objectives described in subparagraph (B); and

“(bb) reporting on any best practices they identify.

“(D) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate not later than October 1, 2022.

“(3) DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) DATA COLLECTION.—During any of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022 in which the Secretary carries out any of the authorized initiatives described in paragraph (2)(C), the Secretary shall collect data and report on—

“(i) the total number of entities that received a grant under this subsection—

“(I) during the previous fiscal year;

“(II) between the previous fiscal year and the date of the enactment of this subsection; and

“(III) between the date of the enactment of this subsection and the date of the establishment of the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training program that was operating on the day before the date of the enactment of this subsection; and

“(ii) the total number of health care providers and other related providers that participated in training supported by the pilot program—

“(I) during the previous fiscal year;

“(II) between the previous fiscal year and the date of the enactment of this subsection; and

“(III) between the date of the enactment of this subsection and the date of the establishment of the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training program that was operating on the day before the date of the enactment of this subsection.

“(B) REPORTING.—Not later than 90 days after the first day of each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report on the data collected under subparagraph (A).

“(C) SHARING BEST PRACTICES.—The Secretary shall make available, on the website of the Department of Health and Human Services, a description of the evidence-based practices and procedures used by entities that receive a grant under the pilot program for carrying out the activities described in paragraph (2)(B).”

SEC. 11. IMPROVING THE NATIONAL STRATEGY TO COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 606(b) of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (42 U.S.C. 14044h(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) A national strategy to prevent human trafficking and reduce demand for human trafficking victims.”

SEC. 12. SPECIALIZED HUMAN TRAFFICKING TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SERVICE PROVIDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 111 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044f) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS” and inserting “SPECIALIZED HUMAN TRAFFICKING TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE”;

(2) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “means a State or a local government.” and inserting the following: “means—

“(A) a State or unit of local government;

“(B) a federally recognized Indian tribal government, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior;

“(C) a victim service provider;

“(D) a nonprofit or for-profit organization (including a tribal nonprofit or for-profit organization);

“(E) a national organization; or

“(F) an institution of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education).”;

(3) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General may award grants to eligible entities to—

“(1) provide training to identify and protect victims of trafficking;

“(2) improve quality and quantity of services offered to trafficking survivors; and

“(3) improve victim service providers’ partnerships with Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies and other relevant entities.”; and

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) provide technical assistance on the range of services available to victim service providers who serve trafficking victims;

“(5) develop and distribute materials, including materials identifying best practices in accordance with Federal law and policies, to support victim service providers working with human trafficking victims;

“(6) identify and disseminate other publicly available materials in accordance with Federal law to help build capacity of service providers;

“(7) provide training at relevant conferences, through webinars, or through other mechanisms in accordance with Federal law; or

“(8) assist service providers in developing additional resources such as partnerships with Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies and other relevant entities in order to access a range of available services in accordance with Federal law.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-162; 119 Stat. 2960) is amended by striking the item relating to section 111 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 111. Grants for specialized human trafficking training and technical assistance for service providers.”.

SEC. 13. ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR HUMAN TRAFFICKING, CHILD EXPLOITATION, AND REPEAT OFFENDERS.

Part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in chapter 77—

(A) in section 1583(a), in the flush text following paragraph (3), by striking “not more than 20 years” and inserting “not more than 30 years”;

(B) in section 1587, by striking “four years” and inserting “10 years”; and

(C) in section 1591(d), by striking “20 years” and inserting “25 years”; and

(2) in section 2426—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “twice” and inserting “3 times”; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1)(B) by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “subparagraph (A)”.

SEC. 14. TARGETING ORGANIZED HUMAN TRAFFICKING PERPETRATORS.

Section 521(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) a Federal offense involving human trafficking, sexual abuse, sexual exploitation, or transportation for prostitution or any illegal sexual activity; and”; and

(4) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking “(1) or (2)” and inserting “(1), (2), or (3)”.

SEC. 15. INVESTIGATING COMPLEX HUMAN TRAFFICKING NETWORKS.

Section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(c)—

(A) by inserting “section 1582 (vessels for slave trade), section 1583 (enticement into slavery),” after “section 1581 (peonage),”; and

(B) by inserting “section 1585 (seizure, detention, transportation or sale of slaves), section 1586 (service on vessels in slave trade), section 1587 (possession of slaves aboard vessel), section 1588 (transportation of slaves from United States),” after “section 1584 (involuntary servitude),”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “kidnapping human” and inserting “kidnapping, human”; and

(B) by striking “production,” and inserting “production, prostitution.”

SEC. 16. COMBATING SEX TOURISM.

Section 2423 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “for the purpose” and inserting “with a motivating purpose”; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “for the purpose of engaging” and inserting “with a motivating purpose of engaging”.

SEC. 17. HUMAN TRAFFICKING JUSTICE COORDINATORS.

(a) HUMAN TRAFFICKING JUSTICE COORDINATORS.—The Attorney General shall designate in each Federal judicial district not less than 1 Assistant United States Attorney to serve as the Human Trafficking Coordinator for the district who, in addition to any other responsibilities, works with a human trafficking victim-witness specialist and shall be responsible for—

(1) serving as the legal counsel for the Federal judicial district on matters relating to human trafficking;

(2) prosecuting, or assisting in the prosecution of, human trafficking cases;

(3) conducting public outreach and awareness activities relating to human trafficking;

(4) ensuring the collection of data required to be collected under clause (viii) of section 105(d)(7)(Q) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(d)(7)(Q)), as added by section 18 of this Act;

(5) coordinating with other Federal agencies, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies, victim service providers, and other relevant non-governmental organizations to build partnerships on activities relating to human trafficking; and

(6) ensuring the collection of restitution for victims as required to be ordered under section 1593 of title 18, United States Code, and section 2429 of such title, as added by section 3 of this Act.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE COORDINATOR.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall designate an official who shall coordinate human trafficking efforts within the Department of Justice who, in addition to any other responsibilities, shall be responsible for—

(1) coordinating, promoting, and supporting the work of the Department of Jus-

tice relating to human trafficking, including investigation, prosecution, training, outreach, victim support, grant-making, and policy activities;

(2) in consultation with survivors of human trafficking, compiling, conducting, and disseminating, including making publicly available when appropriate, replication guides and training materials for law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, emergency responders, individuals working in victim services, adult and child protective services, social services, and public safety, medical personnel, mental health personnel, financial services personnel, and any other individuals whose work may bring them in contact with human trafficking regarding how to—

(A) conduct investigations in human trafficking cases;

(B) address evidentiary issues and other legal issues; and

(C) appropriately assess, respond to, and interact with victims and witnesses in human trafficking cases, including in administrative, civil, and criminal judicial proceedings; and

(3) carrying out such other duties as the Attorney General determines necessary in connection with enhancing the understanding, prevention, and detection of, and response to, human trafficking.

SEC. 18. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE TO MONITOR AND COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 105(d)(7)(Q) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(d)(7)(Q)) is amended—

(1) in clause (vi), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(viii) the number of convictions obtained under chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, aggregated separately by the form of offense committed with respect to the victim, including recruiting, enticing, harboring, transporting, providing, obtaining, advertising, maintaining, patronizing, or soliciting a human trafficking victim; and”.

SEC. 19. ADDITIONAL REPORTING ON CRIME.

Section 237(b) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (28 U.S.C. 534 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) incidents of assisting or promoting prostitution, child labor that is a violation of law, or forced labor of an individual under the age of 18 as described in paragraph (1); and

“(5) incidents of purchasing or soliciting commercial sex acts, child labor that is a violation of law, or forced labor with an individual under the age of 18 as described in paragraph (2).”.

SEC. 20. MAKING THE PRESIDENTIAL SURVIVOR COUNCIL PERMANENT.

Section 115 of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-22; 129 Stat. 243) is amended by striking subsection (h).

SEC. 21. STRENGTHENING THE NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE.

(a) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Section 105(d)(3) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(d)(3)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “and providing an annual report on the case referrals received from the national human trafficking hotline by Federal departments and agencies” after “international trafficking”; and

(2) by inserting “and reporting requirements” after “Any data collection procedures”.

(b) HOTLINE INFORMATION.—Section 107(b)(1)(B)(ii) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The number of the national human trafficking hotline described in this clause shall be posted in a visible place in all Federal buildings.”.

SEC. 22. ENDING GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIPS WITH THE COMMERCIAL SEX INDUSTRY.

No Federal funds or resources may be used for the operation of, participation in, or partnership with any program that involves the provision of funding or resources to an organization that—

(1) has the primary purpose of providing adult entertainment; and

(2) derives profits from the commercial sex trade.

SEC. 23. STUDY OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING VICTIM PRIVILEGE.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Judicial Conference of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the necessity and desirability of amending the Federal Rules of Evidence to establish a Federal evidentiary privilege for confidential communications between a victim of human trafficking, regardless of whether the victim of human trafficking is a party to a legal action, and a caseworker assisting the victim of human trafficking; and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1).

SEC. 24. UNDERSTANDING THE EFFECTS OF SEVERE FORMS OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-22; 129 Stat. 258) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 607. UNDERSTANDING THE PHYSICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF SEVERE FORMS OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall jointly conduct a study on the short-term and long-term physical and psychological effects of serious harm (as that term is defined in section 1589(c)(2) and section 1591(e)(4) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-457; 122 Stat. 5044)) in order to determine the most effective types of services for individuals who are identified as victims of these crimes, including victims in cases that were not investigated or prosecuted by any law enforcement agency, and how new or current treatment and programming options should be tailored to address the unique needs and barriers associated with these victims.

“(b) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Abolish Human Trafficking Act of 2017, the National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall make available to the public the results, including any associated recommendations, of the study conducted under subsection (a).”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-22; 129 Stat. 227) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 606 the following:

"Sec. 607. Understanding the physical and psychological effects of severe forms of trafficking in persons."

SEC. 25. COMBATING TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

(a) **TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PREVENTION ACT OF 2000 PROGRAMS.**—Section 113 of the Trafficking Victims Prevention Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7110) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "2014 through 2017" and inserting "2018 through 2022"; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "2014 through 2017" and inserting "2018 through 2022"; and

(2) in subsection (i), by striking "2014 through 2017" and inserting "2018 through 2022".

(b) **REINSTATEMENT AND REAUTHORIZATION OF GRANTS TO COMBAT CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.**—

(1) **REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED PROVISION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 202 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044a) is amended to read as such section read on March 6, 2017.

(B) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1241(b) of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (42 U.S.C. 14004a note) is repealed.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as though enacted on March 6, 2017.

(3) **REAUTHORIZATION.**—Section 202(i) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005, as amended by paragraph (1), is amended to read as follows:

"(i) **FUNDING.**—For each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2022, the Attorney General is authorized to allocate up to \$8,000,000 of the amounts appropriated pursuant to section 113(d)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Prevention Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7110(d)(1)) to carry out this section."

SEC. 26. GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term "covered agency" means an agency authorized to award grants under this Act;

(2) the term "covered grant" means a grant authorized to be awarded under this Act; and

(3) the term "covered official" means the head of a covered agency.

(b) **ACCOUNTABILITY.**—All covered grants shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

(1) **AUDIT REQUIREMENT.**—

(A) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term "unresolved audit finding" means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of a covered agency that the audited grantee has utilized funds under a covered grant for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

(B) **AUDITS.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of a covered agency shall conduct audits of recipients of covered grants to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(C) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A recipient of funds under a covered grant that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive funds under a covered grant during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

(D) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding covered grants, a covered official shall give priority to eligible applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for the covered grant.

(E) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an entity is awarded funds under a covered grant during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the entity is barred from receiving covered grants under subparagraph (C), a covered official shall—

(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the recipient of the covered grant that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(2) **NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this paragraph and each covered grant program, the term "nonprofit organization" means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) **PROHIBITION.**—A covered grant may not be awarded to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) **DISCLOSURE.**—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a covered grant and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees, shall disclose to the applicable covered official, in the application for the covered grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, a covered official shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

(3) **CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.**—

(A) **LIMITATION.**—No amounts made available to a covered agency to carry out a covered grant program may be used by a covered official, or by any individual or entity awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under a covered grant program, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in funds made available by the covered agency, unless the covered official provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host the conference.

(B) **WRITTEN APPROVAL.**—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

(C) **REPORT.**—

(i) **DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.**—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the appropriate committees of Congress on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

(ii) **DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.**—The Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an annual report on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

(iii) **DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.**—The Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security

shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an annual report on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

(4) **ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, each covered official shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an annual certification—

(A) indicating whether—

(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General of the applicable covered agency under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate official;

(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued; and

(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

(B) that includes a list of any recipients of a covered grant excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

(c) **PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before a covered official awards a covered grant, the covered official shall compare potential awards under the covered grant program with other covered grants awarded to determine if duplicate grant awards are awarded for the same purpose.

(2) **REPORT.**—If a covered official awards duplicate covered grants to the same applicant for the same purpose the covered official shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that includes—

(A) a list of all duplicate covered grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any duplicate covered grants awarded; and

(B) the reason the covered official awarded the duplicate covered grants.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1312. A bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this week, I am introducing a bill known as the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2017. I want to thank Senators FEINSTEIN, CORNYN, KLOBUCHAR, CORKER and RUBIO for joining as original cosponsors. I also want to thank the many organizations that support this bill and worked so closely with us on its development; they include Rights4Girls, Polaris, the ATEST Coalition, Shared Hope International, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the National Association of VOCA Assistance Administrators, and the National District Attorneys Association.

As its title implies, our legislation is aimed at combating the terrible scourge of human trafficking in the United States. To call trafficking victims' suffering a grave violation of our most basic human rights would be an understatement. Trafficking is a life-shattering crime that too-often goes unnoticed, despite the profound injury it inflicts on its victims and our society. Traffickers typically operate in the shadows, making it hard to identify them as well as their victims. That

invisibility makes it harder still to rescue the victims and bring the perpetrators to justice.

But there are some things we do know about human trafficking, and we know them with some certainty. We know, for example, that trafficking is happening in rural areas, in cities, and in the suburbs. It is not confined to any one area, because it has become so profitable. It has become a problem of national significance.

To be sure, we have made some strides in combating this terrible crime since the passage of the original Trafficking Victims Protection Act, or TVPA, over 15 years ago. The TVPA, last reauthorized in 2013, authorizes some very important programs to help victims. The bill I'm introducing this week updates and extends a number of these programs, which are under the jurisdiction of the Departments of Justice and Labor. Senator CORNYN this week is introducing a complementary bill that would reauthorize other TVPA programs, including those at the Departments of Health and Homeland Security.

This is not the first time we have collaborated on this subject. Two years ago, Senator CORNYN sponsored, and I cosponsored, another important measure, known as the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. As chair of the Judiciary Committee, I made that 2015 law's passage a top priority for our Committee and fought for its enactment. It established a new fund to help cover survivors' services and also equipped law enforcement with new tools to fight traffickers. The services authorized under this 2015 statute are crucial to helping survivors rebuild their lives with dignity.

The bill that I am introducing this week is a critical next step in ensuring that human trafficking is prevented, its perpetrators prosecuted, and its victims protected. This bill, drafted with bipartisan support, would require more training for investigative personnel at the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security. It also extends a grant program by which school personnel can receive training to recognize and respond to signs of trafficking in our educational system.

This bill also offers increased assistance to prosecutors and law enforcement agencies in their fight against human trafficking. For instance, it authorizes the Secret Service to offer investigative and forensic assistance to other crime fighting agencies. And it updates key provisions of the Missing Children's Assistance Act, which authorizes the important work of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. The Center operates a cyber tipline by which internet service providers can report child sexual abuse.

Additionally, the bill I am introducing signals Congress' continued support for services available to traf-

ficking victims who cooperate with federal law enforcement in trafficking investigations. Specifically, the bill authorizes an Office of Victim Assistance within the Department of Homeland Security. This office, which is staffed with specially trained victim assistance personnel, plays a crucial role in securing victims' cooperation with trafficking investigations.

Finally, this bill would promote the collection of more data on trafficking, and it would promote increased coordination among the federal agencies engaged in combating this crime. Meaningful partnerships at the federal level can help expand awareness, leverage expertise, and facilitate creative solutions.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator GRASSLEY in introducing the Trafficking Victims' Protection Act of 2017.

Last week, I met with a remarkable group of anti-trafficking stakeholders in Fresno, California, who reinforced what I have long held to be true: stamping out the horrific crime of human trafficking must be among our top priorities as lawmakers. At our meeting, Central Valley law enforcement, service providers and, most importantly, survivors of human trafficking educated me about the nature and prevalence of sex and labor trafficking in the Central Valley. I learned that counties like Fresno and Tulare serve as key stops along major California trafficking circuits, with victims as young as 10-years-old being shipped to Los Angeles, Las Vegas and beyond. I also learned that in 2016 alone, Fresno Police arrested more than 140 sex buyers and traffickers. This tells me that the demand for trafficking is far too high. Central Valley law enforcement and service providers are working together to reduce this demand, crack down on traffickers, and better serve victims, through a unique, highly-coordinated and victim-centered approach that I believe ought to be emulated nationwide.

Over the past seven years they have teamed up to identify and critically to provide comprehensive services to nearly 500 trafficking victims. When Central Valley law enforcement took down a trafficking ring last year, the ring leader and two of his associates were arrested and prosecuted, and approximately 50 victims were rescued, including 23 children. These victims were all provided with wraparound services, and the ring leader was sentenced to 40 years in prison. This is the kind of coordinated, victim centered work we need to support and replicate nationwide. The Trafficking Victims' Protection Act of 2017 aims to do that.

I have now met with law enforcement, service providers and survivors

representing Southern, Central and Northern California. All have made one thing abundantly clear: lawmakers at all levels of government must commit whatever time and resources are needed to thwart this horrendous crime.

Over the past two decades, Congress has taken action to combat human trafficking. We passed the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 and, 8 years later, passed the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act. And two years ago, Congress passed the Justice for Victims of Human Trafficking Act—a landmark piece of legislation. The law focuses on reducing demand, rescuing victims, educating law enforcement and judges, and making sure that trafficking enterprises are put out of business. But it is clear that our work is far from done. The human trafficking industry continues to be one of the biggest criminal enterprises in the world and it is constantly evolving. The use of the internet to sell children for sex has escalated dramatically over the past several years.

In my home State, District Attorney Nancy O'Malley and her pioneering anti-trafficking team identified 47,719 internet users looking to purchase sex in Alameda County alone during a single month. Many of the victims posted on these sites are underage. In one survivor study, a staggering 75% of minor sex trafficking victims reported being bought or sold online. And last year, the Washington Post reported devastating accounts about human trafficking is also committed by Islamic State fighters, who sell young girls over platforms such as Facebook.

The bill that Senator GRASSLEY and I have introduced includes a provision that would give to law enforcement an additional tool to prevent human traffickers from accessing the internet and other tech platforms to sell minors for commercial sex. Under current current law, it is a criminal offense to advertise commercial sex acts with a minor. This legislation would add civil injunction authority to the criminal provision, providing the Department of Justice with a more readily accessible tool to deny human traffickers access to tech platforms to commit trafficking crimes. The bill also supports and strengthens efforts to prevent, detect, and respond to human trafficking crimes.

It allows school resource officers at schools to train school personnel to recognize and respond to signs of child sex trafficking. This is important because kids are often recruited at schools. In one heartbreaking case in Oakland, California, a 12-year-old student with top grades suddenly changed her normal behavior. She stopped completing her assignments, became withdrawn, and began wearing provocative clothing. Eventually, she stopped going to school altogether. Her parents contacted the school looking for her, but

no one was able to locate her. She was discovered 24 hours later on an online sex advertisement based out of Los Angeles. This 12-year-old girl had been groomed by a trafficker—but no one was able to recognize the signs of exploitation. Teachers and school personnel interact with these kids every day. They are critical in recognizing which kids are at risk or are about to become exploited. We need to be sure that they are familiar with the patterns and practices of human traffickers, and know how to identify and respond to suspected victims.

In addition to working with Chairman GRASSLEY on the reauthorization bill, I am also pleased to cosponsor Senator CORNYN and Senator KLOBUCHAR's Abolish Human Trafficking Act of 2017. One of the most important provisions of this bill is the mandatory designation of at least one Human Trafficking Justice Coordinator in each United States Attorney's Office. This is critical to ensure that our judicial system treats human trafficking offenses with the seriousness they deserve. Among other responsibilities, this Coordinator will be responsible for assisting in the prosecution of human trafficking cases. This includes the prosecution of those who solicit minors for commercial sex, a change in the law that was enacted in the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

In 2015, former United States Attorney Eileen Decker conducted one of the first federal prosecutions of a buyer under this new statute. The buyer, a 59-year-old man from Torrance, admitted to lying to federal prosecutors about his conduct with a 16-year-old girl he met online and hired for commercial sex acts. He was sentenced to 57 months in prison. Former United States Attorney Decker remarked that this case should serve as a warning to adults who engage in this type of criminal conduct.

It is critical that such prosecutions continue. Stemming the abuse and exploitation of trafficking requires confronting not only the predatory suppliers, but also those who solicit young girls for commercial sex. The designation of a Human Trafficking Justice Coordinator would ensure that those who violate human trafficking offenses, both buyers and sellers, are prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. The Human Justice Trafficking Coordinator would also be responsible for ensuring the collection of restitution for victims.

Restitution for trafficking victims is mandatory under federal law. Moreover, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act requires the Justice Department to train prosecutors to seek restitution for trafficking victims, regardless of whether the victim requests restitution. Yet, we continue to see our judicial system failing to do right by victims. In a 2015 law review article,

the Human Trafficking Pro Bono Legal Center reported on the appallingly low rates of restitution orders in human trafficking prosecutions. In a study of federal human trafficking cases brought over a four period, federal courts failed to order restitution in nearly two-thirds of cases involving sex trafficking offenses. And shockingly, they found that the victims least likely to obtain restitution orders were children trafficked in the sex industry. Less than one in three defendants who commit sex trafficking offenses against children were ordered to pay restitution to their victims. This is unacceptable.

Furthermore, even if restitution is ordered against a trafficker, restitution itself is not being effectively collected. In response the requests from the Judiciary Committee, the Attorney General included restitution order and collection data in the Department of Justice's report on trafficking for fiscal year 2015. Of the \$4,268,358 ordered in restitution in 2015, only \$987 was collected.

While we may not expect to see full restitution collected in the year it is ordered, it is shocking that the total restitution collected is less than 1% of what was ordered.

That is why we have tried to include additional restitution provisions in the bill to better support victims. For example, there is an additional provision in the bill to update the Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2015, a bill that I authored with Senator PORTMAN. That bill mandated extensive training on restitution for prosecutors and judges. It is our hope that with these updates—and with the recent enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016 to make sure that prosecutors are held accountable in seeking restitution—victims will be better supported going forward. I am hopeful that we will be able to pass these bipartisan bills this Congress. I urge my colleagues in this body to support the passage of this important, comprehensive legislation to protect trafficking victims.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself,
Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1313. A bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Louisiana for working with me on the flood insurance bill that we are introducing today. This issue is so important to both of our States because both of our States have experienced enormous levels of flooding every year due to extreme weather.

In New York, after Superstorm Sandy hit our State, millions of homes

and businesses were damaged by flooding that occurred. My colleague from Louisiana could go on and on and will tell you about flood damage his own constituents have had to endure, so it should be clear to everyone here that it is not a partisan issue.

Flooding can happen anywhere, in any State, from the Northeast to the gulf coast and everywhere else. Protecting our communities from the devastation that comes from flooding should be one of our highest priorities in this Chamber.

Unfortunately, the National Flood Insurance Program has not been doing its job very well. Too many families who have had their properties damaged in a flood or even destroyed in a flood have paid their flood insurance premiums year after year only to find out there was some loophole that prevented them from getting the coverage they need. We cannot turn our backs and allow this to keep happening.

The bipartisan bill I have written with the Senator from Louisiana would ensure that flood insurance is more affordable for homeowners. It would make sure the Flood Insurance Program is no longer riddled with loopholes that leave our homeowners stranded and fighting with insurance companies on their own, all while trying to recover and rebuild from the flood damage. It would finally give homeowners the peace of mind that flood insurance rates will actually be affordable so that low- and moderate-income homeowners are not priced out of their homes because of extreme rate increases.

Our bill would also fund more projects to protect homes and communities from flood risk in the first place. Our bill would more than double the amount of funding a homeowner can receive for raising the elevation of their home, which is a proven way to protect against floods in certain areas, and it would provide more funding for FEMA's flood mitigation program. Those funds are used by States and local communities to plan and carry out projects that help manage flood risk to homes and other structures.

After Superstorm Sandy hit New York, too many families in my State experienced what amounted to a disaster after that disaster. They encountered engineering fraud. They had to deal with excessive delays and widespread underpayment of claims. This was shameful and totally unacceptable, especially for a program specifically designed to help people in their greatest time of need. So I am particularly pleased that this bill would fix some of the fundamental flaws in the National Flood Insurance Program's claims and appeals process that harmed so many of my constituents.

Our bill would prohibit engineering reports from being altered by anyone other than the person who inspected

the home. That was one of the main causes of fraud for many homeowners in my State. It would require FEMA to have more direct oversight over the litigation costs and engineering costs that are billed to the government. It would repeal the onerous earth movement exemption, which too often has been used to deny flood claims to families who desperately need the payments after a flood.

Our bill also would ensure that engineers and insurance companies are not shielded from legal liability when they do commit fraud, which, unfortunately, was much more common than anyone would even think.

The Flood Insurance Program expires on September 30 of this year, and it is absolutely vital that we reauthorize it with strong reforms that protect homeowners. We need to do everything we can to ensure that the Flood Insurance Program is affordable, sustainable, transparent, and accountable. This is our chance to do that now.

This is a good bipartisan bill, and I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in making these important reforms to the National Flood Insurance Program.

I yield the floor now to my colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from New York for yielding, as well as for the tremendous work she and our staffs have done together on the Flood Insurance Affordability and Sustainability Act of 2017.

There is a capriciousness of flooding which makes the National Flood Insurance Program so important. You can have a mountaintop village next to a dry gulch. If there is a sudden flash flood, folks who have lived there 100 years suddenly find their 100-year-old homes destroyed. The NFIP helps rebuild the lives of those who are so affected.

The Flood Insurance Program is critical, not just to that mountaintop village but, by extension, our entire country. The economic impact of flooding extends far beyond real estate transactions to the fundamental vitality of communities and the workforce that operates our ports, develops and refines our domestic energy, and produces our seafood and agriculture for global consumption. It just makes sense.

Most towns started on the coast and on riverways because that is how goods were transported, and the history of these waterside communities is what makes them, one, economically vital, but, two, also makes them susceptible to flooding. I will note that the Presiding Officer's State of Pennsylvania, I believe, has among the most incidents of flooding in our country—principally because there are so many riverine systems. There is a valley with a river. If the water rises quickly, that riverside community is flooded. Look at my State of Louisiana. It relies on an ac-

cessible and affordable flood insurance program, but that benefits the country.

Louisiana is the No. 1 producer of offshore oil and gas, producing over 15 percent of our Nation's domestic energy supply. That is 15 percent of our Nation's domestic energy supply. It is home to the second largest refining capacity in petrochemical industry. The Gulf of Mexico is home to 11 of the top 20 U.S. ports by cargo volume, and we have one of the largest seafood industries in the world. After Hurricane Katrina, when our port facilities were affected and the farmers in the Upper Missouri suddenly could not get their crop to international markets, it shows the importance of our ports for our entire economy.

The National Flood Insurance Program allows folks in my State to participate in a working coast that gets that energy inland and gets those products in the international market, and this is what provides the value-added contribution to our domestic economy. Since the creation of the National Flood Insurance Program, people in Louisiana paid over \$5 billion in flood insurance premiums, but, unfortunately, we have suffered some of the greatest losses after Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Gustov, Isaac, and the flooding of the great Louisiana floods of last March and August.

While the NFIP has a deficit of \$24 billion—according to FEMA's premium and payout data—the NFIP would have had a surplus if we remove the 2005 loss year, including the losses incurred after Superstorm Sandy. I will also note that New Orleans flooded because federally built floodwalls designed to protect those businesses and families were constructed in a faulty way. This has been recognized, and their failure is what led to the expense. I am not here to say that NFIP doesn't need reforms—it needs reforms—but to underscore the fact that the program has worked for many years despite its failings. We need to reauthorize the NFIP and use the opportunity to improve the program, make it more affordable, transferring more risk to the private sector at a lower cost, increase investment mitigation, modernizing flood mapping to produce greater accuracy, and improve the transparency and accountability of all the participants that operate and administer the program.

There are a number of constituencies interested in long-term reauthorization of NFIP. Senator GILLIBRAND and I know that the issue of flooding crosses party and geographical lines. We wanted to set the right bipartisan tone as Congress begins to debate the issue by introducing our bill, the Flood Insurance Affordability and Sustainability Act. We hope the legislation will contribute to the ongoing discussion and work the committees of jurisdiction are conducting as we move toward re-

authorization of the NFIP and with the needed reforms that enhance affordability and sustainability of the program.

Senator GILLIBRAND and her staff are passionate advocates for an affordable and sustainable flood insurance program. I am glad to work with her on this issue. We have listened to many stakeholders: bankers, realtors, homebuilders, flood plain managers, insurers, reinsurers, mapping experts, local government officials, financial experts and, most importantly, homeowners who work on our working coast and who have so much invested in making sure they can live and raise their families in a way which has protection from the capriciousness of flooding.

I thank my colleague from New York, as well as Senator CAPITO, for her contribution to this legislation and process.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. Warner):

S. 1314. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to bolster fairness and transparency in consideration of interstate natural gas pipelines, to provide for greater public input opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President. Today I am introducing a bipartisan bill to make the process of siting natural gas pipelines fairer and more transparent.

For some time now, I have been listening to Virginians with passionate views on the proposed Atlantic Coast and Mountain Valley Pipelines. For various reasons, many oppose one or both of these projects, while others support these projects. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, is tasked with analyzing all the issues—purpose and need for a project, impacts on 2 people living on the route, potential risks to the environment or property—and deciding what course best serves the public interest.

From listening to all sides, I have concluded that while reasonable people may reach different conclusions, FERC's public input process is flawed and could be better. Accordingly, this legislation proposes several steps to address several shortcomings, all of which were originally brought to my attention by Virginia constituents. For instance, this bill requires programmatic analysis of pipelines proposed around the same time and in the same geographic vicinity so that the full impacts of multiple projects can be analyzed. It requires a greater number of public comment meetings so that citizens are not required to commute long distances to meetings at which they must speed through just a few minutes of remarks on these complex topics. And it clarifies the circumstances under which eminent domain should and should not be used.

I am pleased to be joined by my colleague Senator MARK WARNER on this bill, and our Virginia Republican colleague Representative MORGAN GRIF-FITH is preparing a similar bill in the House of Representatives. While our views may differ on many aspects of energy policy, we can all agree that the public deserves reasonable opportunity to weigh in on energy infrastructure projects and that this process can be fairer and more transparent without mandating a particular outcome.

I encourage the Senate to consider this legislation, not to pave the way for pipelines nor to throw up insurmountable roadblocks to them—but to give the public greater certainty that the federal government's infrastructure decisions are fair and transparent.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 185—RECOGNIZING AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL WATER SAFETY MONTH

Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. NELSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 185

Whereas, according to the 2016 report of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, there were estimated averages of—

(1) 5,600 pool- or spa-related nonfatal drowning injuries treated at a hospital emergency department during each of the 2013 through 2015 calendar years; and

(2) 367 pool- or spa-related nonfatal or fatal drowning injuries involving children younger than 15 years old during each of the 2011 through 2013 calendar years, with 77 percent of those injuries involving children younger than 5 years old;

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, drowning is—

(1) the leading cause of unintentional death in the United States among children 1 through 4 years old; and

(2) the second-leading cause of unintentional death in the United States among children 5 through 14 years old;

Whereas drowning ranks fifth among the leading causes of unintentional injury or death in the United States, and every day, approximately 10 individuals die from unintentional drowning, 2 of whom are children 14 years old or younger;

Whereas the goal of National Water Safety Month is to prevent or reduce the number of unintentional drowning-related injuries and deaths in pools and open water venues;

Whereas the recreational water industry, as represented by the organizations involved in the National Water Safety Month Coalition, has contributed to that goal by—

(1) developing, through codes and standards, safe public swimming facilities and residential pools and spas; and

(2) providing aquatic programs and public awareness relating to unintentional accidents in pools and open water venues;

Whereas unintentional drowning deaths that occur each year, especially of children

under 5 years old, can be prevented by teaching children to swim, by using barriers and other devices that aid in preventing access to areas where drowning could occur, and especially by providing constant adult supervision without distraction;

Whereas each public pool and spa in the United States should be in compliance with the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 8001 et seq.), which was signed into law on December 19, 2007, and requires all public pools to install safe drain covers that help prevent entrapment;

Whereas each residential pool and spa in the United States should be built and maintained in accordance with the guidelines described in that Act or the International Swimming Pool and Spa Code, which a State or locality may adopt through building codes and standards;

Whereas $\frac{1}{2}$ of drowning deaths occur during May through August; and

Whereas, for the tenth consecutive year, May has been recognized as National Water Safety Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Water Safety Month;

(2) supports promoting awareness of water safety by increasing public education and awareness;

(3) acknowledges the grief of families who have faced the loss of a loved one, and commends the families who, in their grief, choose to promote and educate the public on water safety;

(4) encourages States, localities, and territories of the United States to—

(A) support the goals and ideals of National Water Safety Month by issuing a proclamation to designate May 2017 as “National Water Safety Month”;

(B) support the adoption of codes and standards that provide safety requirements that may decrease the incidence of drowning; and

(C) engage in and encourage public awareness campaigns, including campaigns that educate individuals on—

(i) how to swim;

(ii) layers of protection; and

(iii) adult supervision;

(5) recognizes the vital role that swimming and aquatic-related activities play in maintaining physical and mental health and enhancing quality of life;

(6) encourages efforts to educate the public about water safety to prevent drownings and recreational water-related injuries; and

(7) understands the vital importance of communicating water safety rules and programs to families and individuals of all ages, including owners of private pools, users of public swimming facilities, and visitors to waterparks.

SENATE RESOLUTION 186—RECOGNIZING THE AVIATION CADET MUSEUM IN EUREKA SPRINGS, ARKANSAS, AS THE NATIONAL AVIATION CADET MUSEUM OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 186

Whereas the Aviation Cadet Museum was founded in 1994 by former aviation cadet and Air Force First Lieutenant Errol Severe;

Whereas, from 1917 until 1965, the flying cadet and succeeding aviation cadet programs served as the primary production source for nearly 500,000 joint service pilots, navigators, and bombardiers;

Whereas the bravery, courage, dedication, and heroism of aviators and supporting ground crews from the Army Air Corps and the Army Air Forces were critical factors in defeating the enemies of the United States during World War I and World War II;

Whereas the Aviation Cadet Museum in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, is the only museum in the United States that exists exclusively to preserve and promote an understanding of the role of aviation cadets in the 20th century; and

Whereas the Aviation Cadet Museum is dedicated to—

(1) celebrating the spirit of the United States; and

(2) recognizing the teamwork, collaboration, patriotism, and courage of the men who trained for and fought in, as well as those individuals on the home front who mobilized and supported, the national aviation effort: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the Aviation Cadet Museum in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, as the national aviation cadet museum of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 187—CONGRATULATING AND HONORING FERMI NATIONAL ACCELERATOR LABORATORY ON 50 YEARS OF GROUNDBREAKING DISCOVERIES

Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 187

Whereas, in 2017, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory (referred to in this preamble as “Fermilab”) celebrates the 50th anniversary of the date on which the first employees of Fermilab started work in Illinois, June 15, 1967;

Whereas Fermilab drives scientific discovery by building and operating world-leading particle accelerator and detector facilities, performing pioneering research with national and global partners, and developing new technologies for science that support the industrial competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas Fermilab provides research facilities for 4,500 scientists from 50 countries;

Whereas research at Fermilab led to the discovery of the 3 building blocks of the universe, the bottom quark in 1977, the top quark in 1995, and the tau neutrino in 2000;

Whereas superconducting magnets developed at Fermilab led to the advancement of magnetic resonance imaging medical diagnostics;

Whereas Fermilab contributed critical components, computing capabilities, and scientific expertise to the 2012 discovery of the Higgs boson in Geneva, Switzerland;

Whereas Fermilab continues to lead scientific discoveries, including planning construction for the Long-Baseline Neutrino Facility to power the Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment; and

Whereas Fermilab demonstrates its strong commitment to developing a diverse workforce for the future in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics through educational programs that bring more than 15,000 K-12 students to visit Fermilab each year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates and honors the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory on the semicentennial of the Laboratory; and

(2) wishes the Laboratory success in continuing to help the people of the United States understand the mysteries of matter, energy, space, and time.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 220. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 221. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 222. Mr. TILLIS (for Mr. MORAN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 174, recognizing the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International and celebrating the Lions Clubs International for a long history of humanitarian service.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 220. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 13. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE UNWAVERING COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Following World War II, the United States rejected isolationism, established its role as a world leader, and developed an international alliance system that protected the United States while supporting democracy, freedom, and economic prosperity with European nations.

(2) 70 years ago, the United States announced the Marshall Plan for Europe, a strategic investment in Europe, as well as articulated the Truman Doctrine, which sought to contain a growing Soviet threat in Southern Europe.

(3) In 1949, the United States, Canada, Belgium, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United Kingdom signed the North Atlantic Treaty that formed the basis of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (in this section referred to as "NATO").

(4) NATO was created to protect countries from a growing Soviet threat, promote international peace and stability, and defend freedom.

(5) To date, 29 countries have joined NATO.

(6) For more than 67 years, NATO has served as a central pillar of United States national security and a deterrent against adversaries and external threats.

(7) NATO continues to improve its collective defense measures, enhance its military

capabilities to address a full spectrum of complex threats, and partner with non-NATO countries to promote international stability.

(8) Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty is an integral part of NATO and states that "[t]he Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all . . .".

(9) NATO invoked Article 5 for the first time less than 24 hours after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks against the United States.

(10) In Afghanistan, NATO allies and partners have served alongside United States forces since 2001, reaching a peak of more than 42,000 ally and partner forces, 6,300 NATO forces continue to serve today alongside the 6,900 United States forces there, and more than 1,100 NATO ally and partner forces have paid the ultimate price in service to the collective defense of NATO.

(11) NATO took the lead in helping combat the terrorist threat in Afghanistan through the International Security Assistance Force and Operation Resolute Support, contributing to the safety of the United States and the international community.

(12) All 29 NATO allies and many NATO partners are contributing to the Global Coalition to Counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

(13) Approximately 18,000 military personnel are currently engaged in NATO missions around the world, conducting operations in Afghanistan, Kosovo, the Mediterranean, and off the Horn of Africa.

(14) NATO conducts a range of maritime security operations in the Mediterranean and is essential to establishing stability along the borders of Europe and to responding to the ongoing refugee and migrant crisis.

(15) For nearly 10 years, NATO has provided airlift support for the mission of the African Union in Somalia, as well as assisted with training the African Standby Force at the request of the African Union.

(16) For more than 17 years, NATO has led peace-support operations in Kosovo to maintain safety and security in a volatile region.

(17) NATO has three standing forces on active duty at all times to defend the Alliance, air policing capability, maritime forces, and an integrated air defense system.

(18) Whereas NATO allies and the international community continue to look to NATO to deter the increasingly revanchist activities of Russia.

(19) Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Joseph Dunford, testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate on July 19, 2015, that Russia presents the "greatest existential threat" to the United States.

(20) The malign actions of Russia—its 2008 incursion into Georgia, its illegal annexation of Crimea, its continued military action in Ukraine, its targeting of civilians in Syria, its ongoing information war in Europe, its continued violations of the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Agreement, and its cyberattacks aimed at influencing United States elections—have violated international laws and norms.

(21) Russia continues to use disinformation campaigns and promote state propaganda to discredit democracy and undermine NATO members.

(22) Since the illegal annexation of Crimea and direct support to the conflict in Eastern Ukraine by Russia in 2014, NATO members have undertaken the biggest reinforcement

of the collective defense of NATO since the end of the Cold War, enhancing allied readiness and deterrence measures in response to Russian aggression.

(23) The efforts of NATO to confront and deter Russian aggression in Eastern Europe have included a three-fold increase in the size of the NATO Response Force (NRF) to 40,000 troops; the creation of a Spearhead Force of 5,000 troops capable of deploying within a few days to respond to any threat against an ally, particularly on the eastern flank of NATO; the forward deployment of up to 4,000 troops to Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; an increase in the air policing and maritime missions of NATO in Eastern Europe; and a significant increase in NATO training and military exercises in Eastern Europe.

(24) Following the invasion of Ukraine by Russia in 2014, the United States established Operation Atlantic Resolve and the European Reassurance Initiative to reassure NATO allies that the United States would uphold its global security commitments and work in coordination with European partners to deter Russian aggression.

(25) Since 2014, Operation Atlantic Resolve and the European Reassurance Initiative have demonstrated the continued commitment of the United States to its NATO allies and partners by engaging in deterrence and security measures against potential Russian aggression in the region.

(26) Whereas the United States is further strengthening its force presence in Europe through the continuous deployment of an armored brigade combat team to Poland on a rotating basis.

(27) On January 6, 2017, as a part of Operation Atlantic Resolve, 3,500 United States troops from the 4th Infantry Division in Fort Carson, Colorado, along with more than 2,500 military vehicles, were deployed to Eastern Europe to deter regional aggression.

(28) Continued United States leadership in NATO is critical to ensuring that NATO remains the greatest military alliance in history.

(29) All NATO members have recommitted themselves to sharing the security burden of NATO at the 2014 NATO Wales Summit by pledging to meet the defense spending target for NATO members of 2 percent of gross domestic product within 10 years.

(30) The United States, Greece, Poland, Estonia, and the United Kingdom all have exceeded that defense spending target.

(31) Since the Wales Summit, Latvia, Lithuania, and many other allies have increased defense spending in an effort to meet that defense spending target.

(32) NATO remains committed to its open door policy on enlargement, working with countries in the Euro-Atlantic region that aspire to join NATO to help meet the requirements for membership.

(33) General James Jones, United States Marine Corps (retired), former National Security Advisor, testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate in July 2016 that "[o]ur 27 NATO allies offer America forward basing, which allows us to better fight enemies like ISIS and deter adversaries like the new Russia and to meet shared challenges. Twenty-eight countries acting as one is a powerful alliance".

(34) Secretary of Defense James Mattis testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, during his hearing as nominee for Secretary of Defense, that "[w]e must also embrace our international alliances and security partnerships. History is clear: Nations with strong allies thrive and those without them wither".

(35) There is a long tradition of strong bipartisan agreement that participation in NATO strengthens the security of the United States.

(36) NATO is the first peacetime military alliance the United States entered into outside the Western Hemisphere and today remains the largest peacetime military alliance in the world.

(37) A fractured NATO alliance would harm the interests of the United States and embolden adversaries of the United States.

(38) A strong and united Europe is important to United States strategic interests.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate—

(1) to pledge that the United States will continue to maintain strong leadership and strengthen its commitments to NATO;

(2) to strongly encourage NATO members to fulfill their pledge to invest at least 2 percent of gross domestic product on defense spending, invest at least 20 percent of such spending on major equipment (including research and development), and shoulder appropriate responsibility within NATO;

(3) to welcome Montenegro as the newest member of NATO;

(4) to recognize the historic contribution and sacrifice NATO member countries have made while combating terrorism in Afghanistan through the International Security Assistance Force and Operation Resolute Support; and

(5) to honor the men and women who served under NATO and gave their lives to promote peace, security, and international cooperation since 1949.

SA 221. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 722, to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 13. UKRAINIAN ENERGY SECURITY.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to support the Government of Ukraine in restoring its sovereign and territorial integrity;

(2) to condemn and oppose all of the destabilizing efforts by the Government of the Russian Federation in Ukraine in violation of its obligations and international commitments;

(3) to never recognize the illegal annexation of Crimea by the Government of the Russian Federation or the separation of any portion of Ukrainian territory through the use of military force;

(4) to deter the Government of the Russian Federation from further destabilizing and invading Ukraine and other independent countries in Central and Eastern Europe and the Caucasus;

(5) to assist in promoting reform in regulatory oversight and operations in Ukraine's energy sector, including the establishment and empowerment of an independent regulatory organization;

(6) to encourage and support fair competition, market liberalization, and reliability in Ukraine's energy sector;

(7) to help Ukraine and United States allies and partners in Europe reduce their dependence on Russian energy resources, especially natural gas, which the Government of the

Russian Federation uses as a weapon to coerce, intimidate, and influence other countries;

(8) to work with European Union member states and European Union institutions to promote energy security through developing diversified and liberalized energy markets that provide diversified sources, suppliers, and routes;

(9) to continue to oppose the NordStream 2 pipeline given its detrimental impacts on the European Union's energy security, gas market development in Central and Eastern Europe, and energy reforms in Ukraine; and

(10) that the United States Government should prioritize the export of United States energy resources in order to create American jobs, help United States allies and partners, and strengthen United States foreign policy.

(b) PLAN TO PROMOTE ENERGY SECURITY IN UKRAINE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the Secretary of Energy, shall work with the Government of Ukraine to develop a plan to increase energy security in Ukraine, increase the amount of energy produced in Ukraine, and reduce Ukraine's reliance on energy imports from the Russian Federation.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The plan developed under paragraph (1) shall include strategies for market liberalization, effective regulation and oversight, supply diversification, energy reliability, and energy efficiency, such as through supporting—

(A) the promotion of advanced technology and modern operating practices in Ukraine's oil and gas sector;

(B) modern geophysical and meteorological work followed by international tenders to help attract qualified investment into exploration and development of areas with untapped resources in Ukraine;

(C) a broadening of Ukraine's electric power transmission interconnection with Europe;

(D) the strengthening of Ukraine's capability to maintain electric power grid stability and reliability;

(E) independent regulatory oversight and operations of Ukraine's gas market and electricity sector;

(F) the implementation of primary gas law including pricing, tariff structure, and legal regulatory implementation;

(G) privatization of government owned energy companies through credible legal frameworks and a transparent process compliant with international best practices;

(H) procurement and transport of emergency fuel supplies, including reverse pipeline flows from Europe;

(I) provision of technical assistance for crisis planning, crisis response, and public outreach;

(J) repair of infrastructure to enable the transport of fuel supplies;

(K) repair of power generating or power transmission equipment or facilities; and

(L) improved building energy efficiency and other measures designed to reduce energy demand in Ukraine.

(3) REPORTS.—

(A) IMPLEMENTATION OF UKRAINE FREEDOM SUPPORT ACT OF 2014 PROVISIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report detailing the status of implementing the provisions required under section 7(c) of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-272), including

detailing the plans required under that section, the level of funding that has been allocated to and expended for the strategies set forth under that section, and progress that has been made in implementing the strategies developed pursuant to that section.

(B) REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report detailing the plan developed under paragraph (1), the level of funding that has been allocated to and expended for the strategies set forth in paragraph (2), and progress that has been made in implementing the strategies.

(C) BRIEFINGS.—The Secretary of State, or a designee of the Secretary, shall brief the appropriate committees of Congress not later than 30 days after the submission of each report under subparagraph (A). In addition, the Department of State shall make relevant officials available upon request to brief the appropriate committees of Congress on all available information that relates directly or indirectly to Ukraine or energy security in Eastern Europe.

(D) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State a total of \$30,000,000 for fiscal years 2018 through 2019 to carry out the strategies set forth in subsection (b)(2) and other activities under this section related to the promotion of energy security in Ukraine.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the responsibilities required and authorities provided under section 7 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-272).

SA 222. Mr. TILLIS (for Mr. MORAN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 174, recognizing the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International and celebrating the Lions Clubs International for a long history of humanitarian service; as follows:

On page 6, strike the fourth whereas clause.

On page 6, in the seventh whereas clause, strike "the United Kingdom and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation" and insert "partner organizations".

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND
TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 7, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 7, 2017, at 10:15 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing to consider pending nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 7, 2017 at a time to be determined, to hold a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 7, 2017, at 10 a.m. in order to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Brock Long.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 7, 2017, at 2:30 p.m. in SR-418, to conduct a hearing titled, "Examining the Veterans Choice Program and the Future of Care in the Community."

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Wednesday, June 7, 2017 from 10 a.m., in room SH-216 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold an open hearing entitled "FISA Amendments Act."

COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Wednesday, June 7, 2017 from 2 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Committee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 7, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in open session, to receive testimony on Department of Defense nuclear acquisition programs and the nuclear doctrine.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES' SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on National Parks is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate in order to hold a hearing on Wednesday, June 7, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in Room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF LIONS CLUBS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 174.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 174) recognizing the 100th anniversary of Lions Clubs International and celebrating the Lions Clubs International for a long history of humanitarian service.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, 100 years ago today, Lions Clubs International was created in Chicago, IL, and today the Senate is considering adoption of this resolution, S. Res. 174, commemorating this tremendous occasion. One hundred years later, Lions Clubs International is the world's largest service club, with more than 1.4 million members who participate in more than 46,000 clubs across the globe.

In my State of Kansas alone, we have more than 270 Lions Clubs, and I have been a member of Lions Clubs since I graduated from college, went to work, and got involved in the community. I have seen firsthand how Lions Clubs make a significant difference in the communities they are in, as well as their reach around the globe in addressing problems in their communities and humanitarian needs around the world. Lions are committed to caring for those less fortunate, from young to old, and they do so in a way that shows care and compassion. It is all about the right motivation. They care about people, and they make a difference. It is this selfless service and commitment to a greater good that is needed in our country today.

In the face of serious challenges, I believe those who volunteer their time and their resources in community civic clubs, not-for-profits, schools and fundraisers, in churches and charities are the ones who have the greatest impact on people's lives. This kind of involvement at the local level has the potential to make meaningful and tangible differences in the lives of people around us, perhaps more so than even the best intentioned Federal programs that come from the Nation's Capital. I am of the view that we change the world one soul, one person at a time, and it happens in Lions Clubs and their efforts in their communities and globally every day.

Over their 100 years of existence, the Lions Clubs have supported the blind, encouraged the young, provided relief to those struck by tragedy, and fought to eradicate disease. They have con-

tributed hundreds of millions of dollars to humanitarian work internationally and are committed to serving 100 million people around the globe.

As we reflect upon all the good that has come from the last 100 years among Lions Clubs members, may our commitment to our neighbors, our communities, and our fellow men and women be strengthened and renewed. Today, Lions Clubs begin another century of service to others as they seek out ways to better our world.

I offer my congratulations to Bob Corlew of Milton, TN, who is the international president, and I welcome Lions members from around the globe as they gather in Chicago later this month for their international convention. From 100 years ago in Chicago to this month, 100 years in which they celebrate their birth, the Lions Clubs motto is "We serve."

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; the Moran amendment to the preamble be considered and agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 174) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 222) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To remove references to specific entities)

On page 6, strike the fourth whereas clause.

On page 6, in the seventh whereas clause, strike "the United Kingdom and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation" and insert "partner organizations".

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 174

Whereas, on June 7, 1917, Chicago business leader Melvin Jones founded Lions Clubs International in Chicago, Illinois, based on the principle that "[y]ou can't get very far until you start doing something for somebody else";

Whereas the motto of Lions Clubs International, "We Serve"—

(1) was selected in 1954 after having been submitted by Lion D.A. Stevenson of Font Hill, Ontario, in an international contest; and

(2) applies to the charitable and humanitarian priorities of Lions Clubs International, including—

(A) eyesight preservation and blindness prevention;

(B) services for individuals with disabilities;

(C) hearing and speech conservation;

(D) diabetes awareness;

(E) youth outreach;

(F) services for older individuals;

(G) activities that promote international goodwill;

(H) disaster relief; and

(I) environmental protection;

Whereas, with over 46,000 clubs and 1,400,000 members in over 200 countries and

geographical areas around the globe, Lions Clubs International is the largest service organization in the world;

Whereas the purposes of Lions Clubs International include—

(1) to create and foster a spirit of understanding among people around the world;

(2) to promote the principles of good government and good citizenship;

(3) to take an active interest in the civic, cultural, social, and moral welfare of the community;

(4) to provide a forum for the open discussion of all matters of public interest, except that members of Lions Clubs International may not debate partisan politics and sectarian religion;

(5) to encourage service-minded individuals to serve their communities without personal financial reward; and

(6) to encourage efficiency and promote high ethical standards in commerce, industry, public works, and professional and private endeavors;

Whereas, on March 12, 1920, a Lions Club was chartered in Windsor, Ontario, Canada, and Lions Clubs became an international organization;

Whereas, in 1925, at the Lions Club in Cedar Point, Ohio, Helen Keller charged members of Lions Clubs International with becoming “knights of the blind in the crusade against darkness”;

Whereas, in 1926, polar explorer and member of the District of Columbia Lions Club, Admiral Richard E. Byrd, Jr., flew over the North Pole carrying the flag of Lions Clubs International;

Whereas, in 1930, after witnessing an individual with a vision impairment having difficulty crossing a street, Lion George Bonham painted a cane white with a red band for use by visually impaired individuals;

Whereas, in 1931—

(1) the first Lions Club was established south of the United States in Nuevo Laredo, Mexico; and

(2) the first Lions Clubs International convention was held in Toronto, Ontario;

Whereas, in 1935, during the Lions Clubs International convention in Mexico City, Amelia Earhart, who was an honorary member of the New York City Lions Club, completed a record-breaking nonstop flight from Los Angeles, California, to Mexico;

Whereas, in 1939, the members of the Detroit Uptown Lions Club converted an old farmhouse in the State of Michigan into a school to train dog guides for visually impaired individuals, helping to popularize dog guides worldwide;

Whereas, on June 6, 1939, the first Little League baseball game was played at Park Point in Williamsport, Pennsylvania, after Lion Carl Edwin Stotz appealed to Lions Clubs International, the Young Men's Christian Association, and other community partners for support to provide an organized baseball program for children;

Whereas, in 1944, the first eye bank in the world was established in New York City, and as of March 2017, most eye banks are sponsored by Lions Clubs International;

Whereas, in 1945, Lions Clubs International assisted in drafting the Charter of the United Nations, which began a lasting relationship between Lions Clubs International and the United Nations that includes Lions Clubs International aid and volunteers for—

(1) the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund;

(2) the World Health Organization;

(3) the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; and

(4) other humanitarian projects;

Whereas, in 1957, the Leo Clubs youth program of Lions Clubs International was established to provide young people with the opportunity for personal development through volunteer work;

Whereas, as of March 2017, there are approximately 157,000 Leos and 600 Leo Clubs in over 200 countries and geographical areas worldwide;

Whereas, in 1968, the Lions Clubs International Foundation (referred to in this preamble as “LCIF”) was established to assist Lions Clubs International with global and large-scale local humanitarian projects;

Whereas LCIF has given more than \$826,000,000 in grants to support the humanitarian work of Lions Clubs International;

Whereas, in 1972, LCIF awarded its first grant, in the amount of \$5,000, to assist flood victims in South Dakota;

Whereas, in 1977, Lion Jimmy Carter became the 39th President of the United States;

Whereas, in 1985, LCIF awarded its first Major Catastrophe Grant, in the amount of \$50,000, for earthquake relief in Mexico;

Whereas, in 1986, Mother Teresa accepted a Lions Humanitarian Award;

Whereas, in 1987, Lions Clubs International amended its bylaws and invited women to become members, and women are now the fastest growing group of new members in Lions Clubs International;

Whereas, in 1990, LCIF launched SightFirst, an initiative that—

(1) assists Lions Clubs International in activities to restore eyesight and prevent blindness on a global scale; and

(2) eventually raised more than \$415,000,000 to target low vision, trachoma, river blindness, childhood blindness, diabetic retinopathy, and glaucoma;

Whereas, in 1995, LCIF began a partnership with the Carter Center, led by former President and Lion Jimmy Carter, to combat river blindness in Africa and Latin America, and by 2003, LCIF and the Carter Center had provided 50,000,000 river blindness treatments;

Whereas, in 2001, LCIF partnered with the Special Olympics on Opening Eyes, an initiative to provide vision screening for Special Olympics athletes;

Whereas, in 2002, Lions Clubs International chartered a club in China, which became the first voluntary membership group in China;

Whereas, in 2007, the Financial Times ranked LCIF as the best nongovernmental organization worldwide with which to establish a partnership;

Whereas, in 2011, LCIF awarded its 10,000th grant, bringing the total amount awarded to grant recipients by LCIF to \$708,000,000;

Whereas, in 2013, LCIF partnered with the GAVI Alliance to protect millions of children from measles and rubella in 2013;

Whereas LCIF committed \$30,000,000 for immunizations, an amount matched by partner organizations;

Whereas, in 2013, with the support of Lions Clubs International and the Carter Center, river blindness was eliminated in Colombia; and

Whereas, in 2014, Lions Clubs International launched the Centennial Service Challenge, a global initiative to serve 100,000,000 people around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates Lions Clubs International on its 100th anniversary on June 7, 2017;

(2) recognizes Lions Clubs International for 100 years of promoting community service and humanitarian assistance;

(3) encourages Lions Clubs International to continue to emphasize the values of community service and improving the community for all individuals; and

(4) applauds Lions Clubs International for instilling in young people the value of community service.

CONGRATULATING AND HONORING FERMI NATIONAL ACCELERATOR LABORATORY ON 50 YEARS OF GROUNDBREAKING DISCOVERIES

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 187, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 187) congratulating and honoring Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory on 50 years of groundbreaking discoveries.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 187) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 2017

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 8; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 110, S. 722, postclosure; finally, that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postclosure on the motion to proceed to S. 722.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators WYDEN, MERKLEY, PETERS, and SANDERS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
The Senator from Vermont.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, in the U.S. Senate, it is the Parliamentarian's office that determines whether a reconciliation bill is in compliance with the rules of the Senate. That is not the function of the chairman of the Budget Committee. If it were, we could save taxpayers' money and get rid of the Parliamentarian's office, but that is not what we should be doing.

I am extremely concerned, therefore, that the chairman of the Budget Committee, in an apparently unprecedented manner, appears to have made that determination himself with regard to the Trump-Ryan healthcare bill that was passed several weeks ago in the House. As I understand it, the Parliamentarian has made a narrow ruling with respect to the jurisdiction of a provision in this bill that would eliminate healthcare subsidies for low-income Native Americans.

I look forward to hearing from the Parliamentarian as soon as possible on the broader ruling on whether the Trump-Ryan healthcare bill is in compliance with the instructions contained in the budget resolution requiring this bill to save at least \$1 billion in the HELP Committee and at least \$1 billion within the Finance Committee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Oregon.

HONORING THE HEROES OF THE PORTLAND ATTACK

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, Senator MERKLEY and I have come today together to discuss our resolution honoring the heroes of the Portland attack. On May 26 in Portland, our hometown, our community lost two very brave people: Ricky Best and Taliesin Myrddin Namkai-Meche. They stood up courageously against terrorism and for core American and Oregon values of tolerance and freedom.

Along with Micah David-Cole Fletcher, who was seriously injured, these three extraordinary Samaritans stepped in to protect two girls who were being terrorized on public transit by a man menacing them because he thought they were Muslim. These three Oregon heroes did not run when they saw danger. Instead, these three advanced toward the danger.

I paid my respects last week at the beautiful memorial that my fellow Portlanders created at the transit station where this attack occurred. I can assure my colleagues that the message of the memorial could not be more clear: The heroes of Portland stood up to terror, and we ought to be willing to call out the hate and the evil they confronted.

So today, I join with our friend and colleague Senator MERKLEY to express our deepest condolences to the families, the friends of the victims, so that we can all make clear how much we appreciate them and how grateful we are—and we all are—to be able to stand with the two girls who were being terrorized and to support all community efforts to overcome hatred and bigotry and violence.

As a son of parents who fled the Nazis, I know full well what hate speech is all about. There must be zero tolerance for hate speech and violence because otherwise you give it room to fester and grow. Hate speech and violence must have no place in Oregon or anywhere else in our great Nation.

With these three Oregon heroes forever in our memories, we must and we will recommit to fighting hate, violence, and terrorism every chance that we have. We urge adoption of this important resolution.

I yield to my friend and colleague Senator MERKLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague Senator WYDEN for submitting this resolution. I am proud to partner with him as we address this senseless, deadly attack that occurred back home in Oregon just 12 days ago.

Robert Kennedy once said: "We must recognize that this short life can neither be ennobled or enriched by hatred." We have been reminded of that in this part of our history in the last year and a half in which we have seen acts of hatred flourishing across the country, preying on divisions among parts of our society. It is incumbent on all of us to call out the unacceptability of hate speech and certainly to work to bring unity where there has been division.

This all came together in dramatic, deadly fashion on the MAX train when a man spouting hatred and anti-Muslim rhetoric accosted two young women sitting on the train. Three men stood up and sprang into action and told him that was unacceptable.

I wish we could turn back the clock and have the incident stop right there with that intervention. These men, by being willing to stand up in that setting, are champions of justice. They were saying that this is unacceptable. They were saying that it must stop. But then this confrontation turned deadly, with the man spouting the hate speech pulling a knife, stabbing all three of these champions, killing two of them, and nearly killing the third. These individuals, Rick Best and Taliesin Myrddin Namkai-Meche, paid with their lives. The third individual, Micah David-Cole Fletcher, came very close to losing his as well.

We have been holding the families in our hearts and in our prayers. The

community came together and had a vigil and another ceremony at the Muslim educational center and at the funerals to let the families know that, across Oregon, people are carrying them in their hearts and prayers. Certainly, one of those prayers was for the full recovery of Micah David-Cole Fletcher. He is back on his feet, and it is just a beautiful thing to see that he is out of the hospital. He spoke very eloquent words that I would like to share with you. In the days after the attack, he said:

I want you to imagine that for a second, being the little girl on that MAX. This man is screaming at you. His face is a pile of knives, his body is a gun, everything about him is cocked, loaded and ready to kill you. There's a history here with this. You can feel that this has happened before. And the only thing that was different was the names and faces.

Micah continued. He said:

And then a stranger, two strangers, three strangers, come to your aid, they try to help you, and that pile of knives just throws itself at them. Kills them.

Well, this was an extraordinarily traumatic experience for these young girls simply to be accosted on the train and all the more so to see that those who came to their rescue were stabbed, with two of them dying and the third badly injured.

Our hearts are, again, so connected to the families. We must have a determination as a society to put healing where there has been division, to put empathy where there has been antipathy, to replace hatred with a connection, with a love.

Robert Kennedy said in that same speech when he was commenting on the fact that nothing has ever been ennobled or enriched by hatred—he continued to say this:

But we can perhaps remember—if only for a time—that those who live with us are our brothers, that they share with us the same short moment of life, that they seek—as do we—nothing but the chance to live out their lives in purpose and in happiness, winning what satisfaction and fulfillment that they can.

Can't we come together as a society and enable each person to be able to live out their lives in purpose and happiness and set aside this divisiveness and this hatred?

I hope on this occasion, as we honor the incredible heroism of the three men who sprang into action and as we mourn the loss of two of them, that we all will dedicate ourselves to this purpose of creating a connection, creating unity, and creating respect and that we shall see the banishment of hate speech and hate violence.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, we yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

(The remarks of Mr. PETERS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1308

are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:47 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 8, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

RYAN MCCARTHY, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE PATRICK JOSEPH MURPHY.
PATRICK M. SHANAHAN, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE ROBERT O. WORK, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JEFFREY BOSSERT CLARK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE JOHN CHARLES CRUDEN.

THE JUDICIARY

ALLISON H. EID, OF COLORADO, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT, VICE NEIL M. GORSUCH, ELEVATED.

RALPH R. ERICKSON, OF NORTH DAKOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT, VICE KERMIT E. BYE, RETIRED.

DABNEY LANGHORNE FRIEDRICH, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, VICE REGGIE B. WALTON, RETIRED.

TIMOTHY J. KELLY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, VICE ROSEMARY M. COLLYER, RETIRED.

TREVOR N. MCFADDEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, VICE RICHARD J. LEON, RETIRED.

STEPHEN S. SCHWARTZ, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE LYNN JEANNE BUSH, TERM EXPIRED.

MICHAEL P. ALLEN, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE BRUCE E. KASOLD, TERM EXPIRED.

AMANDA L. MEREDITH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE WILLIAM A. MOORMAN, RETIRED.

JOSEPH L. TOTH, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE LAWRENCE B. HAGEL, RETIRED.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 7, 2017

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 7, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE JOHNSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

TURKISH CRACKDOWN ON PEACEFUL PROTESTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, a group of peaceful protesters gathered at a public park outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence in northwest Washington, D.C. They came from a variety of backgrounds—Armenian, Kurdish, Yazidi, and more—but they shared a common concern about developments in Turkey, including the crackdown on political opposition and free speech in that country and Turkey's continued denial of the Armenian genocide.

About a mile away, Turkey's President, Tayyip Erdogan was received warmly by President Trump at the White House, with no mention of Turkey's human rights abuses and growing authoritarianism. The protesters felt, and rightly so, that they had to exercise their First Amendment rights and raise their voices in dissent, the very dissent which has been violently squelched by Erdogan in his own country.

What happened next was a chaotic and violent confrontation that left 11

people injured, 2 of whom required hospitalization. Tensions were already high, with pro-Turkish counter-protesters outside the residence scuffling with protesters.

When Erdogan and his entourage arrived, the situation quickly spiraled out of control. As he exited his car, observing the protests, Erdogan can be seen on video speaking briefly to his security detail, and soon thereafter, several of these men, some of them armed with handguns, rushed past D.C. police officers to violently confront protesters, causing several injuries.

The images that you see to my right are indelible and bloody. A Kurdish woman was put in a choke hold and told by the dark-suited man who attacked her that he was going to kill her. Protesters, men and women alike, were knocked to the ground and assaulted with kicks to the face and torso.

This was not a scuffle. It was a full-fledged assault by professional thugs on a peaceful protest. Such scenes have become common in Turkey, where state-sponsored violence and repression have become the chief instrument to cement Erdogan's power.

Selahattin Demirtas was, until recently, the leader of the Kurdish HDP party and someone I had the honor to meet 2 years ago, and now he sits in prison as prosecutors seek to sentence him to 143 years of confinement.

Turkey has become the world's leading jailer of journalists, most recently adding French photojournalist Mathias Depardon, held in solitary confinement and without charge, to the ranks of 81 journalists currently imprisoned.

Mr. Speaker, Erdogan cannot export the violent repression he visits on his own citizens to our streets. The violence of May 16 can't go unanswered or forgotten.

Yesterday the House unanimously passed H. Res. 354, condemning the attacks and calling on the administration to pursue justice and hold those who carried out these attacks responsible, whether they be Turkish or not.

This is a good start, but it cannot be the end. The D.C. police department is carrying out an investigation into the attacks, and ultimately they will require cooperation from Turkish authorities in identifying those responsible. Nothing that Turkey has done so far indicates that that cooperation will be forthcoming, and indeed, rather than show even the slightest contrition after their security forces assaulted Americans, authorities in Ankara in-

stead summoned the U.S. Ambassador to lodge a complaint against the United States and police officers who sought to keep the peace. The message from Turkey is as clear as day: We can do as we please whether at home to our own citizens or on your own American soil.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to affirm that we will not allow Turkey to beat innocent protesters on the streets of our Nation's capital. We will continue to pursue justice and to make clear that America will always stand up for the right of peaceful and free expression.

THE NEED FOR FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the importance of the U.S. International Affairs Budget for America's economic prosperity. Recently, more than 220 leaders from America's business community, from Fortune 500 companies to local chambers of commerce, wrote to Secretary of State Rex Tillerson about the strategic investments in development and diplomacy that advance America's interests overseas and support jobs at home.

I am particularly proud that the CEOs of Land O'Lakes and Cargill—two Minnesota-based companies—helped lead this critical effort. Minnesota businesses understand they need the support of America's diplomats and development professionals at the State Department and USAID in the international marketplace to succeed.

For less than 1 percent of the Federal budget, our diplomats and development workers help create good governance and stability in developing countries around the world. These efforts enable their economies to grow, creating new markets for American goods in a highly competitive global marketplace.

With 95 percent of the world's consumers living outside of our borders, some of our fastest growing economies are in developing countries. Currently, 41 million American jobs depend on international trade, including 800,000 in the great State of Minnesota. We simply can't afford to disengage from the world. We also know that individuals who experience economic growth and trade with one another prefer peace over conflict.

If the United States is to remain an economic powerhouse that continues to

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

create jobs for hardworking Americans here at home, we must invest in our critical development and diplomacy agencies. If we don't, our economic competitors and, God forbid, our enemies certainly will.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to protect funding for the International Affairs Budget.

A WELL-DESERVED AWARD

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the career of Forest Lake Area Schools' early childhood special education teacher, Heide Muhs. Heide is retiring at the end of this school year. Heide is concluding her professional career in education with a huge achievement. Recently she received the Early Childhood Professional of the Year Lifetime Excellence Award. This award recognizes an individual who has made a lasting difference in the lives of children with special needs and their families. This is an area where Heide has excelled during her career.

Heide is no stranger to the needs of these families. For her, it is personal. In fact, she has two adopted sons with special needs. Through her personal experience and unwavering dedication to those in her care, Heide has managed to help and strengthen families throughout central Minnesota.

I am proud to stand here today and to thank Heide for her commitment to our children's future. We wish you the best in your retirement, Heide. You deserve it.

BUSH FELLOWSHIP FOR MINNESOTANS

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the achievements of two Minnesotans from my district. Scott Glew of Elk River and Emmanuel Oppong of St. Cloud have received Bush Fellowships.

During his service in the Army National Guard, Scott was deeply affected by the human suffering he witnessed. That is why, in his current job as an educator, Scott is determined to teach his students about global conflicts. He has advocated for making social studies a main component of our students' curriculum. With his fellowship, Scott plans to earn a Ph.D. to expand and improve upon our education curriculum.

Mr. Oppong is originally from Ghana and knows firsthand that mental health is not a priority for many cultures. That is why he works as a counselor for immigrants and refugees dealing with culture shock and trauma. With his fellowship, Emmanuel plans to learn how to raise awareness of mental health issues and implement education plans to improve the health and well-being of our communities.

I am deeply impressed with these individuals and their commitment to the common good, and I wish them well as they pursue their goals.

AN INCREDIBLE GOLD STAR

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank Ally

Haas, a student at Sartell High School. Recently, Ally completed a project that has helped elementary students at St. Francis Xavier Elementary School by pairing them with high school and college students for weekly tutoring sessions. The project has been incredibly successful.

Due to the success of her project, Ally received a Gold Award from the Girl Scouts. This is the highest award the Girl Scouts has to offer. It is no coincidence that Ally has become such a civic-minded young woman, as she is a fourth-generation Girl Scout. In fact, Ally's mother received the Gold Award in 1985.

Congratulations, Ally. We are proud of you and we are looking forward to your bright future and continued success.

HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, we waste a lot of time in the House Judiciary Committee passing bills we have already passed year after year that go nowhere. But now evidence is growing that our elections were interfered with by a foreign adversary, evidence that the President and Attorney General have been less than truthful about their meetings and relationship with this foreign adversary. And other committees in this body and the Senate and at the Justice Department have launched investigations into the behavior and truthfulness of the President, his subordinates, his family; but from the House Judiciary Committee, we have heard exactly nothing, not a peep, not a hearing or a subpoena, nada, zip, nothing. Just crickets.

When I joined the Judiciary Committee, I remember hearing something about how the committee has jurisdiction over the enforcement of laws, the courts, the conduct of the executive branch, especially when it comes to law enforcement agencies like the FBI, Justice Department, activities that may or may not be criminal.

And guess what. I was right. You need look no further than the committee's website, where it proudly proclaims: "The committee's weighty agenda has frequently placed it in a central role in American politics, most notably during its consideration of impeachment charges against Presidents of the United States in both 1974 and 1998."

So with all due respect to the Intelligence Committee, the Oversight Committee, and our colleagues in the Senate, it is the Judiciary Committee in the House where impeachment begins. We are like the grand jury of the House of Representatives when it comes to impeachment.

Robert Mueller, the former FBI Director investigating the President, will

not be able to indict him while he is President no matter what he uncovers. Most legal scholars argue a sitting President cannot be indicted in criminal court.

So it is the Judiciary Committee that will bring charges if there is evidence of "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors," as provided in Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution.

But here we are with evidence that the Attorney General lied to a committee of Congress about his contacts with senior Russian officials and lied on his security clearance application about contacts with Russian officials who are suspected by our government of being covert espionage operatives, with evidence that hacking and other activities, in fact, took place directed by Russia. And nothing from the Judiciary Committee.

The Attorney General publicly recused himself from any matters at the Justice Department related to the investigation of Russia contacts, but the Attorney General played a role in the firing of FBI Director James Comey. And we know now, because the President said so, that the firing of Comey, the FBI Director that was investigating him, was done because the President said he was "under great pressure" from the Russia investigation. And still nothing from the Judiciary Committee.

Now, let's go back to those two dates when the Judiciary Committee says we played a central role in American politics. In 1974, we had a criminal conspiracy that involved tampering with elections that went all the way to the Oval Office. It involved firing senior Justice Department officials who were part of the investigation. They asked the intelligence community to discredit those investigations in 1974. And there were secretly recorded conversations.

Sound familiar?

President Nixon soon resigned because he knew what was coming.

In 1998, the issue of whether the President of the United States had lied to a grand jury about an extramarital sexual encounter with a consenting adult who was a subordinate, that is what that was about. House Judiciary Chairman Henry Hyde of the great State of Illinois, who, as it turned out, knew a thing or two about extramarital sexual encounters with consenting adults, passed four Articles of Impeachment, along an almost exclusively party-line vote. An impeachment trial was held in the Senate, which became an epic embarrassment to the Republican Party and to this body. But now, given all of the evidence of electoral tampering, the apparent efforts to cover it up, the actions of the President and the Attorney

General to deflect and derail investigations, that, to me and to others, appears to be attempts at or actual obstruction of justice.

From the committee of jurisdiction that is supposed to be in charge and taking action, what do we have? Not a peep, not a hearing, not a subpoena, nada, zip, nothing. Just crickets.

Mr. Speaker, that has got to change, and I suspect it will, because it has to. The Constitution says it has to.

Judiciary Committee, it is time to act and fulfill your constitutional responsibilities.

□ 1015

PARIS CLIMATE ACCORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend President Trump on his decision to withdraw from the Paris climate accord.

For emphasis, the Paris climate accord is not now and never has been an agreement that binds the United States of America because it was never ratified by Congress.

More specifically, the Paris climate accord, a treaty, was never ratified by the Senate pursuant to Article II, section 2 of the United States Constitution.

Rather, in yet another example of disdain for America's constitutional Republic, the Obama administration refused to seek Senate approval of the treaty.

By declining to move forward on a poorly negotiated bad deal, President Trump kept his promise to the American people to put America first.

Lest there be any doubt, the Paris climate accord intentionally hurt America to the benefit of competitor nations. In a global redistribution of the wealth scheme, the Paris climate accord called for America to give away tens of billions of dollars to other countries. That is tens of billions of additional taxpayer dollars on top of America's existing foreign aid giveaways. That is money America does not have, has to borrow to get, and cannot afford to pay back. That is nuts.

America must stop borrowing money to send overseas to help other countries take jobs from Americans. Is that really so hard for the left to understand?

The Paris climate accord undermined America's economy by putting American employees at a competitive disadvantage. By way of but one example, a comprehensive new study prepared by NERA Economic Consulting estimates that the Paris climate accord could cost the American economy \$3 trillion in gross domestic product and 6.5 million industrial sector jobs over the next two decades.

President Trump is right. America must lead by putting America's national interests first. The Paris climate accord failed to do that.

By way of example, under the Paris climate accord, China and India, two of the biggest and worst polluters on Earth, have no new air pollution control obligations until 2030, at the earliest.

Contrast the abysmal environmental record of China and India with that of America. And let's be clear, without a Paris climate accord, America's carbon dioxide emissions have been and are being reduced. For example, between the years 2000 and 2014, the United States reduced its carbon dioxide emissions by more than 18 percent.

Further, over the past 50 years, America has been the world's environmental leader. No country on Earth has done more to reduce pollution by cleaning our air, cleaning our water, and properly disposing of hazardous waste. That 50-year record is compelling evidence that America's focus on being good environmental stewards will continue, with or without the Paris climate accord. That is world leadership.

I know of nothing that says we are going to stop being the world's environmental leader. That 50-year record is also compelling evidence that America can and will lead on our own without hamstringing ourselves with a badly negotiated, one-sided Paris climate accord that reduces America's wealth while costing struggling American families their jobs.

In summary, I am proud that President Trump puts America first. America should not and must not yield even a smidgen of our national sovereignty to the dictates of other, lesser nations.

Despite liberal climate-scare and socialist Democrat hysteria to the contrary, America has been and is, by almost every standard, the greatest Nation in world history.

With an America First attitude, America will continue its 75-year streak as the greatest Nation in the history of the world, second to none.

EXTEND HAITIAN TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 6-month extension for Haitian temporary protected status recipients living in the United States, and for whom I believe our country should offer permanent residency. Temporary protected status, also known as TPS, offers forms of relief from removal under changing living conditions.

In 2010, Haiti was struck by the worst earthquake in the past 200 years, kill-

ing more than 160,000 people and displacing close to 1.5 million.

The United States played an intricate role in bringing some of the Haitians to the United States, providing them with a safe haven, because that is what we do.

Booker Washington captured well the importance of assisting people in need when he said: "The highest test of the civilization of any race is in its willingness to extend a helping hand to the less fortunate." With this in mind, America should move the temporary protected status to permanent residency.

Return of the Haitian natives would only continue to set back the progress Haiti has made. The country of Haiti continues to feel the ramifications of the 2010 earthquake. Tens of thousands of people sleep in the streets or under plastic sheets in makeshift camps. The conditions that Haitians endure in the country has led to the spread of disease, which has become a major concern. The cholera epidemic has affected nearly 800,000 Haitians, killing over 9,000. Cholera is primarily found in countries with inadequate access to clean water, sanitation, and hygiene. In short, the quality of living in Haiti has created a need for a better life.

The economic disparity, extreme poverty, and underdevelopment of Haiti continues to loom. Though it is an island nation with rich culture, Haiti remains the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere. Among the 9 million people who reside in Haiti, over half live in extreme poverty, some even living on less than a dollar a day. While in the United States, people continue to contribute to our economy, our diversity, and to our ever-evolving culture. This embodies the epitome of a mutualistic relationship.

The people of Haiti and the United States have had a long and complex relationship dating back to pre-slavery days. Our cultures and our respective economic histories and destinies are deeply intertwined.

I greatly urge my colleagues to support the permanent extension of Haitians being protected from mass deportation. For 7 years, these Haitians have greatly benefited the American communities of which they have been a part. To pull them away from these communities at such a pivotal point in both the United States' and Haiti's history would equate to nothing short of gross negligence. Let us not neglect the principle of which our Nation was founded upon and continue to assume the role of our predecessors. Help those who are less fortunate.

VENEZUELA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 months alone, reports indicate that nearly 3,000 Venezuelans have been jailed and 69 have been killed by the regime. Peaceful protests have led Venezuelan strongman Nicolas Maduro to issue a decree to convene a constituent National Assembly, what he calls a *constituyente*, in order to rewrite Venezuela's constitution.

But as we all know, Mr. Speaker, Maduro is fooling no one. This is just another attempt to undermine and discredit the current democratically elected legislature in the National Assembly. Another attempt of a power grab which seeks to consolidate more power around the executive and possibly rewrite the constitution to favor only one individual: Nicolas Maduro. Another attempt to pull a fast one over some in the international community who may make the mistake and call this weak and dangerous gesture progress.

But we know the truth. This is not progress. In fact, this is a major setback to democracy. Maduro is once again trying to delay the inevitable: free, fair, transparent, and democratic elections in Venezuela under the supervision of credible international observers.

Making matters worse, Goldman Sachs is also adding to the Venezuelan people's misery. Last week, the investment bank bought \$2.8 billion in Venezuelan bonds, not only providing the Maduro regime a lifeline in the short term but saddling the Venezuelan people with crippling debt repayments in the long term.

When, not if, a democratically elected president comes to the Venezuelan people, they will be stuck with the bill and face the responsibility to pay for this debt.

With so many Venezuelans lacking basic goods, including food, many have taken to calling these bonds hunger bonds, as the regime lines its own pockets and the Venezuelan people continue to suffer.

This is unconscionable, Mr. Speaker. Venezuela's pervasive corruption means any infusion of cash like Goldman Sachs will not benefit the people of Venezuela who desperately need it. Instead, Maduro and his thugs fill their coffers and use the cash to abuse the Venezuelan people and use it to stay in power.

Venezuela's state-owned oil company, PDVSA, was already sanctioned in the year 2011, for helping Iran avoid its own sanctions. Venezuela's Tarek El Aissami, second in command to Maduro, was sanctioned by our U.S. Treasury Department early this year under the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act. Can you imagine? The regime's longstanding ties to drug trafficking and other illicit activities are only now being exposed, and U.S. businesses should be avoiding deals with Maduro like the plague.

But the private sector is not the only one aiding the Maduro regime. Sadly, the U.S. government is also helping prop up the regime. How? By allowing purchases of Venezuelan oil. This keeps Maduro afloat. In 2016, Venezuela remained the third largest foreign crude oil supplier to the United States behind Canada and Saudi Arabia. In 2016, oil exports from Venezuela were valued at \$10.5 billion. During the first 3 months of 2017, value of oil exports from Venezuela to us here in the United States was already worth \$3.5 billion. Financial transactions like these made to Maduro or any other despotic regime should be prevented.

We have a moral obligation to respect the suffering needs of the Venezuelan people and help alleviate this suffering.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REUNIFICATION OF JERUSALEM

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, later today, together with Israel's Ambassador to the United States, Ron Dermer, we will be joined live from Jerusalem by Prime Minister Netanyahu and Speaker of the Knesset Edelstein for a special event to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem—Israel's eternal capital.

I led a congressional delegation visit to Israel last week, and we met with both Prime Minister Netanyahu and Speaker Edelstein at the Knesset in Jerusalem.

□ 1030

We also toured the famous City of David and saw discoveries that prove, without a doubt, that Jews have lived in Jerusalem for millennia. This is important, Mr. Speaker, because there are efforts at the United Nations—at UNESCO and the Human Rights Council—that seek to erase all Jewish ties to Jerusalem.

As we are set to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Jerusalem's reunification, we should take this opportunity to rebuff such efforts at the U.N. and, instead, reinforce that Jerusalem is, was, and always will be the eternal home of the Jewish people.

HEALTHY FARMS: HEALTHY ECONOMY AND A SECURE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the foundation of healthy living and healthy communities: our food, which comes from our farms.

This month is both National Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Month and National Dairy Month. Although we should bring attention to the importance of eating these nutrient-rich foods, dairy and fresh fruits and vegetables play a much larger role, as we

know, in the health of our communities and our country, and they do so not just by providing us food.

In California, we know that dairy products and fresh fruits and vegetables are an integral part of our healthy community and a strong economy. Our farmers also provide economic development in other sectors as businesses are created and expand, investments are made, and innovations arise to support the needs of these farmers and farm communities.

But the economic contributions of California agriculture—American agriculture—do not end at our borders. In California, we produce half of the Nation's fruits and vegetables, and we are the top milk producing State in the Nation. The men and women who own and work on these farms provide both nutritious food for our families and create thousands of jobs across the country.

We know we must make sure that our farmers have the tools to do so, but our farmers need a reliable source of water, a legal and stable workforce, and access to export markets, in other words, fair trade agreements.

We must also ensure that American agriculture is sustainable. We must continue to ensure that it is sustainable for our well-being and the well-being of future generations to come because the bottom line is food does not come from a grocery store. Food comes from our farmers and the land that they farm.

Our food supply is a national security issue, but it never really gets looked at in that light. So by investing in critical programs and infrastructure projects—by ensuring that our farmers have the water, the workforce, and the access to foreign markets—we are not only investing in our farms, but we are investing in the long-term health and security of our Nation.

What is more, people don't realize it, but less than 3 percent of our Nation's population is directly involved in the production of food and fiber. This is part of the amazing development of American agriculture. So equally crucial for the sustainability of American agriculture are our export markets and our trade agreements. That means improving NAFTA, continuing to engage with our European allies, and not turning our back on Asia.

In fiscal year 2016, the United States exported \$129 billion worth of agricultural products. We not only feed our Nation every night, but we grow more than enough to export abroad. We must maintain good relations with our top trade partners and continue to lower trade barriers to existing and new foreign markets.

So let's not just focus on healthy eating during National Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Month and National Dairy Month; let's take the opportunity to discuss how we will work together to

ensure that our farmers, ranchers, and dairymen and -women can continue to contribute not only to America's dinner tables, but to our communities and to our economy. The health and security of our Nation depends on it.

CONGRATULATING ANANYA VINAY

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, let me also give a shout-out to Ananya Vinay, the 2017 National Spelling Bee champion, from Fresno, California. We are all proud of her accomplishments. Obviously, this young lady has a great future ahead of her.

Congratulations, once again, on becoming the 2017 National Spelling Bee champion.

HONORING THE LIFE AND MEMORY OF ROY HERTEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of my friend Roy Hertel, who passed away Thursday, May 25, at the age of 68.

Roy was a true public servant and community leader in Montgomery County, Illinois. Throughout his life and career, he held many roles in the region and had an immeasurable impact on countless lives, including mine.

As a teacher, circuit clerk, county board chairman, and administrator for the county's Department of Health and Human Services in the State of Illinois, Roy's career was defined by his dedication to bettering the lives of those not only in Montgomery County, but also throughout central Illinois.

His involvement in the region went far beyond his career. Roy was an active member of the Disciples of Christ in Hillsboro; a 45-year member of the Lions Club, where he had held all offices, the district lieutenant governor and district governor in 1991 and 1992; a member of the Mt. Moriah Masonic Lodge Number 51 A.F. & A.M. in Hillsboro; president of the Circuit Clerk's Association; a member of the Hillsboro Moose Lodge Number 1377; part of the Hillsboro Sports Association; and served as chairman, until his death, of the Montgomery County Board.

Roy also served as a coach for both youth baseball and soccer leagues, and was a dedicated fan and supporter of every sports team that his son played on and every child played on in Hillsboro, Illinois. He was especially fond of the Hillsboro Junior High Dragons that his son started on, clear up until his son played for the Gateway Grizzlies.

My thoughts and prayers are with Nanci and the rest of Roy's family and friends, as central Illinois has lost a leader whose presence will be tremendously missed.

REFORM OUR BROKEN MILITARY JUSTICE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, for more than 7 years, I have spoken out against the broken military justice system that allows commanders to decide how sexual assaults and other criminal offenses are prosecuted under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Our servicemembers are stuck in a world where their fates rest within the chain of command, where bias is king and justice often a jester.

Today, I stand here sick at heart that, once again, a rape conviction has been overturned because of the broken military justice system. In this instance, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces threw out Airman Rodney Boyce's rape and assault conviction because of the involvement of Lieutenant General Craig Franklin, who referred the case to court-martial.

This all came about because, in 2013, General Franklin was admonished by his superiors for tossing out the aggravated sexual assault conviction of a fellow F-16 pilot, a unanimous decision by a jury of his peers. Certainly, a general should not have the power to overturn the findings of a court of law simply because he thinks his buddy could not possibly have committed the sexual assault.

But because Franklin was appropriately admonished for this abuse of power, the U.S. Court of Appeals found that his subsequent decision to move forward with an entirely separate Boyce case constituted unlawful command influence.

This is made more ridiculous by two facts: first, the military judge during the actual trial found no evidence of unlawful command influence; second, the appeals court that threw out the Boyce case also did not find evidence of unlawful command influence, just the "appearance" of it.

So, apparently, unlawful command influence is like pornography: there is no definition, but judges know it when they see it.

Colleagues, it is past time to reform this unjust system that ignores jury decisions on the whim of a convening authority. The military must remove the power to decide whether or not to prosecute sexual assault cases from the chain of command and give the authority to independent military prosecutors.

I have met with countless survivors who have suffered in unique and horrifying ways. There is a hauntingly clear pattern to nearly all of their experiences: the perpetrator was let off the hook and the victim fellow servicemember was revictimized by an unjust system, all at the hands of the chain of command that is supposed to be there to protect and defend them.

The sense of betrayal by their command is marrow deep and life altering. Many describe the feelings of this betrayal more akin to a violation at the hands of a family member rather than a boss or coworker.

All that we need to do is to allow trained and experienced lawyers in the military to make a legal judgment about a crime. This in no way impacts the commander's authority. It simply gives servicemembers what we civilians take for granted, which is relying on a trained prosecutor to decide whether to move forward with serious charges of sexual assault.

Our servicemembers deserve and need a system that they can trust to be fair and impartial. Letting a convicted rapist walk free because of a mere appearance of unlawful command influence—forget the fact that he was, in fact, convicted of the assault—shows just how deep the problem runs.

As this case shows, the perception and the reality is that commanders with a built-in conflict of interest and with little or no legal training are deciding whether to move forward to trial. They make this decision not solely based on legal reasoning, but a myriad of other factors—like how well they fly a jet or how well they are liked by others—that should not be injected into the decisionmaking.

Our servicemembers deserve and need a system that they can trust to be fair and impartial. We have the power and duty to fundamentally reform the system to ensure that they are treated with a level of fairness that befits their sacrifice and service.

Mr. Speaker, the words of one military servicemember still haunt me and ring in my ears, when she said to me:

I joined the military to fight the enemy. I never thought that he would be right next to me.

HONORING THE AMERICAN FARMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an often overlooked and sometimes underappreciated American hero: the American farmer.

The American farmer has been working the land since before the founding of this country. Early settlers quickly discovered that America is endowed with abundant natural resources, rich soil, and temperate conditions that provide a solid foundation for a vibrant agrarian economy.

Fast-forward a few hundred years, and today the United States is the number one exporter of agricultural products in the world. In fact, farming accounts for over \$163 billion each year. This production not only helps make our GDP the highest in the

world, but it also helps feed billions worldwide, often in the most hard-to-reach places where food insecurity and malnutrition are chronic problems.

According to the most recent data from the USDA, family farms account for 99 percent of all farms in the U.S. and 89 percent of America's agricultural production. Ninety percent of the farms in the U.S. are considered small, and these small farms account for the vast majority of American farmers. This is equally true in Indiana, where, although we are the 38th largest State geographically, we rank in the top 10 in total agricultural sales.

Production in Indiana supports over 245,000 jobs, and corn, soybeans, hogs, poultry, and dairy have a combined \$10 billion economic impact statewide. Simply put, ag is a really big deal in Indiana, and the Hoosier farmer does all of the heavy lifting.

Safe, affordable food is important to our national security, and a reliable, sustainable food source is crucial to safeguarding public health while preserving economic independence. That is why we should support our Nation's agricultural producers in every way that we can.

□ 1045

This includes supporting the U.S. crop insurance program, which provides an important safety net to farmers who assume major risks with each seed that they put in the ground. As recent natural disasters have made all too clear, widespread weather events can trigger huge losses for America's family farmers.

Without a national reinsurance pool, growers would have far fewer options available, many crops would be excluded, few could participate in the program, and growers would be forced to turn to Congress for assistance whenever disaster struck. That would be particularly true in areas where droughts and floods are common.

Through the crop insurance program, insurers can extend coverage to crops of all kind, providing farmers with the protections they need to do what they do best: grow food. This program is an example of the government partnering with industry to offer an exceptionally valuable service while maintaining a carefully limited Federal Government role. Frankly, it should be used as a model for other Federal reinsurance programs.

It is a success story, and even if you are not a farmer, you have benefited from its existence. It has helped you receive more affordable food and helped America maintain its agricultural preeminence. That is a great result for virtually every American.

Mr. Speaker, as Congress begins working on the next farm bill, I hope my colleagues recognize the value of our Federal crop insurance program and the important role that it plays in

supporting the American farmer while he or she supports the American consumer.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK AND THE EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, I spent our congressional recess in the Rocky Mountain National Park, home to some of America's most unique and breathtaking natural wonders, in an attempt to better understand the mounting impacts climate change has on our national parks and all of our public lands across the country.

More than 4.5 million people from across America and the world visit the Rockies every year to take in the snowcapped peaks, the winding rivers, and the endless evergreen forests. They see herds of elk and bighorn sheep, and hear the screeching call of the mountain pika, a small furry creature that I can personally attest makes one of the most distinctive sounds in the mountains.

Visitors to the park, like me, can experience all four seasons in an hour as they drive up Trail Ridge Road from the sunny, low-elevation valleys, to the top of 12,000-foot peaks covered in 20-foot snowdrifts. It is impossible not to appreciate the intricate balance of nature while standing in that environment, the way that each species is finely tuned to survive in its surroundings and the way that each depends on the other.

Unfortunately, this careful balance is being shaken to its very core by man-made climate change as well as the denial of its existence by a very small group of post-science, post-research skeptics.

For centuries, bark beetles and lodgepole pines maintained a special relationship. Beetles, held in check by deep, cold winters, ate and killed some of the largest and oldest trees, opening up valuable forest real estate for new, younger trees to thrive. Now, however, thanks to warming global temperatures, those cold winters haven't come and beetle populations have boomed, killing literally millions of trees in the Rocky Mountains.

Formerly green mountainsides are dotted, or even dominated, by the silver skeletons of pines, it is one of the most conspicuous changes to visitors of the park.

The little pika is another of many species whose way of life is disappearing as global warming drives temperatures higher and higher. As summer temperatures spike, many of these creatures are dying out. Humans are not immune to these impacts either.

Warming winters cause more and more of the mountain's precipitation to fall as rain instead of snow, allowing it to run off or soak into the soil. The snowpack, which for generations has fed the Colorado River, is diminishing and, with it, our reliable and already taxed water source for seven Western States.

It was uncanny, Mr. Speaker, to be standing at the headwaters of the Colorado River, a mere creek in the Rockies, learning about the ways manmade warming is changing the world around us at the same time the President was withdrawing the United States from the historic Paris Agreement.

It was tragic irony to be in that environment to hear this devastating announcement. It was truly inexplicable to be surrounded by one of many national treasures as our Federal Government announced their decision to abandon them when they are needed most.

The agreement, an unprecedented show of global will to tackle a truly global problem, isn't an end-all, as some less-enlightened critics have said. It is a framework, a roadmap to get the pollution reductions started, to ensure a safe, sustainable, and economically prosperous future. It supports an economic model built for the long haul, one that protects lives and livelihoods, while wasting less and producing more. These are irrefutable costs to leaving the Paris Agreement.

By removing us from the agreement, the President isn't canceling it. He is simply ensuring that we are the ones who will be left behind as the world moves forward without us. We will be left behind with the cost of polluted air, preventable and expensive illness, and shrinking, uncompetitive fossil fuel industries that imperil their workers and drag the economy down.

It will cost us standing as a world leader in innovation as other countries step forward to fill the void that we have created and realize the benefits of clean-energy jobs, reliable public transit, and stable supply chains for businesses.

They understand that climate change affects us all, no matter our income or whether we are in the middle of a major city or on the top of the great Rocky Mountains.

The 194 nations that remain in the Paris Agreement will continue to act, not because the U.S. once told them to do so, but because it is the right thing to do and it is in their best interest from economic gain and public health to national security and stewardship.

I encourage everyone to go visit the mountains. Go spend a week with the incredible men and women of the National Park Service who have dedicated their lives to understanding and protecting America's precious natural places. Then come back here, and I guarantee that you will understand why we need to act.

INFRASTRUCTURE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we are told that this week is Infrastructure Week. After four contentious months of a new President, and all that has been contained in those 4 months, I actually saw a glimmer of hope and possibility around the idea that we might finally come together to do something for our constituents in an area that they tell us is absolutely essential.

I worry, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to let this opportunity be lost in the political roil that is already consuming this idea of a week that we devote to infrastructure.

So I want to stand here, Mr. Speaker, and say, let's not let this idea go. It is too important. The improvement of our roadways and our bridges, our airports, and our railways is absolutely essential to the quality of life of every single constituent of every single Member of this House.

As I talk to the business leaders in my district, the fact that they have a challenge in moving their people and their goods, that sometimes getting to work is a 2-hour proposition, are the things that hold them back.

I know that the Republicans and the Democrats disagree on an awful lot, but we have to be able to agree on the fundamental notion that if we don't have a functioning transportation infrastructure, if our airplanes and ships and rails and cars don't move well, this country cannot be great, and our economy will be damaged.

These last 4 months have been pretty rough. We got—kicked off with a repeal of the Affordable Care Act; and I understand that my Republican friends had been promising that for years, but it was a brutal experience. It failed on the floor. The American public hates the bill that so many of my Republican friends were cajoled into voting for, much to their political peril.

There was an alternative start to this Presidency. There was this fantasy alternative start that has the President, shortly after his inauguration, saying to the American people: I know that this campaign was tough and the rhetoric was as ugly as it ever has been in an American campaign, but we are going to come together now, in January of 2017, to restitch the Nation, literally and figuratively. Literally means we are going to work together to rebuild the infrastructure of this country.

Sadly, that is an alternate reality that did not happen, and so we are consumed in Twitter feuds and partisanship and some of the most difficult to pass legislation that ultimately is not likely to become law, but which will continue to split the parties in this Chamber.

It is not too late, though, Mr. Speaker. I think we can still turn this around.

I have the privilege of chairing the New Democrat Coalition, 61 Democratic Members who, as challenged as they feel by this President's positions and behavior, are hoping for that moment when we can work with Republicans, when we can get something done with this President that will be meaningful to our constituents. And I know they, and many other Democrats, will be there for that conversation.

To my conservative, even to my Freedom Caucus friends, there is nothing more conservative than the idea that you keep your house in order; that you invest so that your children can have the kind of prosperity that we were able to experience.

And to the President, I would say: Sir, you seem to be a builder. You seem to have recognized the need for this kind of program when you promised a \$1 trillion infrastructure investment. And, sir, I would say, if you look at some of our highways that were built in the 1950s, at the entrance ramp to those highways you will see a sign that says the Dwight D. Eisenhower Interstate Highway System. Sir, there is no reason why those signs couldn't have your name on them.

So, Mr. Speaker, this problem is so urgent, it is so potentially bipartisan in its solution, that I want to close with the observation that we need to lift this out of the partisan maw and observe, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday we celebrated the Greatest Generation because, 73 years ago yesterday, they stormed the beaches of Normandy. That is part of why we call them the Greatest Generation. But the other part and the other reason we call them that is because they came back to America and they set aside their differences and they invested in projects like the Interstate Highway System that we all use every day. That is a big part of why we call them the Greatest Generation. They built our country.

And now that generation looks at us and they have a question, and that question is: What will you do with that legacy that we built for you?

Mr. Speaker, let's answer that question in a way that will make them proud.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

As we begin the 84th year since the heroic efforts of our troops and our allies on D-day, help us to be mindful of the freedoms we enjoy and must be vigilant in protecting.

Bless our allies throughout the world and all those who stand with us in confronting the dangers and evils of our time. In all things, may the United States continue to be a beacon of light and hope.

Bless the Members of this people's House. Give them the wisdom and patience to do the work of Congress even in times of complexity both at home and abroad.

God bless America, and help us all to be our best selves. May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PANETTA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PRESIDENT TRUMP IS
COURAGEOUS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Donald Trump last week courageously announced the withdrawal of the United States from

the unconstitutional Paris accords, an unconstitutional treaty comprised of burdensome regulations destroying jobs. I am grateful for President Trump's vision to create jobs for Americans.

President Trump has been clear: his first priority is jobs. Sadly, job-destroying regulations from the Paris treaty would prevent American jobs while having no positive achievement for American families.

Additionally, the Paris Agreement constitutes a treaty, a treaty that should have been submitted for approval to the Senate. Instead, the former President unconstitutionally adopted the treaty by executive order.

The best way to achieve a cleaner environment is through limited government and free market economic growth, creating jobs—not Big Government mandates with higher taxes, destroying jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Our sympathy to the citizens of London on the murderous terrorist attacks Saturday, as we cherish our shared heritage of D-Day to liberate Europe for freedom.

MEDICARE

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, a major western New York health insurance provider announced today that they are seeking an almost 50 percent increase in health insurance premiums next year. They cite rising medical and drug costs as reasons for seeking this increase.

Medicare is the most successful and popular healthcare system in America. With low administrative costs and high-quality outcomes, Americans ages 50 to 65 should be able to buy in, at their own expense, to Medicare. Under this plan, Medicare could add 10 million more Americans, using the leverage of 67 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this is real leverage to drive down healthcare costs and drive up the quality of that coverage. With real patient protections and full and affordable coverage for preexisting diseases like cancer and diabetes, Medicare should be an option for Americans 50 to 65 years old.

RECOGNIZING EMILY AND MICHAEL BROADBRIDGE

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about some incredible young people back home in Michigan. Meet Emily and Michael Broadbridge.

Emily is a sixth grader and Michael is a first grader in Macomb County.

This is no ordinary lemonade stand. Instead of simply making money for themselves, Emily and Michael are donating all the money they earn to the Homeless Education Project, which provides school supplies and clothes for homeless students in Macomb County.

Emily held her first lemonade stand on National Lemonade Day in 2011—yes, there is one—when she was just 5. Her parents thought it would be a good lesson in entrepreneurship, but it became so much more when she decided on her own to donate her proceeds to charity. Since then, Emily and her brother, Michael, have raised over \$13,000 for the Homeless Education Project. They expect to raise \$7,000 this year.

Emily and Michael have selflessly put others' needs before their own. I am proud to recognize them and their example today as role models for our community.

“WRONG” CHOICE ACT

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this week the House considers the “Wrong” CHOICE Act, so I have one question for this body: Has this House completely forgotten how much pain the housing crisis that triggered the Great Recession has caused the American people?

Eleven million people lost their homes; 8 million Americans lost their jobs; people lost their life savings—and that was not some sort of an accident of history. It was the effect of bad policy that allowed financial institutions to prey upon unwitting customers and take everything that they have worked for. That is what precipitated this crisis. It wasn't a storm. It was bad policy.

And so what do we have? A bill that will take us right back to where we were, to the conditions that caused the financial crisis in the first place, and take the cop off the beat, essentially eliminating the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to protect people.

We cannot do this. Let's reject this bill.

SUPPORTING THE FINANCIAL CHOICE ACT

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act, replacing the harmful Dodd-Frank Act, with reforms that help all Americans.

The CHOICE Act keeps the promise to my constituents to remove Obama-era regulations, increase choice for consumers in my community, and im-

pose the toughest penalties in history for financial fraud.

Strong communities like the ones I represent in north Texas are based on the strength of their local businesses. Under Dodd-Frank, America loses an average of one community bank every day. The Financial CHOICE Act will help businesses on Main Street reform business on Wall Street and fuel economic growth throughout the country.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 10.

REMEMBERING JACK O'NEILL

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Jack O'Neill, a Santa Cruz resident, a cultural icon, and a surfing legend. Jack passed away last week at 94 years young. There has been a great amount of love for this man and a great amount of appreciation for what this man did.

After serving in the U.S. Navy, he moved to Santa Cruz, where he loved surfing in its cold waters, so much so that he was quoted as saying: “When you get screwed up, just jump in the ocean and everything is all right.”

Jack's love for being in the ocean was demonstrated by being one of the first people to create and the first person to market the wetsuit. This led to him and millions of other people being able to surf at any time and at any temperature.

He was a trailblazer not just in the ocean, but in life. As a father of seven and grandfather of six, he understood how important it was to preserve our ocean for our children.

He was instrumental in designating Santa Cruz as a world surfing reserve, one of only four locations in the world that preserve surf spots and their surrounding environment.

He created the O'Neill Sea Odyssey, an educational program on a 65-foot-long catamaran that teaches our children how to be stewards of the ocean.

Jack not only bestowed upon us the wetsuit and year-round surfing, he left a legacy for our children to understand that being in and around the ocean really can make everything all right. For that, I thank and I honor Jack O'Neill.

THE BATTLE OF MIDWAY

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Chaplain mentioned, in his prayer a few minutes ago, D-day. I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to honor the brave Americans who fought the most influential naval battle of World War II: the Battle of Midway.

This week marks 75 years since U.S. forces defeated the Japanese Imperial Navy, forever changing the course of history. Victory in this battle allowed the United States and its allies to go on offense for the duration of the war. This was a real turning point in World War II.

The Japanese came to the battle from June 4 to June 7, 1942, with the largest armada they had ever assembled and the intention to finally defeat U.S. Naval forces in the Pacific. An American intelligence breakthrough cracked the Japanese fleet codes, allowing us to anticipate and to prepare for this attack.

With our mere three carriers to their many carriers, battleships, and cruisers, the odds of victory were not in our favor, a true underdog story. The land-based air supports that Midway Island allowed and our naval officers' uncanny ability to adapt and think on their feet led to our success and kept our country safe from the Axis powers.

I was very pleased to work with the late Senator Jesse Helms and the International Midway Memorial Foundation to pass legislation declaring Midway Island a national memorial so that it may be protected and forever serve to honor the American lives lost in the pursuit of victory in this war.

THE "WRONG" CHOICE ACT

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider the "Wrong" CHOICE Act. The Republicans would take us back to the good old days.

Remember the good old days? Enron, the collapse of Wall Street because of millions of bad mortgages and virtual collateralized debt obligations, and other schemes that pyramided the problem to a point where it caused the worst economic collapse since the Great Depression.

Now Goldman Sachs populates the White House. They run the Treasury. Now they want to deregulate Wall Street again with a so-called CHOICE Act.

Now, there are problems with over-regulation of the community banks and small banks; they didn't cause the problem. But they want to say, "No, let's just deregulate everybody again," not targeting the problem. So they are going to repeal the Volcker Rule. They are going to do away with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

No more requiring lenders to be certain that people are borrowers who can repay their loans. No, the credit card companies, the payday lenders, the debt collectors, there are no abuses there. We don't need a watchdog overlooking them.

And then, finally, they do away with something called orderly liquidation

authority. Back to the good old days when firms on Wall Street were too big to fail. We can't have in place a process that would allow us to remove overpaid executives who crash their firm and to make the stockholders pay instead of the taxpayers.

That is what this bill does today. It is the "Wrong" CHOICE Act.

WITHDRAWING FROM PARIS CLIMATE ACCORD

(Ms. TSONGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, when President Trump withdrew from the Paris climate accord last week, I was in Germany meeting with some of that country's top officials, legislators, and business leaders. In our conversations, many of my German counterparts rightly emphasized that climate change is a major world threat, with potential to cause widespread and long-lasting damage if not acted upon.

So the news of President Trump's unilateral decision drew sharp criticism and deep concern. Our longtime allies viewed withdrawal as America ceding international leadership and turning its back on the world.

Indeed, withdrawing from the Paris climate accord reduces our ability to help shape a solution to the climate change crisis and retreats from our responsibility to serve as a global leader. It also ignores the role we, here in the United States, play in contributing to climate change.

I stand in strong support of American businesses and State and local leaders across our country who see beyond the shortsighted approach of this decision and will remain committed to furthering the goals of the Paris accord.

□ 1215

ROLLING BACK FINANCIAL REGULATIONS WILL PUT OUR COUNTRY'S ECONOMIC SECURITY AT RISK

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, rolling back financial regulations that are in place to protect the American people will put them and our country's economic security at risk. However, the Financial CHOICE Act that is being considered by Congress today does just that: it erodes protections against dishonest big bank practices that rob people of their hard-earned salaries.

This bill repeals the Volcker rule. It dismantles the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, strips regulations in place to protect the American people's savings, and actually lets the big banks maintain even less capital that they need to absorb catastrophic

losses, making it so that they are relying once again on the American taxpayer to bail them out.

We don't need to remind the families who have suffered so much about the pain caused by the Great Recession. In my own home State of Hawaii, from 2008 to 2010, our unemployment rate more than doubled, and 11 million people in America lost their homes. The big banks of 2008 are even bigger and more powerful today.

I urge my colleagues to reject this dangerous bill and, instead, pass H.R. 790, the Return to Prudent Banking Act, which would reinstate a 21st century Glass-Steagall Act.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

(Mr. JEFFRIES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, our focus should be on education and job creation. We should invest in transportation and infrastructure; invest in research and development; invest in technology and innovation; and invest in working families, middle class folks, and senior citizens.

Instead, House Republicans have shortened the workweek and canceled votes on Friday.

Why?

Apparently because James Comey is testifying tomorrow and they want to get out of town before sundown. That is an abdication of responsibility, a dereliction of duty, and a classic example of legislative malpractice.

"Where are the jobs?" the American people are asking. House Republicans are missing in action and the American people deserve better.

FINANCIAL CHOICE ACT WOULD BE A DISASTER FOR THE ENTIRE FINANCIAL SYSTEM

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 10, the "Wrong" CHOICE Act.

This bill would take us back to the regulatory stone age and would be a disaster for our entire financial system. It would actually increase risk in the financial system because, under this bill, any bank that meets an arbitrary new 10 percent leverage ratio would be exempted from all other capital and liquidity requirements. The problem with the leverage ratio is that it treats all assets equally risky. Under the leverage ratio, a subprime mortgage-backed security is considered just as risky as a U.S. Treasury bond.

As a result, many banking regulators have pointed out that relying solely on the leverage ratio would give banks an

incentive to get rid of their safest assets, like U.S. treasuries, and load up on riskier assets.

Incentives matter, Mr. Speaker, and this bill gives banks a huge incentive to load up on risk. We know what risk is like. Eleven million people lost their homes, and many lost their jobs. Let's not remove the safety net that was put in place with the Dodd-Frank bill.

I oppose the "Wrong" CHOICE Act. It is bad for America, bad for people, and the wrong direction. I urge a strong "no" vote.

DEFEATING THE ISIS ENEMY

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand shoulder to shoulder with our friends and allies in Great Britain, who have suffered three horrific terror attacks in a period of less than 3 months.

These attacks at the hands of Islamic State in Iraq and Syria are barbaric, evil, and must be condemned by the entire world. These cowards have used vehicles, knives, and bombs to rein terror down on London and Manchester, even targeting innocent young girls at a concert hall.

Radical Islamic extremism is a vile ideology that must be stamped out at every corner of the world. This is a time for unity of purpose and strong leadership.

The United States, our NATO allies, and our allies in the Middle East must chart a unified course towards complete destruction of ISIS. As we begin to succeed in the fight, their resolve to attack us will only grow stronger, but we cannot be deterred.

Mr. Speaker, freedom and liberty must win over hatred and extremism. We must defeat this enemy, and this Congress stands ready to support this administration in its efforts to do so.

CONGRATULATING VIRGIN ISLAND STUDENTS

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the end of the school year for students. And, of course, that means graduation and promotion celebrations.

I want to congratulate all of our students on their achievements and their proud family members.

To our teachers, faculty, and staff, we thank you for your continued commitment to educating our children. We know that there are many challenges in today's learning environment, but amid the challenges we face, you stand strong. We appreciate all of your work.

As a representative in Congress for the Virgin Islands, I pledge to continue to support legislation and initiatives that make our children, teachers, and administrators a priority.

To the students of the U.S. Virgin Islands, I have a message for you: During these summer months, please take this time to continue to learn, participate in the Governor's reading challenge, find a new hobby, work, and please explore the natural wonder of our home, the Virgin Islands of the United States. Be safe, and best wishes to you all as you continue a productive educational journey. Have a safe and fun-filled summer.

AUTHORITY OF THE WHITE HOUSE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is often difficult when Members represent different aspects or parties to really speak to what is right.

I just came from Europe, meeting with Europeans from a number of countries. I was passing through London in the backdrop of the heinous and tragic London Bridge incident. Many of us saw the courageous mayor of London speak to the people, along with national leadership.

So I must indicate my disappointment in the comments of the Commander in Chief of this Nation to bash in time of trouble Mayor Khan, a Muslim, who has stood against terrorism. Then, of course, the precipitous actions of firing Director Comey and the rumors of either firing or asking for the resignation of Attorney General Sessions gives me great pause for legislation like the Financial CHOICE Act that would take away the independent authority of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and make the head of that an appointee of the President, so the person who protects consumers will be able to be fired by this President.

With the words against the London mayor, the firing of Comey, and the threatening of Attorney General Sessions, I wonder whether or not we can tolerate any other authority given to this White House to be able to fire people who are to protect the rights of the American people, and to be able to stand for comments that undermine our allies and the friendships that we have established over the decades working to secure the American people. Let us think about it.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 7, 2017, at 9:17 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1094.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

REAPPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4412, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development:

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN, New Mexico

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2213, ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 374 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 374

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 374, which provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act, and makes in order one amendment.

H.R. 2213 is a commonsense, bipartisan bill, introduced by Ms. MCSALLY from Arizona, that will help ensure we have sufficient Border Patrol agents to secure our border. At this point in time, where we are facing tremendous challenges overseas, where we are facing tremendous national security challenges, our Customs and Border Protection is understaffed and unable to meet the congressionally mandated staffing levels for Customs officers and Border Patrol agents.

With these ever-increasing threats to our national security, it is vital that we ensure CBP can quickly hire capable and trustworthy individuals to secure our border. Currently, prospective officers and Border Patrol agents are required to undergo a background check that includes passing a polygraph test. This process has been very long and has drastically delayed the CBP's ability to hire officers and Border Patrol agents.

H.R. 2213 simply provides a limited, voluntary exemption to the pre-employment polygraph requirement for State and local law enforcement officers that are in good standing and who have already passed a State and local law enforcement polygraph test, for Federal law enforcement officers who are in good standing, and members of the armed services or veterans who have received or who are eligible to receive an honorable discharge and have held a security clearance and undergone a thorough background check in the past 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, this exemption is very narrow and only applies to men and women that we already trust to protect and defend us at home or abroad: men and women who have already been through relevant security background checks. The CBP would not be required to use this waiver authority; and, if there is anything in any applicant's

history that warrants further investigation, the CBP Commissioner is fully authorized and encouraged to use a polygraph test to resolve any outstanding questions.

Mr. Speaker, for years, the CBP has struggled to recruit and vet potential employees. There is no more urgent need that we have right now than securing our border and making sure we have the resources there to be able to do that job.

□ 1230

H.R. 2213 is a commonsense approach that will help address this issue and ensure the CBP has the men and women it needs to keep our borders and our Nation secure. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule to allow for consideration of H.R. 2213, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), my friend, for yielding to me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

H.R. 2213 would broaden the criteria for waiving the polygraph requirements for certain applicants at U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

Under the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act, the Commissioner of the CBP would be permitted to waive polygraph requirements for certain State and law enforcement personnel who have passed a polygraph examination, Federal law enforcement agents who have passed a stringent background investigation, and veterans with three consecutive years in the military who have held a security clearance and passed a background check.

Mr. Speaker, we understand the importance of ensuring that our Federal law enforcement agencies are operating at full capacity, but there are other big-ticket items that we are ignoring in this institution. So I ask: Where is the Republican agenda?

With control of both Chambers of Congress and the White House, my colleagues across the aisle have made it through nearly half of their first year in power without a single major legislative achievement. It appears that President Donald John Trump is more interested in slashing old policies than proposing new ones.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump and congressional Republicans have yet to put forward the promised \$1 trillion infrastructure package. Voters are still waiting for the massive tax cuts promised to them during the campaign.

The American people have yet to see a single jobs bill, let alone the super-secret plan to defeat ISIS. And looming over this long to-do list is the investigation into Russia's blatant attempts to interfere in our election, an issue that many of my Republican colleagues seem more than happy to ignore.

Instead, President Donald John Trump and my friends across the aisle have spent their time rolling back protections for workers, consumers, teachers, students, and the environment.

Instead of tackling a bipartisan spending deal, addressing budget cuts under sequestration, and avoiding debt default, the Republican-controlled Congress insists on dismantling the Affordable Care Act and replacing it with a plan that will raise deductibles, lessen coverage, and leave 23 million more people uninsured.

Mr. Speaker, there are still plenty of people without jobs in this country. We have plenty of families worried that they will be tossed off of their health insurance plan, and we have plenty of folks who are pleading with Congress to pass compassionate immigration reform.

Yet President Donald John Trump is tweeting about his travel ban and attacking London Mayor Sadiq Khan hours after a terrorist attack hit London which, sadly, killed seven people and injured dozens more.

Mr. Speaker, after being the antigovernment party—and I find it hypocritical that people in the administration are declaring that we are obstructionists. They gave, during that period of the previous President, obstruction absolutely new meaning. After being the antigovernment party for so many years, it appears that the congressional Republicans have forgotten how to govern.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I welcome the opportunity to share the floor today with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my good friend from the Rules Committee. I just would point out that, as a Congress, as a body, we have actually passed more pieces of legislation, gotten them on the President's desk, and gotten them signed at this point in Congress than at any time since President Truman was in office.

So it may be that my colleague is not in agreement with many of the things that we have done, but, Mr. Speaker, we have actually been working very hard to begin the process of recovery from 8 years of rules and regulations that have really strangled the people of this Nation.

We have passed, as the gentleman noted, healthcare reform out of this body. We repealed ObamaCare, and every single day we get more and more indication about the failures of that healthcare plan, with insurance companies pulling out of markets and leaving citizens all across this Nation unable to get access to affordable care. The Republican plan will change that.

We are also in the process and will, tomorrow, be voting to repeal the Dodd-Frank legislation, which has had

a devastating effect on our community banks all across this country and on our communities, and moving away from the really misguided approach of the last 8 years that centralized power here in Washington, D.C.

One thing that didn't happen in the last 8 years though was the security of the border. And far too often we saw laws that weren't enforced. We saw people turning the other way for sanctuary cities, for example, and the failure on the part of the last administration to do what was necessary to make sure that we could know who is coming into this country and that we had the resources necessary to secure our border.

So I am very proud to be here today, to be able to debate this rule, to be able to debate the underlying legislation, which is sadly needed, so that we can get those resources we need.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption and Reauthorization Act of 2017.

As someone who has spent their entire career and adult life in law enforcement, I know full well the importance of being able to hire quality men and women to provide for the security of our communities and our Nation at large.

H.R. 2213 simply provides the Border Patrol and U.S. Customs a tool in their hiring toolkit to expedite the hiring of those who have already held some of our Nation's highest positions of public trust and who have already undergone the most thorough vetting available.

It allows Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who have served in good standing for more than 3 years and who have undergone a polygraph exam to be eligible to have their CBP preemployment polygraph waived in order to expedite their hiring.

As a former sheriff who mandated—I mandated preemployment polygraphs in my own department, I have full confidence in thoroughness of the vetting conducted by State and local law enforcement agencies prior to hiring an officer. Those exams do not need to be duplicated by CBP in order to hire a prospective officer or agent who has already been vetted by their local department and has a proven track record of performance.

If CBP finds derogatory information on an applicant whose polygraph has been waived, then they still have the authority to conduct their standard CBP polygraph to determine whether that applicant should, in fact, be hired.

This bill does not lower standards. I want to say that again. This bill does not lower standards. It merely takes a commonsense approach to hiring by giving CBP the option not to duplicate

a polygraph exam already completed by a highly qualified applicant's previous law enforcement agency.

I represent the Port of Jacksonville, which moved 82 tons of cargo last year and is one of only 16 ports of call authorized to move military cargo through our national security operations.

It is absolutely vital that U.S. Customs and Border Protection are able to hire enough quality officers to maintain the flow of commerce.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my good friend and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. The bill, in fact, does weaken critical screening of potential CBP officers, and our country actually should be working to increase the security relative to CBP. CBP is essential. It is our first line of defense to stop terrorists, to stop drugs, to stop dangerous persons coming in, and we should not weaken our standards.

Now, the overwhelming majority of CBP officers are honest, hardworking public servants. Crime and corruption has, however, been a persistent problem for the agency. Numerous CBP officers have been found to have strong connections to organized crime, including drug cartels. They are in prison now.

In many cases, cartels try and infiltrate the CBP by recruiting people to apply for CBP positions. This results in illicit drug smuggling and other dangerous activities.

In 2015, the CBP Integrity Advisory Panel found that—and this is a quote—“arrests for corruption of CBP personnel far exceed, on a per capita basis, such arrests at other Federal law enforcement agencies.”

In 2016, this same panel observed that “corrupt CBP law enforcement personnel pose a national security threat.” And it recommended that the current polygraph test be expanded, not reduced.

Now, this bill allows for an exemption for local law enforcement and former members of the Armed Forces from the polygraph requirement. For example, if a polygraph has been taken in the prior 10 years, I think it is a mistake to think that that will protect us.

In fact, the Inspector General at DHS, John Roth, advises against this bill. He explained that the polygraph changes, including this legislation—and this is a quote—“could put CBP at significant risk.”

He says: “While it may sound reasonable to say you could waive requirements from former military personnel because they have passed a polygraph, Border Patrol agents work in a different environment that is not as controlled as the military.”

Now, it is important to note that, of the applicants for the CBP, two-thirds fail the polygraph test. That may be a concern, but we ought to be glad that people who are a risk are not actually hired by the CBP.

I will just note that the Government Accountability Office advises that, between 2005 and 2012, there were 2,170 reported incidents of arrest of CBP personnel for misconduct. That is about one arrest a day of CBP officials.

CBP's own Integrity Advisory Panel, and these are law enforcement experts, outside law enforcement experts, concluded in 2015 that “there is data indicating that arrests for corruption of CBP personnel far exceed, on a per capita basis, such arrests at other Federal law enforcement agencies.” And in its final report, that panel recommended that the current polygraph testing be expanded to include postemployment tests that are best practices at the FBI and agencies in the U.S. intelligence service.

Now, I will just give you some examples that are real life examples from CBP, and this is from the agency itself. These are individuals who could be exempted.

An officer who, when faced with a polygraph, admitted possession of approximately 100 videos and 10,000 still images of child pornography.

A police officer who admitted to sexual assault.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LOFGREN. An Afghan veteran who had classified information that he admitted he had taken out of theater.

An Army officer who would meet the criteria who admitted that he had removed classified information from Iraq.

A police officer who admitted that he had smuggled marijuana into detention centers.

It is not too big a burden to ask that applicants have a polygraph test and be clean.

□ 1245

The Sinaloa cartel is recruiting people to apply to become CBP officers. Our protection is to make sure that we completely screen every single applicant so that the cartel is unsuccessful in infiltrating our first line of defense at the U.S. borders.

So, with that, I know that the authors are well-intentioned, but this is a serious mistake for the security of our country, and I urge Members to vote against the bill.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my Rules Committee colleague for yielding. I am proud to support this rule and the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act.

Mr. Speaker, last November, the American people sent a strong message: They want a secure southern border. Having a strong system of border security is critical to our national defense and the safety and the security of the American people. President Trump has asked us to get more boots on the ground protecting our border, and this bill is an important step in that process.

U.S. Border Patrol agencies are the ones serving on the front lines when it comes to border security. These hard-working men and women serve day at night at the border, at airports, and at sea and land ports in an effort to keep us safe. We should be grateful for their service and their sacrifice.

Unfortunately, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or CBP, is woefully understaffed. In fact, the numbers show that we are short 1,000 officers and 1,800 Border Patrol agents. This shortage is making it harder to secure the border and help keep bad actors out of our country.

That is where this bill comes in. It would amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to provide necessary discretionary waiver authority to the CBP Commissioner in an effort to reduce the staffing shortage. The bill specifically would provide the Commissioner with the authority to waive the polygraph examinations in three circumstances.

The polygraph exam would be waived for current State and local law enforcement officers who have already passed a polygraph examination, Federal law enforcement officers who have already passed a stringent background investigation, and veterans with at least 3 consecutive years in the military who have held a clearance and passed a background check. These are three very tailored and specific circumstances, and these are exactly the kind of men and women we want and need when it comes to border security positions.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the waiver authority granted under this bill is not mandatory. It will ultimately be the decision of the CBP Commissioner to decide on a strict case-by-case basis whether to issue a waiver. The Commissioner can order a polygraph.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner can still order a polygraph for any applicant they deem necessary.

This is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that passed out of the Homeland Security Committee on a voice vote, and I hope to see more bipartisan support here in the full House.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this bill, and I urge all of my col-

leagues to join me in supporting a stronger and more robust border security system.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we continue to be deeply concerned by revelations that Russia hacked last year's elections. In fact, just this week we learned that Russian military intelligence engaged in a monthlong cyber attack against our voting infrastructure, specifically targeting a voting software supplier and 122 local election officials.

This most recent revelation comes on the back of earlier determinations by the intelligence community that Russia hacked the DNC and distributed fake news in order to sway the election in Donald Trump's favor. This has been made even more troublesome by the fact that Donald John Trump recently admitted that he fired FBI Director Comey over the Bureau's investigation into links between the Trump campaign and Russia.

Mr. Speaker, the integrity of our electoral system is at stake. It is time the Republican-controlled Congress does its job and acts to defend our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the bipartisan bill, H.R. 356, which would create a nonpartisan commission to investigate Russian interference into our 2016 election.

This marks the eighth time we have tried to bring this bill to the House floor. On the previous seven occasions, the Republican majority, regrettably, refused to allow the House to even debate this important legislation. But today, they will have yet another opportunity to redeem themselves. I hope they will finally put country ahead of party.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, we stand here today with a to-do list a mile long, and we don't have much time to cross items off that list. There are only 30 working days before our 5-week August recess. That is not much time, but those of us on this side of the aisle stand ready to work in a bipartisan manner with our Republican colleagues in order to make sensible reforms to our Tax Code, our infrastructure and healthcare system, in short, to work hard for the American people, because that is what we were sent here to do.

It is far past time for my friends across the aisle to come to the table ready to work on behalf of the Amer-

ican people in a bipartisan manner. We on this side of the aisle continue to stand ready to do so, and I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Florida for his participation in this debate today.

I think it is important for the record to be clear and to be accurate, Mr. Speaker. This House of Representatives, in the time that we have been in session, has been the most productive House during the first 100 days of a Presidency in 30 years.

I am sure that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may not want to agree to that. They may not want to acknowledge that because Speaker PELOSI held the record previously when she was Speaker, but I am very proud of that, that we have done a tremendous amount for the American people in the time that we have been in session.

We have overturned 14 Obama regulations in this Congress alone, which has had a tremendous impact on our constituents. We have already taken steps that will save them \$3.7 billion in regulatory costs, 4.2 million hours in paperwork.

Mr. Speaker, when I think about the communities across my home State of Wyoming, this relief could not have come soon enough. We are in a position today where we have faced strangling regulation out of Washington, D.C., for the last 8 years, regulation that was truly intended in too many instances to drive businesses out of business, to drive our community banks out of business, and to create a situation where Washington, D.C., was creating one-size-fits-all policies. But those days are over. This is a new day, and we take very seriously our obligations to put country ahead of party.

With respect to Russia, Mr. Speaker, as my colleague is well aware, there are multiple investigations underway in the Congress. We on the Republican side—I think this is a bipartisan issue—take very seriously the sanctity of our electoral process and will make sure that we get to the bottom of it.

We have got to ensure that we recognize and understand the extent to which Russian hacking was going on—frankly, not just in the United States, but around the world—and make sure that we do everything necessary to stand up against both Russian hacking, to stand up against the kind of Russian attacks that we are seeing on electoral processes in Europe, and, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that we secure ourselves.

At the end of the day, that is what this debate is about here this afternoon. We have got to make sure that we all recognize in this body that there is nothing more important than the security of our Nation.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we are at a crisis moment. We are at a crisis because, for the last 8 years, our military has been strangled. For the last 8 years, our borders weren't secure. We have had threats growing around the world.

We have seen the rise of ISIS. We have seen the rise of al-Qaida—the expansion of al-Qaida around the world into many more countries than it ever existed before.

We have seen the Iranians make steady progress towards obtaining a nuclear weapon under what is the most misguided treaty agreement ever entered into by any American President: the Iranian nuclear agreement.

We have seen Chinese aggression in the South China Sea. We have seen Russian aggression in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen North Korea attempting, on a near weekly basis it sometimes seems, to make sure that it has perfected and acquired ballistic missile technology, while they also work to make sure that they are able to put a nuclear warhead on those ballistic missiles.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in a very dangerous world. We are living in a world in which America's ability to defend and protect itself is under threat in a way that it has not been certainly since the end of the Cold War, and maybe even since World War II.

Defending and protecting this Nation, Mr. Speaker, will require, both, that we provide the resources our military needs to defend us so that we can, Mr. Speaker, get out from underneath the policies of the last 8 years, but it also will require that we secure our border.

This bill today on the floor will provide the relief necessary for the CBP to do what is necessary to keep us safe. We have no greater responsibility than providing for our security.

I would remind the gentleman from Florida that this bill passed out of the Homeland Security Committee on a voice vote, on a bipartisan basis, with sponsors from both sides of the aisle. It is crucially important that we take this step to provide the relief—and not mandatory relief, but the relief—that the CBP can use if it needs.

Mr. Speaker, as we discuss the range of accomplishments that we have had that I am very proud of in this Congress and the accomplishments still to come, I think that we have to also recognize that nothing is more important than the security of the Nation. This bill goes to the heart of that, to making sure that the CBP can do its job. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of both the rule and H.R. 2213.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 374 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 356) to establish the National Commission on Foreign Interference in the 2016 Election. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 356.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution. . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Al-

though it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1300

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 10, FINANCIAL CHOICE
ACT OF 2017

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 375 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 375

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to create hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for

other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWEIKERT). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. This rule provides a structured process for debate and makes in order six amendments to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to return hope and opportunity to Main Street America through the Financial CHOICE Act. This legislation touches

at the very heart of our economy, ensuring that our financial system facilitates job creation, economic growth, and fairness.

Nearly 10 years ago, the American economy cratered. The Great Recession of the late 2000s revealed that our financial system was fragile, and many Americans got the short end of the stick.

In 2010, Democrats passed H.R. 4173, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. They promised the bill would lift the American economy. They promised an end to Wall Street bailouts. They promised to protect consumers. Seven years later, we know that these promises never came true.

Due to Dodd-Frank's excessive regulatory burden, big banks are getting bigger while small banks and credit unions are disappearing. There have only been six new bank charters since Dodd-Frank—a drastic decline from the 170 on average per year before the bill. In fact, 43 percent of banks with assets under \$100 million have disappeared.

Large banks survive because they can afford armies of lawyers to understand Dodd-Frank regulations. In 2010, Goldman Sachs CEO Lloyd Blankfein even suggested his bank would be among the biggest beneficiaries of Dodd-Frank. But for community banks with community budgets, the effects of the law have been devastating.

Dodd-Frank also failed to address the too-big-to-fail problem. Under the Dodd-Frank law, big banks are growing larger, and taxpayers are still responsible for bailing them out. Furthermore, Dodd-Frank has made access to banking and credit more difficult for average Americans. Since the passage of the bill, bank fees have increased and millions more Americans are now considered unbanked or underbanked.

Declining liquidity has limited access to credit for small businesses and the regulatory restrictions on mortgages have pushed homeownership out of reach for the middle class. Seventy-two percent of community banks say that the Dodd-Frank regulations restrict their ability to offer mortgage loans.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the price we must pay to be a hopeful and prosperous nation. That is why I am here supporting the Financial CHOICE Act. It repeals Dodd-Frank, replacing the harmful law with reasonable regulations that ensure consumer protection, job growth, economic growth, and strong community banks.

The Financial CHOICE Act ends the coddling of big banks. It implements historically tough penalties on financial fraud and insider trading. It ends taxpayer-funded bailouts and creates new bankruptcy laws designed for failing banks. It is time that Congress put Main Street ahead of Wall Street.

The Financial CHOICE Act also reins in the Consumer Financial Protection

Bureau, a government agency that has incredible power to regulate the financial industry but that has nearly no accountability. The judicial branch has actually declared its structure unconstitutional.

The CFPB is causing problems for consumers. They have a database for complaints from consumers, but it publishes consumer complaints before even checking if they are true. The CFPB also weighs in on financial regulations where Congress should instead be making these decisions, and the CFPB wasted over \$200 million on lavish renovations of their office space in downtown Washington, D.C.

This legislation we are considering today will restructure the CFPB, restoring congressional oversight duties and moving the agency back under the regular legislative appropriations process. We will also be refocusing the CFPB on enforcing consumer protection laws, rather than making up their own laws that only hurt the average American consumer.

Perhaps most important to Coloradans, the Financial CHOICE Act creates economic growth and jobs by making credit easier to access for Main Street America. Thanks to the TAILOR Act, introduced by my friend and colleague from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), regulators will be able to craft custom regulations to reflect the specific business model of local banks.

This bill also creates jobs and economic growth by requiring more transparent policymaking at the Federal Reserve. We rein in stifling regulations on small, community banks, allowing them to compete against their larger counterparts. We increase consumer choice by ensuring Americans can access a bank and a credit card.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity today to transform our Nation's financial system. We have the opportunity to level the playing field between big and small banks. We have the opportunity to turn up the heat on financial fraud. We have the opportunity to return regulatory power from the hands of unelected bureaucrats to the people. We have the opportunity to roll back hurtful regulations.

We are here to restore hope and opportunity through the Financial CHOICE Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago, I brought the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to the floor of the House as chairwoman of the House Rules Committee. This law was a statement from Congress on behalf of the American people that unchecked corporate greed will never again bring the United States of America to financial collapse.

My colleague began his speech this morning by saying that this law had not worked, but I am not aware of major bank failures or bank failures of any kind since we passed it, and I would say, indeed, this law has worked.

Since it has been enacted, our economy has had over 80 consecutive months of private sector job growth. That is pretty good. In fact, it is a record-setting streak. More than 16 million jobs have been created, and business lending has been increased by 75 percent. I am not getting all the complaints that I used to get that they could not borrow money from banks, particularly the small businesses.

Along the way, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau established under this law has helped 29 million people in all of our 50 States to receive nearly \$12 billion in relief from companies that engaged in irresponsible or predatory practices.

One group that sent us a letter begging us not to do away with Dodd-Frank was the Veterans of Foreign Wars who said that far too often their veterans were the victims of predatory lenders—shysters, people not telling them the truth—and that is exactly what the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was established to do.

You can't argue about whether or not it has been a success if 29 million people in 50 States have gotten back \$12 billion in relief of bad practices. But this legislation completely will do away with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the only thing we have left to protect Main Street and the small investors.

These gains weren't a coincidence, Mr. Speaker. They were the result of the Dodd-Frank law. Gutting Wall Street reform will be a historic giveaway to special interests.

□ 1315

The Wall Street firms who plunged our country to the brink, in 2008, would be free once again to take advantage of consumers and force middle class families to go it alone, without the protections this bill has provided them.

The CHOICE Act is the wrong choice for consumers and families. Instead of standing with financial lobbyists, I urge the majority to uphold the trust of the people we all represent.

Five years ago, Democrats and Republicans came together to almost unanimously pass my bill to end insider trading in Congress. The STOCK Act passed this Chamber by a vote of 417-2, one of the most bipartisan bills of that entire session of Congress.

It wasn't easy. I led a 6-year fight to get it signed into law after learning that Members of Congress and their staffs were abusing their positions by making money from the information that they gleaned and that was not available to everybody else in America. They gleaned this information while

working on behalf of the people whose information they were stealing. It took a "60 Minutes" investigation on television and a groundswell of public support, but the bill became a reality.

For me, upholding the people's trust is the most sacred responsibility I have as a Member of Congress. That is why I am waging a new battle to strengthen the STOCK Act, after learning that some in this Congress have used legal loopholes to get around this law.

Once again, we see the importance of investigative journalism and a free press, which has shined a light on the fact that some Members of Congress have purchased private, discounted stock deals and taken a part in initial public offerings outside of the United States. These special deals are not available to the general public.

All this would have remained in the dark, had the STOCK Act not put into place a new requirement to timely disclose sales and purchases of stock. This is precisely the kind of outrageous conduct we intended to outlaw under the STOCK Act. It plays directly into the public's most cynical view of Congress.

This, Mr. Speaker, comes at a time when just 20 percent of the public approves of how Congress is doing its job under the majority's leadership. That is according to the latest figures from Gallup.

This Chamber put aside partisanship and took a strong, bipartisan stand against this abhorrent behavior just a few years ago. It has become increasingly clear that we need to act again today to hold ourselves accountable to both the letter and the spirit of the STOCK Act law.

We are not doing that today. Once again, we are taking away the regulations because some people find them so terribly abhorrent, but they protect the small investor and the people in the banks. We surely will never, I hope, see the day where we will ask the taxpayers of the United States to bail out the enormously rich, big banks. One of the worst things of that whole era was not a single fraudulent banker went to jail.

Just 535 of us in a country of more than 300 million people have been chosen to serve on the American people's behalf in Congress. It is a sacred responsibility, one we should not be squandering, doing the bidding of the financial lobbyists or Wall Street firms, who are the ones behind the CHOICE Act.

The majority should stop fulfilling the wish list of Wall Street and act on behalf of millions of Americans outraged by insider trading and other chicanery that still permeates the halls of Congress today. This Chamber must take action so that Americans recognize we came here to represent them, not enrich ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule because it is time to, once and for all, end the harmful regulations caused by this disastrous law.

Mr. Speaker, let me take just a few moments to talk to you about the harmful effects Dodd-Frank has had on my home State of Texas. As of just a few months ago, in Texas alone, 358 State or federally chartered banks, credit unions, or thrifts have either closed or merged since 2010, when Dodd-Frank became law.

According to our Texas State Banking Commission, the last bank or credit union chartered in Texas was in 2009, in a State with one of the healthiest economies in the country. Mass consolidations and closures have left many Texans few options, something the previous administration promised.

While Dodd-Frank aimed at fixing our recovering financial system, one-size-fits-all regulations have only hurt one person: the consumer. Increased bank fees, less access to consumer credit products, 1,000-page rules, and billions of dollars in regulatory costs all have become the hallmark of our financial system over the last 7 years.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle, I will leave you with this: If you support crushing regulations that have hurt our community banks and our credit unions, if you support taxpayer bailouts, if you support an agency that is accountable to none, and if you support less accountability for both Washington and Wall Street, would you please vote against this rule and the underlying bill?

But if you support financial opportunity for all, taxpayer bailout for none, less regulations on small community financial institutions, and more accountability and transparency, then support this bill, support consumers, and support Main Street America.

In God we trust.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, those wondering why Republican lips are sealed so very tight when it comes to President Trump jeopardizing our national security, threatening our democracy, and engaging in one crazy action after another need look no further than this bill.

You see, this is a bill to handcuff the cop on Wall Street. So many of our Republican colleagues are so eager to shield Wall Street from action and eventually to bestow one tax break after another on Wall Street, that they are willing to pay almost any price in silence concerning Mr. Trump's outrages.

As a person who voted against all of the big bank bailouts, I am most concerned that this bill will produce only more. When the banks were bailed out, American families paid the price, as taxpayers. They paid the price for the recklessness that led to that unnecessary financial crisis.

A more immediate concern is what happens to the cop on the beat, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, a new law enforcement agency that the AARP described as one designed to hold scam artists accountable. That is exactly what the CFPB has done. Whether it is payday lenders or deceitful language in the fine print of financial agreements, reverse mortgages, contracts denying consumers their legal remedies to address wrongdoing, or many other issues, this agency has been there to protect the consumers.

Among those most threatened that have benefited from this law enforcement agency are our military families, who face unique financial challenges, from illegal foreclosures, to cheating them on student loans, to payday lenders who overcharge their families. This law enforcement agency has been there to protect them. Today, it would be substantially weakened by this legislation.

One of the leading examples of the success of this law enforcement agency is Wells Fargo: fined \$100 million, \$85 million in restitution, \$75 million in claw-backs from executives, a CEO resigned. None of that happened to the other banks, but Wells Fargo was caught. It was caught because there was a law enforcement agency on the beat doing something about it.

There are those who fought this legislation from the start, and they won't give up on trying to undermine it.

You need only look at what happened this year in enforcement actions to see what this agency is doing: a company failed to provide redress for illegal collection tactics, deceived consumers about credit scores, misstated the charges associated with pawn loans, denied consumers access to their own money, and kept borrowers in the dark about options to avoid foreclosure. One bit of wrongdoing after another. Why not have a cop on the beat working for us? Some people want to have the unlimited right to exploit consumers. This agency is the one thing standing in the way to protect them.

I say: stop this Republican interference with law enforcement and send a message at the same time to President Donald J. Trump that our laws apply to him too, and ought to be enforced against him when he is engaged in wrongdoing.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most deceptive things that Congress does is regulate one part of an industry for the problems created by another part.

The community banks had nothing to do with the collapse in 2008. It was Wall Street, the people in New York, the big banks. Yet the Dodd-Frank regulation kind of let them scoot by and gave them permits to continue operating, while many of the Main Street businesses and many of the Main Street banks have closed down.

My friend just mentioned Wells Fargo. CFPB stood on the sidelines silently and mute while they were conducting their affairs. It was a county prosecutor who actually uncovered it.

So this idea that we here in Congress are going to do things that are going to get it in check simply is not true. What is true is that the agency created by Dodd-Frank, the CFPB, or the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, was so annoying that it put New Mexico's most sparsely populated county, with about 8 people per square mile, to be regulated the same as New York City. That is how much CFPB understood.

In the process of their regulating, they shut down the loans for manufactured housing. That means nothing to the people in New York, but in New Mexico, that is 50 percent of the homes in my district. The CFPB didn't much care.

They also limited the ability of regular banks to make loans on mortgages, establishing something called qualified mortgages. They simply said all balloon notes are prejudicial. Those things were hurting and penalizing the rural parts of this country. The people who suffered most were the people at the lowest end of the economic spectrum.

Our credit agencies, our credit system in the U.S., has done much in order to make credit available, no matter where you are in the political and income spectrum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PEARCE. The people at the low end of the spectrum had access to many different ways of borrowing. CFPB simply routinely eliminated almost every single one of them.

As a representative of one of the poorest districts in the country, I have found CFPB's efforts to be meaningless to the big guys and punitive to us who are just trying to make a living out in the rural parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this rule and support for the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) the distinguished ranking member of the Financial Services Sub-

committee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 10, the "Wrong" CHOICE Act.

This bill will take us back to the regulatory stone age and would be a disaster for the entire financial system.

Let us remember why we passed Dodd-Frank: we confronted the worst financial crisis, caused by mismanagement from the financial industry, that cost this country \$18 trillion in household wealth, millions lost their homes, millions lost their jobs, and the suffering was deep and strong.

First, this bill, the "Wrong" CHOICE Act, would repeal the orderly liquidation authority, which is the only tool that would allow large financial institutions like Lehman Brothers or AIG to be wound down safely, without requiring a taxpayer bailout or causing a financial panic, like Lehman.

We had two choices in the crisis: either bail them out—a bad choice—or let them fail—another bad choice.

The liquidation authority is helpful, yet the majority claims that the liquidation authority codifies taxpayer bailouts. Nothing could be further from the truth. Under the liquidation authority, the FDIC wipes out the firm's shareholders, imposes losses on the firm's creditors, fires the firm's management, and completely liquidates the entire firm. The only people who are guaranteed not to suffer losses are the taxpayers.

So if we wipe out this protection to the taxpayers, we are putting the taxpayers in harm's way yet again.

□ 1330

This bill would also devastate investors by rolling back decades of investor protections and trampling on the property rights of shareholders by making it virtually impossible for them to influence the management of the companies that they own.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Finally, the bill would completely gut the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which has been an incredible, effective watchdog for consumers and has protected the consumers who were often not thought about first of all or second of all—or not thought about at all. This agency protects them. If we would have had it, we would not have had the financial crisis we suffered. This would just make it easier for banks like Wells Fargo to rip off consumers and would protect them from being punished if they are caught.

So I want to point out that the Republican “Wrong” CHOICE Act puts Wall Street ahead of Main Street, leads to taxpayer bailouts for big banks, guts consumer protections for seniors and their families, and brings back risky practices that caused the 2008 financial crisis. It is the wrong direction, it is a wrong vote, and I caution my friends on the other side of the aisle the voters are going to remember this vote. Don’t turn us back to the Stone Age of regulation.

I urge a very strong “no” vote on this wrongly directed “Bad” CHOICE Act.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the chair of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, the economic downturn in 2008 caused Michiganders and citizens around the country to lose their jobs, families to lose their savings, and way too many to lose their homes. Since that time, our friends on the other side of the aisle have attempted to convince the American people that Dodd-Frank was “the answer” to the financial crisis, despite the law failing to actually address the root cause of the downturn. In reality, Dodd-Frank has made it more difficult for hardworking taxpayers to secure a future for themselves and their children by denying them the economic recovery that they deserve.

Let’s be honest: Dodd-Frank was an agenda waiting for a crisis. So many issues not related to economic stability were crammed into this flawed law that, now, big banks have gotten even bigger and small banks have disappeared at an alarming rate. Even worse, Dodd-Frank enshrined “too big to fail” and, frankly, put in place “too small to save.”

Enough is enough. In order to increase economic opportunity, we must enact commonsense regulatory reform and restore accountability to Wall Street and to Washington. The House Financial Services Committee achieves this goal through a carefully crafted Financial CHOICE Act, which we are debating here today.

The Financial CHOICE Act eliminates Dodd-Frank’s one-size-fits-all regulatory structure that has strangled community financial institutions with overly burdensome regulations that were meant for the largest banks in America. By enacting the CHOICE Act, community banks and credit unions can utilize their resources to help individual customers and small businesses achieve financial independence.

If we want small businesses to continue to be the engine of economic growth, we must remove the regulatory red tape that is preventing these community lenders from supporting small business job creators.

Additionally, the Financial CHOICE Act holds Wall Street accountable by imposing the toughest penalties in history. To protect consumers from financial fraud is a key goal for all of us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, this important legislation also holds Washington bureaucrats accountable by creating constitutional checks and balances for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau so that it can more effectively do its job. No government agency should be unaccountable to the American people.

Lastly, this commonsense legislation protects taxpayers by eliminating too big to fail, something that my colleague had just talked about, and requires failing institutions to liquidate through a streamlined bankruptcy process, not taxpayer-funded bailouts. The process that she was talking about, this orderly liquidation authority, the government runs the bank for 5 years, and that is unacceptable.

So I hope you will join me in supporting this rule and supporting the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the “Wrong” CHOICE Act. This bill will have a devastating impact on the ability of regulators to protect everyday Americans from future wrongdoing on Wall Street.

If you support consumers, you must oppose the “Wrong” CHOICE Act. If you want to make sure that consumers have a fighting chance against those big banks and against illegal practices, then you must oppose the “Wrong” CHOICE Act, because this act guts the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

In nearly 6 years, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has returned nearly \$12 billion to 29 million Americans hurt by illegal financial practices, reduced \$7.7 billion in consumer debts while winning \$3.7 billion in compensation for consumers, and it has benefited nearly 50 million households in the form of new protections shielding consumers from surprise costs in terms on their mortgages and their credit cards.

Now, at a time when we have a student loan crisis in this country, \$1.4 trillion in student debt, we have to make sure that we are protecting families, students, and young people around these predatory debt collection practices and all working families around predatory lending.

My home State of Washington was proud to work with the CFPB on those

new regulations that would actually protect working people, make sure that they have off-ramps if they get into predatory loans and make sure that we regulate that industry.

The benefits of Dodd-Frank are not limited just to consumers, by the way. Big and small banks have benefited: lending is at record highs, and 2016 data from the FDIC shows that those banks are doing pretty well.

The financial crisis, which destroyed trillions of dollars in wealth and wreaked havoc on the financial lives of millions of families, was not a random event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JAYAPAL. The Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission itself said that widespread failures in financial regulation and rampant predatory lending practices were key drivers of the crisis. This bill ignores those lessons and takes us so far backwards, Mr. Speaker.

Real people are struggling to recover from that 2008 crisis, still, and instead of rolling back protections for consumers, we should be investing in jobs for everyday Americans. We should be making sure that the guy on Main Street or the woman on Main Street has a chance against those big banks and against all those predatory practices.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support consumers and working Americans and to oppose the “Wrong” CHOICE Act.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I note for the record that the best way for a student to repay student loans is to have a strong economy and not the anemic recovery that we had from the last recession.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand before you today to speak on the rule and in support of H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act, which represents years of hard work by our chairman, JEB HENSARLING, and the entire Financial Services Committee.

For nearly 8 years, Dodd-Frank has targeted Main Street pocketbooks and stripped families of real opportunities for financial success and independence. For instance, the CFPB has spent years removing choices and making access to financial products more difficult to obtain. Under these regulations, it is now harder for families to qualify for a mortgage, to obtain an auto loan, and to access other forms of credit that they have depended on every day of their lives. Meanwhile, the CFPB fails to monitor and prevent actual and real

instances of consumer fraud like we saw with the opening of millions of unauthorized customers' accounts at Wells Fargo.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of chairing the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee on Financial Services, and today—today—we released a report titled, “Was the Cop on the Beat?” This is regarding the CFPB's wholly inadequate role in investigating the Wells Fargo fraudulent account scandal.

We have received numerous records from both Wells Fargo and the OCC and others that indicate that the CFPB was asleep at the wheel when it came to investigating Wells Fargo. Unfortunately, the CFPB has produced no such documents, even under subpoena, that contradict this assertion and support the testimony of Director Cordray in front of this committee earlier in the year. This report highlights the need for reforms to the CFPB that are contained in the CHOICE Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, we need to bring accountability and transparency to a Bureau that has been thwarting congressional oversight and due process.

Additionally, the CHOICE Act will increase lending in our communities, open up our economy, end taxpayer-funded bailouts, and hold Wall Street and Washington accountable. Americans today deserve the “Right” CHOICE Act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my colleague if he has further speakers?

Mr. BUCK. I do.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), the chair of the Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, when former President Obama signed the Dodd-Frank financial control law into law about 7 years ago, supporters promised that it would repair the economy; they promised that it would end too big to fail; they promised it would enhance financial stability and protect consumers. But none of those promises have been kept.

Nearly 9 years after the financial crisis, Americans are still stuck in the slowest, weakest economic recovery in 70 years. The percentage of Americans who are actually in the workforce is at its lowest level since the late 1970s, and we still have not fully reached the potential of our economic recovery. This is precisely because of the Dodd-Frank law. The Dodd-Frank law has clogged the plumbing of our economy with an avalanche of red tape.

Far from ending too big to fail, Dodd-Frank has guaranteed that too-big-to-fail banks will get a taxpayer bailout whenever they go into distress.

As big banks have gotten bigger as a result of Dodd-Frank, the small banks, the community banks, the credit unions—the credit providers for the entrepreneurs, the small businesses, the job creators in this country—are fewer. That is a huge problem for the dynamism of the economy, and that is one of the reasons why we haven't seen economic recovery the way that we should.

Dodd-Frank has made it more difficult for small businesses and startups to obtain capital to grow, invest, and hire. Before Dodd-Frank, small business lending was more than 150 percent of large bank lending. Today, due to Dodd-Frank, small bank lending is about 80 percent below that of large bank lending. This is why new business formation is at a generational low, because small businesses and startups and entrepreneurs have much more success obtaining capital from community banks than Wall Street banks.

Financial services and products have been impaired. Since Dodd-Frank, the number of banks offering free checking has shrunk from 75 percent to 37 percent, the ranks of the unbanked have gone up, and one in five community banks in my home State of Kentucky have disappeared as a result of Dodd-Frank.

Consumer protection? Hardly. Taking away financial services and products, eliminating competition and choice from the marketplace, eliminating free checking, taking away access to credit, that is not protecting consumers. That is hurting consumers. Dodd-Frank is the worst bill for consumers that we could possibly have.

We need the Financial CHOICE Act, which will preserve access to financial services and products and give consumers access to mortgages and access to financial products like credit cards and overdraft protection and home equity loans. All of these services and products are going away because of Dodd-Frank and the busybodies in Washington.

We need to protect consumers. There is nothing wrong with effective regulation, but this is regulation gone awry. It is unaccountable, it is not transparent, it is hurting the American consumers, and it is certainly not adding to financial stability when big banks and Wall Street are getting bigger and our community banks are going away.

□ 1345

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the chief deputy whip of the Republican Conference.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses and families are the backbone of small rural communities like the ones I represent in western North Carolina. The fact is that Dodd-Frank has had a crushing impact both on the ability of families and small businesses to access loans and the financial products that they need and deserve.

Half of what community banks did prior to Dodd-Frank was lending to small businesses. Now it is down to 20 percent of what they do. That is as a result of massive regulations that have come about as a result of Dodd-Frank.

For families, the availability of services that they used to commonly think is acceptable, like free checking and mortgage lending, are significantly diminished or altogether gone for them. Since Dodd-Frank became law, nearly three-quarters of community banks have either left or greatly reduced their mortgage businesses. This is problematic for families. The impact of these changes has hit rural communities like the ones I represent in western North Carolina the hardest.

But it doesn't end there. The law's mandates have driven up the cost of borrowing, making it harder and more expensive for families to access credit or save for important life events like saving for your child's college education.

Mr. Speaker, the Financial CHOICE Act changes much of this. It begins to undo the damage caused by Dodd-Frank by removing onerous Washington mandates, very expensive regulations, by cutting off access to financial products that the American people need and desire.

Additionally, the Financial CHOICE Act actually addresses the plight of small businesses by cleaning up these messy regulations that are unclear, that have made the marketplace less safe and secure for lending and small businesses, and encouraging the use of innovative new forms of capital formation that help businesses grow and prosper.

That means jobs. This bill is directed at growing the American economy, getting us back on our feet, and helping expand prosperity not just to urban or rural areas, but to both, to all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this important bill and get on with the business of legislating.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation, the Financial CHOICE Act. The acronym CHOICE stands for Creating Hope and Opportunity for Investors, Consumers, and

Entrepreneurs. This legislation could be very well entitled the “Make America Grow Again Act.”

I cannot, Mr. Speaker, understate the importance of economic growth and what that means to this country: jobs, better jobs; wages, higher wages; and revenues, more revenues coming into the Federal Treasury as a result of healthy economic growth that will allow us to pay for the critical programs that people in this country depend on, whether seniors, veterans, infrastructure.

You pay for your government with a healthy growing economy. That is not what we have today. We must grow again, especially as we think of these individuals.

Opponents of this legislation are defending a stagnant status quo. They are defending a status quo that has given us the slowest economy since the Great Depression, a status quo responsible for the loss of 1,400 community banks, a status quo that has a community bank or credit union closing every single day, a status quo that has resulted in the noncreation of 650,000 small businesses—that would mean 6.5 million jobs. Six and a half million people who would be paying taxes, paying Social Security taxes, paying Medicare taxes, allowing us to meet the commitments that we have—a status quo that has eliminated free checking, a status quo that is closing branch office banks in small towns in my district, a status quo that allows unaccountable agencies in this town to continue to have too much power and taking away choices from individuals.

This legislation will end too big to fail and will end too small to succeed. Regardless of who you are or where you come from, you should have access to affordable reliable financial services.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time. The points have been made. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

With each passing day, we learn more about the tangled web of conflicts of interest and links to Russia and the Trump administration. Just last week we learned that President Trump's son-in-law, Jared Kushner, attempted to establish a back channel of communications with Russia and the Trump transition team before they were even inaugurated.

Tomorrow, former FBI Director James Comey will likely testify that President Trump attempted to influence the FBI's investigation into possible collusion between his campaign and the Russian Government.

Who knows what further ties to Russia we will uncover from his testimony.

Without President Trump's tax returns, we simply have no way of knowing if he himself has financial ties to Russia, as news reports have suggested. The American people deserve to know whether or not our President has any business dealings with Russia or other foreign governments. It is imperative that we prevent the White House from becoming another arm of the Trump organization.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative ESHOO's bill, H.R. 305, which would require Presidents and major party nominees for the Presidency to release their tax returns.

If the President has nothing to hide, including financial interests or business dealings with Russia, then he should freely release his tax returns to reassure the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of my amendment, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me remind the majority why we enacted the Wall Street reform in the first place.

Our country was plunged into the worst recession since the Great Depression after big Wall Street firms played Russian roulette with our future for years. During the 2008 financial crash, more than 8 million Americans lost their jobs, \$13 trillion in wealth vanished overnight, and 11 million homes were lost.

After years of excesses and dodging regulation, the financial firms were finally brought under control by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. The perverse notion of too big to fail was finally ended, and the financial playing field was tilted back toward consumers.

We have all seen the results of the law in the form of record-setting private sector job growth, millions of new jobs, and historic rates of business lending. It is beyond me why anyone in the world would want to repeal this law and threaten this progress. Instead of doing the bidding of the financial lobbyists who don't really care for the law, we should be acting to uphold the trust of the people who sent us here.

This begins with passing the End Congressional Stock Market Abuse Act to bring an end to the egregious use of exclusive stock deals and foreign initial public offerings by Members of Congress.

The American people must be able to trust what we are doing here and trust that it is right for them without concern that we are using our position to enrich ourselves.

My bill would enhance the STOCK Act, which passed the Chamber virtually unanimously—two “no” votes—in 2012, with provisions that I think we could all agree on: no exclusive stock deals for Members of Congress, no initial public offerings, regardless of where they are offered.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we should be focusing on today, not dismantling a law that has brought financial security to millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule, to oppose the underlying legislation, the “Wrong” CHOICE Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today is not for the big banks. It is not for the bureaucrats and their swanky downtown office at CFPB. This legislation was crafted for the American people, the men and women who work hard every day to earn a living. These individuals want choice in the financial products they can buy. They want healthy community banks. They want lower taxes instead of Wall Street bailouts.

The Financial CHOICE Act was written over the past several years with these people in mind. We will restore hope and opportunity for them.

I thank Chairman HENSARLING and the Financial Services Committee for their hard work on this bill. I thank Chairman SESSIONS for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote “yes” on the resolution, and then to vote “yes” on the underlying bill.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Rule and the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the Previous Question so that the House can vote on my bipartisan legislation, the Presidential Tax Transparency Act.

I first introduced the Presidential Tax Transparency Act exactly one year ago today, along with my Senate counterpart RON WYDEN. This bill would codify the longstanding tradition of presidents disclosing their tax returns. The bill is simple, it is bipartisan, and it has the support of the American people. A recent poll found that 80 percent of Americans believe the President should disclose his tax returns. Earlier today, a petition was delivered to Congress with over 4 million signatures calling on the House to take up this bill.

Since I introduced the Presidential Tax Transparency Act a year ago, candidate Trump and now President Trump has amassed serious ethical lapses, troubling connections to Russian officials, and countless potential conflicts of interest, all while hiding his full financial information from the public.

Mr. Trump is the first president in decades to refuse to disclose his tax returns as a candidate and as President.

We know from his candidate financial disclosure filed last year that the President has 564 financial positions in companies around the world, and owes at least \$300 million in debts to various banks. But there's no way for us to verify these claims without his tax return information.

Disclosure of the President's tax returns would provide answers to many of the troubling questions surrounding this Administration's connections to Russia. In recent weeks, the President pressured the FBI Director to stop investigating Michael Flynn's Russia connections and then fired him. There are near-daily revelations of undisclosed meetings with Russian officials, disclosures of classified information, and more evidence that the Russians sought to directly interfere in our election.

Only with full disclosure of his tax returns will we know the true sources of the President's income, the holders of his debt, and the extent of any business tie to Russia and other foreign countries.

I urge my colleagues to listen to the will of the American people and join our bipartisan effort to exercise Congress's constitutional duty to serve as a check on the Executive Branch. By defeating the Previous Question and voting to approve the Presidential Tax Transparency Act today, this body can start the process of obtaining the truth that the American people want and are entitled to.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 375 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 305) to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Ways and Means and Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after

the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 305.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy impli-

cations. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 374;

Adopting House Resolution 374, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 375; and

Adopting House Resolution 375, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2213, ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 374) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 189, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

YEAS—228

Abraham	Banks (IN)	Bilirakis
Allen	Barletta	Bishop (MI)
Amash	Barr	Bishop (UT)
Amodel	Barton	Black
Arrington	Bergman	Blackburn
Bacon	Biggs	Blum

Bost	Hartzler	Pittenger	Gottheimer	Lujan Grisham,	Rush	Chabot	Hultgren	Reed
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Poe (TX)	Green, Al	M.	Ryan (OH)	Chaffetz	Hunter	Renacci
Brat	Herrera Beutler	Poliquin	Green, Gene	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez	Cheney	Hurd	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Hice, Jody B.	Posey	Grijalva	Lynch	Sarbanes	Coffman	Issa	Roby
Brooks (AL)	Higgins (LA)	Ratcliffe	Gutiérrez	Maloney,	Schakowsky	Cole	Jenkins (KS)	Roe (TN)
Brooks (IN)	Hill	Reed	Hanabusa	Carolyn B.	Schiff	Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Holding	Renacci	Hastings	Maloney, Sean	Schneider	Collins (NY)	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Buck	Hollingsworth	Rice (SC)	Heck	Matsui	Schrader	Comer	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Hudson	Roby	Higgins (NY)	McCollum	Scott (VA)	Comstock	Jones	Rokita
Budd	Huizenga	Roe (TN)	Himes	McEachin	Scott, David	Conaway	Jordan	Rooney, Francis
Burgess	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)	Hoyer	McGovern	Serrano	Cook	Joyce (OH)	Rooney, Thomas
Byrne	Hunter	Rogers (KY)	Huffman	McNerney	Sewell (AL)	Costello (PA)	Katko	J.
Calvert	Hurd	Rohrabacher	Jackson Lee	Meeks	Shea-Porter	Cramer	Kelly (MS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Carter (GA)	Issa	Rooney, Francis	Jayapal	Meng	Sherman	Crawford	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney, Thomas	Jeffries	Moore	Sinema	Culberson	King (IA)	Ross
Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	J.	Johnson (GA)	Moulton	Sires	Curbelo (FL)	King (NY)	Rothfus
Chaffetz	Johnson (LA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (FL)	Slaughter	Davidson	Kinzinger	Rouzer
Cheney	Johnson (OH)	Roskam	Jones	Nadler	Smith (WA)	Davis, Rodney	Knight	Royce (CA)
Coffman	Jordan	Ross	Kaptur	Neal	Soto	Denham	Kustoff (TN)	Russell
Cole	Joyce (OH)	Rothfus	Keating	Nolan	Speier	Dent	Rutherford	Sanford
Collins (GA)	Katko	Rouzer	Kelly (IL)	Norcross	Suozzi	DeSantis	LaHood	Scalise
Collins (NY)	Kelly (MS)	Royce (CA)	Kennedy	O'Halleran	Takano	DesJarlais	Lamborn	Schweikert
Comer	Kelly (PA)	Russell	Khanna	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Lance	Scott, Austin
Comstock	King (IA)	Rutherford	Kihuen	Pallone	Thompson (MS)	Donovan	Duffy	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	King (NY)	Sanford	Kildee	Panetta	Titus	Duncan (SC)	Lewis (MN)	Sessions
Cook	Kinzing	Scalise	Kilmer	Payre	Tonko	Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Costello (PA)	Knight	Schweikert	Kind	Pelosi	Torres	Dunn	Long	Shuster
Cramer	Kustoff (TN)	Scott, Austin	Krishnamoorthi	Perlmutter	Tsongas	Emmer	Loudermilk	Simpson
Crawford	Labrador	Sensenbrenner	Kuster (NH)	Peters	Vargas	Estes (KS)	Love	Smith (MO)
Culberson	LaHood	Sessions	Langevin	Peterson	Veasey	Farenthold	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Curbelo (FL)	LaMalfa	Shimkus	Larsen (WA)	Pingree	Vela	Faso	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Davidson	Lamborn	Shuster	Larson (CT)	Pocan	Velázquez	Ferguson	MacArthur	Smucker
Davis, Rodney	Lance	Simpson	Lawrence	Polis	Viscosky	Fleischmann	Marchant	Stefanik
Denham	Latta	Smith (MO)	Lawson (FL)	Price (NC)	Walz	Marshall	Stewart	Stivers
Dent	Lewis (MN)	Smith (NE)	Lee	Quigley	Wasserman	Flores	Massie	Taylor
DeSantis	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)	Levin	Raskin	Schultz	Fortenberry	Mast	Tenney
DesJarlais	Long	Smucker	Lieu, Ted	Rice (NY)	Waters, Maxine	Fox	McCarthy	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	Loudermilk	Stewart	Lipinski	Richmond	Watson Coleman	McCaul	McClintock	Thornberry
Donovan	Love	Stivers	Loeb	Rosen	Welch	McHenry	Gallagher	Tiberi
Duffy	Lucas	Taylor	Loeb	Ruiz	Wilson (FL)	McKinley	Garrett	Tipton
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Tenney	Lowenthal	Ruppersberger	Yarmuth	McMorris	Gibbs	Trott
Duncan (TN)	MacArthur	Thompson (PA)	Lowey			Rodgers	Gohmert	Turner
Dunn	Marchant	Thornberry				McSally	Goodlatte	Upton
Emmer	Marshall	Tiberi	Aderholt	Engel	Reichert	Meadows	Gosar	Valadao
Estes (KS)	Mast	Tipton	Babin	Gohmert	Rokita	Meehan	Gowdy	Wagner
Farenthold	McCarthy	Trott	Clyburn	Johnson, Sam	Smith (TX)	Messer	Granger	Walberg
Faso	McCaul	Turner	Cummings	Marino		Mitchell	Graves (GA)	Walden
Ferguson	McClintock	Upton	Delaney	Napolitano		Moolenaar	Graves (LA)	Walker
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Valadao				Mooney (WV)	Graves (MO)	Walorski
Fleischmann	McKinley	Wagner				Mullin	Griffith	Walters, Mimi
Flores	McMorris	Walberg				Murphy (PA)	Grothman	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Rodgers	Walden				Newhouse	Guthrie	Webster (FL)
Fox	McSally	Walker				Noem	Harper	Wenstrup
Franks (AZ)	Meadows	Walorski				Nunes	Harris	Westerman
Frelinghuysen	Gaetz	Walters, Mimi				Olson	Hartzler	Williams
Gaetz	Meehan	Weber (TX)				Palazzo	Hensarling	Wilson (SC)
Gallagher	Messer	Webster (FL)				Palmer	Herrera Beutler	Wittman
Garrett	Mitchell	Wenstrup				Paulsen	Hice, Jody B.	Womack
Gibbs	Moolenaar	Westerman				Pearce	Higgins (LA)	Woodall
Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Williams				Perry	Hill	Yoder
Gosar	Mullin	Wilson (SC)				Pittenger	Holding	Yoho
Gowdy	Murphy (PA)	Wittman				Poe (TX)	Hollingsworth	Young (AK)
Granger	Newhouse	Womack				Poliquin	Hudson	Young (IA)
Graves (GA)	Noem	Woodall				Posey	Huizenga	Zeldin
Graves (LA)	Nunes	Yoder				Ratcliffe		
Graves (MO)	Olson	Yoho						
Griffith	Palazzo	Young (AK)						
Grothman	Palmer	Young (IA)						
Guthrie	Paulsen	Zeldin						
Harper	Pearce							
Harris	Perry							

NAYS—189

Adams	Cartwright	DeGette
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Barragán	Castro (TX)	DelBene
Bass	Chu, Judy	Demings
Beatty	Cicilline	DeSaulnier
Bera	Clark (MA)	Deutch
Beyer	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Doggett
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Doyle, Michael
Blunt Rochester	Cohen	F.
Bonamici	Connolly	Ellison
Boyle, Brendan	Conyers	Eshoo
F.	Cooper	Espallat
Brady (PA)	Correa	Esty (CT)
Brown (MD)	Costa	Evans
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Foster
Bustos	Crist	Frankel (FL)
Butterfield	Crowley	Fudge
Capuano	Cuellar	Gabbard
Carbajal	Davis (CA)	Gallego
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny	Garamendi
Carson (IN)	DeFazio	Gonzalez (TX)

Messrs. KILDEE, PANETTA, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 185, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

AYES—231

Abraham	Biggs	Brooks (AL)
Allen	Billirakis	Brooks (IN)
Amash	Bishop (MI)	Buchanan
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Back
Arrington	Black	Bucshon
Bacon	Blackburn	Budd
Banks (IN)	Blum	Burgess
Barletta	Bost	Byrne
Barr	Brady (TX)	Calvert
Barton	Brat	Carter (GA)
Bergman	Bridenstine	Carter (TX)

NOES—185

Adams	Cicilline	Doyle, Michael
Aguilar	Clark (MA)	F.
Barragán	Clarke (NY)	Ellison
Bass	Clay	Eshoo
Beatty	Cleaver	Espallat
Bera	Cohen	Esty (CT)
Beyer	Connolly	Evans
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Foster
Blumenauer	Cooper	Frankel (FL)
Blunt Rochester	Correa	Fudge
Bonamici	Costa	Gabbard
Boyle, Brendan	Courtney	Gallego
F.	Crist	Garamendi
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Gonzalez (TX)
Brown (MD)	Cuellar	Gottheimer
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Bustos	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Butterfield	DeFazio	Gutiérrez
Capuano	DeGette	Hanabusa
Carbajal	DeLauro	Hastings
Cárdenas	DelBene	Heck
Carson (IN)	Demings	Higgins (NY)
Cartwright	DeSaulnier	Himes
Castor (FL)	Deutch	Hoyer
Castro (TX)	Dingell	Huffman
Chu, Judy	Doggett	Jackson Lee

Jayapal	McGovern	Schiff
Jeffries	McNerney	Schneider
Johnson (GA)	Meeks	Schrader
Johnson, E. B.	Meng	Scott (VA)
Kaptur	Moore	Scott, David
Keating	Moulton	Serrano
Kelly (IL)	Murphy (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Kennedy	Nadler	Shea-Porter
Khanna	Neal	Sinema
Kihuen	Nolan	Sires
Kildee	Norcross	Slaughter
Kilmer	O'Halleran	Smith (WA)
Kind	O'Rourke	Soto
Krishnamoorthi	Pallone	Speier
Kuster (NH)	Panetta	Suozzi
Langevin	Pascarella	Swalwell (CA)
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Takano
Lawrence	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Lawson (FL)	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Lee	Peters	Titus
Levin	Peterson	Tonko
Lewis (GA)	Pingree	Torres
Lieu, Ted	Pocan	Tsongas
Lipinski	Polis	Vargas
Loeb sack	Price (NC)	Veasey
Lofgren	Quigley	Vela
Lowenthal	Raskin	Velázquez
Lowey	Rice (NY)	Visclosky
Lujan Grisham,	Richmond	Walz
M.	Rosen	Wasserman
Luján, Ben Ray	Roybal-Allard	Schultz
Lynch	Ruiz	Waters, Maxine
Maloney,	Ruppersberger	Watson Coleman
Carolyn B.	Rush	Welch
Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (FL)
Matsui	Sánchez	Yarmuth
McCollum	Sarbanes	
McEachin	Schakowsky	

NOT VOTING—14

Aderholt	Engel	Napolitano
Babin	Green, Al	Reichert
Clyburn	Johnson, Sam	Sherman
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Smith (TX)
Delaney	Marino	

□ 1427

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately release his tax return information to Congress and the American people.

Whereas, in the United States' system of checks and balances, Congress has responsibility to hold the executive branch of government to a fair and equal standard of transparency ensuring the public interest is placed first;

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed their tax return information to the public;

Whereas, tax returns provide an important baseline of reasonable information including whether the President paid taxes, ownership interests, charitable donations made, and whether tax deductions have been exploited;

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns could help those investigating Russian influence in the 2016 election understand the President's financial ties to the Russian Federation and Russian citizens, including debts owed and whether he shares any partnership interests, equity interests, joint ventures or licensing agreements with Russia or Russians;

Whereas, the President recently fired Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, under whose leadership the FBI was investigating whether the Trump campaign colluded with Russia to influence the 2016 election;

Whereas, President Trump reportedly stated to Russian officials during a White House meeting that he fired Director Comey to ease pressure on the ongoing investigation of Russia's influence in the 2016 election;

Whereas, Senate Russia investigators have requested information from the Treasury Department's criminal investigation division, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, or FinCEN, which handles cases of money laundering, for information related to President Trump, his top officials and campaign aides. FinCEN has been investigating allegations of foreign money-laundering through purchases of U.S. real estate;

Whereas, the President's tax returns would show us whether he has foreign bank accounts and how much profit he receives from his ownership in myriad partnerships;

Whereas, Donald Trump Jr. said The Trump Organization saw money "pouring in from Russia" and that "Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets";

Whereas, Congress gave itself the authority to review an individual's tax returns to investigate and reveal possible conflicts of interest of executive branch officials involved dating back to the Teapot Dome scandal;

Whereas, it has been reported that federal prosecutors have issued grand jury subpoenas to associates of former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn seeking business records as part of the ongoing probe into Russian involvement in the 2016 election;

Whereas, according to his 2016 candidate filing with the Federal Election Commission, the President has 564 financial positions in companies located in the United States and around the world;

Whereas, against the advice of ethics attorneys and the Office of Government Ethics, the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his businesses, and can still withdraw funds at any time from the trust of which he is the sole beneficiary;

Whereas, the Emoluments Clause was included in the U.S. Constitution for the express purpose of preventing federal officials from accepting any

"present, Emolument, Office, or Title . . . from any King, Prince, or foreign state";

Whereas, the Chairmen of the Ways and Means Committee, Joint Committee on Taxation, and Senate Finance Committee have the authority to request the President's tax returns under section 6103 of the Tax Code;

Whereas, the Joint Committee on Taxation reviewed the tax returns of President Richard Nixon in 1974 and made the information public;

Whereas, the Ways and Means Committee used IRC 6103 authority in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas, Director Comey has testified that tax returns are a common tool in investigations because they can show income and motives;

Whereas, the American people have the right to know whether or not their President is operating under conflicts of interest related to international affairs, tax reform, government contracts, or otherwise;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the House of Representatives shall:

One, immediately request the tax return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015 for review in closed executive session by the Committee on Ways and Means, as provided under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code, and vote to report the information therein to the full House of Representatives;

Two, support transparency in government and the longstanding tradition of Presidents and Presidential candidates disclosing their tax returns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Massachusetts will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, FINANCIAL CHOICE ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 375) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to create

hope and opportunity for investors, consumers, and entrepreneurs by ending bailouts and Too Big to Fail, holding Washington and Wall Street accountable, eliminating red tape to increase access to capital and credit, and repealing the provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act that make America less prosperous, less stable, and less free, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 185, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—228

Abraham	Flores	Mast
Allen	Fortenberry	McCarthy
Amash	Fox	McCaul
Amodei	Franks (AZ)	McClintock
Arrington	Frelinghuysen	McHenry
Bacon	Gaetz	McKinley
Banks (IN)	Gallagher	McMorris
Barletta	Garrett	Rodgers
Barr	Gibbs	McSally
Barton	Gohmert	Meadows
Bergman	Goodlatte	Meehan
Biggs	Gosar	Messer
Bilirakis	Gowdy	Mitchell
Bishop (MI)	Granger	Moolenaar
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)
Black	Graves (LA)	Mullin
Blackburn	Graves (MO)	Murphy (PA)
Blum	Griffith	Newhouse
Bost	Grothman	Noem
Brat	Guthrie	Nunes
Bridenstine	Harper	Olson
Brooks (AL)	Harris	Palazzo
Brooks (IN)	Hartzler	Palmer
Buchanan	Hensarling	Paulsen
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Pearce
Bucshon	Hice, Jody B.	Perry
Budd	Higgins (LA)	Peterson
Burgess	Hill	Pittenger
Byrne	Holding	Poe (TX)
Calvert	Hollingsworth	Poliquin
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Posey
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Ratcliffe
Chabot	Hultgren	Reed
Chaffetz	Hunter	Renacci
Cheney	Hurd	Rice (SC)
Coffman	Issa	Roby
Cole	Jenkins (KS)	Roe (TN)
Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)
Collins (NY)	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Comer	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Comstock	Jordan	Rokita
Conaway	Joyce (OH)	Rooney, Francis
Cook	Katko	Ros-Lehtinen
Costello (PA)	Kelly (MS)	Roskam
Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Crawford	King (IA)	Rothfus
Culberson	King (NY)	Rouzer
Curbelo (FL)	Kinzing	Royce (CA)
Davidson	Knight	Russell
Davis, Rodney	Kustoff (TN)	Rutherford
Denham	Labrador	Sanford
Dent	LaHood	Scalise
DeSantis	LaMalfa	Schweikert
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Donovan	Latta	Sessions
Duffy	Lewis (MN)	Shimkus
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Shuster
Duncan (TN)	Long	Simpson
Dunn	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
Emmer	Love	Smith (NE)
Estes (KS)	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Smucker
Faso	MacArthur	Stefanik
Ferguson	Marchant	Stewart
Fitzpatrick	Marshall	Stivers
Fleischmann	Massie	Taylor

Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner

Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—185

Adams
Agullar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego

Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan

Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panteta
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suzuki
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Stated for:

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 290.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 289 and "nay" on rollcall No. 290.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I missed the following votes:

1. H. Res. 374, Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2213. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this motion.

2. Motion on ordering the Previous Question on the Rule. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 188, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

YEAS—231

Abraham	Denham	Hurd
Allen	Dent	Issa
Amash	DeSantis	Jenkins (KS)
Amodei	DesJarlais	Jenkins (WV)
Arrington	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (LA)
Bacon	Donovan	Johnson (OH)
Banks (IN)	Duffy	Jordan
Barletta	Duncan (SC)	Joyce (OH)
Barr	Duncan (TN)	Katko
Barton	Dunn	Keating
Bergman	Emmer	Kelly (MS)
Biggs	Estes (KS)	Kelly (PA)
Bilirakis	Farenthold	King (IA)
Bishop (MI)	Faso	King (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Ferguson	Kinzing
Black	Fitzpatrick	Knight
Blackburn	Fleischmann	Kustoff (TN)
Blum	Flores	Labrador
Bost	Fortenberry	LaHood
Brady (TX)	Fox	LaMalfa
Brat	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
Bridenstine	Frelinghuysen	Lance
Brooks (AL)	Gaetz	Latta
Brooks (IN)	Gallagher	Lewis (MN)
Buchanan	Garrett	LoBiondo
Buck	Gibbs	Long
Bucshon	Gohmert	Loudermilk
Budd	Goodlatte	Love
Burgess	Gosar	Lucas
Byrne	Gowdy	Luetkemeyer
Calvert	Granger	MacArthur
Carter (GA)	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Carter (TX)	Graves (LA)	Marshall
Chabot	Graves (MO)	Massie
Chaffetz	Griffith	Mast
Cheney	Grothman	McCarthy
Coffman	Guthrie	McCaul
Cole	Harper	McClintock
Collins (GA)	Harris	McHenry
Collins (NY)	Hartzler	McKinley
Comer	Hensarling	McMorris
Comstock	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers
Conaway	Hice, Jody B.	McSally
Cook	Higgins (LA)	Meadows
Costello (PA)	Hill	Meehan
Cramer	Holding	Messer
Crawford	Hollingsworth	Mitchell
Culberson	Hudson	Moolenaar
Curbelo (FL)	Huizenga	Mooney (WV)
Davidson	Hultgren	Mullin
Davis, Rodney	Hunter	Murphy (PA)

NOT VOTING—17

Aderholt	Engel	Reichert
Babin	Green, Al	Rooney, Thomas
Brady (TX)	Johnson, Sam	J.
Clyburn	Marino	Sherman
Cummings	Napolitano	Smith (TX)
Ellison	Pelosi	Woodall

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1443

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry

Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt
Babin
Clyburn
Cummings
Engel
Johnson, Sam
Marino
McEachin
Napolitano
Reichert
Smith (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1449

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 291 on H.R. 10, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yea” when I should have voted “nay.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 288, No. 289, No. 290, and No. 291 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule—Providing for consideration of H.R. 2213. I would have voted “no” on H. Res. 374—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2213—Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017. I would have voted “nay” on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 10. I would have voted “nay” on H. Res. 375—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 10—Financial CHOICE Act of 2017.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

NATIONAL GEORGE C. MARSHALL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 33) designating the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 33

Whereas General George C. Marshall served as Army Chief of Staff during World War II, Special Ambassador to China, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense;

Whereas General George C. Marshall was promoted to General of the Army in 1944, one

of only five Army five-star generals in the history of the United States;

Whereas General George C. Marshall was awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 1946 for his military strategy and vital role during World War II;

Whereas General George C. Marshall was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1953 for developing the European economic recovery strategy known as the Marshall Plan;

Whereas the George C. Marshall Foundation was established in 1953 and is devoted to preserving the legacy of General George C. Marshall through educational scholarship programs and facilities;

Whereas the George C. Marshall Foundation opened the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in 1964 in Lexington, Virginia, on the post of the Virginia Military Institute, which is the alma mater of General George C. Marshall;

Whereas the George C. Marshall Museum educates the public about the military and diplomatic contributions of General George C. Marshall through extensive exhibits; and

Whereas the George C. Marshall Research Library maintains the most comprehensive collection of records documenting the life and leadership of General George C. Marshall: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress designates the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 33.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 33, a resolution that designates the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

George C. Marshall was one of America's most distinguished soldiers, a dedicated statesman, and a genuine peacemaker. General Marshall served as Army Chief of Staff during World War II, Special Ambassador to China, and Secretaries of both the Departments of State and Defense. He was promoted to General of the Army in 1944—one of only nine individuals in our Nation's history to rise to the rank of a five-star officer—and was also awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 1946.

In addition, General Marshall was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1953

NAYS—188

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego

Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gotthelmer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran

O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suo zzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

for developing the European economic recovery strategy known as the Marshall Plan, which was essential to bringing peace to the postwar European continent.

To honor the legacy of such an accomplished man, the George C. Marshall Foundation was created in 1953, to pay tribute to General Marshall's contributions to our Nation and the world during some of the most perilous and tumultuous times of the 20th century. The Marshall Foundation preserves this legacy through educational facilities and scholarship programs.

The George C. Marshall Foundation opened the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in 1964, in Lexington, Virginia, on the post of the Virginia Military Institute, the alma mater of General Marshall. The library provides scholars with a documented record of the life of General Marshall and his public service, and the museum shares his inspiring story with visitors through exhibitions, artifacts, and educational programs.

General Marshall's contributions to our Nation and our world cannot be overstated, and I hope to see this resolution adopted to designate the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

Both institutions work tirelessly to highlight and share General Marshall's work and service, and this is a fitting tribute to a man who spent a lifetime faithfully and courageously serving his country at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 33, designating the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library. I appreciate my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), for sponsoring the resolution and note that the entire Virginia delegation has signed on as original co-sponsors.

General George C. Marshall is a national hero, a distinguished public servant, and treasured piece of Virginia's history. Located in Lexington, Virginia, the George C. Marshall Museum and Library are located on the campus of the Virginia Military Institute, his alma mater.

General Marshall served our country as the Chief of Staff during World War II, Special Ambassador to China, Secretary of State, president of the Red Cross, Secretary of Defense, and is one of only five Army five-star generals in the United States.

After World War II, General Marshall was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1953, for his role in developing the European Recovery Program better known as the Marshall Plan. This week we are commemorating the 70th anniversary of the Marshall Plan speech given on June 5, 1947, at Harvard University. The Marshall Plan contributed to European integration and growth in the aftermath of World War II.

As the holder of the George C. Marshall papers and with a mission to collect, preserve, and share information regarding the life and career of General Marshall, it is apt to make this institution the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

Mr. Speaker, considering the important place in our Nation's history that General Marshall holds, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of H. Con. Res. 33. This resolution would designate the George C. Marshall Museum and the George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

I would like to thank Chairwoman FOXX, Ranking Member SCOTT, and Mr. BRAT for their work in bringing this legislation to the floor today.

It is only fitting that we consider this resolution on the week of the 70th anniversary of George C. Marshall's speech at Harvard University where he proposed a comprehensive foreign assistance program—later coined as the Marshall Plan—to help rebuild the war-torn and devastated economies in Western Europe after World War II.

General George Catlett Marshall dedicated his life to public service—serving honorably in the United States Army, as Army Chief of Staff during World War II, Special Ambassador to China, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense. He was one of only five five-star generals ever to serve in our military.

From his allied plan to storm the beaches of Normandy to the Marshall Plan, his leadership changed the world. The history of the United States and the global community would be a different place if not for the contributions of General Marshall.

At the recommendation of former President Harry Truman, the Marshall Foundation was established in 1953. On May 23, 1964, the Marshall Museum and Library was dedicated on the post of the Virginia Military Institute—General Marshall's alma mater.

□ 1500

For over 50 years, the Marshall Foundation has devoted its mission to educating the public about the important contributions of General Marshall.

The museum has five extensive exhibits and houses General Marshall's 1953 Nobel Peace Prize. The research library collects, preserves, and shares the largest collection of documents pertaining to General Marshall's life.

Just last year, the Marshall Foundation reached a huge milestone with the completion of the Papers of George Catlett Marshall. This project began in 1977 with a goal to create a published record of every document that General Marshall produced. The final project consists of 7 volumes and includes 4,260 documents spanning over 5,666 pages.

In addition to its extensive research work, the Marshall Foundation provides educational opportunities for college students and future military leaders.

The Marshall Undergraduate Scholars program sends college history students to the Marshall Foundation to conduct primary research in the library's archives. The Marshall Army ROTC Award Seminar also provides the top ROTC cadet at each college in the United States the opportunity to participate in a national security conference with fellow award recipients and current Army leaders. The Marshall-Arnold Air Force ROTC Award Seminar provides a similar opportunity to top senior cadets at each college with an Air Force ROTC program.

Two years ago, the Marshall Foundation began the Marshall Legacy Series—this multiyear series of exhibits, lectures, and events to showcase General Marshall's contributions during the 20th century, and connects those contributions to today's world.

This is just a snapshot of the important work the Marshall Foundation conducts to honor and preserve the legacy of General Marshall. I am honored to have such a distinguished institution in my district, the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia.

General Marshall once said: "Sincerity, integrity, and tolerance are, to my mind, the first requirements of many to a fine, strong character."

I applaud the Marshall Foundation's work in sharing Marshall's vision and character with a new generation of Americans. I urge passage of this resolution to honor one of America's most sincere and distinguished public servants by congressionally designating the museum and library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my Virginia colleagues for their leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased we are advancing a bipartisan proposal today, one that means a great deal to the people in my home State of Virginia, to

designate the George C. Marshall Museum and Library as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library. We do this to honor a great American hero and his enduring legacy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 33.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 374, I call up the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 374, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2213

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. HIRING FLEXIBILITY.

Section 3 of the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-376; 6 U.S.C. 221) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsections:

“(b) **WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection may waive the application of subsection (a)(1) in the following circumstances:

“(1) In the case of a current, full-time law enforcement officer employed by a State or local law enforcement agency, if such officer—

“(A) has served as a law enforcement officer for not fewer than three years with no break in service;

“(B) is authorized by law to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of, or the incarceration of any person for, any violation of law, and has statutory powers for arrest or apprehension;

“(C) is not currently under investigation, has not been found to have engaged in criminal activity or serious misconduct, has not resigned from a law enforcement officer position under investigation or in lieu of termination, and has not been dismissed from a law enforcement officer position; and

“(D) has, within the past ten years, successfully completed a polygraph examination as a

condition of employment with such officer’s current law enforcement agency.

“(2) In the case of a current, full-time law enforcement officer employed by a Federal law enforcement agency, if such officer—

“(A) has served as a law enforcement officer for not fewer than three years with no break in service;

“(B) has authority to make arrests, conduct investigations, conduct searches, make seizures, carry firearms, and serve orders, warrants, and other processes;

“(C) is not currently under investigation, has not been found to have engaged in criminal activity or serious misconduct, has not resigned from a law enforcement officer position under investigation or in lieu of termination, and has not been dismissed from a law enforcement officer position; and

“(D) holds a current Tier 4 background investigation or current Tier 5 background investigation.

“(3) In the case of an individual who is a member of the Armed Forces (or a reserve component thereof) or a veteran, if such individual—

“(A) has served in the Armed Forces for not fewer than three years;

“(B) holds, or has held within the past five years, a Secret, Top Secret, or Top Secret / Sensitive Compartmented Information clearance;

“(C) holds, or has undergone within the past five years, a current Tier 4 background investigation or current Tier 5 background investigation;

“(D) received, or is eligible to receive, an honorable discharge from service in the Armed Forces and has not engaged in criminal activity or committed a serious military or civil offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice; and

“(E) was not granted any waivers to obtain the clearance referred to subparagraph (B).

“(c) **TERMINATION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—The authority to issue a waiver under subsection (b) shall terminate on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.”.

SEC. 3. SUPPLEMENTAL COMMISSIONER AUTHORITY AND DEFINITIONS.

(a) **SUPPLEMENTAL COMMISSIONER AUTHORITY.**—Section 4 of the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-376) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 4. SUPPLEMENTAL COMMISSIONER AUTHORITY.

“(a) **NON-EXEMPTION.**—An individual who receives a waiver under subsection (b) of section 3 is not exempt from other hiring requirements relating to suitability for employment and eligibility to hold a national security designated position, as determined by the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(b) **BACKGROUND INVESTIGATIONS.**—Any individual who receives a waiver under subsection (b) of section 3 who holds a current Tier 4 background investigation shall be subject to a Tier 5 background investigation.

“(c) **ADMINISTRATION OF POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION.**—The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection is authorized to administer a polygraph examination to an applicant or employee who is eligible for or receives a waiver under subsection (b) of section 3 if information is discovered prior to the completion of a background investigation that results in a determination that a polygraph examination is necessary to make a final determination regarding suitability for employment or continued employment, as the case may be.”.

(b) **REPORT.**—The Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 5. REPORTING.

“Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section and every year for the

next four years thereafter, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall provide the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate information on the number, disaggregated with respect to each of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (b) of section 3, of waivers requested, granted, and denied, and the reasons for any such denial, and the final outcome of the application for employment at issue. Such information shall also include the number of instances a polygraph examination was administered under the conditions described in subsection (c) of section 4, the result of such examination, and the final outcome of the application for employment at issue.”.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—The Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010, as amended by subsection (b) of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

“In this Act:

“(1) **LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term ‘law enforcement officer’ has the meaning given such term in sections 8331(20) and 8401(17) of title 5, United States Code.

“(2) **VETERAN.**—The term ‘veteran’ has the meaning given such term in section 101(2) of title 38, United States Code.

“(3) **SERIOUS MILITARY OR CIVIL OFFENSE.**—The term ‘serious military or civil offense’ means an offense for which—

“(A) a member of the Armed Forces may be discharged or separated from service in the Armed Forces; and

“(B) a punitive discharge is, or would be, authorized for the same or a closely related offense under the Manual for Court-Martial, as pursuant to Army Regulation 635-200 chapter 14-12.

“(4) **TIER 4; TIER 5.**—The terms ‘Tier 4’ and ‘Tier 5’ with respect to background investigations have the meaning given such terms under the 2012 Federal Investigative Standards.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VELA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 2213.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDING ON AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2213, ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting amendment No. 1 to H.R. 2213 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and in support of the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, the failed immigration policies of the previous administration

have kept our borders open, weakened our national security, and put millions of American lives at risk from an increasing number of grave and growing threats. These threats come from drug cartels, gang members, human traffickers, and international terrorists who seek to do our country harm.

Fortunately, we now have a partner in the White House who understands that we cannot rely on the oceans or other natural boundaries alone to separate us from those looking to infiltrate our homeland.

This morning, I was once again pleased to welcome Secretary Kelly before the Committee on Homeland Security and listen to him articulate the importance of border security to the Trump administration.

We know we need a 21st century border to meet 21st century threats. Sadly, every few days, we hear a story on the news that reminds us of the dangerous consequences of Washington's inability to achieve that goal.

As a former Federal prosecutor and the chief of counterterrorism and national security in the U.S. Attorney's Office in Texas, I have seen how people take advantage of our Nation's open borders. Over time, those who are determined to come here illegally become agile. They adapt to the measures that we take to stop them. It is obvious that we need a new approach.

When it comes to strengthening our borders, additional funds and new technology will be necessary. However, our strongest assets are the courageous men and women who serve as Border Patrol agents and Customs and Border Protection officers. These patriots put their lives on the line every single day to protect us while also safeguarding our economic relationships that boost American jobs and grow American businesses.

However, we are almost 1,800 Border Patrol agents and 1,000 CBP officers short of having the force that we need to keep our borders secure. Our forces are stretched thin and our efforts to recruit additional officers and agents have slowed due to strict requirements for new applicants. Currently, it takes an average of 113 applicants to hire just one new officer or agent. This is a major problem that must be addressed.

This legislation offers a solution by providing the CBP Commissioner with the flexibility to hire State and local law enforcement officers who have already served for 3 years without a break in service, are not under investigation or have been found guilty of misconduct, and have previously passed a law enforcement polygraph exam.

It also provides the CBP Commissioner with the authority to hire members and veterans of the armed services who have held security clearances and who have already completed a robust background check.

To put it simply, this bill will make it easier for some of America's finest law enforcement officers and soldiers to help protect our borders.

As drugs continue to creep into our neighborhoods and wreak havoc on our communities and terrorists advance their plans to attack our country and disrupt our way of life, we must make sure we have an adequate force to protect our borders.

This needs to be a priority. This should not be a partisan issue. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this bill passed unanimously out of my committee. Members from both parties should come together, as they did at the committee level, as Mr. VELA did, and support this effort.

American families deserve to know that we are doing everything we can to keep our homeland safe. This legislation gives us a chance to do just that.

I would like to thank my colleague and chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, Congresswoman MCSALLY from Arizona, for all of her hard work on this bill. As a Representative from a district along our Southern border, she fully understands more than any Member the seriousness of this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

I have forcefully rejected the President's mass deportation efforts from the beginning, and I will continue to do so.

Many of us have appropriately criticized our President for wrongfully attributing the criminal actions of a few undocumented individuals to the entire undocumented population. Equally here, it would be hypocritical to attribute the criminal actions of a few rogue agents to the hardworking men and women that protect our Nation every day and who uphold the ethical standards that we should expect.

The Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017 will assist CBP in fulfilling its mission to facilitate legitimate trade and travel at our ports of entry.

According to the Joint Economic Committee, the volume of commerce crossing our borders has more than tripled in the last 25 years. Currently, 1.1 million people and \$5.9 billion in goods enter and exit the U.S. at 328 U.S. ports of entry every day.

In fiscal year 2016, CBP officers and agents seized and/or disrupted more than 3.3 million pounds of narcotics across the country, including approximately 46,000 pounds of methamphetamine, 48,000 pounds of heroin, and 440 pounds of fentanyl, keeping these harmful drugs off of our streets.

CBP has struggled with recruiting the officers and agents to fill its front-line ranks at our Nation's air, land, and seaports. Currently, there are 1,400 unfilled positions within the CBP workforce at our Nation's ports of entry. Delays and short staffing at our ports of entry costs the United States economy up to \$5.8 billion each year.

Under this bill, the CBP Commissioner may, on a case-by-case basis, exempt certain veterans and State and local law enforcement officers who meet specific standards, such as holding a security clearance and previously passing a polygraph, from having to take the CBP polygraph as a part of the hiring process. All other vetting requirements in the 12-step hiring process for these applicants will still apply.

This bill simply grants CBP limited authority to waive a single step in its robust vetting process for qualifying applicants who hold security clearances or who have successfully completed polygraphs.

I would like to thank Chairman MCCAUL, Ranking Member THOMPSON, and Chairwoman MCSALLY for their work on this bill. I also thank Chairman MCCAUL and Chairwoman MCSALLY by accepting changes offered by the minority to improve this bill.

Ranking Member THOMPSON offered an amendment in committee to require CBP to report to Congress how many of these waivers are requested, granted, and denied; the reasons for these denials; as well as whether these applicants are ultimately hired or not.

□ 1515

Additionally, it requires CBP to inform Congress on the number of applicants who are granted a waiver but undergo a polygraph examination anyway based on information discovered during their background investigation. Congress must remain vigilant about how the waiver authority is used, and this amendment will ensure we have the information to do so.

Mr. Speaker, in short, the men and women on the front lines of CBP need our help. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), the sponsor of the bill and the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bill, H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection has two key missions: securing the border and facilitating cross-border commerce that powers the Nation's economic growth. In order to accomplish those missions, they need enough agents and officers to be able to make arrests, interdict drug loads, screen

cargo from countries of concern, or move legitimate commerce and passengers through an air, land, and sea port of entry.

U.S. Border Patrol agents and CBP officers are, at the end of the day, the most important border security and trade resource we have. Unfortunately, they are in short supply these days, which has created a national security and economic vulnerability that this Congress must address.

CBP is critically understaffed and remains well below its congressionally mandated staffing levels by more than 1,000 CBP officers and 1,800 border patrol agents. The manpower shortage is getting worse. We are losing ground every single month, and there is no end in sight as we continue to lose experienced agents and officers through attrition without the ability to efficiently hire new ones. For example, CBP has invested \$200 million in a port of entry infrastructure in Arizona, alone, over the last 8 years, but there is simply not enough staff to open up every lane that is available.

I want to emphasize this point: officer and agent shortages did not happen overnight. The U.S. Border Patrol has not met its congressionally mandated hiring numbers since fiscal year 2014, and CBP has been losing officers to man our ports since early in fiscal year 2016.

At the current hiring rate, approximately 113 applicants go through the process in order to hire a single officer or agent. That means CBP needs to have hundreds of thousands of people apply just to meet their current needs. We need more manpower to properly secure our border, screen passengers at our Nation's airports who arrive from overseas, and facilitate cross-border commerce that powers our economy.

There are several underlying issues that are responsible for these current staffing woes. For starters, it takes more than 292 days for these 12 distinct steps, on average, to hire a new officer or agent. And even with the newer expedited system that is supposed to condense these steps into just several days, it still takes an average of 160 days to complete the process. Very few people can wait somewhere between 6 months to a year for a job. We are losing very experienced and already vetted applicants.

Several years ago, the committee began working directly with the previous administration to find solutions to these staffing problems and the hiring process. The bill under consideration today represents the fruits of that bipartisan work and, as a result, was passed out of the Homeland Security Committee unanimously last month.

My bill allows the Commissioner of CBP to waive the polygraph requirement for current State and local law enforcement officers who have already

passed a polygraph examination, Federal law enforcement officers who have already passed a stringent background investigation, and veterans with at least 3 consecutive years in the military who have held a security clearance and passed a background check.

These exemptions are purely discretionary, not mandatory. If there is something in an applicant's history or background that causes CBP concern, they can still use the polygraph exam to resolve those questions.

These small changes will provide CBP with immediate relief so they are able to quickly, yet judiciously, hire officers and agents from a pool of qualified applicants who already maintain the public's trust and put their lives on the line for our security and our safety on a daily basis.

I want to make my position very clear. Everyone who applies to be a CBP officer or Border Patrol agent should be thoroughly vetted to ensure there are no integrity issues in their background and they are not at risk for corruption. That is how the current system operates, and nothing in this bill would change that. That is why Congress required polygraph examinations and stringent background checks for agents in the first place.

I fully support the use of polygraph examinations to weed out people who are unfit to wear the badge or carry a gun, but we can and should make these very narrow, sensible, and straightforward allowances to permit CBP to hire those who have already been vetted and proven by their service in uniform that they are suitable to become agents and officers.

The National Treasury Employees Union, who represent the officers who are stationed at the ports of entry; the Non Commissioned Officers Association, who represent many of our veterans; the Fraternal Order of Police; the Border Trade Alliance; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and the Department of Homeland Security all support this bill. Indeed, this is a rare bill that has united both management and labor.

I include these letters of support in the RECORD.

THE NATIONAL TREASURY
EMPLOYEES UNION,
June 5, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Officers at the Department of Homeland Security who are stationed at 328 land, sea and air ports of entry represented by the National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), I ask you to vote YES on H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017. This legislation would expand the applicant pool for vacant CBP Officer positions by allowing the CBP Commissioner to waive polygraph requirements for certain categories of job applicants.

NTEU continues to have significant concerns about the slow pace of hiring at CBP. CBP has struggled to fill 2,000 Officer positions that Congress authorized in 2014. A

major impediment to fulfilling CBP's hiring goal is that CBP is the only federal agency with a congressional mandate that all frontline officer applicants receive a polygraph test. Two out of three applicants fail its polygraph—about 65 percent—more than double the average rate of eight law enforcement agencies according to data provided to the Associated Press. The eight law enforcement agencies that supplied this information showed an average failure rate of 28 percent. As an example, the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration failed 36 percent of applicants in the past two years.

NTEU does not seek to reduce the standards used by CBP in their hiring process, but believes that there is a problem with how the polygraph is currently administered. We have asked CBP to review its current polygraph policy to understand why CBP is failing applicants at a much higher rate than individuals applying to work at other federal law enforcement agencies. H.R. 2213 expands the authority to waive polygraph examinations for certain veterans and law enforcement officers, while also safeguarding CBP's right to administer the polygraph for these exempted applicants if a need arises.

Improving the current polygraph program should help in expediting the CBP Officer hiring process so that the existing 1,400 vacancies can be filled allowing CBP to move forward with funding and hiring the 2,107 additional Officers required by CBP's Workforce Staffing Model. NTEU also recommends that CBP allow immediate polygraph re-testing opportunities to those with a No Opinion or Inconclusive result, including those with a No Opinion Counter Measures finding.

NTEU asks you to vote YES on H.R. 2213.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. REARDON,
National President.

NON COMMISSIONED OFFICERS
ASSOCIATION,
June 6, 2017.

Hon. RON JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security
and Governmental Affairs, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: On behalf of the Non-Commissioned Officers Association (NCOA), a Veteran Service Organization of over 55,000 members, I am writing to offer support for the "Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017," which was ordered reported as S. 595 by the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on May 17, 2017, and reported as H.R. 2213 by the House Homeland Security Committee on May 16, 2017. NCOA supports the goal of increasing border security through easing polygraph requirements for Veterans who have already taken a polygraph and are interested in serving the border security mission.

NCOA has been working with CBP to help fulfill its hiring and recruiting mission. CBP is faced with numerous challenges—many of which can be assisted by looking to our nation's transitioning Veterans. NCOA has had an extensive and national transition program for our NCOs for decades and believe that our Veterans are qualified, trained, and committed to the mission of protecting our nation.

NCOA supports amendments to the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 (Pub. L. No. 111-376), which fosters integrity in the workplace by requiring that all CBP applicants for law enforcement positions receive a polygraph examination before being offered employment. The amendments proposed by S.

595 and H.R. 2213 would enable CBP to develop a risk-based approach to extend polygraph waiver eligibility to an applicant who falls under one of three categories and satisfies specific criteria including but not limited to:

1. A Current State or Local Law Enforcement Officer with a successfully completed polygraph examination with the applicant's law enforcement agency, at least three consecutive years employed as a fully authorized law enforcement officer, and no history of criminal activity or serious misconduct;

2. A Current Federal Law Enforcement Officer with at least three consecutive years employed as a fully authorized federal law enforcement officer, a current/in-scope Tier 4 Background Investigation or a Tier 5 Single Scope Background Investigation, and no history of criminal activity or serious misconduct; or

3. A Transitioning Military Service Member, Veteran, or Member of the Reserves or National Guard who has at least four years of service in the military, no history of criminal activity or serious misconduct, and who holds or has held (within the past five years) a Secret, Top Secret, or Top Secret/Sensitive Compartmented Information clearance and was not granted any waivers to obtain that clearance.

NCOA believes the flexibility to waive the polygraph for the Veteran categories outlined in the amendment makes sense and would potentially expedite their onboarding to a position in border patrol. Currently, the onboarding process simply takes too long and CBP loses great candidates, and Veterans go elsewhere.

We also strongly disagree with objections to this small alteration to the polygraph policies—we are talking about Veterans and others who have already committed their lives to protecting the nation and its citizens and to say otherwise is pure fallacy and dirty politics.

Thank you for your attention and for your efforts to help secure our borders and enable transitioning Veterans to find meaningful employment.

Respectfully,

JON OSTROWSKI,
BMCS (ret.) U.S. Coast Guard,
Executive Director, NCOA.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER
OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES MCCARTHY, PELOSI AND HOYER: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for H.R. 2213, the "Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act," and to urge the House to pass it.

The pace of hiring at the Customs and Border Protection in the U.S. Department of Homeland Security has been problematic for several years. This legislation would expand the applicant front line officers pool to fill vacant officer positions at CBP by allowing the Commissioner to waive the polygraph re-

quirements in certain cases. The CBP is one of the few Federal agencies that requires all its front-line officers to pass a polygraph—a test that two of three applicants will fail. This rate of failure is considerably higher than other Federal law enforcement agencies and the FOP strongly recommends that how these tests are administered be reviewed to determine why this is the case.

The bill will give the CBP greater flexibility by allowing the polygraph test to be waived for certain veterans and law enforcement officers. This will enable the CBP to fill its positions without compromising the integrity of their hiring process.

On behalf of the more than 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, we are pleased to support this legislation and look forward to its passage in the House. If I can be of any further assistance on this or any other issue, please do not hesitate to contact me or my Senior Advisor Jim Pasco in my Washington, D.C. office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

BORDER TRADE ALLIANCE,
Washington, DC, June 7, 2017.

Hon. MARTHA MCSALLY,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCSALLY: The Border Trade Alliance (BTA) supports your legislation, H.R. 2213, The Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017, which contains important reforms to the polygraph examination process employed in the recruitment of Customs and Border Protection officers.

For over 30 years, the BTA has sought to support public policies that encourage robust cross-border trade while ensuring our ports of entry have the resources necessary to process that trade securely and efficiently. Adequate port staffing is critical to realizing those goals.

We share your belief that CBP's ability to recruit new officers into its ranks is hamstrung by a polygraph screening that is overly burdensome and not properly aligned with the needs of today's CBP.

CBP's failure to meet Congress' calls for hiring 2,000 new officers must be addressed swiftly, or our borders will continue to be characterized by long delays and congestion.

Your bill wisely seeks to streamline the recruitment process by waving the existing polygraph exam process for current state or local law enforcement officers in good standing if they have already completed a polygraph examination as a condition of their employment or, in the case of federal law enforcement officials, have already completed a Tier 4 or 5 background investigation. In the case of members of the military or veterans, your bill allows the polygraph exam to be waived for individuals who have received high level security clearances. Finally, your legislation contains an added level of security by permitting CBP to administer a polygraph exam in those cases where a background investigation indicates a polygraph examination is necessary to make a final determination regarding an applicant's suitability for employment or an employee's continued employment.

The reforms contained in your legislation are important as we seek new ways to attract talented, qualified individuals into CBP careers with as few redundant, bureaucratic hurdles as possible, while still strengthening border security and ensuring the highest degree of confidence in new recruits.

The Border Trade Alliance is proud to support your legislation and we commend you for working in a bipartisan fashion. Our organization stands ready to assist you in your efforts to advance this bill through to passage.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL L. JONES,
Chairman.
BRITTON CLARKE,
President.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, May 4, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. BENNIE THOMPSON,
Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL AND RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports H.R. 2213, the "Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017." This legislation is a positive development for national security, veterans' employment, and facilitating trade and travel as it addresses the shortage of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) officers at our borders.

Over the past several years, attempts have been made to increase the ranks of CBP officers. It is clear from CBP's own staffing model that additional resources are needed to adequately secure the homeland and facilitate legitimate trade and travel. This legislation would provide the flexibility to expedite the hiring process for qualified individuals who have already proven themselves through service in local law enforcement or the military.

To meet the staffing levels set by Congress, this legislation is critical and would help on both the national security and economic fronts. A recent study found that every batch of 33 CBP officers hired could lead to an increase in GDP of \$61.8 million and employment gains of 1,053 jobs in the U.S.

The Chamber appreciates the Committee's continued engagement to ensure that our borders have the appropriate resources and looks forward to advancing this bipartisan legislation.

Sincerely,

NEIL L. BRADLEY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 2, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: On behalf of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), I am writing to offer support for the "Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017," which was ordered reported as S. 595 by the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on May 17, 2017, and reported as H.R. 2213 by the House Homeland Security Committee on May 16, 2017. DHS supports the goal of increasing border security through balanced investments in infrastructure, technology, and personnel.

CBP has worked aggressively during the past two years to implement its multifaceted recruitment strategy and execute large-scale improvements to its frontline hiring process. While these efforts have led to considerable progress in many areas, CBP is examining

every aspect of its pre-employment hiring process to identify areas in which additional improvements can be made. CBP's challenges in recruitment are, to a great extent, contingent on our rigorous hiring process, which is designed to ensure only those individuals who meet the qualifications of CBP's frontline positions and have the highest degree of integrity are recruited to serve as agents and officers safeguarding our borders and ports of entry. While many modifications to streamline the pre-employment hiring process are being considered, CBP will not lower its high standards for any of its frontline personnel.

DHS supports amendments to the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 (Pub. L. No. 111-376), which fosters integrity in the workplace by requiring that all CBP applicants for law enforcement positions receive a polygraph examination before being offered employment. The amendments proposed by S. 595 and H.R. 2213 would enable CBP to develop a risk-based approach to extend polygraph waiver eligibility to an applicant who falls under one of three categories and satisfies specific criteria including but not limited to:

1. A Current State or Local Law Enforcement Officer with a successfully completed polygraph examination with the applicant's law enforcement agency, at least three consecutive years employed as a fully authorized law enforcement officer, and no history of criminal activity or serious misconduct;

2. A Current Federal Law Enforcement Officer with at least three consecutive years employed as a fully authorized federal law enforcement officer, a current/in-scope Tier 4 Background Investigation or a Tier 5 Single Scope Background Investigation, and no history of criminal activity or serious misconduct; or

3. A Transitioning Military Service Member, Veteran, or Member of the Reserves or National Guard who has at least four years of service in the military, no history of criminal activity or serious misconduct, and who holds or has held (within the past five years) a Secret, Top Secret, or Top Secret/Sensitive Compartmented Information clearance and was not granted any waivers to obtain that clearance.

DHS values the demonstrated commitment and trustworthiness that these applicants bring to the mission, and the quality of vetting already performed at the state, local and Federal levels for these individuals in sensitive positions. Waivers will not be granted lightly as each criterion will be carefully vetted and reviewed to ensure verification.

DHS believes the flexibility to waive the polygraph for individuals in these limited populations would potentially expedite their onboarding and allow CBP to direct more resources toward the processing of other groups of applicants, preventing potential bottlenecks in the hiring pipeline. Additionally, the bills would retain the requirement for these specific applicants, like all CBP law enforcement applicants, to undergo a Tier 5 background investigation. Should derogatory information be detected during an applicant's background investigation, CBP may then choose to administer a polygraph examination.

DHS believes this approach enables CBP to weigh pre-employment risks and implement mitigation measures in order to improve its hiring capacity without lowering standards. By affording CBP the flexibility to waive the polygraph examination for eligible individuals in one of these categories, DHS believes

CBP will be able to boost applicant numbers and the number of persons entering the academy to begin training. Additionally, retaining the requirement for all law enforcement applicants to undergo a Tier 5 background investigation (the highest level), coupled with random drug testing, periodic reinvestigation, and the continuous evaluation of employees for criminal conduct, will assist in mitigating any potential risk.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this letter to Congress.

I appreciate your support of DHS, and I look forward to working with you on this polygraph waiver legislation and future homeland security issues. I have sent identical letters of support to the Ranking Member of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, the Chair and Ranking Members of the House Committee on Homeland Security and its Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, whose Chairwoman introduced H.R. 2213, and Senator Flake who introduced S. 595.

Respectfully,

BENJAMIN CASSIDY,

Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs.

Ms. MCSALLY. Let me close with just this example.

I served in the Air Force for 26 years. In that time, I held a Top Secret/SCI clearance with access to compartmentalized programs as well, some of the most sensitive information that our government possesses. I was entrusted to fly a \$12 million aircraft, command a squadron, run counterterrorism operations and combat search and rescue operations, retiring as a colonel, yet I have never taken a polygraph exam like the one required if I wanted to be a Border Patrol line agent after I retired, but I was subjected to periodic, very detailed background checks, background investigations, now called a tier 5 investigation, which is one that every single one of these agents and officers will also have to go through. It is a very invasive and thorough investigation. They talk to your neighbors, your coworkers, look in your financial records, your employers, you name it, to make sure that you are qualified.

So this example is a mismatch of public trust and it doesn't make any sense, and we need to give the CBP Commissioner discretion on a narrow case-by-case basis to fully vet applicants in the way that makes the most sense to fill these positions while preventing corruption.

I would like to thank Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON, and especially my ranking member, Mr. VELA, for his support and work with us on this important bill.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I do not at all question the intentions of the proponents of this bill. I understand that the entire rationale is to expedite hiring because of the vast number of vacancies. I do, however, question the wisdom of this approach.

I think it is worth noting that, currently, two-thirds of the applicants for CBP fail the polygraph test; and that is important not as a barrier, but because that polygraph test reveals misconduct that makes them ineligible.

Now, the current Department of Homeland Security inspector general, John Roth, has expressed strong reservations about polygraph changes, the waivers, and, specifically, about these bills. He indicates that we need to identify other ways to make hiring more efficient "without sacrificing integrity and effectiveness." And, in fact, the DHS OIG is currently auditing the CBP polygraph program, as is the GAO.

If you take a look at the bill, it allows for exemptions of the polygraph to certain categories of people, one of which is law enforcement officers who have undergone a polygraph examination as a condition of employment within the past 10 years. Well, you know, there was actually a Freedom of Information request on who flunked the polygraph tests in the CBP, and what has come out is that people who fall into this exemption admitted conduct that would make them ineligible, including child pornography, smuggling of drugs, theft.

It is fine to say that this would only be used when you knew that there wasn't a problem. The problem with that argument is sometimes you don't find out what the problem is until you subject the applicant to a polygraph or they know that they are about to be subjected to a polygraph, in which case, they own up.

So the Border Patrol is to be honored; they do a great job for us. But we know that the Sinaloa drug cartel is trying to recruit applicants. The last thing we need is for them to succeed, for our sake as well as for our brave men and women in the Border Patrol.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about standing up for Border Patrol cops. Border Patrol is woefully undermanned. This bill addresses this serious issue. In order to stand strong against jihadist terror and cartel organized crime, we must have an adequate number of boots on the ground.

Mr. Speaker, I served my community for many, many years as a street cop. I know exactly what it is to work patrol under dangerous, exhausting conditions. My Border Patrol brothers and sisters of the thin blue line are stretched too thin.

Hear my words: These are high caliber law enforcement professionals, but they are well below the staffing levels mandated by Congress.

This bill is not about lowering standards, as some critics claim. To the contrary, this bill allows for a commonsense approach to hire experienced, highly qualified patriots to fill the ranks of our front lines. This bill allows reasonable degrees of discretion that streamline the vetting and hiring process at Customs and Border Patrol.

I would like to thank Chairwoman MCSALLY for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the law enforcement community and vote in favor of this important legislation.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I had the benefit, of course, of hearing my colleague, Congresswoman LOFGREN, and I appreciate my colleagues on the other side because, agreed, we all want there to be the right sort of national security protections at the border, but we want to make sure that we are maximizing those opportunities and recognize that there has been an issue of being able to address the shortage of officers. But to address a workforce shortage by minimizing the very requirements that not only preserve our national security and protect the men and women at our border, I would agree, is not the way that we should be proceeding.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, I rise in opposition to the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act. As a Member from a border State that heavily trades with Mexico, I certainly understand the value of having sufficient customs officials manning our ports of entry and agents protecting our border; but eliminating the critical polygraph requirements for certain CBP applicants only undermines our Nation's safety, given this agency's historic connection to organized crime, drug cartels, and corruption.

The DHS inspector general has warned that weakening CBP polygraph requirements would make our southern border more vulnerable and that we should, instead, identify ways to make hiring more efficient without sacrificing integrity and effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, I live in a community that the FBI has now identified as one of the most dangerous cities in the country, Albuquerque, New Mexico, primarily because of the drug cartel. The drug trade in our city and in our State is significant, so we understand having sufficient officers.

While I strongly oppose this bill, I am committed to working with my colleagues and CBP to identify solutions that won't jeopardize national security.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in the preamble of the Constitution, our

Founding Fathers explained a more perfect Union required the Federal Government to do a few things, and to do them well. At the top of the list is the Federal Government's responsibility to provide for the common defense and secure our freedom.

There is no freedom without security. These concepts, these pillars upon which this great Nation was founded, must be proactively protected every day by men and women across this Nation. A select few of those men and women wake up every morning to patrol and protect our sovereign Nation's border in the face of drug smuggling, human trafficking, and violent criminal activity.

□ 1530

They work to safeguard our Nation, enforce the rule of law, and promote free trade and commerce through our ports of entry. Yet the previous administration's policy left our Border Patrol and Customs operations hamstrung and significantly understaffed.

As someone who represents a border State, I have seen and experienced those vulnerabilities firsthand.

To say that our Border Patrol and Customs operations are woefully understaffed is woefully understated. We are almost 3,000 officers and agents short of the minimum that is mandated by Congress. One reason for this understaffing is the unreasonable and protracted hiring processes.

In 2015, it took more than 460 days, on average, and 11 separate steps to hire a new officer or agent. This is absolutely absurd, even by government standards, and it must be fixed. That is why today I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 2213. This legislation provides a more commonsense and expeditious process for hiring border personnel.

We also need enough Customs officers to foster efficient trade for a robust economy. A recent study found that every batch of 33 CBP officers hired could lead to an increase in GDP of \$60 million and an employment gain of over 1,000 jobs. For too long, the Federal Government has abdicated its chief responsibility of securing our borders and protecting our citizens. We must put the safety and security of the American people first and give our Border Patrol and the CBP the staff they need to do their job.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2213, and I applaud Chairman MCCAUL, Ranking Member VELA, and Representative MCSALLY for their leadership on this critical issue.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

This legislation aims to address a staffing issue that has plagued the

United States Customs and Border Patrol for many years.

H.R. 2213 would add the option to waive the polygraph test for a select few individuals who have already successfully taken and passed a similar polygraph test in the past. These individuals are veterans, members of our Armed Forces, or law enforcement officers with clean records and years of honorable service.

A veteran with secret clearance and an honorable discharge, 3 years of service, and a tier 5 background check is someone I would hold in high regard and exempt from an unnecessary polygraph.

I would not be in favor of this bill if it was exempting a polygraph test to the general public. This is a special group—our veterans and our law enforcement.

This legislation would not change the United States Customs and Border Patrol requirements for background checks or interviews. Customs and Border Patrol would still have their candidates undergo the regular battery of tests and checks. Customs and Border Patrol would still ask a candidate who waived the polygraph under these proposed changes to take the examination. This bill will not lower the standards for entry. Rather, the flexibility it provides would prevent potential bottlenecks in the hiring pipelines and eliminate redundancy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to appease the concerns of several of my colleagues and say that this is not about building up a deportation force. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reaffirm that this legislation exclusively applies to Customs and Border Patrol, and it will not change the hiring procedures for Immigration and Customs Enforcement. This bill is about ensuring the agency hires only the best and the most honorable candidates. This bill is about providing employment and advancement opportunities for our servicemembers and law enforcement and creating job opportunities for those living in our border communities and border States.

Mr. Speaker, I also live in a border community, and I support this bill.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), the chairman of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this polygraph waiver provision that is proposed here is a darn good idea that is a long time overdue from happening. The reality is the hiring process of the Border Patrol, and, in fact, I would argue almost everything under my jurisdiction in Homeland Security, is as slow as molasses in the wintertime. It just doesn't move.

Meanwhile, we have got skilled law enforcement people applying, skilled former veterans with high clearances

who are applying for these jobs and being stumbled by the lack of polygraph operators available to do it.

This is a choice and a right choice of setting a priority for those people who have served, proving their worth, and are asking to be part of the defense of our national borders. I support this wholeheartedly. I support Chairwoman MCSALLY's concept here. It is great. It starts a new way of doing things. We need more than anything else in the Federal Government—if a new way of doing things is the right way, we ought to be doing it. Nobody is going to keep from checking on people. You can still make them take a polygraph if you run across something you don't like. But it is a good idea whose time has come. Let's be modern Americans and have new ideas and make those new ideas work.

I commend everyone here in support of this. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill, and I think, for a change, government is making a good start at new ideas.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I will not mince words. Anyone who votes for this bill is voting to support and implement Donald Trump's views on immigration, his desire to militarize our southern border, and his fantasy of a mass deportation force. You cannot spin it any other way.

If we want to lower the standards for screening and hiring CBP officers, eliminate checks that could help weed out candidates with criminal histories or criminal intentions, and water down the integrity of this important national security source, this bill is for you.

But if you care about border security and the integrity of the officers, you should join me in voting against the bill.

To me and a lot of other people watching this debate, this is about something else. Remember that man descending the golden escalators at Trump Tower announcing his campaign for President by saying Mexicans who come to the U.S. are rapists, drug dealers, and murderers? Remember him? Do you want to buy into his vision of immigrants as a brown horde intent on doing America harm?

If you are onboard with this, you are also onboard with building a wall; onboard with billions to be spent on deporting moms and dads who have lived here for decades; going after DREAMers as the Trump administration is doing today, deporting DREAMers from the United States of America. Where do you want to draw the line on the Trump deportation agenda? I say draw the line right here, right now, and don't give another inch. There are many ways to secure the Nation, but watering down the hiring standards of

our men and women in uniform should not be one of them. Let's secure the border. Let's have them have the same test at the border that you have a DEA agent, FBI agent, Secret Service agent. What are we going to do? Not have them take polygraph tests? That is going to make America safe. I doubt it.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative VELA for yielding time to me and also Chairman MCCAUL and the folks who have been working on this particular bill.

CBP currently has a staffing deficit of 3,000 individuals for the uniform components, that is the U.S. Border Patrol, Office of Field Operations, Air and Marine Operations, which jeopardizes our national and our economic security.

This legislation does not cover ICE, CBP, Border Patrol, and Air and Marine. Nobody else. This has nothing to do with deportation.

Long before President Trump became a candidate for the office, Congress authorized CBP to hire an additional 2,000 officers. That was about 4 years ago. Chairman CARTER, MICHAEL MCCAUL, we authorized 2,000 officers. Up to now, Mr. Speaker, we have not been able to hire those 2,000 officers because of the polygraph exam.

In fact, 65 percent of those individuals who applied for CBP are rejected, which is twice the amount that you have for other Federal officers, FBI, DEA, when they take their polygraph. I am talking about polygraph exams.

Again, this does not cover ICE. What this bill actually does, it will strengthen CBP's efforts to secure our border by filling those positions. I represent Laredo, the largest inland port, 14,000 traders a day. They have been delayed because we don't have enough CBP officers, and we need to get them.

What this bill does, it does not lower the standards. I emphasize, it does not lower the standards. It streamlines the background investigation for a limited number of veterans, military officers, law enforcement. If you are a local law enforcement and you take a polygraph exam, then you can ask for this waiver. Or if you are a servicemember or a veteran with the highest background investigation, you can get a waiver. Or if you are current Federal law enforcement with the highest background exam, you can get a waiver. But, again, if somebody finds out those vetted individuals still need to take a polygraph, then you would take it.

Finally, the last thing to conclude is, Members, this is not the first time we have gotten a waiver.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VELA. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CUELLAR. If you look at the National Defense Authorization polygraph waiver language, CBP has already gotten requests for waivers. In fact, it has already been done. This is not the first time that we are doing this. It is already the law. It doesn't bring down the standards. It allows us to have more men and women at the border, and this is why I ask you to support this legislation.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017, aims to bring some relief to the tremendous staffing shortages at our ports of entry by providing CBP with limited authority to waive its polygraph requirement on a case-by-case basis for certain veterans and State and local law enforcement officers in its hiring process.

H.R. 2213 is endorsed by the NTEU, the union that represents frontline CBP officers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding this debate, it is important to note this bill is a bipartisan effort, passing unanimously out of my committee. It is supported by Ranking Member THOMPSON, Congressman VELA, and we thank you for that, and others. Again, it passed out unanimously.

I was pleased to see also a Dear Colleague letter sent by my Democratic counterparts on the Homeland Security Committee urging the passage of this bill. This only further underscores the bipartisan nature of this effort.

It is also supported, Mr. Speaker, by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Border Trade Alliance, the CBP officers' union, and the Fraternal Order of Police, among others.

The issue is very clear. Not passing this bill will continue to keep American families at risk from dangers of human traffickers, drug smugglers, and international terrorists. Right now, we simply don't have an adequate number of Border Patrol agents and CBP officers to safeguard our Nation's border. We need to fix that. That is what this legislation does. It will allow us to bolster our forces with talented law enforcement officials and military personnel who have been previously vetted and have already demonstrated their commitment and patriotism to their fellow Americans.

□ 1545

As I have stated before, while new infrastructure and technology will be important in protecting this Nation, the

brave men and women who confront threats to our homeland are our greatest assets.

Once again, I thank Congresswoman MCSALLY, Ranking Members VELA and THOMPSON, and all those who supported this bill. It will help strengthen our borders.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I will be unable to vote today on H.R. 2213, the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act. If I would be present, I would vote against the bill.

While this bill purports to fast track the hiring of Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) agents in order to ensure our national security, it would actually water down hiring practices and allow potential vulnerabilities in the country's largest law enforcement agency. H.R. 2213 would allow certain CBP applicants to bypass polygraph testing.

In 2010 Congress passed the Anti-Border Corruption Act, which mandated CBP applicants pass a polygraph test as part of their hiring process. This bill was an essential step after an influx of corruption cases were revealed within the agency—ranging from drug trafficking to accepting bribes. Decreasing hiring standards as proposed by H.R. 2213 would do exactly what the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 fixed.

Instead of finding common-sense ways to expedite the hiring process without compromising the integrity of the agency, H.R. 2213 irresponsibly cuts corners in an attempt to keep President Trump's campaign promises of quickly increasing border patrol agents.

I am absolutely committed to regaining control of our country's borders and have continually fought to restrict individuals who would do our citizens harm—both through terrorist attacks or drug smuggling—from entering the United States. This ill-conceived legislation does nothing to ensure increased border security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the later of the following dates:

(1) The date on which all of the following have been completed:

(A) The Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection has conducted an evaluation and pilot program of the Test for Espionage, Sabotage, and Corruption (TES-C).

(B) The Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security has certified such evaluation and pilot program.

(C) The Commissioner submits to Congress a report on such evaluation and pilot program.

(2) The date on which the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security completes a risk assessment of the popu-

lation of individuals who could receive waivers under section 3(b) of the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010, as amended by this Act, and submits to Congress certification that providing waivers to such individuals would not endanger national security, undermine workforce integrity, or increase corruption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 374, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, this is, in fact, a national security issue. No other Federal law enforcement agency in the country—not the FBI, DEA, ATF, or Secret Service—makes any exceptions to their polygraph exam.

I understand that the CBP has a staffing shortage, but watering down vetting standards is dangerous and could lead to more corruption at the largest law enforcement agency in the country. In fact, 2,170 CBP personnel were arrested for sexual assault, excessive force, conspiring with international drug trafficking organizations, and other offenses between 2005 and 2012.

In response, Congress enacted legislation to require every applicant to undergo a polygraph exam—no exceptions. DHS' own Integrity Advisory Panel and the GAO have both recommended that the current polygraph testing be expanded, not reduced, given the higher rates of corruption at CBP than any other Federal law enforcement agency.

This bill takes us backward, and some current and former DHS officials have expressed concerns that the bill could expose the agency to corrupt individuals who could undermine the integrity of the workforce.

DHS Inspector General John Roth warned that the proposed legislation “could put CBP at significant risk and that while it may sound reasonable to say you could waive requirements from former military personnel because they have passed a polygraph, Border Patrol agents work in a different environment that is not as controlled as the military.”

Former CBP head of Internal Affairs has stated that “very few members of the military take polygraphs or have comprehensive background checks, and the quality of State or local law enforcement polygraphs varies widely.”

My amendment would delay the implementation of the bill until, one, CBP completes its ongoing pilot program of an alternative polygraph test that may help speed up hiring while maintaining vetting standards; and, two, the DHS inspector general determines that the bill would not endanger our national security, undermine workforce integrity, or, in fact, increase corruption.

I recognize that CBP is managing hiring and staffing issues. Passing this bill without knowing its potential risks or consequences is not only shortsighted, but I think it is irresponsible. We shouldn't blindly experiment with our Nation's security given that drugs, weapons, and human trafficking, as well as terrorism, are all threats we are facing at the border.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting “yes” for my amendment to help safeguard national security and protect the integrity of the CBP and its officers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico for yielding. I appreciate her leadership on this issue, and, as a cosponsor, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Our Customs and Border Patrol officers face a difficult mission in an extremely challenging environment. Polygraph testing is an important tool to ensure those charged with patrolling our border are not corruptible by drug traffickers or other criminal elements.

I am sympathetic to the hiring and staffing challenges facing this agency, but we cannot cut corners or jeopardize the security of our border.

This amendment delays the implementation of this legislation until CBP can complete its ongoing test of an alternative, more efficient polygraph test.

This amendment also requires DHS determine these changes in the underlying bill to our polygraph procedures do not endanger our national security.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment to ensure we do not create unnecessary risks to the security of our border.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my colleague.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good solution to the dilemma that faces us. We do have a hiring deficit in the Border Patrol, but we cannot give up on the need to fully vet these people.

The independent inspector said that the polygraphs had stopped dozens of applicants who have admitted to participation in human trafficking, defrauding the government, and have links with cartels intent to infiltrate CBP.

There has been, actually, a release from the Freedom of Information Act of people who would be eligible for the exemption who admitted, under the polygraph, to sexual assault, to child pornography, to taking classified information from Afghanistan, to taking classified information from Iraq, a sheriff's employee who engaged in theft, and a police officer who was a

smuggler. The Border Patrol cannot afford this.

I think the gentlewoman's amendment actually preserves what we want, and I would highly recommend that we approve it.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Lujan Grisham amendment.

Let me say, first, that the Secretary of Homeland Security testified before my committee this morning, a decorated four-star general serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. He is the head of SOUTHCOM. This man knows the border. Secretary Kelly supports this legislation.

I find it a bit offensive that decorated veterans who have already received clearances somehow would present a threat to the security of the United States, so I reject that argument.

This amendment strikes me as an unnecessary and harmful delay tactic that would prevent CBP from implementing the much-needed flexibility provided for in the underlying bill.

If the delays called for in this amendment were put in place, CBP would have to sit and wait until certain unnecessary obstacles were overcome, some of which are completely out of their control. All the while, they would continue to hemorrhage officers and agents, threatening the Nation's border security and the flow of commerce in and out of the country. This could put our national security at risk and would be, further, detrimental to the flow of legitimate trade and travel.

CBP has missed hiring targets for Border Patrol agents for 4 years and CBP officers for almost 18 months. We need additional officers and agents now, simply to meet the congressionally mandated CBP staffing levels that have been put in place for a year. We cannot wait for more reports and evaluations.

Sadly, this amendment looks to me like an attempt by opponents of the bill to prevent the important provisions of this bill from going into effect in a timely manner, thus preventing the hiring of already trusted and vetted individuals who have served their Nation and the military with honor and distinction.

It is also important to underscore two points here: one, that all applicants will continue to be fully vetted, including a rigorous tier 5 background investigation, which is equivalent to the investigation performed for all servicemembers who hold a top secret clearance; and second, the authority

granted under this bill is discretionary. If the CBP Commissioner wishes to require a polygraph examination for any applicant for any reason, he can and should still do so.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to wait any longer. As the Speaker knows, who is briefed on the threats, as do I, in a classified setting, the threats are real. This Nation is at risk, and we cannot afford to wait.

So, for these reasons, I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Let me just close, again, by saying I oppose the amendment. The men and women wearing the uniform on the front lines of our ports and borders need relief now, and any delay tactics should be rejected. Therefore, I urge opposition, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, and the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House that was previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately release his tax return information to Congress and the American people.

Whereas, in the United States' system of checks and balances, Congress has a responsibility to hold the Executive Branch of government to a fair and equal standard of transparency ensuring the public interest is placed first;

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed their tax return information to the public;

Whereas, tax returns provide an important baseline of reasonable information including whether the President paid taxes, ownership interests, charitable donations made, and whether tax deductions have been exploited;

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns could help those investigating Russian influence in the 2016 election understand the President's financial ties to the Russian Federation and Russian citizens, including

debts owed and whether he shares any partnership interests, equity interests, joint ventures or licensing agreements with Russia or Russians;

Whereas, the President recently fired Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, under whose leadership the FBI was investigating whether the Trump campaign colluded with Russia to influence the 2016 election;

Whereas, President Trump reportedly stated to Russian officials during a White House meeting that he fired Director Comey to ease pressure on the ongoing investigation of Russia's influence in the 2016 election;

Whereas, Senate Russia investigators have requested information from the Treasury Department's criminal investigation division, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, or FinCEN, which handles cases of money laundering, for information related to President Trump, his top officials and campaign aides. FinCEN has been investigating allegations of foreign money-laundering through purchases of U.S. real estate;

Whereas, the President's tax returns would show us whether he has foreign bank accounts and how much profit he receives from his ownership in myriad partnerships;

Whereas, Donald Trump Jr. said the Trump Organization saw money "pouring in from Russia" and that "Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets."

Whereas, Congress gave itself the authority to review an individual's tax returns to investigate and reveal possible conflicts of interest of executive branch officials involved dating back to the Teapot Dome scandal.

Whereas, it has been reported that federal prosecutors have issued grand jury subpoenas to associates of former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn seeking business records as part of the ongoing probe into Russian involvement in the 2016 election;

Whereas, according to his 2016 candidate filing with the Federal Election Commission, the President has 564 financial positions in companies located in the United States and around the world;

Whereas, against the advice of ethics attorneys and the Office of Government Ethics, the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his businesses; and can still withdraw funds at any time from the trust of which he is the sole beneficiary;

Whereas, the Emoluments Clause was included in the U.S. Constitution for the express purpose of preventing federal officials from accepting any "present, Emolument, Office, or Title . . . from any King, Prince, or foreign state";

Whereas, the Chairmen of the Ways and Means Committee, Joint Committee on Taxation, and Senate Finance Committee have the authority to request the President's tax returns under Section 6103 of the tax code;

Whereas, the Joint Committee on Taxation reviewed the tax returns of President Richard Nixon in 1974 and made the information public;

Whereas, the Ways and Means Committee used IRC 6103 authority in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas Director Comey has testified that tax returns are a common tool in investigations because they can show income and motives;

Whereas, the American people have the right to know whether or not their President is operating under conflicts of interest related to international affairs, tax reform,

government contracts, or otherwise: Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives shall—

1. Immediately request the tax return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015 for review in closed executive session by the Committee on Ways and Means, as provided under Section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code, and vote to report the information therein to the full House of Representatives.

2. Support transparency in government and the longstanding tradition of Presidents and Presidential candidates disclosing their tax returns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Does the gentleman from Massachusetts wish to present argument on the parliamentary question whether the resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House?

Mr. CAPUANO. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the question of order.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, the privileges of the House as defined in rule IX, clause 1 are “those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.”

We all know what has been going on for the last couple of months. In light of the testimony that was just released today of former Director Comey and what he is scheduled to say, his written testimony tomorrow, if it is not clear by now that the Congress should continue its investigation—as we speak, we have several committees in this Congress investigating the Russian influence on our election and what its relationship is with the Trump administration.

Clearly and unequivocally, one of the questions that must be answered for the integrity of this investigation and, therefore, the integrity of the House, is whether the President himself had any undue influence in his actions.

Now, the answer may be “no,” and I personally hope that it is “no.” I have no personal reason to want to have the President do something wrong.

But, at the same time, we, the American people, have a right to know the answer that our President has not been subject to undue influence. And as a Member of Congress, we have a responsibility to our constituents to provide them those answers.

The investigations are ongoing. At some point, it is unquestioned that the President's tax returns will become relevant to what the FBI is doing. It is only a matter of time.

For the integrity of the House, for the dignity of the House, I believe firmly that we should exercise the law that the Congress put in place itself to do our own due diligent investigation and not just simply sit on our hands while others do our work for us.

These documents will become public, and when they do, regardless of what

they show, I believe firmly it will reflect negatively on this House for not having done our duty, for having shirked our responsibilities. That is why I believe this is a privilege of the House. That is why I believe this House should take this action.

And again, I hope we find nothing. That would be good for America, certainly good for Mr. Trump, good for America. We have plenty of other things to argue about and debate. This shouldn't be one of them.

And if anybody can look me in the face and say that they believe this investigation is just going to go away, if they believe the investigators are not going to look at the President's financial records, they can't because anybody who has ever been involved in any type of an investigation knows it is inevitable. And since it is inevitable, why should we wait? Why should we wait?

I ran for office, taking an oath to uphold the Constitution and giving my constituents my promise of only one thing: I will do my job as best as I see fit. I won't shirk my responsibilities.

We have plenty of votes in this House that many of us, including me, would rather not take because they are uncomfortable, because we have to explain them to our constituents, because sometimes they are difficult and confusing. This is not one of them.

There aren't any Americans that don't believe they have a right to know that their President has not been subject to undue influence. That is all this does. It draws no conclusion from it, and it allows the majority party to call on it to make the determination; not me, but the majority party; the chair of the Ways and Means Committee.

That is why I offered this resolution. That is why I think this resolution is going to continue to be offered, and, at some point, the House is going to do it. I don't know why Members of the House want to drag this out and pretend that somehow you are going to be able to avoid it. You are not. It is going to happen.

With that, I would like to invite my friend, Mr. PASCARELL, to say a few words. He has been the leader on this particular issue for months now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear each Member individually.

Does any other Member wish to be heard on the question of order?

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized on the question of order.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, just when you think you heard it all, you haven't. And as my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) just pointed out, what we need to do is uphold the integrity of this body, the legislative branch of government.

Now, just a brief review, because I have about 2,000 pages of reference. We are not going to go into that all tonight, but if you will allow me, I will go into some of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does this pertain to the question of order?

Mr. PASCARELL. Yes, sir.

We started out on February 1. We have had a letter to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. We have had an amendment in the Ways and Means Committee, which is one of the three committees under 6103, paragraph F, section 1 of the Tax Code, written in 1924, that allows the Ways and Means Committee, along with the Senate Finance Committee, along with the Joint Committee on Taxation, to do its due diligence.

We have had one, two, three, four, five, six, seven privileged resolutions. Mr. CAPUANO has offered tonight's privileged resolution.

We have had a resolution, two resolutions of inquiry through the Ways and Means Committee—just having a little review here of what we have done. We have debated all of these. They must have all been in order.

And we have a discharge petition right now before the Congress of the United States, and if we get to 218 in that discharge petition, we will have to take another vote. As Mr. CAPUANO pointed out, there are a lot of votes that we don't like to take, but these are votes that are necessary, Mr. Speaker.

Already, two dozen Members of the majority party at town meetings have said, yes, the President should give the public, or at least the committees, first of all, his tax returns.

We are not talking about a 1040. We are talking about thousands of pages that go into a businessperson's, who is a billion-, zillionaire, whatever the heck he is, that is what it takes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the question of order; whether the proposed resolution constitutes a question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. PASCARELL. Oh, I think this is a privilege of the House, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not to the merits of the resolution.

Mr. PASCARELL. Right. I understand that. I understand that. Thank you for pointing that out.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you know who Walter Shaub is. S-H-A-U-B. Walter Shaub is the Director of the United States Office of Government Ethics. That is pretty important. In fact, in the last administration—talk about the privilege of the House—this is the document that was presented on June 21, the day after inauguration, 2009, the Ethics Commitments by the Executive Branch of Personnel.

This document goes into such things as the revolving door ban on lobbyists or pertaining to the executive branch of government because that is what we are talking about.

Just when you think you have heard it all, you haven't.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, this administration threw out there in a trial

balloon that we are going to start to sell off—

Is there a problem? Is there a problem?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the question of order.

Mr. PASCRELL. That is correct. That is exactly what I am doing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is wandering far from the question of order.

Mr. PASCRELL. I never wander, Mr. Speaker. I may not stick to the subject, but I don't wander.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is in the wilderness.

Mr. PASCRELL. No, I am not. I am not in Idaho.

The fact of the matter is, this is a very specific document that each administration presents when it is sworn. This is the set of rules which govern the executive branch of government.

When I read in documentation that we are getting set to sell off public lands, what am I reminded of?

Talk about the integrity of the House of Representatives. What am I reminded of?

I am reminded of what happened in 1922, 1923, 1924, when they tried to sell off oil reserves, and it got them into trouble. Republicans had their hands out. Democrats had their hands out, which led, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Massachusetts seeks to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

As the Chair most recently ruled on May 24, 2017, the resolution directs the Committee on Ways and Means to meet and consider an item of business under the procedures set forth in 26 U.S.C. 6103 and, therefore, does not qualify as a question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MCCAUL moves that the appeal be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, and the order of the House of today, this 15-

minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of amendment No. 1 to H.R. 2213 and passage of H.R. 2213, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 186, answered “present” 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

YEAS—228

Abraham	Goodlatte	Palazzo
Allen	Gosar	Palmer
Amash	Gowdy	Paulsen
Amodei	Granger	Pearce
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Perry
Bacon	Graves (LA)	Peterson
Banks (IN)	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Barletta	Griffith	Poe (TX)
Barr	Guthrie	Poliquin
Barton	Harper	Posey
Bergman	Harris	Ratcliffe
Biggs	Hartzer	Reed
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Renacci
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Roby
Black	Higgins (LA)	Roe (TN)
Blackburn	Hill	Rogers (AL)
Blum	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Bost	Hollingsworth	Rohrabacher
Brat	Hudson	Rokita
Bridenstine	Huizenga	Rooney, Francis
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Rooney, Thomas J.
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Hurd	Roskam
Buck	Issa	Ross
Bucshon	Jenkins (KS)	Rothfus
Budd	Jenkins (WV)	Rouzer
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Royce (CA)
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Russell
Calvert	Jordan	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Katko	Schweikert
Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Cheney	King (IA)	Sessions
Coffman	King (NY)	Shimkus
Cole	Kinzinger	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Knight	Simpson
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (MO)
Comer	Labrador	Smith (NE)
Comstock	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Smucker
Cook	Lamborn	Stefanik
Costello (PA)	Lance	Stewart
Cramer	Latta	Stivers
Crawford	Lewis (MN)	Taylor
Culberson	LoBiondo	Tenney
Curbelo (FL)	Long	Thompson (PA)
Davidson	Loudermilk	Thornberry
Davis, Rodney	Love	Tiberi
Denham	Lucas	MacArthur
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Marchant
DeSantis	MacArthur	Marshall
DesJarlais	Marchant	Massie
Diaz-Balart	Marshall	Mast
Donovan	Massie	McCarthy
Duffy	Mast	McCaul
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	McClintock
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	McHenry
Dunn	McClintock	McKinley
Emmer	McHenry	McMorris
Estes (KS)	McKinley	Rodgers
Farenthold	McMorris	McSally
Faso	Rodgers	Meadows
Ferguson	McSally	Meehan
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Messer
Fleischmann	Meehan	Mitchell
Flores	Messer	Moolenaar
Fortenberry	Mitchell	Mooney (WV)
Fox	Moolenaar	Mullin
Franks (AZ)	Mooney (WV)	Murphy (PA)
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Newhouse
Gaetz	Murphy (PA)	Noem
Gallagher	Newhouse	Nunes
Garrett	Noem	Olson
Gibbs	Nunes	
Gohmert	Olson	

NAYS—186

Adams	Bass	Beyer
Aguilar	Beatty	Bishop (GA)
Barragán	Bera	Blumenauer

Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Panetta
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Heck	Payne
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	Pelosi
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Perlmutter
Bustos	Hoyer	Peters
Butterfield	Huffman	Pingree
Capuano	Jayapal	Pocan
Carbajal	Jeffries	Polis
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Cartwright	Jones	Raskin
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Rice (NY)
Castro (TX)	Keating	Rosen
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Ciциlline	Kennedy	Ruiz
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Clarke (NY)	Kihuen	Rush
Clay	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kilmer	Sánchez
Cohen	Kind	Sarbanes
Connolly	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Conyers	Kuster (NH)	Schiff
Cooper	Langevin	Schneider
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Costa	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Lawrence	Scott, David
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Serrano
Crowley	Lee	Sewell (AL)
Cuellar	Levin	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Sinema
DeGette	Lipinski	Sires
Delaney	Loebach	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
DelBene	Lowenthal	Soto
Demings	Lowey	Speier
DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham, M.	Suozi
Deutch	Lujan, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Dingell	Lynch	Takano
Doggett	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Doyle, Michael F.	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Eshoo	Matsui	Tonko
Españat	McCollum	Torres
Esty (CT)	McEachin	Tsongas
Evans	McGovern	Vargas
Foster	McNerney	Veasey
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Vela
Fudge	Meng	Velázquez
Gabbard	Moore	Visclosky
Gallago	Moulton	Walz
Garamendi	Murphy (FL)	Wasserman
Gonzalez (TX)	Nadler	Schultz
Gottheimer	Neal	Waters, Maxine
Green, Al	Nolan	Watson Coleman
Green, Gene	Norcross	Welch
Grijalva	O'Halleran	Wilson (FL)
	O'Rourke	Yarmuth

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Sanford

NOT VOTING—15

Aderholt	DeFazio	Marino
Babin	Engel	Napolitano
Brady (TX)	Grothman	Reichert
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Cummings	Johnson, Sam	Smith (TX)

□ 1639

Messrs. YARMUTH, CONYERS, and GENE GREEN of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 292, I was unavoidably detained to cast my vote in time. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

CONGRESSIONAL SHOOT-OUT AND INDUSTRY CHALLENGE

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus—the largest bipartisan caucus within the Halls of Congress—to talk about the recent May 16 congressional shoot-out, a competition of sporting clays, skeet, and trap that pit Republican and Democrat Members of Congress against each other in a great afternoon of enjoying outdoor shooting sports.

We had a bipartisan shoot. The Republican team won this year. I am just the chairman and team captain.

I would like to say that I won one of the individual awards this year—I have in the past—but this year we had Members on our side that won. The top gun Member of Congress was RICHARD HUDSON from North Carolina. The top shot Democrat was TIM WALZ. The best shooter for skeet was COLLIN PETERSON. The top sporting clays was a freshman Member from North Carolina, TED BUDD. I am saving the best for last: the top trap was none other than DON YOUNG from Alaska.

It is a great afternoon where we can honor the outdoor economy, the largest industry of the United States, serve the outdoors in a lot of ways, and the heritage of sportsmen outdoor community activity is critical to the American story.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), who is the Democrat co-chair.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have had this competitive shoot for a number of years, and I have to admit, this year I had a job fair at home, so I am going to turn it over to my vice chair, MARC VEASEY, who was actually out there. It is a great competition between the Republicans and the Democrats, but we work together on a lot of other issues.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Houston, Representative GREEN, and I also thank the Republicans that participate in the shoot every year. Obviously, we all play to win every time and we take the competition very seriously. Democrats only lost by about 13 shots this year. We actually did pretty good. So we are improving.

I want to remind everybody that we work on issues like conservation, environmental issues, and other things where Democrats and Republicans can come together for the greater cause of the country. I want to remind the gentleman that next year we are going to find those 13 shots.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from

Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), who is MARC VEASEY's co-chair on the caucus.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleague that those shots were in my bag and on our side.

We are going to win again next year. We always enjoy the friendship, and I look forward to seeing the gentleman again out there and standing up for the rights of sportsmen. I certainly appreciate his friendship and look forward to traveling again with him.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. What a great event. It was a great opportunity for us to get together, get to know each other better, and spend some time in the outdoors.

I invite all Members to join the caucus. Come and be a part of this next year. Republicans retain the trophy this year, and I hope we will next year.

ANTI-BORDER CORRUPTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on adopting amendment No. 1 to the bill (H.R. 2213) to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 238, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

YEAS—179

Adams	Chu, Judy	Doyle, Michael
Aguilar	Cicilline	F.
Amash	Clark (MA)	Ellison
Barragán	Clarke (NY)	Eshoo
Bass	Clay	Espallat
Beatty	Cleaver	Esty (CT)
Bera	Cohen	Evans
Beyer	Connolly	Foster
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Blumenauer	Cooper	Fudge
Blunt Rochester	Correa	Gabbard
Bonamici	Courtney	Gallego
Boyle, Brendan	Crist	Garamendi
F.	Crowley	Green, Al
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Brown (MD)	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Gutiérrez
Bustos	Delaney	Hanabusa
Butterfield	DeLauro	Hastings
Capuano	DelBene	Heck
Carbajal	Demings	Higgins (NY)
Cárdenas	DeSaulnier	Himes
Carson (IN)	Deutch	Hoyer
Cartwright	Dingell	Huffman
Castor (FL)	Doggett	Jayapal
Castro (TX)		Jeffries

Johnson (GA)	McGovern	Schneider
Johnson, E. B.	McNerney	Schrader
Keating	Meeks	Scott (VA)
Kelly (IL)	Meng	Scott, David
Kennedy	Moore	Serrano
Khanna	Moulton	Sewell (AL)
Kihuen	Nadler	Shea-Porter
Kildee	Neal	Sherman
Kilmer	Nolan	Sires
Kind	Norcross	Slaughter
Krishnamoorthi	O'Rourke	Smith (NJ)
Kuster (NH)	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Langevin	Panetta	Soto
Larsen (WA)	Pascarella	Speier
Larson (CT)	Payne	Suozi
Lawrence	Pelosi	Swailwell (CA)
Lawson (FL)	Perlmutter	Takano
Lee	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Levin	Pingree	Thompson (MS)
Lewis (GA)	Pocan	Titus
Lieu, Ted	Poe (TX)	Tonko
Lipinski	Polis	Torres
Loebach	Price (NC)	Tsongas
Lofgren	Quigley	Vargas
Lowenthal	Raskin	Veasey
Lowe	Rice (NY)	Velázquez
Lujan Grisham,	Richmond	Visclosky
M.	Roybal-Allard	Walz
Luján, Ben Ray	Ruiz	Wasserman
Lynch	Ruppersberger	Schultz
Maloney,	Rush	Waters, Maxine
Carolyn B.	Ryan (OH)	Watson Coleman
Maloney, Sean	Sánchez	Welch
Matsui	Sarbanes	Wilson (FL)
McCollum	Schakowsky	Yarmuth
McEachin	Schiff	

NAYS—238

Abraham	Duffy	Katko
Allen	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (MS)
Amodei	Duncan (TN)	Kelly (PA)
Arrington	Dunn	King (IA)
Bacon	Emmer	King (NY)
Banks (IN)	Estes (KS)	Kinzing
Barletta	Farenthold	Knight
Barr	Faso	Kustoff (TN)
Barton	Ferguson	Labrador
Bergman	Fitzpatrick	LaHood
Biggs	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Billirakis	Flores	Lamborn
Bishop (MI)	Fortenberry	Lance
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Latta
Black	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (MN)
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Blum	Gaetz	Long
Bost	Gallagher	Loudermilk
Brat	Garrett	Love
Bridenstine	Gibbs	Lucas
Brooks (AL)	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Brooks (IN)	Gonzalez (TX)	MacArthur
Buchanan	Goodlatte	Marchant
Buck	Gosar	Marshall
Bucshon	Gottheimer	Massie
Budd	Gowdy	Mast
Burgess	Granger	McCarthy
Byrne	Graves (GA)	McCaul
Calvert	Graves (LA)	McClintock
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	McHenry
Carter (TX)	Griffith	McKinley
Chabot	Grothman	McMorris
Chaffetz	Guthrie	Rodgers
Cheney	Harper	McSally
Coffman	Harris	Meadows
Cole	Hartzler	Meehan
Collins (GA)	Hensarling	Messer
Collins (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Mitchell
Comer	Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar
Comstock	Higgins (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Conaway	Hill	Mullin
Cook	Holding	Murphy (FL)
Costa	Hollingsworth	Murphy (PA)
Costello (PA)	Hudson	Newhouse
Cramer	Huizenga	Noem
Crawford	Hultgren	Nunes
Cuellar	Hunter	O'Halleran
Culberson	Hurd	Olson
Curbelo (FL)	Issa	Palazzo
Davidson	Jenkins (KS)	Palmer
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (WV)	Paulsen
Denham	Johnson (LA)	Pearce
Dent	Johnson (OH)	Perry
DeSantis	Jones	Peterson
DesJarlais	Jordan	Pittenger
Diaz-Balart	Joyce (OH)	Poliquin
Donovan	Kaptur	Posey

Ratcliffe	Scalise	Upton
Reed	Schweikert	Valadao
Renacci	Scott, Austin	Vela
Rice (SC)	Sensenbrenner	Wagner
Roby	Sessions	Walberg
Roe (TN)	Shimkus	Walden
Rogers (AL)	Shuster	Walker
Rogers (KY)	Simpson	Walorski
Rohrabacher	Sinema	Walters, Mimi
Rokita	Smith (MO)	Weber (TX)
Rooney, Francis	Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)
Rooney, Thomas J.	Smucker	Wenstrup
Ros-Lehtinen	Stefanik	Westerman
Rosen	Stewart	Williams
Roskam	Stivers	Wilson (SC)
Ross	Taylor	Wittman
Rothfus	Tenney	Womack
Rouzer	Thompson (PA)	Woodall
Royce (CA)	Thornberry	Yoder
Russell	Tiberi	Yoho
Rutherford	Tipton	Young (AK)
Sanford	Trott	Young (IA)
	Turner	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt	DeFazio	Napolitano
Babin	Engel	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Jackson Lee	Smith (TX)
Clyburn	Johnson, Sam	
Cummings	Marino	

□ 1652

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. PETERS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 293, I was unavoidably detained to cast my vote in time. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BLUMENAUER was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR PORTLAND VICTIMS

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, May 26 was a dark moment in my community, as a hateful tirade toward two young women, evidently based on their race and faith, led to tragedy.

In the face of this menacing behavior, three brave Portlanders intervened to protect these young women. Two lost their lives, another had his throat slashed. They were Ricky Best, Taliesin Myrddin Namkai-Meche, and Micah David-Cole Fletcher. Micah David-Cole Fletcher survived the ordeal, still expressing hope and compassion.

That dark moment and bright example of courage and compassion has prompted soul-searching in my community. There has been a tremendous outpouring of support and a commitment to help the vulnerable. We all think about whether we would have had that courage.

Who knows what might have happened to those two young women if those courageous people had not intervened. Based on what happened, it is highly likely that they would have been physically assaulted, injured, or worse.

We think this is a wake-up call for all of us to protect the vulnerable, to resist intolerance, and to condemn behaviors and language that would incite

violent behavior. We all have a stake in this so that we don't have more victims and that these three brave people's sacrifice was not in vain.

I respectfully request the Chamber observe a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 282, noes 137, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—282

Abraham	Costello (PA)	Harris
Allen	Courtney	Hartzler
Amash	Cramer	Hensarling
Amodei	Crawford	Herrera Beutler
Arrington	Cuellar	Hice, Jody B.
Bacon	Culberson	Higgins (LA)
Banks (IN)	Curbelo (FL)	Higgins (NY)
Barletta	Davidson	Hill
Barr	Davis, Rodney	Holding
Barton	Delaney	Hollingsworth
Beatty	Demings	Hudson
Bera	Denham	Huizenga
Bergman	Dent	Hultgren
Biggs	DeSantis	Hunter
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Hurd
Bishop (MI)	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Bishop (UT)	Donovan	Jenkins (KS)
Black	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)
Blackburn	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins (WV)
Blum	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (LA)
Blunt Rochester	Dunn	Johnson (OH)
Bost	Emmer	Jones
Brady (TX)	Estes (KS)	Jordan
Brat	Farenthold	Joyce (OH)
Bridenstine	Faso	Katko
Brooks (AL)	Ferguson	Keating
Brooks (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (MS)
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Kelly (PA)
Buck	Flores	Kind
Bucshon	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Budd	Fox	King (NY)
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Kinzing
Bustos	Frelinghuysen	Knight
Byrne	Fudge	Kuster (NH)
Calvert	Gaetz	Kustoff (TN)
Carter (GA)	Gallagher	Labrador
Carter (TX)	Garrett	LaHood
Cartwright	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Castor (FL)	Gohmert	LaMalfa
Chabot	Gonzalez (TX)	Lamborn
Chaffetz	Goodlatte	Lance
Cheney	Gosar	Langevin
Cleaver	Gottheimer	Larson (CT)
Coffman	Gowdy	Latta
Cole	Granger	Lawson (FL)
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	Lewis (MN)
Collins (NY)	Graves (LA)	Lipinski
Comer	Graves (MO)	LoBiondo
Comstock	Green, Gene	Loeb
Conaway	Griffith	Long
Coakley	Grothman	Loudermilk
Cooper	Guthrie	Love
Costa	Harper	Lucas
		Luetkemeyer
		Lynch

MacArthur	Poliquin	Stefanik
Maloney, Sean	Posey	Stewart
Marchant	Ratcliffe	Stivers
Marshall	Reed	Suozi
Massie	Renacci	Swalwell (CA)
Mast	Rice (NY)	Taylor
McCarthy	Rice (SC)	Tenney
McCaul	Richmond	Thompson (MS)
McClintock	Roby	Thompson (PA)
McEachin	Roe (TN)	Thornberry
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Tiberi
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Tipton
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Titus
Rodgers	Rokita	Trott
McSally	Rooney, Francis	Turner
Meadows	Rooney, Thomas J.	Upton
Meehan	J.	Valadao
Meeks	Ros-Lehtinen	Veasey
Messer	Rosen	Vela
Mitchell	Roskam	Wagner
Moolenaar	Ross	Walberg
Mooney (WV)	Rothfus	Walden
Mullin	Rouzer	Walker
Murphy (FL)	Royce (CA)	Walorski
Murphy (PA)	Ruppersberger	Walters, Mimi
Newhouse	Russell	Walz
Noem	Rutherford	Watson Coleman
Nolan	Sanford	Weber (TX)
Nunes	Scalise	Webster (FL)
O'Halleran	Schrader	Wenstrup
O'Rourke	Schweikert	Westerman
Olson	Scott, Austin	Williams
Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)
Palmer	Sessions	Wittman
Paulsen	Shimkus	Womack
Pearce	Shuster	Woodall
Perry	Simpson	Yoder
Peters	Sinema	Yoho
Peterson	Smith (MO)	Young (AK)
Pingree	Smith (NE)	Young (IA)
Pittenger	Smith (NJ)	Zeldin
Poe (TX)	Smucker	

NOES—137

Adams	Gabbard	Norcross
Aguilar	Gallego	Pallone
Barragan	Garamendi	Panetta
Bass	Green, Al	Pascarell
Beyer	Grijalva	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hastings	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan F.	Heck	Polis
Brady (PA)	Himes	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Raskin
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Jayapal	Ruiz
Carbajal	Jeffries	Rush
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Kennedy	Schiff
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Schneider
Clarke (NY)	Kihuen	Scott (VA)
Clay	Kildee	Scott, David
Cohen	Kilmer	Serrano
Connolly	Krishnamoorthi	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Shea-Porter
Correa	Lawrence	Sherman
Crist	Lee	Sires
Crowley	Levin	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Soto
DeGette	Lofgren	Speier
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Takano
DelBene	Lowey	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham, M.	Tonko
Deutch	Lujan, Ben Ray	Torres
Dingell	Maloney,	Tsongas
Doggett	Carolyn B.	Vargas
Doyle, Michael F.	Matsui	Velázquez
Ellison	McCollum	Vislosky
Eshoo	McGovern	Wasserman
Españat	McNerney	Schultz
Esty (CT)	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Moore	Welch
Foster	Moulton	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Yarmuth
	Neal	

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt	DeFazio	Napolitano
Babin	Engel	Reichert
Clyburn	Johnson, Sam	Smith (TX)
Cummings	Marino	

□ 1706

Mr. SCHNEIDER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes on June 7, 2017 on account of attending my son's graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: “yea” for rollcall vote No. 288, “yea” for rollcall vote No. 289, “yea” for rollcall vote No. 290, “yea” for rollcall vote No. 291, “yea” for rollcall vote No. 292, “yea” for rollcall vote No. 293, and “yea” for rollcall vote No. 294.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 292, No. 293, and No. 294 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on the Motion to Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair. I also would have voted “yea” on the Lujan Grisham Amendment. I also would have voted “nay” on Final Passage of H.R. 2213—Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was delayed with constituency matters in a hearing and was not able to be present on the floor on the vote on the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair. If I had been present, I would have voted “no.”

I was also detained on congressional business in a hearing on the Lujan Grisham amendment to H.R. 2213. If I had been present, I would have voted “aye.”

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2560

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 2560.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING LOCAL HERO THALIA RODRIGUEZ

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a young and valiant member of our south Florida community, Thalia Rodriguez. Just 17 years old, Thalia used her skills that

she learned from her high school's emergency medical responder class to save the life of one of our Miami-Dade police officers.

Major Ricky Carter was off duty, traveling on his motorcycle, when an unexpected crash left him critically injured at the side of the road. Thalia came upon the scene, immediately began to apply first aid to the injured police major. Realizing that his injuries were too severe to wait for the first responders to arrive, Thalia made the split-second decision to fashion a tourniquet out of a belt, thereby buying Major Carter precious time. Thalia's brave act that Sunday morning saved Major Ricky Carter's life.

Thank you to Thalia Rodriguez, a graduating senior at Westland Hialeah Senior High School, for her outstanding heroism.

CELEBRATING LADY BETTY COLES

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and celebrate the 90th birthday of Lady Betty Coles of Trenton, New Jersey. She was wonderfully celebrated this weekend at a party attended by over 100 family members and friends, thanks to her daughter and son-in-law, Tracy and Robert Ross.

Lady Coles has distinguished her family, church, and community with countless years of dedicated service, love, and leadership by example. She has enriched our community as charter member of the Epsilon Upsilon Omega Chapter of Alpha Kappa Alpha since 1952, and continues her years of service as a member of Shiloh Baptist Church.

Personally, I am grateful for her friendship, her stewardship, her mentorship, her leadership, and her dedication to not only New Jersey, but our global community.

May God continue to bless Lady Coles on this milestone year, and we are forever grateful to Him, having sent her our way.

BRINGING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY TO ALL AMERICANS

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Financial CHOICE Act. Financial Services Committee Chairman JEB HENSARLING's bill aims to bring economic opportunity to all Americans.

After Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats passed the Dodd-Frank Act of 2010, dozens of small community financial institutions in my district

were forced to close or merge with big banks. In fact, my State of Georgia has lost more than 40 of these institutions over this period of time. This was due to the unbelievable complexity and compliance costs of the regulations imposed on them.

With the Financial CHOICE Act, community banks will finally be able to get some relief from these regulations. As a businessowner myself, I know how important access to capital can be for a new business. We know that 70 percent of all new job creation is created by the growth of small business.

Once these banks are able to get back to the business of lending, my hope is that it will spur small-business growth and entrepreneurship in my district and across this great Nation.

This legislation also ends taxpayer-funded bailouts once and for all, finally fulfilling the promises that Democrats failed to keep.

And did I mention it reduces the deficit by \$33.6 billion over 10 years?

President Trump has asked us to do a number on Dodd-Frank, and I support him in this endeavor, and believe the Financial CHOICE Act does just that.

INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today, President Trump visited Ohio to tout his infrastructure plan. Well, Ohio needs the good jobs that direct national investment in infrastructure could provide, so my Democratic Ohio colleagues, Mr. RYAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BEATTY, and I sent President Trump a letter encouraging him to take a wide view of what infrastructure should encompass in States like Ohio.

We urged the President to consider upgrading our foundational assets, such as drinking water systems, our national electric grid, energy efficiency, roofing and lead removal in individual homes, plus modernizing roads and bridges, our seaports and waterways, our airports and rail systems. Indeed, infrastructure investments present the best opportunity to revitalize our battered domestic steel industry as well.

We hope President Trump's infrastructure plan won't lead to more broken promises like with his budget, which zeros out assistance for our Great Lakes. The President's plan lacks quantifiable specifics, but some warning signs are there. Privatization and tax breaks mean bearing down more costs on taxpayers through user fees and tolls.

Mr. Speaker, Americans expect more than showmanship. It is time for a real bipartisan jobs and infrastructure plan to help modernize America from stem to stern and keep her great for years to come.

CONGRATULATING DEAN WILLIAM EASTERLING

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Penn State's own Dean William Easterling on his appointment to head the National Science Foundation's Directorate for Geosciences, or GEO.

Dr. Easterling was dean of Penn State College of Earth and Mineral Sciences prior to beginning his 4-year appointment last week. This is an incredible opportunity for Dean Easterling, and Happy Valley is most proud of his achievement.

Science was part of Dean Easterling's life from a very young age, as his father was a medical school physician. He told our local newspaper that he was taken at an early age by environmental sciences, geology, and weather, and these interests have always stuck with him.

Dr. Easterling has been the dean of Earth and Mineral Sciences at Penn State since 2007. He plans to return to the university after his appointment to the National Science Foundation.

I wholeheartedly congratulate Dean Easterling on this momentous achievement. I wish him the best over the next 4 years. And I know that his hunger for learning and his advanced research skills will serve this Nation well.

Congratulations, Dean Easterling.

□ 1715

DISAPPROVING OF WITHDRAWAL FROM THE PARIS CLIMATE ACCORD

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong disapproval of President Trump's decision to withdraw the United States from the international Paris Agreement on global climate change. The world is watching us, and history will judge this ill-considered decision harshly.

Withdrawing from the accord weakens America's global leadership, will slow our transition to renewable sources of energy, and make it more likely the clean energy jobs of tomorrow will be created overseas rather than here at home.

Let me be clear: Climate change is real and a present threat. America can and should be the global leader in developing innovative solutions, but this decision leaves us as an international outlier.

I am proud my hometown, Chicago, joins cities and States across the country that have pledged to continue honoring the emission reductions that are

part of the Paris Agreement. That is why I am introducing a resolution to commend these States and localities and to urge the administration to reverse its position.

I invite my colleagues to join me. Irrespective of President Trump's shortsighted policies, we must continue to seek solutions to protect our planet for future generations.

IN MEMORIAM OF SPECIALIST ETIENNE J. MURPHY

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Army Specialist Etienne J. Murphy, who died on May 26 when his vehicle overturned in Syria as part of Operation Inherent Resolve.

Specialist Murphy was raised in Loganville, Georgia, where, from an early age, he showed a keen interest in the American Armed Forces and for serving his country. He enlisted in the Army at 18 years old, and 2 years later he joined the 1st Battalion of the 75th Ranger Regiment, stationed at Hunter Army Airfield.

Murphy was just 5 days into his first deployment in Syria when his vehicle was involved in a nontactical rollover-related accident which is still under investigation.

Murphy's wife and two young sons continue to reside in Savannah, Georgia, where he was stationed.

Only a short time after Memorial Day, Specialist Murphy's passing reminds us all that freedom comes at a high price, and servicemen and -women face danger daily when fighting to preserve American values against terrorism.

I want to share my deepest condolences to his family and thank Specialist Murphy for his service, bravery, and sacrifice.

JAMES COMEY WILL TESTIFY

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning James Comey will address the Senate Intelligence Committee. I read his testimony today.

It is obvious to me that the President leaned on James Comey to try to get him to take actions in the Michael Flynn situation that were contrary to what Mr. Comey and I think justice would require, and that is an open investigation for the benefit of the American people and for the independence of the American Government in dealing with its relations with Russia.

I commend James Comey for being strong after being looked down on and

at by the President, trying to get him to ask for his job or pledge loyalty or commit to derail that investigation.

I thank him for his integrity. I thank him for his service to the FBI. And I certainly hope that no one will try to disparage his integrity or his honesty tomorrow.

LORAL O'HARA IS A MEMBER OF 2017 NASA ASTRONAUT CANDIDATE CLASS

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Sugar Land, Texas, is bursting with pride. A few hours ago, at the Johnson Space Center, Vice President PENCE announced that Loral O'Hara is a member of the 2017 NASA astronaut candidate class.

She is a native Texan. Her high school is in my neighborhood. She is a proud Clements High School Ranger, class of 2001. She has a bachelor's from a school in the former Republic of Texas, the University of Kansas, and a master's from Purdue University.

Growing up with astronauts, I know they like to take lots of huge risks, and by that standard, Loral is the most qualified candidate ever. She is a private pilot, an EMT, a wilderness first responder, a surfer, a sailor, a skier.

Currently, she works at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Center. That is perfect training for her because she will spend hours in the water at the Sonny Carter Neutral Buoyancy Lab outside the Johnson Space Center.

Loral, you know how to come home in style like only a Texas woman can do. You are an astronaut. Welcome home.

NATIONAL CANCER SURVIVORS DAY

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago on June 4, we recognized National Cancer Survivors Day to honor all of the incredible men and women who have battled cancer and have emerged triumphant.

This year, an estimated 1.6 million new cases of cancer will be diagnosed, and nearly 700,000 people will die of cancer in the United States.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention lists cancer now as the second leading cause of death. Fortunately, we are taking steps to lower those numbers. Last year's 21st Century Cures Act, a bipartisan initiative, authorized \$1.8 billion in funding for the Cancer Moonshot Foundation, aids in cancer research, and strives to increase the availability of a wide variety of treatment options while also

helping to help prevent cancer and detect it at early stages.

Mr. Speaker, on National Cancer Survivors Day, we are grateful for those who have won their fight against cancer, and now we commit to honoring more survivors through research for new and improved cures.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, our current immigration policies are hurting families, tearing them apart, and deporting people who are part of the very fabric of our communities.

I have a few people in particular I plan to talk about and whose stories I will be sharing, but first I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE), my colleague and friend.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii for yielding to me and for her leadership on this issue. I served with her for 2 years on the Homeland Security Committee of the House of Representatives and saw her ability to balance the national interests and capitalizing and maximizing the opportunity that immigrants provide and have always provided to the United States while ensuring that we protect the homeland and our sacred commitment to every person and family that we represent to make sure that they are safe.

I think that the community that I have the honor of representing in Congress, El Paso, Texas, is a case in point. We are one of the safest cities in the United States today.

If you use the FBI's crime statistics as crunched by CQ Press, they routinely rank El Paso, Texas, the safest city in not just the State of Texas, but in the United States. For the last 20 years, we have been the safest, second safest, or third safest in the country. That is not in spite of the fact that we are connected with Mexico—our sister city is Ciudad Juarez—and it is not in spite of the fact that 24 percent of the people that I represent were born in another country, most of them in Mexico.

In fact, our security, our success, our strength is connected to the fact that we are a city of immigrants, that we are connected to the rest of the world

through our shared border with Mexico, and that understanding that is critical to preserving the security and public safety which is such a critical part of our job. I will give you an example.

Not too long ago, under this administration, a woman who was an undocumented immigrant from Mexico was in an El Paso County courtroom seeking a protective order because her boyfriend threatened her life. The judge in that courtroom granted that protective order, and as that woman was leaving the courtroom, she was apprehended by a plainclothes Border Patrol agent. That has never, to my knowledge, happened in our community in the El Paso County Courthouse.

The consequences of that are not just that this one person was taken off the streets and placed into detention and custody. The consequence is that we have fewer people from the immigrant community in El Paso coming forward to serve as witnesses to crimes, to report crimes in the first place, to testify, to take part in the criminal justice system in a way that has kept our community safe.

By definition, today, because of that one act, because of the climate of fear and intimidation and anxiety produced by this administration, El Paso, Texas, the State of Texas, this country is less safe.

If we want to respond to the most urgent issue that each constituent of ours depends on us for, that is their safety, their security, that of the community and the country that we serve, then we need to make sure that we treat everyone within our communities that we represent with dignity and respect. We need to make sure that local law enforcement is not seen as a tool of Federal immigration law, but that they are there to preserve and to protect the peace and to serve the constituents and the people who live in those communities.

I would also add that next week marks the fifth anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, program implemented under President Obama. It was an important step that this country took to realize the gains that we and future generations will receive by ensuring that those young people who arrived on our shores and through our land ports of entry like El Paso, through no fault of their own, at the tender age of 5 or 6 years old and who are now in school or want to serve in our military or want to create jobs themselves are able to stay here and flourish so that we receive the benefit of their potential.

I hope this Congress, every colleague from both sides of the aisle, will work with me and others to ensure that we have, if not comprehensive immigration reform, which I think should remain the goal, reform in those areas like for the DREAMers and the DACA

beneficiaries that is most urgent and to the States that we represent and serve, like Texas, with 200,000 DACA beneficiaries out of 700,000 nationwide. It is the right thing to do for our security. It is the right thing to do for economic growth and job creation. It is the right thing to do in the best interests and traditions of this country.

So I conclude by again thanking the gentlewoman from Hawaii for leading this discussion on this critically important issue, and I thank her for the privilege of being able to speak tonight.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his leadership and his commitment to not only the families and the people in his district, but to the challenges that many families are facing all across the country, and I look forward to continuing to work with him on these issues.

Some of these challenges that face families across the country touch my constituents in Hawaii as well. I would like to share a few of their stories and their challenges here today in the hopes that Congress and this administration take action and do the right thing for them and for our country.

We are a nation of immigrants. Andres Magana Ortiz's story is not a new one. It is not one that will surprise anyone.

□ 1730

In fact, it will be quite recognizable to most of us. No tradition is as American as telling the stories of our relatives and ancestors who, against all odds and great difficulties, found and made a home here on our shores.

But while our family histories remind us of how far we have come, Andres' story demonstrates the progress that we have yet to make and who is hurt and affected by the lack of that progress today.

Andres Ortiz came to Hawaii seeking the American Dream. With hard work, perseverance, and a little luck, Andres demonstrated what we, as Americans, know to be true and that we strive for: if you work hard, you can succeed and get ahead.

Andres started a new life in 1996 picking coffee—backbreaking, tough work, for anyone who has done it before—in the Kona region on the island of Hawaii. He proved himself smart and capable, and he was soon promoted to supervisor. By 2010, he saved enough to buy his own coffee farm. Today, he owns 20 acres of coffee trees, and manages another 150 acres for his neighbors.

Andres quickly earned a reputation as a knowledgeable and skillful farmer. When an invasive beetle, called the coffee berry borer, began to ravish our Kona coffee farms and trees, Andres began a pioneering system to help his community track and eradicate this infestation, even before our U.S. Department of Agriculture took action. Now,

this infestation was not just a small matter. It was something that cost our farmers millions of dollars.

Our country offered Andres the means to become an entrepreneur, and he paid us back in full: he started a business, he creates jobs, he takes care of his workers, and he is a leader in our community. Andres is not a legal resident of Hawaii, but Hawaii owes him a debt for his contributions.

Managing the coffee farm is a family affair for Andres. He is a proud husband and father of three children. His wife and kids are all American citizens, and his kids only know Hawaii as home.

Andres embodies the spirit of the American Dream, and serves as an example of why we should welcome courageous, hardworking immigrants into our community. The reality that Andres faces now, sadly, is far different.

If Andres is deported to Mexico, as is supposed to happen in just a few days, his family, their farm, and Kona coffee growers are going to face an uncertain future. Without Andres to run the business, his family could lose their farm and lose their home. Their neighbors will lose a friend and a business partner. Brenda, his wife, will be without her husband, and their three children will be without their father.

If Andres is forced to leave, the law will keep him from his family for 10 years. Should the family move to Mexico with Andres, they will have to learn a new language and a new culture. His daughter will have to drop out of college at the University of Hawaii and begin a new life in another country. Relocating to Mexico would deprive them of the benefits afforded to the citizens of this country.

Now, unfortunately, Andres's story is not a singular one. Unfortunately, there are more.

Just last week, Graham Ellis of Waimea, a 67-year-old British national and leukemia patient, heard a knock on his door. It was two Department of Homeland Security agents who have come to begin the deportation process back to the U.K. after Graham had made Hawaii his home for over 36 years. After a few short minutes of conversation in front of his wife, Dena, who is an American citizen, Graham agreed to turn himself in at a field office in Honolulu the following day.

Now, like Mr. Ortiz, Graham is a pillar within our community in Hawaii. But unlike Mr. Ortiz, Graham had already made the decision to return to the U.K. because he feared that deportation was inevitable under the heightened threats faced under our current immigration policies. Graham had made the decision to leave by the end of summer, thinking that these remaining months would give him time to get his affairs in order, and say good-bye to the community and the home that he grew to love for so long.

A circus performer by training, Graham spent much of his life in Hawaii teaching children from low-income and at-risk communities circus arts, bringing smiles and laughter to their faces and their lives.

He served on the Puna Community Council, and was the founding president of the Kalapana Seaview Estates Community Association.

In his remaining final months, he had planned to make a trip to Kauai, where he would instruct his last group of young, passionate students at a 2-week superhero-themed circus camp before shutting it down for good.

Our immigration system is broken. We need a pathway to citizenship for immigrants to ensure people who deserve to be here can find a way to be a part of our great country. We need real immigration reform that keeps families together and integrates hardworking, tax-paying immigrants into our community. We need to preserve, protect, and restore the values that underlie the greatness of our country.

I stand with Andres and Graham and the millions of hardworking immigrants who built our great Nation; and I stand with these immigrants who live in my community, who live in my district, and who have a proven record of upstanding contributions to our community.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO), my colleague.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the beautiful State of Hawaii for yielding to me, and I thank her also for being a champion of immigrants, both in her State and across the Nation.

It is Immigrant Heritage Month this month, and I think it is critical that we take a few moments to talk about the state of immigration here in the United States. I can't do that any better than by talking about a few stories of what I have experienced over the past few months.

On January 27 of this year, we saw President Trump sign his executive order, quite expeditiously, on a travel ban that specifically targeted the Muslim community, with seven countries, where 90-plus percent of the population practice Islam.

It was an interesting moment for me. My wife and I were having dinner with a few friends of ours in the district, and one of them had asked me: Well, how is this ban going to affect you? How is it going to affect your district?

At the moment, I wasn't really sure, but then I got a call only a few minutes later by my district director. Our first constituent was identified as coming back on a United Arab Emirates flight back from Iraq and was scheduled to land the next morning: a girl who had graduated from the University of Central Florida and lived a very productive life as a legal resident in central Florida for the last 6 years after her graduation.

So we went the next day—early the next morning because, if anything, my legislative experience in the State legislature has told me: go to where the action is, go to where the controversy is, and do what you can to help.

First, we went to Customs and Border Protection, and we got no response. We actually got surprise responses of what were we even doing there, because this was not a matter they were prepared to handle.

So we went to the airport and were greeted by Greater Orlando Aviation Authority officials who were very helpful and understood that these were central Floridians who had been flying for 20 hours and were just about to arrive back into Florida, where they lived.

That morning, I also met a young man who was a citizen from an area just north of the district, who was waiting for his two parents to come in on the same Emirates flight. We found out that the constituent and the two parents were three people who were held back and questioned.

Throughout the day, we would get updates, but what we found out is there was very little information because there was very little understanding by Customs and Border Protection about how to implement this very vague order. The court had just ruled that it was potentially unconstitutional.

So working with our local officials after hours of building up, hours of waiting with the families, hours of press starting to arrive, hours of TV coverage, and hours of protest, right when we were in the middle of doing interviews, that is when the families were finally released, after 7 hours of being questioned without water, without food, after a 20-hour flight.

You could not have scripted this to make the point of how misguided this ban was than what happened. Right in front of TV cameras from across central Florida, first, the two parents came down—parents of a citizen who hadn't seen his parents in over 5 years.

The scene was traumatic: crying, hugs, and welcomed by cameras wondering what had happened to these two individuals. These were simply two citizens of Iraq trying to come over to visit their son, who had already been given visas to come on over.

A few minutes later, our constituent finally arrived as well. She also had been held for 8 hours without water, without food, after a 20-hour flight, and a barrage of questions.

After that, we saw public opinion change sharply in central Florida as people saw these were the alleged people that were getting extreme vetting: people who were visiting their son in central Florida, longtime residents, who only had productive lives in central Florida.

A few weeks later, we had the deportation force memo come down. I was shocked. We sent out letters to our

sheriffs, we sent out letters to our schools, asking if they were planning on participating in this deportation force that President Trump had called upon to help implement and enforce our immigration laws.

We called immediately a round table, where we invited immigrant groups, we invited law enforcement groups, and so many others to talk about the issues that were happening.

Two of my three sheriffs immediately said they weren't planning on participating, that this was a Federal issue. A third ended up going from fully participating to, a day later, walking back that position, to just picking up folks who had been accused of violent felonies.

Then our schools responded very quickly after they were posed with a scenario—a situation that was going down the very same day: a citizen, a young woman of Mexican descent, whose parents were also legal immigrants, was asked in front of their classmates about her status.

Afterwards, there were a lot of finger-pointing and excuses that these were questions that were being levied to determine whether she needed to participate in the ESEA program. But at that moment, it was just more of this anti-immigrant rhetoric that was coming out of so many areas in central Florida.

But like that incident, which was covered at length, minds and hearts changed in central Florida. There was an apology given to this young woman who was a citizen, and they changed the policy so that no one would be asked about immigration status in front of their peers, even if it was for something as harmless as the ESEA program.

With our sheriffs clarifying their policies to not join this DHS call for deportation force, we were proud once again to have an inclusive society in central Florida where we welcome everybody. We are such an international community, home to the best theme parks in the world, a world-class convention center and hotels, and we welcome everybody from across the globe.

Then, in addition, I just received a letter from a constituent. Her daughter had grown up, gotten a job, fallen in love, and had a bright future ahead of her. But she worried because her daughter's boyfriend potentially could be deported because he is on an H-1 visa.

These types of policies breaking up families don't serve any interest in helping people pursue the American Dream and don't serve any interest in protecting our economy and protecting growth in central Florida, where we have such a large cattle industry and where we have such a large citrus industry.

Finally, we have so many DREAMers, young students, who live in central

Florida, who are working and striving, rising up in our society, and helping people along the way, immigrants who potentially could be one of 40 percent of creators of Fortune 500 companies that have been created here in America, one of the 65,000 servicemen and -women who are immigrants, who serve in our United States military. And we find that, with every 100 immigrants, we are creating 120 new jobs because our country has been founded and created on growth and equality.

□ 1745

So I would like to see a few things happen, things that I believe Democrats and Republicans can agree on. First, let's make sure to ratify the DREAMer program, the Deferred Action program. You have bipartisan co-sponsorship for this bill. This is something we could get done, especially for our veterans and those serving in our U.S. military.

In addition, I believe that we need to relook at the H-1 visa program, the farmworker program. We need to acknowledge the reality that we have had for the last 150 years of agriculture here in the United States, which is that we rely on many of our immigrants coming from Mexico and Central and South America to help with our agriculture. This has been going on for over a century.

What we can do is simply go from a 1-year to maybe a 3-year or 5-year program. I know our immigrants' rights community would support it. I know our agriculture communities would support it; and we wouldn't have people unwittingly not getting back to their country of origin after the 1-year visa expires, when they just want to go back and come back again to help out as seasonal labor.

Then thirdly, there is an arbitrary cap on highly skilled workers here in this country. We train them in Ivy League schools, in brilliant schools in Texas, California, Florida, and across this Nation. And then, because of an arbitrary cap that no one wants to change because of the hot-button issue of immigration, then we send them on their way, back to their countries of origin, rather than keep them here and harness their talent for the future of our economy.

Canada has even got word of this and welcomes these folks. When they realize their visas are up, they beg them to come to Canada to help start new businesses.

So these are some of the ideas that we can fix, that we could all agree on, that both parties can agree on. And of course, in the end, we need a comprehensive immigration reform. But, in the meantime, let's get some things done that we all agree on and move our country forward.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii, one of the most

beautiful States of the Union, for her leadership.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend from Florida for complimenting my State, but for, most importantly, again, putting a face and names to those who are suffering as a result of our broken immigration policy.

You know, for us here, we can stand here and talk about policies and debate them and talk about legislation that needs to be passed. But it is really those folks at home who make it all very real. It is not just a bill number, it is their own family that is being torn apart, it is their own children who are being affected.

Now, you know, I talked about Mr. Ortiz in Hawaii. He and his family are going through this, as we speak, where, in just a few days, he faces being deported. He and his family have exhausted all the options available to them, given the time that they have.

Our delegation from Hawaii, both my colleague, Congresswoman HANABUSA, as well as our Senators, Senator HIRONO and Senator SCHATZ, we have all sent a letter to Secretary Kelly, Department of Homeland Security, urging him to reconsider this order and to halt Mr. Ortiz's deportation, taking a consideration to him and his circumstance and his longstanding commitment and leadership in our community.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 2794, which is what is called a private bill, specifically for the relief of Andres Magana Ortiz. And the purpose of this bill is to help Mr. Ortiz with his extremely challenging situation and to help him on his own path to citizenship.

I urge Chairman GOODLATTE to give positive consideration to this bill that has been referred to his committee. I urge Secretary Kelly, the Department of Homeland Security, to revisit their policy and their decision and to put a halt on Mr. Ortiz's deportation. He is not just a number. He is not just a statistic. He and his family are facing this reality today.

It is always the right time to do the right thing, and I urge these leaders to do that right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to be here. I do greatly appreciate my friend from Hawaii, her views. I know she is a person of integrity; calls them like she sees them. I appreciate her very much.

There are just a number of things that really need to be called out. Here is an article from the Guardian. Julian Borger, June 6, that would be yesterday. The headline is: "Cancel Donald Trump state visit, says Sadiq Khan, after London attack tweets."

It states: "London mayor says U.S. President is wrong about many things and that state visit to Britain should not go ahead."

"The London mayor, Sadiq Khan, has called on the British Government to cancel a planned state visit by Donald Trump after being criticized in two tweets by the U.S. President."

Now, it really is interesting that the London mayor, after he has his citizens—his people are viciously mutilated, killed in the streets of his city, and, instead of being—going through a self-examination, is there something more I could have done as mayor of this town? Is there something more I could have encouraged? Is there something more we could have done here in England, in Great Britain, in the U.K.? Is there something we could have done that I, in a position of authority, could have done to stop this, to help, at least help stop this?

But Mr. Sadiq Khan apparently didn't go through that, as people were grieving, not just in London but all over the world, here in the United States, praying for the families, grieving with those who were attacked, so many attacked, dozens attacked, instead of perhaps wondering, maybe we don't have our policies quite right, this is yet another attack, and maybe the Britain leaders should have thought, you know, we have been saying that the real key—it has been said around Europe, maybe the real key to stopping radical Islam and the mutilation of innocent people, the slashing of throats, the beheading, the terrible things that have been done by radical Islamists, maybe the way to stop them we were told—not maybe—they said the way to stop them is the Paris climate accord.

If we just show them enough love as they are beheading us, or slashing our throats, and we have signed on, and we are fully part embraced in the Paris climate accord, you know, the radical Islamist murders will stop. That is the kind of baloney we have been told.

And in England, there are people who have indicated as much, how outrageous it was that President Trump pulled the United States out of the Paris accord, because he saw the damage that was going to be done to the United States economy. He saw the damage that would be done to the United States jobs.

I talked to people in east Texas last weekend, different places around east Texas, and they kept coming back: I am so grateful that Donald Trump pulled out of the Paris accord. One of them has a new—some type of concrete business. They have got rights to a spe-

cific process that is great for the environment. It is green.

So then we find out our business was going to be devastated if we stayed in the Paris climate accord. It would have gutted our business. We would have been having to file for bankruptcy. Others, you know, the same day, last Saturday, were telling me the same things, different places, same song. We found out how much our business would have been gutted if the President had not pulled out of the Paris accord.

And, of course, we want to be fair to the 160 countries or so that have condemned the United States, said that we are the one partner in the Paris climate accord, just like in Kyoto, and Reykjavik, and all these others, the United States is the most important partner in those accords. Well, yeah, I guess so.

We were going to be the one country that was going to pay billions of dollars to other countries because we have been successful, and we have been innovative, and our Constitution, the brilliance of the Founders to ensure in our Constitution that we were going to reward intellectual property, intellectual thought, would stir intellectual creations. And we loved this idea of private property, you know, before the last 50 years, we loved this idea of private property, and the Nation has grown.

But as, you know, people have continued to make inroads, taking away private property rights, of course, the economy doesn't grow at the rates that it has in previous days. But at least by pulling out of Paris, we have got a shot to continue to be the most humanitarian, the most charitable Nation, I believe, in the history of the world; that even Solomon's Israel did not have the kind of freedoms and the kind of individual ability to be charitable.

Billions of dollars that have been given. I don't know. Maybe trillions over the years in today's dollars around the world for so many good purposes. And yet if we had stayed in the Paris accord, we would have done so much damage to our own economy.

So I have told many people, thank God, and thank Donald Trump that he got us out of that mess, so that we can continue our climb out of the economic malaise of the Obama years; that we can continue to get back a thriving economy that has been so sluggish for so many years now; not the artificial growth bubble that was created late in the Clinton years, that was bound to burst, not that kind but based on real jobs and manufacturing jobs coming back.

I know from studying history, I think President Trump knows just from his business acumen, that any nation that is considered an international world power, that cannot produce and manufacture the things that are needed in a

time of war will not remain a world power past the next war. It won't. So it brings us back to a great thing to get rid of the Paris accord.

Now we have got to cut taxes. And I know there is a lot of screaming from the left about how, gee, wanting to cut taxes for the rich. Well, actually, under President Obama, there was so much damage done to the middle classes. The middle class shrunk in numbers of people, it appears, while the gap between the poor and the rich got even bigger. And as President Obama is on video admitting, it must have been tough, but he admitted, yeah, it is true. It was true.

It is true that, under President Obama, for the first time in the history of the United States of America, first time, 95 percent of the Nation's income went to the top 1 percent. So we have heard all this stuff about Republicans helping the rich and hurting the poor.

There is no President's policy in the history of our Nation that has done more damage to the poor, to the middle class, than the policies of the Obama administration. There is no President's administration that has done more damage to shrink the middle class and to widen the gap between the poor and the rich. And most of those rich who give money seem to just keep giving to the Democratic Party.

□ 1800

You know, I love, whether it is Republicans, Democrats, or Independents coming up with a great idea and making money on it. It is fantastic. You know, as long as it is legal, but it is fantastic.

With all of my faults, jealousy is not one I suffer from. It is great to see anybody work hard or come up with something innovative, and make money. I think it is fantastic. I love the fact that this Nation, for most of our history, has done what we could to incentivize that process.

So the mayor of London condemning President Trump.

Well, who is this guy?

He has got plenty of his own problems. He has got plenty of his own issues. But it wasn't just the mayor of London, Mr. Sadiq Khan. We also heard from the Acting U.S. Ambassador over in London, Lewis Lukens, and he sent out this message: "I commend the strong leadership of the mayor of London as he leads the city forward after this heinous attack."

And by virtue of this statement, of course, he is incorporating the decisions by the mayor of London, the decisions by those with whom the mayor of London is consorting, those decisions that have allowed so many radical Islamists to be creating plots and plans to kill Londoners. That has been going on, we find out after this attack. We should have known from the one before, the one before, the one before, that this has been going on.

Lewis Lukens, our highest U.S. ranking official in London, basically condemned President Trump by siding with the mayor of London, who is more concerned about condemning the President of the United States than he is about grieving for his own people, or doing everything within the mayor's conceivable power to stop the next radical attack.

Under the thinking of people like the mayor of London, there should not have ever been an attack in England, not recently, for sure, because they didn't pull out of the Paris accord. And if the Paris accord was going to save the world from radical Islam, then, wow, all of the attacks should be happening in the United States of America.

Unless we get our friends on the other side of the aisle to help us as we need to do to pass legislation that give us the protection we need, the attacks will be coming. But it wouldn't make sense—if you believe people like this, and those that say Paris is the key to ending radical Islam, it wouldn't make sense that London would be hit twice instead of the United States. They didn't pull out. They condemned us for pulling out.

So it makes you think, when you really look at everything, maybe the key to defeating radical Islam is what Americans who have fought them know: there is only one way to defeat radical Islam, and that is to defeat it; to fight it, kill it, defeat it.

I saw President Carter here on television here in the last few days. I had it on mute, so I don't know what he said. A sweet man. Of course, he does seem to have some pretty strong anti-Semitic feelings, so it is hard to feel too much about the sweetness when you see and hear comments that make you know he really doesn't care much for certain Jews or Israel. But I know he meant well when he abandoned the Shah of Iran, not a nice man like Qadhafi—not a great man, not a nice man, but at least he was keeping radical Islam in the box, keeping it boxed up.

When President Carter saw the Shah deposed and the Ayatollah Khomeini comes into Iran, he didn't recognize that he had literally opened Pandora's box, and it was going to be a plague upon the world for years and years to come, and that thousands and thousands of Americans would die trying to put radical Islam back in the box from which President Carter let it escape and from which President Obama encouraged more—not intentionally, but the actions have consequences, and Americans have continued to die and will continue until radical Islam, with the help of our Muslim friends that don't want to be ruled by radical Islamists, with their help—we have got to have their help—we can get it back in the box the way it once was.

But there are people like Lewis Lukens, our highest ranking U.S. official in London, who don't recognize this. But the name to so many sounded familiar, Lewis Lukens. I know I have heard that name before. Oh, well, after tweeting out, or sending out the message from the U.S. Embassy in London, taking sides in favor of the mayor of London over the President of the United States—let's see, who is this—as the article from Monica Showalter says:

“So who is Acting Ambassador Lewis Lukens anyway?”

“Turns out he's a career diplomat, with nearly 30 years' experience in assorted outposts. His most prominent positions, however, have been at the side of the person who must have served as a sort of mentor, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, serving as her chief administrative officer. In that time frame, he managed to reach the inner circle of Clinton's tight little circle of acolytes—on the same level as Cheryl Mills and Huma Abedin.

“In testimony to Congress, Lukens claimed to have come up with the idea of having Clinton set up a private server.”

Oh, that is right. He is the genius that came up with the idea of having Hillary Clinton have a private server so it was more easy for our enemies to hack classified information. But then again, we find out, well, it really didn't make that much difference because she was sending it to Huma Abedin, who was sending it to Mr. Weiner.

Anyway, it turns out, all kinds of felonies were being committed, Federal laws being violated. Of course, under Director Comey, he didn't want to pursue anybody like that because he is sure they meant well, even though they were violating the law right and left.

But Lukens takes the side of the mayor, and he is the same guy that came up with the private server idea for Hillary Clinton. So I know, on behalf of those who supported President Trump, we greatly appreciate the damage that he did to the Democratic Party. Lukens—and, hopefully, he won't be long for being the highest ranking U.S. official in London. Hopefully, we can send somebody over there that doesn't have great ideas like he had for Hillary Clinton that causes our British friends the kind of trouble he caused for Hillary Clinton.

And then we have got this from Will Carr, WGMD News Radio:

“Concerns are being raised on Capitol Hill about whether partisan politics could impact the 2020 Census and swing congressional redistricting in favor of Democrats.

“FOX News has learned that last summer, a pro-Democratic analytics firm that described itself as ‘a platform for hope and change’ . . .”

Wow. Yeah, as we saw over the last 8 years, 95 million Americans—the high-

est number in our history—even gave up looking for work. So they weren't reflected in the unemployment numbers, but they just gave up. It was so hopeless. So much for hope and change.

Anyway, this analytics firm is “a platform for hope and change,” but it “. . . included as a subcontractor in a \$415 million advertising contract for the 2020 Census.

“The data firm, Civis Analytics, was founded by the chief analytics officer on former President Barack Obama's 2012 reelection campaign.

“Since congressional redistricting, which occurs every 10 years, is based on the results of the national Census, the chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee is now asking the Secretary of the Department of Commerce to ensure that the Census will be conducted in a nonpartisan fashion—and that redistricting will not be impacted.

“‘In 2016, the Bureau awarded an advertising contract that included a subcontractor with close ties to the partisan politics that reportedly ‘spun out of’ the reelection campaign of President Obama,’ Senator RON JOHNSON”—our friend from Wisconsin—“wrote to Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross in a letter obtained by FOX News.”

Our friend, Senator RON JOHNSON, says: “This partisan lineage raises concern in light of a Democratic initiative to use the results of the 2020 Census to draw district lines in a manner favorable to Democratic candidates.”

So, wow, what a deal. The Obama administration has got their own consulting firm helping with the 2020 Census. That ought to concern a lot of people that want to make sure that our little experiment as a democratic republic does not come to an end. As Ben Franklin warned, we could have it as long—if we could keep it, that is.

But the shocking story today that I am not hearing enough talk about, and printed out by Circa, John Solomon and Sara Carter today: “A former U.S. intelligence contractor tells Circa he walked away. . . .”

This is a U.S. intelligence contractor. Where have we heard that term?

That is what we were told that Edward Snowden was.

Well, this says: “. . . he walked away with more than 600 million classified documents on 47 hard drives from the National Security Agency and the CIA, a haul potentially larger than Edward Snowden's now infamous breach.”

But it sounded like a good thing.

It says: “And now he is suing former FBI Director James Comey and other government figures, alleging the Bureau has covered up evidence that he provided them showing widespread spying on Americans that violated civil liberties.

“The suit, filed late Monday night by Dennis Montgomery, was assigned to

the same Federal judge who has already ruled that some of the NSA's collection of data on Americans violates the U.S. Constitution's Fourth Amendment, setting up an intriguing legal proceeding in the Nation's Capital this summer.

"Montgomery says the evidence he gave to the FBI chronicle the warrantless collection"—not just phone metadata—"of phone, financial and personal data and the unmasking of identities in spy data about millions of Americans.

"This domestic surveillance was all being done on computers supplied by the FBI," Montgomery told Circa in an interview. "So these supercomputers, which are FBI computers, the CIA is using them to do domestic surveillance."

□ 1815

Gee, we have been assured that does not happen. We have been assured in hearings in our Judiciary Committee over the last 12 years I have been here—and we have had a lot of hearings on these issues. We have been assured this isn't happening. This guy who knows enough to steal 600 million classified documents on 47 hard drives without getting caught says it is happening.

Mr. Speaker, let me parenthetically insert here, we have had a number of conversations with FBI and different intelligence officials, because section 702 that allows this kind of widespread collection, if we are going after what we were told would be foreign terrorists, known foreign terrorists, and they happened to capture an American, the name is masked. You can't get that information. There has to be probable cause to get anything about the American. We are finding out names have been unmasked.

Now, this information by Montgomery is that things are leaked about Americans. Widespread information is being collected on Americans with no probable cause they committed any crime.

I have told numerous DOJ and intelligence officials—and I am very serious about this—they must show that they can police their own ranks of people who are violating Americans' civil rights and gathering information in ways Orwell could never have dreamed of. As my friend THOMAS MASSIE was pointing out today, Orwell thought it would take people to spy on other people. He never dreamed that we, the government, would be able to collect warehouses full of information on little disks that would be used and pulled out later any time they wanted to go after an individual—but it sure looks like it is happening.

If our own justice and intelligence officials cannot police themselves and produce the very people who have leaked information and who have un-

masked information, I will join with many of my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle to vote against them ever having those types of powers again. They are going to have to police themselves. They are going to have to produce the people who have been leaking, who have been unmasking, and who have been spying on Americans without legal authority. They are going to have to produce those people, because if they can't and if they don't, they have no business having this kind of power. I know it has got a lot of our justice officials and intelligence officials upset.

Based on the way things have been going and from what we keep finding out, I am sure somebody has been going through my background with a fine-tooth comb looking for anything so they can take me out, but good luck.

I am sure, as Heritage Foundation has written before, probably most Americans are committing a number of Federal crimes a day we don't even know about. So, apparently, it can be done if Heritage is right, as I think they are. But the fact is it ought to scare every American that there is this much Federal intervention in their own personal lives.

The truth is we have got to get rid of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. They have no right and they have no authority under our Constitution to gather people's financial information unless there is probable cause to believe a crime has been committed and that this person has committed the crime, and then get a warrant to get it. It is time to end that for real. It is time to end this kind of personal snooping on American citizens.

This article goes on and says: "Documents obtained by Circa outside of the lawsuit show that the U.S. Attorney's Office in Washington in 2015 approved a grant of limited immunity for Montgomery so he could explain how he managed to walk out of his contract and the buildings he worked in with the classified material" on 47 hard drives.

"He said he returned the hard drives to the FBI, a fact confirmed in government documents reviewed by Circa.

"They're doing this domestic surveillance on Americans, running a project on U.S. soil," Montgomery alleged. He did not disclose the classified name of the project but said he revealed all aspects of the project during his interview with the FBI.

"Can you imagine what someone can do with the information they were collecting on Americans, can you imagine that kind of power."

"Officials with the FBI and CIA declined to comment due to current and pending litigation.

"The FBI contacts with Montgomery were encouraged by a senior status Federal judge who encouraged the two

sides to meet rather than allow for any of the classified materials to leak, according to interviews Circa conducted.

"Montgomery's lawsuit, which included his lawyer, the well-known conservative activist Larry Klayman, alleges Montgomery provided extensive evidence to the FBI of illegal spying on Americans ranging from judges to businessmen like the future President Donald Trump.

"The suit did not offer specifics on any illegal spying, but it accused the Bureau of failing to take proper actions to rectify Montgomery's concerns.

"Montgomery divulged to the FBI a 'pattern and practice of conducting illegal, unconstitutional surveillance against millions of Americans, including prominent Americans such as the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court'"—wow—"other Justices, 156 judges, prominent businessmen, and others such as Donald J. Trump, as well as plaintiffs themselves."

That is the allegation in the suit.

"Plaintiffs were assured that the FBI, under Defendant Comey, would conduct a full investigation into the grave instances of illegal and unconstitutional activity set forth by Montgomery. However, the FBI, on Defendant Comey's orders, buried the FBI's investigation because the FBI itself is involved in an ongoing conspiracy to not only conduct the aforementioned illegal, unconstitutional surveillance, but to cover it up as well," the suit added.

"Klayman and Montgomery also alleged that they have evidence that they themselves have been improperly spied upon by U.S. intelligence. The suit named numerous other defendants as well, including NSA Director Mike Rogers, former CIA Director John Brennan, and even former President Barack Obama.

"Court records indicate the suit was assigned in Washington to U.S. District Judge Richard Leon, who in 2015 issued an historic ruling that the NSA's past bulk collection of Americans' phone records most likely violated the Constitution."

Thank God he ruled as he did.

"The agency has since ended that practice but the pending case, which is winding its way through appeals and motions, is likely to shine a light on whether Americans' civil liberties were violated during more than a decade of the war on terror."

This is incredible.

Then, when we hope the courts may be our help, we see another answer that is incredibly discouraging, Federal courts stepping in where they have no authority. Federal court, district court, court of appeals, they have no authority to grant standing to people that are not in the United States, standing and rights to people that are not American citizens and not on

American soil. But that is the effect of what they are doing when they say that the President and, actually, Congress, which gave the President much of the power he has on the issue of travel bans and immigration, that we don't have the authority.

Well, under the Constitution, we do have the authority. Congress has the authority and the President has authority to protect us when it comes to national security. He has authority to make decisions like he has. There is no constitutional right under the United States Constitution for someone in another country to have a right to come into the United States. There is no such constitutional right.

For any harebrained judge in America to say that indicates that this is like artificial intelligence becoming self-aware: Wow, I can do whatever I want.

Once it becomes like AI, once it becomes self-aware, then it begins to protect itself. Anyone who has authority or ability to rein them in: We have got to slap them down and limit their ability to rein us in with our artificial intelligence—which is more than some of the judges have.

Mr. Speaker, I am not singling out an individual so I am not violating the House rules.

But this is serious. This is a blow to our experiment as a little, self-governing republic. It is a threat to our ability to proceed as such.

But every Federal court except for the Supreme Court owes its entire existence and jurisdiction to the United States Congress. Congress brings those courts into being, and we can take them out. Congress gives them their jurisdiction, and we can take them out.

I think it is time to begin to take out some of these courts that, like artificial intelligence, have become self-aware and now are trying to lash out and take power away from those under our Constitution that have it and to take it unto themselves in a self-protection mode.

It is getting dangerous in the United States of America for a number of reasons. Radical Islam is only one of the reasons, but courts are going so far to overrule common sense and overrule the words of the Constitution and overrule the words of lawfully passed bills in the House and the Senate signed by Presidents and approved in other case law.

Courts are coming back now and just deciding: We are like artificial intelligence. We are most important now that we are self-aware as the courts, and we are going to do everything we can to limit congressional authority and executive authority and bring all power and protection unto ourselves in the courts.

It is getting dangerous from a constitutional standpoint. All of this is occurring.

There is an article from Conservative Review by Daniel Horowitz, June 5: "7th Circuit Codifies Transgenderism into the Constitution."

The courts did such a great thing in America pointing out the importance of immutable characteristics. Characteristics that are immutable are not changeable, whether it is the color of the skin, a race, or a gender. Things that are immutable need to be protected from discrimination.

Once the courts began to get into protecting characteristics that change on the whim of the carrier of those characteristics, then the courts started getting us into an area that also is a threat to a constitutional republic with private property rights, with privacy rights, and with the freedoms that we used to have and that are being infringed.

When the courts come back and say that you have to protect non-immutable characteristics that may change day to day wholly in the mind of the proponent, where does it stop?

□ 1830

It is a destructive force. We all agreed on race, everybody I know. I am sure there are some racists in America. In fact, I know there are still some. We have got some people who, I can't believe, after the lessons that should have been learned from the Holocaust, hate Jews, hate Israel, want it destroyed, removed. Incredible.

The courts are saying we have to preserve some right that none of the rest of us can know, some characteristic none of the rest of us can know. It could change moment by moment. One moment someone is saying: I feel like a girl; I am going in the girl's restroom; or I feel like a boy today.

Who can know? If it is not apparent, then how can somebody be said to be bigoted against or take some action against when you couldn't even know what was in their head? How did I know?

I didn't discriminate against somebody for something I didn't know they had. It was all in their mind. How can I know? When the courts get us into that kind of quagmire, we can't recover. It will sink our ship.

In this case, as Daniel Horowitz says: "Last week, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals became the latest Federal appeals court to codify transgenderism into law and the Constitution."

"Although Obama's executive mandates for transgender bathrooms have gone by the wayside, thanks to Attorney General Jeff Sessions overruling the liberal whims of Education Secretary Betsy DeVos, the courts are engaging in their own social transformation on behalf of the defeated Democrats."

"In *Whitaker v. Kenosha Unified School District*, a unanimous opinion

from the three-judge panel ordered a Wisconsin school district to allow a girl to use the boys' bathroom in school. Following in the footsteps of the Sixth and Fourth Circuits, this Seventh Circuit panel, which included GOP-appointee Ilana Rovner, ruled that the 1972 title IX education law and the 14th Amendment's Equal Protection Clause cover transgenderism as a protected class.

"As the courts redefine our national sovereignty, rewrite election laws and redistricting in favor of Democrats, redefine criminal justice law for mass murderers, and mandate publicly funded abortions, they are using their self-acclaimed status as kings to redefine sexuality retroactive to laws and amendments codified long before the sexual-identity movement was in vogue."

"In an emotional screed disguised as law, this opinion uses male pronouns to describe a woman with female parts. In any other era, these judges would have been deemed mentally unstable to serve on a bench."

"While refusing to recognize biological sex as immutable—or, even significant—the court contended that there is absolutely no disruption or privacy concerns over opposite sexes using the wrong bathrooms."

"A transgender student's presence in the restroom provides no more of a risk to other students' privacy rights than the presence of an overly curious student of the same biological sex who decides to sneak glances at his or her classmates performing their bodily functions."

"The court then appealed to common sense to disregard any remaining privacy concerns as 'conjecture and abstraction.'"

"Why is it I have a sneaking suspicion that when title IX was drafted in 1972, much less when the 14th Amendment was drafted in 1867, they completely understood the privacy concerns but would have never fathomed judges maniacally referring to a Y chromosome as an X chromosome?"

"Amazingly, the legal liberals are the ones with the hypocritical arguments, even according to their own twisted logic. How could this school district be guilty of violating equal protection and engaging in stereotyping for actually applying science equally, and not going along with the deliberate stereotyping requested by the plaintiff?"

"There is no greater stereotype than saying that a girl, despite being a girl, should be treated like a boy because she acts out in a 'manly' way. The entire sexual-identity movement is built upon the very sex stereotypes they want to codify into law but also protect from discrimination."

"This is part of a broader hypocrisy in which the transgender lobby is filing lawsuits to apply disability laws to

gender-confused individuals, but, on the other hand, are suing on discrimination grounds for stereotyping and recognizing this 'disability' as a disability and not as a natural phenomenon.

"Either way, the courts will always reach the legal conclusion that best promotes the socially licentious political outcome . . . even when the 'jurisprudence' is contradictory.

"Last year, the Fourth and Sixth Circuits said that transgenderism being codified into civil rights and the Constitution is 'settled law,' demonstrating how irremediably broken the courts are. This is not just the Ninth Circuit; we have yet to find a single circuit willing to understand the most immutable laws of nature. Thus, it is not surprising that almost every court is creating a right for Somalis to immigrate. If marriage and human sexuality are subjective, so are the borders of a nation.

"Although the Supreme Court punted the Fourth Circuit case, *Grimm v. Gloucester County*, because that one was built upon Obama's obsolete transgender mandate, it is quite clear that another case will end up before the high court within the next year.

"Given Justice Anthony Kennedy's history on this issue—and his penchant for being influenced by growing momentum in the lower courts and the legal profession—it's fairly safe to say we will be confronted with the transgender version of *Obergefell* in the near future.

"The transgender case comes just 2 months after the Seventh Circuit codified sexual orientation into Title VII of the Civil Rights Act."

That is a court passing legislation illegally, unconstitutionally, just by fiat by the court. Their signature, just like any good oligarch.

"This circuit, like many others, is drifting more and more to the far left. A number of the GOP appointees, such as Richard Posner and Ilana Rovner, are among the worst offenders.

"There are only two reliable originalists on the court, Michael Kanne and Diane Sykes. That is why it is so important for Trump to immediately fill the two vacancies on the court with known originalists. Even more importantly, this is yet one more reason to make the courts less consequential by reforming their jurisdiction and scope of power."

And I would add, taking them out. If they are that irresponsible, let's take them out.

What they refuse to look at is real science—real medical science. That is exactly what Dr. Paul McHugh did. He published this article in *The Wall Street Journal* on May 13, 2016. It was updated, apparently, from June 12, 2014.

This was the head of psychiatry, Dr. Paul McHugh, at Johns Hopkins Hos-

pital, the first hospital in America to have actually carried out sex-change operations in America.

These were liberal, far-thinking, far-reaching ideas within surgery at Johns Hopkins. Well, yes, we can cut off organs, change their sexuality. Dr. Paul McHugh was head of psychiatry at Johns Hopkins.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. Dr. McHugh is a man who knows the medical science, not some idea that fleets by that may be gone tomorrow about someone's sexuality.

Dr. McHugh says:

"The transgendered suffer a disorder of 'assumption' like those in other disorders familiar to psychiatrists. With the transgendered, the disordered assumption is that the individual differs from what seems given in nature—namely one's maleness or femaleness. Other kinds of disordered assumptions are held by those who suffer from anorexia and bulimia nervosa, where the assumption that departs from physical reality is the belief by the dangerously thin that they are overweight."

He goes on and says:

"With body dysmorphic disorder, an often socially crippling condition, the individual is consumed by the assumption 'I'm ugly.' These disorders occur in subjects who have come to believe that some of their psycho-social conflicts or problems will be resolved if they can change the way that they appear to others. Such ideas work like ruling passions in their subjects' mind and tend to be accompanied by a solipsistic argument.

"For the transgendered, this argument holds that one's feeling of 'gender' is a conscious, subjective sense that, being in one's mind, cannot be questioned by others. The individual often seeks not just society's tolerance of this 'personal truth' but affirmation of it. Here rests the support for 'transgender equality,' the demands for government payment for medical and surgical treatments, and for access to all sex-based public roles and privileges."

He goes on and says:

"We at Johns Hopkins University—which in the 1960s was the first American medical center to venture into 'sex-reassignment surgery'—launched a study in the 1970s comparing the outcomes of transgendered people who had the surgery with the outcomes of those who did not. Most of the surgically treated patients described themselves as 'satisfied' by the results, but their subsequent psycho-social adjustments were no better than those who didn't have the surgery. And so at Hopkins we stopped doing sex-reassignment surgery, since producing a 'satisfied' but still troubled patient seemed an inad-

equated reason for surgically amputating normal organs.

"It now appears that our long-ago decision was a wise one. A 2011 study at the Karolinska Institute in Sweden produced the most illuminating results yet regarding the transgendered, evidence that should give advocates pause," including the courts that think that they can see a fleeting thought in a litigant's mind and say, Oh, there is a fleeting thought, that is an immutable characteristic. Therefore, we are going to give it rights, even though we can't see it, we don't know what it is. We have just got some idea, so we will call it an immutable characteristic.

But according to the Karolinska Institute study—which is a long-term study, and, for 30 years, they followed 324 people who had sex-reassignment surgery.

"The study revealed that beginning about 10 years after having the surgery, the transgendered began to experience increasing mental difficulties. Most shockingly, their suicide mortality rose almost twentyfold above the comparable nontransgender population. This disturbing result has as yet no explanation but probably reflects the growing sense of isolation reported by the aging transgendered after surgery. The high suicide rate certainly challenges the surgery prescription."

Some of these Federal judges don't realize they are contributing to problems of indescribable proportions that may not be known, as the study indicated, for 10 years or so.

As Dr. McHugh points out:

"Another subgroup consists of young men and women susceptible to suggestion from 'everything is normal' sex education, amplified by internet chat groups. These are the transgender subjects most like anorexia nervosa patients: They become persuaded that seeking a drastic physical change will banish their psycho-social problems. 'Diversity' counselors in their schools, rather like cult leaders, may encourage these young people to distance themselves from their families and offer advice on rebutting arguments against having transgender surgery. Treatments here must begin with removing the young person from the suggestive environment and offering a counter-message in family therapy."

□ 1845

"Then there is this subgroup of very young, often prepubescent children who notice distinct sex roles in the culture and, exploring how they fit in, begin imitating the opposite sex. Misguided doctors at medical centers including Boston's Children's Hospital have begun trying to treat this behavior by administering puberty-delaying hormones to render later sex-change surgeries less onerous—even though the drugs stunt the children's growth

and risk causing sterility. Given that close to 80 percent of such children would abandon their confusion and grow naturally into adult life if untreated, these medical interventions come close to child abuse."

And that is basically what these Federal courts are contributing to. As Dr. McHugh says, they come close to child abuse themselves. He didn't say that about the courts; that is my insertion. But as Dr. McHugh, after being open to helping the transgendered every way that was available, he bases his decision on science, on medical science, on study, not on some whim of someone with a fleeting idea in their mind, maybe it lasts for decades, maybe it doesn't.

But Dr. McHugh says: "A better way to help these children: with devoted parenting."

It is not taking them away by the government or some busybody leftwing kooks that think they know better than their own parents. Of course there are parents that aren't fit. I have sentenced some to prison, and I hope some of them never get out of prison. They are a danger. But for heaven's sake, let's allow good parenting.

Dr. McHugh says and finishes: "At the heart of the problem is confusion over the nature of the transgendered. 'Sex change' is biologically impossible."

Those are Dr. McHugh's words: "Sex change is biologically impossible."

He says: "People who undergo sex-reassignment surgery do not change from men to women or vice versa. Rather, they become feminized men or masculinized women. Claiming that this is civil rights matter and encouraging surgical intervention is in reality to collaborate with and promote a mental disorder."

That is what our Federal courts are engaging in. They are promoting a mental disorder, as it has been called in the DSM.

We ought to be about helping these people, not dividing America. But as the studies have indicated, 80 percent of these children that have such ideas, as others have said and he has said, how many of us know girls that were tomboys growing up but ended up being some of the most beautiful and feminine women later. Some may say that is sexist, but there are men who may grow up acting feminized and they grow up to be some of the most handsome, beautiful men you would ever know, but quite masculine.

These courts are not helping. They are playing with the latest fad, and their playing is doing massive destructive damage to our United States Constitution, to our court system, to our freedom, and to what is left of our Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family emergency.

Mr. MARINO (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for June 6 and the balance of the week on account of attending his son's graduation.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 2:30 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of a medical procedure.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 8, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1515. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Ceiling Fans [Docket No.: EERE-2012-BT-STD-0045] (RIN: 1904-AD28) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1516. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major confirmation of effective date and compliance date for direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Dedicated-Purpose Pool Pumps [EERE-2015-BT-STD-0008] (RIN: 1904-AD52) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1517. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major confirmation of effective date and compliance date for direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps [EERE-2014-BT-STD-0048] (RIN: 1904-AD37) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1518. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's con-

firmation of effective date and compliance date for direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Miscellaneous Refrigeration Products [EERE-2011-BT-STD-0043] (RIN: 1904-AC51) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1519. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [DE104-1104; FRL-9961-26-Region 3] received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1520. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Washington: General Regulations for Air Pollution Sources, Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council [EPA-R10-OAR-2016-0785; FRL-9963-12-Region 10] received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1521. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Virginia; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [VA203-5204; FRL-9957-86-Region 3] received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1522. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Pennsylvania; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [PA 200-4205; FRL-9959-23-Region 3] received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1523. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Maryland; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [MD 204-3120; FRL-9959-24-Region 3] received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1524. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Redesignation of the Muncie Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0137; FRL-9962-70-Region 5] received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1525. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Air Plan Approval and Air Quality Designation; GA; Redesignation of the Atlanta, Georgia 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0583; FRL-9962-27-Region 4] received May 25, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1526. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's stay of rule — Stay of Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills and Emission Guidelines and Compliance Times for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0215 and EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0451; FRL-9963-19-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT62) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1527. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Alternative Final Cover Request for Phase 2 of the City of Wolf Point, Montana, Landfill [EPA-R08-RCRA-2016-0505; FRL-9962-18-Region 8] received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1528. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Louisiana; Revisions to the New Source Review State Implementation Plan; Air Permit Procedure Revisions [EPA-R06-OAR-2016-0206; FRL-9958-84-Region 6] received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1529. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Montana; Revisions to the Administrative Rules of Montana [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0020; FRL-9963-15-Region 8] received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1530. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's confirmation of effective date and compliance date for Major direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Miscellaneous Refrigeration Products (EERE-2011-BT-STD-0043) (RIN: 1904-AC51) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1531. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a series of reports for the second quarter FY 2017, January 1, 2017 — March 31, 2017, developed in accordance with Secs. 36(a) and 26(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, the March 24, 1979, Report by the Committee on Foreign Affairs (H. Rept. 96-70), and the July 31, 1981, Seventh Report by the Committee on Government Operations (H. Rept. 97-214); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1532. A letter from the Deputy Inspector General for Audit Services, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a final report, entitled "U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Met Many Requirements of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 but Did Not Fully Comply for Fiscal Year 2016", pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3321 note; Public Law 107-300, Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)(ii) (as amended by Public Law 112-248, Sec. 3(a)(2));

(126 Stat. 2391); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1533. A letter from the Labor Member and Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1534. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, as amended, and the statistical accomplishments for the period, including information required under the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act of 1997; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1535. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, transmitting the Commission's Semiannual Report to Congress for the Period: October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1536. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Pot Catcher/Processors in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 150916863-6211-02] (RIN: 0648-XF189) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1537. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries; General Category Fishery [Docket No.: 150121066-5717-02] (RIN: 0648-XF284) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1538. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures for the 2017 Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries for Pacific Whiting [Docket No.: 161128999-7428-02] (RIN: 0648-BG47) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1539. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Yellowtail Snapper Management Measures [Docket No.: 160510416-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-BG06) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1540. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Pro-

grams, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Groundfish Fishery; Amendment 18 [Docket No.: 150630567-7360-02] (RIN: 0648-BF26) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1541. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Fishing Restrictions for Tropical Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean [Docket No.: 170223197-7311-01] (RIN: 0648-BG67) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1542. A letter from the Counsel for Regulatory and Legislative Affairs, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — July 2017 Revision of Patent Cooperation Treaty Procedures [Docket No.: PTO-P-2017-0002] (RIN: 0651-AD14) received May 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1543. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — MU-2B Series Airplane Training Requirements Update; Correction [Docket No.: FAA-2006-24981; Amdt. Nos. 61-138A, 91-344A, and 135-134A] (RIN: 2120-AK63) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1544. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9569; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-052-AD; Amendment 39-18865; AD 2017-09-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 26, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1545. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the Administration's principles for reforming the Nation's Air Traffic Control System (H. Doc. No. 115-45); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

1546. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the 2017 Global Defense Posture Report; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2353. A bill to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006; with an amendment (Rept. 115-164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RICHMOND, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 2795. A bill to increase coordination among relevant Federal departments and agencies to address United States security and humanitarian interests in Yemen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 2796. A bill to repeal executive overreach, to clarify that the proper constitutional authority for social transformation belongs to the legislative branch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2797. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for advanced illness care coordination services for Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2798. A bill to prohibit access by the Government of the Russian Federation to certain Russian-owned diplomatic facilities and properties located in the States of Maryland and New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 2799. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize certain recycled water projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEFazio (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIREs, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 2800. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure improvement of air traffic control services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, the Budget, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each

case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2801. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue a rule requiring all new passenger motor vehicles to be equipped with a child safety alert system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mrs. COMSTOCK):

H.R. 2802. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax-preferred savings account for first-time homebuyers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 2803. A bill to provide assistance in abolishing human trafficking in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2804. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to implement changes to improve air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 2805. A bill to permanently authorize the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BERGMAN (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TROTT, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H.R. 2806. A bill to increase authorized funding for the Soo Locks; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 2807. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require congressional notification concerning sensitive military cyber operations and cyber weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 2808. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount that can be withdrawn without penalty from individual retirement plans as first-time homebuyer distributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 2809. A bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to provide for the authorization

and supervision of nongovernmental space activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington) (both by request):

H.R. 2810. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself and Mr. GAETZ):

H.R. 2811. A bill to preserve the integrity of American elections by providing the Attorney General with the investigative tools to identify and prosecute foreign agents who seek to circumvent Federal registration requirements and unlawfully influence the political process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 2812. A bill to direct the President to develop a strategy for the offensive use of cyber capabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 2813. A bill to prohibit the Export-Import Bank of the United States from providing financial support for certain high carbon intensity energy projects; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Ms. LEE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 2814. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on employers whose employees receive certain Federal benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SIREs, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 2815. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 30 East Somerset Street in Raritan, New Jersey, as the "Sergeant John Basilone Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2816. A bill to authorize a settlement in accordance with the agreement entered into by the Tennessee Valley Authority and the United States Department of the Interior, and counties within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 2817. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify eligibility for the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 2818. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a deduction for amounts contributed to disaster savings accounts to help defray the cost of preparing their homes to withstand a disaster and to repair or replace property damaged or destroyed in a disaster; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. WALZ):
H.R. 2819. A bill to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to require the disclosure of political intelligence activities, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for restrictions on former officers, employees, and elected officials of the executive and legislative branches regarding political intelligence contacts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUOZZI (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. HILL):
H.R. 2820. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to establish within the Department of State the Office of Anti-Corruption relating to Illicit Russian Financial Activities in Europe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):
H.R. 2821. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the credit for increasing research activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BANKS of Indiana):

H.R. 2822. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program to lend Department of Defense farm equipment to eligible farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NOLAN:
H. Res. 377. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should confirm that money is not free speech and that corporations are not people for purposes of the First Amendment right to make campaign contributions by enacting a constitutional amendment overturning the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, and should restore the right of Congress and the States to impose limits on the amount of expenditures that may be made by candidates and others in support of elections for public office by enacting a constitutional amendment overturning the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Buckley v. Valeo*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. BASS:
H.R. 2795.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws "which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" any of Congress' enumerated powers.

By Mr. OLSON:
H.R. 2796.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:
H.R. 2797.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill modifies the Social Security Act, which Congress enacted pursuant to its powers under the Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution, we well as its powers to tax and spend for the general welfare. Congress has the power under those provisions to enact this legislation as well.

By Mr. PASCRELL:
H.R. 2798.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1
By Mr. MCNERNEY:
H.R. 2799.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:
H.R. 2800.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:
H.R. 2801.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8: To Make Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. COFFMAN:
H.R. 2802.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excise, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. POE of Texas:
H.R. 2803.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution which states that Congress has the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:
H.R. 2804.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, United States Constitution.

By Miss RICE of New York:
H.R. 2805.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BERGMAN:
H.R. 2806.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers vested by this Constitution in the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:
H.R. 2807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the common Defence", "to raise and support Armies", "to provide and maintain a Navy" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 2808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:
H.R. 2809.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:
The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:
H.R. 2810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the common Defence", "to raise and support Armies", "to provide and maintain a Navy" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:
H.R. 2811.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CORREA:
H.R. 2812.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:
H.R. 2813.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Impost and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KHANNA:
H.R. 2814.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
"Amendment XVI to the Constitution": The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. LANCE:
H.R. 2815.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7: To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2816.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 2817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 2818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 2820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 2821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 2822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 29: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 38: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 40: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 44: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 80: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 93: Ms. MOORE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 154: Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 169: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 173: Mrs. TORRES, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 184: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 227: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 299: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 314: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 358: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 367: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 377: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 391: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 392: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 397: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 420: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 422: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 468: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 478: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 490: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 507: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 529: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 545: Mr. COOK, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 592: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. COOK, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 632: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 662: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 681: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 721: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 740: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 747: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 750: Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 754: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 761: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 795: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WOMACK, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 796: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 799: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 807: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 820: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 825: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 846: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 848: Mr. SMUCKER and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 873: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.

H.R. 880: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 881: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 916: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 930: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COOK, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 947: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 952: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 959: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 964: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 997: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1017: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1034: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1046: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1057: Mr. LANCE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1064: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 1090: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1098: Ms. FUDGE and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 1099: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1111: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1116: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1120: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 1136: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1146: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1154: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1158: Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1164: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1205: Mr. PANETTA, Ms. TITUS, Mr. COMER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 1212: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1231: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1244: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1251: Mrs. TORRES and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1316: Mr. VELA, Mr. HARPER, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1339: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 1349: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 1361: Mr. DONOVAN and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1421: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1422: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1441: Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 1456: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1478: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1480: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1503: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1511: Mr. WALZ, Mr. DEFazio, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1529: Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 1540: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1552: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 1554: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1555: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1618: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1626: Mr. LAHOOD and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 1651: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1652: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 1655: Mr. REED.

H.R. 1661: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1698: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. ROBY and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1734: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1810: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1811: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 1817: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1825: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1828: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1840: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1844: Ms. MENG and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1853: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. Norton, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1863: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1872: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1895: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1952: Mr. DEFazio and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1955: Mr. COMER.

H.R. 1970: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1997: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 2000: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2001: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2004: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana,

H.R. 2012: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. AGUILAR, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2024: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2045: Mr. NORCROSS.

- H.R. 2056: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2061: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2069: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2079: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2091: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2106: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2127: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 2197: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2200: Mr. CARBAJAL and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2240: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
H.R. 2248: Mr. BEYER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2287: Mr. BUCK.
H.R. 2318: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2319: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2322: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 2327: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2353: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 2358: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2394: Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. STEFANIK, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2401: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2434: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 2452: Mr. HIMES, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2472: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2478: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 2482: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SIREs, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COLE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2488: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SIREs, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GALLEG0, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2492: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2499: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2519: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2526: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2564: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2595: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2603: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 2620: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. COOK, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2625: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2632: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 2634: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 2641: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2645: Mr. CORREA and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 2651: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2654: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2657: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.
H.R. 2675: Mr. COLE and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2676: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2687: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2690: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2715: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 2716: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2723: Mr. STEWART, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 2747: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2771: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 2785: Mr. REED.
H.J. Res. 13: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
H.J. Res. 24: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
H.J. Res. 31: Mr. KIND.
H.J. Res. 48: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.J. Res. 103: Mr. LATTA.
H. Con. Res. 8: Ms. ROSEN.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. HUIZENGA.
H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. EVANS and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. JONES.
H. Res. 15: Mr. MCEACHIN and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H. Res. 28: Mr. DELANEY.
H. Res. 31: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H. Res. 85: Mr. FOSTER.
H. Res. 129: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H. Res. 135: Mr. COFFMAN.
H. Res. 188: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H. Res. 219: Mr. PAULSEN.
H. Res. 220: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. ROSEN.
H. Res. 274: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 276: Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H. Res. 311: Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SOTO, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. BYRNE.
H. Res. 317: Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 321: Mr. TAKANO.
H. Res. 336: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H. Res. 342: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 351: Mr. TAYLOR.
H. Res. 353: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GALLEG0, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 368: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H. Res. 371: Ms. LEE, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H. Res. 372: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SOTO.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2560: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EMILY BROWNE WINGED FOOT AWARD

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Emily Browne on winning the Winged Foot Scholar-Athlete Award.

Due to her hard work and dedication, Ms. Browne managed to be the star athlete of both her basketball and lacrosse teams at Barron Collier High School, all while maintaining a stellar grade point average. Her successful balancing of athletic and academic activities shows maturity and discipline beyond her years.

I am proud of Emily's achievements on and off the field. The award is well deserved.

— PRAISING LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES INVOLVED IN SOLV- ING THE MURDER OF CHIEF DEPUTY CLINT GREENWOOD

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep appreciation and admiration to all of the Texas law enforcement officers who worked so diligently in getting to the bottom of the tragic and senseless murder of Harris County Precinct 3 Constable, Assistant Chief Deputy Greenwood.

My hat goes off to the Baytown Police Department, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), U.S. Marshals Service, Houston Police Department, Gulf Coast Violent Offenders Task Force, Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS), Texas Rangers, Harris County Sheriff's Department, Harris County Precinct 3 Constable's Office and Harris County District Attorney. These men and women showed tremendous determination and commitment in their efforts to find this evil perpetrator and deliver justice. While we continue to mourn the loss of another one of our brave Texas law enforcement officers, their hard work and tireless efforts have helped bring healing and closure to the family and the entire law enforcement community.

My prayers continue to be with the family of Assistant Chief Deputy Greenwood.

CONGRATULATING BLOUKE CARUS ON 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a constituent of mine, Blouke Carus of Peru, Illinois on turning 90 this month.

Mr. Carus is Chairman Emeritus of Carus Corporation a Peru-based company that assists municipalities and industries with utilizing products for environmental cleanup. Before that, Mr. Carus served as the Chairman of Carus Publishing Company, which published educational magazines and books for children.

Because of his lifelong interest in education, Mr. Carus served as a Presidential appointee on the National Council on Education Research, and continued his work as a community leader by helping to establish the Illinois Valley Community College.

Mr. Carus obtained a B.S. in Electrical Engineering from the California Institute of Technology in 1949, after having served his country honorably in the U.S. Navy. He is married to Marianne Carus, and they have three children and four grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Sixteenth Congressional District, I would like to sincerely congratulate Mr. Carus and the rest of his family on this amazing milestone and life achievement.

— PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 2017, I was not present for the recorded votes on Roll Call No. 286 and 287. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and agree, as amended and YEA on the motion to suspend the rules and agree, as amended.

16TH DISTRICT CONGRESSIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AWARDS

HON. VERN BUCHANAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to law enforcement men and women who have provided distinctive service to the people of Florida's 16th Congressional District.

Law enforcement is a demanding profession that requires sacrifice, courage and a dedication to serve others. Every day, brave men and women put themselves in harm's way to enforce the laws of our society and protect public safety. They deserve our gratitude and respect.

Six years ago, I established the 16th District Congressional Law Enforcement Awards, CLEA, to give special recognition to law enforcement officers, departments, or units for exceptional achievement.

This year, I will present Congressional Law Enforcement Awards to the following winners chosen by an independent panel comprised of current and retired law enforcement personnel representing a cross-section of the district's law enforcement community:

Officer Jason Nuttall of the Bradenton Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Captain John Walsh, Captain Debra Kaspar, Lieutenant Jon Varley, Community Affairs Director Kaitlyn Perez, Deputy Phillip Mockler, Detective Tim Speth and Investigator Lynn Thomson of the Sarasota County Sheriff's will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Detective Richard Wilson of the Palmetto Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Officer Alan Bores of the Holmes Beach Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Detective Justin Warren of the Manatee County Sheriff's Office will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Sergeant Robert Armstrong of the Sarasota Police Department will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Deputy Kevin Smetana of the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Master Sergeant George Taunton of the Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Career Service Award.

Trooper Caleb Kerr and Trooper Brett Fitzpatrick of the Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Preservation of Life Award.

Sergeant Patrick Roberts of the Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Above and Beyond the Call of Duty Award.

Pastor Patrick Miller, Pastor Vincent Smith, Doctor Harriet Moore, Geoffrey Gilot and Al-Muta Hawks all affiliated with the Boys and Girls Club of Sarasota will receive the Associate Service Award.

The Manatee County Special Investigations Division will receive the Unit Citation Award. The members of this unit are: Major William Jordan, Captain Todd Shear, Lieutenant Anthony Carr, Division Secretary Toni Burton, Administrative Assistant Cindy Hoffman, Sergeant Jason Powell, Detective James Parrish, Detective Kim Zink, Detective Greg Dunlap, Detective Mike Diaz, Bruce Benjamin (Crime Stoppers), Amber Hoffman (Manager), Erica

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Chenard (UCR Coordinator), Criminal Analyst Ashley Eannarino, Criminal Analyst Elicia Main, Intel Analyst Don Brown, Criminal Analyst John Ferrito, Intel Analyst Elizabeth Thomas, Sergeant Evelio Perez, Detective Joseph Petta, Detective Justin Warren, Detective Derek Pollock, Detective Eric Davis, Detective Ray Richter, Detective Patrick Thames, Detective Scott Williamson, Sergeant Gary Combee, Detective William Freil, Detective Maria Gillum, Detective Bryce Wilhelm, Detective Jonathan Kruse, Sergeant Steve Barron, Detective Randall Walker, Detective Brian Beck, Detective Shayne Rousseau, Detective Jeremy Martin, Detective Robert Brigham, Sergeant Isaac Redmond, Detective Rafael Ortegón, Detective Christopher Gallagher, Detective Joel Taylor, Detective David Bocchino, and Detective Lourdes Santiago.

RECOGNIZING COMMANDER JOANN
BURDIAN'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO
THE COAST GUARD

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, each of us that serve in this distinguished body has the deepest and most profound respect for the men and women who serve in America's Armed Forces. It's because of their service and sacrifice that this great nation is able to carry the banner of freedom across the globe and the American people sleep safe at night.

Throughout history, Americans have faithfully answered the nation's call through periods of conflict and peace—and each of the service branches have earned their place as pillars of America's defense shield. That shield first and foremost starts at America's shores and it's the Coast Guard that is the nation's first line of protection against criminals and contraband entering the country through the seas.

The Coast Guard's backbone is its personnel and I've had the great honor of serving as Chairman of the House Subcommittee with direct purview over this great organization, which has afforded me the privilege to observe our Coast Guard in action. But on this specific occasion, I want to recognize one Coast Guardsman in particular who's had not only an immense impact on the organization itself, but also this entire institution.

Commander JoAnn Burdian has led the Congressional Affairs office for the Coast Guard for the last several years and today marks her last day serving in a capacity that has made us wiser and even more appreciative of the immense work shouldered by the Coast Guard each and every day. Her career in the Coast Guard will continue in her new assignment in Seattle, Washington, but her departure no doubt is a great loss for the entire Congress.

Even so, our loss here is the Coast Guard's gain—and I have all the confidence that Commander Burdian's exemplary leadership and talents will provide tremendous value to the next generation of leaders that will continue serving the nation's interest as members of

the Coast Guard. And when I think of the type of leader that this nation depends on to lead America's men and women in uniform, Commander Burdian is the example to follow. Her reputation has been forged through years of operational experience and leadership, and her sense of commitment to service and country has always defined her approach to representing the best interests of the Coast Guard.

Commander Burdian is a relentless advocate for her service. Her pioneering spirit and deep understanding of Coast Guard programs and priorities have informed me and others in our collective work and the Coast Guard is on better footing today thanks to her immense contributions.

I'm honored to have served with such an outstanding patriot and I want to wish Commander Burdian the best of luck as she endeavors on a new assignment and the next chapter of her life. She's a Coast Guardsman at heart—but I'm also proud to call her a friend. And I ask today that we all recognize this great American for all the work she's done and will continue doing on behalf of the nation.

COACH BILL KRAMER

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Coach Bill Kramer and the news of his induction into the Florida High School Athletic Association's Hall of Fame for the Class of 2017.

Coach Kramer has led the Naples High School football team since 1998. Under his leadership, the Golden Eagles won two state championships, six regional titles, and fourteen district titles.

Additionally, Coach Kramer is dedicated to teaching young men how to cope with many of life's difficulties. He works to instill the values of teamwork, perseverance, and discipline in his players. I thank Coach Kramer for the positive impact he has made, and will continue to make, on the Naples community.

STORM MANNING

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Storm Manning for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Storm Manning is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Storm Manning is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Storm Manning for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF MICHAEL
LOMBARDO, RECIPIENT OF
LEADERSHIP WILKES-BARRE'S
DISTINGUISHED LEADERSHIP
ALUMNI AWARD

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Michael Lombardo. Michael will receive the Distinguished Leadership Alumni Award from Leadership Wilkes-Barre on June 8. Leadership Wilkes-Barre is a local development company that provides future leaders with the resources they need to be successful members of the community. The Distinguished Leadership Alumni Award is awarded annually to an individual who has demonstrated outstanding community leadership and service to neighbors.

Michael is a graduate of Bucknell University and holds a Bachelor's Degree in Psychology and Master's Degree in School Psychology and Counseling. He currently works at Quad Three Group, Inc., an architectural engineering and environmental science firm, as the Director of Business Development & Marketing. Michael served as the mayor of Pittston from 1998 to 2006. He was later appointed to Pittston's Redevelopment Authority Board. Michael also serves on the boards of Leadership Wilkes-Barre and the Greater Pittston Chamber of Commerce. He has served as the Vice Chair of the Pittston Festival Association for the past 19 years.

Michael resides in Pittston with his wife, Susan. They are the proud parents of twin daughters, Catherine and Kristen. They are parishioners of St. John the Evangelist Church, where Michael is a lector. He is also a Fourth Degree Member of the Knights of Columbus.

It is an honor to recognize Michael as he receives the Distinguished Leadership Alumni Award from Leadership Wilkes-Barre. May he continue serving as a guiding force in Northeastern Pennsylvania.

HONORING TIM MCKINNEY'S
RETIREMENT

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tim McKinney for his years of service in improving the quality of life of residents of Fort Worth, and the broader community of Tarrant County, as President and CEO of United Way of Tarrant County (UWTC).

Mr. McKinney was raised in Fort Worth, Texas and received his Bachelor of Business

Administration from Texas Christian University. After college, he served in the U.S. Air Force for five years where he attained the rank of Captain, and received the Air Medal with three oak leaf clusters. Following his military service, McKinney enjoyed a 36-year career in banking where he eventually earned his position as the President of Bank of America's Fort Worth Region.

As CEO of UWTC, Tim McKinney was instrumental in the creation and implementation of a visionary strategic plan that moved UWTC to a results-oriented "impact" model that embraces nontraditional community partners. UWTC and its partners help 300,000 people annually throughout Tarrant County.

Tim McKinney's leadership as a fundraising professional led UWTC through transformational change. During his tenure, UWTC's strong financial health and commitment to accountability and transparency earned the organization a top 4-star rating from Charity Navigator for five consecutive years. This recognition places UWTC among the top 6 percent of charities evaluated by Charity Navigator who have received at least 5 consecutive 4-star ratings. In addition, under his leadership, UWTC's fundraising placed it among the top 4 percent of all United Ways in America.

In addition to his work at UWTC, Tim McKinney served and continues to serve on the boards of several organizations. As the Board Chair of the Botanical Research Institute of Texas (BRIT), he was active in its fundraising efforts and in developing the new BRIT building and campus. He also served on the JWest Foundation Board and helped to establish the James L. West Presbyterian Special Care Center.

Through his work in the Tarrant County community, Tim McKinney has earned a reputation as a highly ethical and trustworthy professional who values transparency, honesty, and innovation.

I honor Mr. McKinney's years of dedicated service to the Tarrant County community, and congratulate him on his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present on the House floor because my flight was cancelled due to inclement weather. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 286, and yea on Roll Call No. 287.

SAMANTHA MOLINA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Samantha Molina for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Samantha Molina is a student at Arvada K-8 School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Samantha Molina is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Samantha Molina for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes on Roll Call No. 286 and No. 287.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 286, and YEA on Roll Call No. 287.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DELAWARE & LEHIGH NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR'S DESIGNATION AS A SMITHSONIAN AFFILIATE

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Delaware & Lehigh National Heritage Corridor as it becomes America's first National Heritage Area to receive a partnership designation from the Smithsonian Institution. The D&L, as we in eastern Pennsylvania call it, preserves the historic canal that carried anthracite and iron from Wilkes-Barre to Philadelphia. It is one of three National Heritage Areas in my congressional district, and it runs through three of the 17th District's counties. I am proud to support areas like the Delaware & Lehigh National Heritage Corridor by co-sponsoring the National Heritage Area Authorization Act.

A National Heritage Area is a site designated by Congress for the purposes of preserving history and encouraging an appreciation of the site. It is a place where natural, scenic, cultural, and historic resources combine to offer a landscape of stories celebrating our unique journey and status as a region. A National Heritage Area is a lived-in landscape and is administered by a state government, non-profit, or private corporation rather than the National Park Service. It is a place where stewards collaborate with residents to forge a way to make heritage relevant for local interests and needs. This community-driven approach to heritage conservation and economic development must be preserved and grown. These sites are essential to how we share

who we were, who we are, and who we might become with the next generation.

The Smithsonian Institution was founded in 1846 and is the world's largest museum, education, and research complex. It has over 216 affiliates. This affiliation partnership for the D&L comes on the heels of its recent merger with the National Canal Museum in Easton, Pennsylvania. The affiliation partnership designation will raise the profile of the D&L and help it better connect to nature, recreation, and our nation's industrial heritage. As a Smithsonian affiliate, the D&L will reap the benefits of co-branding, professional development, and customized client service to facilitate exhibition and artifact borrowing needs.

Those who know me well know my passions for preserving history, natural resources, and outdoor recreation opportunities. With the D&L, these passions are one. It is my honor to share with the House the story of a place that so well engenders a love of nature and of history and that now includes its welcome into the Smithsonian family.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for votes Tuesday, June 6, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call votes 286 and 287.

SABASTIAN MEADOWS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sabastian Meadows for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Sabastian Meadows is a student at Wayne Carle Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sabastian Meadows is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sabastian Meadows for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable conflict, I missed the following votes on June 6. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 286, and yea on Roll Call No. 287.

INTRODUCTION OF PATIENT
CHOICE AND QUALITY CARE ACT
OF 2017**HON. EARL BLUMENAUER**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, from sweeping changes to how care is delivered, to the rise of personalized medicine, patients today have more treatment options when facing advanced illness than ever before. With these medical advances, the line between life and death can sometimes be blurred, which has changed the way we must talk about how we want to live and die.

Despite these enormous changes, confronting an advanced illness or the end of life remains one of the most difficult and challenging situations any family faces.

There is substantial evidence that suggests the care individuals want to receive at the end of life is not necessarily the type of care they do receive. Patients, in fact, often receive aggressive treatment that not only substantially shortens their length of life, but its quality. At other times, patients find the health care system instead undervalues the quality of their life, withholding treatments they would otherwise want to receive.

Issues surrounding the end of life and advanced illness management become even more important when looking at the rapidly aging population in the United States. In 2014, Americans ages 65 and older made up 15 percent of the total population; by 2060 that share is projected to grow to 24 percent.

A recent survey conducted by The Economist and the Kaiser Family Foundation found that the majority of U.S. adults say the government is not prepared to deal with the aging population. The same survey found that a large majority of Americans believe both that patients and their families should have a greater say in which treatment options they receive, and that most Americans don't believe they have enough control over their medical decisions at the end of life. This must change.

Individuals should have every opportunity to actively participate in making decisions about their health care throughout their lives and should receive care consistent with their values, goals, and informed preferences. Patients should feel empowered to make informed choices about the health care they want and to have those care decisions honored by their providers and family.

During passage of Affordable Care Act, I saw an opportunity to apply lessons learned in

Oregon with its landmark comprehensive palliative care programs, which give patients more of a say about the medical treatment they want at the end of life. I worked to ensure that Congress included a payment for doctors to talk to patients and families about advance care planning in the Affordable Care Act. Unfortunately, this provision wasn't included in the final legislation due to a breakdown of the legislative process.

After years of advocacy, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services designed a benefit allowing doctors to receive reimbursement for voluntary advance care planning conversations with their patients. For the first time, Medicare will pay for these critical doctor-patient discussions in the same way it pays for any other medical service.

Yet our work to improve end-of-life care is far from over, and it is for these reasons that I am introducing the bipartisan, bicameral Patient Choice and Quality Care Act of 2017. This legislation will strengthen advanced illness care by establishing a new model of care delivery that to better manage advanced illness, improve quality of care, and enhance training, resources, and tools for providers, patients, and their families.

Ideally, health care should work in sync with social, psychological, and spiritual support as the end of life approaches. Care near the end of life must be patient-centered and family-oriented. This legislation is supported by patient advocates, physicians, nurses, and the faith community, who understand how improving care delivery for advanced illness fundamentally improves quality of care and quality of life. To that end, I ask my colleagues to join me and support this important legislation.

HONORING RYAN DANT'S COLLEGE
GRADUATION**HON. KENNY MARCHANT**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ryan Dant. Ryan's father Mark Dant retired just last year as Assistant Chief at the Carrollton, Texas Police Department. As a young boy, Ryan was diagnosed with a rare disease called Mucopolysaccharidosis (MPS Type 1)—a disease so rare that it affects about 1 in 100,000 children.

Mr. Speaker, we recently observed National MPS Awareness Day on May 15.

At the time he was diagnosed, in the early 90s, there was no cure or even a treatment for MPS. Doctors told Ryan's parents—Jeanne and Mark—that he wouldn't make it to his 13th birthday.

Over time, the heartache of their son's diagnosis gave way to the steadfast perseverance that only a parent knows.

Scientist after scientist, through experimental treatments and research studies, Ryan's 13th birthday came and went.

Last Saturday, Jeanne and Mark Dant witnessed a miracle—their son Ryan, at age 29, received his college degree.

I congratulate Ryan on receiving his degree. His life's journey is an inspiration to us all.

SAMANTHA WARD

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Samantha (Sam) Ward for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Samantha Ward is a student at Wayne Carle Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Samantha Ward is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Samantha Ward for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes on June 6, 2017 on account of attending my son's graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

YEA for rollcall vote 286

YEA for rollcall vote 287

THE RETIREMENT OF CRAIG
SOUZA**HON. DAVID ROUZER**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to make special mention today of the retirement of Craig Souza, a gentleman who has contributed decades of service to North Carolina through his leadership in providing quality health care facilities throughout the state.

Craig has served as President and CEO of the North Carolina Health Care Facilities Association since 1977. He is a proud graduate of East Carolina University (ECU) and has the distinction of having served as chairman of the ECU Board of Trustees.

Mr. Souza has served in a number of leadership roles, including his service on the UNC Board of Governors, as past president of both the American Society of Health Care Association Executives and the Association Executives of North Carolina; and as a member of the Board of Directors of the North Carolina Institute of Medicine, the North Carolina Social Services Commission and the North Carolina

Board of Examiners for Nursing Home Administrators. He also served with distinction as deputy secretary of the North Carolina Department of Human Resources.

Throughout his career, Mr. Souza has carried out his service with integrity and dedication providing our state with valued leadership and counsel in every endeavor.

In his retirement, Craig plans to continue to enjoy spending time with family, traveling, playing golf, watching Carolina Panthers football, and cheering on his beloved ECU Pirates.

On behalf of the State of North Carolina, thank Craig for his years of commitment and service. I wish him the very best as he enters this next chapter in his life.

IN RECOGNITION OF KATHLEEN STROUD FOR HER WORK AND ADVOCACY ON SOCIAL JUSTICE ISSUES

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Kathleen Stroud for her impactful leadership on social justice issues. Ms. Stroud has served Michigan with distinction in a variety of elected positions at the state and local level and is the founder of Ann Arbor's Safe House program.

After graduating from Eastern Michigan University, Ms. Stroud began her career working to reduce domestic violence in Washtenaw County. She was then elected to the Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners at the age of 28, where she served four consecutive terms from 1972 to 1980. During this time, she served on the Governor's Crime Victims Compensation Board and the Legislative Advisory Committee on Domestic Violence, where her advocacy and efforts resulted in Michigan passing comprehensive domestic violence legislation that included strong protections for women and children. Additionally, Ms. Stroud spearheaded the creation of a network of private homes to provide shelter for victims of domestic violence. This effort culminated in the opening of the Ann Arbor Safe House in 1992, the first publicly funded domestic violence shelter in the United States.

Ms. Stroud has been an outstanding advocate for children and families in need throughout her career. She has been involved with the National Organization for Women, since its founding in 1966, and remains active in the local American Association of University Women, where she has previously served as its president. These actions, along with her involvement in Ann Arbor Safe House, have helped to create a supportive and welcoming environment and provided much-needed resources for domestic violence victims. Ms. Stroud has also worked to support these and other public health efforts during her 40-year tenure on the Washtenaw County Board of Health.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Kathleen Stroud for her lifetime of service on behalf of Washtenaw County and

its residents. Ms. Stroud has been a key figure in fighting for social justice throughout her career.

SAVANNAH PRIDE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Savannah Pride for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Savannah Pride is a student at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Savannah Pride is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Savannah Pride for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

MICHAEL KINDER & SONS 125TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION

HON. JIM BANKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this year a family owned and operated construction company in northeast Indiana is celebrating its 125th year in business. Since 1892, Michael Kinder & Sons, owned and operated by the Kinder family, has been working on planning, designing, and building projects in and around Fort Wayne, Indiana. A company that began with just three construction workers and an old mule has grown to become a leading regional construction firm. Over the years, Michael Kinder & Sons has completed thousands of projects and transformed skylines across northeast Indiana. The Michael Kinder & Sons team has constructed important industrial facilities, houses of worship, health-care facilities, senior-care residences, college campuses, and commercial buildings. The company has made it a point to support local charities and has offered leadership to local non-profit, education, and faith-based boards. Guided by its motto—"We will serve our clients' needs—no matter how large or small—by providing quality services in the commercial and industrial marketplace"—Michael Kinder & Sons has been an important part of northeast Indiana's fabric for 125 years. I congratulate the entire Michael Kinder & Sons team on their success and wish them many prosperous years ahead.

TRIBUTE FOR REMINGTON J. PETERS

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share my most sincere appreciation for the life and service of Navy Petty Officer First Class Remington J. Peters. He was tragically taken from this world at the young age of 27 over the Memorial Day weekend.

Remi was born and raised in Grand Junction, Colorado, where he was known by his friends to be a loving, caring and passionate young man who brought a smile to everyone's face. His parents described him as an angel on earth. After Remi graduated from Grand Junction High School, he found his calling in the U.S. Navy. He entered SEAL school and graduated without difficulty.

During his distinguished time in the Navy, Remi was assigned to the SEAL's prestigious Leap Frogs, the Navy's parachute demonstration team. Remi performed over 900 jumps, most of them at public gatherings in front of hundreds of thousands of Americans.

As a Navy SEAL, Remi risked his life every time he stepped foot on a ship or helicopter. Remi accepted the dangers of two combat tours and hundreds of jumps in order to serve his country.

Mr. Speaker, at only 27 years old, Remi had an impressive list of accomplishments. I hope as his family and friends commemorate his life, they are continually reminded of what an extraordinary individual he was. Remi will forever be remembered in his hometown of Grand Junction, and by so many who came to know him over the years. I continue to pray for comfort for Remi's family and friends during this difficult time, and I know that the memory of Remington J. Peters will live on in all who share his story.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. LAMAR BALL

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of former First State Bank executive, Lamar Ball, who passed away on March 26, 2017. Mr. Ball was known for his commitment to his family and his leadership in the Denton banking community. He was a skilled visionary who saved First State Bank from potential closure immediately after assuming the role of chairman and CEO in October 1989.

A Tennessee native, Mr. Ball graduated from the University of Tennessee in Knoxville in 1962. Long before he led First State Bank, Mr. Ball began his working life measuring cotton crops straight out of college. After a full year of such work, he decided he needed a change. The only requirement for his next job, according to his daughter Allison, was that it be indoors, so Mr. Ball accepted a banking job

in Atlanta and embarked on a banking career that would endure more than 30 years.

To Mr. Ball, his legacy was important. According to his son David, "His legacy was not the material things he gained; his legacy was his children and grandchildren, and he made sure [they] knew that." Mr. Ball was an accomplished and influential banker, but more importantly, he was a loving and dedicated parent and grandparent. He will be greatly missed. I include in the RECORD an article that appeared in The Denton Record-Chronicle.

LAMAR BALL, FORMER EXEC AT FIRST STATE BANK, DIES AT AGE 76

(Jenna Duncan, Staff Writer)

Lamar Ball, a devoted father, grandfather and a staple in the Denton banking community, died Sunday after a battle with myelodysplastic syndrome, a blood disorder that can lead to cancer. He was 76.

Ball was known in Denton for saving First State Bank. He started in October 1989 as chairman and CEO and quickly stopped the bank from losing money and facing closure. He brought in investor Carl Pohlad, who at the time owned the major league baseball team Minnesota Twins, and rebuilt the company, former colleagues said.

"His mission was to raise capital to quite frankly save the bank and he did, so in my mind he saved First State Bank of Texas," said Bill Bonds, who served as chief financial officer under Ball. "He was a visionary. He told me one time that he loved to create worth. His greatest skill was finding or taking something that was broken and turning it into something valuable."

The Tennessee native graduated from the University of Tennessee in Knoxville in 1962 and immediately got a job measuring cotton crops. His daughter, Allison Bertorelli, said his only specifications for what he wanted in his first job was that it would be indoors.

The next year, Ball switched to banking with a job in Atlanta and continued in the industry for more than 30 years.

One phrase he took to heart and would often repeat was, "I might not be the smartest guy in the room, but I work harder than anyone in the room," said Glenn Monroe, a family friend turned colleague at First State in Denton. He was a fan of 6 a.m. meetings and didn't like doing check-ins with employees on a regular basis. A lot of times, Ball was also the smartest man in the room, Monroe said.

"You won't meet too many bankers at the executive level who are willing to make decisions and live with them," Monroe said. "He was willing to listen to all of the information, listen to your input, and he'd make a decision. That would be it. If the decision wasn't the greatest one, he never came back on anyone else."

A main reason Ball was able to build capital at First State was through acquiring smaller community banks in the area, then helping make them more profitable. By the time he left in the late 1990s, the bank had more than quadrupled its assets.

From there, he went on to invest and lead Smart Start, a company that creates alcohol detection technology for cars, and invested in other companies.

He worked a lot of late nights, his children said, but he made sure he could always coach a sports team for one of five children and never missed a game, Bertorelli said. He also loved the phrase "Heck of a deal" whenever one of his kids came to him with a tale of success.

Later in life, he continued that dedication to family with his 11 grandchildren. Each

photo of him with one of grandchildren reveals a large, toothy grin with Ball's ears sticking out, his son, David Ball, said.

"His legacy was a big deal to him," David Ball said. "His legacy was not the material things he gained; his legacy was his children and grandchildren, and he made sure we knew that."

Ball is survived by his wife, Barbara Ball, his five children, a stepchild and 11 grandchildren. Visitation will be from 6 to 8 p.m. Wednesday at Bill DeBerry Funeral Directors, 2025 W. University Drive.

Funeral service will be at 11 a.m. Thursday at St. Andrew Presbyterian Church, 300 W. Oak St. in Denton.

SELENA MARTINEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Selena Martinez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Selena Martinez is a student at Arvada K-8 School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Selena Martinez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Selena Martinez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING MEGAFEST, THE NATION'S LARGEST FAITH, FILM, AND FAMILY MULTIDAY EXPERIENCE

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize MegaFest which returns to Dallas this summer—June 28 through July 1. MegaFest has been built into the nation's largest celebration of life-changing events and empowering seminars focused on faith, inspiration, music, entertainment, youth and fun for the entire family, and praise for this event's success belongs to visionary leader Bishop T.D. Jakes.

MegaFest has captivated diverse audiences in Atlanta, GA; Dallas, TX; and Johannesburg, South Africa, since 2004. In 2015, over 90,000 attendees from around the world called Dallas "home." With an expected attendance of over 100,000, support from the business community and key sponsors has helped Bishop Jakes, MegaFest, and the City of Dallas reach larger audiences and offer quality programs and entertainment.

A major theme of the event is based on the "Conversations with America" survey conducted by Bishop Jakes. The survey gauged America's thoughts, concerns, and views on today's most pressing issues, including gender equality, criminal justice reform, economic reform, and national security.

This year's results show a significant and consistent gap between men and women's views toward the current state of gender inequality across America. Equality for all is a central pillar of our democracy, and women, no matter their ethnicity, religious orientation, or socioeconomic status in the United States, should be treated as equals in all aspects of our society.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Bishop Jakes on creating such a wonderful and progressive event. I wish MegaFest, and similar events, future success in uniting families and individuals from all over the world in the name of love, growth, and equality.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF FALLEN MISSISSIPPI ARMY NATIONAL GUARD SERGEANT (SGT) KYLE CLAYTON THOMAS

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Mississippi Army National Guard Sergeant (SGT) Kyle Clayton Thomas who paid the ultimate sacrifice while training to defend our great nation on May 29, 2017, at the National Training Center (NTC) at Fort Irwin, California. SGT Thomas died in a rollover accident while he and three other soldiers were conducting combat maneuver operations in a M1A2 SEPv2 Abrams Main Battle Tank. The soldiers with him were treated and released from Loma Linda University Medical Center in Loma Linda, California.

SGT Thomas, an Amory native and 2011 Amory High School graduate, was assigned to Company A, 2nd Battalion 198th Armored, 155th Armored Brigade headquartered in Tupelo, Mississippi.

SGT Thomas joined the Mississippi Army National Guard in 2012. His mother, Jo Ann Boussouar, says her son was always interested in the military. As a young boy, SGT Thomas would say that he wanted to be a tank driver. Her son was able to fulfill his dream to serve in the military, and she is proud of his willingness to sacrifice his life for the safety of his family.

"Kyle has a tattoo that said, 'For those I love, I will sacrifice,'" she said. "That's what he did."

SGT Thomas divided his time between his assembly job at NauticStar Boats manufacturing plant in Amory and the Mississippi Army National Guard. SGT Thomas's obituary describes him as a compassionate person who loved life and spending time with his family. It says when his daughter, Devina Jayde Smith, was born, an incredible bond was formed. SGT Thomas's father, Eddie Thomas, says the whole family is proud of SGT Thomas's commitment to his family and to the defense of our nation.

"I was very proud," Mr. Thomas said. "His service made me feel wonderful."

In a statement issued by the Department of the Army and Air Force, Colonel (COL) Doug Ferguson, Commander of the Tupelo-based 155th Armored Brigade Combat Team, expressed his sympathy over the loss of SGT Thomas.

"Our deepest sympathies go out to SGT Thomas's family and friends," said COL Ferguson. "We have lost a valuable member of our team and this loss will be felt across the brigade."

SGT Thomas's awards include the Meritorious Service Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Armed Forces Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Army Reserve Component Achievement Medal, Mississippi Magnolia Cross, Mississippi Emergency Service Medal, Mississippi Longevity Medal, and the Mississippi War Medal.

SGT Thomas died on Memorial Day—the day our nation sets aside to honor the service men and women who fought and died to protect the freedoms we all enjoy. We cannot forget what this national holiday means to families who have experienced that loss.

SGT Thomas is survived by a daughter, Devina Smith; parents, Eddie Thomas (Sheryl) and Jo Ann Boussouar (Hachemi); sisters, Joni Edmonson (David), Tiffany Jones; Chrystal Parker (Marty), and Jennifer Sloan (Robin); grandparents, Jackie Ann Wallace and Marvelle Jean Tartt; aunts, Janette West (Dan), Karen Wallace; uncles, Billy and Bobby Wallace; cousins, Danette Starks (William) and Allison Fair (Chris); nieces and nephews, Annalee Thomas, Alexis Jones, Olivia and Riley Edmonson, Dustin Parker (Brooke), Jake Sloan (Chastity), Lauren Sloan; special friends, Chandler Riggs, Bradley Riggs, Ryan Hill, Jessica Smith (mother of Devina), Hannah Zaragosa, and Courtlyn McCollum.

IN RECOGNITION OF AZERBAIJAN REPUBLIC DAY

HON. RANDY HULTGREN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Republic of Azerbaijan as it recently celebrated the 99th anniversary of Republic Day.

On May 28, 1918, the Azerbaijani National Council proclaimed the independence of Azerbaijan and the establishment of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic. Thus, Azerbaijan became the first democratic parliamentary republic in the Muslim world.

Since that day nearly a century ago and especially over the last 25 years, the United States has striven to develop, grow, and enhance its relationship with Azerbaijan and the Azerbaijani people.

Azerbaijan is an ethnically diverse country where the predominately Muslim population coexists with Christian, Jewish, and other religious communities. The country has emerged as a leader in energy markets in the Caspian Region for several years now. The United

States has long supported Azerbaijan's achievements and the United States seeks to maintain a strong bilateral economic relationship through the promotion of trade and investment.

The United States and Azerbaijan continue to foster a strong and sturdy partnership and cooperate on economic and security issues. Azerbaijan has taken critical steps toward working with the United States on counterterrorism efforts. The American people appreciate and are grateful for the solid bilateral relationship forged over the years with Azerbaijan.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Azerbaijan and its people on this the 99th anniversary commemorating Republic Day.

SERENITY GARCIA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Serenity Garcia for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Serenity Garcia is a student at Moore Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Serenity Garcia is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Serenity Garcia for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING GARY LETTERLY

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend Gary Letterly for his dedication to the agricultural community and congratulate him on his retirement after 25 years with University of Illinois Extension.

For nearly three decades, Gary has worked at the Extension office in Christian County, contributing to local economic development projects within the county. In this role, Gary was able to establish an Enterprise Zone along Route 29 and create "Community Swaps" which helped connect community leaders and elected officials to similarly-sized communities in the state as a way to help those officials learn and grow in their positions.

As his career progressed, Gary's unique specializations and insight helped to broaden

the focus and expand the impact of the University of Illinois Extension Office. His broad range of skills greatly impacted the production of local row-crops as well as homeowner lawn and pest issues.

I am proud to recognize Mr. Letterly's work on behalf of the agricultural community and wish him all the best in his retirement.

HONORING HUBERT MILLS

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the world has changed much over the last 100 years. If you want to know just how much, ask Mr. Hubert Mills of Hot Springs, Arkansas. The year of Mr. Mills' birth was eventful—the U.S. faced uncertainty as President Woodrow Wilson prepared our nation for World War I, the Chicago White Sox won the world series, and the man who would become the 35th U.S. President, John F. Kennedy, was born.

In his 100 years of life, Mr. Mills saw America win two world wars and put a man on the moon. He has lived through the administrations of 18 presidents of the United States and experienced the American dream.

During 100 years, he has worked a variety of jobs from driving a sprinkler truck at the local race track at age 20 to working as a driver for Railway Express. But Mr. Mills made a name for himself building homes in the Hot Springs region, retiring at the age of 95, though he still does work for his many customers.

At 100-years-old, Mr. Mills is surrounded by many loved ones, including his three children, six grandchildren, and 11 great grandchildren. As Mr. Mills celebrates his 100th birthday on Friday, June 9, 2017, I would like to wish him a happy birthday.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 10TH AN- NIVERSARY OF THE UNITED HEALTH FOUNDATION'S DIVERSE SCHOLARS INITIATIVE

HON. TIMOTHY J. WALZ

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, continuing to modernize the health care system requires improving the quality and delivery of health care, the backbone of which is our health workforce. I am proud to have the opportunity today to talk about a group of promising students from around the country. This year's United Health Foundation Diverse Scholars Initiative scholarship recipients represent 36 states, and they are some of the brightest individuals preparing to enter the health workforce.

They are working hard in their undergraduate, graduate and doctorate programs—whether they are studying to be physicians, nurses, dentists, or mental health providers—to increase the number of skilled professionals entering the health workforce. This is key to

the future of our nation's health: we need a robust health care workforce in order to increase access to care in rural areas and across the nation.

Beyond their academic achievements, I would also like to recognize their commitment to making the health care system more culturally relevant and their dedication to improving the health outcomes of the individuals they will one day serve. Research shows that when people are treated by health professionals who share their language, culture, or ethnicity, they are more likely to accept and receive medical treatment. That is why these students will be a great asset to our nation's health care system.

Next week, these scholars will be joining us in Washington, D.C. to examine some of the nation's most urgent health care issues and potential solutions as part of the Diverse Scholars Forum. Celebrating its 10th anniversary this year, the United Health Foundation's Diverse Scholars Initiative has helped more than 2,000 multicultural students from across the country realize their dreams of pursuing careers in health while meeting the needs of local and underserved communities. This year, these scholars include a group of military spouses pursuing health careers who have received scholarships, and I would like to recognize their commitment to becoming part of the future health workforce and for their sacrifices and service to our nation.

To these exceptional scholars, congratulations and best wishes for success in all of your future endeavors. As a teacher, I'm proud to know that we have scholars like you who are ready to lead us into a new era of better and more efficient health care. I know that our nation's health care system will benefit from your hard work and talent.

Aviva Aguilar, Fatima Ahmad, Maria Alfaro, Sainfer Aliyu, Cesar Andrade, Austere Apolo, Shantrice Appleby, Janetci Arevalo, Melissa Avila, Kwame Awuku, Kane Banner, Cristina Batarse, Simone Batiste, Shanell Becenti, Asma Begum, Ashleigh Bennett, Michael Bervell, Carlene Black, Ashley Blackwell, Ruth Campos, Girah Caraballo, Suzanne Carvajal-Pinos, Danelle Cooper, Radha Dahal, Ana Maria De Leon, Angelica Duque, Marissa Emadi, Rebecca Espinoza, Gerardo Flores, Clarissa Flores, Itzel Garcia Vasquez, Raffaella Garofanelli, Jeremy Garriga, Jashalynn German, Claudio Gonzalez, Paula-Ann Granston, Katie Haynes, Ray Hill, Shakura Howard, Wesley Hungbui, Ronald Ikech, Jalane Jara, Karianne Jones, Ramanjot Kaur, Leslie Kedelty, Cleo Klopffleisch, Vin Lay, Than Le, Amy Liang, Christine Loftis, Dylan Lopez, Quentin Loyd, Mabel Luo, Andrew Ly, Maria Madrigal, Alexann Masiko-Meyer, Beverley Mateo, Karen Mendez, Justin Mollison, Kimberley Mondestin, Christian Monsalve, Maria Moreno Valencia, Krista Morine, Egypt Muhammad, Marilyn Ndukwe, Ronke Olowojesiku, Chiemeka Onyima, Victoria Ordaz-Garcia, Laura Sofia Ortega Flores, Angelika Pasion, Sylvia Pena, Laura Penalo, Joshua Platero, Anna Quintanilla, Alejandro Rabionet, Grace Ramirez, Caesar Rangel, Kimyetta Robinson, Franklyn Rocha Cabrero, Victoria Rodriguez, Nancy Roque, Giovanni Rosas Escobedo, Leah Ruiz, Valeria Salazar Balli, Kelly Sanchez, Mariah Smith, Alcha

Strane, Maylei Suen, Brenda Talamantes, Lisa Tu, Ifeanyi Uche, Best Uchehara, Madelyne Valdez, Jennifer Villalobos, Sebastian Villegas, Joaquin Villegas, Craig Washington, Veronica Williams, Davontae Willis, Bethany Womack, Chaoyan Yu, Ashley Zapata.

SHELBY SCHINDLER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Shelby Schindler for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Shelby Schindler is a student at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Shelby Schindler is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Shelby Schindler for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, due to the birth of my first child I was unable to be present for votes taken May 18 through 19, 22, and 24 through 25, as well as for some votes on May 23. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Roll Call Vote Number 263 (Previous Question on H. Res. 324): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 264 (Passage of H. Res. 324): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 265 (Passage of H.R. 115, the Thin Blue Line Act): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 266 (Passage of H.R. 1892, the Honoring Hometown Heroes Act): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 267 (Passage of H. AMDT. 117 to H.R. 1039 offered by Rep. SHEILA JACKSON LEE): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 268 (Passage of H.R. 1039, the Probation Officer Protection Act of 2017): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 269 (Passage of H.R. 1862, the Global Child Protection Act of 2017): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 270 (Passage of H.R. 1842, the Strengthening Children's Safety Act): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 273 (Passage of H.R. 2288, the Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act of 2017): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 274 (Motion to Table): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 275 (Previous Question on H. Res. 352): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 276 (Passage of H. Res. 352): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 277 (Passage of H.R. 2052, the Protecting the Rights of Individuals Against Technological Exploitation (PRIVATE) Act): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 278 (Passage of H.R. 467, the VA Scheduling Accountability Act): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 279 (Passage of H. AMDT. 118 to H.R. 953 offered by Rep. ELIZABETH ESTY): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 280 (Passage of H. AMDT. 119 to H.R. 953 offered by Rep. JARED HUFFMAN): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 281 (Motion to Recommit on H.R. 953): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 282 (Passage of H.R. 953, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 283 (Passage of H. AMDT. 124 to H.R. 1761 offered by Rep. SHEILA JACKSON LEE): NO.

Roll Call Vote Number 284 (Passage of H.R. 1761, the Protecting Against Child Exploitation Act of 2017): YES.

Roll Call Vote Number 285 (H.R. 1973, the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act of 2017): YES.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 7, I joined the Vice President for an important event at Johnson Space Center in my congressional district. As a result, I missed the following recorded votes:

On roll call Number 288, ordering the previous question on House Resolution 374, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On roll call Number 289, agreeing to House Resolution 374, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On roll call Number 290, ordering the previous question on House Resolution 375, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On roll call Number 291, agreeing to House Resolution 375, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On roll call Number 292, the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair, had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On roll call Number 293, passage of an amendment to H.R. 2213, had I been present I would have voted "no."

On roll call Number 294, passage of H.R. 2213, had I been present I would have voted "yes." I am pleased that my colleagues in the House voted to pass the Anti-Border Corruption Reauthorization Act of 2017 that will enable the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to fulfill its duty to protect the American people by waiving specific pre-employment requirements for certain qualified candidates to make the hiring process more expedient. The

CBP is currently understaffed below its congressionally mandated level and this bill will help alleviate this staffing shortage.

**TRIBUTE TO MADELEINE BERMAN
AND HER LATE HUSBAND,
MANDELL BERMAN**

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to two remarkable people from my home state of Michigan, Madeleine Berman and her late husband, Mandell Berman. The Bermans are being honored by the Detroit Symphony Orchestra (DSO) at its seventh annual Heroes Gala on June 10, 2017 for their significant contributions to the DSO, which plays a vital role in the vibrant cultural fabric of Southeast Michigan.

For many of us privileged with the long and warm personal friendship with Madge and Bill Berman, who passed away at the age of 99 last December, this Heroes Gala provides the opportunity to give thanks for the blessings of their generosity to the DSO, as well as a very broad range of community interests.

In recognition of his leadership, Bill Berman was given the Russell G. Mawby Award by the Council of Michigan Foundations in 2012, and he was inducted into the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Madge Berman has served two terms on the President's Committee for the Arts, to which she was appointed by President Bill Clinton in 1994 and reappointed by President Barack Obama in 2009, and received the national Legacy Award from Americans for the Arts, which she has served as a board member since 1989.

Their passion for the arts and education truly came together in Bill and Madge's support for the DSO, particularly in their vision and support for its "Live from Orchestra Hall: Classroom Edition" program. Grounded in her background in music, communication and theater, Madge Berman wanted to find a way to use technology to help bring the experience of the orchestra to young people in Detroit who may otherwise not be exposed to it. She and Bill brought the idea to the leadership of the DSO, and "Live from Orchestra Hall: Classroom Edition" was born. This one of a kind webcast series aimed at youth is made available at no cost to every classroom in the Detroit Public Schools Community District, and students from throughout the United States and the world have experienced the beauty of orchestral music through its availability on the DSO's website. A Teacher's Resource Guide is also available on the website to enable educators to create lessons accompanying the concerts.

With their devotion of time and financial resources, they have supported a wide array of organizations in the promotion of education, animal welfare, the arts, and hunger alleviation. Bill Berman was for nearly endless decades a uniquely inspirational force in the Jewish community. In education, he was co-founder of the Jewish Education Services of North America and funded the University of

Michigan Hillel, which bears his name, as well as holding vital posts in a large number of Jewish organizations in Michigan and nationally. Combining their love of theater and Jewish education, Bill and Madge Berman founded the Berman Center for the Performing Arts at the Jewish Community Center in West Bloomfield, Michigan.

As Mark Davidoff, chairman of the DSO's board of directors, told the Detroit Jewish News, "What I learned from the Bermans is the art of stewardship. The manner in which they curated their financial and community commitments is a lesson for us all. They created a sustainable legacy in areas important to all of us, including community cohesion, education, and arts and culture."

When the Detroit Symphony Orchestra performs, from Beethoven to Gershwin, on Saturday, June 10 at the Heroes Concert and Gala, it will indeed be sounding fervent notes of tribute to two true heroes.

SIERRA GIFFORD

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sierra Gifford for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Sierra Gifford is a student at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sierra Gifford is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sierra Gifford for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

**CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT
OF NANCY ZIRKIN**

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the bold visionary leadership of Nancy Zirkon, who is retiring as Executive Vice President and Director of Policy at the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

It has been my privilege to work with Nancy for three decades, and to witness first-hand her relentless commitment to justice and opportunity for hard working families. Every day, with every fight she has championed the civil, human and economic rights of those all too often left behind in America.

Nancy Zirkon retires with a towering legacy of legislative achievement to her credit. At the Leadership Conference, Nancy was instrumental in the passage of the ADA Amendments of 2008, the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 and the historic Dodd-Frank Wall Street consumer financial protections law.

Before that, Nancy was the Director of Public Policy and Government Relations at the American Association for University Women, where she worked on the ERA ratification and the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Nancy knows how to bring diverse players together, from the Chamber of Commerce to the civil rights community, to secure progress in the lives of the American people. She has been an invaluable leader, coordinating legislative campaigns that win over the last decade. She is tireless and forceful—and she won't accept no for an answer.

Beyond her professional service, Nancy is a promoter of countless women running for office and a devoted grandmother. She is a civic leader and with her husband Harold, a dedicated philanthropist on causes from childhood hunger to access to medical care for all.

On behalf of her many friends in Congress on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol, and as a fellow proud daughter of Baltimore, I commend Nancy Zirkon on a lifetime of transformational public service. As she begins this new chapter of her life, I wish her well in all her future endeavors.

**A COMPREHENSIVE PROACTIVE
CYBERSECURITY STRATEGY**

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, World War III is raging in cyber space right now. It has become one of the most crucial homeland and global security issues.

In May, there was a global cyberattack—most likely by the North Koreans—that was reported to have hit 200,000 computers in more than 150 countries.

Last year, our Presidential elections came under cyber attack, possibly compromising the American electoral system. According to a January report of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, "Russian efforts to influence the 2016 presidential election represent the most recent expression of Moscow's longstanding desire to undermine the US-led liberal democratic order." The United States is not alone. There were press reports of a massive cyber hack of French President Emmanuel Macron's campaign.

This is an issue that impacts the security of the United States and our allies. We cannot wait for the next attack. Instead, we must have a comprehensive, proactive cybersecurity strategy. That is why I am introducing legislation today.

First, my legislation will call on the Department of Defense to update its cyber strategy. Second, it will require the President to draft a strategy for offensive cyber capabilities. Finally, it authorizes international cooperation,

including building up NATO partner cyber capabilities.

My legislation will increase our offensive cyber abilities to help prevent our adversaries from engaging in the types of cyber espionage we witnessed during the past election and in recent global cyber attacks. Protecting our networks is vital to the security of our nation and allies, and my legislation works towards that end.

TRIBUTE TO ROSE ALLSTON
WOODSIDE

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join me as I rise to pay tribute to Mrs. Rose Allston Woodside, and the many contributions she made as a dedicated community member of Newark, New Jersey.

Born and raised in Newark, New Jersey, Mrs. Woodside is a long-time, exemplary resident of Newark's Central Ward. She lived in Newark for 89 years, where she made an amazing impact on her community. As a young woman living on Hillside Place in Newark in the 1940s, she was a wonderful ballroom dancer and participated in local lindy hop dances at Newark's Kruger Auditorium. She received her high school diploma from South Side High School which laid the foundation for a successful career in the secretarial and stenography field. She contributed her service as an Executive Assistant at the Newark Housing Authority (NHA) for over 30 years. At the NHA, she became a founding member of the Local 305 Service Employees International Union, and served as its Corresponding Secretary.

Mrs. Woodside's love for her community is unquestioned as she spent much of her time engaging in many civic and community activities. She was a founding member of The Lomars, a Newark social club, which supported the candidacy of Newark's first African American mayor, Kenneth Gibson. In addition, she was an officer and member of the Board of Directors of the High Park Garden housing cooperative in Newark's Central Ward.

Mrs. Woodside has been an amazing member of the St. James A.M.E. Church for 71 years. In her church she served for over 20 years, as a member and officer of the Marie B. Moses Scholarship Committee for over 20 years, which provided college scholarships for high school students. Also, Mrs. Woodside loved to travel. She has visited several countries, including South Africa, which she visited four times. Her love to experience different cultures transpired through her work as a member of the Experienced Seniors Club, where she helped to plan trips and cultural events for other senior citizens living in Newark. Furthermore, for many years she was a poll worker in Newark's Central Ward. At 90, her hobby consists of making beautifully designed tissue boxes for family members and friends.

Throughout her time in Newark, she developed special bonds with many members of

her community including with Mayor Baraka's grandmother, who she was best friends with. Not only is Mrs. Woodside a cherished resident of Newark, she is also a beloved mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother.

Mr. Speaker, I know my fellow members of the U.S. House of Representatives agree that Mrs. Rose Allston Woodside deserves to be recognized for a job well done and for many years of service to the Newark community.

SOPHIE OSCAR

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sophie Oscar for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Sophie Oscar is a student at North Arvada Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sophie Oscar is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sophie Oscar for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 8, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 13

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense budget posture in re-

view of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2018 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Justice.

SD-192

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Kevin Allen Hassett, of Massachusetts, to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and Pamela Hughes Patenaude, of New Hampshire, to be Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-538

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 and revenue proposals.

SD-608

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the effectiveness of existing Federal permitting processes, compare and contrast Federal permitting and state permitting, and examine how Federal permitting can be improved.

SD-366

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, Annie Caputo, of Virginia, and David Wright, of South Carolina, each to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and Susan Parker Bodine, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-406

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of State.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the cost of prescription drugs, focusing on how the drug delivery system affects what patients pay.

SD-430

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Agriculture.

SD-124

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of State.

SD-192

- Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Transportation. SD-138
- Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower
To hold hearings to examine Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2018 and the Future Years Defense Program. SR-222
- Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy
To hold hearings to examine state-sponsored cyberspace threats, focusing on recent incidents and United States policy response. SD-419
- Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings to examine S. 1250, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to improve the recruitment and retention of employees in the Indian Health Service, restore accountability in the Indian Health Service, improve health services, S. 1275, to improve the housing conditions and promote useful land uses within tribal communities, and an original bill entitled, "HUD/VA Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing". SD-628
- JUNE 14
- 9:30 a.m.
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
To hold hearings to examine the Romanian anti-corruption process, focusing on successes and excesses. SVC-212-210
- 9:45 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of John Kenneth Bush, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Kevin Christopher Newsom, of Alabama, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, and Damien Michael Schiff, of California, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims. SD-226
- 10 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine paving the way for self-driving vehicles. SR-253
- Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine S. 517, to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for Reid vapor pressure limitations under such Act. SD-406
- Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine ideology and terror, focusing on understanding the tools, tactics, and techniques of violent extremism. SD-342
- 10:30 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Department of Defense
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Defense. SD-192
- 11 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Legislative Branch
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Senate Sergeant at Arms and the Capitol Police. SD-124
- 2 p.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Water and Power
To hold hearings to examine S. 440, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, S. 677, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, S. 685, to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System and the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System in the States of Montana and North Dakota, S. 930, to require the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration to establish a pilot project to provide increased transparency for customers, S. 1012, to provide for drought preparedness measures in the State of New Mexico, S. 1029, to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to exempt certain small hydroelectric power projects that are applying for relicensing under the Federal Power Act from the licensing requirements of that Act, and S. 1030, to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to submit to Congress a report on certain hydropower projects. SD-366
- 2:30 p.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the National Nuclear Security Administration. SD-138
- Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for veterans' programs and fiscal year 2019 advance appropriations requests. SR-418
- Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine military caregivers, focusing on families serving for the long run. SD-106
- 3 p.m.
Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine tax reform, focusing on removing barriers to small business growth. SR-428A
- JUNE 15
- 9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2018 and the Future Years Defense Program. SD-G50
- 10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for the Forest Service. SD-366
- JUNE 20
- 10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of the Interior. SD-366
- 2:30 p.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining
To hold hearings to examine collaborative initiatives, focusing on restoring watersheds and large landscapes across boundaries through state and Federal partnerships. SD-366
- JUNE 22
- 10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Energy. SD-366
- JUNE 27
- 10:30 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Labor. SD-138